The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini

Volume VI

English Translation of Adhyāyas Seven and Eight with Sanskrit Text, Transliteration, Word-Boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices

Rama Nath Sharma

This volume of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini* contains English translation of *adhyāyas* seven and eight. It includes Sanskrit text of individual *sūtras* with their transliteration, word-boundaries, indication of inflectional endings and formation of compounds. Each *sūtra* is also furnished with *anuvṛtti, vṛtti,* examples, detailed explanatory notes and complete derivational history of examples, cited by the *Kāśikāvṛtti.*

Explanatory notes are presented to facilitate proper understanding of individual *sūtras,* especially in view of their formulation, interpretation, application and relative placement in the grammar.

An attempt has been made to sort out and explain pertinent issues, as raised and discussed by major commentaries particularly the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. Derivational details of examples, unlike earlier volumes, are furnished under explanatory notes of individual rules. This completes the author's six-volume study on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.*

This volume of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini* contains English translation of *adhyāyas* seven and eight. It includes Sanskrit text of individual *sūtras* with their transliteration, word-boundaries, indication of inflectional endings and formation of compounds. Each *sūtra* is also furnished with *anuvṛtti, vṛtti,* examples, detailed explanatory notes and complete derivational history of examples, cited by the *Kāśikāvṛtti.*

Explanatory notes are presented to facilitate proper understanding of individual *sūtras,* especially in view of their formulation, interpretation, application and relative placement in the grammar.

An attempt has been made to sort out and explain pertinent issues, as raised and discussed by major commentaries particularly the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. Derivational details of examples, unlike earlier volumes, are furnished under explanatory notes of individual rules. This completes the author's six-volume study on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.*

Rama Nath Sharma was born (1939) at Chhata, Ballia (India), as the eldest son of Pandit Raghunath Sharma, the author of the commentary *Ambākartrī* on the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari. He is currently Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA. After receiving M.A. in Hindi literature (Allahabad, 1959) and Linguistics (Agra, 1962), he taught Linguistics and Hindi literature at the University of Allahabad (1962-66). He received his Ph.D. (1971) in General Linguistics from the University of Rochester where he also taught Linguistics for five years (1970-75). His research interest includes Linguistic theory in general, and Pāṇini and the Indian grammatical tradition, in particular.

THE AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ OF PĀṆINI

VOL. VI

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF *ADHYĀYAS* SEVEN AND EIGHT WITH SANSKRIT TEXT, TRANSLITERATION, WORD-BOUNDARY, *ANUVṚTTI, VṚTTI,* EXPLANATORY NOTES, DERIVATIONAL HISTORY OF EXAMPLES, AND INDICES

RAMA NATH SHARMA
University of Hawaii



Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

ISBN 81-215-0051-6 (for the set)
ISBN 81-215-1051-1 (Vol. VI)
First published 2003

© 2003, **Sharma,** Rama Nath

All rights reserved, including those of translations into other languages. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written permission of the publisher.

Typeset, printed and published by
Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.,
Post Box 5715, 54 Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110 055.

For my wife
Kamala
without whose support
I could not complete this study

Contents

Preface xi

Abbreviations xv

Adhyāya Seven 1

Adhyāya Eight 409

Bibliography 795

Index of Derivations 803

Index of Terms 806

Index of Sūtras 811

Preface

I planned this project on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini* in August of 1978. My initial plan was to produce a five-volume study of which the first was to be a theoretical treatment of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as a grammatical device. Since subsequent volumes grew in size, and also since volume two could only cover the first *adhyāya*, I had to plan a sixth volume covering the rules of the seventh and eighth *adhyāyas*.

Many of my ideas on formulation, interpretation, order and application of rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* found their better shape during discussions at the Summer Institute of Linguistics (1978), in Honolulu, where I was teaching a course on Pāṇini. The first volume was written during 1982-83, mostly at Varanasi, where I was on sabbatical leave. Since this volume was basically a presentation of my ideas on aspects of rule-formulation, order and application, and also since I wanted to avoid repetition, it was a relatively shorter volume.

Volume II was big, but could only cover the first *adhyāya*, mostly because of a very detailed appendix on derivational history of examples cited by the *Kāśikāvṛtti* under individual rules. This volume pretty much set the trend for all subsequent volumes. Volume III covered *adhyāyas* two and three, where derivational history of examples had to be given comparatively larger space. Volume IV is perhaps the largest because of the sheer number of rules of *adhyāyas* four and five. Derivations and explanatory notes, however, demanded relatively less space. The fifth volume had to be published independently, due mostly to the nature of its content and size. Volume VI, of course, had to cover the remaining two *adhyāyas*, seven and eight. I had intended to publish the *tripādī* (the last three quarters of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*) as a separate volume which, obviously, was not possible.

I have always followed traditional interpretations in sorting out issues concerning formulation, interpretation, order and application of rules. In doing that, I have not taken anything for granted. While the *Kāśikāvṛtti* has been my main source for organizing explanatory notes, its commentaries, the *Nyāsa* of Jinendrabuddhi and the *Padamañjarī* of Haradatta, have been my primary sources for raising issues and resolving conflicts of interpretations. I have consulted the *Mahābhāṣya* for *vārttikas*, and also to understand clearly Haradatta's statements on the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. I have relied heavily on the *Rūpāvatāra* of Dharmakīrtti, the *Prakriyā-kaumudī* of Rāmacandra, and last but not the least, the *Siddhānta-kaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, for derivational details. While my mind has always remained open to interpretations of the learned (*śiṣṭa*), especially Nāgeśa, Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita of the new school of grammar (*navya-vyākaraṇa*), my heart always remained in favor

of the old school in general, and the *Kāśikāvṛtti* with the *Nyāsa* and *Padamañjarī*, in particular. Patañjali, of course, remained my final authority on all aspects of discussions:

> *kṛte' tha patañjalinā guruṇā tīrthadarśinā /*
> *sarveṣāṃ nyāyabījānāṃ bhāṣya eva nibandhane //*
>
> (*VP* II:477)

The task of preparing these volumes has been very challenging, especially when it came to fully understanding the intricacies of this grammar, and more so when it came to writing in the English language. I have tried my best to present my translations, notes, and derivations, in a non-technical way focusing primarily on ease of understanding of my readers both Sanskritists and linguists. Works of George Cardona, Brahmadatta Jijñāsu / Prajñā Devī, S.M. Katre, Harshanath Mishra, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, Charudeva Shastri, Bhimasena Shastri and Jayashankar Lal Tripathi have proved to be of great help. A few summers ago I studied the *aṅgādhikāra* and *tripādī* with commentaries, in detail, with Pandit Ramaprasad Tripathi. I was fortunate to have his permission to record all sessions. These recordings have proved extremely valuable for my explanatory notes on rules of the *aṅgādhikāra* and *tripādī*. Commentators rejoice in expatiation (*prapañca*), albeit out of compassion for knowers but only of part-truths (*siddhāntaika-deśin*). But this resort to expatiation also shows their great acumen in diving into a much deeper realm of grammatical speculation and argumentation. I am guilty of following in their foot-steps, albeit with shaky feet, in my notes under rules 7.1.18 *auṅ āpaḥ*, 7.1.35 *tuhyos tātaṅ . . .*, 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*, 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca* and 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*. I hope this will give my reader some ideas about the depth of grammatical thinking in ancient India. For, my effort in expatiation is certainly not guided by any compassion for slow-wit (*manda-dhī*).

Many traditional insights of the Vārāṇasī school on organization and function of rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, especially those pertaining to some major interpretive conventions and rules, for example, 1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam*, 3.1.94 *vā' sarūpo' striyām*, 4.1.1 *ṅyāpprātipadikāt*, 6.4.1 *aṅgasya*, 6.4.22 *asiddhavad atrābhāt*, and 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*, deserve separate treatments. I am grateful to my father Pandit Raghunath Sharma, and my guru Pandit Ramaprasad Tripathi, for teaching me about the richness of this tradition. I have also benefited from reading *adhyāya* three with Śrīnārāyaṇa Miśra of the Banaras Hindu University. I owe an enormous debt to these scholars. I am grateful to Dr. Vidya Niwas Mishra, Dr. G.C. Pande and Dr. Namvar Singh for their continued support and encouragement. As I have already indicated in the preface of my earlier volumes, this project has been very difficult and time-consuming. It has taken nearly twenty-five years of diligent work. I may have made many erros in interpretation and presentation. I

plan to edit these volumes so that their second edition could be made free of typos, and any possible errors. The second reprint edition of the first volume is already published with some additions.

My younger brother Narendra Nath Pandeya of the Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, Varanasi, must get credit, not only for reading and explaining things to me, but also for keeping my western analytical mind in check, grounded in the tradition. I commend him for his patience with the eldest brother. My son Alok has virtually grown up with this project. He deserves my sincere appreciation, and love, for his patience and understanding.

The American Institute of Indian Studies, and the University of Hawaii's Research Council and Research Relations, have been regular supporters of this project with grants and logistical assistance. They deserve my thanks. My former Hindi-Sanskrit students, Stanley Schab, Julie Trott, Abigail Brown, and Christopher Bopp, have worked on this project at different stages. They deserve more than mere thanks. Christopher Bopp has the credit of seeing the last four volumes through press. His competence in things computer has been a blessing for me. I shall, forever, remain indebted to Chris Bopp for his diligent assistance. I must thank Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, particularly Mr. Devendra Jain, for their patience and dedication in bringing this series to light. What a relief?

I dedicate this volume to my wife Kamala without whose love and support I would not have been able to bring this project to a successful completion.

gahanataragranthārthān
vīkṣya maṅkṣu saṃkṣipatām /
skhalitam api sambhaven nas
tatra vibhudhā vimatsarāḥ śaraṇam //

Prakriyāsarvasvam (I:79) of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa

RAMA NATH SHARMA

University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.
1 November 2002

Abbreviations

abl	ablative
acc	accusative
Ait	*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*
bv	*bahuvrīhi*
cat tat	*caturthī-tatpuruṣa*
DP	*Dhātupāṭha*
dat	dative
du	dual
dv	*dvandva*
dvi tat	*dvitīyā-tatpuruṣa*
itar dv	*itaretara-dvandva*
fem	feminine
GP	*Gaṇapāṭha*
gen	genitive
inst	instrumental
int	internal
KS	*Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā*
Kāś	*Kāśikāvṛtti* of Vāmana Jayāditya with *Padamañjarī (PM)* of Haradatta and the *Nyāsa* of Jinendrabuddhi
loc	locative
LS	*Laghuśabdenduśekhara* of Nāgeśa
Mbh	*Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* of Patañjali with the *Pradīpa* of Kaiyaṭa and the *Udyota* of Nāgeśa
masc	masculine
nañ tat	*nañ-tatpuruṣa*
neut	neuter
nom	nominative
PM	*Padamañjarī* of Haradatta as *Kāśikāvṛtti* of Vāmana Jayāditya
PŚ	*Paribhāṣenduśekhara* of Nāgeśa
Pai	*Paippalāda Saṃhitā*
pbh	*paribhāṣā*
pañc	*pañcamī*
pl	plural
RV	*Ṛgveda*
SK	*Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita with the *Bālamanoramā* of Vāsudeva Dīkṣita, and the *Tattvabodhinī* of Jñānendra Sarasvatī
SP	*Sūtrapāṭha*
sam	*samāhāra*

sg	singular
Śs	*Śivasūtra*
Śat	*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*
ṣaṣ	*ṣaṣṭhī*
Tai	*Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*
tat	*tatpuruṣa*
tr/tṛt	*tṛtīyā*
VP	*Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari with the commentary *Ambākartrī* of Pandit Raghunath Sharma
vt	*vārttika*
Vāj	*Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā*
voc	vocative

Adhyāya Seven

Pāda One

7.1.1 युवोरनाकौ

yuvor anākau
/yuvoḥ 6/1 = *yuś ca vuś ca* = *yuvu* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya; anākau* 1/2 = *anaś ca akaś ca* (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
'yu, vu' ity etayor utsṛṣṭaviśeṣaṇayor anunāsikayaṇoḥ pratyayayor grahaṇam, tayoḥ sthāne yathāsaṃkhyam 'ana, aka' ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ
Affixes *yu* and *vu*, in relation to an *aṅga*, are replaced with *ana* and *aka*, respectively.

EXAMPLES:

nandanaḥ 'he who brings joy; a son'
ramaṇaḥ 'delightful, playful'
sāyantanaḥ 'pertaining to an evening'
cirantanaḥ 'eternal'
kārakaḥ 'he who does'
hārakaḥ 'he who carries'
vāsudevakaḥ 'he whose object of devotion is Vāsudeva'
arjunakaḥ 'he whose object of devotion is Arjuna'

1. Consider *nandanaḥ* and *ramaṇaḥ*, both derivates of affix *Lyu* (3.1.134 *nandigrahipacādy* . . .), which, in turn, is introduced after *ṬUnadI* 'to be joyous' and *ramU* 'to sport' with the signification of *kartṛ* 'agent'. Our next two examples, i.e., *sāyantanaḥ* and *cirantanaḥ*, are derivates of affixes *Ṭyu* and *ṬyuL* (4.3.23 *sāyaṃciraṃ* . . . *tuṭ ca*), respectively, where, in addition to affixes *Ṭyu* and *ṬyuL*, we also find a concurrent introduction of augment *tUṬ*. The *yu* of these affixes, all, is hereby replaced with *ana*. Refer to derivational details of *kārakaḥ* and *hārakaḥ* (II:450) where *vu* (of affix *ṆvuL*) is replaced with *aka*. Examples such as *vāsudevakaḥ* and *arjunakaḥ* are derivates of *vuN* (4.3.98 *vāsudevārjunābhyāṃ vun*).

Note that *yu* and *vu*, for brevity of application (*lāghavārtham śāstrasya*), are here interpreted as affixes relative to an item termed *aṅga* (1.4.13 *yasmāt pratyayavidhis* . . .). For, in its absence, *ana* and *aka* could widely replace any *yu* and *vu*. This specification of *yu* and *vu*, made without any qualifying *it*-elements, is accepted as made with *anunāsika* 'nasalization'. Thus, *yu* of the non-nasalized *yuS* (5.2.123 *ūrṇāyaḥ yus*), introduced after *ūrṇā* (in *ūrṇāyuḥ*) with the signification of *matUP* (*ūrṇā asya asti*; 5.2.94 *tad asyāsty* . . .), cannot be replaced with *ana*.

The *Uṇādi* affixes *yuK* and *tyuK* can similalrly not be replaced with ***ana***, when occurring after *bhujI* 'to consume' and *mṛN* 'to die', as in *bhujyuḥ* 'food' and *mṛtyuḥ* 'death'.

How do we know that these specifications are made with nasalization. It is known by the tradition. This is how the *pāṇinīyas* know what is taught by Pāṇini with nasalization (*pratijñānunāsikyāḥ pāṇinīyāḥ*).

2. Questions have been raised against *yuvoḥ*, the genitive dual of *yuvū* with *os*. For, as a *dvandva* compound of the type *samāhāra*, the form should have been *yuvanaḥ*, a singular neuter with *nUM* (7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*). If interpreted as a *dvandva* compound of the *itaretarayoga* kind, the dual form, with *yaN* before *os*, should have been *yuvvoḥ*. How do we get *yuvoḥ*? It is stated that *yuvoḥ* is a dual of the *itaretarayoga* type where augment *nUM* can be accepted as *anitya* 'non-obligatory'. Thus, given *yuvū* + *Ṅas*, we will get *yuvoḥ*, through *guṇa* (*yuv*(*u*→*o*) + *as*; 7.3.11 *gher ṅiti*), *pūrvarūpa* (*yuv*(*o* + *a*)*s* = *yuvos*; 6.1.110 *ṅasiṅasoś ca*) and *rutva-visarga* (*yuvo*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*)).

A specification with *yuvoḥ*, with a *dvandva* compound of the *samāhāra* type, can still be accepted as correct. The problem of masculine (*puṃstvam*), as against neuter (*napuṃsakatvam*), can then be resolved by accepting the usage (*loka*) as standard (*pramāṇa*). For, determination of gender is based upon usage (*lokāśrayatvāl liṅgasya*). Thus, *yuvoḥ* follows the derivational pattern of *bhānoḥ*/*śambhoḥ*, etc. If one still insists on accepting the *itaretarayoga* analysis, one has to resort to *chandovat sūtrāṇi bhavanti* '*sūtras* are similar to the Vedic hymns.' The *bahulam* 'variously' provision of the Vedic (*chandasi*) can thus account for a lack, or deletion, of an additional *v* in *yuvoḥ*. The following *ślokavārttika* summarizes this view as follows:

> *yuvoś ced dvitvanirdeśo dvitve yaṇ tu prasajyate/*
> *atha ced ekavadbhāvaḥ kathaṃ puṃvad bhaved ayam//*
> *dvitve naigamiko lopa ekatve num anityatā/*
> *aśiṣyatvādd hi liṅgasya puṃstvaṃ veha samāśritam//*
> 'if *yu* and *vu* are specified together in the dual, with a subsequent introduction of the genitive dual ending *-os*, we will get an application of *yaN* of *u* of *vū* (6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*). If one accepts that *yu* and *vu* are combined together in a *dvandva* compound with the state of denoting one (*ekavadbhāva*), we should get the form *yuvoḥ*, similar to *bhānoḥ* and *śambhoḥ*. But since consideration of the denotation of one would obligatorily require introduction, and subsequent non-deletion, of augment *nUM*, the form should be *yuvunaḥ*, a neuter (*napuṃsaka*). Why are we getting the form *yuvoḥ* similar to masculine *śambhoḥ*? A masculine form is adhered to with the understanding that, since gender is dependent upon usage (*lokāśraya*), gender should not be taught.'

Accepitng a *dvandva*-form such as *yuvoḥ* with no *nUM*, and signification of one (genitive singular), would be tantamount to refuting the formulation

of rule 2.4.17 *sa napuṃsakam.* If the form is to be accepted as *yuvoḥ*, and thereby 2.4.17 *sa napuṃsakam* is saved from becoming vacuous, we have to block introduction of *nUM* on the basis of accepting its augmentation as *anitya* 'non-obligatory'. But what would one do to its teaching of gender? Can we say that it does not teach gender because gender should not be taught? But if this rule does not teach gender, we will not get neuter in many instances of *samāhāra-dvandva.* May be we should accept *yuvoḥ* as a Vedic anamoly (*chāndasatvāt*). I refrain from discussing it any further since that, in view of Haradatta, the author of *Padamañjarī*, will be an exercise in *vanya-gaja-śauca* 'cleansing of a wild elephant'.

7.1.2 आयनेयीनीयियः फढखछघां प्रत्ययादीनाम्

āyaneyīnīyiyaḥ phaḍhakhachaghāṃ pratyayādīnām
/āyan-ey-īn-īy-iyaḥ 1/3 (*itar. dv.*); *pha-ḍha-kha-cha-ghām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
'*āyan, ey, īn, īy, iy*' *ity ete ādeśā bhavanti yathāsaṃkhyaṃ* '*pha, ḍha, kha, cha, gha*' *ity eteṣāṃ pratyayādīnām*
A *phA, ḍhA, khA, chA* and *ghA* which, relative to an *aṅga*, occurs at the beginning of an affix is replaced with *āyan, ey, īn, īy* and *iy*, respectively.

EXAMPLES:

nāḍāyanaḥ 'grandson of Naḍa'
cārāyaṇaḥ 'grandson of Cara'
sauparṇeyaḥ 'son of Suparṇā'
vainateyaḥ 'son of Vinatā'
āḍhyakulīnaḥ 'born in a rich family'
śrotriyakulīnaḥ 'born in the family of śrotriyas'
gārgīyaḥ 'student of Garga'
vātsīyaḥ 'student of Vatsa'
kṣattriyaḥ 'a kṣatriya'

1. The *a* in *pha, ḍha,* etc., is used for ease of articulation (*uccāraṇārtha*). That is, these replacements are intended in place of consonants *ph, ḍh,* etc. (*phakārāder halmātrasya*). The following is a select list of specified affixes:

(*a*) Affixes with initial *ph*: *CphaÑ* (4.1.98 *gotre kuñjādibhyaś ca*), *phaK* (4.1.99 *naḍādibhyaḥ phak*), *phaÑ* (4.1.110 *aśvādibhyaḥ phañ*), *phiÑ* (4.1.159 *tikādibhyaḥ phiñ*), *phiN* (4.1.160 *prācām avṛddhāt . . .*), *Ṣpha* (4.1.17 *prācāṃ ṣphas . . .*), and *ṢphaK* (4.2.99 *kāpiśyāḥ ṣphak*);

(*b*) affixes with initial *ḍh*: *ḍhaK* (4.1.119 *ḍhak ca maṇḍūkāt*), *ḍhaKAÑ* (4.1.140 *apūrvapadād . . .*), *ḍhaÑ* (4.1.135 *catuṣpādbhyo ḍhañ*), *ḍhinUK* (4.3.109 *chagalino ḍhinuk*), and *ḍhraK* (4.1.129 *godhāyā ḍhrak*);

(*c*) affixes with initial *kh*: *kha* (4.1.139 *kulāt khaḥ*), *khaÑ* (4.1.142 *mahākulād añkhañau*);
(*d*) affixes with initial *ch*: *cha* (4.1.143 *svasuś chaḥ*), *chaṆ* (4.1.132 *pitṛṣvasuś chaṇ*), *chaS* (4.2.115 *bhavataṣ ṭhakchasau*);
(*e*) affixes with initial *gh*: *gha* (4.1.138 *kṣatrād ghaḥ*), *ghaC* (4.4.117 *ghacchau ca*), *ghaN* (4.2.26 *śukrād ghan*) and *ghaS* (5.1.106 *chandasi ghas*).

Derivational details of many forms similar to these examples have already been discussed in the appendices of volumes (II) and (IV).

2. The condition of *pratyayādi* is necessary so that root-initial *ph, ḍh, kh, ch* and *gh* in *phakkati, ḍhaukate, khanati, chinatti,* and *ghūrṇate* could not be replaced with corresponding *āyan,* etc. A specification with *ādi* excludes replacement of *gh* with *iy* in *urudaghnaḥ,* where affix *daghnaÑ* contains *gh* in the middle.

This replacement does not apply to an affix introduced after a verbal root. For, if it was intended, 3.1.29 *ṛter īyaṅ* would have been formulated as *ṛteś chaṅ,* where initial *ch* could have then been replaced with *īy* of this rule. The formulation of 3.1.29 as *ṛter īyaṅ* then becomes a *jñāpaka* 'indicator'. A replacement of this rule does not apply to *kh* and *ḍh* of *śaṅkhaḥ* and *ṣaṇḍhaḥ* where affixes *kha* and *ḍha* are introduced after verbal roots *śam* and *ṣaṇ.* This is possible at the strength of rule 3.3.1 *uṇādayo bahulam.*

The *gh* and *kh* of affixes *KHaŚ* (3.2.28 *ejeḥ khaś*) and *GHaÑ* (3.3.16 *padarujaviśaspṛśo ghañ*) cannot be replaced with *īn* and *īy,* either. They are elements termed *it* (1.3.8 *laśakv ataddhite*) and thus cannot be replaced with *īn* and *īy.*

Note that 1.3.3 *halantyam* should be blocked from assigning the term *it* to the final *n* of *āyan* and *in.* This is indicated by *N* as an *it* in *phiN* (4.1.160 *prācām avṛddhāt . . .*). The *N* as an *it* in *phiN* facilitates initial *udātta* (6.1.194 *ñnityādir nityam*). If the *n* of *āyan* and *in* was also considered as an *it,* marking *phiN* with *N* as an *it* will become useless. For, *n* of *āyan* and *in* could have accounted for the desired accent.

3. A proposal is made in the *Mahābhāṣya* to replace *ph* , etc. with *āyan,* etc., at the time when affixes are introduced (*āyannādayaḥ pratyayopadeśakāla eva bhavanti*). This way, the *udātta* (3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*) at the beginning of affixes remains intact. The *C* as an *it* in an affix also becomes meaningful. Thus, consider 4.4.117 *ghacchau ca* where *ghaC,* an affix marked with *C* as an *it,* conditions final *udātta* (6.1.161? *citaḥ*).

It is stated that *āyan,* etc., do not replace affixes which occur after a verbal root. This is indicated by not formulating 3.1.29 *ṛter īyaṅ* as *ṛteś chaṅ.* A formulation with *chaṄ,* with subsequent replacement of *ch* with *īyaṄ,* would have served the purpose. Thus, we do not get replacements for *kh* (*Uṇ.* I:99: *śameḥ khaḥ*) and *ḍh* (*Uṇ.* I:102: *śamer ḍhaḥ*) in *śam + kha = śaṃkha* and *śam + ḍha = śaṇḍha,* vide 3.3.1 *uṇādayo bahulam.* Now consider affixes *KHaŚ* (3.2.28

ejeḥ khaś) and *GHaÑ* (3.3.16 *padarujaviśaspṛśo ghañ*), where *KH* and *GH* are not replaced with *īn* and *īy*. For, they are treated as *it* elements (1.3.8 *laśakv ataddhite*). A substitute replaces *kh* and *gh* in a *taddhita* affix when assignment of the term *it* does not find its scope (*anavakāśa*). What about the final *n* of *āyan*? This cannot be considered as an *it*. It is indicated by the final *n* of *phiN* (4.1.160 *prācām avṛddhāt . . .*). That is, the *ph* of *phiN* is replaced with *āyan* and the affix-final *N* is treated as an *it* to block the *udātta* of 6.1.197 *ñnityādir nityam*. There is no purpose served by using the final *n* as an *it* in *āyan*. Conversely, the *N* of *phiN* becomes vacuous if the final *n* of *āyan* is treated as an *it* (cf. *Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*: *tad etat phino nitkaraṇam itsaṃjñābhāvasya jñāpakam eva. yogāpekṣaṃ cedaṃ jñāpakam—anena yogena vihitasyādeśasya yo nakāras tasyetsaṃjñā na bhavatīti. teneno' pi nakārasyetsaṃjñā' bhāvo bhavati siddaḥ*).

7.1.3 **झोऽन्तः**

jho' ntaḥ
/jhaḥ 6/1 *antaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *pratyayasya* #2)
pratyayāvayavasya jhasya 'anta' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
A *jh* which is contained within an affix, relative to an *aṅga*, is replaced with *antA*.

EXAMPLES:

kurvanti 'they are doing...'
sunvanti 'they are pressing out (soma)'
cinvanti 'they are heaping up (the ritual fire)'
śayāntai ' . . . should recline'
veśantaḥ 'a small pond'
jarantaḥ 'very old'

1. Note that *ādiḥ* is not carried. The final *a* of *anta* is given for ease of articulation (*uccāraṇārtha*). Consider *kurvanti* which derives from *kṛ* + (*LAṬ→jhi*) where *jhi* replaces *LAṬ* (4.1.78 *tiptasjhi . . .*) and *u* is introduced after *kṛ* (3.1.79 *tanādikṛñbhyo uḥ*). Rule 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārddhdhākukayoḥ* (read with 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*), then introduces *ar* as a *guṇa* replacement for *ṛ* of *kṛ* + *u* + *jhi*. The *a* of *k*(*ṛ→ar*) + *u* + *jhi* = *kar* + *u* + *jhi* is then replaced with *u* (6.4.110 *at ut sārvadhātuke*) to produce *k*(*a→u*)*r* + *u* + *jhi*. We finally get *kurvanti* through *yaṆ* of *u* and *ant* as a replacement for *jh*. Thus, *kur* + (*u→v*) + (*jh→ant*)*i*)) = *kurvanti*. Refer to derivational details (II:340) relevant for deriving *cinvanti* and *sunvanti*. Our example *śayāntai*, derived with Vedic *LEṬ* introduced after *śīṄ*, follows the pattern of *gṛhyāntai* (III:900). The last two examples derive with the *Uṇādi* affix *jhaC* where *jh* is replaced with *ant*. The root-vowels *ṝ* and *i* also go through *guṇa* replacements *ar* and *e*.

2. Note that this replacement in *ant* is available only to *jh* of an affix (*Kāś.*: '*pratyayasya*' *ity eva*). Thus, the *jh* of *ujjh* 'to abandon, leave', in *ujjhitā, ujjhitum* and *ujjhitavyam*, does not get replaced with *ant*. It should be remembered here that a replacement in *ant* does not remove the initial *udātta* status of an affix (3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*). For, this is how *C* as an *it* in *jhaC* becomes meaningful. That is, *C* is used as an *it* where initial *udātta* is to be blocked in favor of a final *udātta* (6.1.163 *citaḥ*).

7.1.4 अदभ्यस्तात्

ad abhyastāt
/at 1/1 *abhyastāt* 5/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *pratyayasya* #2 *jhaḥ* #3)
abhyastād aṅgād uttarasya jhakārasya 'at' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
The *jhA* part of an affix which occurs after an *aṅga* termed *abhyasta* is replaced with *aT* (1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*).

EXAMPLES:

dadati 'third person singular present active of *dā*'
dadatu 'second person singular imperative of *dā*'
dadhati 'third person singular active of *dhā*'
dadhatu 'second person singular imperative of *dhā*'
jakṣati 'third person singular present active of *jakṣ*'
jakṣatu 'second person singular imperative of *jakṣ*'
jāgrati 'third person singular present active of *jāgṛ*'
jāgratu 'second person singular imperative of *jāgṛ*'

1. This rule replaces *jh* with *aT* when *jh* is part of an affix and occurs after an *aṅga* termed *abhyasta*. Refer to derivational details of *dadati* and *dadhati* (6.1.5 *jakṣityādayaḥ . . .*), where *dadā + jhi* and *dadhā + jhi* are produced, via reduplication (6.1.10 *ślau*), after deletion of *ŚaP* by *ŚLU*. Our present rule replaces *jh* with *aT* and *ā* of *dadā* and *dadhā* gets deleted by 6.4.112 *śnābhyastayor ātaḥ*. Thus, *dad*(*ā*→ϕ) + (*jh*→*at*) *i* = *dadati*; *dadh*(*ā*→ϕ) + (*jh*→*at*) *i* = *dadhati*. Recall that the final *i* of a replacement of *LOṬ* is replaced with *u* (3.4.86 *eruḥ*). This gives us *dadatu* and *dadhatu*, etc.

This replacement in *aT* blocks *ant* of the earlier rule. Note, however, that this replacement cannot block a replacement in *Jus* (3.4.110 *jher jus*; 3.4.111 *sijabhyasta . . .*). Thus, consider *adaduḥ* and *adadhuḥ*, etc.

Here, too, a replacement, when accomplished at the outset, brings *udātta* at the beginning of the affix. This provision, however, is more relatable to derivates of subsequent rules. Derivates of this rule will get initial *udātta* in consonance with 6.1.189 *abhyastānām ādiḥ*.

7.1.5 आत्मनेपदेष्वनतः

ātmanepadeṣv anataḥ

/ātmanepadeṣu 7/3 *anataḥ* 5/1 = *na at* = *anat* (*nañ.*), *tasmāt*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *jhaḥ* #2 *pratyayasya* #3 *at* #4)
ātmanepadeṣu yo jhakāras tasyānakārāntād aṅgād uttarasya 'at' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
A *jh* which, as part of an affix termed *ātmanepada*, follows an *aṅga* not ending in *na*, is replaced with *aT*.

EXAMPLES:

cinvate 'third person plural present (*LAṬ*) of *ciÑ*'
cinvatām 'third person plural imperative (*LOṬ*) . . .'
acinvata 'third person plural imperfect (*LAṄ*) middlle of *ciÑ*'
punate 'third person plural present (*LAṬ*) middle of *pūÑ*'
lunate 'third person plural present (*LAṬ*) middle of *lūÑ*'
lunatām 'third person plural imperative (*LOṬ*) of *lūÑ*'
alunata '. . . of Aorist (*LUṄ*) . . .'

1. This rule does not apply after an *abhyasta*, or when an *aṅga* terminates in *a*. Consider *cinvate* which derives from *ci* + *LAṬ* where *LAṬ* gets replaced with the third person plural *ātmanepada* suffix *jha*, and *ŚnU* is introduced as a *vikaraṇa* (3.1.73 *svādibhyaḥ śnuḥ*). We derive *ci* + *nu* + (*jh*→*at*) *a* → *cin* + *u* + *at*(*a*→*e*) = *cin* + (*u*→*v*) + *ate* = *cinvate*, through *aT*-replacement of *jh* followed by *etva* (3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ ter eḥ*) and *yaṆ*. This replacement in *jh* occurs after an *aṅga* which here ends in *u*. A replacement in *e* (*etva*) in *cinvatām* is blocked in favor of *ām* (3.4.90 *ām etaḥ*). Thus, *ci* + (*LOṬ*→*jha*) → *ci* + (*jh*→*at*) *a* → *ci* + *nu* + *ata* → *ci* + *nu* + *at* (*a*→*ām*) → *ci* + (*n*(*u*→*v*) + *atām*)) = *cinvatām*. Similar rules apply in deriving derivates of *LAṄ*, such as *acinvata*, etc., where *etva* does not apply since *LAṄ* is not marked with *Ṭ* as an *it*.

Refer to derivational details of *vyatilunate* (II:467-68) for deriving *lunate*.

2. The condition of *ātmanepadeṣu* blocks this replacement where a *parasmaipada* replacement may be involved. Thus, *cinvanti*, etc., will be treated as counter-examples. The condition of an *aṅga* ending in something other than an *a* is also required. Thus, consider *cyavante* and *plavante* which are third plural *LAṬ* forms of *cyu* and *plu*. Given *cyu* + *ŚaP* + *jha* and *plu* + *ŚaP* + *jha*, the *u* of *cyu* and *plu* goes through *guṇa* and its subsequent replacement in *av*. This yields *cy*(*u*→*o*→*av*) + *a* + *jha*. This *jh*, for reason of occurring after an *aṅga* terminating in *a*, cannot be replaced with *aT*. It must then be replaced with *ant*. There is no way other than replacing *jh* with *ant* here. For, *ŚaP* is obligatory (*nitya*). Thus, *cyava* + (*jh*→*ant*) *a* → *cyav*(*a* + *a*→*a*) *nta* → *cyavant*(*a*→*e*) = *cyavante*. Similar rules apply in deriving *plavante*. A derivate such as *śayāntai* must also be excluded from a replacement in *at*. For, *jh* here occurs after *śayā*, an *aṅga* intervened by *āṬ*.

7.1.6 शीङो रुट्

śīṅo ruṭ

/śīṅaḥ 5/1 *ruṭ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *jhaḥ* #3 *at* #4)
śīṅo' ṅgād uttarasya jhādeśasyāto ruḍāgamo bhavati
An *aT* which comes in place of a *jha* contained within an affix following an *aṅga*, namely *śīṄ*, is introduced with augment *rUṬ*.

EXAMPLES:

śerate 'third person plural present (*LOṬ*) middle of *śīṄ*'
śeratām 'third person plural imperative (*LOṬ*) middle . . .'
aśerata 'third person plural middle imperfect (*LAṄ*) . . .'

1. This rule introduces *rUṬ* to the *at*-replacement of *jh* which occurs after *śīṄ*. Consider *śī* + (*LAṬ*→*jha*) → *śī* + (*jh*→*at*) *a* → *śī* + *at*(*a*→*e*) → *śī* + *rUṬ* + *ate* → *ś*(*ī*→*e*) + *r* + *ate* = *śerate*, where *guṇa* is accomplished by 7.4.12 *śīṅaḥ sārvadhātuke guṇaḥ*. A derivate of *LOṬ* will have its *e* replaced with *ām* to yield *śeratām*. A derivate of *LAṄ*, i.e., *aśerata*, will not permit this *e* (*etva*). Note that *rUṬ* is introduced as initial of a form which follows the root. Why can it not be introduced to *jha*? A replacement in *at* for *jh* will be blocked if *rUṬ* was introduced to *jha*. For, *rUṬ* will then intervene. This is why *rUṬ* is introduced after replacing *jh* with *at*.

Why is verbal root *śīṄ* specified here with *Ṅ* as an *it*? So that *rUṬ* can be introduced only when there is no following *yaṄ*. Consider *vyatiśeśyate* which derives from (*vi* + *ati* + *śīṄ* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*)). Affix *yaṄ* is here deleted, but reduplication and replacement in *at*, followed by *etva*, are accomplished. Augment *rUṬ* is not introduced. Note that *Ṅ* as an *it* in *śīṄ* is specified so that *rUṬ* could not be introduced where deletion of *yaN* applies (*a-yaṅ-lugartham*).

7.1.7 वेत्तेर्विभाषा

vetter vibhāṣā
/vetteḥ 5/1 *vibhāṣa* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *jhaḥ* #3 *at* #4 *ruṭ* #6)
vetter aṅgād uttarasya jhādeśasyāto vibhāṣā ruḍ āgamo bhavati
The *at* which comes in place of a *jha* contained within an affix occurring after an *aṅga*, namely *vid* 'to know', is optionally introduced with augment *rUṬ*.

EXAMPLES:

saṃvidrate
saṃvidate
saṃvidratām
saṃvidatām
samavidrata
samavidata

1. This rule introduces *rUṬ* to an *at*-replacement of *jha* which occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *vid*. Given *sam-vid* + (*LAṬ→jha→at*) *a* → *sam-vid* + (*ŚaP→ϕ*) + *ata*, where *ŚaP* gets deleted because *vid* is an *adādi* (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyo . . .*) root, we get *sam-vid* +*r*(*UṬ*) + *ata*. This option of *rUṬ* is technically known as *aprāptavibhāṣā* 'an option not made available'. The final form *samvidrate* is derived with a replacement in *e* (*etva*). Thus, *samvidrat*(*a→e*) = *samvidrate*. The *ātmanepada* of this derivate is introduced in view of a *vārttika* (*saṃyogamāṣdiṣu . . .*; ad 1.3.29 *samogamyṛcchibhyām . . .*). We will get *samvidate* when the option of *rUṬ* is not availed. Recall that *e* is replaced with *ām* in derivates of *LOṬ* (3.4.90 *ām etaḥ*). Thus, *samvidratām*/ *samvidatām*. Derivates of *LAṄ* are not allowed replacement in *e* (*etva*). Thus, *samavidrata* and *samavidata*.

2. A specification of *vid*, in *vetti*, is here made with deleted *ŚaP* to indicate that this optional *rUṬ* is not available to *vid* 'to contemplate', a root of the *rudhādi* group, in its forms such as third personal present middle *vintte* / *vindāte* / *vindate*.

7.1.8 बहुलं छन्दसि

bahulaṃ chandasi
/*bahulam* 1/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *jhaḥ* #3 *at* #4 *ruṭ* #6)
chandasi viṣaye bahulaṃ ruḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *rUṬ* is variously introduced to an *aT* which replaces a *jh* contained within an affix occurring after an *aṅga*.

EXAMPLES:

deṽā aduhra 'gods extracted milk . . .'
adṛśrannasya keṭavaḥ 'saw its . . . his banner'

1. This *rUṬ* is observed as occurring variously in the Vedic. That is, sometimes it does, at others it does not. Thus, *devā aduhra* where *aduhra* is derived frm *aṬ* + *duh* + (*ŚaP→ϕ*) + (*jh→at*) *a*)) = *a* + *duh* + *at* + *a*. Augment *rUṬ* is then introduced and *t* of *at* goes through deletion (7.1.41 *lopas ta ātmanepadeṣu*). This yields *a* + *duh* + *r*(*UṬ*) + *a* (*t→ϕ*) + *a* = *aduhra* + *a*. We finally get the application of 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*, whereby the *a*+*a* sequence is replaced with a single *a* similar to the following (*pararūpa*) to yield *aduhra*.

One may also find *rUṬ*, elsewhere (*anyatra*), also because of *bahulam* 'variously'. Thus, (*aṬ*) + *dṛś* + *rUṬ* + *a* + *am* → *adṛśram*, the first person singular *LUṄ*-derivate of *dṛś*, where *CLI* is replaced with *aṄ* (3.1.57 *irito vā*). The *a*+*a* sequence, of course, goes through *pararūpa* 'a single replacement similar to the following of a vocalic sequence' of 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*.

7.1.9 अतो भिस् ऐस्

ato bhis ais
/ataḥ 5/1 *bhisaḥ* 6/1 *ais* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
akārāntād aṅgād uttarasya bhisa ais ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ais* comes in place of *bhis* which occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *a*.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣaiḥ 'instrumental plural of *vṛkṣa*'
plakṣaiḥ 'instrumental plural of *plakṣa*'
atijarasaiḥ 'instrumental plural of *atijaras* (extremely old)'

1. This rule offers *ais* as a replacement for *bhis* 'instrumental plural', provided *bhis* occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *a*. Consider *vṛkṣa* + (*bhis*→*ais*) = *vṛkṣa* + *ais* → *vṛkṣ*(*a*+*ai*→*ai*)*s* → *vṛkṣai*(*s*→*rU*→*ḥ*)) = *vṛkṣaiḥ*, where 6.1.85 *vṛddhir eci* offers a single *vṛddhi* replacement. The final derivate is gotten via *rutva-visarga*.

The last example, i.e., *atijarasaiḥ*, has a compound base *atijara* used before *bhis*. The compound base, paraphrased as: *jarām atikrāntaḥ*, is formed in consonance with a *vārttika* (ad 2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ; krāntādyarthe dvitīyayā*). The shortening of *jarā* to *jara* is accomplished by 1.2.48 *gostriyor upasarjanasya*. The replacement of *ais* for *bhis* is here accomplished by treating *jara* as ending in *a*. But a problem is encountered here. Rule 7.2.101 *jarāyā jaras anyatarasyām* orders *jaras* as an optional replacement for *jarā*. It is argued that *jara* which causes replacement of *bhis* with *ais* cannot be accepted as cause for modification of *jara*. This is argued in view of *sannipātavidhi* 'an operation conditioned by close contextual relation between two things'. Thus, *jara* cannot be replaced with *jaras*. Even if one invokes *Paribhāṣā* (38): *ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat* 'that which is modified in one part can still be treated as what it was' and accepts *jara* as *jarā*. It is stated that *Paribhāṣā* (86): *sannipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animitto tadvighātasya* 'an operation characterized with *sannipāta* (close relationship between two) cannot become a cause for relational impairment' is not universally accepted (*anitya*). This has been indicated by *kaṣṭāya* of 3.1.14 *kaṣṭāya kramaṇe*. The *ya*-replacement (7.1.33 *ṅer yaḥ*) in *kaṣṭa* + *Ṅe* is conditioned by *Ṅi* when following an *aṅga* ending in *a*, i.e., *kaṣṭa*. This *ya* again cannot become a condition for the *ā*-replacement of *a* of *kaṣṭa* to yield *kaṣṭāya*. But it does. Consequently, *Paribhāṣā* (86) is non-obligatory (*anitya*) A replacement in *jaras* for *jara* is thus possible.

Yet another doubt is raised here. Given *vṛkṣa* + *bhis*, our present rule requires *ais* as a replacement for *bhis*. Rule 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et* requires *e* as a replacement for *a*. Why can we not apply *e* first on the basis of *paratva* (1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe*. . .) and then apply *ais* under the condition of *e* treated as

the former *a*, via *sthānivadbhāva*? There should be no problem invoking *paratva* since both *e* and *ais* have their independent scope of application elsewhere. That is, *ais* can be accomplished by treating *e* as *a* and *etva* has its independent scope in *vṛkṣebhyaḥ*, etc. If one invokes *paratva* and applies *etva* then offering a replacement in *ais* will become useless. For, there will not be any *a* which *bhis* will follow. If one accepts *e* as if it was *a*, then offering a replacement in *e* will become useless. For, *ais* will then become obligatory (*nitya*) in view of *kṛtākṛtaprasaṅga* 'a context where an operation obtains whether some other is performed'. Replacement in *ais* will obtain, whether or not replacement in *e* (*etva*) is accomplished. Thus, the *Mahābhāṣya* favors blocking *e*-replacement (*etva*) with *ais*:

> *etvaṃ bhisi paratvāc ced ata ais kva bhaviṣyati/*
> *kṛtepy etve bhautapaūrvyād ais tu nityas tathā sati//*
> If it is stated that *-e* should replace the final *-a* of an *aṅga* before a nominal ending beginning with a sound denoted by *jhaL*, i.e., here the *bh* of *bhis*, on the basis of subsequent order of enumeration (*paratva*; 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et*), where will *-ais* find its scope of application. If one replaces *-bhis* with *-ais*, even after replacing *a* with *e*, based especially on *kṛtākṛta-prasaṅga*, and the belief that *e* is not any different from what it previously was, i.e., *a* (*bhautapaurvyāt*), replacing *-bhis* with *-ais* becomes obligatory (*nitya*). Rule 7.1.9 *ato bhis ais* will now obligatorily block 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et* because of it's status as *nitya* (based upon *kṛtākṛta-prasaṅga*), and since a *nitya* rule is considered more powerful than a rule which is *para* 'subsequent in order of enumeration'. Now that *-ais* has become obligatory, *-etva* (replacement in *e*) will become non-obligatory, and hence 7.1.9 *ato bhis ais* will obligatorily block 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et* in the context of its application.

7.1.10 बहुलं छन्दसि

> *bahulaṃ chandasi*
> */bahulam* 1/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
> (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ato bhis ais* #9)
> *chandasi viṣaye bahulam aisādeśo bhavati*
> A replacement in *ais* comes in place of *bhis*, variously, in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

> *nadyaiḥ* 'by all rivers'
> *devebhiḥ sarvebhiḥ proktam* '(it was) spoken by all gods'

1. Note that *ais* replaces *bhis* when *bhis* occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *a*. But consider *nadyaiḥ* where *bhis* is replaced with *ais* when the *aṅga* ends in *ī*. Now consider *devebhiḥ* where the *aṅga* ends in *a* but *bhis* is not replaced with

ais. We get a replacement in *e* (*etva*), instead. All these violations, in the Vedic, are accounted for by *bahulam* 'variously'.

7.1.11 नेदमदसोरकोः

nedamadasor akoḥ
/na ϕ idam-adasoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*); *akoḥ* 6/2 = *avidyamānaḥ kakāro yayos tau* = *akau* (*bv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *bhis ais* #9)
'*idam, adas*' *ity etayor akakārayor bhisa ais na bhavati*
A replacement in *ais* does not come in place of *bhis* when it has to occur after *idam* 'this' and *adas* 'that', with no *k* contained in them.

EXAMPLES:

ebhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *idam*'
amībhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *adas*'

1. Refer to derivational details of (64) *ābhyām* (II:354-55). Derive *a* + *bhis*, from *idam* + *bhis*, following steps (9a-d) of (64) *ābhyām*. The *a* of *a* + *bhis* then goes through a replacement in *e* (*etva*; 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et*). Refer to derivational details of (52) *amī* (II:348-49) for deriving *amībhiḥ* from *adas* + *bhis*.

This replacement is not permitted when *idam* and *adas* contain a *k*, for example in deriving the instrumental plural forms *imakaiḥ* and *amukaiḥ*. These forms result when *akAC* is introduced prior to their *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*) by rule 5.3.71 *avyayasarvanāmnām akac prāk ṭeḥ*. This specification by negative *akoḥ* itself indicates that 'that which is introduced as an insert to *x* can also be included within the reference of *x*' (*PŚ* (90): *tanmmadhyapatitas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*).

7.1.12 टाङसिङसामिनात्स्याः

ṭāṅasiṅasām inātsyāḥ
/ṭā-ṅasi-ṅas-ām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*); *in-āt-syāḥ* 1/3 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ataḥ* #9)
akārāntād aṅgād uttareṣāṃ ṭāṅasiṅasām '*in, āt, sya*' *ity ete ādeśā bhavanti yathāsaṃkhyam*
Affixes *Ṭā, ṄasI* and *Ṅas*, when occurring after an *aṅga* which ends in *a*, are replaced with *in, āt* and *sya*, respectively.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣeṇa 'instrumental singular of *vṛkṣa*'
plakṣeṇa 'instrumental singular of *plakṣa*'
vṛkṣāt 'ablative singular of *vṛkṣa*'
plakṣāt 'ablative singular of *plakṣa*'

vṛkṣasya 'genitive singular of *vṛkṣa*'
plakṣasya 'genitive singular of *plakṣa*'

1. Note that the instrumental singular nominal ending *Ṭā* of *vṛkṣa* + *Ṭā* and *plakṣa* + *Ṭā* is replaced with *in*. Rule 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* requires a single *guṇa* replacement similar to *i* of *vṛkṣ*(*a*+*i*→*e*) *na* = *vṛkṣena* and *plakṣ*(*a*+*i*→*e*) *na* = *plakṣena*. Their *n* is then replaced with *ṇ* (8.4.1 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ . . .*). Derivation of *vṛkṣāt* and *plakṣāt* involves application of *savarṇadīrgha* 'homogeneous long' after ablative singular *Ṅasi* is replaced with *āt* (6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*). Derivates with a replacement in *sya* for the genitive singular *Ṅas* do not offer anything new. Here again these replacements are valid only when the *aṅga* ends in *a*. Thus, *sakhyā* and *patyā* which derive from *sakhi* + *Ṭā* and *pati* + *Ṭā* serve as counter-examples.

7.1.13 ङेर्यः

ṅer yaḥ
/*ṅeḥ* 6/1 *yaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ataḥ* #9)
akārāntād aṅgād uttarasya '*ṅe*' *ity etasya* '*ya*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
Affix *Ṅe*, when occurring after an *aṅga* ending in *ya*, is replaced with *ya*.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣāya 'dative singular of *vṛkṣa*'
plakṣāya 'dative singular of *plakṣa*'

1. Refer to my notes under 7.1.9 *ato bhis ais* on the non-obligatory (*anitya*) nature of *Paribhāṣā* (86). Thus, lengthening (7.3.102 *supi ca*) of *a* in *vṛkṣa* + *ya* applies to yield *vṛkṣ*(*a*→*ā*) + *ya* = *vṛkṣāya*. The condition of an *aṅga* ending in *a* blocks these replacements in the dative singular forms *sakhye* and *patye*, derived from *sakhi* + *Ṅe* and *pati* + *Ṅe*.

7.1.14 सर्वनाम्नः स्मै

sarvanāmnaḥ smai
/*sarvanāmnaḥ* 5/1 *smai* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ataḥ* #9 *ṅeḥ* #13)
akārāntāt sarvanāmna uttarasya ṅeḥ smai ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affix *Ṅe*, when occurring after a pronominal ending in *a*, is replaced with *smai*.

EXAMPLES:

sarvasmai 'dative singular of *sarva*'
viśvasmai 'dative singular of *viśva*'

yasmai 'dative singular of *yad*'
kasmai 'dative singular of *kim*'
tasmai 'dative singular of *tad*'

1. This rule offers *smai* as a replacement for the dative singular nominal ending *Ṅe* when the same occurs after a pronominal (*sarvanāma*) ending in *a*. Thus, the *Ṅe* after *bhavat*, where *bhavat* ends in *t*, cannot be replaced with *smai* in deriving *bhavate*. A pronominal enumerated within the *tyadādi* group ends in *a*, by way of getting its final consonant replaced with *a* (7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*). Note that *bhavat* is not a *tyadādi*. Except for *sarva* and *viśva* 'all', all other example-bases here belong to the *tyadādi* group. This rule is an exception to 7.1.13 *ṅer yaḥ*.

2. A problem is raised in connection with the derivation of *atra* + *idam* + *Ṅe* → *atrāsmai*, where, in the *vākyasaṃskāra-pakṣa*, *aŚ* is introduced as a replacement for *idam* (2.4.32 *idamo' nvādeśe . . .*) in *anvādeśa* 'bringing something again which was already brought earlier', before *smai* is introduced as a replacement for *Ṅe*. Given *atra* + (*idam*→*a*(*Ś*)) + (*Ṅ*)*e* = *atra* + *a* + *e*, rule 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* becomes applicable by blocking *smai* even when it is subsequent (*para*). This blocking is based on the obligatory (*nityatvāt*) nature of a single homogeneous replacement denoted by *aK*. The result of this application will be *atrā* + *e*. A replacement in *smai* will be blocked because *atrā* will then end in *ā*. But since the replacement of *e* with *smai* is internal (*antaraṅga*), it will be accomplished first. The *savarṇadīrgha* is external (*bahiraṅga*) because of having two words as its locus. Thus, *ida*(*m*→*a*) + *Ṅe* = *ida* + *a*(*Ś*) + *Ṅe* → *ida* + *a* + (*Ṅe*→*smai*) = *ida* + *a* + *smai*. Recall that *idam* is a word of the *tyadādi* group of pronominals. That is why its *m* is replaced with *a*. A single replacement in *a* for *a*+*a* (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*) then produces (*a*+*a*→*a*) + *smai* = *asmai*. A long replacement (*savarṇadīrgha*) application can now apply to yield *atra* + *asmai* → *atrāsmai*.

7.1.15 ङसिङ्योः स्मात्स्मिनौ

ṅasiṅyoḥ smātsminau
/ṅasi-ṅyoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*); *smāt-sminau* 1/2/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ataḥ* #9 *sarvanāmnaḥ* #14)
'*ṅasi, ṅi*' *ity etayor akārāntāt sarvanāmna uttarayoḥ* '*smāt, smin*' *ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ*

Affixes *ṄasI* and *Ṅi*, when occurring after a pronominal ending in *a*, are replaced with *smāt* and *smin*, respectively.

EXAMPLES:

sarvasmāt 'ablative singular of *sarva*'
viśvasmāt 'ablative singular of *viśva*'

yasmāt 'ablative singular of *yad*'
kasmāt 'ablative singular of *kim*'
sarvasmin 'locative singular of *sarva*'
viśvasmin 'locative singular of *viśva*'
yasmin 'locative singular of *yad*'
kasmin 'locative singular of *kim*'

1. Note that *sarva* and *viśva* already end in *a*. The *a* at the end of other bases is gotten from 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*. Here again *bhavataḥ* 'genitive singular' and *bhavati* 'locative singular', because *bhavat* is not a pronominal of the *tyadādi* group, do not qualify for this replacement. This replacement will, of course, be allowed only after a pronominal (*sarvanāman*). Thus, we cannot get this in *vṛkṣāt* and *vṛkṣe*.

Note that *Ṅasi* and *Ṅi*, in this order, will be replaced with *smāt* and *smin*, in view of 1.3.10 *yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām*. The final *t* and *n* of *smāt* and *smin* could not be termed an *it* by 1.3.3 *halantyam* because 1.3.4 *na vibhaktau tusmāḥ* will block it.

7.1.16 पूर्वादिभ्यो नवभ्यो वा

pūrvādibhyo navabhyo vā
/pūrvādibhyaḥ 5/3 = *pūrva ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *tebhyaḥ; navabhyaḥ* 5/3 *vā* *ϕ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ataḥ* #9 *ṅasiṅyoḥ smātsminau* #15)
pūrvādibhyo navabhyaḥ sarvanāmna uttarayor ṅasiṅyoḥ 'smāt, smin' ity etāv ādeśau vā bhavataḥ
Affixes *Ṅasi* and *Ṅi* are optionally replaced with *smāt* and *smin*, in this order, when they occur after nine pronominals enumerated in the list beginning with *pūrva* (*pūrvādi*).

EXAMPLES:

pūrvasmāt 'ablative singular of *pūrva*'
pūrvāt 'ibidem'
pūrvasmin 'locative singular of *pūrva*'
pūrve 'ibidem'
parasmāt 'ablative singular of *para*'
parāt 'ibidem'
parasmin 'locative singular of *para*'
pare 'ibidem'
avarasmāt 'ablative singular of *avara*'
avarāt 'ibidem'
avarasmin 'locative singular of *avara*'
avare 'ibidem'

1. This rule makes *smāt* and *smin* optional in case of nine bases enumerated beginning with *pūrva*. Thus, we get *pūrvasmāt / pūrvāt* and *pūrvasmin / pūrve*, etc. But we must uniquely get *tyasmāt* and *tyasmin* because *tyad* falls outside the *pūrvādi* listing of nine.

Note that *sarva*, etc., are *sarvanāman* (1.1.26 *sarvādīni sarvanāmāni*). The ablative and locative nominal endings *Ṅasi* and *Ṅi*, when occurring after a base termed *sarvanāman*, are to be obligatorily replaced with *smāt* and *smin*, in this order. Our present rule makes this replacement optional in case of nine pronominals listed beginning with *pūrva*. That is, after *pūrva* 'first, prior', *para* 'subsequent, other', *avara* 'less, lower', *dakṣiṇa* 'right', *uttara* 'next, ahead', *apara* 'other', *adhara* 'lower', *sva* 'one's own' and *antara* 'outer . . .'. These nine pronominals are specified under rules 1.1.33 *pūrvaparā' varadakṣiṇottarā . . .*, 1.1.34 *svam ajñātidhanākhyāyām* and 1.1.35 *antaraṃ bahiryogo. . . .*

7.1.17 जसः शी

jasaḥ śī
/ aṅgasya #6.4.1 *śī* (1/1 deleted) /
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ataḥ* #9 *sarvanāmnaḥ* #1)
akārāntāt sarvanāmna uttarasya jasaḥ 'śī' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affix *Jas*, when occurring after a pronominal ending in *a*, is replaced with *Śī*.

EXAMPLES:

sarve 'nominative plural of *sarva*'
viśve 'nominative plural of *viśva*'
ye 'nominative plural of the relative pronoun *yad*'
ke 'nominative plural of the interrogative *kim*'
te 'nominative plural of *tad*'

1. Why did Pāṇini not specify the replacement with a short *i*, as in *Śi*? The long replacement is ordered, instead, for the benefit of subsequent rule (*dīrghoccāraṇam uttarārtham*). Thus, consider *trapuṇī* and *jatunī* of 7.1.19 *napuṃsakāc ca*, which, for reasons of this long *ī*, will end in *ī*. Note here that a single *guṇa*-replacement, for example in *sarva* + (*Jas* → *Śī*) → *sarv*(*a*+*ī*→*e*) = *sarve*, can be accomplished, irrespective of whether *i* of *Śī* (7.1.17 *jasaḥ śī*) is short or long. It is stated that *Ś* of *Śī* is intended for total replacement (*sarvādeśa*; 1.1.55 *anekāl śit sarvasya*). This, however, is debatable. Recall in this connection that *Śī* could not be assigned the term *pratyaya* before it replaces *Jas*. For, *Śī* is not enumerated within the domain of 3.1.1 *pratyayaḥ*. It can receive the term *pratyaya* only via *sthānivadbhāva*. That is, on account of being a replacement of affix *Jas*. Assignment of the term *pratyaya* facilitates assignment of the term *it* to *Ś* by 1.3.8 *laśakv ataddhite*. This, in turn,

facilitates deletion of *Ś* by 1.3.9 *tasya lopaḥ.* A total replacement of *Jas* by *Śī* is not accomplished because of *Ś* as an *it.* It is, instead, accomplished on the basis of *anekāltva* 'consisting of more than one sound segment'.

7.1.18 औङ आपः

auṅa āpaḥ
/auṅaḥ 6/1 *āpaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śī* #17)
ābantād uttarasyauṅaḥ 'śī' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affixes *au* and *auṬ*, when occurring after an *aṅga* ending in the feminine affixes marked with *āP*, are replaced with *Śī.*

EXAMPLES:

khaṭve tiṣṭhataḥ 'there are two cots here'
khaṭve paśya 'look at these two cots'
bahurāje 'a city with many kings'
kārīṣagandhye 'for Kārīṣagandhyā'

1. Note that these examples all involve application of 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*, whereby a single *guṇa* replacement similar to *ī* is received. Thus, *khaṭvā* + *au* → *khaṭvā* + (*au* → *Śī*) → *khaṭv*(*ā*+*ī* → *e*) → *khaṭve*, etc.

2. The *auṄ* of this rule is interpreted as referring to the nominative and accusative dual endings *au* and *auṬ*. Questions have been raised against formulating this abbreviatory term with *Ṅ*, i.e., *au* + *Ṅ* = *auṄ*, to refer to *au* and *auṬ*. Where do we get this from?. The following *kārikā*-verses of the *Mahābhāṣya* discuss it in detail:

aukāro' yaṃ śīvidhau ṅidgṛhīto
ṅic cāsmākaṃ nāsti ko' yaṃ prakāraḥ /
'this *au*, in this process relative to replacement in *Śī*, has been accepted as marked with *Ṅ*; but since there is no *au* marked with *Ṅ*, elsehwere, in this grammar, what kind of a bad abbreviatory term it is'

sāmānyārthaḥ tasya cāsañjane' smin
ṅitkāryaṃ te śyāṃ prasaktaṃ sa doṣaḥ //1//
'if it is stated that *Ṅ* is made an *it* for making a general reference to both *au* and *auṬ*, then operations relative to that which is marked with *Ṅ* must also be performed relative to *Śī*'

ṅitve vidyād varṇanirdeśamātraṃ
varṇe yat syāt tac ca vidyāt tadādau /
'a specification, in context where *Ṅ* is used as an *it*, should be understood as making a reference only to sound segments; and that which is specified with a sound segment should be understood as referring to that which begins with that sound segment'

varṇaś cāyaṃ tena ṅitve' py adoṣo
nirdeśo' yaṃ pūrvasūtreṇa vā syāt //2 //
'there is no problem here since this is a sound, and not an affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*'; or else, this could be accepted as the specification of earlier teachers'

Some claim that *Ṅ* in *auṄ* is not an *it*. The term *auṄ* is simply is used by earlier grammarians to refer to both *au* and *auṬ* with *Ṅ* as an *it*. *Nyāsa* indicates that their reading of the *sūtra* was *āvauṭāvauṅ*. Bhaṭṭoji (*SK*) states that *auṅ ity aukāravibhakteḥ saṃjñā* '*auṄ* is a name assigned to the nominative and accusative dual endings *au* and *auṬ*'.

Note that *au* of this rule, in operations relative to replacement in *Śī*, has been accepted as marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. But since we do not find *au*, marked with *Ṅ* as an *it* as an abbreviatory term in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the use and formulation of this abbreviatory term is bad. One can argue here that *Ṅ* is made an *it* in the abbreviatory term *auṄ* to represent both *au* and *auṬ* which could, otherwise, only represent *au*, in view of a possible formulation of this rule as *auṬ āpaḥ*. For, a specification made with no *anubandha* does not make any reference to that which is specified with one *anubandha* (*Pś* (82): *niranubandhakagrahaṇe na sānubandhakasya grahaṇam*). It can be stated here that *auṬ* is marked with *Ṭ* as an *it* to facilitate the formation of abbreviatory term *sUṬ*, thereby to facilitate representation with *sUṬ* of *sU/au/Jas/am/auṬ*. But this will make *Ṭ* as an *iṬ* to all five elements represented by *sUṬ*. That means *Ṅ* as an *it* in *auṄ* should not be used. This view, however, is not acceptable. For, there should not be any conflict in accepting an *anubandha* intended for making an abbreviatory term as the *anubandha* of a group of elements on the one hand, and retaining the *anubandha* of a particular item within a group on the other. The *Ṭ* as an *it* can be accepted as an *it* for *auṬ* as this same can also be accepted as the *anubandha* of elements in the group. The *anubandha* of an affix cannot be considered improper simply becauase it can not serve any purpose. In fact, its purpose is to have the accusative dual *auṬ* marked with *Ṭ* as an *it*. It becomes clear that by accepting the *anubandha* of a part (*Ṭ* of *sUṬ* in *auṬ*) as affixal *anubandha*, and also by accepting *Ṅ* as an *it* in *auṄ* of 7.1.18 *auṅ āpaḥ*, *au* of the accusative dual cannot be represented. There are two reasons behind it:

(*i*) an *anubandha* cannot be manipulated to represent a corresponding item used without an *anubandha* (*Pś* (83): *tad anubandhakagrahaṇe nātadanubandhakasya grahaṇam*);
(*ii*) an item referenced with one *anubandha* cannot be manipulated to represent corresponding items used with two *anubandhas* (*Pś: ekānubandhakagrahaṇe nātadanubandhakasya grahaṇam*).

That is, accusative dual, because of *Ṅ* of 7.1.18 *auṅ āpaḥ*, will now carry two *anubandhas*, *Ṅ* and *Ṭ*. The *Ṅ* of *auṄ* will have to be carried over to *auṬ*

since *Ṅ* is to be used for gerealized reference. Thus, *au* and *auṬ* will both be considered marked with *Ṅ* as their *it*. If this *auṄ* goes through a replacement in *Śī*, operations which obtain under the following condition of *auṄ*, for example the introduction of augment *yāṬ*, will apply (7.3.113 *yād āpaḥ*; cf. . . . *tasya āsañjane' smin sa doṣaḥ*). The word *ṅitkāryam* is here interpreted as *ṇiti kāryam* 'an operation when that which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it* follows'.

It is stated that *ṅit* can be inrterpreted in two ways: *ṅa it yasya* 'that whose *it* is a *Ṅ*', a *bahuvrīhi* used as a qualifier to an affix having *Ṅ* as an *it*; and *ṅakāraś cāsau ic ca* 'that which is a *Ṅ* and is also an *it*'. Operationally, a *bahuvrīhi* will give us the meaning of 'when *au*, whose *Ṅ* is an *it*, follows'. This will create problems. That is why, a suggestion is made to accept *Ṅit* as a *bahuvrīhi* but simply as a specification of the sound *auṄ*. It should not be considered making a reference to an affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. One can now invoke *tadādividhi* '*Ṅ* which occurs at the beginning' to yield the interpretation:

> 'an operation which is specified with a sound to follow applies under the right condition of that which begins with that sound'

Since *Ṅ* is not used at the beginning of *auṄ*, its replacement in *Śī* cannot condition introduction of *yāṬ*.

Now some solutions based on the fourth line of the *kārikā* verses:

(*a*) The *auṄ* of *auṅ āpaḥ* only references the sound *au*. That is, *Śī* should replace *au*. Since *auṅ āpaḥ* is contained within the domain of *aṅga*, one must make a reference to the following affix. The *au* will be interpreted as a qualifier to the affix occurring after the *aṅga* ending *āP*. One will now invoke *tadanta-vidhi* 'treating *x* as also that which ends in *x*' to yield the meaning: an affix which ends in *au* (*vyapadeśivadbhāva* will be invoked to treat *au* as ending in *au*) and occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *āP*. The *Ṅ* will then not be considered an *it* but a sound used for ease of articulation. This tretment will not be any different from *d* of 3.3.57 *ṛdor ap*. But there is a problem: application of *niranubandhaka* . . . (see above (*i*)) convention can still not be blocked.

(*b*) It is stated that *auṄ* refers to the rule formulation *āvauṭāvauṅ*, a rule of earlier scholars. This formulation represented both *au* and *auṄ*. The *auṄ* of *auṅ āpaḥ* thus represents both *au* and *auṬ*. The *Ṅ* will not cause any operation dependent upon that which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. The *anubandhas* of earlier scholars will not be treated here as functional. Thus, if there is no problem in accepting *Ṅ* as an *it*, how could there be any problem in not accepting it as an *it*.

SUMMARY:

If one accepts *Ṅ* as an *it*, operations relative to that which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it* will obtain. These operations would not obtain if one accepts the

specification with *auṄ* as simply referring to the sound *au*, and *Ṅ* used for ease of articulation, and not to an affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. A formulation of this rule as *auṬ āpaḥ*, where *Ṭ* can be considered used for ease of articulation, will enable references to both *au* and *auṬ* with *auṬ*. Consequently, *Ṅ* should not be used as an *it* in *auṄ*. But this view is not appropriate.

4. A specification with *āpaḥ* includes references to bases ending in the feminine affixes *ṬāP*, *CāP* and *ḌāP*. Thus, we get *khaṭvā* (*ṬāP*; 4.1.4 *ajādyataṣ ṭāp*), *bahurājā* (*ḌāP*; 4.1.13 *ḍāb ubhābhyām anyatarasyām*) and *kārīṣagandhyā* (*CāP*; 4.1.74 *yaṅaś cāp*).

7.1.19 नपुंसकाच्च

napuṃsakāc ca
/napuṃsakāt 5/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śī* #17 *auṅaḥ* #18)
napuṃsakād uttarasya auṅaḥ 'śī' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affixes *au* and *auṬ*, when occurring after an *aṅga* termed neuter, are replaced with *Śī*.

EXAMPLES:

kuṇḍe tiṣṭhataḥ 'two bowls are there'
kuṇḍe paśya 'see (these) two bowls'

1. Note that *ī* of *Śī*, for example in *kuṇḍa* + (*au*→*Śī*), qualifies for its status as *svādi* 'nominal ending enumerated beginning with *sU*'. It can, however, not be assigned the term *sarvanāmasthāna* since *kuṇḍa* 'bowl' is neuter. The word *kuṇḍa*, however, qualifies for assignment of the term *bha* since *ī* is an ending beginning with a vowel (*ajādi*).

The *a* of *kuṇḍa* + *ī* qualifies for deletion by 6.4.148 *yasyeti ca*. A *vārttika* (*vt: śyāṃ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ*) blocks this deletion in favor of a single *guṇa*-replacement (6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*), instead. The *i* and *u* before *trapu*, *dadhi* and *madhu*, in *trapuṇī*, *dadhinī* and *madhunī*, is similarly saved from deletion before *Śī*. Augment *nUM* in *dadhinī* and *madhunī* is introduced by 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*.

7.1.20 जश्शसोः शिः

jaśśasoḥ śiḥ
/jaś-śasoḥ 6/2 *śiḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *napuṃsakāt* #19)
napuṃsakād aṅgād uttarayor jaśśasoḥ 'śiḥ' ity aym ādeśo bhavati
Affixes *Jas* and *Śas*, when occurring after an *aṅga* used with the signification of neuter, are replaced with *Śi*.

EXAMPLES:

kuṇḍāni paśya 'see these bowls'
kuṇḍāni tiṣṭhanti 'there are (these) bowls'
kuṇḍāni paśya 'see these bowls'
dadhīni 'nominative-accusative plural of *dadhi*'
madhūni 'nominative-accusative plural of *madhu*'
trapūṇi 'nominative-accusative plural of *trapu* (bashful, lead)'
jatūni 'nominative-accusative plural of *jatu* (red dye, lac)'

1. Note that *Śas*, because of its associated listing (*sāhacarya*) with the nominative plural ending *Jas*, can here refer only to the accusative plural nominal ending. It cannot refer, for example, to the *taddhita* affix *Śas* (5.4.43 *saṃkhyaikavacanāc . . .*). Thus, no *Śi* for *Śas* in *kuṇḍaṃ kuṇḍaṃ = kuṇḍaśaḥ dadāti* 'gives bowls after bowls full of food'; *vanaṃ vanaṃ = vanaśaḥ praviśanti* '. . . enter each and every forest'. The *nUM*, in examples of *Jas*, is introduced by 7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya jhaly acaḥ*. It is introduced by 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*, elsewhere. The lengthening of the penultimate vowel (*upadhādīrgha*) is accomplished, in these examples, by 6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne cāsambuddhau*.

2. Note that Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*), based on listing of this rule by earlier grammarians (cf. *Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā* 7.1.50 *jaseḥ iti pūrvācāryanirdeśaḥ. pūrvācāryā hi jasir ity evaṃ vihitavantaḥ*), accepts the wording of this rule as: *jasiśasoḥ śiḥ*. He explains that *i* at the end in *jasi* is used for ease of articulation (*Nyāsa: jasīty atrekāra uccāraṇārthaḥ*).

7.1.21 अष्टाभ्य औश्

aṣṭābhya auś
/aṣṭābhyaḥ 6/3 *auś* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *jaśśasoḥ* #20)
kṛtākārād aṣṭan śabdād uttarayor jaśśasoḥ 'auś' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affixes *Jas* and *Śas*, when occurring after an *aṅga* namely *aṣṭā* with its final replaced with *ā* (*ātva*), are replaced with *auŚ*.

EXAMPLES:

aṣṭau tiṣṭhanti 'these eight are staying'
aṣṭau paśya 'look at those eight'
paramāṣṭau 'the best eight'
uttamāṣṭau 'the best eight'

1. This rule allows *auŚ* as a replacement for *Jas* and *Śas* which, in turn, occur after *aṣṭā*, a form of *aṣṭan* with its final *n* replaced with *ā* by 7.2.84 *aṣṭan ā vibhaktau*. Thus, *aṣṭan* + *au* → *aṣṭa*(*n*→*ā*) + *au* → *aṣṭ*(*a*+*ā*→*ā*) + *au; aṣṭā* + (*Jas*→*au*(*Ś*) → *aṣṭā* + *auŚ*, through a single homogeneous long vowel re-

placement (6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*). Rule 6.1.88 *vṛddhir eci* finally produces *aṣṭ(ā+au→au)* = *aṣṭau*, through a single *vṛddhi*-replacement in *au*.

2. Note that 7.2.84 *aṣṭan ā vibhaktau* offers a replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) when a nominal ending beginning with a consonant (*halādi*) follows *aṣṭan*. The nominal endings (*J*) *as* and (*Ś*) *as* both begin with a vowel (*ajādi*). How is this replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) possible here? Pāṇini's specification of *aṣṭābhyaḥ*, as against *aṣṭabhyaḥ*, itself, will become an indicator (*jñāpaka*), and will account for this replacement in *ā* (*ātva*). For, he would have specified the rule more economically as *aṣṭabhya auś* if he did not intend this application of replacement in *ā* (*ātva*). That is, if he, otherwise, intended this replacement in *auŚ*, after *aṣṭan*.

This rule is an exception to 7.1.22 *ṣaḍbhyo luk* whereby we get *aṣṭa paśya* 'look at the eight . . .'. This replacement in *auŚ* is thus an exception to that *LUK*-deletion. For, this rule is formulated against the obligatory application of 7.1.22 *ṣaḍbhyo luk*. It will become useless if *LUK*-deletion applied everywhere. This rule is also optional because 6.1.169 *aṣṭano dīrghāt* requires a non-*sarvanāmasthāna* nominal ending to be marked with *udātta* when occurring after *aṣṭan*. If this replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) was obligatory then *dīrghāt* in 6.1.169 *aṣṭano dīrghāt* would have become unnecessary. As a consequence, *udātta* must be made available when replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) applies.

This rule is formulated irrespective of *LUK*-deletion application, and / or non-application, of rule 2.4.72 *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ*. That is, it does not apply where *aṣṭan* is part of a compound. Consider *aṣṭaputraḥ* 'he who has eight sons' and *aṣṭabhāryaḥ* 'he who has eight wives' where deletion applies.

This specification with *aṣṭā* also includes a reference to bases which may end in *aṣṭā*. Thus, we get *paramāṣṭau* and *uttamāṣṭau* 'eight best'. Since replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) is optional, we also get *priyāṣṭānaḥ*, a *bahuvrīhi* paraphrased as *priyā aṣṭau yeṣām* 'those to whom eight are dear', with no *auŚ*.

7.1.22 षड्भ्यो लुक्

ṣaḍbhyo luk
/ṣaḍbhyaḥ 5/3 *luk* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *jaśśasoḥ* #20)
ṣaṭsaṃjñakebhyaḥ uttarayor jaśśasor lug bhavati
Affixes *Jas* and *Śas*, when occurring after an *aṅga* termed *ṣaṭ*, are deleted by means of *LUK*.

EXAMPLES:

ṣaṭ tiṣṭhanti 'six are standing'
ṣaṭ paśya 'see those six'
pañca 'five'
sapta 'seven'
nava 'nine'
daśa 'ten'

1. The term *ṣaṭ* is assigned by 1.1.24 *ṣṇāntā ṣaṭ*. Refer to the appendix (II:359) for derivational details. Here again, *tadantavidhi*, i.e., reference to forms which may end in *ṣaṭ*, is desired, especially since constituents referred to by *ṣaṭ* are principal (*pradhāna*). Thus, we get *LUK*-deletion in *paramaṣaṭ* and *uttamaṣaṭ*. However, this deletion does not apply when a constituent referred to by *ṣaṭ* occurs as an *upasarjana* 'secondary' (2.2.30 *upasarjanaṃ pūrvam*). Thus, we do not find this *LUK*-deletion in *priyaṣaṣaḥ* 'he to whom those six are dear' and *priyapañcānaḥ* 'he to whom those five are dear', the *bahuvrīhi* compounds denote someone outside their constituency (*anyapadārtha*) as principal.

7.1.23 स्वमोर्नपुंसकात्

svamor napuṃsakāt
/svamoḥ 6/2 = *suś ca am ca* (*itar. dv.; tayoḥ*); *napuṃsakāt* 5/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *luk* #22)
'*su, am*' *ity etayor napuṃsakād uttarayor lug bhavati*
Affixes *sU* and *am*, when occurring after an *aṅga* used with the signification of neuter (*napuṃsaka*), are deleted by means of *LUK*.

EXAMPLES:

dadhi tiṣṭhati 'there is yoghurt'
dadhi paśya 'see yoghurt'
madhu tiṣṭhati 'there is honey'
madhu paśya 'see honey'
trapu 'lead; bashful'
jatu 'red-dye'

1. This rule offers deletion of *sU* and *am* after an *aṅga* used with the signification of neuter. What about *tad brāhmaṇakulam* 'that clan of the brāhmaṇas' where *LUK* of this rule should have caused deletion of *sU* after *tad* 'that'. Rule 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ* is thus blocked form replacing the final *d* of *tad* with *a*. Why can 7.2.102 not block *LUK*-deletion on the basis of *paratva*? *LUK*-deletion will still block that in anticipation of a possible conflict (*pūrvavipratiṣedha*). Or else, this deletion by *LUK* is obligatory (*nitya*). But this is unacceptable. If it was a *nitya* 'obligatory' rule then it could not be blocked by 7.1.24 *ato' m*. This rule is still *nitya* because *yasya ca lakṣaṇāntareṇa nimittaṃ vihanyate na tad anityam* (*Paribh:* 49) 'that whose condition of application is removed by some other rule is still not considered non-obligatory (*anitya*)'. Thus, in a conflict between *LUK*-deletion and replacement in *a* of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*, 7.1.24 *ato' m*, a third rule, removes the condition of *LUK*-deletion. This makes *LUK*-deletion obligatory, and hence, more powerful. The application of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ* is, therefore, blocked in the absence of a following nominal ending. One cannot, here, invoke 1.1.63

pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam and thereby try to apply 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*. For, 1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya* will not permit it.

7.1.24 अतोऽम्

ato' m
/ataḥ 5/1 *am* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *svamor napuṃsakāt* #23)
akārāntān napuṃsakād uttarayoḥ svamoḥ 'am' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affixes *sU* and *am*, when occurring after an *aṅga* ending in *a* and used with the signification of neuter, is replaced with *am*.

EXAMPLES:

kuṇḍaṃ (*tiṣṭhati*)
kuṇḍaṃ (*paśya*)
vanam
pīṭham

1. This rule offers *am* as a replacement for the nominal endings *sU* and *am* when they occur after a neuter base ending in *a*. Thus *kuṇḍa* + (*sU*→*am*) = *kuṇḍa* + *am*, where *a*+*a* will get a single replacement similar to the preceding (*pūrvarūpa*; 6.1.106 *ami pūrvaḥ*).

2. Why did this rule not specify the replacement simply as *m*? Rule 7.3.102 *supi ca* could then have occasioned lengthening (*dīrgha*) before a nominal ending (*sUP*) beginning with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *yaÑ* (*Kāśikā: makāraḥ kasmān na kriyate. dīrghatvaṃ* (7.3.102 *supi ca*) *prāpnoti*). If Pāṇini had intended to formulate this rule as *ataḥ m*, then, following the economy (*lāghava*) of formulation, he would have simply formulated the rule as *mataḥ*. But he still formulated the rule as *ato' m*. This rule is an exception to the preceding rule which occasions *LUK*-deletion.

7.1.25 अद्ड्डतरादिभ्यः पञ्चभ्यः

add ḍatarādibhyaḥ pañcabhyaḥ
/add 1/1 *ḍatarādibhyaḥ* 5/3 = *ḍatara ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *tebhyaḥ; pañcabhyaḥ* 5/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *svamoḥ* #23)
ḍatarādibhyaḥ parayoḥ svamor 'add' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affixes *sU* and *am*, when occurring after the first five *aṅgas* ending in affixes specified beginning with *ḌataraC* (5.3.92 *kiṃyattador nirdhāraṇe dvayor ekasya ḍatarac*), are replaced with *adD*.

EXAMPLES:

katarat tiṣṭhati 'which one of the two . . .'
katarat paśya 'which of the two . . .'

katamat tiṣṭhati 'which of the many . . .'
katamat paśya 'which of the many . . .'
itarat 'the other'
anyatarat 'any, either'
anyat 'the other'

1. Note that the five bases specified here are enumerated in the *sarvādi* '*sarva*, etc.' group (*gaṇa*) of pronominals (*sarvanāman*; 1.1.27 *sarvādīni sarvanāmāni*) as: *Ḍatara, Ḍatama, anya, anyatara,* and *itara.* The first two are affixes which, when interpreted in view of *tadantavidhi* 'process of interpreting *x* as also denoting that which ends in *x*', gives us bases which end in affixes *ḌataraC* and *ḌatamaC.* The remaining three bases are *anya, anyatara* and *itara.* Consider *katarat* where *katara* derives from *kim* + *ḌatarC* with the signification of singling out one from among two (5.3.92 *kiṃyattador nirdhāraṇe dvayor ekasya ḍatarac*). Rule 6.4.143 *teḥ* (*vt.: ḍid abhasyāpi ṭer lopaḥ*) causes deletion of *ṭi* of *kim.* Thus, *k*(*im*→ϕ) + (*Ḍ*) *atara*(*C*) = *k* + *atara* → *katara.* One can also derive *katama* with affix (*Ḍ*) *atama* (5.3.93 *vā bahūnāṃ jātiparipraśne ḍatamac*) used with the signification of singling out one from among many.

Now consider *katara* + *sU* and *katam* + *sU* where *sU* gets replaced with *ad*(*Ḍ*). This *ḍit*-status of *ad*(*Ḍ*) will again cause *ṭi*-deletion. Thus, *katar*(*a*→ϕ) + *ad* = *katar* + *ad* and *katam*(*a*→ϕ) + *ad* = *katam* + *ad.* The final *d* of these derivates will be optionally replaced with *t* (8.4.55 *vāvasāne*).

2. Why is *adḌ* marked with *Ḍ* as an *it*? So that *ṭi*-deletion in *katarat paśya* can be accomplished. For, in its absence, we will get *katara* + *at* which, by *pūrvasavarṇadīrgha* 'single long vowel replacement similar to what precedes' will produce an undesired form **katarāt* (6.1.101 *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇaḥ*). In summary, *sU* and *am* are replaced with *adḌ*, and *ṭi*-deletion then applies.

3. It is claimed that *katarat* of *katarat paśya* can still be derived with the application of 6.1.107 *ami pūrvaḥ* by accepting the nominal ending *am* to follow *katara,* via *sthānivadbhāva* 'accepting *x* as *y* which it replaced' (1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo' nalvidhau*). Why could the replacement then not be simply given as *t*? So that deletion of *t* by 6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt sambuddheḥ,* based on extension of *sambuddhi* via *sthānivadbhāva,* could be blocked in case of *he katarat.* It is further argued that this deletion can be saved if *apṛkta* (1.2.41 *apṛkta ekāl pratyayaḥ*) is carried to 6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt sambuddheḥ* from 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo dīrghāt* . . . and *a* of *am* is replaced with *d* in consonance with 1.1.54 *ādeḥ parasya.* The *m,* of course, will then go through conjunct-final deletion (*saṃyogānta-lopa*) of 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ.* But since this deletion will be considered suspended (*asiddha*; 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*), we can no longer have the affixal sound termed *apṛkta.* As a consequence, deletion will be blocked. But accepting this will also block deletion of *am* in *he kāṇḍa.* For, we can also not get *apṛkta* here. It is for this reason that taking recourse to the *anuvṛtti* of *apṛkta* is not advised. But still, if the *anuvṛtti* of *apṛkta* is not

accepted, deletion will become applicable in *he katarat*, etc. It is for this reason that this replacement in *adḌ* is offered with *Ḍ* as an *it*, consequential to *ṭi*-deletion. Thus,

apṛktaś cedamo doṣo nivṛtte ḍatarādiṣu /
addittvāḍ ḍatarādīnāṃ na lopo nāpi dīrghatā//

4. A question is raised as to why Pāṇini, given *adḍ ḍatarādibhyaḥ . . .*, did not apply 8.4.40 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*. That is, why did he not formulate this rule with *aḍ* by replacing *d* before *ḍ* with *ḍ* and deleting the final *ḍ* with the application of 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*. He chose *adḍ*, instead, to avoid any confusion as to whether the replacement was *aḍ* or *adḍ*.

7.1.26 नेतराच्छन्दसि

netarāc chandasi
/ na ϕ itarāt 5/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *svamoḥ* #23 *adḍ* #25)
itaraśabdād uttarayoḥ svamoś chandasi viṣaye adḍ ādeśo na bhavati
A replacement in *adḌ* does not come in place of affixes *sU* and *am* when they occur after an *aṅga*, namely *itara* 'other', in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

mṛtámitaramitaramāṇḍámájāyata
vārtraghnamitaram

1. This negation of *adḌ* is made in favor of 7.1.24 *ato' m*. Thus, *itara* + *am* → *itar*(*a*+*a*→*a*) *m* = *itaram* 'the other of the two', through *pūrvarūpa* 'single replacement similar to the preceding of a vocalic sequence' (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*). This replacement in *adḌ*, however, will apply in the classical language. Thus, *itarat kāṣṭham* 'the other of the two pieces of wood', etc.

2. Why did Pāṇini not formulate 7.1.26 *netarāc chandasi* simply as *itarāc chandasi* after the preceding 7.1.25 *ato' m*? This way, a negative provision with *na* 'not' would not be needed. A replacement in *am* would thus have become an exception to replacement in *adḌ*. Actually, *netarāc chandasi* is preferred to facilitate rule-splitting (*yogavibhāga*). This way, we get *na* 'not' as a separate split-rule (*Kāś: netarāc chandasi iti vacanaṃ yogavibhāgārtham*). This split-rule facilitates negation after *eka*(*tara*) everywhere (*PM: ekaśabdādd hi sarvatra pratiṣedha iṣyate, sa ca neti yogavibhāgāl labhyate. tasmād yogavibhāga iṣyate*).

3. Still, a *vārttika* proposal is made for negation (*pratiṣedha*) of *adḌ* after *ekatara* 'one of the two' in all (classical as well as Vedic) usage (*vt: ekatarādd hi sarvatra chandasi bhāṣāyāṃ pratiṣedha iṣyate*). Consider the following examples with *am*: *ekataraṃ tiṣṭhati* and *ekataraṃ paśya*.

7.1.27 युष्मदस्मद्भ्यां ङसोऽश्

yuṣmadasmadbhyāṃ ṅaso' ś
/yuṣmad-asmadbhyām 5 / 2 (*itar. dv.*); *ṅasaḥ* 6/1 *aś* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
'*yuṣmad-asmad*' *ity etābhyām uttarasya ṅasaḥ* '*aś*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
Affix *Ṅas* is replaced with *aŚ* when the same occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* 'second personal pronominal base (you)' and *asmad* 'first personal pronominal base (I)'.

EXAMPLES:

tava svam 'your possession'
mama svam 'my possession'

1. Note that, given *yuṣmad* + (*Ṅas*→*aŚ*) = *yuṣmad* + *a* and *asmad* + (*Ṅas*→*aŚ*) = *asmad* + *a*, rule 7.2.96 *tavamamau ṇasi* will replace *yuṣm* and *asm* with *tava* and *mama*, thereby yielding *tava* + *ad* + *a* and *mama* + *ad* + *a*. The final *d* of *tava* + *ad* and *mama* + *ad* will then go through deletion of 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ* to produce *tava* + *a*(*d*→ϕ) + *a* = *tava* + *a* + *a* and *mama* + *a* + *a*. Two applications of 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* (*pararūpa* 'a single replacement similar to what follows in a sequence'), first on *tav*(*a*+*a*→*a*) and then on *tav*(*a* +*a*→*a*), will produce the final derivates: *tava* and *mama*. There are some who consider the deletion by 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ* as *ṭi*-deletion in consonance with 1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*. If one prefers *ṭi*-deletion, instead, application of 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ* will affect the deletion of *ad*. Since one *a* will be deleted through *ṭi*-deletion, there will be only one application of *pararūpa* by 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*. This will be economical. However, one must find justification for applying *ṭi*-deletion, as against deletion of the final sound segment per 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*.

2. The *Ś* as an *it*, in *aŚ*, is intended for total replacement (*sarvādeśa*; 1.1.55 *anekāl śit sarvasya*), as against application of 1.1.53 *ādeḥ parasya*. If *a* alone was given as replacement, only *s* of *Ṅas* (of *Ṅas*) could be replaced in view of 1.1.53 *ādeḥ parasya*. This would yield *tava* + *a*(*d*→ϕ) + *a*(*s*→*a*) = *tava* + *a* + *a* + *a* . One can still derive *tava* from this string but one has to resort to application of *pararūpa* three times: *tav*(*a* + *a*→*a*) = *tav* (*a*+*a*→*a*) = *tav*(*a*+*a*→*a*) = *tava*. That is, if one does not accept *ṭi*-deletion of *ad* in case of the application of 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*. This process will be very prolix (*gaurava*). Replacing (*Ṅ*)*as* with *aŚ* marked with *Ś* as an *it* also involves a replacement of *a* with *a*. This *a*-replacement of *a* is not useless since this secondary representation of *a*-replacement blocks *y*-replacement of 7.2.29 *yo' ci*. Consequently, it is proper and economical to replace *Ṅas* in toto with *aŚ* marked with *Ś* as an *it*.

7.1.28 ङे प्रथमयोरम्

ṅe prathamayor am

/ṅe ϕ prathamayoḥ 6/2 *am* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* #27)
'ṅe' ity etasya prathamayoś ca vibhaktyoḥ = prathamādvitīyayor yuṣmadasmadbhyām uttarayoḥ 'am' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
The fourth (*caturthī*) singular triplet of nominal ending *Ṅe*, and individual triplets of the nominative (*prathamā*) and accusative (*dvitīyā*), i.e., *sU, au, Jas* and *am, auṬ, Śas*, are fully replaced with *am* when they occur after an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

EXAMPLES:

tubhyaṃ dīyate '. . . is given to you'
mahyaṃ dīyate '. . . is given to me'
tvam / yuvām / yūyam 'nominative singular, dual and plural forms of the second personal pronominal *yuṣmad*'
aham / āvām / vayam 'nominative singular, dual and plural forms of the first personal pronominal *asmad*'
tvām 'accusative singular form of *yuṣmad*'
mām 'accusative singular form of *asmad*'

1. This rule offers *am* as a total replacement for the fourth singular triplet of nominal ending *Ṅe*, and also for the first (nominative) and second (accusative) singular, dual, plural endings *sU / au /Jas* and *am / auṬ / Śas*. Of course, when these nominal endings occur after an *aṅga* constituted by *yuṣmad* 'second personal pronominal (you)' and *asmad* 'first personal pronominal (I)'. Note that the accusative plural ending *Śas* is to be excluded here. For, our next rule makes a separate proposal for *Śas* (7.1.29 *śasaḥ na*). These replacements, along with deletion of *d* by 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*, follow derivational patterns similar to *tava* and *mama* of the earlier rule. A replacement in *tubhya* and *mahya* for *yuṣm* and *asm* is offered by 7.2.95 *tubhyamahyau ṅayi*. Thus, *yuṣmad* + (*Ṅe*→*am*) = (*yuṣm*→*tubhya*)*ad* + *am* = *tubhya* + *a*(*d*=ϕ) + *am* = *tubhy*(*a*+*a*→*a*) + *am* = *tubhy*(*a* + *a*→*a*) *m* → *tubhyam*. Recall that 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* accomplishes *pararūpa*-replacement in *tubhy* (*a* + *a*→*a*) = *tubhya*. Rule 6.1.106 *ami pūrvaḥ* also accomplishes *pūrvarūpa* in *tubhy*(*a*+*a*→*a*) *m* = *tubhyam*. Similar applications are also involved in other derivates. A replacement in *tva* and *aha* in the nominative singular is accomplished by 7.2.94 *tvāhau sau*. The accusative dual *yuvām* and *āvām* involve *ā* as a replacement for the final *d* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* (7.2.88 *prathamāyāśca dvivacane bhāṣāyām*). A replacement in *yūya* and *vaya*, for *yuṣm* and *asm*, is specified by 7.3.93 *yūyavayau jasi* before *Jas*. Rule 7.2.97 *tvamāv ekavacane* requires *tva* and *ma* as replacement for *yuṣm* and *asm*, respectively, in singular before *am* of the accusative. A replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) for *d* is here accomplished by 7.2.87 *dvitīyāyāñ ca*.

2. Note that *Ṅe* is specified in this rule without the use of any nominal ending (*avibhaktiko' yaṃ nirdeśaḥ*). Our word *prathamayoḥ*, in the dual, refers to *prathamā* 'first (nominative)' and *dvitīyā* 'second (accusative)' triplets of

nominal endings. The *m* of *am* is not termed an *it* by 1.3.3 *halantyam.* For, 1.3.4 *na vibhaktau tusmāḥ* blocks the assignment of this term.

7.1.29 शसो न

śaso na
/śasaḥ 6/1 *na* (1/1 deleted)*/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* #27)
yuṣmadasmadbhyām uttarasya śaso nakārādeśo bhavati
Affix *Śas* is replaced with *nA* when the same occurs after an *aṅga*, namely, *yuṣmad* and *asmad.*

EXAMPLES:

yuṣmān brāhmaṇān '. . . you brāhmaṇas'
asmān brāhmaṇān '. . . us brāhmaṇas'
yuṣmān kulāni '. . . you clansmen'
asmān kulāni '. . . us clansmen'

1. The *A* of *nA* is for used for ease of articulation (*uccāraṇārthaḥ*). The *a* of *Śas* is replaced with *n*, in view of 1.1.54 *ādeḥ parasya*, of course, by blocking the replacement to come in place of the final sound segment in accord with 1.1.51 *alo' ntyasya.* This rule is an exception to the preceding rule which, in turn, makes a provision for *am.* Thus, *yuṣmad* + (($\acute{S}$) *a* →*n*) *s*)) = *yuṣmad* + *n* + *s.* The *d* of *yuṣmad* is then replaced with *ā* of 7.2.87 *dvitīyāyāñ ca*, thereby yielding *yuṣma*(*d*→*ā*) + *n* + *s* = *yuṣma* + *ā* + *n* + *s.* Similarly, we get *asma* + *ā* + *n* + *s.* An application of 6.1.101 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* will produce *yuṣm*(*a*+*ā*→*ā*) + *n* + *s* = *yuṣmā* + *n* + *s* and *asm*(*a*+*ā*→*ā*) + *n* + *s* = *asmā* + *n* + *s.* A conjunct deletion of *s* at the end (8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*) will finally produce *yuṣmān* (*s*→ϕ) = *yuṣmāṇ* and *asmān*(*s*→ϕ) = *asmān.* Recall that suspension (*asiddhatva*) of conjunct deletion cannot be manipulated to accomplish deletion of *n* by 8.2.7 *na lopaḥ prātipadikāntasya.* In fact, a replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*), for *n* in *yuṣmān*, which may become available from 8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅ* . . ., is also blocked by 8.4.36 *padāntasya.*

This rule is formulated for derivates in the neuter and feminine. For, the *n* of masculine derivates could be accomplished by 6.1.102 *tasmāc chaso naḥ puṃsi.* Or else, if one believes that a pronominal does not have a specific gender, this rule is formulated so that *n* could also be made available in the neuter and feminine.

7.1.30 भ्यसो भ्यम्

bhyaso bhyam
/bhyasaḥ 6/1 *bhyam* 1/1*/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* #27)

yuṣmadasmadbhyām uttarasya bhyasaḥ 'bhyam' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affix *bhyas* is replaced with *bhyam* when the same occurs after an *aṅga*, namely, *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

EXAMPLES:

yuṣmabhyaṃ dīyate '. . . is given to you all'
asmabhyaṃ dīyate ' . . . is given to us all'

1. Note that an interpretation of this rule may yield both *bhyam* and *abhyam* as replacements. That is, by accepting *bhyasaḥ bhyam* and *bhyasaḥ abhyam* as two readings. If one accepts *bhyam*, then a deletion of *d* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* has to be accomplished by 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*. Thus, *asmad* + (*bhyas* → *bhyam*) → *asma*(*d*→ϕ) + *bhyam* = *asmabhyam*. Note that this deletion of *d* will not be a *ṭi*-deletion. It will be accomplished to simply derive desired forms (*iṣṭa-sidhyartha*). Accepting *abhyam* will entail *ṭi*-deletion of *ad*, again by 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*. See my notes about *ṭi*-deletion of *ad* under rule 7.1.27 *yuṣmadasmadbhyāṃ ṇaso' ś*. Thus, *asmad* + (*bhyas*→*abhyam*) → *asm*(*ad*→ϕ) + *abhyam; asm* + *abhyam* = *asmabhyam*. Many prefer *abhyam* as the proper replacement. Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* for further details.

2. Why can we not accomplish *e*-replacement (*etva*) of 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et* after *bhyam* replaces *bhyas* and 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ* deletes *d*? This is not possible, especially in view of *paribhāṣā* (93) *aṅgavṛtte punarvṛttāv avidhiḥ*. That is, *aṅgakāryaṃ kṛte punar nāṅgakāryam* 'one should not perform another operation on an *aṅga* once one has already been performed'.

7.1.31 पञ्चम्या अत्

pañcamyā at
/pañcamyāḥ 6/1 *at* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* #27 *bhyasaḥ* #30)
pañcamyā bhyaso yuṣmadasmadbhyām uttarasya 'at' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
The *bhyas* of the fifth triplet of nominal endings (*pañcamī*) which occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, is replaced with *at*.

EXAMPLES:

yuṣmad gacchanti 'they move away from you'
asmad gacchanti 'they move away from us'

1. This is an exception to *bhyam* which is made available by the earlier rule (*Nyāsa: pūrveṇa prāptasya bhyamo' pavādaḥ*). The derivates both involve *ṭi*-deletion, or deletion of *d* of *ad* (7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*), in addition to total replacement of *bhyas* with *at*. Thus, *yuṣmad* + *bhyas* → *yuṣmad* + (*bhyas*→*at*) = *yum*(*ad*→ϕ) + *at* = *yuṣmat*. Similarly, we get *asmat*. If one prefers final deletion of *d* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* before *at* by 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*, one may have to derive the desired forms *yuṣmat* and *asmat* by applying the *pararūpa* 'single

replacement similar to what follows in a sequence' provision of 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*. The example derivates are given with verbal form *gacchanti* to illustrate *apāya* 'movement away from' as one of the conditions under which the fifth triplet can be used to denote *apādāna* (2.3.28 *apādāne pañcamī*).

7.1.32 एकवचनस्य च

ekavacanasya ca
/ekavacanasya 6/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* #27 *pañcamyā at* #31)
pañcamyā ekavacanasya yuṣmadasmadbhyām uttarasya 'at' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
The singular ending of the fifth triplet, i.e., *ṄasI*, when occurring after an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, is also replaced with *at*.

EXAMPLES:

tvad gacchanti 'they move away from you'
mad gacchanti 'they move away from me'

1. Note that *yuṣm* and *asm* are here replaced with *tva* and *ma* (7.2.97 *tvamāv ekavacane*). Rules 7.2.97 *śeṣe lopaḥ* and 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* apply as usual to offer *ṭi*-deletion and *pararūpa*. Thus, (*yuṣm→tva*) *ad* + (*ṄasI→at*) → (*tv*(*ad→*ϕ) + *at* = *tvat*. We similarly get *asmad* + *at* → (*asm→ma*) *d* + *at* = *m*(*ad→*ϕ) + *at* = *mat*. Accepting deletion of final *d*, against *ṭi*-deletion, will again require application of *pararūpa* of 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*.

7.1.33 साम आकम्

sāma ākam
/sāmaḥ 6/1 *ākam* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yuṣmadasmadbhyām* #27)
'sāma' iti ṣaṣṭhībahuvacanam āgatsuṭkaṃ gṛhyate; tasya yuṣmadasmadbhyām uttarasya 'ākam' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
The word-form *sām*, when occurring after an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, is replaced with *ākam*.

EXAMPLES:

yuṣmākam 'yours'
asmākam 'ours'

1. Note that *sām* is here interpreted as the genitive plural ending *ām*, specified with augment *sUṬ* (*āgatasuṭka*). Augment *sUṬ* is brought here from 7.1.52 *āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ*. This specification of *ām* with *sUṬ* is made to get rid of this *sUṬ* by way of replacement. It is also to indicate that *ākam* will not get *sUṬ* which, otherwise, may be available to *yuṣma* and *asma* after deletion

of *d* by 7.2.97 *śeṣe lopaḥ*. A specification with *sām* gets rid of *sUṬ* by way of its being part of *ām*. A replacement with long *ā* in *ākam* is given for blocking *pararūpa* (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*).

The *ṭi*-deletion of 7.2.97 *śeṣe lopaḥ* again applies. Thus, *yuṣmad* + *sām* → *yuṣmad* + (*sām*→*ākam*) → *yuṣm*(*ad*→ϕ) + *ākam* = *yuṣmākam*. We similarly get *asmākam*. This rule thus does three things: (*i*) it introduces *ākam* as a replacement for *ām* by specifying it with *s* of *sUṬ*; (*ii*) it thus gets rid of *sUṬ*; (*iii*) if one follows the final-deletion view of 7.2.97 *śeṣe lopaḥ*, this rule, by way of including *sUṬ* as part of *sthānī* 'item to be replaced', also negates *sUṬ* which may, subsequently, become applicable (*Kāś: ādeśe kṛte hi śeṣelope yuṣmadasmador akārāntatvāt suṭ prāpnoti sa sthānyantarbhūtatvān nivartate*).

2. It is stated that *ākam* is specified with a long *ā* to facilitate homogeneous long vowel replacement (*savarṇa-dīrgha*; 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*). But this replacement could be blocked simply at the strength of offering the replacement in *akam* with a short *a*. A specification with short *a* could block replacement in *e* (*etva*; 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et*). But it could not block the application of *pararūpa* by 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*. That is, homogeneous long vowel replacement could not be accomplished. It is to facilitate the application of 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* that *ākam* is specified with the long *ā* of *ākam*. If *ṭi*-deletion is accomplished by way of the application of 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*, the condition of introduction of augment *sUṬ* will be removed. For, there will not be any *a* at the end of the *aṅga*. This will then render the specification of *sākam* with augment *sUṬ* (*sasuṭka*) vacuous (*vyartha*).

7.1.34 आत् औ णलः

āt au ṇalaḥ
/*ātaḥ* 5/1 *au* (1/1 deleted) *ṇalaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
ākārād aṅgād uttarasya ṇal aukārādeśo bhavati
Affix *āL*, when occurring after an *aṅga* ending in *āT*, is replaced with *au*.

EXAMPLES:

papau 'third person active *LIṬ*-derivate of *pā* 'to drink''
tasthau 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *sthā* 'to stand''
jaglau 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *glai* 'to be weary, sad''
mamlau 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *mlai* 'to be weary, languid''

1. Note that *ṆaL* is a replacement of the third person singular active verbal ending *tip* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ ṇalatusus . . .*). Consider *papau* derived from *pā* + (*LIṬ*→*tiP*) → *pā* + (*tiP*→*ṆaL*) = *pā* + (*Ṇ*)*a*(*L*), where this rule replaces *ṆaL* with *au* to produce *pā* + *au*. A single replacement in *vṛddhi*

(6.1.88 *vṛddhir eci*) then produces *p*(*ā*+*au*→*au*) = *pau*. Rule 6.1.8 *liṭi dhātor anabhyāsasya* is then applied for reduplication. It takes place via *rūpātideśa* 'extension of form (here of *pā* to *pau*)'. We thus get *pā* + *pau*. The *ā* of *pā* is then replaced with its short counterpart of 7.4.59 *hrasvaḥ*. That is, *p*(*ā*→*a*) + *pau* = *papau*. Similar order of rules apply in deriving other examples. Note, however, that *tha* of the *abhyāsa*, alone, is retained in view of application of 7.4.61 *śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ*. This *th*, eventually, goes through a replacement in *t* (*cartva*) of 8.4.54 *abhyāse car ca*, thereby yielding *tasthau*. Refer to the appendix (III:787) for derivational details of *jagle* and *mamle* which share rule applications similar to *jaglau* and *mamlau*.

2. Note that the order of application of rules is: *autva* 'replacement in *au*', *ekādeśa* 'single replacement', *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating a replacement as if it was the item it replaced' and *dvirvacana* 'reduplication'. That is, if *ekādeśa* preceded replacement in *au*, then *au* could never find its scope of application. It is because of *niravakāśatva* 'no scope of application' that single replacement (*ekādeśa*) is accomplished first. Reduplication, with reference to *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating *x* as *y* which *x* replaced', must also be accomplished after *ekādeśa* (*Kāś: atrautvam ekādeśaḥ, sthānivadbhāvaḥ, dvirvacanam—ity anena krameṇa kāryāṇi kriyante; ekādeśād anavakāśatvād autvaṃ dvirvacanād api paratvād ekādeśa iti*). Reduplication in *papau* is accomplished after *ekādeśa* of 6.1.88 *vṛddhir eci* on the basis of *paratva* (1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam*). A single replacement, therefore, is considered as *sthānī* 'the item it replaced', provided an operation on what precedes is to be performed (*Mbh: ekādeśaḥ pūrvavidhau kartavye sthānivad bhavatīti vaktavyam*).

7.1.35 तुह्योस्तातङाशिष्यन्यतरस्याम्

tuhyos tātaṅāśiṣy anyatarasyām
/ *tuhyoḥ* 6/2 *tātaṅ* 1/1 *āśiṣi* 7/1 *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
Affixes *tu* and *hi*, when occurring after an *aṅga*, are optionally replaced with *tātAṄ*, provided benediction (*āśīḥ*) is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

jīvatād bhavān 'may you live for long'
jīvatāt tvam 'ibidem'
jīvatu bhavān 'ibidem'
jīva tvam 'ibidem'

1. This optional replacement in *tātAṄ* is intended for *tu* and *hi* when *āśīḥ* 'benediction, blessing' is denoted. Thus, *jīv* + *ŚaP* + (*LOṬ*→ *tu*) = *jīv* + *a* + (*tu*→*tāt*) = *jīv* + *a* + *tāt* = *jīvatāt*. We will get *jīvatu*, instead, if *tātAṄ* does not replace *tu*.

2. *Ṅ* as an *it* in *tātAṄ* is not intended for facilitating a replacement to

come in place of a final sound (1.1.53 *ṅic ca*). It is for this reason that *tātAṄ* replaces *tu* and *hi*, in toto.

What then is the purpose of specifying *tātAṄ* with *Ṅ* as an *it*? The purpose is to block *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*, as in *brūtād bhavān* 'may you please speak'. Why is it that *anAṄ* (7.1.93 *anaṅ sau*), marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*, similarly to *tātAṄ*, replaces the final sound only? For, *Ṅ* as an *it* in *tātAṄ* is expressly used as an *it* for replacement. That is why it replaces the final sound in view of 1.1.53 *ṅic ca*. It is not used there for blocking *guṇa* or *vṛddhi*. If it did not replace the final sound as a result of its *Ṅ* as an *it*, marking it with *Ṅ* as an *it* will become vacuous (*vyartha*). Augment *īṬ* (7.2.93 *bruva īṭ*) is also blocked here in addition to blocking of *guṇa*. For, *tātAṄ*, although a replacement of an affix marked with *P* as an *it*, can no longer be treated as marked with *P* as an *it* (*pit*). It is a *ṅit* as marked, and it cannot be treated as marked with *P* as an *it* (*pit*). A *Ṅ*, used as an *it* for purposes of replacement, must allow replacement in place of the final sound segment.

How come *tātAṄ*, by way of being a replacement for *hi*, cannot be deleted after *jīva* (6.4.105 *ato heḥ*)? Rule 6.4.105 *ato heḥ* deletes *hi*, and not *tātAṄ*. How do we know this? By the fact that an additional *hi* is also carried over to rule 6.4.105 *ato heḥ* from 6.4.101 *hu jhalbhyo her dhiḥ*. This enables deletion to apply to *hi* which is available in the form of *hi*.

Kāśikā quotes two verses in connection with the status of items marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*:

> *tātaṅi ṅitvaṃ saṃkramakṛt syād*
> *antyavidhiś cet tac ca tathā na /*
> *her adhikāre her adhikāre*
> *lopavidhau tu jñāpakam āha //1//*
> '*Ṅ* as an *it* in *tātAṄ* is intended for blocking *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*; it is not intended for replacing the final sound segment; the *heḥ* which he (Pāṇini) states in the context of deletion by 6.4.105 *ato heḥ* within the domain of *hi* (6.4.101 *hujhalbhyor her dhiḥ*) becomes an indicator (*jñāpaka*); that *hi* which is given in the form of *hi*, alone, goes through deletion.'

> *tātaṅo ṇitvasāmarthyān nāyam antyavidhiḥ smṛtaḥ /*
> *na tadvad anaṅādīnāṃ tena te' ntyavikārajāḥ //2//*
> 'it is at the strength of *Ṅ* as an *it* in *tātAṄ* that it is not considered marking an operation applicable to replacement of the final consonant; since *anAṄ*, etc., do not have that kind of competence, they are considered replacements in place of final sound segments.'

The *Ṅ* as an *it* in *tātaṄ* is intended for blocking *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* (*saṅkramaṇa*). It should not be accepted for facilitating final replacement. For, if final replacement is accepted as the purpose, we will not find that

base directly followed by that which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. That is, for example, when *tātAṄ* replaces the *i* of *hi*. There will be *h* intervening between the base and *tātAṄ*. Given this, 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca* cannot block *guṇa*. Consequently, in order for a *Ṅit* to fully realize its function, we will have to accept *tātaṄ* as a total replacement for *hi*.

The *Ṅ* of *tatAṄ* should not be accepted for facilitating a partial replacement of only a final sound segment. This will go against the stipulation of 1.1.53 *ṅic ca*. Besides, there are ways other than making *Ṅ* as an *it* for specifying replacement of a final sound segment. Consider, for example, the following line-up of rules:

> *eruḥ tuhyos tād āśiṣi* 'let the final sound of *tu* and *hi* be replaced with *tāt* when benediction . . .'

Thus, *tuhyos tāt*, when read with *eruḥ* (3.4.86), could yield the interpretation: 'let *tāt* be the replacement for final of *tu* and *hi* related with *eruḥ*'. Note that *eruḥ* cannot be associated with *hi* but it will facilitate replacement of *ti* with *tu*. The resultant *tu* will then go through a replacement with *tātAṄ*. We do not need *Ṅ* to facilitate the replacement of the final sound segment. The same can be accomplished in view of 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*. But why do we have *Ṅ* as an *it* in *tātAṄ*. Because we want to block *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*. Recall that *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* are not possible unless there is a total replacement (*sarvādeśa*). For example, given an *aṅga* ending in *i*, we find an immediately preceding *aṅga* ending in *i* before *tāt* which, in turn, is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. If a replacement for the final sound of *hi* and *tu* is accomplished by *tātAṄ*, we will end up with *t* and *h* of *tu* and *hi* intervening between the *aṅga* and the replacement. A *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* could thus not be blocked. If one still insists on replacement of the final sound segment, one has to extend the status of *Ṅ* as an *it* to the totality of form whose final is replaced with *tātAṄ*, in view of *avayave kṛtaṃ liṅgaṃ samudāye upacaryate* 'a mark made on a part is transferred to the whole'. I do not discuss full implication of this transfer. Suffice it to say that such a transfer is favored to save *Ṅ* as an *it* from becoming vacuous.

A solution to this problem is offered by *her adhikāre*. . . . Note here that *heḥ* can be easily carried over to 6.4.105 *ato heḥ* from 6.4.101 *hu jhalyo her dhiḥ*. Yet we are getting the explicit mention of *heḥ* in 6.4.105 *ato heḥ*. This indicates that deletion by *LUK* applies to a *hi* which happens to be in the form of *hi*, and not to a *hi* which one gets through replacement, via *sthānivadbhāva* 'treatment of a replacement as what it replaced'. An indicatication (*jñāpaka*) of this nature can be gotten only when that which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it* is gotten by total replacement. A *Ṅ* as an *it*, gotten via *sthānivadbhāva*, will render the explicit mention of *hi* without any opurpose. Why can we not state this *jñāpaka* by some other means? That is, let *hi* of the form *hi* go through *LUK*-deletion, and the *hi* which is modified by replace-

ment of its final not go through *LUK*-deletion. That is, why can we not manipulate this *jñāpaka* in view of replacement of the final sound? But how could we then account for *sarvādeśa* 'replacement in toto' indicated by *Ṅ* as an *it* (1.1.53 *ṅic ca*).

It is in view of this that a direct statement is being made: *tātaṅo ṅitvasāmarthyān nāyam antyavidhismṛtaḥ* 'based on the competency of *Ṅ* as an *it*, this should not be cosidered a replacement operation of the final sound segment'. This total replacement has further consequences for negation of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* in cases where replacement of the final sound segment is not accomplished. A *Ṅ* as an *it* which facilitates replacement of the final could not be capable of blocking *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*. For, it is not capable of facilitating total replacement. A replacement in *anAṄ* which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it* is capable of facilitating replacement of the final sound segment. But it is not capable of blocking *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*. The *Ṅ* as an *it* in *tātAṄ* has an added purpose of blocking *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*. It cannot be considered having the purpose of facilitating replacement of the final sound segment. Thus, *tātAṄ* because of containing more sound segments will replace *hi* in toto.

7.1.36 विदेः शतुर्वसुः

videḥ śatur vasuḥ
/videḥ 5/1 *śatuḥ* 6/1 *vasuḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
'*vid*' *jñāne ity etasmād dhātor uttarasya śatur vasur ādeśo bhavati*
Affix *ŚatṚ*, when occurring after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *vid* 'to know', is replaced with *vasU* (3.2.107).

EXAMPLES:

vidvān 'nominative singular of *vidvat* 'scholar' '
vidvāṃsau 'nominative dual . . .'
vidvāṃsaḥ 'nominative plural . . .'

1. This rule allows *vasU* to replace affix *ŚatṚ* (3.2.124 *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv . . .*) when this same occurs after *vid* 'to know'. Our example-derivate *vidvān* derives from *vidvas* + *sU*, where *vidvas* derives from *vid* + (*LAṬ*→*ŚatṚ* → *vid* + *at*)). An introduction of *ŚaP* (3.1.68 *kartari śap*) and its subsequent *LUK*-deletion by 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyo śapaḥ* yields *vid* + *at*. Our present rule then introduces the form *vas*(*U*) as a replacement for (*Ś*)*at*(*Ṛ*). We thus get *vid* + *vas* = *vidvas*. Augment *nUM* is then introduced after *a* of *vidvas* + *sU* by rule 7.1.70 *ugidacām. . . .* The penultimate *a* of *vidvans* is then replaced with its long counterpart (6.4.10 *sāntamahataḥ . . .*) to produce *vidvāns* + *sU*. Rule 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo dīrghāt . . .* then deletes *sU*. The final *s* of the conjunct subsequently goes through its deletion by 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ* to yield *vidvāns* + (*sU*→ϕ) → *vidvān*(*s*→ϕ) = *vidvān*. The dual and plural forms, i.e.,

vidvāṃsau and *vidvāṃsaḥ*, are derived by replacing the *n* of *nUM* with *ṃ* (*anusvāra*; 8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya . . .*).

2. Some consider the *anuvṛtti* of *anyatarasyām* valid here, thereby recognizing the replacement in *vasU* as optional. If one does not accept the option of replacing (*Ś*)*at*(*Ṛ*) with *vasU*, one would derive the base as *vid* + *at* = *vidat*. The nominative singular, dual and plural forms will then be: *vidan / vidantau / vidantaḥ*. Those who accept this replacement in *vasU* as obligatory (*nitya*), must claim *vidan / vidantau / vidantaḥ* to be non-existent.

3. Why do we have to mark *vas* with *U* as an *it* (*ugit*) when its purpose can be served by treating *vas* as marked with *uK*, i.e., *ṛ*, via *sthānivadbhāva*, on the basis of the *ŚatṚ* it replaced. This would have equally facilitated operations such as introduction of *nUM*, etc. A replacement in *vasU*, as against *vas*, is given so that, in rules such as 6.4.131 *vasoḥ samprasāraṇam*, *vasU* could also include a reference to *KvasU*. But this reference may be blocked on the basis of *ekānubandha-paribhāṣā: ekānubandhakagrahaṇe na dvyanubandhakasya* 'a specification made by that which consists of a single *it*-element cannot refer to an element which consisted of two *it*-elements'. But accepting this application of *ekānubandha-paribhāṣā* will render the use of *U*, as an *it* in *vasU*, vacuous. For, *vas*, without *U*, will then be serving its purpose via *sthānivadbhāva*. This, in turn, becomes an indicator that the *ekānubandha-paribhāṣā* does not apply here.

7.1.37 समासेऽनञ्पूर्वे क्त्वो ल्यप्

samāse' nañpūrve ktvo lyap
/samāse 7/1 *anañpūrve* 7/1 = *na nañ* (*nañ.*); *anañ pūrvo' vayavo yasya* (*bv.*), *tasmin; ktvaḥ* 6/1 *lyap* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
samāse' nañpūrve 'ktvā' ity etasya 'lyap' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affix *Ktvā*, when occurring after a compound (*samāsa*) termed *aṅga* having an indeclinable other than *naÑ* as its initial constituent, is replaced with *LyaP*.

EXAMPLES:

prakṛtya 'after having made or done well'
prahṛtya 'after having carried well'
pārśvataḥkṛtya 'after having placed something aside'
nānākṛtya 'after having made (something) many'
dvidhākṛtya 'after having split (something) into two'

1. Refer to the appendix (II:394) for derivational details of *prakṛtya* and *prahṛtya*. The *Ktvā*, after *kṛ* in *pārśvataḥkṛtya*, is introduced by 3.4.61 *svāṅge taspratyaye . . .* under the condition of a cooccurring nominal ending in *tasI* and denoting 'one's limb'. The *Ktvā* in *nānākṛtya* and *dvidhākṛtya* is intro-

duced by 3.4.62 *nādhārthapratyaye*. . . . The compounds are all formed by 2.2.22 *ktvā ca*.

Recall here that *Ktvā* is marked with *K* as an *it*. It is also assigned the terms *kṛt* (3.1.93 *kṛd atiṅ*) and *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*). Finally, a form which ends in *Ktvā* is also assigned the term *avyaya* by 1.1.40 *ktvātosunkasunaḥ*. A *sUP* which is introduced after an indeclinable goes through deletion, via *LUK*, of 2.4.82 *avyayād āp supaḥ*. A *LyaP* never receives augment *iṬ*. *L* as an *it* in *LyaP* is used for initial *udātta* accent in view of 6.1.190 *liti*.

2. This replacement is not allowed where non-compounds are involved. Thus, consider *kṛtvā* and *hṛtvā*. The negation in *anaÑ* is here interpreted as *paryudāsa*, paraphrased as *naño' nyad anañ* 'that which is other than a *naÑ*'. This *anaÑ*, interpreted as *paryudāsa*, will then refer to forms which are similar to, but are not, *naÑ* (*tadbhinnatatsadṛśa*). The non-*naÑ* forms similar to *naÑ*, in this context, are indeclinables (*avyaya*). That is why, *akṛtvā*, *ahṛtvā*, *paramakṛtvā* and *uttamakṛtvā* cannot qualify for this replacement.

How come *ktvā* of *snātvākālakaḥ* is not replaced with *LyaP*? Can this be attributed to *nipātana* of 2.4.72 *mayūravyaṃsakādayaś ca*? No. The locative of *samāse* denotes *nirdhāraṇa* 'exact specification; singling out one from among many'. Thus, *Ktvā* must be used within a compound. The *Ktvā*, when interpreted via *tadantavidhi*, will also refer to a compound ending in *Ktvā*. Our example does not have *Ktvā* at the end. Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* for further details.

Why do we not get *hi* (7.4.42 *dadhāter hiḥ*) as a replacement for *dhā* in *pradhāya*, and *ī* (7.4.40 *dyatisyatimāsthāmitti kiti*) in place of *ā* of *sthā* in *prasthāya*? Even an externally conditioned *LyaP* blocks internally conditioned operations (*pbh.* (55): *aṇtaraṅgān api vidhīn bahiraṅgo lyab bādhate*). This has been indicated by the following under rule 2.4.36 *ado jagdhir lyapti kiti*:

> *jagdhau siddhe' ntaraṅgatvāt ti kitīti lyab ucyate /*
> *jñāpayaty antaraṅgāṇāṃ lyaṭā bhavati bādhanam //*
> 'an explicit mention of *LyaP*, even when its purpose can be accomplished by the internally conditioned replacement of *ad* with *jagdh* before a *t*-initial affix marked with *K* as an *it*, is to indicate that *LyaP* can block internally conditioned operations'

7.1.38 क्त्वापि छन्दसि

> *ktvāpi chandasi*
> */ktvā* (1/1 deleted) *api* ϕ *chandasi* 7/1/
> (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *samāse' nañpūrve ktvo lyap* #37)
> *samāse' nañpūrve 'ktvā' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati apiśabdād lyab api bhavati chandasi viṣaye*
> Affix *Ktvā*, when occurring in the Vedic after a compound termed *aṅga*

not used with *naÑ* as its initial constituent, is also replaced with *Ktvā*, in addition to being replaced with *LyaP*.

EXAMPLES:

kṛṣṇaṃ vāso yajamānaṃ paridhāpayitvā 'the sacrificer having covered himself with a black cloth'
pratyañcamarkaṃ pratyarpayitvā 'after having offered the oblation of water to the setting sun'
uddhṛtya juhoti 'after having taken out (raised) he offers ritual oblation'

1. Note that the *anuvṛtti* of *chandasi* is carried over to 7.1.50 *ājjaser asuk*.

2. Why was the *sūtra* not formulated simply as *vā chandasi*? So that all other qualifications of this rule-application could be made optional (*sarvopādhi vyabhicārārtham*). Thus, we get *arcya tān devān gataḥ* 'left after having worshiped those gods' where *LyaP* is found in a non-compound (*asamāsa*).

The use of *api* is made so that *LyaP* can also be made an option. Thus, consider *pratyarpayitvā* 'having made the offerings to . . .', as against *paridhāpayitvā* 'having made to cover', where the option of *LyaP* is not accepted even when we have the preverbs *prati* and *pari*. These examples, both, are derivates of *ṆiC* (3.1.26 *hetumati ca*), used after *prati-ṛ* and *pari-dhā* with *Ktvā* and *pUK* (7.3.36 *arttihri . . .*). An application of *guṇa* (7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*), followed by *yaṆ*, produces *prati + arpi* → *prat(i→y) arpi = pratyarpi*, a derived root. We get *pari-dhāpi* without any *guṇa*. Further application of *guṇa, iṬ*, and *ay* as a replacement for *e*, produces *pratyarp(i→ey) + i + tvā = pratyarpayitvā* and *paridhāpayitvā*.

Now consider *uddhṛtya*, derived from *ud + hṛ + (Ktvā→LyaP)*, where augment *tUK* is introduced by 6.1.71 *hrasvasya piti kṛti tuk*. The *h* of *hṛ* is replaced with *dh* by 8.4.62 *jhayo ho' nyatarasyām*.

7.1.39 सुपां सुलुक्पूर्वसवर्णाच्छेयाडाड्यायाजालः

supāṃ sulukpūrvasavarṇāccheyāḍāḍyāyājālaḥ
/ supām 6/1 *su-luk-pūrvasavarṇa-ā-āc-che-yā-ḍā-ḍyā-yāj-ālaḥ* 1/3 (*itar. dv.*) / (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
chandasi viṣaye supāṃ sthāne '*su, luk, pūrvasavarṇa, ā, āt, śe, yā, ḍā, ḍyā, yāc, āl' ity ete ādeśā bhavanti*
Affixes denoted by the abbreviatory term *sUP*, when occurring after an *aṅga* in the Vedic, are replaced with *sU, LUK, pūrvasavarṇa* 'single replacement homogeneous with the preceding', *ā, āt, śe, yā, Ḍā, Ḍyā, yāC* and *āL*.

EXAMPLES

aṇṛkṣarā ṛjaváḥ santu panthāḥ 'may the paths be thorn-less and trouble free'

ārdre carman 'on (blood)soaked hide'
dhītī '. . . through prayer'
ubhā devā . . . 'both divinities . . .'
na tād (*tān*) *brāhmaṇād* (*brāhmaṇān*) *nindāmi* 'I do not curse those brāhmaṇas'
na yaṣmé bājabandhavaḥ 'you do not have associates in battle'
asme índrābṛhaspatī 'O Indra and Bṛhaspati, you two for us two . . .'
uruyā 'from thighs . . .'
nābahā́ pṛthivyām 'in the navel (north) of the altar . . .'
auṣṭuyoccyāvayatāt sādhurā 'with goodness . . .'
vasantā yajeta 'should offer sacrifice in the spring'

1. This rule offers a series of replacements for nominal endings (*sUP*) in the Vedic.

(*a*) Refer to derivational details of *panthāḥ* (II:398-99) where *sU* is selected over *Jas* of the nominative plural.
A proposal is made to rephrase operational statements as follows:

(*i*) *supāṃ supo bhavanti* 'affixes denoted by *sUP* 'nominal endings' come in place of *sUP*'. Consider *dakṣiṇāyāḥ* where *Ṅas* 'genitive singular' replaces *Ṅi* 'locative singular', for example, of *dakṣiṇāyām.*

(*ii*) *tiṅāṃ tiṅo bhavanti* 'affixes denoted by *tiṄ* 'verbal endings' come in place of *tiṄ*'. Consider . . . *ye takṣati* 'those who carve out . . .', as opposed to *ye takṣanti*, where *tiP* 'third singular active' is selected over its plural counterpart *jhi.*

(*b*) Derivates of *carman, yad* 'that which' and *tad* 'that' illustrate how locative singular *Ṅi* goes through deletion by *LUK.* Thus, we find *lohite carman* 'on red hide', *yat sunvanti* 'that which they press out . . .' and *tat sunvanti* 'that they press out . . .', as against *lohite carmaṇi* 'on red skin', *yasmin sunvanti* 'in that which they press out' and *tasmin sunvanti* 'in that they press out'.

(*c*) A replacement for *Ṭā*, similar to what precedes (*pūrvarūpa*), is illustrated by *dhītī* 'thought, intellect, devotion, thirst' and *matī* 'ibidem'. Thus, *dhīti* + (*Ṭ*) *ā* = *dhīti* + (*ā*→*i*) → *dhīt*(*i*+*i*→*ī*; 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe . . .*) = *dhītī.*

(*d*) Consider *ubhā* + *au*, of *ubhā yantārā*, where *au* 'nominative dual' is replaced with *ā.* We get *ubhā* 'both' through application of 6.1.98 *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇaḥ.* Thus, *ubh*(*a*+*ā*→ *ā*) = *ubhā.*

(*e*) A replacment in *āt*, for *Śas* 'accusative dual' of *tad* + *Śas*/ *brāhmaṇa* + *Śas*, is illustrated by *tād brāhmaṇān*, as against *tān brāhmaṇān* 'those brāhmaṇas . . .'.

(*f*) Refer to derivational details of *yuṣme* and *asme* (II:350-52), as against *yuṣmāsu* and *asmāsu*, where *Śe* replaces *suP* 'locative plural'. A lack of replacement in *yūya* and *vaya*, for *yuṣm* and *asm*, is also a Vedic peculiarity.

(*g*) A replacement in *yāC*, for *Ṭā*, is illustrated by *uru* + (*Ṭ*) *ā* = *uru* + (*ā*→*yā*) = *uruyā* 'with greatness, by the great one' and *dhṛṣṇu* + (*ā*→ *yā*) = *dhṛṣṇuyā* 'with boldness, by the bold one'. The regular instrumental singular forms being *uruṇā* and *dhṛṣṇunā*.

(*h*) A *Ṅi* occurring after *nābhi* 'navel' is similarly replaced with *Ḍā* to yield *nābhi* + (*Ṅi*→*Ḍā*) = *nābhi* + *ā*. The *Ḍ* as an *it* in *Ḍā* causes *ṭi*-deletion to produce *nābhā*. A similar replacement in *Ḍyā* is found for *Ṭā* when occurring after *anuṣṭup*. This yields *anuṣṭyā* after *ṭi*-deletion. The form would otherwise be *anuṣṭubhā*.

(*i*) Now consider *sādhu* 'good; neuter nominative singular' where *sU* gets deleted. We find *sādhuyā* where *sU* gets replaced with *yāC*, instead. A similar replacement of *Ṅi* with *āL* produces *vasantā*, as against *vasante*.

2. A series of other proposals have also been made. Thus,

(*iii*) *iyā*, *ḌiyāC* and *ī* in *urviyā* 'from thighs' / *dārviyā* 'from wood', *sugātriyā* 'by one with a beautiful body' / *sukṣetriyā* 'by one with beautiful field' and *sarasī* 'pond', where the first set illustrates replacing *Ṭā* 'instrumental singular' after *uru* and *dāru* with *iyā*. The second set replaces *Ṭā* with *ḌiyāC* involving *ṭi*-deletion. The last *sarasī* has its *Ṅi* replaced with *ī*. Recall that regular forms would be: *uruṇā*/ *dāruṇā*, *sukṣetriṇā*/ *sugātriṇā* and *sarasi*.

(*iv*) Additional replacements for *Ṭā* 'instrumental singular' include *āṄ*, *ayāC* and *ayāR*. Thus, *bāhavā* against *bāhunā*, *svapnayā* against *svapnena*, and *nāvayā* against *nāvā*.

7.1.40 अमो मश्

amo maś
/*amaḥ* 6/1 *maś* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
amaḥ chandasi viṣaye maś ādeśo bhavati
Affix *am*, when occurring after an *aṅga* in the Vedic, is replaced with *mAŚ*.

EXAMPLES:

vadhīṃ vṛtram 'I killed Vṛtra'
kramīṃ vṛkṣasya śākhām
'I climbed up the branch of a tree'

1. Note that *am* is not interpreted here as accusative singular *am*. It is a replacement of *miP* in consonance with 3.4.101 *tasthasthamipām. . . .* The *A* of *mAŚ* is for ease of articulation. The *Ś* as an *it* is intended for allowing total replacement (*sarvādeśa*). If *Ś* was not attached as an *it*, rule 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya* would have applied to replace the final sound segment. What is the purpose of proposing *m* as a replacement of *m*? The purpose is to block the application of 8.2.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*.

Consider *vadhīm* which derives from *han* + *LUṄ*. Follow derivational steps of *alāvīt* (II:333-34) to arrive at *vadh* + *i* + *ī* + *am*. Remember, however, that, given *han* + (*LUṄ*→*miP*), *am* replaces *miP*. Additionally, verbal root *han* is replaced with *vadha* (2.4.42 *luṅi ca*) and augment *aṬ* is blocked at the strength of *bahulam* 'variously' (6.4.75 *bahulaṃ chandasi*). A replacement for *am* in *mAŚ* can then produce *vadh* + *i* + *ī* + (*am*→*m*(*AŚ*) = *vadh* + *i* + *ī* + *m* = *vadhīm*. Similar steps can be followed to derive *kramīm*, a derivate of *kram* + *LUṄ*, where augment *iṬ* is introduced by 7.2.36 *snukramor. . . .*

7.1.41 लोपस्त आत्मनेपदेषु

lopas ta ātmanepadeṣu
/ lopaḥ 1/1 *taḥ* 6/1 *ātmanepadeṣu* 7/3/
(*chandasi* #38)
ātmanepadeṣu yas takāras tasya chandasi viṣaye lopo bhavati
The *t* of an affix termed *ātmanepada*, when occurring after an *aṅga* in the Vedic, is deleted by means of *LOPA*.

EXAMPLES:

dēvā aduhra 'gods extracted the milk'
duhrāmaśvibhyāṃ payó aghnyeyam
'may the two extract milk for the Aśvins'
dakṣiṇataḥ śaye 'reclines on the right side'

1. Refer to derivational details of *aduhra* under notes of 7.1.8 *bahulaṃ chandasi*. Derive *duh* + *te* from *duh* + *ŚaP* + *LOṬ* where *LOṬ* gets replaced with the third person singular middle (*ātmanepada*) ending *ta*. The *e*-replacement (*etva*) of *ta* (3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ . . .*) and deletion of *ŚaP* (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ*), as usual, follow. Our present rule deletes *t* of *duh* + *te* to produce *duh* + *e*. An application of 3.4.90 *ām etaḥ* then yields *duh* + (*e*→*ām*) = *duh* + *ām* = *duhām*, as against *dugdhām*. One can similarly derive *śī* + *e* from *śīṄ* + *ŚaP* + *te*, where *te* is a replacement of *LAṬ*. An application of *guṇa* (*ś*(*ī*→*e*) + *e*); 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*), followed by *e*→*ay* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*), will finally produce *ś*(*e*→*ay*) + *e* = *śaye*, first person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *śīṄ* 'to recline', as against *śete*.

The condition of *ātmanepadeṣu* is imposed so that *t*, for example of *duhanti*, a *parasmaipada* 'active' could not go through deletion.

7.1.42 ध्वमो ध्वात्

dhvamo dhvāt
/*dhvamaḥ* 6/1 *dhvāt* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
chandasi viṣaye dhvamo dhvād ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affix *dhvam*, when occurring after an *aṅga* in the Vedic, is replaced with *dhvāt*.

EXAMPLES:

antárevóṣmā́ṇam vārayadhvāt 'breathing (or life, of an animal) be stopped inside (the mouth)'

1. Derive *vārayadhvāt* from *vāri* + (*LOṬ*→*dhvam*) = *vāri* + *ŚaP* + *dhvam*, where *vāri* is causal (3.1.26 *hetumati ca*) form of *vṛṄ* or *vṛÑ* 'to cover', with *vṛddhi* of *ṛ* before *ṆiC*. Affix *dhvam* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhi* . . .) is the second plural middle replacement of *LOṬ*. Our present rule replaces this *dhvam* with *dhvāt*. An application of *guṇa*, followed by *ay*, as in *śaye* of the previous rule, will finally produce *vār*(*i*→*e*→*ay*) + *a* + *dhvāt* = *vārayadhvāt*. Note that the regular derivate would, of course, be *vārayadhvam*.

7.1.43 यजध्वैनमिति च

yajadhvainam iti ca
/*yajadhvainam* 1/1 *iti* ϕ *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
'*yajadhvam*' *ity etasya* '*enam*' *ity etasmin parato makāralopo nipātyate* (*vakārasya ca yakāraś*) *chandasi viṣaye*
The word *yajadhvainam* is derived, via *nipātana*, from *yajadhvam* + *enam* when the scope of the usage is Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

yajádhvainaṃ priyamedhāḥ 'O Priyamedhā, offer the sacrifice to Indra'

1. This rule derives *yajadhvainam*, from *yajadhvam* used with a following *enam*, by deletion of *m* via *nipātana*. A deletion of *m*, followed by a single *vṛddhi* replacement in *au*, for *a*+*e*, finally produces *yajadhvainam*. This, of course, goes against the expected derivate *yajadhvam enam*.

2. The author of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* accepts the reading of the derivate as *yajadhva*(*m*→ϕ) + *enam* → *yajadh*(*v*→*y*) *a* + *enam* → *yajadhy*(*a*+*e*→*ai*) *nam* → *yajadhyainam*, where *v* of *dhvam* is also considered replaced with *y*. That is, they also replace *v* of *dhvam* with *y*, in addition to deletion of its final *m*. The *SK* calls it all carelessness (*prāmādikī*) and accepts *yajadhvainam* as the example derivate (*SK: vakārasya yakāro nipātyate iti vṛttikāroktiḥ prāmādikī*). Haradatta (*PM*) also accepts the derivate as *yajadhvainam*. He clearly states that deletion of *m*, alone, is accomplished via *nipātana* (*PM: bahvṛcās tu vakāram*

evādhīyate, tatra malopamātraṃ nipātyate). I have enclosed the debatable portion of the *vṛtti* in parenthesis. For, I have accepted *yajadhvainam* as the desired derivate.

7.1.44 तस्य तात्

tasya tāt
/tasya 6/1 *tāt* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
taśabdasya loṇmadhyamapuruṣabahuvacanasya sthāne 'tāt' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
Affix *ta*, i.e., the second personal plural replacement of *LOṬ*, when occurring after an *aṅga* in the Vedic is replaced with *tāt*.

EXAMPLES:

. . . *kṛṇutāt* 'make . . .'
. . . *sáṃsṛjatāt* '. . . create . . .'
. . . *khanatāt* '. . . dig . . .'
. . . *gamayatāt* '. . . have someone go . . .'

1. This rule offers *tāt* as a replacement for *ta* which, in turn, is a second person active replacement of *tha* of *LOṬ* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhisipthastha* . . .; 3.4.101 *tasthastha* . . .) introduced after verbal root *kṛvI* 'to do, harm'. Rule 7.1.58 *idito num dhātoḥ* introduces augment *nUM* based on *I* as an *it*. Thus, *kṛ* + (*nUM*) *v* + (*LOṬ*→*tha*→*ta*→*tāt*) = *kṛ* + (*n*→*ṇ*) *v* + *tāt*. Rule 3.1.80 *dhinvikṛṇvor a ca* then introduces the *ārdhadhātuka* affix *u* after *kṛṇv*, where root-final *v* is also replaced with *a*, simultaneously. This will give *kṛiṇ* + (*v*→*a*) + *u* + *tāt* = *kṛṇ* + *a* + *u* + *tāt*. This *a* will be subsequently deleted by 6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*. We can thus get *kṛṇutāt*, as against *kṛṇuta*. Follow similar rules to derive *saṃsṛjatāt*, as against *saṃsṛjata*, where 3.1.77 *tudādibhyaḥ śaḥ* introduces *Śa*. Deriving *gamayatāt*, as against *gamayata*, will involve *ṆiC* after *gam* followed by *ŚaP*, *guṇa*, and *e*→*ay*. Deriving *gamayatāt* from *gamay* + *a* + *tāt* is easy.

7.1.45 तप्तनप्तनथनाश्च

taptanaptanathanāś ca
/tap-tanap-tan-thanāḥ 1/3 (*itar. dv.*); *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38 *tasya* #44)
chandasi viṣaye tasya sthāne 'tap, tanap, tana, than' ity ete ādeśā bhavanti
Affix *ta*, when occurring after an *aṅga* in the Vedic, is also replaced with *taP*, *tanaP*, *tana* and *than*.

EXAMPLES:

. . . *śṛṇota grāvāṇaḥ* 'stones, used for pressing out soma, listen'
. . . *sunotá* 'press out!'

. . . dádhātana '. . . place . . .'
jújuṣṭana '. . . rejoice'
. . . iṣṭhaná '. . . wish . . .'

1. This rule offers *taP, tanaP, tana* and *thana* as replacements, in the Vedic, for the second plural *ta*-replacement of *LOṬ* (3.4.101 *tasthasthamipām. . . .* Consider *śṛṇota* where, in addition to *śṛ* as a replacement for *śru* 'to hear', *Śnu* is introduced (3.1.73 *svādibhyaḥ śnuḥ*). Since *taP* is marked with *P* as an *it*, it cannot be treated as *Ṅit* (3.4.85 *loṭo laṅvat*; 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*). Consequently, *guṇa* of *u* cannot be blocked. Similar applications are also involved in *sunota*, a derivate of *ṣu* 'to press out'. Reduplication in *dadhātana*, a derivate of *dhā* 'to place', is accomplished by (6.1.10 *ślau*; 2.4.75 *juhotyādibhyaḥ śluḥ*). Given *dhā* + *dhā* + (*Śap→ŚLU*) + (*LOṬ→ta→tana*(*P*)) = *dhā* + *dhā* + *tana*, the *ā* of the first *dhā* will be replaced with its short counterpart (7.4.59 *hrasvaḥ*) and its *dh* will be replaced with *d* (6.4.8.4.54 *abhyāse car ca*). Thus, *dh*(*ā→a*) + *dhā* + *tana* → (*dh→d*) *a* + *dhā* + *tana* = *dadhātana*. The *Śa* (3.1.77 *tudādibhyaḥ śaḥ*) after *juṣ* 'to be pleased, enjoy', in *jujuṣṭana*, is deleted by 2.4.76 *bahulaṃ chandasi*. Reduplication, i.e., (*ju*(*ṣ→ϕ*) + *juṣ* + (*ta→tana*), is again accomplished by 6.1.10 *ślau*. Rule 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ* then accomplishes a replacement in *ṭ* for *t* (*ṣṭutva*), thereby yielding *jujuṣ* + (*t→ṭ*) *ana* = *jujuṣṭana*, as against *juṣata*. Similar rules apply in deriving *iṣṭhana*, a derivate of *iṣ* 'to wish' with *thana*, as against *icchata*.

Note that introduction of *P* as an *it* in *taP* and *tanaP* (*pitkaraṇa*) is made for negating the status marking it with *Ṅ* as an *it* (*aṅitkaraṇa*; *Kāś: pitkaraṇam aṅitvārtham*). Consequently, there is no negation of *guṇa*.

7.1.46 इदन्तो मसि

idanto masi
/*idantaḥ* 1/1 *id anto' vayavo yasya* (*bv.*); *masi*
(1/1 deleted)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
chandasi viṣaye mas ity ayaṃ śabda ikārānto bhavati
The word *mas*, in the Vedic, is considered ending in *i*.

EXAMPLES:

dīpayāmasi 'we have it lighted'
bhañjayāmasi 'we have it shattered'
vāsayāmasi 'we have someone dwell'

1. Note that *mas* 'first person plural active verbal ending' is offered *i* as its augment at the end. A reference with *mas* includes forms ending in *mas*. Thus, *dīpi* + (*LAṬ→mas*), where *dīpi* is a causal counterpart of *dip* 'to glow, shine'. Thus, *dīpi* + *mas* = *dīpi*+ *ŚaP* + *mas* → *dīp*(*i→e→ay*) + *mas* = *dīpay* + *mas*+*i* = *dīpaya* + *masi*. It is clear that *mas* is here augmented with *i* at the end.

The final *a* of *dīpaya* is replaced with its long counterpart by 7.3.101 *ato dīrgho yañi.* Similar rules apply in deriving *uddīpayāmasi,* where *dīpi* is used with the preverb *ud.* Similar rules apply in deriving *bhañjayāmasi* and *vāsayāmasi* from *bhañji* + (*LOṬ→mas*) and *vāsi* + (*LOṬ→mas*). These forms are given against the regular *dīpayāmaḥ, bhañjayāmaḥ* and *vāsayāmaḥ.*

7.1.47 क्त्वो यक्

ktvo yak
/ktvaḥ 6/1 *yak* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
'*ktvā*' *ity etasya yag āgamo bhavati*
Augment *yaK* is introduced to affix *Ktvā,* in the Vedic, when the same occurs after an *aṅga.*

EXAMPLES:

dattvâya (*savitā dhiyaḥ*) 'after having given . . .'

1. This rule offers *yaK,* an augment marked with *K,* to the final of *Ktvā* (1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*), in the Vedic. Thus, (*dā→dad*) + *Ktvā* (7.4.46 *dā dad ghoḥ*)); *dad* + (*tvā* + *yaK*) → (*da*(*d→t*) + *tvā* + *ya*(*K*) = *dattvāya.*

2. Why was this rule not formulated after 7.1.38 *ktvāpi chandasi*? That rule also includes the *anuvṛtti* of *samāse.* Consequently, *yaK* could have applied only to compounds with *Ktvā.*

7.1.48 इष्ट्वीनमिति च

iṣṭvīnam iti ca
/iṣṭvīnam 1/1 *iti* ϕ *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
'*iṣṭvīnam*' *ity ayaṃ śabdo nipātyate chandasi viṣaye*
The word *iṣṭvīnam,* in the Vedic, is derived via *nipātana.*

EXAMPLES:

iṣṭvīnam devān 'after having offered the sacrifice to gods'

1. Note that *iṣṭvā* is a derivate of *Ktvā* introduced after *iṣ* 'to wish'. The *t* of *tvā* goes through a replacement in *ṭ* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). Our present rule offers *iṣṭavīnam,* via *nipātana,* by introducing *īnam* as a replacement for the final *ā* of *īṣṭvā.* Recall, however, that a *nipātana* provision need not be explained in terms of bases, affixes and operations. Derivates of *nipātana* are treated as fully derived, without any consideration of rule applications.

2. It is stated that *ca* can also account for other desired derivates. Thus, we get *pītvīnam* 'after having drunk'.

7.1.49 स्नात्व्यादयश्च

snātvyādayaś ca
/snātvyādayaḥ 1/3 = *snātvī ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *te; ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
'snātvī' ity evam ādayaḥ śabdā nipātyante chandasi viṣaye
The word *snātvī*, and its likes, are derived via *nipātana* in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

snātvī́ (*málādiva*) 'having bathed . . .'
pītvī (*somásya vāvṛdhe*) 'having drunk . . .'

1. This rule accounts for *snātvī*, and others like it. The use of *ādi* 'et cetera' is here made in the sense of *prakāra* 'kind, like'. This derivation of *snātvī*, by means of *nipātana*, entails *ī* as a replacement for final *ā* of *Ktvā*. Of course, the classical forms will be *snātvā* and *pītvā*.

7.1.50 आज्जसेरसुक्

āj jaser asuk
/āt 5/1 *jaseḥ* 6/1 *asuk* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #38)
avarṇād aṅgād uttarasya jaser asug āgamo bhavati chandasi viṣaye
Augment *asUK* is introduced to *Jas* 'nominative plural' when the same occurs in the Vedic after an *aṅga* ending in *a* (*aT*; 1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*).

EXAMPLES:

brāhmáṇāsaḥ (*pítaraḥ somyā́saḥ*) 'the brāhmaṇas . . .'
ye pūrvā́so ya upárāsaḥ 'those who preceded and those who followed'

1. Consider *brāhmaṇa* + (*J*) *as* + *as*(*UK*), where augment *asUK* is introduced at the end because of its status as *kit* 'that which has *K* as an *it*'. Thus, *brāhmaṇa* + *as* + *as* → *brāhman*(*a*+ *a*→*ā*) *s* + *as* → *brāhmaṇās* + *a*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*)) = *brāhmaṇās* + *aḥ* = *brāhmaṇāsaḥ*. Note that a long replacement for the vocalic sequence *a*+*a* results with the application of 6.1.102 *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇaḥ*. The *visarga*, of course, is accomplished, via *rutva-visarga* (8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ*; 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor* . . .). Augment *asUK*, in *pūrvāsaḥ* and *uparāsaḥ*, is introduced prior to replacement of *Jas* by *Śī* (7.1.17 *jasaḥ śī*). For, this introduction of *asUK* is subsequent in order of application (*paratvāt*). Note that *Śī* cannot be introduced, subsequently, on the basis of appearance of its context after the introduction of *asUK* (*Paribhāṣā* (40): *punaḥ prasaṅgavijñānāt siddham*). For, *sakṛd gatau vipratiṣedhe yad bādhitaṃ tad bādhitam eva* (*Paribhāṣā* (41)) 'that which goes once through blocking of a conflict of equal strength, remains blocked forever'.

2. Since operations in the Vedic usage frequently follow provisions of *bāhulaka* 'various ways', derivates may also be found without augment *asUK*. After all, (*paribhāṣā* 36): *sarve vidhayaś chandasi vikalpyante* 'all operations in the Vedic are considered optional'.

Pāṇini usually makes his specification of the nominative plural with *Jas*. Earlier grammarians must have used *jasi*, as Pāṇini himself uses here in *jaseḥ* of this rule.

7.1.51 अश्वक्षीरवृषलवणानामात्मप्रीतौ क्यचि

aśvakṣīravṛṣalavaṇānām ātmaprītau kyaci
/ aśva-kṣīra-vṛṣa-lavaṇānām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*); *ātmaprītau* 7/1 = *ātmanaḥ prītiḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasyām; kyaci* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *asuk* #50)
'*aśva, kṣīra, vṛṣa, lavaṇa*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānām ātmaprītiviṣaye kyaci parato asug āgamo bhavati*
Augment *asUK* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *aśva* 'horse', *kṣīra* 'milk', *vṛṣa* 'bull' and *lavaṇa* 'salt', when affix *KyaC* (3.1.8 *supa ātmanaḥ kyac*) follows and *ātmaprīti* 'agent's own pleasure' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

aśvasyati vaḍavā 'the mare longs for a stallion'
kṣīrasyati māṇavakaḥ 'the boy desires milk'
vṛṣasyati gauḥ 'the cow longs for a bull'
lavaṇasyaty uṣṭraḥ 'the camel longs for salt'

1. These derivates of *KyaC* (3.1.8 *supa ātmanaḥ kyac*) all involve assignment of the term *dhātu* 'verbal root' (3.1.32 *sanādyantā dhātavaḥ*) and *pararūpa* 'single replacement similar to what follows in a vocalic sequence' (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*). Refer to derivational details of derivates of *KyaC* under notes and appendix of relevant rules (3.1.8 *supa ātnmanaḥ . . .*; 3.1.32 *sanādyantā dhātavaḥ*).

2. Note that the condition of *ātmaprīti* 'agent's own pleasure' is important. For, elsewhere, we cannot get *asUK*. Thus, consider *aśvīyati* and *kṣīrīyati*, etc., where *KyaC* (3.1.10 *upamānād ācāre*) is introduced with the signification of *ācāra* 'conduct, treatment'.

Proposals are also made in the *Mahābhāṣya* to restrict usages with *aśva* 'horse' and *vṛṣa* 'bull' to the context of *maithunecchā* 'desire for sex' (*vt: aśvavṛṣayor maithunecchāyām iti vaktavyam*). The context of *kṣīra* 'milk' and *lavaṇa* 'salt' is restricted to *lālasā* 'longing; intense desire'. Some say that augment *asUK* should be introduced after all stems when *lālasā* is signified (*vt: sarvaprātipadikebhyo lālasāyām asug vaktavyaḥ*). Others simply recommend *sUK* as the augment (*apara āha: sug vaktavyaḥ*). This way, they can account for *dadhyasyati* 'desires for curd' and *madhvasyati* 'desires for honey'.

7.1.52 आमि सर्वनाम्नः सुट्

āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ
/āmi 7/1 *sarvanāmnaḥ* 5/1 *suṭ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *āt* #50)
avarṇāt sarvanāmna uttarasyāmaḥ suḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *sUṬ* is introduced to affix *ām* when the same occurs after a *sarvanāman* 'pronominal' termed *aṅga* ending in *a*.

EXAMPLES:

sarveṣām 'genitive plural of *sarva* (all)'
viśveṣām '. . . of *viśva* . . .'
yeṣām '. . . of *yad* 'he who'''
teṣām '. . . of *tad* 'that'''
yāsām '. . . of *yad* (feminine)'
tāsām '. . . of *tad* (feminine)'
bhavatām '. . . of *bhavat* (you)'

1. Refer to derivational details of *sarveṣām* and *viśveṣām* in the appendix (II:362). Deriving *yeṣām* and *teṣām* from *yad* + *ām* and *tad* + *ām* involves application of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ* and *pararūpa* (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*). This gives us *ya*(*d*→*a*) + *ām* → *ya*(*a*+*a*→*a*) *d* + *ām* and *ta* + *ām* → *ta* + *ām*. Introduction of *sUṬ*, replacement in *e* (*etva*) and *ṣatva* 'replacement in *ṣ*' are similar to *sarveṣām*. The feminine forms, i.e., *yad* + *ṬāP* and *tad* + *ṬāP*, will similarly yield *ya* + *ā* and *ta* + *ā*. The final forms *yāsām* and *tāsām* could result after *savarṇadīrgha* (6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*) and introduction of *sUṬ* to *ām*. This *sUṬ* is offered against *nUṬ* made available after bases ending in a short vowel (7.1.54 *hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ*).

2. Note that *ām* of *āmi* is here interpreted as the genitive plural (*ṣaṣṭhī-bahuvacana*). It cannot be interpreted as *ām* introduced by 7.3.116 *ṅer āṁ*. . . . For, that *ām*, because of being subsequent in order, would require augments *āṬ* (7.3.112 *āṇ nadyāḥ*), *yāṬ* (7.3.113 *yāḍ āpaḥ*) and *syāṬ* (7.3.114 *sarvanāmnaḥ syāṭ hrasvaś ca*). The *ām* of 5.4.11 *kimettiṅa* . . . and 3.1.35 *kāspratyayād* . . ., of course, does not relate to pronominal bases. Or else, they both are marked with *anubandhas* 'markers' (*sānubandhaka*). The *āmU* of 5.4.11 *kimettiṅa* . . . is marked with *U* as an *it*. The *āmA* of 3.1.35 *kāspratyayād* . . . is similarly marked with *A*. They thus are both out.

This specification of *ām* with the locative *āmi* is intended for subsequent rule(s). It is transformed into genitive in view of 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*, because *sarvanāmnaḥ* is here specified with the ablative.

7.1.53 त्रेस्त्रयः

tres trayaḥ
/treḥ 6/1 *trayaḥ* 1/1/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *āmi* #51)
'*tri*' *ity etasya āmi pare* '*traya*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
An *aṅga*, namely *tri*, is replaced with *traya* when *ām* follows.

EXAMPLES:

trayāṇām 'genitive plural of *tri* 'three''

1. Thus, consider *tri* + *ām* → (*tri*→*traya*) + *ām* = *traya* + *ām*, where *traya* replaces *tri*, in toto, because of being *anekāl* 'a replacement consisting of more than one sound segment' (1.1.55 *anekālśit sarvasya*). This will finally yield *trayāṇām* with introduction of augment *nUṬ* (7.1.54 *hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ*), lengthening (*dīrgha*; 6.4.3 *nāmi*) and replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*; 8.4.1 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ . . .*).

2. Note that *trīṇām* is also desired in the Vedic usage. Thus, *trīṇām api samudrāṇām* ' . . . also of the three oceans'.

7.1.54 ह्रस्वनद्यापो नुट्

hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ
/ *hrasvanadyāpaḥ* 5/1 = *hrasvaś ca nadī ca āp ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt; nuṭ* 1/1/
hrasvāntān nadyantād ābantāc cottarasyāmo nuḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUṬ* is introduced to affix *ām* when it occurs after an *aṅga* which ends in a short vowel (*hrasvānta*), or in a form which is termed *nadī* (*nadyanta*), or else, ends in the feminine affix *āP* (*ābanta*).

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣāṇām 'genitive plural of *vṛkṣa* 'tree''
agnīnām 'genitive plural of *agni* 'fire''
kumārīṇām 'genitive plural of *kumārī* 'girl''
gaurīṇām 'genitive plural of *gaurī* 'fair''
brahmabandhūnām 'genitive plural of *brahmabandhū* 'a brāhmaṇa woman whose brother is a true brāhmaṇa but she herself is not''
bahurājānām 'genitive plural of *bahurājā* (a city with many kings)'
kārīṣagandhyānām 'genitive plural of Kārīṣagandhyā'

1. Here again we find *dīrgha* 'lengthening' and *ṇatva* 'replacement in *ṇ*', etc. Note, however, that *dīrgha* of bases ending in *a* is accomplished by 7.3.102 *supi ca*. The others are accomplished by 6.4.3 *nāmi*. Bases such as *kumārī*, etc., are termed *nadī* in view of 1.4.3 *yūstryākhyau nadī*. The feminine affix *Ḍāp* of *bahurājā* is introduced by 4.1.13 *ḍāb ubhābhyām. . . .* The feminine affix *CāP* in *kārīṣagandhyā* is introduced by 4.1.74 *yaṅaś cāp*.

7.1.55 षट्चतुर्भ्यश्च

ṣaṭcaturbhyaś ca

/ṣaṭcaturbhyaḥ 5/3 = *ṣaṭ ca catvāraś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ; ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *āmi* #50 *nuṭ* #54)
ṣaṭsaṃjñakebhyaś catuḥśabdāc cottarasyāmo nuḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUṬ* is introduced to affix *ām* when this same occurs after an *aṅga* termed *ṣaṭ* (1.1.23 *ṣṇāntā ṣaṭ*), or after an *aṅga* constituted by *catur* 'four'.

EXAMPLES:

ṣaṇṇām 'genitive plural of *ṣaṣ* 'six''
catruṇām 'genitive plural of *catur* 'four''
pañcānām 'genitive plural of *pañcan* 'five''
navānām 'genitive plural of *navan* 'nine''
saptānām 'genitive plural of *saptan* 'seven''
daśan 'genitive plural of *daśan* 'ten''

1. Note that the term *ṣaṭ* is assigned by 1.1.23 *ṣṇāntā ṣaṭ*. Augment *nUṬ*, for example in *ṣaṣ* + *ām*, produces *ṣaṣ* + *n* + *ām*, which, after replacement of the final *ṣ* with *ḍ* (*jaśtva*; 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*), yields *ṣaṣ* + *n* + *ām* → *ṣa*(*ṣ*→*ḍ*) + *n* + *ām*. Rule 8.4.44 *yaro' nunāsike* . . . then replaces *ḍ* with *ṇ* to yield *ṣa*(*ḍ*→*ṇ*) + *n* + *ām* = *ṣaṇ* + *nām*. An application of *ṣṭutva* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*) will then produce *ṣaṇ* + (*n*→*ṇ*) *ām* = *ṣaṇṇām* by replacing the *n* of *nām* with its retroflex counterpart *ṇ*. Deriving *pañcānām*, from *pañcan* + *n* + *ām* involves deletion of the final *n* of *pañcan* (8.2.7 *nalopaḥ* . . .). Introduction of augment *nUṬ* and replacement of a short vowel with its corresponding long (*dīrgha*), etc., are additionally applied.

2. Note that *catur*, a base ending in *r*, is not assigned the term *ṣaṭ*. Consequently, it is to be specified separately. This has been done to block deletion of the nominative and accusative plural nominal endings *Jas* and *Śas* by 7.1.22 *ṣaḍbhyo luk*. Since this specification of *ṣaṭcaturbhyaḥ* is made with *bahuvacana* 'plural', its reference must be construed as made to a principal (*pradhāna*) constituent denoted by the number (*saṃkhyā*). That is, the number should not be construed as denoting the secondary (*upasarjana*) constituent. Thus, consider *paramaṣaṇṇām* 'best among the six' and *priyaṣasām* 'those for whom those six are dear (*priyāḥ ṣaṭ yeṣāṃ te*)', where the first has *pañcan* as principal. The second, of course, has *ṣaṣ* 'six' as secondary. This explains why the second example lacks the term *ṣaṭ* and subsequent introduction of augment *nUṬ*.

7.1.56 श्रीग्रामण्योश्छन्दसि

śrīgrāmaṇyoś chandasi
/śrī-grāmaṇyoḥ (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ; chandasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *āmi* #50 *nuṭ* #54)
'śrī, grāmaṇī' ity etayoś chandasi viṣaye āmo nūḍ āgamo bhavati

Augment *nUṬ* is introduced to affix *ām*, in the Vedic, when the same occurs after an *aṅga* constituted by *śrī* 'glory, lustre, wealth' and *grāmaṇī* 'village leader'.

EXAMPLES:

śrīṇāmúdāro dharuṇó rayīṇām
'Agni, the holder of beauty and wealth'
sūtagrāmaṇīnām 'of charioteers and village leaders'

1. Note that *śrī* is assigned the term *nadī*, optionally, by 1.4.5 *vā' mi*. This will block *nUṬ* where option of assigning the term *nadī* is not accepted. A particular mention of *śrī* in this rule makes *nUṬ* obligatory (*nitya*). The compound in *sūtagrāmaṇīnām* is interpreted as a *dvandva* of *itaretarayoga* type. That is *sūtāś ca grāmaṇyaś ca = sūtagrāmaṇyaḥ, teṣām*. The *itaretarayoga* compund will not offer a base ending in *hrasva* 'short'. Consequently, *nUṬ* could not be made available. Our present rule makes this provision of *nUṬ* possible where the *dvandva* compound ends in a long vowel. If the compound is interpreted as a *samāhāra* 'collection, grouping', paralllel to *sūtaś ca grāmaṇīś ca = sūtagrāmaṇi* 'charioteer and village leader', *nUṬ* could then be made available to *sūtagrāmaṇi* (ending in a short vowel) before the genitive plural ending *ām*. This, however, will involve deriving *sūtagrāmaṇi*, via *ekaśeṣa* 'retaining one base of many', from *sūtagrāmaṇi ca sūtagrāmaṇi ca sūtagrāmaṇi = sūtagrāmaṇi*, where, in view of *sarvo dvandvo vibhāṣayā ekavad bhavati* 'all *dvandva* compounds, optionally, are treated as denoting the sense of one'. That is, they are treated as neuter (*napuṃsaka*) singular (*ekavacana*). They can avail the introduction of augment *nUṬ* by 7.1.54 *hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ*. This rule thus does not become necessary. Incidentally, Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*) does not accept the compound to be an *itaretarayoga*. He accepts it to be a *karmadhāraya*.

7.1.57 गोः पादान्ते

goḥ pādānte
/goḥ 5/1 *pādānte* 7/1 *= pādasya antaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *āmi* #50 *nuṭ* #54 *chandasi* #56)
'go' ity etasmād ṛkpādānte vartamānād uttarasyāmo nuḍāgamo bhavati
Augment *nUṬ* is introduced to affix *ām* when this same occurs after *go* 'cow' used at the end of the quarter of a hymn.

EXAMPLES:

vidmā hi tvā satpatiṃ śūragonām
'o brave Indra, we consider you the owner of many cows'

1. The word *pāda* is interpreted here as *ṛkpāda* 'quarter of a hymn'. Thus, *go + nUṬ + ām = gonām*, which we find at the end of the example hymn.

Why do we have the condition of *pādānte* 'at the end of the quarter of a hymn'? Consider *gavāṃ gotramudasṛjo yadaṅgiraḥ* where augment *nUṬ* is not introduced at the beginning of the quarter of a hymn. Recall that all operations, in the Vedic, become optional (*sarve vidhayaś chandasi vikalpyante*). This sometime results into non-introduction of augment *nUṬ* even at the end of the quarter of a hymn. Consider *hantāraṃ śatrūṇāṃ kṛdhi virājaṃ gopatiṃ gavām* 'killer of enemies, owner of many cows . . ., a distinguished king', where *nUṬ* is not attached even at the end of a *ṛk*.

7.1.58 इदितो नुम् धातोः

idito num dhātoḥ
/iditaḥ 6/1 = *id it yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya; num* 1/1 *dhātoḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
idito dhātor num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to a verbal root (*dhātu*) which is marked with a short *i* as an *it*.

EXAMPLES:

kuṇḍitā '. . . burning; a derivate of *tṛC*'
kuṇḍitum 'to burn; a derivate of *tumUN*'
kuṇḍitavyam '. . . should burn; a derivate of *tavyaT*'
kuṇḍā '. . . burning; a derivate of *a*'

1. Why is *dhātoḥ* '. . . of a verbal root' used here against *aṅgasya* 'of an *aṅga*' which is supposed to be carried over? So that this augment could be introduced right at the outset when a verbal root marked with a short *i* as an *it* (*idit*) appears in the derivational process. No function other than this can be accomplished by making a specification by *dhātoḥ* 'of a verbal root', characterized with a short *i* as an *it*. Refer to derivational details of *kuṇḍā* and *huṇḍā* (II:509), where this augment is introduced after the last sound segment of the root (1.1.47 *mid aco' ntyāt paraḥ*) right at the beginning of the derivational process. Consequently, 1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru* assigns the term *guru* and 3.3.103 *guroś ca halaḥ* offers affix *a* to facilitate the derivation of a feminine derivate with subsequent *ṬāP*. If *nUM* is not introduced to *kuḍI* at the outset, we will not get the assignment of the term *guru* (1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*) to *u* of *kuḍ*. This will then block affix *a* in favor of affix *KtiN* (3.3.94 *striyāṃ ktin*).

Refer also to 3.1.80 *dhinvikṛṇvyor a ca* where *dhinvi* 'to please, satisfy' and *kṛṇvi* 'to hurt, injure' are specified with *nUM* already accomplished (*numanuṣakta*). This same also applies to *nUM* of this rule. Incidentally, rule 3.1.80 *dhinvikṛṇvyor a ca* also introduces affix *a*.

7.1.59 शे मुचादीनाम्

śe mucādīnām

/śe 7/1 *mucādīnām* 6/3 = *muc ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58)
śe pratyaye parato mucādīnām num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga* constituted by a root enumerated in the group headed by *mucL̤* 'to release' when affix *Śa* follows.

EXAMPLES:

muñcati 'third singular active present form of *muc*'
lumpati '. . . of *lup* 'to cut' '
vindati '. . . of *vid* 'to gain' '

1. Refer to derivational details of *muñcati* (II:384) where *Śa* is introduced after *muc* 'to set free, release' (3.1.77 *tudādibhyaḥ śaḥ*). Similar derivational patterns are also followed by other examples.

2. The *mucādi* 'group of verbal roots headed by *mucL*', etc. are a group of eight verbs enumerated at the end of the *tudādi* listing of the *Dhātupāṭha*. The class-marker for this group is *Śa* (3.1.77 *tudādibhyaḥ śaḥ*).

A *vārttika* proposal is also made to introduce *nUM* when *Śa* follows: *tṛphA/ tṛmphA* 'to be satiated', *dṛphA/dṛmphA* 'to torture', *guphA/gumphA* 'to string', *ubhA/umbhA* 'to fill' and *śubhA/śumbhA* 'to glow' (*vt: śe tṛmphādīnām upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam*). Note that deletion of roots with *m* (6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hal . . .*) is compensated by *nUM*. This *n* of *nUM*, however, cannot be deleted. For, its introduction will then serve no purpose. Roots enumerated with no nasal sounds do not go through deletion, or get augment *nUM*. They also lack *guṇa* because their *sārvadhātuka* affixes, except for those marked with *P* as an *it* (*apit*; 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*), are treated as *Ṅit* 'marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*'. Thus, we get *tṛpati, dṛpati, guphati, ubhati*, and *śubhati*.

7.1.60 मस्जिनशोर्झलि

masjinaśor jhali
/masji-naśoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ; jhali* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58)
'*masji, naśi*' *ity etayor aṅgayor jhalādau pratyaye num āgamo bhavati*
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *ṬUmasjI* 'to sink, immerse' and *naś* 'to disappear, be destroyed' when an affix beginning with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* (non-nasal consonants; *Śs.* 7-14) follows.

EXAMPLES:

maṅktā 'he who immerses; derivate of *tṛC*'
maṅktum 'to immerse; derivate of *tumUN*'
maṅktavyam '. . . should immerse; derivate of *tavyaT*'
naṃṣṭā 'he who disappears; derivate of *tṛC*'

naṃṣṭum 'to disappear; derivate of *tumUN*'
naṃṣṭavyam 'should disappear; derivate of *tavyaT*'

1. Note that *nUM*, though it is marked with *M* as an *it*, is not introduced after the *a* of *masj* + *tṛC* (1.1.64 *mid aco' tyāt paraḥ*; 3.1.133 *ṇvul tṛcau*). It is attached (*vt.: masjer antyāt pūrvo nuṃ vācyaḥ*) before *j*, instead. Thus, we get *masj* + *tṛ* → *mas* + *nUM* + *j* + *tṛ* = *masnj* + *tṛ*. The *s* is then deleted by 8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ca*. The *j* of the string yields *k* through replacement applications of *g* (*kutva*; 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*) and *k* (*cartva*; 8.4.54 *khari ca*). We thus get (*man*(*s*→ϕ) + (*j*→*g*→*k*)) + *tṛ* = *man* + *ktṛ*. An application of 8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya . . .* and 8.4.57 *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ* yields *ma*(*n*→*ṃ*→*ṅ*) + *ktṛ* = *maṅktṛ*. Note here that augment *iṬ* is blocked by 7.2.10 *ekāc upadeśe. . . .* Follow derivational details of *taritṛ* + *sU* (II:328-29) for deriving *maṅktā* from *maṅktṛ* + *sU*. Deriving *maṅktā*, *maṅktum* and *maṅktavyam* offers nothing new.

Deriving *naṃṣṭā*, from (*naś* + *tṛ*) + *sU*, involves introduction of augment *nUM* only optionally. That is, *nUM* will be introduced where the option of *iṬ* (7.2.54 *radhādibhyaś ca*) is not availed. Thus, *na* + *n*(*UM*) + *ś* + *tṛ* → *na* (*n*→*ṃ*) + *ś*) + *tṛ* → *naṃś* + *tṛ*. An application of replacement in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*; 8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjasṛja . . .*) and *t*→*ṭ* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*), on *naṃś* + *tṛ*, will produce: *naṃ* (*ś*→ *ṣ*) + *tṛ*)) → *naṃṣ* + (*t*→*ṭ*) *ṛ* = *naṃṣṭṛ*. Deriving *naṃṣṭā* from *naṃṣṭṛ* + *sU* should not pose any problem. We will get (*naś* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *tṛ*)) + *sU*))) = *naśitā*, when, because of the absence of a non-nasal consonant at the beginning of *itṛ*, *nUM* is blocked in favor of *iṬ*. Derivates of *tavyaT* and *tumUN* can be similarly derived.

2. Why should we accept the condition of a following affix beginning with *jhaL*? So that *majjanam* 'immersing' and *naśanam* 'perishing' could be excluded. These counter-examples both are derivates of *LyuṬ*, where 3.1.1 *yuvor anākau* replaces *yu* with *ana*. Note that, given *masj* + (*L*)*yu*(*Ṭ*), replacements in *ś* for *s* (*cutva*; 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*) and *j* for *ś* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*) both become applicable. However, *jaśtva* becomes suspended (*asiddha*) and *cutva* applies. The resultant *ś* later on goes through a replacement in *j* (*jaśtva*). Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*) applies *jaśtva*, thereby replacing *s* with *d*. He then applies *cutva*, thereby replacing *d* with *j*. Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kāś*) favors the first pattern of application.

3. Patañjali (*Mahābhāṣya* ad 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*) states that *nUM* is desired to be introduced before the last sound segment of *masj*, so that the inititial *s* of the sequence with *nUM*, i.e., *ns*, can be deleted. That is, we must get *mas* + *n*(*UM*) + *j* + (*K*) *ta* and *mas* + *n*(*UM*) + *j* + (*K*) *tavat*(*U*), for deriving *magna* and *magnavat*. If we, instead, got *ma* + *n*(*UM*) + *sj* + (*K*) *ta* and *ma* + *n*(*UM*) + *sj* + (*K*) *tavat*(*U*), 8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor . . .* cannot delete *s*. For, *s* will then not be at the beginning of the conjunct (*saṃyogādi*). The *n* can also not be deleted since it will not be penultimate (*upadhā*) sound of the *aṅga* (6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hal . . .*). This will yield wrong results. It is for this reason that *nUM* is not introduced after *j*, the final consonant of *masj*. It is, instead,

introduced before *j*, the final consonant. This will clear the way for appropriate rules to delete *s* and *n*. The *t* of *Kta* is replaced with *n* by 8.2.45 *oditaś ca*. The *j*, of *maj* + (*t*→*n*) *a* = *maj* + *na*, is then replaced with *g* (*kutva*; 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*). An introduction of *sU*, after *magna* and *magnavat*, will eventually derive *magnaḥ* and *magnavān*.

7.1.61 रधिजभोरचि

radhijabhor aci
/*radhi-jabhoḥ* 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *aci* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58)
'*radhi, jabhi*' *ity etayor ajādau pratyaye num āgamo bhavati*
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *radhA* 'to harm, subdue' and *jabhA* 'to gape, yawn' when an affix beginning with a vowel follows.

EXAMPLES:

randhayati 'he has someone (cook or be subdued)'
randhakaḥ 'he who cooks'
sādhurandhī 'he who cooks well'
randhaṃrandham 'cooking over and over again'
jambhayati 'he yawns'
jambhakaḥ 'he who yawns'
sādhujambhī 'he who yawns well'
jambhaṃjambham 'yawning over and over again'

1. This *nUM* is allowed when a vowel-initial affix follows. Examples such as *randhayati* and *jambhayati* derive from (*radh* + (*ṆiC*)) + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*))) = *randhi* + *ŚaP* + *tiP* and (*jabh* + (*ṆiC*)) + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*))) = *jambhi* + *ŚaP* + *tiP*, where *nUM* is introduced to *radh*, i.e., *ra* + *n*(*UM*) + *dhi*, and *jabh*, i.e., *ja* + *n*(*UM*) + *bhi*, termed *aṅga* before the vowel-initial affix (*Ṇ*) *i*(*C*). A replacement in *guṇa* for *i* (7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārddhadhātukayoḥ*), followed by a replacement in *ay* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*) finally produces *randhayati* and *jambhayati*. A derivate such as *randhaka* derives from (*ra* + *n*(*UM*) + *dh*) + (*Ṇ*) *vu*(*L*) → *randh* + (*vu*→*aka*) = *randhaka* (7.1.1 *yuvor anākau*). Affix *ṆinI* is introduced after *radh* which, in turn, receives *nUM* under the cooccurrence condition of *sādhu* 'good, well' (3.2.78 *supy ajātau ṇini . . .*). We thus get the derivate *sādhurandhin*. Yet another derivate, i.e., *randhaṃrandham*, is derived with (*Ṇ*) *am*(*UL*) (3.4.22 *ābhīkṣṇye ṇamul ca*) introduced after *radh*. This gives us *radh* + (*Ṇ*) *am*(*UL*) = *radh* + *am*. Augment *nUm* is now introduced to derive *ra* + *n*(*UM*) + *dh* + *am* = *randham*. Note that *randham* goes through iteration (*vt: ābhīkṣṇye dve bhavata iti vaktavyam*, ad 8.1.12 *prakāre guṇavacanasya*) under the denotational condition of intense or repeated action. Thus, we get *randhaṃrandham*.

2. Why do we not get a *vṛddhi* replacement for the penultimate *a* (7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*) of the *aṅga*, i.e., *radh* + *ṆiC*, etc.? This *vṛddhi*, though it is *para* 'subsequent', is blocked by *nUM*. For, *nUM* is obligatory (*nitya*). An obligatory provision is considered more powerful than a provision made by a subsequent (*para*) rule. Augment *nUM* becomes obligatory because its context must receive application, whether or not the application of penultimate *vṛddhi* is carried out (*kṛtākṛtaprasaṅgitvān nityam*). Once *nUM* is introduced, the *vṛddhi* condition of *a* in the *upadhā* 'penultimate position' is removed. Consequently, there is no application of *vṛddhi* by 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*.

Kāśikā offers (*radh* + *tṛC*) + *sU* → *raddhā* and (*jabh* + *yaT*) + *sU* → *jabhyam* as counter-examples for the condition of *aci* 'when an affix beginning with a vowel follows'. Note here that affixes *tṛC* and *yaT* do not begin with a vowel.

7.1.62 नेट्यलिटि रधेः

neṭy aliṭi radheḥ
/ *na* ϕ *iṭi* 7/1 *aliṭi* 7/1 = *na liṭ* (*nañ.*), *tasmin; radheḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58)
iḍādāv aliṭi pratyaye pare radher num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is not introduced to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *radhA*, when a non-*LIṬ* affix beginning with *iṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

radhitā 'he who will cook'
radhitum 'to cook'
radhitavyam 'should cook'

1. Note that our earlier rule introduces *nUM* to *radh* in deriving *randhana* 'cooking' and *randhaka* 'cook' when a vowel-initial affix follows. This was possible there because affixes introduced after it began with a vowel. Our present rule blocks *nUM* where *radh* is followed by a non-*LIṬ* (*aliṭ*) affix which begins with a vowel, namely *iṬ* (*iḍādi*). This right context of negation of augment *nUM* is very specific. That is, *radh* must occur before a non-*LIṬ* affix and this affix must be made *ajādi* 'beginning with a vowel' by way of introduction of augment *iṬ*. Consider *rarandhiva* and *rarandhima*, the first person dual and plural active perfect derivates of *randh* where affix *LIṬ* is replaced with the first dual and plural endings *vas* and *mas*. Our present rule cannot block the introduction of *nUM* here. For, *radh* is followed by a replacement of *LIṬ*. Our earlier rule will thus introduce *nUM*. Iteration, and subsequent deletion relative to *abhyāsa*, will produce *rarandhiva* and *rarandhima*. Note also that *radh* will receive *iṬ* of 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛ* . . ., by way of being an exception to roots enumerated by that rule.

A question is raised as to why a replacement of *LIṬ* after *radh*, which does

not end in a conjunct to start with, cannot be accepted as marked with *K* as an *it* (1.2.5 *asaṃyogāl liṭ kit*). For, this status as marked with *K* as an *it* will facilitate deletion of *nUM* by rule 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hal upadhāyāḥ*. That is why, can we not treat *LIṬ* at the stage of *ra* + *nUM* + *dh* + *LIṬ* as marked with *K* as an *it* (*kit*; 1.2.5 *asaṃyogāl liṭ kit*), thereby facilitating deletion of penultimate *n* (6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hal*...). *Kāśikā* states that this *LIṬ* cannot be treated as marked with *K* as an *it* (*kit*) because it will be occurring after *randh*, a root ending in a conjunct (*saṃyoga*; *Kāś: numi kṛte saṃyogāntatvād 'asaṃyogāl liṭ kit' iti kitvaṃ nāstīti nalopo na bhavati*). How do we get the root to end in a conjunct? The root is *radh* and it ends in *dh* and not *ndh*. It can end in *ndh* if one follows the recommendation of introducing augment *nUM* to it right at the outset (*upadeśa*) of derivation. The question of *n*-deletion thus does not arise.

What should be the form of *radh* when *LIṬ*, especially when it is replaced with *KvasU*, follows? The form should be: *redhivān*? Where do we get *KvasU* from? We get *KvasU* as a replacement of *LIṬ* under the provision of 3.2.107 *kvasuś ca*. Iteration and operations relative to *abhyāsa* are then performed. That is, rule 6.4.120 *ata ekahalmadhye*... offers *e* as a replacement for *a* of *radhr*(*a*→*e*)*dh* + (*K*)*vas*(*U*) = *radhredh* + *vas*. The *abhyāsa* also concurrently goes through deletion by this same rule to produce: (*radh*→ϕ)*redh* + *vas* = *redhi* + *vas*. We get *redh*(*iṬ*) + *va*(*nUM*)*s* = *redhivan*, through introduction of *iṬ*, *nUM* and deletion of *n* under the condition of *K* as an *it* (*kit*). The form should thus be *redhivas* + *sU* → *redhivān*.

Others claim that the form should be *raradhvān* where *iṬ* will not be introduced. For, the condition of *ekāc* 'single vowel' cannot be met after iteration. The non-introduction of *iṬ* will also block introduction of *nUM*. The form should thus be *raradhvān*.

Actually, *nUM*, in *redhivān*, is introduced after replacement in *e* (*etva*; *r*(*a*→*e*), deletion relative to *abhyāsa* (*abhyāsalopa*; *ra*(*dh*→ϕ) and introduction of augment *iṬ* (*iḍāgama*). A *nUM*, now introduced under the condition of a *LIṬ* affix beginning with *iṬ* (*iḍādi-liṭ*), is deleted under the condition of *radh* not ending in a conjunct (*saṃyoga*) in *upadeśa*. This derivational order facilitates replacement in *e* (*etva*) and deletion relative to *abhyāsa*. Others claim that *nUM* is introduced to start with, but *radh* of *randh* is still treated as not ending in a conjunct. This facilitates deletion of *n*. Once *iṬ* is introduced, *nUM* is introduced and goes through deletion again. The question of replacement in *e*, and deletion of the *abhyāsa*, thus does not arise.

Yet another question. Why can we not have a restrictive provision like *iṭi liṭi* 'augment *nUM* is introduced only when affix *LIṬ* follows an *iṭ*-initial affix, and not anywhere else'. But this kind of restrictive provision may also occasion an entirely opposite interpretation: '*nUM* should be introduced only when an *iṬ*-initial *LIṬ* follows, and not anywhere else'. This will block *nUM* in *rarandha* and allow it in *radhitā* because of an absence of *LIṬ*. Our

preceding rule then may allow *iṬ*, etc., to be introduced to a vowel-initial *LIṬ*, etc., which may follow. Consequently, the restrictive provision must read: '*nUM* is negated only when a vowel-initial affix other than *LIṬ* follows'.

7.1.63 रभेरशब्लिटोः

rabher aśab liṭoḥ
/rabheḥ 6/1 *aśab-liṭoḥ* 7/2/ = *śap ca liṭ ca = śabliṭau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ; na śabliṭoḥ* (*nañ.* with int. *bv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *aci* #61)
rabher aṅgasya śabliḍvarjite' jādau pratyaye parato num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *rabhI* 'to undertake, initiate', when an affix other than *ŚaP* and *LIṬ*, beginning with a vowel follows.

EXAMPLES:

ārambhayati 'he has someone begin . . .'
ārambhakaḥ 'he who begins . . .'
sādhvārambhī 'he who begins well'
ārambhamārambham 'starting (something) over and over again'
ārambho vartate 'an undertaking is in progress'

1. This rule allows *nUM* for an *aṅga* which is followed by a vowel-initial affix other than *ŚaP* and (a replacement of) *LIṬ*. Examples of this rule derive similarly to examples of 7.1.61 *radhijabhor aci*. Rules of replacement in *n→ṃ*(*anusvāra*; 8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhalī*) and a sound homogeneous with what follows (*parasavarṇa; ṃ→m*; 8.4.58 *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ*) apply in addition.

Provisions of this rule will exclude *ārabhate* 'third singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *rabh*, used after the preverb *ā*' because *ārabh* will have a following *ŚaP*. Similar exclusion applies to the third singular middle perfect *ārebhe*, where *LIṬ* is replaced with *eŚ*, via *ta* (3.4.81 *liṭas tajhayor . . .*). A derivate such as *ārabdhā* is also out since its affix, i.e., *tṛC*, a replacement of *LUṬ*, begins with a consonant.

7.1.64 लभेश्च

labheś ca
/labheḥ 6/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *aci* #61 *aśabliṭoḥ* #63)
labheś cājādau pratyaye śabliḍvarjite num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is also introduced to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *labh* 'to obtain, gain', when an affix other than *ŚaP* and *LIṬ*, beginning with a vowel follows.

EXAMPLES:

lambhayati 'third singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *labh* ending in causal *ṆiC*'
lambhakaḥ 'a derivate of *ṆvuL*; he who obtains'
sādhulambhī 'he who obtains well'
lambhaṃlaṃbham 'obtaining over and over again'
lambho vartate 'process of obtaining goes on'

1. Here again we can cite exclusions such as *labhate* and *lebhe*, parallel to *ārabhate* and *ārebhe*, of the preceding rule. Derivational details stay similar to earlier rules.

Why was *labh* not included in the earlier rule? This rule is formulated separately so that *labh* alone could be carried over to subsequent rules. A single formulation in the form of *rabhilabhyor aśabliṭoḥ*, with *rabh* and *labh* both, would have necessitated the *anuvṛtti* of them both in subsequent rules. A separate formulation is made to exclude all subsequent operations to *rabh* (*Nyāsa: yadi 'rabhilabhyor aśabliṭoḥ' ity eko yogaḥ kriyate tato rabher ity anuvṛttir uttaratra syāt. ataś ca tasyāpy uttaratra kāryaṃ prasajyeta*).

7.1.65 आङो यि

āṅo yi
/*āṅaḥ* 5/1 *yi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *nuṃ* #58 *labheḥ* #64)
āṅ uttarasya labher yakārādau pratyayaviṣaye num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *labh* used with the preverb *āṄ*, when an affix beginning with *y* finds its scope to follow.

EXAMPLES:

ālambhyā gauḥ 'a cow to be obtained; touched'
ālambhyā vaḍavā 'a mare to be obtained; touched'

1. Note that *saptamī* 'locative' in *yi* is not a *parasaptamī* 'a locative specifying what follows'. It is *viṣayasaptamī* 'locative of domain', instead. That is, *nUM* will be introduced with the understanding that an affix with required specification will find its scope, and hence, *nUM* will be introduced. This way, *nUM* will be introduced to *labh*, yielding *lambh* at the outset. We will thus get the subsequent application of *anusvāra* (8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*) and *parasavarṇa* (8.4.58 *anusvārasya yayi . . .*). Once *nUM* is introduced, the root will no longer remain *ad-upadha* 'having *a* in its penultimate position'. Consequently, only affix *ṆyaT* (3.1.124 *ṛhalor ṇyat*), and no *yaT* (3.1.98 *por ad upadhāt*), can be introduced. But why do we have to resort to this rather prolix (*gaurava*) blocking of *yaT* by *ṆyaT*, when the two affixal derivates do not differ in form? Commentators hasten to add that these two derivates

differ in accent. That is, the final compound constituent, as a derivate of *yaT*, is marked with *udātta* at the beginning (6.1.210 *yato' nāvaḥ*). A final constituent as a derivate of *ṆyaT*, especially in view of retention of its *kṛt* accent (*kṛduttarapadaprakṛtisvara*), is marked with *udātta* at the end. Finally, an *anudātta* which occurs after an *udātta* is changed into a *svarita* (8.4.66 *udāttād anudāttasya svaritaḥ*).

Note that *labhya*, as a derivate of *yaT*, will be excluded because *labh* is not used in combination after the preverb *āṄ*. How can one then explain *agniṣṭoma ālabhyaḥ* 'the Agniṣṭoma sacrifice is to be performed' where *labh* is used after the preverb *āṄ*, and no *nUM* is heard. All operations, in the Vedic, can be considered optional (*sarve vidhayaś chandasi vikalpyante*). Or else, one can accept that *nUM* is introduced but its attendant introduction of *n* (*anuṣaṅga*) subsequently goes through deletion (6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala . . .*). Incidentally, Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kās*) shows that *labhya* can be derived with *yaK*. But since there is no affix marked with *K* as an *it* which is introduced after *labh*, Haradatta's *yaK* becomes a suspect. *Nyāsa* clearly recognizes the affix as *yaT*. Accepting *yaK* as the affix also renders Haradatta's statement confusing: *etena yaklyapau vyākhyātau* 'affixes *yaK* and *Lyap* have been illustrated by this'. That Haradatta's *yaK* is clearly *yaT* becomes clear when he adds: *tena 'yi' ity sāmānyoktāv api ṇyad evodāhṛta iti bhāvaḥ* 'therefore, the sense is: eventhough the specification is made with a general *yi*, only *ṆyaT* is illustrated'.

7.1.66 उपात्प्रशंसायाम्

upāt praśaṃsāyām
/upāt 5/1 *praśaṃsāyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *labheḥ* #64 *yi* #65)
upād uttarasya labheḥ praśaṃsāyāṃ gamyamānāyāṃ yakārādau pratyaya-viṣaye num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *labh* used after the preverb *upa*, when an affix beginning with *y* finds its scope to follow and the derivate denotes *praśaṃsā* 'praise'.

EXAMPLES:

upalambhyā bhavatā vidyā 'knowledge is worth your efforts to obtain'
upalambhyāni dhanāni 'riches are worth obtaining'

1. Note that the condition of *praśaṃsā* 'praise' is important. Thus, *upalabhyam asmād vṛṣalāt kiṃcit* 'something should be gotten out from this untouchable' will form an exception. For, *nUM* is not introduced in the absence of praise. The meaning here is simply 'to obtain', with no indication of 'praise'. The example is a derivate of *yaT*, introduced on the basis of *labh* ending in *pU*, i.e., *bh*, and having an *a* in its penultimate position (3.1.98 *por ad upadhāt*).

A derivate of *ṆyaT*, as explained earlier, will eventually end up being marked with a *svarita* at the end. Here again, since the affix is introduced after augment *nUM*, applications of replacement in *anusvāra* (8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya . . .*) and a homogeneous sound similar to what follows (*parasavarṇa*; 8.4.58 *anusvārasya yayi . . .*), are then accomplished. That is, even before the affix is introduced.

7.1.67 उपसर्गात्खल्घञोः

upasargāt khalghañoḥ
/upasargāt 5/1 *khal-ghañoḥ* 7/2 = *khal ca ghañ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *labheḥ* #64 *yi* #65)
upasargād uttarasya labheḥ khalghañoḥ parato num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *labh* used after a preverb (*upasarga*), when affixes *khaL* and *GHaÑ* follow.

EXAMPLES:

īṣatpralambhaḥ 'a little gain'
supralambhaḥ 'a big gain'
duṣpralambhaḥ 'a bad result'
pralambhaḥ 'gain, cheating'
vipralambhaḥ 'deceit'

1. This rule allows *nUM* when *labh*, used with a preverb (*upasarga*), is followed by affixes *KHaL* (3.3.126 *īṣadduḥsuṣu . . .*) and *GHaÑ*. Why should this rule be formulated when 7.1.64 *labheś ca* can already account for its scope? A formulation, made against another which already exists, is made for restrictive purposes (*siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*). Thus, *nUM* is to be introduced under the right context of *KHaL* and *GHaÑ*, only when *labh* is used in combination after a preverb (*upasargād eva nānyatra*). Consider *īṣallābhaḥ* 'easily available' and *lābhaḥ* 'gain', where *nUM* could not be introduced for a lack of *upasarga*, used in combination before *labh*.

7.1.68 न सुदुर्भ्यां केवलाभ्याम्

na sudurbhyāṃ kevalābhyām
/na ϕ *su-durbhyām* 5/2 = *suś ca dur ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām; kevalābhyām* 5/2/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *labheḥ* #64 *upasargāt khalghañoḥ* #67)
'su, dur' ity etābhyām kevalābhyām anyopasargarahitābhyām upasṛṣṭasya labheḥ khalghañoḥ parato num āgamo na bhavati
Augment *nUM* is not introduced to verbal root *labh* when it occurs in combination after *su* and *dur* alone, and when affixes *khaL* and *GHaÑ* follow.

EXAMPLES:

sudurlabham 'extremely hard to obtain'
sulabham 'easily available'
durlabham 'difficult to obtain'
sulābhaḥ 'better gain'
durlābhaḥ 'bad gain'

1. Note that *kevala* refers to the occurrence of *su* and *dur* alone, individually, or jointly, as preverbs. Or else, it refers to the absence of forms similar in class to *su* and *dur* (*aṇyasya sajātīyasyābhāvaṁ*). It negates *nUM* when read with *na* 'not'. Thus, we get *sulabha* 'easily available', *durlabha* 'available with difficulty' and *sudurlabha* 'extremelty hard to obtain'. Some may wrongly assume that this restriction also applies to *atisulabham* 'beyond easy reach'. Actually, *ati* is here termed a *karmapravacanīya* (1.4.95 *atir atikramaṇe ca*). It cannot be termed an *upasarga*. For, class inclusion (*saṃjñāsamāveśa*) is not permitted (1.4.1 *ā kaḍārād ekā saṃjñā*). That is, this restriction applies to forms which are similar in class (*sajātīya*) to *su* and *dur*. But what if *ati* is an *upasarga*, and not a *karmapravacanīya*? Augment *nUM* cannot be blocked there. Thus, we will get *sulambham* with *nUṬ*, *anusvāra* (*n*→*ṃ*) and *parasavarṇa* (*ṃ*→*m*).

The nominal ending *byām*, in *kevalābhyām* 'after the two alone', is interpreted as instrumental dual (*tṛtīyādvivacana*). It cannot be interpreted as an ablative dual (*pañcamīdvivacana*). For, an ablative interpretation will block *nUM* in *supralambhaḥ* and *duṣpralambhaḥ*. An ablative interpretation would require the restriction to apply when *su* and *dur* directly preceded the verbal root. That is, with no intervening *pra*, as in *supralambhaḥ* and *duṣpralambhaḥ*. If this is what was tended then *kevalābhyām* was not needed. The *sūtra* uses *kevalābhyām* to indicate absence of any other preverb before or after *su* and *dur*.

7.1.69 विभाषा चिण्णमुलोः

vibhāṣā ciṇṇamuloḥ
/vibhāṣā 1/1 *ciṇ-ṇamuloḥ* 7/2 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *labheḥ* #64)
'*ciṇ, ṇamul' ity etayor vibhāṣā labher num bhavati*
Augment *nUM* is introduced only optionally to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *labh*, when affixes *CiṆ* and *ṆamUL* follow.

EXAMPLES:

alābhi 'he obtained'
alambhi 'ibidem'
lābhaṃlābham 'gaining over and over again'
lambhaṃlambham 'ibidem'

1. This optional provision of *nUM* is interpreted as *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* 'fixed option'. That is, it applies optionally when the root is not used with a preverb (*anupasṛṣṭa*); it applies obligatorily (*nitya*) when the root is used with a preverb (*upasṛṣṭa*). Thus, we get *alābhi*, a derivate of *LUṄ* introduced after *labh* 'to gain', where *CLI* occurs before *LUṄ* (3.1.143 *cli luṅi*) and *LUṄ*, itself, is replaced with the third singular middle ending *ta*. Affix *CLI* also gets replaced with *CiṆ* (3.1.66 *ciṇ bhāvakarmaṇoḥ*). The *ta*-replacement of *LUṄ*, however, is deleted by 6.4.104 *ciṇo luk*. The penultimate of *labh* goes through *vṛddhi*, if the option of *nUM* is not availed. This will produce *alābhi* with the introduction of augment *aṬ* (6.4.71 *luṅlaṅlṛṅkṣv aḍ udāttaḥ*). Availing *nUM* will require *anusvāra* and *parasavarṇa* 'homogeneous replacement similar to what follows', as usual. We will thus get *alambhi*, with no penultimate *vṛddhi*. Derivates of *ṆamUL*, with the signification of *ābhīkṣṇya* 'over and over again', i.e., *lābhaṃlābham* and *lambhaṃlambham*, will again have *nUM*, optionally. But consider *prālambhi* and *pralambhaṃpralambham*, where, since the root is used with the preverb *pra*, *nUM* becomes obligatory (*nitya*).

7.1.70 उगिदचां सर्वनामस्थानेऽधातोः

ugidacāṃ sarvanāmasthāne' dhātoḥ
/ugid-acām 6/3 = *ug it yeṣāṃ te* = *ugitaḥ* (*bv.*); *ugitaś ca ac ca* = *ugidacaḥ* (*itar. dv.*); *sarvanāmasthāne* 7/1 *adhātoḥ* 6/1 = *na dhātuḥ* (*nañ.*), *tasya/* (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58)
ugitām aṅgānāṃ dhātuvarjitānām añcateś ca sarvanāmasthāne parato num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga* which is not a verbal root but is marked with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *UK* (*u/ṛ/ḷ*) as an *it*, and also to an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *añcU*, when an affix termed *sarvanāmasthāna* follows.

EXAMPLES:

bhavān/bhavantau/bhavantaḥ 'nominative singular, dual and plural polite of *bhavatU* (*bhā* + *ḌavatU*)'
śreyān / śreyāṃsau/śreyāṃsaḥ 'nominative singular, dual and plural derivates of *praśasya* 'superior' with *īyasUN*'
pacan/pacantau/pacantaḥ 'nominative singular, dual and plural derivates of *pac* with *ŚatṚ*'
prāṅ/prāñcau /prāñcaḥ 'nominative singular, dual and plural derivates of *añcU* with *KvIP*'

1. Why state *adhātoḥ* '*nUM* is introduced after that which is other than a verbal root . . .', especially when an inclusion of *añcU*, itself, could have excluded other roots? A specification by *adhātoḥ* is needed so that *nUM* could also be introduced to a form which was previously not a root but which

currently was (*Kāś: adhātubhūtapūrasya yathā syāt*). Thus, consider *gomān*, a derivate of verbal root *gomatya*, itself a root derived with affix *KyaC* introduced after *gomat* + *am* with the signification of *gomantaṃ icchati* = *gomatyati* 'wishes for himself to be rich in cows' (3.1.8 *supa ātmanaḥ kyac*). Now, *gomān* 'rich in cows' derives with *nUM*, introduced to *gomatya* + *KvIP* = *gomān*, where *KvIP*, also dubbed as *apratyayaḥ* 'no affix' or *aśrāvī* 'an affix which is not heard', goes through total deletion (*sarvāpahārilopa*). Introduction of *nUM* then produces *gomantya*. The final *a* of *gomantya* is deleted by 6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*. The *y* of *gomanty* is also deleted by 6.4.41 *kyasya vibhāṣā*. The *a* of *gomant* is then replaced with its long counterpart *ā* (6.4.14 *atvasantasya cādhātoḥ*) to yield *gom* (*a*→*ā*)*nt*. The final *t*, at the end of *nt*, a conjunct (*saṃyoga*), is dropped by 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*.

2. Recall that *bhavatU* is a derivate of the *Uṇādi* (I:63: *bhāter ḍavatuḥ*) affix *ḌavatU*. Refer to the appendix of 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*, especially *citavān* (II:338), for further derivational details of *bhavān*. Deriving *śreyān*, from *praśasya* + *īyasUN*, involves replacing *praśasya* with *śra* (5.3.60 *praśasya śraḥ*). Refer to notes under 5.3.60 *praśasya śraḥ* (IV:630) for additional derivational details. Thus, (*praśasya*→*śra*) + *īyas*(*UN*) = *śra* + *īyas* = *śreyas*. Derivational details of *pacat* and its paradigmatic forms are offered in the appendix (III:751) of 3.2.124 *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv*. . . . Derivational details of *prāṅ* are offered under the appendix (III:737-38) of 3.2.59 *ṛtvigdadhṛk*. . . .

3. Note that a specification with *añcati* is here made for restrictive purposes. That is, if *nUM* is to be introduced to a *dhātu*, it must be none other than *añcU*. Consider *ukhāsrat* and *parṇadvat* under 3.2.76 *kvip ca* (III:741-42), where *srans* and *dvans* at the end of a nominal stem could not avail *nUM*.

7.1.71 युजेरसमासे

yujer asamāse
/*yujeḥ* 6/1 *asamāse* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *sarvanāmasthāne* #70)
yujer asamāse sarvanāmasthāne parato num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *yujI* 'to join, yoke', when this same is not used in a compound (*samāsa*) and when an affix termed *sarvanāmasthāna* follows.

EXAMPLES:

yuṅ/*yuñjau*/*yujaḥ* 'nominative singular, dual and plural forms of *yuṅ*'

1. Note that *yuṅ* is a derivate of verbal root *yuj* with affix *KvIN* (cf. *vt: sampadādibhyaḥ kvip*; ad 3.3.94 *striyāṃ ktin*), where *KvIP* goes through total deletion. Augment *nUM* is introduced to *yuj* + *sU*, thereby yielding *yunj* + *sU*. Our final derivate *yuṅ* is derived through deletion of *sU* (6.1.68 *halṅyāb-*

bhyo . . .), deletion of conjunct final *j* (*saṃyogāntalopa*; 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*) and replacement of *n* with *ṅ* (*kutva*; 8.2.62 *kvin pratyayasya kuḥ*). Notice that *aśvayuk* 'he who yokes horses', *aśvayujau* and *aśvayujaḥ* cannot be allowed *nUM* because their base is a compound.

Incidentally, a specification of *yuj* with *i*, in *ujI* of *ujeḥ*, is intended for excluding any reference to verbal root *yuj* having the signification of *samādhi* 'state of deep meditation'. Thus, we do not get *nUM* in the accusative singular *yujam* of *yujam āpannāḥ ṛṣayaḥ* 'the sages have attained their state of deep meditation'.

7.1.72 नपुंसकस्य झलचः

napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ
/ napuṃsakasya 6/1 *jhalacaḥ* 6/1 = *jhal ca ac ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya/* (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *sarvanāmasthāne* #70)
napuṃsakasya jhalantasyājantasya ca sarvanāmasthāne parato num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to a neuter *aṅga* which ends either in a sound denoted by a non-nasal consonant (*jhaL*; *Śs*.8-14), or in a vowel, provided an affix termed *sarvanāmasthāna* follows.

EXAMPLES:

udaśvinti '(nominative (*Jas*)/accusative (*Śas*) plural of *udaśvit* 'butter-milk' '
śakṛnti 'nominative/accusative plural of *śakṛt* 'excretion' '
yaśāṃsi '. . . of *yaśas* 'fame' '
payāṃsi '. . . of *payas* 'milk' '
kuṇḍāni '. . . of *kuṇḍa* 'bowl' '
vanāni '. . . of *vana* 'forest' '
trapūṇi '. . . of *trapu* 'lead' '
jatūni '. . . of *jatu* 'lacquer' '

1. Refer to derivational details of *payāṃsi*, *trapūṇi* (I:384-85) and *kuṇḍāni* (II:377-78) in the appendix. Derivational patterns of these examples can also be followed to derive *yaśāṃsi*, *jatūni* and *vanāni*. Similar rule applications are also involved in deriving *udaśvinti* and *śakṛnti*, from *udaśvit* 'butter-milk' and *śakṛt* 'excretion, feces'. Recall that *anusvāra* (8.4.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*) and *parasavarṇa* 'replacement in a homogeneous sound similar to what follows' (8.4.58 *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ*) applications, both, follow the introduction of *nUM*.

2. Recall that this rule introduces *nUM* when a *sarvanāmasthāna* affix follows a neuter. A *Śi* (7.1.20 *jaśśasoḥ śi*) which comes in place of the nominative and accusative plural forms *Jas* and *Śas*, alone, gets the assignment of the term *sarvanāmasthāna* (1.1.42 *śi sarvanāmasthānam*). Rule 1.1.43 *suṭ*

anapuṃsakasya assigns the term *sarvanāmasthāna* to the nominative singular, dual, plural and accusative singular and dual endings *sU, au, Jas, am, auṬ* and *Śas*, only when they occur after a non-neuter. Thus, one should not expect *nUM* when singular and dual endings of nominative and accusative follow a neuter base.

3. A specification with *napuṃsakasya* is made in this rule to block *nUM* on the basis of neuter, for example, in *agnicit + sU = agnicid brāhmaṇaḥ* 'a brāhmaṇa who heaps ritual fire'.

A nominal which is marked with *UK* as an *it* and ends in a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* receives its *nUM* by this rule, and not by 7.1.70 *ugid acām*. . . . For, this rule is subsequent in order of enumeration (*paratvāt*). This is how we get *nUM* in *śreyāṃsi/ yaśāṃsi/ bhūyāṃsi* 'nominative and accusative plurals of *yaśas* 'fame', etc.'; *kurvanti/ kṛṣanti brāhmaṇakulāni* '(these) clans of the brāhmaṇas farm'.

4. A *vārttika* proposal is made to negate *nUM* in *bahūrji* 'much energy'. Thus, we get *bahūrji brāhmaṇakulāni* '(these) clans of the brāhmaṇas are powerful'.

Some, however, desire *nUM* prior to the last sound segment of *bahūrji*. They, thus, get *bahūrñji brāhmaṇakulāni*.

7.1.73 इकोऽचि विभक्तौ

iko' ci vibhaktau
/ikaḥ 6/1 *aci* 7/1 *vibhaktau* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *napuṃsakasya* #72)
igantasya napuṃsakasyāṅgasyājādau num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is attached to a neuter *aṅga* which ends in a sound denoted by *iK*, provided a vowel-initial affix termed *vibhakti* follows.

EXAMPLES:

trapuṇī 'nominative dual of neuter *trapu*'
jatunī '. . . of *jatu*'
tumburuṇī '. . . of *tumburu*'
trapuṇe 'dative singular of *trapu*'
jatune '. . . of *jatu*'
tumburuṇe '. . . of *tumburu*'

1. Note that *trapuṇī, jatunī, tumburuṇī*; and *trapuṇe, jatune, tumburuṇe* are two sets of derivates with *au* 'nominative dual' and *Ṅe* 'dative singular', respectively. The nominal ending *au* is replaced with *Śī* (7.1.19 *napuṃsakāc ca*). Forms of *trapu* and *tumburu* will also involve *ṇatva* (8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅ num vyavāye' pi*).

What is the purpose of stating 'when ending in a vowel denoted by *iK*'? Perhaps it is intended for *anuvṛtti* in the following rule. Why could it not be

stated at the place where it is intended to be used? Why could it not be stated in the subsequent rule? Well, not including *iK* in this rule may occasion introduction of *nUM* in *trapu + bhyām*. But this could hardly be the purpose. This *n*, subsequent to assignment of the term *pada* by 1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*, can be deleted by 8.2.7 *na lopaḥ prātipadikāntasya*. What then is the problem? Actually, the real purpose of including this specification made with *iK* is to block *nUM* in *he trapo* 'O Trapu'. Even if *nUM* gets introduced here, it cannot be deleted by 8.2.7 *na lopaḥ*. . . . For, 8.2.8 *na ṅisambuddhyoḥ* will block it.

One cannot argue that the question of introducing *nUM* does not arise since the inflectional ending (*vibhakti*) will be deleted by 7.1.23 *svamor nupuṃsakāt*. Rule 1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya* will block operations relative to deleted affix. Thus, this specification by *iK* does not serve any purpose. But it does serve a purpose. Pāṇini knew that 1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya* will block operations relative to a deleted affix. Thus, there was no point in making a specification with *iK*. Yet he did. It indicates that negation of 1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya* does not apply here. That is, a *guṇa* conditioned by *sambuddhi* (2.3.49 *ekavacanaṃ sambuddhiḥ*) still applies. Thus, we get *he trapo*.

2. The *Mahābhāṣya* cites the following *kārikā*-verses which summarize complexities of this rule-formulation:

> *iko' ci vyañjane mā bhūd astu lopaḥ svaraḥ katham*
> '*iko' ci* shows that *nUM* cannot be introduced when a consonant follows; how can one account for accent when the affix goes through deletion'
> *svaro vai śrūyamāṇo' pi lupte kiṃ na bhaviṣyati//*
> 'why can an accent, when heard, cannot be accounted for even when the affix goes through deletion'
> *rāyātvaṃ tisṛbhāvaś ca vyavadhānān numā api*
> 'we will get *ā*-replacement of *rai*, and also replacement of *tri* with *tisṛ* (*tisṛbhāva*), even when there is intervention by *nUM*'
> *nuḍ vācya uttarārthaṃ tu iha kiṃ citrapo iti//*
> '*nUṬ* should then be stated for subsequent application (why here); it is used here only for *citrapo*'

(2.1) Why is *aci* used in this rule?

If *aci* is not specified in the wording of rule 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*, augment *nUM* could be introduced even when an affix beginning with a consonant follows. That is, we will get augment *nUM* in *trapubhyām/ trapubhiḥ* where *bhyām* and *bhis* begin with a consonant. But there should not be any problem in introducing *nUM* when an affix beginning with a consonant followed. We can assign the term *pada* by 1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*, the deletion of *nUM* could then be accomplished by 8.2.7 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya*. Since *nUM* will go through deletion, there will not be any formal difference. This,

however, is not acceptable. There will be problems in retaining the original accent of initial constituents in *pañcatrapubhyām* and *pañcatrapubhiḥ.*

Let us consider *pañcaptrapubhyām/ pañcatrapubhiḥ* where *pañcatrapu* is derived as a compound by 2.1.51 *taddhitārthottarapadasamāhāre ca.* Rule 2.1.52 *saṃkhyāpūrvo dviguḥ* assigns the term *dvigu,* and 5.1.19 *ārhād agopuccha . . .* introduces *ṭhaK.* This *ṭhaK* will be subsequently deleted by 5.1.28 *adhyardhapūrvadvigor lug asaṃjñāyām.* If we introduced *bhyām/ bhis* after *pañcatrapu* with introduction (7.1.73), and subsequent deletion (8.2.7) of *nUM* before *bhyām/ bhis* without any consideration of *aci, n*-deletion will become suspended (*asiddha*; 8.2.2 *nalopaḥ supsvara . . .*). That is, *n* will still be seen as part of *pañcatrapu.* Consequently, 6.2.29 *iganta-kapāla-bhagāla-śarāveṣu dvigau* will not be able to retain the original accent of initial constituent, i.e., *pañca.* Recall that, under the suspension provision of *n*-deletion, the final constituent, i.e., *trapu,* will no longer be ending in a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK,* as is requred by 6.2.28 *igantakapāla-bhagāla. . . .* In the absence of accentual retention of the first constituent, we will find application of a rule which assigns initial *udātta* accent to bases ending in *n* and *r.* But the problem is much more complex because we do not find initial *udātta* in usage. We still get the retention of the original accent. This begs a question: why can we not retain what is heard in usage, even after *n*-deletion and its suspension (*asiddhatva*). Why do we have to accept the impairment of the condition of a vowel denoted by *iK* at the end. It is stated that, in *pañcatrapuṇe* and *pañcatrapuṇaḥ,* augment *nUM* is considered part of the whole form. It could not be accepted as a reason for impairment of condition of a vowel denoted by *iK* at the end of the following constituent. This can clear the way for retention of original accent of initial constituent. We can also find yet another solution. It can be argued that retention operation of original accent is internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*). Consequently, it will be accomplished prior to introduction of nominal endings *bhyām/ bhis.* This way, we can accomplish the retention of original accent of initial constituents in *pañcatrapubhyām* and *pañcatrapubhiḥ.*

(2.2) *rāyātvaṃ tisṛbhāvaś ca vyavadhānaṃ numā api. . . .*

Now consider *atirābhyām,* paraphrased as *rāyam atikrāntābhyāṃ kulābhyām* 'by the clans having excelled in wealth', where *atirai* is a compound formed with 2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ,* and given *atirai + bhyām,* the final *ai* of *atirai* goes through shortening of 1.2.47 *hrasvo napuṃsake prātipadikāntasya.* If, given *atiri + bhyām,* one introduces *nUM* before the consonant initial affix *bhyām* and subjects *n* to subsequent deletion. This *n*-deletion will become suspended (*asiddha*). Consequently, replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) of 7.2.85 *rāyo hali* cannot be accomplished. For, *rai* and *bhyām* will then be intervened by *nUM.* Since this *nUM* has been introduced to *atiri,* it may also be considered part of *atiri* in accord with interpretive convention of *yadāgama* (*PŚ* (12): *yadāgamā*

guṇībhūtās tad grahaṇena gṛhyante). But this consideration will still create problem in getting *ā*-replacement of *ai* of *atirai*, before *bhyām*. For, *nUM* will become part of *rai* as its final, intervening between *rai* and *bhyām*.

An additional problem is discussed in connection with replacement of *tri* with *tisṛ* (*tisṛbhāvaś ca*). The *pañcamī* of *vyavadhānāt* 'because of intervention' indicates *lyab-lopa* 'deletion of *LyaP*' before *pañcamī* 'ablative' is introduced. This will yield an interpretive sentence as: *numvyavadhānam api prāpya rāya ātvaṃ tisṛbbhāvaś ca* 'even after reaching the intervention of *nUM*, *r*(*ai*) receives replacement in *ā*, and *tri* receives a replacement in *tisṛ*'. For, *rāyo hali* will include the interpretation: '. . . the nominal ending which is introduced after *rai* . . .'. The word *tricaturoḥ* will have a simialr interpretation '. . . the nominal ending which is introduced after *tri* . . .'. Replacement in *ā*, and *tisṛ*, will both be accomplished before such endings. Eventhough *nUM* will be introduced when the nominal ending will be introduced. Still, contiguity of elements will be accepted as that which emerges at the time of introductioon of the nominal ending. The word *api* indicates that replacement in *ā*, and in *tisṛ*, can also be accomplished by some other method. Consider *atribhyām* where introduction of *nUM*, and replacement in *ā*, will both become applicable concurrently. We will apply *ā*-replacement (*ātva*) on the basis of *paratva* 'subsequent in order of rules'. We will similarly get *tisṛ* as a replacement for *tri*. For, that which goes through *vipratiṣedha* 'conflict among two rules of equal strength where a subsequent rule wins application', and is blocked, is blocked forever (*PŚ* (41)*: sakṛd gatau vipratiṣedhe yad bādhitaṃ tad bādhitam eva*). Or else, even if *nUM* is introduced after replacements in *ā* and *tisṛ*, *n*-deletion will apply to remove it.

3. *Nyāsa* and *Padamañjarī* both discuss the express purpose of using the word *aci* in the wording of this rule (7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*). *Nyāsa* states that *eveṃ tarhi numnuṭo vipratiṣedhārtham ajgrahaṇaṃ kartavyam, nuṭi kṛte num na kriyate* 'this way, *aC* should be used to illustrate conflict of equal strength between *nUM* and *nUṬ*; *nUM* is not introduced after having introduced *nUṬ*'. Augment *nUṬ* is introduced by 7.1.54 *hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ* which, in turn, has its independent scope of application in *agnīnām* and *vāyūnām*. One can similarly cite *trapuṇe* and *jatune* as independent scopes of *nUM* qualified with *iganta* 'that which has a vowel denoted by *iK* at the end'. These two rule-applications concurrently become applicable both to *trapūṇām* and *jatūnām* (neuter) where *nUṬ* is introduced on the basis of *pūrva-vipratiṣedha* 'conflict of equal strength where a prior rule wins application'. For, subsequent upon introduction of *nUṬ*, we will get a replacement in long vowel (*dīrgha*) 6.4.3 *nāmi*. This long replacement cannot be accomplished when *nUṬ* is introduced. For, *n* will occur at the end of the *aṅga*, and this same will be found when *nām* follows. That this situation of conflict (*vipratiṣedha*) arises in connection with the use of *aci* in 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau* is stated by Jinendrabuddhi (see *Nyāsa*) as follows:

'*nUM* cannot be availed after *nUṬ* is introduced. For, *trapu* will occur before *nām*, and not before the vowel-initial nominal ending *ām*. If we introduced *nUM*, the *aṅga* will then end in *n* (*nānta*). Consequently, *nuṬ* can not be introduced, especially since *ām* will not be occurring after an *aṅga* ending in a short vowel. This way, *nUM* and *nUṬ* both become equal in strength. The context of *vipratiṣedha* then becomes real. If *aC* is not used in rule 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*, and the rule is formulated simply as *iko vibhaktau*, then, after introduction of *nUṬ*, we will get the introduction of *nUM* under the condition of a following nominal ending beginning with a consonant. If *nUṬ* is not introduced, introduction of *nUM* can be accomplished under the condition of a following nominal ending beginning with a vowel. Augment *nUM*, in view of *kṛtākṛta-prasaṅga* of *nUṬ*, will become obligatory (*nitya*). Augment *nUṬ* will thus become non-universal (*anitya*).

We can still apply *nUṬ* if we took recouse to *pūrva-vipratiṣedha* 'conflict among rules where the preceding wins application'. This is what the author of the *vārttika* proposes. This, however, will render the use of *aci* without any purpose. Our rule 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau* becomes econominal without *aci*. One can still argue here in favor of keeping *aci* in the rule. For, even if one applies *nUṬ*, via *pūrva-vipratiṣedha*, one has to introduce *nUM*, in the absence of *aci*, before a nominal ending beginning with a consonant. Though there will be *n*-deletion via assignment of the term *pada*. The *n* will thus not be heard (*śruta*). But deletion of *n* could be treated as suspended (*asiddha*; 8.2.2 *nalopaḥ supsvara . . .*). Consequently, long-replacement of *nāmi* (6.4.3) will be blocked. But this should not deter us from accepting *aci* without any purpose. The long-replacement of *nāmi* (6.4.3) can be accomplished by applying 6.4.7 *nopadhāyāḥ*, as is done in examples such as *pañcānām*. If *aci* is not used, we cannot get long-replacement in *śuci* before *nām* of *śucīnām*. This should not pose any problem. For, *in* of 6.4.12 *inhanpūṣāryamṇām* considers *in* as part of an enumerated list of nominals (*pratipadokta*). The *in* of *śucin* is not so. The use of *aci* could still not serve any purpose.

Commentators generally agree that *aci* does not serve any purpose here. They hasten to add that *aci* is needed in subsequent rules. Now a question: why did he not use *aci* where it was needed? It is argued that *aci* is used in 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau* to facilitate the derivation of *he trapo*. Patañjali accepts both *he trapu* and *he trapo* as correct forms. Note that *trapu* is neuter. Consequently, a *sU* introduced after it will go through deletion by *LUK* of 7.1.23 *svamor napuṃsakāt*. Rule 1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya* will subsequently block application of 7.3.108 *hrasvasya guṇaḥ* whereby a replacement in *o* for *u* of *trapu* cannot be realized. That is, *he trapu* alone will be the address form. If 1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya* is considered non-universal (*anitya*), we can still have *trapu + sU*. An application of 7.3.108 *hrasvasya guṇaḥ* can then yield the desired form *he trapo*. But this can be made possible only at the strength of the use of *aci* in 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*. For, if *aci* is not used, we will get the

introduction of augment *nUM* in *trapu + sU.* If *aci* is used we will not get this *nUM* since *sU* begins with a consonant. If *aci* is not used, and *nUM* is introduced, we will get *trapun + sU.* Rule 7.3.108 *hrasvasya guṇaḥ* cannot apply here to replace *u* with *o.* For, 1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne* will assign the term *pada,* and *n* will go through deletion via *LOPA.* Since this *n*-deletion will become suspended (*asiddha*; 8.2.2 *nalopaḥ supsvara . . .*), we will not get an *aṅga* ending in a short vowel, here *u.* This clearly shows that *aci* is used here with the purpose of facilitating the derivation of *he trapo.*

It should be noted that the term *sarvanāmasthāna* is assigned only in the context of non-neuter masculine and feminine bases occurring before nominal endings denoted by the abbreviatory term *sUṬ* (1.1.43 *sud anapuṃsakasya*). The term *pada* is assigned only before non-*sarvanāmasthāna* affixes (1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*). The assignment of the term *pada* in case of *trapun + sU* should thus not be questioned. The phrase *nuḍ vācyaḥ* of the fourth quarter of the verse refutes the purpose of *aci* in deriving *he trapo.*

7.1.74 तृतीयादिषु भाषितपुंस्कं पुंवद् गालवस्य

tṛtīyādiṣu bhāṣitapuṃskaṃ puṃvad gālavasya
/ tṛtīyādiṣu 7/3 = *tṛtīyā ādir yāsāṃ tāḥ* (*bv.*); *bhāṣitapuṃskam* 1/1 = *bhāṣitaḥ pumān yena tat* (*bv.*); *puṃvat* ϕ *gālavasya* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *napuṃsakasya* #72 *iko' ci vibhaktau* #73)
tṛtīyādiṣu vibhaktiṣv ajādiṣu bhāṣitapuṃskaṃ igantaṃ napuṃsakaṃ gālavasya ācāryasya matena puṃvad bhavati
An *aṅga* termed neuter which ends in a sound denoted by *iK* and has a corresponding form with the denotation of masculine, is, in the opinion of Gālava, treated as if masculine when a vowel-initial nominal ending, particulalry one enumerated beginning with the instrumental (*tṛtīyā*), follows.

EXAMPLES:

grāmaṇīr brāhmaṇaḥ 'this brāhmaṇa is the village leader'
grāmaṇi brāhmaṇakulam 'village-leader clan of the brāhmaṇas'
grāmaṇye brāhmaṇakulena 'by the village-leader clan of the brāhmaṇas'
grāmaṇinā brāhmaṇakulena 'ibidem'
grāmaṇye brāhmaṇakulāya 'to the village-leader clan of the brāhmaṇas'
grāmaṇine brāhmaṇakulāya 'ibidem'
grāmaṇyo brāhmaṇakulāt 'from the village-leader clan of the brāhmaṇas'
grāmaṇino brāhmaṇakulāt 'ibidem'
grāmaṇyo brāhmaṇakulasya 'of the village-leader clan of the brāhmaṇas'
grāmaṇino brāhmaṇakulasya '. . . genitive singular'
grāmaṇyor brāhmaṇakulayoḥ '. . . genitive dual'
grāmaṇinor brāhamaṇakulayoḥ 'ibidem'
grāmaṇyāṃ brāhmaṇakulānām 'genitive plural . . .'

grāmaṇīnāṃ brāhamaṇakulānām 'ibidem'
grāmaṇyāṃ brāhmaṇakule 'locative singular . . .'
grāmaṇini brāhmaṇakule 'ibidem'
śucinā brāhmaṇakulena 'by the pure clan of the brāhmaṇas'
śucaye brāhmaṇakulena 'to the pure . . .'
śuceḥ brāhmaṇakulena 'from the pure . . .'

1. This rule allows treating a neuter presuffixal base as masculine, when the base ends in an *iK* and there exists a regular masculine parallel to it, provided a vowel initial affix enumerated beginning with the instrumental singular *Ṭā* follows. This is true in the opinion of Gālava. This, however, will not be acceptable in the opinion of others. Note that this treatment of a neuter as if it was a masculine blocks two applications: (*a*) shortening (*hrasva*; 1.2.47 *hrasvo napuṃsake prātipadikasya*) and (*b*) introduction of augment *nUM* (7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*), as these two applications are both blocked in case of a masculine. We will thus get two sets of forms: (*i*) where, because of treatment as masculine in the opinion of Gālava, *grāmaṇyā brāhmaṇakulena* cannot have *nUM*, shortening (*hrasva*) and its *yaṆ* resulting from 6.4.82 *eranekāco . . .*; (*ii*) where, given *grāmaṇinā brāhmaṇakulena*, and because of non-treatment of a neuter as masculine, *nUM* and shortening (*hrasva*) apply. Thus, consider *grāmaṇinā*, where instrumental singular *Ṭā* yields *nā*, through *nUM* and application of 7.3.119 *āṅo nā' striyām*. Similar consequences of *yaṆ*, in masculine, and *hrasva* with *nUM* in the neuter, can be seen before nominal endings *Ṅe*, *ṄasI*, *Ṅas*, *os*, *ām*, and *Ṅi*, etc.

Note that, since *śuci* 'pure' ends in a *hrasva*, its instrumental singular will be *śucinā*, both in the masculine and neuter. A treatment as masculine, for example in cases of *śucaye* and *śuceḥ*, requires application of *guṇa* (7.3.111 *gher ṅiti*), and replacement in *ay* where applicable.

7.1.75 अस्थिदधिसक्थ्यक्ष्णामनङुदात्तः

asthidadhisakthyakṣṇām anaṅ udāttaḥ
/ asthi-dadhi-sakthy-akṣṇām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām; anaṅ* 1/1 *udāttaḥ* 1/1/ (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *napuṃsakasya* #72 *aci vibhaktau* #73 *tṛtīyādiṣu* #74)
'*asthi, dadhi, sakthi, akṣi*' *ity eteṣāṃ napuṃsakānāṃ tṛtīyādiṣv ajādiṣu vibhaktiṣu parato' naṅ ity ayam ādeśo bhavati sa codātto bhavati*
The final sound segment of a neuter *aṅga*, namely *asthi* 'bone', *dadhi* 'yogurt', *sakthi* 'thigh', and *akṣi* 'eye', is replaced with *anAṄ* marked with *udātta*, when a vowel-initial nominal ending enumerated beginning with *tṛtīyā* 'third triplet; instrumental' follows.

EXAMPLES:

asthnā 'instrumental singular of *asthi*'
asthne 'dative singular . . .'

dadhnā 'instrumental singular of *dadhi*'
dadhne 'dative singular . . .'
sakthnā 'instrumental singular of *sakthi*'
sakthne 'dative singular . . .'
akṣṇā 'instrumental singular of *akṣi*'
akṣṇe 'dative singular . . .'

1. Note that these derivates already had *nUM* (7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*) available to them. This rule offers *anAṄ*, instead. The words *asthi*, *dadhi*, *sakthi* and *akṣi* are all marked with *udātta* at the beginning (*Phiṭsūtra* 26: *nabviṣay . . .*). Their remainder, i.e., *i*, will then be marked with *anudātta* (6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ . . .*). Augment *anAṄ*, by way of being a replacement of an *anudātta*, should have been marked with an *anudātta*. Our present rule marks it *udātta*, instead. Augment *anAṄ* will replace *i* of *asthi*, etc., in view of 1.1.52 *ṅic ca*. The penultimate *a* of *asthan*, in *asth* + (*i*→*an*(*AṄ*)) + (*Ṭ*)*ā* = *asthan* + *ā*, is deleted by 6.4.134 *al lopo' naḥ*. Since this deleted *a* was marked with *udātta*, our nominal ending *Ṭā* then became *udātta* (6.1.158 *anudāttasya ca yatrodāttalopaḥ*).

7.1.76 छन्दस्यपि दृश्यते

chandasy api dṛśyate
/*chandasi* 7/1 *api* ϕ *dṛśyate* (verbal *pada*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *napuṃsakasya* #72 *asthidadhisakthyakṣṇām anaṅ udāttaḥ* #75)
asthidadhisakthyakṣṇām anaṅ chandasy api dṛśyate
A replacement in *anAṄ* which comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* termed neuter, namely *asthi*, *dadhi*, *sakthi*, and *akṣi*, is also seen in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

índro dadhīco asthibhiḥ
bhadraṃ páśyemākṣabhíḥ
asthanvantaṃ yadánasthā bibhárti

1. This observation about *anAṄ*, in the Vedic, opens all kinds of possibilities. For example, *anAṄ* is stated in the preceding rule to obtain before a vowel-initial nominal ending. We find *anAṄ*, in the Vedic, also before a consonant-initial ending (*anajādi*; cf. instrumental plural, in *asthibhíḥ*, and *akṣabhiḥ*). It has been stated to occur before instrumental (*ṭṛtīyā*), etc. It can also violate this condition of *ṭṛtīyā* in the Vedic (cf. accusative plural *Śas*, in *asthāni*). Finally, *anAṄ* is stated to occur only before a nominal ending (*vibhakti*). We can find it, in the Vedic, also before affixes which are not termed *vibhakti* (cf. before affix *matUP*, in *akṣaṇvatā* and *asthanvantam*).

Affix *mat*, in (*akṣ*(*i*→*anAṄ*)) → (*akṣan* + *mat*) + (*Ṭ*) *ā* = *akṣan* + *mat* + *ā*, receives *nUṬ* (8.2.16 *ano nuṭ*) to produce *akṣan* + *n* + *mat* + *ā*. Affix *mat* now goes through a replacement in *v* (*vatva*) of 8.2.9 *mād upadhāyā*. . . . Thus, *akṣan* + *n* + (*m*→*v*) *at* + *ā*= *akṣan* + *n* + *vat* + *ā*. The *n* of *anAṄ* is deleted as shown before. The other *n* goes through a replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*). We then get *akṣa*(*n*→ϕ) + (*n*→*ṇ*) + *vat* + *ā* = *akṣaṇvatā*.

7.1.77 ई च द्विवचने

ī ca dvivacane
/*ī* (1/1 deleted) *ca* ϕ *dvivacane* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *napuṃsakasya* #72 *asthidadhisakthyakṣṇām udāttaḥ* #75 *chandasi* #76)
dvivacane parataś chandasi viṣaye' sthyādīnām īkārādeśo bhavati sa codāttaḥ
The final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *asthi* 'bone', *dadhi* 'yogurt', *sakthi* 'thigh', and *akṣi* 'eye', is, in the Vedic, is replaced with *ī̲* marked with *udātta*, when a nominal ending with the signification of dual (*dvivacana*) follows.

EXAMPLES:

akṣō te indra piṅgale kaper iva 'your eyes o! Indra, are brown like those of a monkey's'
a̲kṣībhyā́ṃ te̲ nāsíkābhya̲ām '. . . your eyes . . . your nostrils'

1. This rule offers *ī*, concurrently marked with *udātta*, as a replacement for the final short *i* of *asthi*, etc., provided a dual nominal ending follows. Thus, consider *akṣi* + *au*, where 7.1.19 *napuṃsakāc ca* replaces *au* with *Śī*. Given *akṣi* + (*au* →(*Ś*) *ī*)) = *akṣi* + *ī*, the short *i* will now be replaced with the *anudātta ī* of this rule. An application of a single long homogeneous vowel-replacement (*savarṇadīrgha*; 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*) will finally derive *akṣ*(*i*→*ī*) + *ī* → *akṣ* (*ī* + *ī* → *ī*)) = *akṣī*. Note that 6.1.105 *dīrghāj jasi ca*, read with 6.1.106 *vā chandasi*, cannot block this long replacement since the usage is Vedic.

Commentators state that *nUM* is here blocked by *ī* on the basis of *paratva* 'subsequent in order'. This *nUM*, once blocked in this conflict of equal strength (*sakṛdgatau vipratiṣedhe*), shall remain blocked forever (*yad bādhitam tad bādhitam eva*).

7.1.78 नाभ्यस्ताच्छतुः

nābhyastāc chatuḥ
/*na* ϕ *abhyastāt* 5/1 *śatuḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58)
abhyastād aṅgād uttarasya śatur num na bhavati

Augment *nUM* is not introduced to affix *ŚatṚ* when it occurs after an *aṅga* termed *abhyasta.*

EXAMPLES:

dadat 'nominative singular of *dadat* (giving)'
dadatau 'nominative dual . . .'
datataḥ 'nominative plural . . .'
dadhat 'nominative singular of *dadhat* (placing)'
dadhatau 'nominative dual . . .'
dadhataḥ 'nominative plural . . .'
jakṣat 'nominative singular of *jakṣat* (eating)'
jakṣatau 'nominative dual . . .'
jakṣataḥ 'nominative plural . . .'
jāgrat 'nominative singular of *jāgrat* (waking, alert)'
jāgratau 'nominative dual . . .'
jāgrataḥ 'nominative plural . . .'

1. A sequence of two forms, i.e., one which goes through reduplication (*dvitva*) and the other which results from this process of reduplication, is termed *abhyasta* (6.1.5 *ubhe abhyastam*). Such sequences in *dadhat* and *jakṣat*, forms of *dhā* 'to place' and *jakṣ* 'to eat' with affix *ŚatṚ* are assigned the term *abhyasta* by 6.1.6 *jakṣityādayaḥ ṣaṭ.* Augment *nUM*, made available to these forms before nominative endings *sU, au* and *Jas*, is blocked here. How come what is negated here is not identified as the *ī* of the earlier rule? Is it not true that a negation applies to the most immediate positive provision? Yes, but where is that positive provision? A replacement in *ī* is not offered to forms ending in *ŚatṚ.* This replacement then cannot form a positive provision for negation. A negation applies to that for which a positive provision is made. No positive provision for *ī* is made for a form ending in affix *ŚatṚ.* Since a positive provision is made for augment *nUM* (7.1.70 *ugid acāṃ . . .*), it alone is to be considered the most immediately available provision for negation.

Incidentally, the *ā* of *dadā + at* and *dadhā + at*, etc., is deleted by 6.4.112 *śnābhyas tayor ātaḥ.* Our reduplicated (*abhyasta*) forms *dadā* and *dadhā* will result from applications of reduplication and subsequent shortening (7.4.59 *hrasvaḥ*).

7.1.79 वा नपुंसकस्य

vā napuṃsakasya
/vā ϕ napuṃsakasya 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #58 *abhyastāc chatuḥ* #78)
abhyastād aṅgād uttaro yaḥ śatṛpratyayas tadantasya napuṃsakasya vā num āgamo bhavati

Augment *nUM* is introduced, optionally, to an *aṅga* termed neuter which is termed *abhyasta* and ends in affix *ŚatṚ*.

EXAMPLES:

dadati kulāni 'the giving clans'
dadanti kulāni 'ibidem'
dadhati kulāni 'the sustaining clans'
dadhanti kulāni 'ibidem'
jakṣati kulāni 'the consuming clans'
jakṣanti kulāni 'ibidem'
jāgrati kulāni 'the alert clans'
jāgranti kulāni 'ibidem'

1. This rule makes *nUM* optional in connection with a neuter *aṅga* which ends in *ŚatṚ*. Thus, consider *dadat* + *Jas*, where *dadat* is an *aṅga* termed neuter ending in *ŚatṚ*. We get the form *dadati* when *Jas* is replaced with (*Ś*)*i* (7.1.20 *jaśśasoḥ śiḥ*). One can also get an optional derivate *dadanti*, if the option of introducing augment *nUM* is accepted. Thus, *dadat* + (*Ś*)*i* → *dada* + (*n*(*UM*) + *t* + *i* = *dadanti*. Similar rules apply in deriving other examples.

7.1.80 आच्छीनद्योर्नुम्

ācchīr nadyor num
/*āt* 5/1 *śī-nadyoḥ* 7/2 (*itar. dv.*) *num* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śatuḥ* #78 *vā* #79)
avarṇāntād aṅgād uttarasya śatur vā num āgamo bhavati śīnadyoḥ parataḥ
Augment *nUM* is optionally attached to affix *ŚatṚ* when it occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *a*, provided *Śī*, or an item termed *nadī*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

tudatī kule 'the two grieving clans'
tudantī kule 'ibidem'
tudatī brāhmaṇī 'the grieving brāhmaṇa woman'
tudantī brāhmaṇī 'ibidem'
yātī kule 'the two prospering (?) clans'
yāntī kule 'ibidem'
yātī brāhmaṇī 'the prospering brāhmaṇa woman'
yāntī brāhmaṇī 'ibidem'
kariṣyatī kule 'the two clans which will do'
kariṣyantī kule 'ibidem'
kariṣyatī brāhmaṇī 'the brāhmaṇa woman who will do'
kariṣyantī brāhmaṇī 'ibidem'

1. This rule makes augment *nUM* optional, also for an *aṅga* which ends in *a* and which occurs before *Śī* and *nadī* (1.4.3 *yū stryākhyau nadī*). Obviously,

we will get two sets of forms: one with *nUM*, the other without *nUM*. Consider *tud* + *at* + (*Ś*) *ī* = *tudat* + *ī* = *tudatī*, where *ŚatṚ* occurs after *tud* to yield an *aṅga*, *tudat*. The nominative plural *Jas*, of *tudat* + *Jas*, is replaced with *Śī* (7.1.19 *napuṃsakāc ca*). An optional *nUM* will produce *tuda*+*n*+*t* + *ī* = *tudantī*. A feminine counterpart of *tudat* can be derived as *tudatī*, by introducing the feminine affix *ṄīP* (4.1.4 *ugitaś ca*). We will get *tudat* + (*Ṅ*) *ī*(*P*) → *tudatī* + *Jas* → *tudatī* + (*Jas*→*Śī*) = *tudatī* + *ī* → *tudatī*. An optional *nUM*, where *nUM* goes through its replacement in *anusvāra* and subsequent homogeneous replacement similar to what follows (*parasavarṇa*), will give us *tudantī*. Note that the term *nadī* is assigned by 1.4.3 *yū stryākhyau nadī*. Similar rules apply in deriving most of the other examples.

Now consider *kariṣyantī* where *LṚṬ*, of *kṛ* + *LṚṬ*, gets replaced with *ŚatṚ* and *ŚānaC*. These *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*) affixes which both are marked with *Ś* as an *it* are further assigned the term *sat* (3.2.127 *tau sat*). This, as a direct consequence, also requires introduction of *sya* (3.1.33 *syatāsī lṛluṭoḥ*). Rule 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdha* . . . then requires a replacement in *guṇa*: *kṛ* + (*LṚṬ*→(*Ś*) *at*(*Ṛ*) = *kṛ* + *at* → *kṛ* + *sya* + *at* → *k*(*ṛ*→*ar*) + *sya* + *at*. An introduction of *iṬ* (7.2.70 *ṛddhanoḥ sye*), followed by a replacement in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*), will produce *kar* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *sya* + *at* → *kari* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *ya* + *at* → *kariṣy*(*a*+*a*) *t* → *kariṣyat*. An intorduction of the feminine affix *ṄīP*, followed by an optional augment *nUM*, can then offer us *kariṣyantī* or *kariṣyatī*.

Recall that the final *a* of *kariṣya* and the initial *a* of *at*, go through a single replacement in *a* (*parasavarṇa*; 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*).

This rule requires that *nUM* be attached to a *ŚatṚ* which occurs after an *aṅga*. . . . The problem is, the *aṅga* no longer ends in *ŚatṚ* after a single replacement similar to the following (*parasavarṇa*) has taken effect. Thus, *nUM* could not be made available. But since part of *at*, i.e., *t*, is still there, we can still introduce *nUM*.

7.1.81 शप्श्यनोर्नित्यम्

śapśyanor nityam
/śyap-śyanoḥ 6/2 *nityam* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śatuḥ* #78 *śīnadyor num* #80)
'*śap, śyan*' *ity etayoḥ śatuḥ śīnadyoḥ parato nityaṃ num āgamo bhavati*
Augment *nUM* is introduced, obligatorily, to a *ŚatṚ* which is relatable to *ŚaP* and *ŚyaN*, provided *Śī* and an item termed *nadī* follow.

EXAMPLES:

pacantī kule
pacantī brāhmaṇī
dīvyantī kule
dīvyantī brāhmaṇī

sīvyantī kule
sīvyantī brāhmaṇī

1. Note that the use of *nityam* 'obligatorily' cancels *vā* 'optionally'. The word *śyapśyanoḥ* is interpreted as ending in the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*). This then gives the meaning: 'augment *nUM* is obligatorily introduced to a *Śat*, introduced relative to *ŚaP* and *ŚyaN*'. Deriving *pacantī* from *pac* + (*LAṬ*→*ŚatṚ*) → *pac* + *ŚaP* + *ŚatṚ* = *pac* + *a* + *at*, will again involve *parasavarṇa* (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*), thereby yielding *pacat*. One can now derive *pacantī*, with *nUM*, from *pacat* + *NUM* + *au*, where *Śī* comes as a replacement for *au*. A *nadī* form will, of course, end in affix *ṄīP*.

2. Why do we have to state *nityam* 'obligatorily' in the rule when forming the rule itself (*ārambhasāmarthyāt*), against an already available optional *nUM*, will account for its obligatory nature. But there still will be a confusion about *vā* 'or' in subsequent rules. It is to cancel *vā* that a specification with *nityam* is made here.

7.1.82 सावनडुहः

sāv anaḍuhaḥ
/*sau* 7/1 *anaḍuhaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *num* #80)
sau parato' naḍuho' ṅgasya num āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *anaḍuh* 'ox, bull', when affix *sU* follows.

EXAMPLES:

anaḍvān 'nominative singular of *anaḍuh*'
he anaḍvan! 'vocative singular . . .'

1. Note that *sU* here refers to the nominative and vocative (*sambodhana*) singular endings, both. Augment *nUM* is introduced after the final vowel of *anaḍuh* (1.1.46 *mid aco' ntyāt paraḥ*) to derive *anaḍvān*. Thus, *anaḍuh* + *sU*→ *anaḍu* + *n*(*UM*) + *h* + *s* = *anaḍunh* + *s*. Augment *ām* (7.1.98 *catur anaḍuhor ām udāttaḥ*) is then introduced to yield *anaḍu* + *ā*(*M*) + *n* + *h* + *s*. Here again, *āM* is introduced after the final vowel of *anaḍuh*. The *s*, i.e., *sU*, and *h* of the string, go through deletion by 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo* . . . and 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*, respectively. This gives us: *anaḍu* + *ā* + (*h*→ϕ) *n* + (*s*→ϕ) = *anaḍu* + *ā* + *n*. An application of *yaṆ*, on *u* of *ananḍu*, will produce *anaḍ*(*u*→*v*) + *ā* + *n* = *anaḍvān*. The vocative singular form, however, will be *anaḍvan*, a derivate with *aM* (7.1.99 *am sambuddhau*), as against *āM*.

2. Some here perceive 'blocked-blocker' (*bādhyabādhaka*) relationship between *āM*/*aM* and *nUM*. They, therefore, introduce *āM*/*aM* first, thereby meeting the condition of *āT* carried from 7.1.80 *ācchīr nadyor num*. This way,

āM/aM cannot be blocked by *nUM* and, at the same time, *nUM* cannot be blocked by *āM/aM*. Others, however, do not see this 'blocked-blocker' relationship between them. They, instead, favor inclusion of *nUM* (*samāveśa*), in a manner similar to inclusion of lengthening (*dīrghatva*) and reduplication (*dvirvacana*) in *cicīṣati* '. . . wishes to heap . . .'.

7.1.83 दृक्स्ववस्स्वतवसां छन्दसि

dṛksvavassvatavasāṃ chandasi
/dṛk-svavas-svatavasām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*); *chandasi* 7/1/
'dṛk, svavas, svatavas' ity eteṣāṃ sau parato num āgamo bhavati chandasi viṣaye
Augment *nUM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *dṛk*, *svavas* and *svatavas*, in the Vedic, when affix *sU* follows.

EXAMPLES:

īdṛṅ 'like this'
kīdṛṅ 'like what'
tādṛṅ 'like that'
yādṛṅ 'like one which . . .'
sadṛṅ 'similar . . .'
svavān 'wealthy'
svatávān pāyurágne

1. Note that *īdṛṅ* derives from *idam* + *dṛś* + *KvIN* (3.2.60 *tyadādiṣu dṛśo' nālocane*), where *idam* gets replaced with *īŚ* (6.3.89 *idaṅkimor īśkī*). Given *īdṛś* + (*KvIN*→ϕ)) + *sU*, augment *nUM* is introduced to produce *īdṛ* + *n* + *ś* + *sU*. An application of *halṅyādilopa* (*sU*→ϕ); (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhy . . .*) and final conjunct deletion (*saṃyogāntalopa*; 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*) will produce: *ídṛnś* + (*s*(*U*)→ϕ)) → *īdṛ*(*ś*→ϕ) + *n*. The *n* will then go through a replacement in *ṅ* (*kutva*; 8.2.62 *kvinpratyayasya kuḥ*). We thus get *īdṛ*(*n*→*ṇ*) = *īdṛṅ*. Deriving *kīdṛṅ* with *kim* will require replacing *kim* with *kī*.

Similar rules apply in deriving *tādṛṅ* and *yādṛṅ*, with *KvIN* or *KaÑ*, introduced after *dṛś* (3.2.60 *tyadādiṣu dṛśo' nālocane kañ ca*). The final *d* of *tad* and *yad* gets replaced with *ā* (6.3.90 *ā sarvanāmnaḥ*). The resultant *a*+*ā*, of *ta*(*d*→*ā*) + *dṛś* = *ta* + *ā* + *dṛś*, goes through a single replacement in homogeneous long (*savarṇadīrgha*; 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*) vowel. Other rule applications are similar to *īdṛṅ*.

Deriving *svavān*, from *svava* + *nUM* + *s* + *sU*, would require *nUM* to be introduced after the last *a* of *svavas*. Here again, *halṅyādi* (deletion of *sU*) and *saṃyogānta* (final of a conjunct) deletions will apply to *svava* + *n* + *s* + (*sU* →ϕ) → *svavan*(*s*→ϕ) = *svavan*. The penultimate *a* will be subsequently replaced with *ā* (6.4.10 *sāntamahataḥ saṃyogasya*) to produce *svav*(*a*→*ā*) *n* = *svavān*. Similar derivational applications are followed in deriving *svatavān*.

Note that *svataṯavān pāyur ágneṯ* is an example of the *padapāṭha* 'listing of individual *padas* with no *sandhi*'. A listing in accord with the *saṃhitāpāṭha* 'junctional recitation' with *sandhi* will require the *n* of *svatavān* to go through a replacement in *rU* and *visarga* (*rutva-visarga*) of (8.3.11 *svatavān pāyau*). The preceding *ā* will then also go through nasalization (*anunāsika*; 8.3.2 *atrānunāsikaḥ pūrvasya . . .*). We will thus get *svatavāḥ pāyur agne.* An occurrence with *anusvāra* is hard to find.

7.1.84 दिव औत्

div aut
/divaḥ 6/1 *aut* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sau* #82)
'*div*' *ity etasya sau parataḥ* '*aut*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
The final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *div* 'heaven', is replaced with *auT* when affix *sU* follows.

EXAMPLES:

dyauḥ 'heaven'

1. Note that *div* 'heaven' is here interpreted as a nominal stem with no *it*-elements. Its specification does not make any reference to verbal root *divŨ* 'to sport'. Thus, a derivate with this verbal root, i.e., *akṣadyūḥ* 'he who plays with dice', will not be covered by this rule. Incidentally, *akṣadyū* is a compound formed under the cooccurrence condition of a conjoined word (*upapada*); i.e., *akṣa* + *bhis* + *div* + *KvIP*, where *KvIP* goes through total deletion (*sarvāpahārilopa*) and augment *ūṬH* is subsequently introduced (6.4.19 *chvoḥ śūḍ anunāsike*).

Refer to derivational details of *dyauḥ* (II:398), under the appendix of 1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo' nalvidhau.*

7.1.85 पथिमथ्यृभुक्षामात्

pathimathyṛbhukṣām āt
/pathi-mathi-ṛbhukṣām 6/3 = *panthāś ca manthāś ca ṛbhukṣāś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām; āt* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sau* #82)
'*pathin, mathin, ṛbhukṣin*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānāṃ sau parata ākāra ādeśo bhavati*
The final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *pathin, mathin,* and *ṛbhukṣin,* is replaced with *āT* (1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*) when affix *sU* follows.

EXAMPLES:

panthāḥ 'path'
manthāḥ 'churning stick'
ṛbhukṣāḥ 'Indra'

1. Refer to derivational details of *panthāḥ* in the appendix (II:398-99). Other derivates follow similar rule applications. Note, however, that 7.1.87 *tho nthaḥ* does not apply in deriving *ṛbhukṣāḥ*.

Note that *ā* replaces the *n* of *panthan*. This, however, does not make the replacement in *ā* nasalized. For, a sound which is denoted by *aÑ*, and is also brought about (*bhāvyamāna*) by application of a rule, does not include references to its homogeneous counterparts (*Paribh* 20: *bhāvyamānena savarṇānāṃ grahaṇaṃ na* (*bhavati*)). It is just the clear non-nasalized *ā* which is articulated.

7.1.86 इतोऽत् सर्वनामस्थाने

ito' at sarvanāmasthāne
/itaḥ 6/1 *at* 1/1 *sarvanāmasthāne* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *pathimathyṛbhukṣām* #85)
The *iT* (1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*) of an *aṅga*, namely of *pathin*, *mathin* and *ṛbhukṣin*, is replaced with *aT*, when a nominal ending termed *sarvanāmasthāna* (1.1.42 *śi sarvanāmasthānam*; 1.1.43 *suḍ anapuṃsakasya*) follows.

EXAMPLES:

panthāḥ 'nominative singular of *pathin*'
panthānau 'nominative dual . . .'
panthānaḥ 'nominative plural . . .'
manthāḥ 'nominative singular of *mathin*'
manthānau 'nominative dual . . .'
manthānaḥ 'nominative plural . . .'
ṛbhukṣāḥ 'nominative singular of *ṛbhukṣin*'
ṛbhukṣāṇau 'nominative dual . . .'
ṛbhukṣāṇaḥ 'nominative plural . . .'

1. This rule offers *a* as a replacement for *i* of *pathin*, etc., so that we can get *pathin* + *au* → *path*(*i*→*a*) + *n* + *au* → *pa*(*th*→*nth*) + *a* + *n* + *au* = *panthan* + *au*. The *th* of *pathin* and *mathin* is replaced with *nth* by the following rule. A long replacement for the second *a* of *panthan* (6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne* . . .) will produce *panth*(*a*→*ā*) *n* + *au* = *panthānau*. Forms of *ṛbhukṣin* will additionally involve a replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*).

Why is this specification made with *aT* when the *anuvṛtti* of *āt* could easily accomplish a reference to *a*. A specification with *aT* is made to capture the optional provision of short made by 6.4.9 *vā ṣapūrvasya nigame*. If *āT* alone was carried, *ṛbhukṣaṇam indram* could not have the short *a* heard. It will have the *ā*, instead. We can get the short *a*, optionally, replaced with its long counterpart by 6.4.9 *vā pūrvasya nigame*.

7.1.87 **थोन्थः**

tho nthaḥ
/thaḥ 6/1 *nthaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *pathimathoḥ* #85 *sarvanāmasthāne* #86)
pathimathos thakārasya sthāne 'ntha' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati sarvanāmasthāne parataḥ
The *th* of an *aṅga*, namely *pathin* and *mathin*, is replaced with *nth* when a nominal ending termed *sarvanāmasthāna* follows.

EXAMPLES:

panthāḥ/ panthānau/ panthānaḥ
panthānam/ panthānau
manthāḥ/ manthānau/ manthānaḥ
manthānam/ manthānau

1. Note that this rule does not apply to *ṛbhukṣin*. For, it does not have any *th* that could be replaced with *nth*.

Note also that what is to be replaced (*sthānī*), i.e., *th*, and what replaces (*ādeśa*), i.e., *nth*, are both specified here without any vowel (*anackau*). The *a* at the end of *nth* is for ease of articulation (*uccāraṇārthaḥ*).

7.1.88 **भस्य टेर्लोपः**

bhasya ṭer lopaḥ
/bhasya 6/1 *ṭeḥ* 6/1 *lopaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *pathimathyṛbhukṣām* #85)
pathyādīnāṃ bhasaṃjñakānāṃ ṭer lopo bhavati
The *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*) of an *aṅga* termed *bha* (1.4.18 *yaci bham*, etc.), namely *pathin*, *mathin* and *ṛbhukṣin*, is deleted by means of *LOPA*.

EXAMPLES:

pathaḥ 'ablative/genitive singular of *pathin*'
pathā 'instrumental singular . . .'
pathe 'dative singular . . .'
mathaḥ 'ablative/genitive singular of *mathin*'
mathā 'instrumental singular . . .'
mathe 'dative singular . . .'
ṛbhukṣaḥ 'ablative/genitive singular of *ṛbhukṣin*'
ṛbhukṣā 'instrumental singular . . .'
ṛbhukṣe 'dative singular . . .'

1. Note that *ṭi*-deletion of *bha* (1.4.18 *yaci bham*) applies before affixes beginning with a vowel. Since assignment of the term *bha* is made by 1.4.18 *yaci bham* with the *anuvṛtti* of *asarvanāmasthāne* 'when an affix other than a *sarvanāmasthāna* follows', *pathin*, etc., for purposes of *ṭi*-deletion, cannot be

termed *bha*. If they get the term *bha* assigned, *ṭi*-deletion cannot be accomplished when a *sarvanāmasthāna* followed. This is what commentators characterize as conflict (*virodha*) between items termed *bha* and *sarvanāmasthāna*, with no possible resolution (*anavasthānalakṣaṇa*). Consequently, *sarvanāmasthāne*, though carried for subsequent rules, is not associated here with *ṭi*-deletion (7.1.87 *bhasya ṭer lopaḥ*). This *ṭi*-deletion thus applies to *in*, for example, of *pathin* + (*Ṅ*)*as*, etc., when a non-*sarvanāmasthāna* affix follows. Thus, *path*(*in*→ϕ) + (*Ṅ*)*as* = *path* + *a*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *pathaḥ*, through *ṭi*-deletion and *s*→*r*→*ḥ* (*rutva-vasarga*).

7.1.89 पुंसोऽसुङ्

puṃso' suṅ
/*puṃsaḥ* 6/1 *asuṅ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sarvanāmasthāne* #86)
'*puṃs*' *ity etasya sarvanāmasthāne parato*' *suṅ ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
The final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *puṃs* 'male', is replaced with *asUṄ* when a nominal ending termed *sarvanāmasthāna* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pumān 'nominative singular of *puṃs*'
pumāṃsau 'nominative dual . . .'
pumāṃsaḥ 'nominative plural . . .'

1. This rule introduces augment *asUṄ* to an *aṅga*, namely *puṃs*, when a *sarvanāmasthāna* affix follows. Thus, *asUṄ* replaces the final *s* (1.1.52 *ṅic ca*) of *puṃs*, occurring, for example, before the nominative singular ending *sU*. We derive *pumān* from *puṃ*(*s*→*as*(*UṄ*) + *s*(*U*) = *pumas* + *s*, where applications of *nUM* (7.1.70 *ugid acām* . . .) and lengthening (*dīrgha*; 6.4.10 *sāntamahataḥ* . . .) produce: *puma* + *n*(*UM*) + *s* + *s* → *pum*(*a*→*ā*)*n* + *s* + *s* = *pumān* + *s* + *s*. Our final derivate *pumān* can be derived now with *halṅyādi* (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo*. . . . ; *pumān* + *s* + (*s*→ϕ)) and *saṃyogānta* (8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ; pumān*(*s*→ϕ)) deletions. Other forms are similarly derived. Incidentally, the *U* as an *it* in *asUṄ* facilitates operations such as introduction of *nUM* (7.1.70 *ugidacāṃ* . . .).

2. Commentators advise that a compound such as *paramapumān* 'best man' should be marked with *udātta* at the end (6.2.220 *samāsasya*), prior to the introduction of a nominal ending termed *sarvanāmasthāna*. This is advised in view of *pumān* which is marked *udātta* at the beginning, obligatorily. Introducing a nominal ending, especially with subsequent *asUṄ*, will create problems of accentuation.

7.1.90 गोतो णित्

goto ṇit

/gotaḥ 5/1 *ṇit* 1/1 = *ṇakāra it yasya* (*bv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sarvanāmasthāne* #86)
gośabdāt paraṃ sarvanāmasthānaṃ ṇid bhavati
A nominal ending termed *sarvanāmasthāna* which occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *go* 'cow', is treated as if marked with *Ṇ* as an *it*.

EXAMPLES:

gauḥ 'nominative singular of *go*'
gāvau 'nominative dual . . .'
gāvaḥ 'nominative plural . . .'

1. This rule extends the status of *ṇit* '*Ṇ* as an *it*' to a *sarvanāmasthāna* affix which follows *go*. This extensional (*atideśa*) provision facilitates *vṛddhi*. Thus, *go* + *s*(*U*) → *g*(*o*→*au*) + *s* → *gau* + (*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *gauḥ*. This same happens when the nominative and accusative plural endings follow *go*. Thus, *g*(*o*→*au*) + *as* → *g*(*au*→*āv*) + *as* → *gāva*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *gāvaḥ*, through an additional application of 6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*. A single replacement in *ā*, i.e., *g*(*o* + *a*→*ā*) *m* = *gām*, will be required when *go* occurs before *am* 'accusative singular' (6.1.93 *auto' ṃśasoḥ*).

Incidentally, the locative (*saptamī*) singular of *sarvanāmasthāne*, because of its desired syntactic coordination with *ṇit*, is changed to the nominative.

2. Why is this specification of *go* made here with *t* (*taparakaraṇa*; 1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*)? So that this rule does not apply in *citragu* 'he who owns brindled cows' and *śabalagu* 'ibidem', where *o* of *go* termed an *upasarjana* 'secondary constituent', goes through a replacement in *hrasva* 'shortening' (1.2.48 *gostriyor upasarjanasya*). That is, *o* can be found there only through *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating a replacement as what it replaced'.

Why is this extension (*atideśa*) not applicable to vocative (*sambodhana*) forms *he citrago* and *he śabalagavaḥ*? This operation does not take place when another operation relative to an *aṅga* has taken effect (*pbh.* (93): *aṅgavṛtte punar vṛttāv avidhirniṣṭhitasya*). That is, status as *Ṇit* is blocked when *guṇa*, conditioned by *sambuddhi* 'vocative singular' and *Jas* 'nominative plural', has taken effect. This is how *vṛddhi*, caused by the status as *Ṇit*, is not applied. Or else, *gotaḥ* is interpreted as denoting relational (*sambandhalakṣaṇā*) genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*). This, when read with *sarvanāmasthāne*, yields the interpretation: *Ṇit* status applies when a *sarvanāmasthāna* relative to *got* follows'. What can be interpreted as a *sarvanāmasthāna* relative to *got*? A *sarvanāmasthāna* which is used to denote meanings such as *ekatva* 'oneness' and *bahutva* 'manyness' of the denotatum of *go* 'cow'. The *sarvanāmasthāna* ending of *citragu*, etc., does not denote the meaning of *go*. It denotes the meaning of something else. That is, it denotes the meaning of the owner of brindled cows. A specification with *t* is made here for clarity (*spaṣṭanirdeśārtham*).

Some read this *sūtra* as *oto ṇit*. This way, *Ṇit* status can then be applicable also to *dyo*, etc., in deriving the nominative singular, dual and plural forms

of *dyu*, i.e., *dyauḥ, dyāvau* and *dyāvaḥ*. This, however, is not necessary since *taparakaraṇa* 'making a specification with a following *t*' in *got* itself can account for it. For, *taparakaraṇa* is employed generally with reference to a sound segment (*varṇanirdeśeṣv hi taparakaraṇam prasiddham*).

7.1.91 णलुत्तमो वा

ṇal uttamo vā
/ṇal 1/1 *uttamaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
uttamo ṇal vā ṇid bhavati
A *ṆaL* of *uttama* 'first person' is, only optionally, treated as marked with *Ṇ* as an *it*.

EXAMPLES:

ahaṃ cakāra 'I made'
ahaṃ cakara 'ibidem'
ahaṃ papāca 'I cooked'
ahaṃ papaca 'ibidem'

1. This status as *Ṇit* 'marked with *Ṇ* as an *it*' is hereby extended (*atidiśyate*) to affix *ṆaL*, a replacement of first personal active verbal ending *miP* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhi . . .*; 3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*), only optionally (*vā*). Example derivates will have *vṛddhi* of 7.2.115 *aco' ñṇiti* and 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ* when this optional extension of *Ṇit* is accepted. In the absence of accepting this extensional status, we get an application of *guṇa* marked with assignment of the term *ārdhadhātuka* (7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārddhadhātukayoḥ*).

Notice that affix *ṆaL* is already marked with *Ṇ* as an *it*, at the outset (*upadeśa*). This is how *Ṇ* is assigned the term *it* and goes through deletion by 1.3.9 *tasya lopaḥ*. This extensional proposal of *Ṇ* as an *it* is, obviously, not intended for assigning the term *it* and subsequent deletion of *Ṇ*. It is intended for facilitating operations, for example replacement in *vṛddhi*, relative to status as marked with *Ṇ*. The assignment of the term *it* to *Ṇ* (1.3.5 *ādir ñituḍavaḥ*) and its subsequent deletion by 1.3.9 *tasya lopaḥ* cannot be negated, or made optional, even by a hundred statements like this (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś: na tu ṇal upadeśāvasthāyāṃ siddhaṃ ṇitvaṃ tad vacanaśatenāpi śakyaṃ pratiṣeddhum iti bhāvaḥ*).

Refer to relevant derivational details under 6.1.1 *ekāco dve prathamasya*.

7.1.92 सख्युरसम्बुद्धौ

sakhyur asambuddhau
/sakhyuḥ 6/1 *asambuddhau* 7/1 = *na sambuddhiḥ*
(*nañ.*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sarvanāmasthāne* #86 *ṇit* #90)

asambuddhau yaḥ sakhiśabdaḥ tasmāt paraṃ sarvanāmasthānaṃ ṇid bhavati
A nominal ending termed *sarvanāmasthāna* which occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *sakhi* 'companion, friend', is treated as marked with *Ṇ* as an *it*, provided a nominal ending termed *sambuddhi* (2.3.49 *ekavacanaṃ sambuddhiḥ*) does not follow.

EXAMPLES:

sakhāyau 'nominative dual of *sakhi*'
sakhāyaḥ 'nominative plural . . .'

1. Here again the locative *sarvanāmasthāne* is interpreted as nominative *sarvanāmasthānam*, because of its desired syntactic coordination (*sāmānādhikaraṇyāt*) with the nominative singular form of *ṇit*. The word *asambuddhau* is interpreted as *sambudher anyā' sambuddhiḥ, tasmin* 'when an ending, (similar to but) other than a *sambuddhi*, follows'. A *vṛddhi*, characterized with *Ṇ* as an *it* (*ṇit*), thus does not apply in *he sakhe* 'O, friend', where *sakhi* is followed by a *sambuddhi*. It, however, applies, for example, in *sakhāyau* and *sakhāyaḥ*, the nominative dual and plural forms. Thus, *sakh*(*i*→*ai*→*āy*) + *au* = *sakhāyau* and *sakh*(*i*→*ai*→*āy*) + *as* = *sakhāya*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *sakhāyaḥ*, through a replacement in *āy* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*).

7.1.93 अनङ् सौ

anaṅ sau
/*anaṃ* 1/1 *sau* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sakhyur asambuddhau* #92)
sakhiśabdasya sau parato' naṅ ity ayam ādeśo bhavati sa cet suśabdaḥ sambuddhir na bhavati
The final vowel (1.1.52 *ṅic ca*) of an *aṅga*, namely *sakhi*, is replaced with *anAṄ* when a *sU*, other than that of *sambuddhi*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

sakhā 'nominative singular of *sakhi*'

1. This nominative singular of *sakhi* derives from *sakhi* + *sU*, where *anAṄ* comes in place of the final *i* of *sakhi* (1.1.52 *ṅic ca*) to yield *sakh*(*i* →*an*(*AṄ*) → *sakh* + *an* + *s*(*U*). An application of penultimate lengthening (*upadhādīrgha*; 6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne . . .*), followed by *halṅyādi*-deletion of *s*(*U*) and *nalopa* (8.2.7 *na lopaḥ . . .*), produces *sakh* + (*a*→*ā*) *n* + *s*(*U*) → *sakh* + *ān* + (*s*(*U*)→ϕ) → *sakhā*(*n*→ϕ) = *sakhā*. This replacement in *anAṄ* will not apply in deriving *he sakhe* 'o companion' because of negation of *asambuddhau* 'when an affix other than *sambuddhi* follows'.

7.1.94 ऋदुशनस्पुरुदंसोऽनेहसां च

ṛduśanaspurudaṃso' nehasāṃ ca

/ṛd-uśanas-purudaṃsas-anehasām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām; ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #1 *asambuddhau* #92 *anaṅ sau* #93)
ṛkārāntānām aṅgānām, 'uśanas, purudaṃsas, anehas' ity eteṣāṃ cāsambuddhau sau parato' naṅādeśo bhavati
The final sound segment of an *aṅga* which ends in *ṛT* (1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*), or is constituted by *uśanas, purudaṃsas* and *anehas*, is replaced with *anAṄ* when a non-*sambuddhi* nominal ending, namely *sU*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

karttā 'nominative singular of *kartṛ*'
harttā 'nominative singular of *hartṛ*'
mātā 'nominative singular of *mātṛ*'
pitā 'nominative singular of *pitṛ*'
bhrātā 'nominative singular of *bhrātṛ*'
uśanā 'a name; nominative singular of *uśanas*'
purudaṃsā 'a name; nominative singular of *purudaṃsas*'
anehā 'a name; nominative singular of *anehas*'

1. Note that *anAṄ* replaces the final *ṛ* (*ṛT*) of *pitṛ*, etc., before a non-*sambuddhi* nominal ending *sU*. An application of *upadhādīrgha* 'penultimate lengthening' and *nalopa* 'deletion of *n*', similar to earlier examples, will finally derive *pitā, bhrātā*, etc. Refer to derivational details of *karttā* and *harttā* (II:388) for additional information. Derivates of *uśanas, purudaṃsas* and *anehas* will also have their final *s* replaced with *anAṄ*. An application of 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* will produce *uśana* + (*s*→*an*(*AṄ*)) + *sU* → *uśan*(*a*+*a*→*a*) + *s*(*U*) = *uśanan* + *s*. This, after penultimate lengthening, *halṅyādi*-deletion of *sU* and *n*-deletion, will produce *uśan*(*a*→*ā*) *n* + *s* → *uśanān* + (*s*→ϕ) → *uśanā*(*n*→ϕ) = *uśanā*. Similar rules apply in deriving other examples.

2. Here again *anAṄ* cannot apply in the context of *sambuddhi* 'vocative singular'. Thus, we will get *he pitaḥ* 'o, father', etc., where *ṛ* will go through *guṇa* (7.3.110 *ṛto ṇisarvanāmasthānayoḥ*) followed by *r* (*raparaḥ*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*). The *r* then goes through *visarga*, after deletion of the conjunct final *s* (*saṃyogāntalopa*; 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*).

3. A specification of *ṛ*, with *t* (*ṛt*; *taparakaraṇa*), is intended for avoiding confusion (*asandehārtham*). It is not intended for specifying *ṛ* of any constrained duration (*tatkāla*). For, given *ṛ*+ *uśanas* = *ruśanas*, there would be confusion, especially after the application of replacement in *yaṆ*.

4. A *vārttika* proposal makes an optional *anAṄ* desired, also when *sambuddhi* follows (*uśanasaḥ sambuddhāv api pakṣe' naṅ iṣyate*). Thus, we get an additional form *he uśanan* 'o Uśanas', optionally to *he uśanaḥ*. Yet another proposal also desires optional negation of *n*-deletion (*nalopa*; 8.2.8 *na ṅisambuddhyoḥ*). This will give us *he uśana*(*n*→ϕ) = *uśana*, after *n*-deletion. Consider the following:

sambodhane tūśanas trirūpaṃ
sāntaṃ tathā nāntam athāpy adantam/
mādhyandinir vaṣṭi guṇaṃ tv igante
napuṃsake vyāghrapadāṃ variṣṭaḥ//
'Mādhyandini desires three forms of *uśanas* in the vocative: (*i*) ending in *s* (*sānta*; with no *anAṄ*: *he uśanaḥ*); (*ii*) ending in *n* (*nānta*; with no *n*-deletion: *he uśanan*); (*iii*) ending in *a* (*adanta*; with *n*-deletion: *he uśana*); Vaiyāghrapadya, an older offspring of Vyāghrapād, desires *guṇa* in a neuter base ending in *iK* (*iganta*; *he trapo*)'

7.1.95 तृज्वत्क्रोष्टुः

tṛjvat kroṣṭuḥ
/tṛjvat ϕ kroṣṭuḥ 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sarvanāmasthāne* #86 *asambuddhau* #92)
kroṣṭuśabdas tunpratyayāntaḥ saṃjñāśabdaḥ sarvanāmasthāne' sambuddhau parataḥ tṛjvad bhavati
An *aṅga*, namely *kroṣṭu* 'jackal', is treated as if ending in affix *tṛC*, when a nominal ending termed *sarvanāmasthāna*, other than one termed *sambuddhi*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

kroṣṭā 'nominative singular of *kroṣṭu*'
kroṣṭārau 'nominative dual . . .'
kroṣṭāraḥ 'nominative plural . . .'
kroṣṭāram 'accusative singular . . .'
kroṣṭārau 'accusative dual . . .'

1. This rule offers an extension of form (*rūpātideśa*). That is, *kroṣṭu*, a derivate of *tuN* (*Uṇādi* I:69: *sitanimasigami* . . .), is here allowed to be treated as its counterpart ending in *tṛC*, i.e., *kroṣṭṛ*. For reasons of close contextual proximity with *tṛC*, a form of *kruś* 'to call out' which ends in *tṛC*, alone, will have the benefit of this extension (*atideśa*). Note that this rule does not extend the word-form *tṛC*, itself, to *kroṣṭu*. It refers to *kroṣṭṛ*, a form of *kroṣṭu* ending in affix *tṛC* (*pratyayagrahaṇe yasmāt sa vihitas tadādes tadantasya grahaṇam*).

Forms of *kroṣṭu* will here follow the derivational pattern of *kroṣṭṛ*. A derivate of *kruś* with *tṛC*, i.e., *kroṣṭṛ*, is marked *udātta* at the end (6.1.160 *citaḥ*). Derivates of *kroṣṭu*, in this context, will also be marked with *udātta* at the end.

Now consider the derivation of *kroṣṭā*, from *kroṣṭu* + *sU*, where *kroṣṭu* will be treated as *kroṣṭṛ*. This will occasion introduction of *anAṄ* of the earlier rule. The lengthening of the penultimate (*upadhādīrgha*) vowel will here be accomplished by 6.4.11 *aptṛntṛc*. . . . An application of *halṅyādi*-deletion of *s*(*U*) and *n*-deletion (*nalopa*), similar to earlier examples, will finally derive

kroṣṭā. The dual and plural forms, i.e., *kroṣṭārau* and *kroṣṭāraḥ*, will similarly involve *guṇa* of *ṛ* (7.3.110 *ṛto ṅisarvanāmasthānayoḥ*), and replacement in *vṛddhi* of the penultimate (*upadhā*) vowel (6.4.11 *aptṛn* . . .).

7.1.96 **स्त्रियां च**

striyāṃ ca
/striyām 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *tṛjvat kroṣṭuḥ* #95)
striyāṃ ca kroṣṭuśabdasya tṛjvad bhavati
An *aṅga*, namely *kroṣṭu*, is also treated as if ending in affix *tṛC*, when the denotation is feminine.

EXAMPLES:

kroṣṭrī 'instrumental singular of *kroṣṭrī*'
kroṣṭrībhyām 'instrumental dual . . .'
kroṣṭrībhiḥ 'instrumental plural . . .'

1. This rule is formulated so that *kroṣṭu* could be treated as *kroṣṭṛ*, in the feminine, also before endings other than those termed *sarvanāmasthāna*. Our preceding rule could have accounted for feminine derivates before *sarvanāmasthāna* endings, anyway. This rule makes extensional provisions before non-*sarvanāmasthāna* endings, in the feminine. Forms, such as *kroṣṭrī*, etc., are derived with *ṄīP* (4.1.5 *ṛnnebhyo* . . .), introduced after extensional (*ātideśika*) *kroṣṭṛ* and subsequent replacement in a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *yaṆ*.

2. Some treat *kroṣṭu* as part of the *gaurādi* group of nominals. They, thereby, introduce *ṄīṢ* (4.1.41 *ṣid gaurādibhyaś ca*) after *kroṣṭṛ*. For, a *ṄīP*, because of being marked with *P* as an *it* (*pit*; 3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*), will create accentual problems. A *ṄīṢ* will retain the final *udātta* of *kroṣṭrī*.

But this view is also not free of problems. For example, consider *pañca-kroṣṭrībhiḥ*, parallel to *pañcakroṣṭrībhiḥ* (*krītaiḥ*) *rathaiḥ* 'by a chariot purchased with five . . .', where the compound is formed by 2.1.51 *taddhitārthottarapada*. . . . Rule 5.1.19 *ārhād agopuccha* . . . introduces affix *ṬHaK* which goes through deletion by *LUK* of 4.1.28 *adhyardhapūrvād*. . . . We then get the application of 1.2.49 *luk taddhitaluki* whereby the feminine affix *ṄīṢ* also goes through deletion by *LUK*. We now have a problem. Deletion of the feminine affix removes condition of treatment as a form ending in *tṛC*. For, this treatment (*tṛjvadbhāva*) applies when the denotation is feminine. This is why one needs a counter-proposal.

Those who do not accept *kroṣṭu* listed as part of the *gaurādi* group consider *striyām* as a specification made in view of meaning. That is, they do not see any problem in *tṛjvadbhāva* so long as feminine is denoted. Whether or not the feminine affix gets deleted is none of their concern. Once *tṛjvadbhāva*

is extended we can get the introduction of affix *ṄīP*. We thus get *kroṣṭṛ* + *ṄīP* = *kroṣṭrī*, where the *udātta* vowel *ṛ* of *kroṣṭṛ* goes through a replacement in *yaN*. Our derivate *kroṣṭrī* is still marked with *udātta* at the end by 6.1.174 *udāttayaṇo halpūrvāt*.

7.1.97 विभाषा तृतीयादिष्वचि

vibhāṣā tṛtīyādiṣv aci
/vibhāṣā 1/1 *tṛtīyādiṣu* 7/3 = *tṛtīyā ādir yāsāṃ tāḥ* (*bv.*), *tāsu; aci* 7/1/ (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *tṛjvat kroṣṭuḥ* #95)
tṛtīyādiṣu vibhaktiṣv ajādiṣu kroṣṭur vibhāṣā tṛjvad bhavati
An *aṅga*, namely *kroṣṭu*, is treated as if ending in affix *ṭṛC*, only optionally, when a vowel-initial nominal ending enumerated beginning with *tṛtīyā* 'third triplet; instrumental' follows.

EXAMPLES:

kroṣṭrā 'instrumental singular of *kroṣṭu*'
kroṣṭunā 'ibidem'
kroṣṭre 'dative singular . . .'
kroṣṭave 'ibidem'
kroṣṭuḥ 'ablative/genitive singular . . .'
kroṣṭoḥ 'ibidem'
kroṣṭari 'locative singular . . .'
kroṣṭau 'ibidem'
kroṣṭoḥ 'locative dual . . .'
kroṣṭvoḥ 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers optional extensional (*ātideśika*) treatment of *kroṣṭu*, as if it was *kroṣṭṛ* (*ṭṛjvadbhāva*), when a vowel-initial nominal ending listed beginning with the instrumental (*ṭṛtīyā*) follows. We thus get *kroṣṭṛ* + (*Ṭ*)*ā* → *kroṣṭ*(*ṛ*→*r*) + *ā*, through a replacement in *yaṆ*. We will get *kroṣṭu* + (*Ṭ*)*ā* → *kroṣṭu* + (*ā*→*nā*) = *kroṣṭunā*, through *nā* as a replacement for *ā* (7.3.120 *āṅo nā' striyām*), provided the extensional option of treating *kroṣṭu* as *kroṣṭṛ* is not accepted. We will get *kroṣṭe* and *kroṣṭave* in the dative singular. The first form results from *kroṣṭṛ* + (*Ṅ*)*e* → *kroṣṭre*, through *yaṆ*. The second results from application of *guṇa* (7.3.111 *gher ṅiti*) and a subsequent replacement in *av* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*): *kroṣṭ*(*u*→*o*) + *e* = *kroṣṭ*(*o*→*av*) + *e* = *kroṣṭave*. The ablative-genitive singular forms *kroṣṭuḥ* and *kroṣṭoḥ* derive from *kroṣṭu* + *ṄasI* and *kroṣṭu* + *Ṅas*, respectively. Given *kroṣṭṛ* + *as*, where *kroṣṭu* is treated as *kroṣṭṛ*, *u*, with a following *r* (*rapara*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*), comes as a single replacement for *ṛ* + *a* (6.1.111 *ṛta uta*). The *s*, of *kroṣṭ*(*ṛ*+*a*→*ur*) + *s* = *kroṣṭur* + *s*, is deleted (8.2.24 *rāt sasya*). We thus get *kroṣṭur* + (*s*→ϕ) = *kroṣṭu*(*r*→*ḥ*) = *kroṣṭuḥ*. We get *kroṣṭoḥ* from *kroṣṭu* + *ṄasI*, where option of extensional *ṭṛC* is not accepted. The *u* will here go through *guṇa* and the *a* of *as*, in *kroṣṭ*(*u*→*o*) + *as*

= *kroṣṭo* + *as*, will go through a single replacement with *o* (*pūrvarūpa*; 6.1.110 *ṅasiṅasoś ca*). Thus, *kroṣṭ*(*o*+*a*→*o*) *s* = *kroṣṭo*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *kroṣṭoḥ*. This same will be a derivate with the genitive singular nominal ending *Ṅas*. The locative singular form *kroṣṭari* is derived from *kroṣṭṛ* + (*Ṅ*) *i*, through *guṇa* of *ṛ* with the following *r* (7.3.110 *ṛto ṅisarva . . .*). We get an optional *kroṣṭau*, where the final *u* of *kroṣṭu* is replaced with *a*, and *i* of *Ṅi* is replaced with *au*. Thus, *kroṣṭ*(*u* →*a*) + (*Ṅ*) (*i*→*au*) = *kroṣṭ*(*a* + *au* →*au*) = *kroṣṭau*. The locative dual *kroṣṭoḥ* can be similarly derived with an optional *kroṣṭvoḥ*.

2. A *vārttika* proposal recommends augments *nUM* and *nUṬ*, as against *tṛjvadbhāva* 'extensional *tṛC*', on the basis of *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'conflict of equal strength where a prior rule wins'. It is claimed that *tṛjvadbhāva* 'treatment as *tṛC*' has its independently established scope in masculine *kroṣṭṛe*. An independent scope of *nUM* and *nUṬ* can be established on the basis of *trapuṇe/jatune*, and *agnīnām/vāyūnām*. These applicational scopes can be found in *priyakroṣṭune vanāya* 'to the forest to whom jackals are dear', simultaneously. Hence, *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'blocking by a prior exception' is invoked in favor of *nUM* and *nUṬ*. Consider the *bahuvrīhi* compound *priyakroṣṭune*, in neuter dative singular, parallel to *priyāḥ kroṣṭāraḥ yasya tat, tasmai* 'that to whom jackals are dear, to him'. Given *priyakroṣṭu* + (*Ṅ*) *e*, we find *tṛjvadbhāva* and *nUM* (7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*), both applicable. We favor *nUM* as a prior exception to block *tṛjvadbhāva*. Thus, *priyakroṣṭu* + *n*(*UM*) + *e* = *priyakroṣṭune*. Similar argument can be offered for deriving *hatakroṣṭune* 'he by who jackals were killed, to him'. An example with introduction of augment *nUṬ* could be *kroṣṭūnām*, where *nUṬ* of 7.1.54 *hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ* comes into conflict with *tṛjvadbhāva*.

7.1.98 चतुरनडुहोरामुदात्तः

caturanaḍuhor ām udāttaḥ

/catur-anaḍuhoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ; ām* 1/1 *udāttaḥ* 1/1/ (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sarvanāmasthāne* #86)

'*catur, anaḍuh*' *ity etayoḥ sarvanāmasthāna parata ām āgamo bhavati, sa codāttaḥ*

Augment *ām*, marked with *udātta*, is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *catur* 'four' and *anaḍuh* 'ox, bull', when a nominal ending termed *sarvanāmasthāna* follows.

EXAMPLES:

catvāriḥ 'nominative plural of *catur*'
anaḍvān 'nominative singular of *anaḍuh*'
anaḍvāhaú 'nominative dual . . .'
anaḍvāháḥ 'nominative plural . . .'
anaḍvāhám 'accusative singular . . '
anaḍvāhaú 'accusative dual . . .'

1. Refer to derivational details of *anaḍuh* under 7.1.82 *sāv anaḍuhaḥ*. Augment *āM*, because it is marked with *M* as an *it*, is introduced to (after) the final *u* of *catur*. Thus, *catu* + *ā*(*M*) + *r* + (*J*) *as* = *cat*(*u*→*v*) + *ā* + *r* + *as* = *catvāra* (*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *catvāraḥ*.

Incidentally, augments are treated as *anudātta* (*āgamā anudāttā bhavanti*).

2. Note that the *Mahābhāṣya* considers *tadantavidhi* 'treating a form as also ending in that by means of which it is specified'. Thus, augment *āM* can also be introduced in deriving *priyānaḍvān* 'he to whom the oxen are dear' and *priyacatvāraḥ* 'he to whom the four are dear', where *anaḍuh* and *catur* occur at the end of a form.

Yet another proposal renders the introduction of *āM* as optional, in case of *anaḍuh* used in the feminine. Thus, we get *anaḍvāhī* and *anaḍuhī*, both derivates of the feminine affix *ṄīṢ* (4.1.41 *ṣidgaurādibhyaś ca*). Recall that introduction of the feminine affix *ṄīṢ* is facilitated by the listing of *anaḍuh* in the group of nominal stems headed by *gaura* (*gaurādi*).

7.1.99 अम् सम्बुद्धौ

am sambuddhau
/*am* 1/1 *sambuddhau* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *caturanaḍuhoḥ* #98)
sambuddhau parataś caturanaḍuhor am āgamo bhavati
Augment *aM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *catur* and *anaḍuh*, when a nominal ending termed *sambuddhi* follows.

EXAMPLES:

he priyacatvaḥ 'o, you, to whom four are dear'
he priyānaḍvan 'o, you, to whom the ox is dear'

1. This rule introduces augment *aM* to *catur* and *anaḍuh* when they occur before a nominal ening termed *sambuddhi*. This then is an exception to the *āM* of the preceding rule.

7.1.100 ऋत इद्धातोः

ṝta id dhātoḥ
/*ṝtaḥ* 6/1 *it* 1/1 *dhātoḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
ṝkārāntasya dhātor aṅgasya ikārādeśo bhavati
The final vowel of a verbal root termed *aṅga* which ends in *ṝT* 'long *ṝ*' is replaced with *i*.

EXAMPLES:

kirati '. . . scatters about'
girati '. . . swallows'

āstīrṇam 'strewn about'
viśīrṇam 'wasted'

1. Refer to derivational details of *kirati* and *girati*, under the appendix of 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ* (II:388). The two *niṣṭhā* (1.1.26 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) derivates, i.e., *āstīrṇam* and *viśīrṇam*, can be similarly derived from *āstṝ* + (*K*) *ta* and *viśṝ* + (*K*) *ta*. The root-final *ṝ* is here replaced with *i*, followed by *r* (*rapara*), thereby yielding *āst*(*ṝ*→*ir*) + *ta* = *āstir* + *ta* and *viś*(*ṝ*→*ir*) + *ta* = *viśir* + *ta*. The *t* of (*K*) *ta* is then replaced with *n* (*natva*; 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ . . .*). A replacement in *ṇ* for *n* (8.4.1 *raṣābhyāṃ . . .*), followed by lengthening (*dīrgha*) of *i* (8.2.77 *hali ca*), produces *āstir* + (*t*→*n*→*ṇ*) *a* → *āst*(*i*→*ī*) *r* + *ṇa* = *āstīrṇa*. Similar applications are also involved in deriving *viśīrṇa*. Note that the introduction of augment *iṬ* is blocked here by 7.2.11 *śryukaḥ kiti*.

2. A condition of *dhātoḥ* is imposed so that we do not get *ir* in the context of *mātṝṇām* 'genitive plural of *mātṛ* (mother)' and *pitṝṇām* 'genitive plural of *pitṛ* (father)'.

3. Note that this specification with *ṝT*, as desired by the *Mahābhāṣya*, may also refer to a *ṝ* derived by some rule application. Thus, consider *kṛ* + *sa*(*N*) → *k*(*ṛ*→*ṝ*) + *sa*(*N*) = *kṝ* + *sa* of *cikīrṣati* ' . . . wishes to do or make', where root-final *ṛ* gets replaced with *ṝ*, through application of 6.4.16 *ajjhanagamāṃ sani*.

7.1.101 उपधायाश्च

upadhāyāś ca
/*upadhāyāḥ* 6/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṝta id dhātoḥ* #100)
upadhāyāś ca ṝkārasya ikārādeśo bhavati
The penultimate *ṝT* of a verbal root termed *aṅga* is also replaced with *iT*.

EXAMPLES:

kīrttayati '. . . has someone praise . . .; third person singular causal present of *kīrti*'
kīrttayataḥ 'third person dual . . .'
kīrttayanti 'third person plural . . .'

1. This rule allows a replacement in *i* (*itva*), also for the penultimate *ṝ* of a verbal root (*dhātu*) termed *aṅga*. Thus, we get *kṝt* + (*Ṇ*) *i*(*C*) = *k*(*ṝ*→*ir*) + *t* + *i* → *k*(*i*→*ī*) *r* + *t* + *i* = *kīrti*, where *i* of *kir* is replaced with its long counterpart (8.2.78 *upadhāyāṃ ca*). Our final derivates can be derived from *kīrti* + (*LAṬ* → *ti*(*P*)) → *kīrti* + *ti*, etc.

2. Why did Pāṇini not formulate the rule as *kṝtasya* or *kṝtaś ca*? He formulated the rule as *upadhāyāś ca* simply for variation in style.

7.1.102 उदोष्ठ्यपूर्वस्य

ud oṣṭhyapūrvasya
/ut 1/1 *oṣṭhyapūrvasya* 6/1 = *oṣṭhyaḥ pūrvo yasmāt sa* (*bv.*), *tasya/* (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṛtaḥ dhātoḥ* #100)
oṣṭhyaḥ pūrvo yasmād ṛkārāt tadantasya dhātor aṅgasya ukārādeśo bhavati
A *ṛ*(*T*) which occurs after a labial (*oṣṭhya*) sound at the end of a verbal root (*dhātu*) termed *aṅga* is replaced with *u*.

EXAMPLES:

pūrttāḥ piṇḍāḥ 'the rice-balls for oblation are made'
pupūrṣati '. . . wishes to nourish'
mumūrṣati '. . . wishes to die'
susvūrṣati '. . . wishes to speak'

1. This rule replaces the root-final *ṛ* of an *aṅga* with *u*. Thus, we get *pūrtta* from *pṝ* + (*K*) *ta*, where *ṛ* of *pṝ* 'to fill' is replaced with *ur*, *u* followed by *r* (1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*). This *u* is subsequently replaced with *ū* (8.2.77 *hali ca*). Recall that a replacement in *n* (*natva*), for *t* of *Kta*, is blocked by 8.2.57 *na dhyākhyāpṝ*. . . . The *saN*-derivates of *pṝ* 'to fill' and *mṛṄ* 'to die', i.e., *pupūrṣati* 'wishes to fill up' and *mumūrṣati* 'wishes to die', can be derived by following the pattern of *cikīrṣati* (II:432). A long replacement for the corresponding short vowel *u* is again accomplished by 8.2.77 *hali ca*.

This replacement in *ur* is also allowed where *v*, a labio- dental, precedes *ṛ*. Thus, we get *vuvūrṣati* '. . . wishes to select', a derivate of *vṝ* + *sa*(*N*) with *LAṬ*. Note, however, that a *niṣṭhā*-derivate of *ṛ* 'to go' cannot be allowed *ur*. For, the *m* of *sam*, which precedes *ṛ* is not a part of the *aṅga*. Thus, we will get *samīrṇa* 'properly departed'.

2. A *Mahābhāṣya* proposal also invokes *vipratiṣedha* 'a rule conflict of equal strength where a subsequent rule wins' where *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* applications come into conflict with replacements in *i* and *u*. Thus, given *āṄ* + *stṝ* + (*L*) *yu*(*Ṭ*) → *āstṝ* + (*yu*→*ana*) = *āstaraṇa*, we apply *guṇa* (7.3.84 *sārvadhātuka-kārdhadhātukayoḥ*) against *ur*. A similar application of *vṛddhi* is made in *nigāraka*, a derivate of *ni-gṝ* + (*Ṇ*) *vu*(*L*). This *Mahābhāṣya* statement enables *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* (*paratvād guṇavṛddhī bhavataḥ*) to block replacements in *i* and *u* on the basis of *paratva* 'subsequent order of enumeration'. But since these replacements in *i* and *u* are internally conditioned, and also since an internally conditioned application is considered more powerful, we find a *vārttikā* proposal in support of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* applications: *itvotvābhyāṃ guṇavṛddhī bhavato vipratiṣedhena* '*guṇa* and *vṛddhi* apply against replacements in *i* (*itva*) and *u* (*utva*) on the basis of *paratva*'.

7.1.103 बहुलं छन्दसि

bahulaṃ chandasi

/bahulam 1/1 *chandasi* 7/1)
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṛtaḥ dhātoḥ* #100 *ut* #102)
chandasi viṣaye ṛkārāntasya dhātor aṅgasya bahulam ukārādeśo bhavati
The final *ṛ* of a verbal root termed *aṅga* is variously (*bahulam*) replaced with *uT* when the usage is Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

mitrāvaruṇau taturiḥ
dūre hyadhvā jaguriḥ
papritamam
vavritamam
papuriḥ

1. This provision of *bahulam* 'variously' also allows *ur* when, in the Vedic, *ṛ* is preceded by a labial or not. Refer to the appendix (III:757) for derivational details of *taturiḥ* and *jaguriḥ*. Derivates of *tamaP*, i.e., *papritama* and *vavritama*, illustrate how replacement in *ur* is not applied when *p* and *v* precede. It does, however, apply in a derivate such as *papuriḥ*.

Incidentally, *papritama* and *vavritama* are forms of *pṝ* and *vṝ* derived with affix *Ki* or *KiN* (3.2.171 *ādṛgamahana . . .*). Their *tamaP*, of course, is introduced to denote excellence (5.3.55 *atiśāyane tamabiṣṭhanau*). One must also remember here that a *bāhulaka* provision works in diverse ways: it sometimes applies, at others does not; at times it is optional; at others it is simply different altogether. Thus, the famous verse: *kavacid pravṛttiḥ kvacid apravṛttiḥ/ kvacid vibhāṣā kvacid anyad eva.*

PĀDA TWO

7.2.1 सिचि वृद्धिः परस्मैपदेषु

sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu
/sici 7/1 *vṛddhiḥ* 1/1 *parasmaipadeṣu* 7/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
parasmaipadapare sici parata igantasyāṅgasya vṛddhir bhavati
The final sound segment of an *aṅga* denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK* (*Śs.* 1-2) is replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart when *sIC*, followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

acaiṣīt '. . . heaped . . .'
anaiṣīt '. . . led'
alāvīt '. . . cut . . .'
apāvīt '. . . cleansed . . .'
akārṣīt '. . . made . . .'
ahārṣīt '. . . carried . . .'

1. This rule is formulated against the *guṇa* application of 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*. It thus offers *vṛddhi*, instead, to the final *iK* (*i, u, ṛ, ḷ*; 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) sound of an *aṅga* when *sIC* (3.1.43 *cli luṅi*; 3.1.44 *cleḥ sic*), followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada* (1.4.99 *laḥ parasmaipadam*), follows. Note that *sici* 'when *sIC* follows' and *parasmaipadeṣu* 'when affixes termed *parasmaipada* 'active' follow' are both specified with the locative (*saptamī*). They thus form a right context (*parasaptamī*). The right context of *sici* is construed in relation to the *aṅga*. That is, 'when an *aṅga* is followed by *sIC*'. The right context of *parasmaipadeṣu* is construed in relation to *sIC*. That is, 'when *sIC* is followed by affixes termed *parasmaipada*'. A specification with *vṛddhi* brings *ikaḥ* (1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*) to this context. This, in turn, becomes a qualifier (*viśeṣaṇa*) to the *aṅga* on hand. An application of *tadantavidhi* 'treating a specification made with *x* as also denoting 'that which ends in *x*' is then invoked to yield the interpretation 'a *vṛddhi* comes in place of an *aṅga*-final vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK* when *sIC*, followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada*, follows' (*igantasya aṅgasya sici parataḥ parasmaipadapare vṛddhir bhavati*). Refer to the appendix under rule 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī* (II:333) for derivational details of *acaiṣīt*, etc.

A problem is raised in connection with this *vṛddhi* in deriving examples such as *akārṣīt*. Thus, given *aṬ + kṛ + sIC + ī + t*, why can we not apply *guṇa* under the condition of *sIC* (7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārddhadhātukayoḥ*)? After all, this *guṇa* is internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) by *sIC*, as against replacement in *vṛddhi* which is internally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) by the *parasmaipada* 'active' affix *tiP* 'third personal singular'. But this rule will become vacuous (*vyartha*) if *guṇa* is applied. For, it will remove the *aṅga*-final *iK*, *i/u/ṛ/ḷ*, which, in turn, is required for application of this *vṛddhi*. That is, *guṇa* will replace the *ṛ* of *kṛ* with *ar*, and hence, the *aṅga* will no longer end in *iK*. It is therefore suggested that, at the strength of Pāṇini's formulation of this statement, externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) *vṛddhi* blocks even an internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) *guṇa* (*Kāś*: *antaraṅgam api guṇam eṣāṃ vṛddhir vacanād bādhate*).

In summary, the *vṛddhi* of this rule always comes into conflict with *guṇa*. Application of *guṇa*, since it expects *sIC*, will be accepted as internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*). The *vṛddhi*, since it will expect both *sIC* and *parasmaipada*, will be considered externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*). Given this, an internally conditioned *guṇa* will always block the externally conditioned *vṛddhi*. This rule could then not find any scope of application.

It is clear that this externally conditioned *vṛddhi*, because of becoming vacuous if not applied, blocks the application of an internally conditioned *guṇa*. Can it also, on this same basis, block an internally conditioned replacement in *uvAṄ*? No. Consider *nyanuvīt* and *dhyanuvīt* which derive from *ni + aṬ + (nu→uvAṄ) + ī + tiP* and *ni + aṬ + dh(ū→uvAṄ) + ī + tiP*, where *uvAṄ* (6.4.77 *aciśnudhātubhruvām . . .*) replaces *u/ū*. A replacement in *guṇa*

and *vṛddhi* will both be negated here (1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*) since *ṇu* and *dhū* are listed in the *kuṭādi* class (1.2.1 *gāṅkuṭādibhyo . . .*) of roots. Why can a *vṛddhi* not block its negation (*pratiṣedha*, and hence also block *uvAṄ*), as it blocks *guṇa*. It is argued that this blocking of *guṇa* by *vṛddhi* is stated against the sure application of *guṇa* (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *guṇe hi nāprāpte vṛddhir ārabhyate, pratiṣedhe tu prāpte cāprāpte ca*). Its negation is stated irrespective of its availability (*prāpti*) or non-availablility (*aprāpti*) of application. This *vṛddhi*, therefore, cannot block its negation, and hence, the replacement in *uvAṄ*.

Note that *acyoṣṭa* and *aploṣṭa* are third singular past imperfect derivates of the middle (*ātmanepada*) verbs *cyuṄ* 'to drip' and *pluṄ* 'to float', respectively. They are offered here as counter-examples to the condition of *parasmaipadeṣu* 'when affixes termed *parasmaipada* follow'. Their *guṇa* cannot be blocked because affix *ta* 'third personal singular', an *ātmanepada*, follows.

7.2.2 अतो ल्रान्तस्य

ato lrāntasya
/ataḥ 6/1 *lrāntasya* 6/1 = *la ca raś ca* = *lram* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu*)
rephalakārau yāv ato' ntau = *samīpau, tadantasyāṅgasya ata eva sthāne vṛddhir bhavati*
An *aT* which occurs in proximity of an *aṅga*-final *l* and *r* is replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart when *sIC*, followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

akṣārīt '. . . oozed or trickled . . .'
atsārīt '. . . moved (in disguise)'
ajvālīt '. . . burned . . .'
ahmlālīt '. . . moved . . .'

1. This rule allows *vṛddhi* to the *a* of an *aṅga* which ends in *l* or *r*, with *a* occurring in their proximity. Additionally, the *aṅga* must be followed by a *sIC* which, in turn, is followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada* (1.4.99 *laḥ parasmaipadam*). The word *anta* 'end' is here used in the sense of *samīpa* 'proximate' (*Kāś*: . . . *antau* = *samīpau* . . .). The preceding rule offers *vṛddhi* for a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK*. This rule offers it in place of an *a*. Consider *kṣar* 'to flow, glide', *tsar* 'to creep, move stealthily' and *jval* 'to glow, burn' where *a* occurs in the proximity of *r* and *l*. This *a* is replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart in deriving *akṣārīt*, *atsārīt* and *ajvālīt* from *akṣar* + *īt*, *atsar* + *īt* and *ajval* + *īt*, respectively. Refer to *acaisīt* (II:333) and *abhaitsīt* (III:312) in the appendix for appropriate derivational details. This rule offers *vṛddhi*, obligatorily (*nitya*), against an optional provision made by 7.2.7 *ato halāder laghoḥ*.

2. That this *vṛddhi* applies only to an *a* is made clear by counter-examples such as *nyakhorīt* ← *ny-a-khur* + *īt* and *nyamīlīt* ← *ny-a-mīl* + *īt*, the third singular active imperfect forms of *khur* 'to scratch, cut' and *mīl* 'to wink, close eyes'. This *vṛddhi* is applicable only to an *aṅga* ending in *l* and *r*. Thus, it cannot apply in deriving *aṭīt*, of *mā bhavān aṭīt*, and *aśīt*, of *mā bhavān aśīt*, where verbal roots do not end in *l* and *r*. They also differ in their signification: the first is used with the signification of 'moving'; the second with the signification of 'eating'. These examples are both given with *māṄ* to block augment *āṬ* (6.4.74 *na māṅyoge*), and thereby, keep the identity of *aṭīt* and *aśīt*, intact. An introduction of *āṬ* would have yielded **āṭīt* and **āśīt* which, in turn, would have created confusion about the *vṛddhi* of *aṬ*. Finally, *anta* is used in this rule to focus on close proximity of *l* and *r* with *a*. Consider *avabhravīt* and *aśvalīt* where the final *r* and *l* sounds of the *aṅga* do not occur in close proximity of *a*. They are intervened by *bh* and *l*, repectively. Consequently, *vṛddhi* does not apply here. Verbal roots *vabhrA* and *śvallA* are here used in the senses of 'movement (*gati*)' and *āśugamana* 'moving fast', respectively.

7.2.3 वदव्रजहलन्तस्याचः

vadavrajahalantasyācaḥ
/vada-vraja-halantasya 6/1 = *hal ante yasya* (*bv.*); *vadaś ca vrajaś ca halantaś ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya*; *acaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu* #1)
vadavrajor halantānāṃ cāṅgānām acaḥ sthāne vṛddhir bhavati sici parasmaipade parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of the vowel of an *aṅga*, namely *vad*, *vraj*, and also an *aṅga* which ends in a consonant (*haL*), when *sIC* followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows.

EXAMPLES:

avādīt '. . . killed . . .'
avrājīt '. . . went away . . .'
apākṣīt '. . . cooked . . .'
abhaitsīt '. . . cracked open . . .'
acchaitsīt '. . . cut . . .'
arautsīt '. . . blocked . . .'

1. Why should we have a separate specification of *vad* 'to speak' and *vraj* 'to go' when they can both be covered by the specification of *halantānām* 'of those which end in a consonant'? For, an *aṅga* constituted by *vad* and *vraj* already ends in a consonant. A separate specification of *vad* and *vraj* is made to block the optional *vṛddhi*, made available by rule 7.2.7 *ato halāder laghoḥ*. Our present rule offers *vṛddhi*, obligatorily. Consider *avādīt*, *avrājīt*, and

apākṣīt, *abhaitsīt*, etc. Refer to the appendix (III:312) of 3.1.57 *irito vā* for appropriate derivational details, especially of *abhaitsīt* and *acchaitsīt*. Note that *apākṣīt* derives from *pac* + (*LUṄ→tiP*), where 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ* causes a replacement in *k* for *c* (*kutva*).

2. Why was this rule formulated with *hal* 'consonant' of *halantasya*? A split-interpretation of this rule formulated without *haL* would have accounted for its derivates. The two split-rules will be: (*i*) *vadavrajyoḥ* 'the *a* of an *aṅga* constituted by *vad* and *vraj* goes through a replacement in *vṛddhi* . . .'; (*ii*) *acaḥ*, where *aṅga* is used as a qualifer to *aC* and the *aC* of an *aṅga* goes through a replacement in *vṛddhi*. . . . Commentators state that *haL* is used to indicate not just one *haL* but a sequence. Thus, consider *arāṅkṣīt* and *asāṅkṣīt* where *a* of *rañj* 'to color' and *sañj* 'to come in contact' is intervened by two consonants. It is because of the specification of *haL*, referring to a group (*samudāya*) of consonants, that this rule can still apply to offer a replacement in *vṛddhi*. The *anta* of *halanta* is used for clarity.

It is also argued that the *vṛddhi* should have been specified only for an *aṅga* which ended in a consonant. For, *vad* and *vraj* end in a consonant, and thus, would have easily availed the *vṛddhi*. Why state them explicitly? Note here that our next rule 7.2.4 *neṭi* negates this *vṛddhi* marked with final consonant (*halanta-lakṣaṇā*), especially when a *sIC* with initial *iṬ* follows. It is to save *vad* and *vraj* from that negation at the strength of this explicit statement (*vacana-sāmarthya*) that *vad* and *vraj* are separately specified. Their *vṛddhi* will thus become obligatory (*nitya*). We will thus get *avādīt* and *avrājīt*. If this explicit statement was not made, our next rule would have negated *vṛddhi*. Rule 7.2.7 *ato halāder laghoḥ* would then have applied to accomplish optional *vṛddhi*.

Why do we use the word *acaḥ* 'genitive singular of *aC* (vowel)' when *ikaḥ*, of 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*, could have easily presented itself for specifying the *sthānī* 'item to be replaced'? The *vṛddhi* of *abhaitsīt* and *arautsīt* could have thus been accomplished. However, we would have run into problems in accomplishing the *vṛddhi* in *apākṣīt*. Such problems will not be encountered if the specification is made with *acaḥ*.

A question is raised as to why, in deriving the third personal dual and second personal dual active aorist forms of *vah* 'to carry', used with the preverb *ud*, we do not get the *vṛddhi* of *o*, in *udavoḍhām* and *udavoḍham*. Note that *udavoḍhām* derives from *ud-vah* + (*LUṄ→tas →tām*) → *ud- vah* + *sIC* + *tām*, where *tas* is replaced with *tām* (3.4.101 *tasthasthamipām* . . .) and *a* of *vah* is replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart, characterized as marked with the final consonant (*halanta-lakṣaṇā*; 7.2.3 *vadavrajahalantasyācaḥ*). A replacement of *h*, of *vah*, with *ḍh* (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*), and deletion of *sIC*, follow (8.2.26 *jhalo jhalī*). The *t* of *tām* then goes through a replacement, first in *dh* (8.2.40 *jhaṣastathordho' dhaḥ*) and then in *ḍh* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). The *ā* of *ud* + *a*(*Ṭ*) + *vā*(*h→ḍh*)) + *ḍhām* → *ud* + *a* + *vāḍh* + *ḍhām* is then replaced with *o*

(6.3.112 *sahivahor od avarṇasya*). Given *ud* + *a* + *v*(*ā*→*o*) *ḍh* + *ḍhām* → *uda* + *voḍh* + *ḍhām*, the first *ḍh* of the string goes through deletion (8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ*) under the condition of the second *ḍh* which follows. We thus get *uda* + *vo*(*ḍh*→ϕ) + *ḍhām* → *udavoḍhām*.

Actually, the *o* of *vo* is conditioned by *ḍh* which, in turn, is produced by *h* of *vah*. This *ḍh* is then deleted, in addition to the *s* of *sIC*. Both *ḍh* and *s*(*IC*)-deletions become *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*. This is how we get *o* which is conditioned by *ḍh*. But a replacement in *vṛddhi* characterized as 'marked with a final consonant' (*halanta-lakṣaṇā*) has taken effect already. A *vṛddhi* which has applied once, cannot apply again (*Kāś*: *kṛte vṛddhir na bhavati, kṛtatvāt*). Incidentally, *udavoḍham* involves a replacement in *tam*, via *thas* of *LUṄ*. Note, however, that the *vṛddhi*, for example of *o*, would become applicable if it has not already applied. Thus, consider *soḍhāmitrasya apatyam* = *sauḍhāmitriḥ* 'Sauḍhāmitri, an offspring of Sauḍhāmitra', where 7.1.117 *taddhiteṣv acām* . . . accomplishes the *vṛddhi* replacement of *o*.

The derivational details of *udavoḍhām* and *udavoḍham* clearly indicate that a *lakṣaṇa* 'rule' applies only once in a *lakṣya* 'goal, derivate'. It is for this reason that a *vṛddhi* marked with *halanta* 'final consonant' is applied first. What follows it is the replacement in *o* (*otva*) conditioned by deletion of *ḍh* (*ḍha-lopa*). Thus, we do not get the application of *vṛddhi* again.

7.2.4 नेटि

neṭi
/*na* ϕ *iṭi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu* #2 *halantānām* #3)
iḍādau sici halantasyāṅgasya vṛddhir na bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* does not come in place of the vowel of an *aṅga* which ends in a consonant when an *iṬ*-initial *sIC*, followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

adevīt '. . . sported . . .'
asevīt ' . . . sewed . . . '
akoṣīt ' . . . resolved . . . '
amoṣīt ' . . . stole . . . '

1. An *aṅga* which ends in a consonant does not go through *vṛddhi* when an *iṬ*-initial *sIC* follows. This rule negates what could be called an over-application (*ativyāpti*) of the preceding rule. The penultimate replacement in *guṇa* of 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca* applies, instead, in deriving *asevīt*, *akoṣīt* and *amoṣīt*. Other derivational details, i.e., deletion of *i* of *tiP* (3.4.99 *itaś ca*), augment *aṬ* (3.4.98 *luṅlaṅlṛṅ* . . .), and introduction of *īṬ* (7.3.96

astisico' apṛkte), are similar to *alāvīt*, etc. Refer to the appendix under rule 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī* for full derivational details.

Note that a verbal root having gone through a *guṇa*-replacement in *e*, followed by a replacement in *av* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*), can produce a consonant-final *aṅga* before *sIC*. Why do we have to negate this *vṛddhi* when an internally conditioned *guṇa* will block it. Is this negation meant for situations where *vṛddhi* may obtain subsequently? No. It is because of this formulation (*ārambhasāmarthya*) that internal *guṇa* will be blocked by *vṛddhi* (7.2.3 *vadavraja . . .*). This rule will then negate *vṛddhi* which obtains against internal *guṇa*. A replacement application of the short penultimate *guṇa* (*laghūpadhaguṇa*; 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*) will then follow this negation.

7.2.5 ह्म्यन्तक्षणश्वसजागृणिश्व्येदिताम्

hmyantakṣaṇaśvasajāgṛṇiśvyeditām
/ hmyanta-kṣaṇa-śvasa-jāgṛ-ṇi-śvi-editām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *hmyantaḥ = h ca m ca y ca = hmyaḥ*; *hmyo' nte yasya* (*bv.* with int. *dv.*); *edit = ed it yasya* (*bv.*) /
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu* #1 *neṭi* #4)
hakārāntānāṃ makārāntānāṃ yakārāntānām aṅgānāṃ 'kṣaṇa, śvasa, ṇi, śvi' ity eteṣām editāṃ ca iḍādau sici parasmaipade parato vṛddhir na bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* does not come in place of the vowel of an *aṅga* which (*i*) ends in *h*, *m*, *y*; or (*ii*) is constituted by *kṣaṇA* 'to harm', *śvasA* 'to breathe' and *jāgṛ* 'to remain awake'; or (*iv*) ends in the causative affix *ṆiC*; or is constituted by *śvi* 'to move, grow', or else, is marked with *e* as an *it*, when an *iṬ*-initial *sIC*, followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

agrahīt '. . . seized . . .'
asyamīt '. . . made noise . . .'
avyayīt '. . . spend . . .'
avamīt '. . . threw up . . .'
akṣaṇīt '. . . harmed . . .'
aśvasīt '. . . breathed . . .'
ajāgarīt '. . . remained awake . . .'
aunayīt '. . . abandoned . . .'
ailayīt '. . . inspired . . .'
aśvayīt '. . . moved . . .'
rage/ aragīt '. . . laughed . . .'
kakhe / akakhīt '. . . laughed . . .'

1. Note that the genitive singular of *aṅgasya* is here transformed into plural because of the contextual requirement of *hmyanta-kṣaṇa-śvasa-jāgṛ-ṇi-*

śvi-editām. This rather long specification with *hyamanta-kṣaṇa . . . editām* is interpreted as an *itaretara-dvandva* compound with internal *bahuvrīhi*, itself containing an internal *itaretara-dvandva*. Thus, we first form a *dvandva* paraphrased as *h ca m ca y ca = hmyaḥ* '*h*, and *m*, and *y*'. We then form a *bahuvrīhi* with *anta* 'end', paraphrased as: *hmyo' nte yeṣāṃ te = hmyantāḥ* 'those at the end of which are *h*, *m* and *y*'. Now we form the final *itaretara-dvandva*, paraphrased as: *hmyantāś ca kṣaṇ ca śvas ca jāgṛ ca ṇiś ca śviś ca edic ca = hmyanta-kṣaṇa-śvasa-jāgṛ-ṇiśvyeditaḥ, teṣām*. Of course, *et-it* → *edit* 'that which has its *e* termed an *it*', itself, is a *bahuvrīhi* compound.

2. Note that *jāgṛ*, *śvi* and roots which end in *ṆiC* qualify for *vṛddhi* (7.2.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ . . .*) which here gets negated (also cf. 7.2.4 *neṭi*). The rest of the roots are subject to optional *vṛddhi* of 7.2.7 *ato halāder laghoḥ*. This rule negates that optional *vṛddhi*. Here again an internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) *guṇa* should not apply. For, this *vṛddhi* could then not find its scope of application, ever, before *sIC*. If *guṇa* is applied first, *ṇi* and *śvi* need not be specified here. Since they will yield a form ending in *y* after *guṇa*, anyway, as a result of application of a subsequent replacement in *ay*. The *vṛddhi* can then be negated on the basis of the final *y*. Why then state them individually in this rule? This, in turn, indicates that an internally conditioned *guṇa* is not applied before *sIC*.

Why is *jāgṛ* stated here? For, 7.3.85 *jāgṛo' viciṇṇa . . .* specifies *guṇa* for its *ṛ*, as an exception to the *vṛddhi* of 7.2.115 *aco' ñiti*. An internally conditioned *guṇa* will block the *vṛddhi* of this rule, in a manner similar to the earlier *vṛddhi*. But this view is not correct. For, the *vṛddhi* which may obtain from 7.2.2 *ato lrāntasya*, subsequent upon application of *guṇa*, is also negated here. But don't you think that a provision of *guṇa* should itself be enough to indicate that any future *vṛddhi*, before *CiṆ* (3.1.60 *cleś ciṇ*) and *ṆaL* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*), will be negated? Is it not the case in *jāgarayati* '. . . remains awake', where *vṛddhi* of 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ* does not apply. Why then state *jāgṛ*? It is stated for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*). This specification of *jāgṛ* anticipates a particular order of rule application. Thus, given *jāgṛ* + *iṬ* + *sIC* + *īt*, we find a replacement in *yaṆ* applicable to *ṛ*. This *yaṆ* is blocked by replacement in *guṇa* of 7.3.84 *sārvadhādhukārdhadhātukayoḥ . . .*, an exception. The *vṛddhi*-replacement of 7.2.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ . . .* blocks this *guṇa*. But the *guṇa* of 7.3.85 *jāgṛo' viciṇṇa . . .* succeeds in blocking this *vṛddhi*. It is after this that the *vṛddhi* of 7.2.3 *vadavraja . . .* becomes applicable. But it is negated by 7.3.4 *neṭi*. But 7.2.7 *ato halāder . . .* renders this negation of 7.3.4 *neṭi*, optional. The problem is: the obligatory *vṛddhi* of 7.4.2 *ato lrāntasya* could still apply. Rule 7.2.6 *ūṛṇoter . . .* then offers the present negation. The following verse summarizes availability, blocking, negation, option and negation, of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*, as they obtain:

guṇo vṛddhir guṇo vṛddhiḥ pratiṣedho vikalpanam/
punar vṛddhir niṣedho' to yaṇpūrvāḥ prāptayo nava//

'*guṇa*, *vṛddhi*, *guṇa*, *vṛddhi*, *viklpana* 'option', *vṛddhi* again, negation, and *guṇa* before replacement in *yaṆ*, these nine are applicational possibilities'.

2. Consider *agrahīt*, *ayasmīt*, *avamīt* and *avyayīt* which are *LUṄ*-derivates of *grah* 'to seize', *syam* 'to sound, cry' and *ṬUvam* 'to vomit'. This rule negates *vṛddhi* before a *sIC* affix beginning with *iṬ*, of course, when a *parasmaipada* affix follows. Refer to the appendix of 3.1.49 *vibhāṣā dheṭśvyoḥ* for derivational details of *aśvayīt*. Deriving *aunayīt* and *ailayīt* from *ūnA* and *ilA*, both ending in *ṆiC*, should pose no problem. Derivates of *ragE* and *kakhE*, i.e., *aragīt* and *akakhīt*, get their replacements in *vṛddhi* negated on the basis of their *E* as an *it*.

7.2.6 ऊर्णोतेर्विभाषा

ūrṇoter vibhāṣā
/ *ūrṇoteḥ* 6/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu* #1 *neṭi* #4)
ūrṇāter iḍādau sici parasmaipade parato vibhāṣā vṛddhir na bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* does not, optionally, come in place of the vowel of an *aṅga*, namely *ūrṇuÑ*, when an *iṬ*-initial *sIC* followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows.

EXAMPLES:

praurṇavīt '. . . covered properly . . .'
praurṇāvīt 'ibidem'
praurṇuvīt 'ibidem'

1. This rule negates *vṛddhi*, optionally, in case of an *aṅga* constituted by *ūrṇuÑ* 'to cover'. The condition of an *iṬ*-initial *sIC*, followed by a *parasmaipada* affix, still remains valid. The obligatory *vṛddhi* of 7.2.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ* . . . is here negated, optionally. We will thus get *pra-ūrṇu* + *LUṄ* → *praurṇavīt*, through replacement in *guṇa*, and a subsequent replacement of *o* with *av*, when option of *vṛddhi* is not accepted. An option of *vṛddhi* will yield *praurṇāvīt*, through *vṛddhi* and a replacement in *au*→*āv*. But since 1.2.3 *vibhāṣorṇoḥ* offers an optional status of *Ṅit*, *vṛddhi* and *guṇa*-derivates will become optional to *uvAṄ*. Thus, we get *praurṇuvīt*. Incidentally, *a* of *pra*, and *ā* of *āṬ* (6.1.87 *āṭaś ca*), get replaced with a single replacement in the *vṛddhi* vowel *au* (6.1.85 *vṛddhir eci*).

7.2.7 अतो हलादेर्लघोः

ato halāder laghoḥ
/ *ataḥ* 6/1 *halādeḥ* 6/1 = *hal ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *laghoḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu* #1 *neṭi* #4 *vibhāṣa* #6)

halāder aṅgasya laghor akārasya iḍādau sici parasmaipade parato vibhāṣā vṛddhir na bhavati
A short *a* termed *laghu* 'light' (*hrasvaṃ laghu*) of an *aṅga* beginning with a consonant (*haL*) is optionally not replaced with a corresponding *vṛddhi* vowel when an *iṬ*-initial *sIC*, followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

akaṇīt '. . . moved . . .'
akāṇīt 'ibidem'
araṇīt '. . . fought . . .'
arāṇīt 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers an optional negation of *vṛddhi* to the light (1.4.10 *hrasvaṃlaghu*; short) *a* of a consonant-initial *aṅga*. This option is offered against obligatory negation of 7.2.4 *neṭi*. That this optional negation applies to an *a* is made clear by counter-examples such as *adevīt* and *asevīt* where *div* and *siv* have an *i*. The negation of *vṛddhi* thus stays intact. If *aT* was not stated in this rule, we would have carried *acaḥ*, via *anuvṛtti* (7.2.3 *vadavraja* . . .). For, in its absence, and thus in the absence of a clear specification of a substituendum of this *vṛddhi*, a short *iK* alone would have qualified for *vṛddhi* (1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*). A *vṛddhi* which is ordered without any specification of its substituendum (*sthānī*) is generally known as one characterized with *iK* (*iglakṣaṇā*). Recall, in this connection, that a *vṛddhi* which is characterized with *iK* (*iglakṣaṇā*), alone, comes within the scope of negation of 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*. For, *ikaḥ* is carried over there, via *anuvṛtti*. A *vṛddhi* characterized with *acaḥ*, and especially because of the specification of its substituendum (*sthānī*), would thus not come within the negative scope of 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*. This may not block optional *vṛddhi* provision of *ni-aṬ-kuṭ* + *LUṄ* → *nyakuṭīt* '. . . moved crookedly . . .' and *ni-aṬ-puṭ* + *LUṄ* → *nyapuṭīt* '. . . embraced . . .' (1.2.1 *gāṅkuṭādi* . . .). It is to remove these difficulties that *ataḥ* is specified in this rule.

The condition of *halādi* 'that which has a consonant at its beginning' facilitates obligatory negation of *vṛddhi*. The option of this rule is not available because *aṭ* 'to move' and *aś* 'to eat' are roots which begin with a vowel (*ajādi*). We thus get an obligatory negation in *LIṄ*-derivates of these roots in *mā bhavān aśīt* and *mā bhavān aṭīt*.

The condition of *laghu* is required so that this option is not available to *atakṣīt* '. . . planed . . .' and *arakṣīt* '. . . protected . . .' where *a* before *kṣ*, a conjunct, can no longer be termed *laghu*. It must be termed *guru* 'heavy' because it occurs before a conjunct (*saṃyoga*; 1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*).

Why is this option not made availavle to the *a* of *acakāsīt* '. . . glowed . . .'? Because the short *a* before *sIC* remains intervened, not just by the conso-

nant *k* but also by *ā*. Note that *iḍādau sici* 'when an *iṬ*-initial *sIC* follows' is not used here as a qualifier to the *aṅga*. It, instead, is used as a qualifier to *laghor ataḥ* 'of an *a* termed *laghu*'. Now consider the interpretive provision of *yena nāvyavadhānaṃ tena vyavahite' pi vacanaprāmāṇyāt*, whereby an intervention which does not result into non-intervention is allowed as intervention for operational purposes. An intervention of a consonant is acceptable at the strength of this statement. The intervention of a vowel is not acceptable. The *a* which occurs after *c* in *acakāsīt*, etc., does not go through a replacement in *vṛddhi* because intervention of *k*, a consonant, is acceptable but the intervention of *ā* before *sIC* is not. The optional negation of *vṛddhi* is thus not allowed. The negation thus becomes obligatory.

Why can we not accept the limit of such interventions to a single sound, and not to more than one. This will then block optional negation, for example in *aṬ + takṣ + LUṄ* → *atakṣīt*, etc., where more than one sound segments intervene. We thus do not need a specification with *laghoḥ*. If this is to be accepted then *laghoḥ* is used here for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*).

Finally, this rule applies only when *iṬ* is followed by *sIC*. Consider *aṬ + pac + sIC + ī + t* → *apākṣīt*, where *iṬ* does not occur before *sIC*. This optional negation will thus not be allowed here.

7.2.8 नेड् वशि कृति

neḍ vaśi kṛti
/na ϕ iṭ 1/1 *vaśi* 7/1 *kṛti* 7/1/
vaśādau kṛti pratyaye parata iḍ āgamo na bhavati
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced relative to an *aṅga* when a *kṛt* affix which begins with a sound denoted by *vaŚ* (*Śs.* 5-9) follows.

EXAMPLES:

īśvaraḥ 'lord, master'
dīpraḥ 'burning, glowing'
bhasma 'ash'

1. This rule negates introduction of augment *iṬ* (7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*) to an *aṅga* when a *kṛt* affix beginning with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *vaŚ* (*Śs.* 5-10) follows. This section of rules thus constitutes prior exception (*purastāpavāda*) to the section of rules dealing with introduction of *iṬ*. Consider *īśvara* where 3.2.175 *stheśabhāsa* . . . introduces the *kṛt* (3.1.93 *kṛd atiṅ*) affix *varaC* after *īśA* 'to govern'. Derivates of *īśA*, i.e., *īśitā* and *īśitum*, are allowed *iṬ* before affixes *tṛC* and *tumuN*. This same is also applicable to *dīpitā* and *dīpitum*. But consider *dīpra* where 3.2.167 *namikampi* . . . introduces the *kṛt* affix *ra* after *dīp* 'to shine, glow'. Augment *iṬ* must be blocked here since *ra* begins with a sound denoted by *vaŚ*. We

will similarly get *bhasitā* and *bhasitum* from *bhas* + *tṛC* and *bhas* + *tumUN* with *iṬ*. However, *bhasma*, a derivate of *manIN* (3.2.75 *anyebhyo' pi . . .*) must be denied *iṬ*. A derivate of *naṄ* (3.3.90 *yajayāca . . .*), introduced with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense' after *yāc* 'to beg', yields *yācñā* 'begging' in the feminine with *ṬāP*, with no *iṬ* but through a replacement in *ñ* for *n* (*cutva*; 8.4.40 *stoś cunā ścuḥ*). This negation of *iṬ*, however, does not apply in deriving *yāc* + *iṬ* + *tṛC* → *yācitā* and *yāc* + *iṬ* + *tumUN* → *yācitum*.

2. *Kāśikā* states that *iṬ* is blocked before an affix beginning with *va*, *ra*, *ma* and *na*. It then adds that this statement should be interpreted as made with reference to illustrations on hand. This, in no way, should be accepted as an effort toward enumerating the totality of contexts where *iṬ* is blocked (*Kāś*: *varamanādau ity udāharaṇapradarśanārtham, na parigaṇananam*). For, there are other contexts where negation of *iṬ* is valid. Consider *daṇḍa*, a derivate of the *Uṇādi* (I:113: *ñamantāḍ ḍaḥ*) affix *ḍa*, introduced after *dam*. There is no *iṬ* here, though *ḍa* begins with a sound denoted by *vaŚ*. If one argues that this lack of *iṬ* can be accounted for by *bahulam* of 3.3.1 *uṇādayo bahulam*, then this statement of *Kāśikā* can be treated as an effort toward exactly defining the scope of *vaŚ* with possible examples.

There are hardly any *kṛt* affixes which begin with something other than *v*, *r*, *m*, and *n*. The *kṛt* affixes which begin with *vaŚ* are: *vanIP*, *KvanIP*, *ṄvanIP*; *varaC* and *KvaraC*; *KvasU*; *Kru*, *KlukAN*, *manIN*, *KmaraC*, *naṄ*, *naN*, *najIṄ*, and *Knu*.

Why do we need the condition of *kṛti*? So that we do not introduce an *iṬ* where a non-*kṛt* affix, for example a *tiṄ*, follows. Thus, consider *rudiva* and *rudima*, first personal active dual and plural perfect forms of *rud* 'to cry' where *iṬ* is introduced before *vas* and *mas* (7.2.76 *rudādibhyaḥ sārvadhātuke*). Some texts of *Kāśikā* mention *rurudiva* and *rurudima* as counter-examples to the condition of *kṛti*. This, according to Haradatta, is not correct (*PM*: *kvacid rurudiva, rurudimeti liṭi paṭhyante, tad ayuktam*). For, their *iṬ* is already valid in view of the enumeration beginning with *kṛ* (*krādiniyama*; 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛvṛ . . .*).

3. Recall that a negative provision is made in view of some positive provision already on hand (*prāptipūrvako niṣedhaḥ*). But this is not what we find here. Refer to notes under 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛ. . . .*

7.2.9 तितुत्रतथसिसुसरकसेषु च

titutratathasisusarakaseṣu ca
/ti-tu-tra-ta-tha-si-su-sara-ka-seṣu 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neḍ kṛti* #8)
'*ti*, *tu*, *tra*, *ta*, *tha*, *si*, *su*, *sara*, *ka*, *sa*' *ity eteṣu kṛtsu iḍ āgamo na bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is also not introduced relative to an *aṅga* when *kṛt* affixes, namely *ti*, *tu*, *tra*, *ta*, *tha*, *si*, *su*, *sara*, *ka*, and *sa* follow.

EXAMPLES:

tantiḥ (*KtiC*) 'spread'
dīptiḥ (*KtiN*) 'glow'
saktuḥ (*tuN*; *Uṇ.* I:70 *sitanigami . . .*)
'parched gram-flour'
patram (*ṢṭraN*; 3.3.182 *dāmnīśa . . .*) 'carriage'
tantram (*ṢṭraN*; *Uṇ.* IV:158) 'principal'
hastaḥ (*ta*; *Uṇ.* III:80 *hasimṛgṛ . . .*) 'hand'
kuṣṭham (*tha*; *Uṇ.* II.2 *hanikuṣi . . .*) 'leprosy'
kukṣiḥ (*ksi*; *Uṇ.* III.155 *pluṣiśuṣi . . .*) 'belly, lap'
ikṣuḥ (*ksu*; *Uṇ.* III.157 *suk ca iṣeḥ*) 'sugar-cane'
akṣaram (*saraN*; *Uṇ.* III.70 *aśeḥ saran*)
'that which does not decay'
śalkaḥ (*kaN*; *Uṇ.* III.43 *iṇbhīkā . . .*) 'bark, chip'
vatsaḥ (*sa*; *Uṇ.* III.62 *vṛtṝ . . .*) 'calf'

1. This rule enumerates a set of ten *kṛt* affixes which cannot be covered by the *vaśādi* 'that which has a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *vaŚ* at the beginning' condition of the preceding rule, but which may cause negation of *iṬ*. This negation of *iṬ* is made against the positive provision of 7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*. Affix *ti* generally refers here to both *KtiC* (3.3.174 *kticktau ca saṃjñāyām*) and *KtiN* (3.3.94 *striyāṃ ktin*). It, mostly because of the specification of *kṛti*, excludes any reference to *tiP*, eventhough used with *P* as a single *it*-element. Thus, we get *tan* + *KtiC* = *tanti* and *dīp* + *KtiN* → *dīpti*. Note that most examples are derived with the *Uṇādi* affixes. A non-*kṛt* affix, for example *ti*, as in *roditi* and *svapiti*, cannot be denied *iṬ*.

A *vārttika* proposal extends *iṬ* to derivates of *grah* 'to seize', and its like, when *ti*, *tu* and *tri* follow. Thus, *nigṛhītiḥ* 'restraint, check', *upasnihitiḥ* 'watering, soaking', *nikucitiḥ* 'contraction', etc. This listing of the *grahādi* class refers to roots which allow *iṬ* before *KtiN*.

7.2.10 एकाच उपदेशेऽनुदात्तात्

ekāc upadeśe' nudāttāt
/*ekāc* 1/1 = *eko' c yasmin* (*bv.*); *upadeśe* 7/1 *anudāttāt* 5/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭ* #8)
upadeśe ya ekāc dhātur anudāttaś ca tasmād iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced to a verbal root termed *aṅga*, which, at the time of *upadeśa*, consists of one vowel (*ekāc*) and is marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

cetā 'he who will heap, gather'
stotā 'he who will praise'

taritā 'he who will go across'
lavitā 'he who will cut'
pavitā 'he who will cleanse'

1. It has been stated that *upadeśa* means *ādyoccāraṇa* 'initial citation'. To determine what roots are *ekāc* 'consisting of a single vowel; monosyllabic' is not difficult. However, it is hard to determine what roots are marked with *anudātta* in *upadeśa*.

2. Commentators have presented a detailed enumeration of roots which may be marked for introduction of augment *iṬ*. Consider the following *kārikā* verses:

aniṭsvarānto bhavatīti dṛśyatām
imāṃs tu seṭaḥ pravadanti tadvidaḥ/
'a root which ends in a vowel may generally be considered as non-*iṭ*'; experts of *seṭ* and *aniṭ* roots, however, consider the following as used with *iṭ* (*seṭ*):

adantamṝdantamṛtāṃ ca vṛṅvṛñau
śviḍīṅivarṇeṣv atha śīṅśriñav api/
'(*i*) those which end in a short *a*;
(*ii*) those which end in a long *ṝ*;
(*iii*) *vṛṄ* and *vṛÑ* which end in a short *ṛ*;
(*iv*) those which end in *i*, for example, *śvi* 'to move, grow', *ḍīṄ* 'to fly', and also *ŚīṄ* 'to sleep' and *śriÑ* 'to serve';'

gaṇastham ūdantam utāṃ ca rusnuvau
kṣuvaṃ tathorṇotimatho yuṇukṣṇavaḥ/
iti svarānto nipuṇaṃ samuccitāḥ
tato halantān api sannibodhataḥ//
'(*v*) of roots listed in groups (*gaṇa*) *lūÑ* 'to cut' and *pūÑ* 'to cleanse, purify' are used with *i*, from among those terminating in a long *ū*;
(*vi*) those which end in a short *u* are: *ru* 'noise', *snu* 'flow', *kṣu* 'noise', *ūrṇuÑ* 'cover', *yu* 'mix', *ṇu* 'praise', *kṣu* 'sharpen'.'

The preceding roots which all end in vowels are enumerated here with care. Those which end in a consonant are to be comprehended hereafter:

śakis tu kānteṣv aniḍ eka iṣyate
ghasiś ca sānteṣu vasiḥ prasāraṇī/
rabhis tu bhānteṣv atha maithune yabhis
tatas tṛtīyo labhir eva netare//
'(*i*) only *śakI* 'strong', of those which end in *k*, is desired to be classed as non-*iṭ*;
(*ii*) of those which end in *s*, *ghasI* 'to eat' (an independent root; not a replacement of *ad* 'to consume') and *vas* 'to dwell' which goes through *samprasāraṇa*, are non-*iṭ*;

(*iii*) among those which end in *bh, rabhI, yabhI,* with the signification of *maithuna* 'sexual intercourse', and *labhI* 'to gain', these three, and not any other, are classed as non-*iṭ*;'

yamir yamanteṣv aniḍ eka iṣyate
ramiś ca yaś ca śyani paṭhyate maniḥ/
namiś caturtho hanir eva pañcamo
gamiś ca ṣaṣṭhaḥ pratiṣedhavācinām//

'(*iv*) the *ācāryas* who desire negation of *iṭ* enumerate these six roots ending in sounds denoted by the abbreviatory term *yaM* (*Śs.*7): (1) *yam, ram, man* 'to know', a *divādi* root used with *ŚyaN, nam* 'bend', *han* 'to kill' and *gam* 'to go';'

dihir duhir mehati rohatī vahir
nahis tu ṣaṣṭho dahatis tathā lihiḥ/
ime niṭo ṣṭāv iha muktasaṃśayā
gaṇeṣu hāntāḥ pravibhajya kīrtitāḥ//

'(*v*) *dih* 'to grow', *duh* 'to milk', *mih* 'to water, sprinkle', *ruh* 'to grow', *vah* 'to carry', *nah* 'to tie', *dah* 'to burn', and *lih* 'to lick', these eight which are listed in groups as ending in *ha,* are here, without any doubt, enumerated as non-*iṭ*.'

Why *muktasaṃśayā* 'without any doubt'? Because there is a set of four roots which creates doubts: *sahA* 'to endure' which is optionally stated to be used with *iṬ* before an affix beginning with *t* (7.2.48 *tīṣasaha . . .*); *muh* 'to be confused', *radhādi* root, which also gets optional *iṭ* (7.2.45 *radhādibhyaś ca*); *rih* and *lih,* nobody knows whether these two even exist:

diśiṃ dṛśiṃ daṃśimatho mṛśiṃ spṛśiṃ
riśiṃ ruśiṃ krośatim aṣṭamaṃ viśim/
liśaṃ ca śāntān aniṭaḥ purāṇagāḥ
paṭhanti pāṭheṣu daśaiva netarān//

'(*vi*) grammarians only consider these following ten roots which end in *ś* and are classed as non-*iṭ*: *diś* 'to direct', *dṛś* 'to see', *daś* 'to bite', *mṛś* 'to rub', *spṛś* 'to touch', *riś* and *ruś* 'to harm', *kruś* 'to call, cry', *viś* 'to enter', and *liś* 'to lessen';'

rudhiḥ sarādhir yudhibandhisādhayaḥ
krudhikṣudhī śudhyatibudhyatī vyadhiḥ/
ime tu dhāntā daśa ye niṭo matās
tataḥ paraṃ sidhyatir eva netare//

'(*vii*) *rādh* 'to accomplish', along with *rudh* 'to obstruct', *yudh* 'to attack', *bandh* 'to bind', *sādh* 'to accomplish', *krudh* 'to be angry', *kṣudh* 'to be hungry', *śudh* 'to be clean', *budh* 'to know' and *vyadh* 'to pierce'— these ten, and none other than *sidh,* an eleventh, are roots which end in *dh* and are classed as non-*iṭ*;'

śiṣiṃ piṣiṃ śuṣyati puṣyati tviṣiṃ
viṣiṃ śliṣim tuṣyati duṣyati dviṣim/
imān daśaivopadiśanty aniḍvidhau
gaṇeṣu ṣāntān kṛṣikarṣatī tathā//

'(*viii*) *śiṣ* 'to distinguish', *piṣ* 'to grind', *śuṣ* 'to dry out', *puṣ* 'to nurture', *tviṣ* 'to glow', *viṣ* 'to sprinkle, to pervade (*viṣLṚ*)', *śliṣ* 'to embrace', *tuṣ* 'to be satisfied', *duṣ* 'to be contaminated', *dviṣ* 'to wish harm to', these ten, and two more, *kṛṣ* 'to draw' and *karṣ* 'to drag', are cited in the group-listings relative to non-*iṭ* operations';'

tapiṃ tipiṃ cāpim atho vapiṃ tvapiṃ
lipiṃ lapiṃ tṛpyati dṛpyati sṛpim/
svareṇa nīcena śapiṃ chupiṃ kṣipiṃ
pratīhi pāntān paṭhitāṃs trayodaśān//

'(*ix*) the following thirteen which all end in *p* have been enumerated as marked with *anudātta*: *tap* 'to be hot', *tip* 'to drip, distil', *āp* 'to pervade', *vap* 'to sow', *svap* 'to sleep', *lip* 'to anoint', *lup* 'to break, pierce', *tṛp* 'to please' (*tudādi*), *dṛp* 'to be happy' (*tudādi*), *sṛp* 'to crawl', *śap* 'to curse', *kṣup* 'to touch', and *kṣip* 'to hurl';'

adiṃ hadiṃ skandibhidicchidikṣudīn
śadiṃ sadiṃ svidyatipadyatī khidim/
tudiṃ nudiṃ vidyati vinta ity api
pratīhi dāntān daśa pañca cāniṭaḥ//

'(*x*) the following, ten plus five = fifteen, all end in *d* and have been enumerated as non-*iṭ*: *ad* 'to consume', *had* 'to excrete waste from bowels', *skand* 'to leap', *bhid* 'to split', *chid* 'to cut', *kṣud* 'to powder', *śad* 'to perish', *sad* 'to sink', *svid* 'to perspire', *pad* 'to go', *khid* 'to be sad', *tud* 'to strike', *nud* 'to inspire', *vid* 'to exist', and *vid* 'to think';'

paciṃ vaciṃ viciricirañjipṛcchatīn
nijiṃ sijiṃ mucibhajibhañjibhṛjjatīn/
tyajiṃ yajiṃ yujirujisañjimajjatīn
bhujiṃ svajiṃ sṛjimṛji viddhy aniṭsvarān//

'(*xi*) the following are to be understood as marked with non-*iṭ* accent: *pac* 'to cook', *vac* 'to speak', *vic* 'to separate', *ric* 'to empty', *rañj* 'to color', *pracch* 'to ask', *nij* 'to cleanse', *sic* 'to sprinkle', *muc* 'to release', *bhaj* 'to serve', *bhañj* 'to break', *bhṛjj* 'to cook', *tyaj* 'to abandon', *yaj* 'to sacrifice', *yuj* 'to join', *ruj* 'to break', *sañj* 'to adhere', *majj* 'to be immersed' and *bhuj* 'to consume', *svaj* 'to embrace', *sṛj* 'to create', and *mṛj* 'to wipe, clean'.'

7.2.11 **श्रयुकः किति**

śryukaḥ kiti

/śryukaḥ 6/1 = *śriś ca uk ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya*; *kiti* 7/1 = *kakāra it yasya* (*bv.*), *tasmin*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭ* #8)
'*śri*' *ity etasya ugantānāṃ ca kiti pratyaye parata iḍ āgamo na bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced relative to an *aṅga*, namely *śri* 'to resort to, cling', and also to an *aṅga* which ends in a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *uK* (*Śs*.1-2), when an affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

śritvā 'absolutive *Ktvā*-derivate of *śri*'
śritaḥ 'a derivate of *Kta*'
śritavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'
yutvā 'absolutive *Ktvā*-derivate of *yu* 'to mix'''
yutaḥ 'a derivate of *Kta*'
yutavān 'a derivate fo *KtavatU*'
lūtvā 'absolutive *Ktvā*-derivate of *lūÑ* 'to cut'''
lūnaḥ 'a derivate of *Kta*'
lūnavāṅ 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'
vṛtvā 'absolutive *Ktvā*-derivate of *vṛ* 'to choose'''
vṛtaḥ 'a derivate of *Kta*'
vṛtavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'
tīrtvā 'absolutive *Ktvā*-derivate of *tṝ* 'to float'''
tīrṇaḥ 'a derivate of *Kta*'
tīrṇavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'

1. Note that wherever, in this section, a root is specified with the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*), it is to be interpreted as used in the sense of the ablative (*pañcamī*). This enables *iṬ* to be introduced to the affix on hand in consonance with 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*. A negation (*pratiṣedha*) of *iṬ* similarly applies to the affix.

This rule blocks *iṬ* when an affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows *śri* and other bases ending in a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *uK* (*Śs*. 1-2). We thus get *śritvā*, *śritaḥ* and *śritavān* which are derivates of *Ktvā*, *Kta* and *KtavatU*, respectively. Parallel examples for bases ending in *u* are offered as *yutvā*/*yutaḥ*/*yutavān*; *lūtvā*/*lūnaḥ*/*lūnavān*, etc. Refer to derivational details of *āstīrṇaḥ* (note under 7.1.100 *ṛta id dhātoḥ*) for applications relevant to *tīrṇaḥ*, etc.

That this negation is applicable to *śri*, and roots which end in *uK*, is made clear by allowing *iṬ* to *viditaḥ* of *vid* 'to know'. A similar allowance of *iṬ* is made to *śrayitā*, *śrayitum* and *śrayitavyam* where the condition of *kiti* 'when an affix marked with *K* as an *it*' is not satisfied. All three examples are forms of *śri* derived witrh the non-*kit* affixes *tṛC*, *tumUN* and *tavyaT*, respectively.

2. Commentators also discuss whether *k* of *kiti* should be accepted as referring to both *g* and *k*. That is, *kiti* should be read as *ḳniti* where the first *k* is *g*, devoiced on account of the following *k*. This question is raised in view of deriving *bhūṣṇuḥ* from *bhū* + *Gsnu*. Or else, *bhū* + *Ksnu*. Refer to notes under 1.1.5 *ḳniti ca* and 4.2.139 *glājisthaś ca ksnuḥ*.

The *k* of *kiti* does not include a reference also to *g* as an *it*. Pāṇini's own formulation of this rule where *śryukaḥ* ends in a *visarga*, indicates it. If *kiti* was intended to be *giti*, the reading of this rule should preferably have been *śryuko giti*. I omit further discussion of this subject for fear of expatiation (*prapañca*). Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* for further details.

3. Commentators also recommend that *upadeśe* should be carried over to this rule to resolve derivational difficulties faced with forms of roots ending in *ṝ*. Consider *tīrṇaḥ* where we get *tir* from *tṝ* 'to be afloat' by replacing *ṝ* with *i* followed by *r* (*rapara*). But since *tṝ* ends in *uK* in *upadeśa*, we get the negation of *iṬ*. Some state that it is not necessary since 7.2.41 *iṭ sani vā* can make an optional provision of *iṬ* which can then be negated in the context of *niṣṭhā* suffixes by rule 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā*. Why carry *upadeśe*? Why not treat the *ir*-replacement as *ṝ*, via *sthānivadbhāva*, thereby meeting the requirement of *uK*. This is not possible because treating *ṝ* as *ir*, via *sthānivadbhāva* (1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo' nalvidhau*), will be considered part of *al-vidhi* 'operation relative to a sound segment'. Such a *sthānivadbhāva* will be allowed only when an operation not relative to a sound segment is to be performed.

It is resolved then that *upadeśe* should be carried to block *iṬ* in *tīrṇaḥ*. But this will block *iṬ* also in *jāgaritaḥ* and *jāgaritavān* where *jāgṛ* ends in *uK* in *upadeśa*. We must then carry the *anuvṛtti* of *ekācaḥ* '. . . consisting of a single vowel' for blocking the negation of augment *iṬ* in *jāgaritaḥ* and *jāgaritavān* where *jāgṛ* consists of more than one vowel. But carrying *ekācaḥ* will not allow negation of *iṬ* in *prorṇutaḥ / prorṇutavān*. We must then state *nuvadbhāva* 'treatment as *nu*' of *ūrṇuÑ*. That is, we should split it into *ūr* + *nu*, and then treat it as *nu* by the extensional provision of *nuvadbhāva*. What will be the purpose of doing this? The purposes are: (*i*) to facilitate introduction of affix *yaṄ* after *nu*, a consonant-initial verbal root consisting of a single vowel (3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco halāder . . .*); (*ii*) negation of introduction of *ām*, based on *ekāc* 'consisting of a single vowel' status of *nu* via *nuvadbhāva* (3.1.36 *ijādeś ca gurumato' nṛcchaḥ*); and (*iii*) negation of augment *iṬ* introduced to affixes marked with *K* and *G* as an *it*, on the basis of *ekāc*-status of *ūrṇuÑ*, via *nuvadbhāva* (7.2.11 *śryukaḥ kiti*). Thus,

> *vācya ūrṇor ṇuvadbhāvo yaṅprasiddhiḥ prayojanam /*
> *āmaś ca pratiṣedhārtham ekācaś ceḍ upagrahāt //*
> '*ūrṇuÑ* should be stated to be *nu* for application of affix *yaṄ*; it is desired for negation of *ām*, and augment *iṬ*, via treating it as consisting of a single vowel (*ekāc*)'

4. Verbal root *ūrṇuÑ* should be stated to have the form *nu*, so that it could meet the requirement of *ekāc* 'single vowel' condition for introduction of affix *yaÑ*. This then is the purpose of accepting *nu* as the form of *urṇUÑ*. It will also enable us to negate application of *ām* in *LIṬ*. For, *nu* will not be a verb which begins with a vowel denoted by *iC* and contains a vowel termed *guru* (1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*; 3.1.36 *ijādeś ca gurumato' nṛcchaḥ*).

A *vārttika* (ad 3.1.35 *kāspratyaye ām amantre, kāsy anekāc vaktavyaḥ*) cannot introduce *ām* since *nu* will not be consisting of more than a single vowel. Since *ūrṇuÑ* is read as *anudātta* in *upadeśa*, we will get the introduction of *iṬ* before an *ārdhadhātuka* affix beginning with a consonant denoted by *vaL* (7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*). Recall here that the *SK* (ad 8.2.46 *kṣiyo dīrghāt*) also mentions two other *vārttikas*: *ūrṇoter ām neti vaktavayḥ* '*ām* should not be stated in connection with *ūrṇoti*'; *ūrṇoter ṇuvadbhāvo vācyaḥ* 'a form of *nu* should be stated for *ūrṇoti*'. The result of the first proposal is anticipated by the second (see *Tattvabodhinī* ad *SK*: *ūrṇoter ṇuvadbhāvo vācya iti vakṣyamāṇasya ām abhāvo' pi phalam iti bhāvaḥ*).

The phrase *ekācaś ceḍ upagrahāt* presents the last purpose of *ṇuvadbhāva* of ūrṇuÑ. When verbal root is accepted as *nu* it becomes *ekāC* ending in a vowel denoted by *uK*. Rule 7.2.11 *śryukaḥ kiti* negates augment *iṬ* to an affix which is marked with *K* and *G* as an *it*, and follows verbal root *śīÑ* and other roots consisting of a single vowel. Rule 7.2.10 *ekāc upadeśe anudāttāt* negates introduction of augment *iṬ* after roots which are marked with *anudātta*. Rule 7.2.11 negates *iṬ* where roots are marked with *udātta*. Verbal root *ūrṇuÑ* is marked with *udātta*. It becomes *ekāC* with its form in *nu*. Augment *iṬ* which may become available to it from 7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* is thus blocked. This is also a purpose served by accepting *nu* as the form of *ūrṇuÑ*. Augment *iṬ* can thus be negated in *prorṇutaḥ* and *prorṇutavān*, based on status of *nu* as *ekāc*.

7.2.12 सनि ग्रहगुहोश्च

sani grahaguhoś ca
/sani 7/1 *graha-guhoḥ* 6/2 (*itar. dv.*) *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭ* #8 *ukaḥ* #11)
'*graha, guha*' *ity etayor ugantānāṃ ca sani pratyaye parata iḍ āgamo na bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced relative to an *aṅga*, namely *grahA* and *guhA*, and also to an *aṅga* which ends in a vowel denoted by *uK*, when affix *saN* follows.

EXAMPLES:

jighṛkṣati '. . . wishes to seize . . .'
jughukṣati '. . . wishes to cover . . .'

rurūṣati '. . . wishes to cry . . .'
lulūḍati '. . . wishes to cut . . .'

1. This rule negates *iṬ* where *grah* 'to seize, hold', *guh* 'to cover', and roots which end in *uK*, are followed by affix *saN* (3.1.7 *dhātoḥ samāna-kartṛkād . . .*). Refer to derivational details of *jighṛkṣati*, also for deriving *jughukṣati*, under the appendix of 1.2.8 *rudavidamuṣa . . .* (II:431-2). Derivational details of *rurūṣati* and *lulūṣati* are similar to those of *cicīṣati*, under the appendix of 1.2.9 *iko jhal* (II:435).

2. Note that *śri* is not carried over, simply because an optional provision of *iṬ* is made by 7.2.49 *sanīvantardhabhrasj. . . .* Thus, *śri* gets two forms when *saN* follows: one with *iṬ* and the other without. This rule offers negation of *iṬ* to *guhŪ* 'to cover', against the optional provision of rule 7.2.44 *svaratisūti . . .*, based on *Ū* as an *it*. This rule negates *iṬ* of *grah* 'to seize' against an obligatory (*nitya*) provision.

7.2.13 कृसृभृवृस्तुद्रुस्रुश्रुवो लिटि

kṛsṛbhṛvṛstudrusruśruvo liṭi
/kṛ-sṛ-bhṛ-vṛ-stu-dru-sru-śruvoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*); *liṭi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭ* #8)
'*kṛ, sṛ, bhṛ, vṛ, stu, dru, sru, śru*' *ity eteṣāṃ liṭi pratyaya iḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced relative to an *aṅga*, namely *kṛ, sṛ, bhṛ, vṛ, stu, dru, sru,* and *śru,* when affix *LIṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

cakṛva 'first person dual *LIṬ*-derivate of *kṛ*'
cakṛma 'first person plural . . .'
sasṛva 'second person dual *LIṬ*-derivate of *sṛ*'
sasṛma 'first person plural . . .'
babhūva 'first person dual *LIṬ*-derivate of *bhū*'
babhūma 'first person plural . . .'
vavṛva 'first person dual *LIṬ*-derivate of *vṛ*'
vavṛma 'first person plural . . .'
vavṛvahe 'first person dual middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *vṛ*'
vavṛmahe 'first person plural middle . . .'
tuṣṭuva 'first person dual *LIṬ*-derivate of *stu*'
tuṣṭuma 'first person plural . . .'
dudruva 'first person dual *LIṬ*-derivate of *dru*'
dudruma 'first person plural . . .'
susruva 'first person dual *LIṬ*-derivate of *sru*'
susruma 'first person plural . . .'
śuśruva 'first person dual *LIṬ*-derivate of *śru*'
śuśruma 'first person plural . . .'

1. Since *kṛ*, *bhṛ* and *vṛ* are here specified without any elements termed *it* (*anubandha*), they will be able to refer to all of their counterparts similar in form, without any *it*. That is, *kṛ* will refer to both *kṛÑ* 'to harm' and *ḌUkṛÑ* 'to make, do'; *bhṛ* will refer to both *bhṛÑ* 'to provide' and *ḌUbhṛÑ* 'to sustain, nurture'; and *vṛ* will refer to both *vṛṄ* 'honor' and *vṛÑ* 'to choose'.

The first three roots are denied *iṬ* by 7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe' nudāttāt*. The fourth, i.e., *vṛ*, is denied *iṬ* by 7.2.11 *śryukaḥ kiti*. Why restate this negation? A provision made against one which already exists is made for restrictive purposes (*siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*). What is the restrictive purpose here (*niyama*)? This negation of *iṬ* before *LIṬ* must apply only when *LIṬ* occurs after these specified roots. That is, a negation of *iṬ* after roots other than those specified here will be canceled. Why can we not interpret this restrictive provision to mean: '*iṬ* is negated after these roots, only when *LIṬ* follows'? Bhīmasen Shastrī (II:161) notes that Pāṇini's own practice of using *kṛte* (4.3.116 *kṛte granthe*), *bhṛtaḥ* (5.1.79 *tam adhīṣṭo bhṛto . . .*), *parivṛtaḥ* (4.2.10 *parivṛto rathaḥ*) indicates that such a restrictive provision cannot be accepted.

Now consider *bibhidiva / bibhidima* and *cicchidiva / cicchidima*, both derivates of first person dual and plural *LIṬ* of *bhid* 'to split' and *chid* 'to cut', where 7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe . . .* negates *iṬ*. Since our present rule does not include *bhidIR* and *chidIR* which are both marked with *anudātta*, this rule cannot restrict them from receiving *iṬ*. The negation of 7.2.10 *ekāca . . .* will thus be canceled. Note that this negation of 7.2.10 is made on the basis of enumeration of bases (*prakṛtyāśraya*). The negation of 7.2.11 *śryukaḥ kiti* is made on the basis of affixal operation (*pratyayāśraya*). This *niyama* will also apply on *vṛṄ* and *vṛÑ* which are denied *iṬ* by 7.2.11 *śryukaḥ kiti*.

Yet another question: why should we accept *kṛ*, *sṛ*, *bhṛ* and *vṛ*, alone, included here for restrictive purposes. Why not also include *stu*, etc. After all, these are also *anudātta* and they also have the negation of *iṬ* in *LIṬ* of 7.2.10 *ekāc upadeśe. . . .* It is explained that roots beginning with *stu* are enumerated here for a special purpose. That is, they are included here for negation of optional *iṬ*, made available to *thaL* by 7.2.63 *ṛto bhāradvājasya*. Notice that *kṛ*, *sṛ*, *bhṛ* and *vṛ* do not have that optional *iṬ* made available. Verbal roots *stu*, etc., are enumerated here to block optional *iṬ* made available to *thaL* by 7.2.63 *ṛto bhāradvājasya*. They are also enumerated to block *iṬ* before *va / ma / se / dhve / vahi / mahiṄ*. Consider *tuṣṭuva / tuṣṭuma / tuṣṭuṣe / tuṣṭudhve/ tuṣṭuvahe / tuṣṭumahe* as examples. An inclusion of *stu* 'to praise', *dru* 'to run, move', *sru* 'to move' and *śru* 'to hear' is made here to obligatorily block *iṬ*, everywhere, when *LIṬ* follows them.

2. Note that we get *dhū* + *va* → *dhūva* and *dhū* + *ma* → *dhūma*, where *va* and *ma* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*) are replacements of *LIṬ*, via *vas* and *mas* (3.4.77 *tiptasjhi . . .*). These replacements are treated as marked with *K* as an *it* (1.2.5 *asaṃyogāl . . .*). This rule consequently negates *iṬ* here. Note, however, that 7.2.44 *svaratisūti . . .* makes an optional provision of *iṬ*. Can

this negation be blocked by this optional *iṬ*? Commentators note that *vipratiṣedha* cannot apply here. For, negation carries more weight. How do we know it? We know it from Pāṇini's practice of offering negation of *iṬ* first. It is generally understood that a negation makes sense only when a positive provision is already made. Pāṇini makes positive provisions of *iṬ* only after making its negative provision. This, in turn, indicates that negation of *iṬ* takes precedence over its positive provision (*SK*: *pratiṣedhakāṇḍā-rambhasāmarthyāt*. . .). How do we then derive *dudhuviva* and *dudhuvima* where *iṬ* is introduced. This is accomplished by the restrictive provision of 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛ*. . . . How? A provision made in view of an existing negation becomes restrictive on the basis of its own formulation (*ārambhasāmarthyāt*). That is, roots which are listed under this rule are obligatorily denied *iṬ*. Others, which also include *dhū*, are thus allowed *iṬ*. Is *dhū* allowed an optional *iṬ* which was negated earlier. No. This *iṬ* will be obligatory.

3. The negation of this rule, and subsequent application of *iṬ* via its status as a restrictive provision (*niyama*), is traditionally referred to as *krādiniyama*. The purpose of this *niyama* is to negate *iṬ* where *kṛ*, etc., occur before *LIṬ*. Elsewhere, it allows introduction of *iṬ*. Now a question: Where exactly does this assignment of *iṬ* apply? It applies where *iṬ* is negated. But there are two ways this negation of *iṬ* is offered. One, where negative *na* is exactly stated with the rule. Two, where negation of *iṬ* is offered by way of an option. Does this rule offer *iṬ* in both instances where *iṬ* is negated with *na* and where it is negated as an option? Jñānendra Sarasvatī (*Tattvabodhinī* ad *SK*) states that this rule offers *iṬ* against a negation explicitly stated with *na* (*nañāpāditasyaivābhāvasya niyamaḥ*). A negation of *iṬ*, offered by way of an optional provision, is not affected by this rule. For, (*PŚ* 62): *anantarasya vidhir bhavati pratiṣedho vā* 'application or negation of an operational provision is valid only in most immediate contexts'. This application of *iṬ* will then be made in view of negation of 7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe*. . . . The most immediate context of negation here relates to the *na* of 7.2.8 *neḍvaśi kṛti*. This rule cannot have any impact on the optional non-*iṬ* of 7.2.44 *svaratisūti*. . . . For, the *vā* 'option' is far removed from this restrictive (*niyama*) provision. Nāgeśa does not accept this position. He claims that the *Mahābhāṣya* (ad 7.2.6 *upadeśe atvataḥ*) clearly indicates otherwise. This *niyama* applies on both instances where negation results out of *na* 'not', or *vā* 'option'. They, for example, accept *jugopitha* as the only correct form. They do not consider *jugoptha* as correct. I have followed Nāgeśa's interpretation since it is closer to the intent of the *Mahābhāṣya*.

7.2.14 श्वीदितो निष्ठायाम्

śvīdito niṣṭhāyām

/śvīditaḥ 6/1 = *īt it yasya* (*bv.*) *sa* = *īdit*; *śvic ca īdic ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya/* (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭ* #8)
śvayater īdiś ca niṣṭhāyām iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced relative to a verbal root termed *aṅga*, namely *ṬUOśvi* 'to move, grow', and a verbal root marked with *i* as *it*, when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* (1.1.26 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) follows.

EXAMPLES:

śunaḥ 'a *Kta*-derivate of *ṬUOśvi*'
śūnavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'
lagnaḥ 'a *Kta*-derivate of *OlasjĪ* (to cling)'
lagnavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'
udvignaḥ 'a *Kta*-deriavte of *ud-vij* (to be agitated)'
udvignavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'
dīptaḥ 'a *Kta*-derivate of *dīpḶ* (to glow)'
dīptavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'

1. Refer to derivational details of *śūnaḥ* and *śunavān* under notes and appendix of 6.1.15 *vacisvapiyajādīnām kiti*. Derivates of *OlasjĪ*, with *Kta* and *KtavatU*, get their *t* replaced with *n* by 8.2.45 *oditaś ca*. This *n* is treated as *asiddha* (8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*) in view of application of 8.2.29 *coḥ kuḥ*, whereby *j* of the root is replaced with *g*. The *s* of the root is deleted by 8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ca*. Other derivates follow similar applications. Now consider *uḍḍīnaḥ* and *uḍḍīnavān*, both derivates of *ḍīṄ* with *Kta* and *KtavatU*. Note that *ḍīṄ* is listed under *svādi*, a class of roots with *O* as an *it* (*odit*). This listing indicates that *iṬ* is not allowed when a *niṣṭhā* affix follows such roots. What will happen if *iṬ* is introduced? It will block the *n*-replacement (*natva*) of *t*. For, *iṬ* will then intervene between the root and the *niṣṭhā* suffix. Thus, *ḍīṄ* should be treated as marked with *O* as an *it*, though it literally is not. Deriving *uḍḍīna* and *uḍḍīnavat*, from *ud* + *ḍī* + (*t* → *n*) *a* and *ud* + *ḍī* + (*t* → *n*) *avat*, involves replacing *d* of the prevarb with *ḍ* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*).

2. Note that the *anuvṛtti* of *niṣṭhāyām* is valid up to 7.2.5 *ārddhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*.

7.2.15 यस्य विभाषा

yasya vibhāṣā
/yasya 6/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #14)
yasya dhātor kvacid iḍ uktas tasya niṣṭhāyāṃ parata iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced to a verbal root termed *aṅga* relative to which an optional *iṬ* has already been introduced, provided when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows.

EXAMPLES:

vidhūtaḥ 'a *Kta*-derivate of *vi-dhūÑ*'
vidhūtavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'
gūḍhaḥ '*Kta*-derivate of *guhÚ* (to cover)'
gūḍhavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'
vṛddhaḥ 'a *Kta*-derivate of *vṛdh* (to grow)'
vṛddhavān 'a derivate of *KtavatU*'

1. A root which is offered an optional *iṬ*, elsewhere, is hereby denied *iṬ* when a *niṣṭhā* suffix follows. Thus, consider 7.2.44 *svaratisūti* . . ., whereby roots specified under this rule are allowed an optional *iṬ*. An optional *iṬ* is also allowed in case of roots which may be marked with *ū* as an *it*, provided the *niṣṭhā* suffix *Ktvā* follows. These optional *iṬ* augments are hereby denied. We thus get *vidhūta* and *vidhūtavat*, from *vi-dhūÑ* + *Kta* and *vi-dhūÑ* + *KtavatU*, with no *iṬ* before these *niṣṭhā* suffixes. Follow derivational details of *ūḍhaḥ* and *ūḍhavān* under notes and appendix of 6.1.15 *vacisvapi* . . ., for deriving *gūḍhaḥ* and *gūḍhavān*. Remember, however, that *guhŪ* 'to cover' does not go through the process of *samprasāraṇa* (1.1.45 *ig yaṇaḥ samprasāraṇam*) as *vah* 'to carry' of *ūḍhaḥ* does. Similar applications are also followed in deriving *vṛddha* and *vṛddhavat*, from *vṛdh* + *Kta* and *vṛdh* + *KtvatU*, where *t* of the *niṣṭhā* suffix is replaced with *dh* (8.2.40 *jhaṣas tathor* . . .). The *dh* of the root is also then replaced with *d* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.52 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*).

2. Some state that *tani*, *pati* and *daridrā* must also be included within the specification of 7.2.49 *sanīvantardha*. . . . This, if accepted, will create problems in deriving *patita*. For, 7.2.49 will offer an optional *iṬ* which, in turn, will be denied by this present rule. It is stated that *patita* can then be derived by introducing *iṬ*, via *nipātana*, in accord with Pāṇini's own usage (2.1.24 *dvitīyā śritātītapatita* . . .).

7.2.16 आदितश्च

āditaś ca
/*āditaḥ* 6/1 = *āt it yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #14)
āditaś ca dhātor niṣṭhāyām iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is also not introduced to a verbal root termed *aṅga*, which is marked with *āT* as an *it*, provided when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows.

EXAMPLES:

minnaḥ 'fat'
minnavān 'grew fat'
kṣviṇṇaḥ 'soft sounding'
kṣviṇṇavān 'sounded soft'

svinnaḥ 'perspiring'
svinnavān 'perspired'
āśvastaḥ 'assured'
vāntaḥ 'vomited'

1. This rule blocks augment *iṬ* after a root which is marked with a long *ā* as an *it*, when a *niṣṭhā* suffix follows. Thus, we get *minnaḥ, minnavān; kṣviṇṇaḥ, kṣviṇṇavān* and *svinnaḥ, svinnavān*, etc. Refer to derivational details of *minnaḥ*, etc., under the appendix of 1.3.5 *ādir ñiṭuḍavaḥ*. The *ca* of this rule is used to attract additional roots (*anuktasamuccayārthaḥ*). Thus, consider *āśvastaḥ* and *vāntaḥ*, where *śvas* 'to breathe' and *ṬUvam* 'to emit' are not marked with *ā* as an *it*, but still are denied *iṬ*.

2. It is argued that a single rule should be formulated with this and the following rule as: *āditaś ca vibhāṣā bhāvakarmaṇoḥ*. The *iṬ* which obtains under this *vibhāṣā*, with reference to denotation of something other than *bhāva* and *ādikarman*, i.e., *kartṛ*, etc., will then be negated by 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā*. It is thus not proper to formulate two separate rules. Commentators state that a separate rule is needed to indicate *yad upādher vibhāṣā tad upādher niṣedhaḥ* 'a negation must be stated with qualifications similar to which an option is stated'. For example, 7.2.86 *vibhāṣā gamahanavidaviśām* allows optional *iṬ* to *gam, han, vid* and *viś*. Verbal root *vid* of this rule, because of its association (*sāhacarya*) with the *tudādi* root *viś*, is interpreted as *tudādi*, used with the signification of *lābha* 'gain'. The negation of 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā* must also be applied to *vid* thus qualified. It cannot, for example, apply to *vid* 'to know'. Thus, we get *viditaḥ* and *viditavān* with *iṬ*.

7.2.17 विभाषा भावादिकर्मणोः

vibhāṣā bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ
/vibhāṣā 1/1 *bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ = bhāvaś ca ādikarma ca bhāvādikarmaṇī* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*;
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #14 *āditaḥ* #16)
bhāve ādikarmaṇi ca ādito dhātor vibhāṣā niṣṭhāyām iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ*, optionally, is not introduced to a verbal root termed an *aṅga*, marked with *ā* as an *it*, when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense' and *ādikarman* 'on-set of, or incipient, action' follows.

EXAMPLES:

minnam anena
meditam anena
praminnaḥ
prameditaḥ

1. This rule negates *iṬ*, optionally, after a root marked with *āT* as an *it*, of course, when a *niṣṭhā* affix denoting *bhāva* and *ādikarman* follows. Thus, we get *minnam = minnam anena* and *meditam = meditam anena*; and *praminnaḥ* and *prameditaḥ*, where the first two examples denote *bhāva* (*Kta*; 3.3.114 *napuṃsake bhāve ktaḥ*) and the next two *ādikarman* (*Kta*; 3.4.71 *ādikarmai . . .*). A negation of *mid* as marked with *K* (*kit*; 1.2.19 *niṣṭhā śīṅ . . .*) facilitates *guṇa* in *meditam*. The *pra* of the examples is used to explain the denotation of *ādikarman*. The *t* of the affix, and the *d* of the root as well, is replaced with *n* (*natva*; 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto . . .*). This is when optional negation of *iṬ* is not accepted. Accepting the option of introducing *iṬ* also blocks *guṇa*, conditioned by affixal *kit*-status.

2. Followers of Sunāga, i.e., Saunāgas, desire an optional *iṬ* after *śīṄ*, when a *niṣṭhā* affix with the denotation of *karman* follows. Thus, *śakitaḥ* (*ghaṭaḥ kartum*) and *śaktaḥ* (*ghaṭam kartum*) '. . . capable of making a jar'. The Saunāgas, however, do not accept *iṬ* when *bhāva* 'root-sense' is denoted. Thus, *śaktam* (*anena*). This *iṬ* is, however, valid in the context of *as* when *bhāva* is denoted. Thus, *asitam* (*anena*). But not when *ādikarman* is denoted. Thus, *astaḥ kāṇḍaḥ*.

Note here that *śak* is intransitive (*akarmaka*). However, it becomes transitive by way of serving as a qualifier to the denotatum of derivates of *tumUN*. Thus, *ayaṃ yogaḥ śakyo' vaktum* 'this rule is not possible to state' and *ayam arhtaḥ śakyate vaktum* 'this meaning is possible to state'. *Nyāsa* states that the Saunāga options can be accounted for if *vibhāṣā*, without carrying the *anuvṛtti* of *āditaś ca*, is formulated as a separate rule. The second split-rule, i.e., *bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ*, will carry the *anuvṛtti* of *āditaś ca*.

7.2.18 क्षुब्धस्वान्तध्वान्तलग्नम्लिष्टविरिब्धफाण्टबाढानि मन्थमनस्तमःसक्ताविस्पष्ट-स्वरानायासभृशेषु

kṣubdhasvāntadhvāntalagnamliṣṭaviribdhaphāṇṭabāḍhāni manthamanas-tamaḥsaktāvispaṣṭasvarānāyāsabhṛśeṣu
/kṣubdha-svānta-dhvānta-lagna-mliṣṭa-viribdhi-phāṇṭa-bāḍhāni 1/3 (*itar. dv.*); *mantha-manas-tamas-sakta- avispaṣṭa-svara-anāyāsa-bhṛśeṣu* 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #14)
'*kṣubdha, svānta, dhvānta, lagna, mliṣṭa, viribdha, phāṇṭa, bāḍha' ity ete nipātyante yathāsaṃkhyaṃ mantha, manaḥ, tamaḥ, saktaḥ, avispaṣṭa, svara, anāyāsa, bhṛśa' ity eteṣv artheṣu*
The words *kṣubdha, svānta, dhvānta, lagna, mliṣṭa, viribdha, phāṇṭa, bāḍha* are derived, via *nipātana*, provided the signification is *mantha, manas, tamas, sakta, avispaṣṭa, svara, anāyāsa*, and *bhṛśa*, respectively.

EXAMPLES:

kṣubdho manthaḥ 'moving . . .; churning stick'

svāntaṃ manaḥ 'unattached mind'
dhvāntaṃ tamaḥ 'darkness'
lagnaṃ saktam 'attached'
mliṣṭam avispaṣṭam 'indistinct'
virabdhiḥ svaraḥ 'a note or tune'
phāṇṭam anāyāsaḥ 'easily extracted; medicinal potion'
bāḍham bhṛśam 'excessive'

1. This is a *nipātana* rule whereby *iṬ* is blocked in deriving *kṣubdha*, etc., when their corresponding denotation is *mantha*, etc. Thus, *kṣubdha* is derived without *iṬ* when the derivate denotes *mantha* 'moving . . .; churning stick'. The meaning of these derivates is not always easy to determine. For example, *phāṇṭa* may denote one of the five forms of medicinal potions prepared with water: *rasa* 'juice', *kalka* 'paste', *śṛta* 'extraction', *śta* 'cold-extraction' and *phāṇṭa* 'hot-extraction'.

7.2.19 धृषिशसी वैयात्ये

dhṛṣiśasī vaiyātye
/dhṛṣi-śasī 1/2 (*itar. dv.*); *vaiyātye* 7/1 = *virūpaṃ yātaṃ yasya = viyātaḥ; viyātasya bhāvo vaiyātyaḥ, tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18)
vaiyātasya bhāvo vaiyātyam, tatra 'dhṛṣ, śas' ity etayor niṣṭhāyām iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced to an *aṅga*, namely verbal roots *dhṛṣ* 'to dare' and *śas* 'to injure, harm', when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows and derivates denote *vaiyātya* 'impudence'.

EXAMPLES:

dhṛṣṭo' yam 'this one is daring'
viśasto' yam 'this one is arrogant'

1. It is argued that the negation of *iṬ* is already made available to *ÑIdhṛṣĀ* by 7.2.16 *āditaś ca*. Verbal root *śasU* is simialrly denied *iṬ* by 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā*. This negation by 7.2.15 is made against the option of 7.2.56 *udito vā*. Why do we state this negation here? This negation is restrictive in nature. It applies to *dhṛṣ* and *viś* only when derivates denote *vaiyātya* 'impudence'. Elsewhere, for example in *dhṛṣitaḥ* 'overpowered' and *viśasitaḥ* 'mutilated, modified', we do get the introduction of augment *iṬ*. Verbal root *dhṛṣ*, because of its staus as non-*kit*, goes through *guṇa* as usual. *Kāśikā* states that forms of *dhṛṣ* with the denotation of *bhāva* 'root-sense' and *ādikarman* 'onset of an action' are impossible. Haradatta questions this claim (*PM*: *evaṃ cāsya āditve prayojanaṃ cintyam*).

7.2.20 **दृढः स्थूलबलयोः**

dṛḍhaḥ sthūlabalayoḥ
/ dṛḍhaḥ 1/1 *sthūla-balayoḥ* 7/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18)
'*dṛḍha*' *ity nipātyate, sthūle balavati cārthe*
The word *dṛḍha* is derived, via *nipātana*, when the derivate denotes *sthūla* 'stout, huge' and *bala* 'strong'.

EXAMPLES:

dṛḍhaḥ = *sthūlaḥ* 'huge, stout'
dṛḍhaḥ = *balavān* 'strong'

1. This, again, is a *nipātana* rule. Thus, *dṛḍha* is derived from *dṛṃh* + *Kta*, where deletion of *h*, and its preceding nasal, and replacement with *ḍh*, for *t* of *Kta* as well, is accomplished via *nipātana*. Note that this form can also be derived with *dṛh* as the verb. In this case, we do not have to delete the nasal, via *nipātana*.

Why can we not just replace *h* with *ḍh*, via *nipātana*, and then delete *ḍh* subsequently by 8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ*. This is not acceptable. For, this deletion of *ḍh* will become *asiddha* (8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*) in view of application of *ra*, as a replacement (6.4.161 *ra ṛto . . .*) for *ṛ* in deriving *draḍhimā* and *draḍhīyān*. The *ra*-replacement will thus be blocked. A replacement in *ay*, for *Ṅi* of 6.4.54 *lyapi laghupūrvāt*, will be similarly blocked in deriving *paridṛḍhayya* (*gataḥ*). This will also make affix *ṢyaÑ* (4.1.78 *aṇiñor anārṣayor gurūpottamayoḥ*) applicable in deriving *paridṛḍhī*, parallel to *paridṛḍhasyāpatyaṃ kanyā* 'female offspring of Paridṛḍha'.

The condition of *sthūlabalayoḥ* is imposed so that, elsewhere, we can get forms with *iṬ*. Thus, *dṛṃhitam* and *dṛhitam*, depending on whether the root is read with a nasal.

7.2.21 **प्रभौ परिवृढः**

prabhau parivṛḍhaḥ
/ prabhau 7/1 *parivṛḍhaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18)
'*parivṛḍhaḥ*' *iti nipātyate prabhuś ced bhavati*
The word *parivṛḍha* is derived, via *nipātana*, provided the derivate denotes *prabhu* 'lord, master'.

EXAMPLES:

parivṛḍhaḥ (*kuṭumbī*) 'head of the clan'
parivṛḍhayya (*gataḥ*) 'he left after owning'
pārivṛḍhī (*kanyā*) 'a girl received in marriage'

1. There are two roots involved: *bṛṃh* and *bṛhI* 'to grow'. This *nipātana* is

similar to that of *dṛḍhaḥ* of the previous rule. Deletion of *ḍh* and a conflict with 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham* constitute the basis for *nipātana.*

Notice that *parivṛḍhayya* is formed with *LyaP.* Affix *ṆiC* is introduced after *vṛḍh,* subsequent to which affix *Ktvā* is introduced after *vraḍhi.* A compound is then formed with *pari,* subsequent to which *Ktvā* is replaced with *LyaP.* If *ṆiC* were to be introduced after *parivṛḍh,* we will find accentual problems in *parivṛḍhayati.* Rule 8.2.28 *tiṅṅatiṅaḥ* assigns *nighāta* to a *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ,* used in combination after one which does not. Introducing *ṆiC* after *parivṛḍh* necessarily accepts *pari* as part of the *tiṄ*-form *parivṛḍhayati.* For proper accent, we must have *pari* not included as part of *vṛḍhayati,* a *pada* ending in a *tiṄ.* This is the reason why *ṆiC* (and *Ktvā*) are introduced after *vṛṃhI* (*vṛhI*). Refer to derivational details in the appendix.

Derivates outside the meaning of *prabhu* 'lord' will be: *parivṛṃhitam* 'prosperous' and *parivṛhitam,* with *iṬ* and no deletion.

7.2.22 कृच्छ्रगहनयोः कषः

kṛcchragahanayoḥ kaṣaḥ
/kṛcchra-gahanayoḥ 7/2 (*itar. dv.*) *kaṣaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18)
'*kṛcchra, gahana*' *ity etayor arthayoḥ kaṣer dhātor niṣṭhāyām iḍ āgamo na bhavati*

Augment *iṬ* is not introduced relative to an *aṅga,* namely verbal root *kaṣ,* when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows, and the derivate signifies *kṛcchra* 'suffering, misery' and *gahana* 'deep'.

EXAMPLES:

kaṣṭo' gniḥ '(heaping the ritual) fire is painful'
kaṣṭo vyākaraṇam 'study of grammar is painful'
kaṣṭāni vanāni 'forests are painful . . .'
kaṣṭāḥ parvatāḥ 'mountains are painful . . .'

1. An *iṬ* is not introduced when a *niṣṭhā* affix follows verbal root *kaṣ,* and the derivate denotes *kṛcchra* 'difficult' and *gahana* 'deep, impenetrable'. A lack of proper understanding of *iḍāgamādivyavasthā* 'process of *iṬ*-augmentation, etc.' can turn into a nightmare for a student of grammar. Not knowing how to heap a ritual fire can also turn into pain for a student of ritual sacrifices (*PM: cīyamāno' gnir atra . . . cayanaprakārasya durjñānatvāt kaṣṭo bhavati. vyākaraṇasya kaṣṭatvam iḍāgamādivyavasthāyā durjñānatvāt*). It is the source of *kaṣṭa* which is denoted literally, or figuratively, as *kṛcchra* and *gahana.* We will get *iṬ* outside these two meanings. Thus, *kaṣitaṃ suvarṇam* 'tested (on the touchstone) gold'.

7.2.23 घुषिरविशब्दने

ghuṣir aviśabdane

/ghuṣiḥ 1/1 *aviśabdane* 7/1 = *na viśabdanam* (*nañ.*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18)
ghuṣer dhātor aviśabdane' rthe niṣṭhāyām iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced relative to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *ghuṣI*, when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows, and the derivate signifies *aviśabdana* 'non-expression with words'.

EXAMPLES:

ghuṣṭā rajjuḥ 'braided rope'
ghuṣṭau pādau 'crooked legs'

1. An absence of *viśabdana* is *aviśabdana*. The word *viśabdana* is explained as *svābhiprāyasya śabdenā' viṣkaraṇam* 'expressing one's intent with words'. Note that *bhvādi* and *curādi* roots both are here specified with *ghuṣi*. The *bhvādi* root denotes *śabda* 'noise'; the *curādi* denotes *aviśabdana* 'non-expression with words'. If the specification refers to *ghuṣ* of *curādi*, *ṆiC* will be introduced, anyway. This *ghuṣ* with *ṆiC* does not offer anything special with regard to augment *iṬ*. If *iṬ* is introduced then we will get *ghoṣita*, through deletion of *ṆiC* by 6.4.52 *niṣṭhāyāṃ seṭi*. If *iṬ* is not introduced, we could still get *ghoṣita*, through non-deletion of *ṆiC*. A non-*ṆiC ghuṣ*, for reasons of being *ekāc* 'monosyllabic', will not qualify for negation of *iṬ*. The *bhvādi* root *ghuṣ* does not require any negation by *aviśabdane*. For, its usage in the sense of *viśabdana* is not found. What would this negation by *aviśabdane* indicate? It indicates that the *ṆiC* of *ghuṣ*, signifying *viśabdana*, is non-obligatory (*anitya*). That is, *ṆiC* may also not be used after it. This is how accepting the *anitya* 'non-obligatory' status of *ṆiC*, after verbal root *ghuṣ* used with the meaning of *viśabdana*, that we get *jughuṣuḥ* 'they expressed their intent in words' in the perfect. If not, the form will be *ghoṣāyāñcakruḥ*, with an obligatory *iṬ*. All told, the *curādi* verbal root *ghuṣ* allows *iṬ* only optionally. Some still believe that *ṆiC* of all *curādi* roots is non-obligatory (*anitya*). They claim that verbal root *citI* 'to remember' is specified with *I* as an *it*. This, in turn, indicates that 7.1.58 *idito num dhātoḥ* will introduce *nUM*. Since this *nUM* will be retained, we will get forms such as *cintita*. If *ṆiC* was obligatory, then, because of no deletion of *n*, the specification should have been made as *cinta smṛtyām*. The following verse summarises it:

citi smṛtyām itīditvam atra jñāpakam asya hi
phalaṃ cintita ity ādau nalopo mā sma bhūd iti/
nitye ca ṇici saty atra nalopasyāprasaṅgataḥ
cinta smṛtyām ity eva ca paṭhitavyaṃ bhaved iti//

7.2.24 अर्देः संनिविभ्यः

ardeḥ saṃnivibhyaḥ
/ardeḥ 6/1 *saṃ-ni-vi-bhyaḥ* 5/3 (*itar. dv.*)/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18)
'*sam, ni, vi*' *ity etebhya uttarasyārder niṣṭhāyām iḍ āgamo na bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced relative to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *ardA* 'torment, afflict, kill' used after the preverbs *sam, ni* and *vi*, when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows.

EXAMPLES:

samarṇaḥ 'capable, appropriate'
nyarṇaḥ 'agitated'
vyarṇaḥ 'useless, afflicted'

1. This rule negates *iṬ* when verbal root *ard* is used with the preverbs *sam, ni* and *vi*, and a *niṣṭhā* affix follows. Thus, consider *samarṇaḥ*, where *ard* is used with *sam* before *Kta*. The *t* of *Kta*, and its preceding *d* as well, is replaced with *n* (8.2.42 *radābhyām . . .*). We get *sam* + *ar*(*d*→*n*) + (*t*→*n*) *a* = *sam* + *ar*(*n*→*ṇ*) + *na* = *sam* + *arṇ* + *na*, through *ṇ*-replacement of *n* (*ṇatva*; 8.4.1 *raṣābhyām . . .*). The following *n* is also replaced with *ṇ* through application of 8.4.40 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*. Finally, the preceding *ṇ* is deleted (8.4.63 *halo yamāṃ yami lopaḥ*) to produce *sam* + *ar*(*ṇ*→ϕ) + (*t*→*n*→*ṇ*) *a* = *samarṇa*.

The condition of *ardeḥ* is imposed so that *iṬ* could be introduced, for example, in *samedhitaḥ*. The condition of *sannivibhyaḥ* is needed so that in *arditaḥ*, because of *ard* not used after *sam, ni* and *vi*, *iṬ* could be allowed.

7.2.25 अभेश्चाविदूर्ये

abheś cāvidūrye
/*abheḥ* 5/1 *ca* ϕ *āvidūrye* 7/1 = *viśeṣeṇa dūram* = *vidūram*; *na vidūram* = *avidūram* (*nañ.*); *tasya bhāvaḥ* = *āvidūryam*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18)
abhiśabdād uttarasyārder āvidūrye' rthe niṣṭhāyām iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced relative to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *ardA*, used after the preverb *abhi*, provided an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows, and the derivate signifies *āvidūrya* 'proximity'.

EXAMPLES:

abhyarṇā senā 'the army is in the vicinity'
abhyarṇā śarat 'autumn is around the corner'

1. This rule negates *iṬ* in contexts where *ard* is used with the preverb *abhi* and a *niṣṭhā* suffix follows. The word *āvidūrya* is explained as denoting the sense of *avidūra* 'not very far'. Note that *āvidūrya* is derived with affix *ŚyaÑ*. This affix denoting *bhāva* 'root-sense' is negated after a *tatpuruṣa* compound used in combination after *naÑ* (5.3.121 *na nañpūrvāt . . .*). How do we then get *āvidūrya*? This specification of *āvidūrye* itself indicates that *ṆyaÑ* is not negated by affixes specified by 5.3.121 *na nañpūrvāt . . .*, etc.

7.2.26 णेरध्ययने वृत्तम्

ṇer adhyayane vṛttam
/ṇeḥ 6/1 *adhyayane* 7/1 *vṛttam* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18)
ṇyantasya vṛtter niṣṭhāyām adhyayanārthe 'vṛttam' itīḍ abhāvo ṇiluk ca nipātyate
The word *vṛtta* is derived, via *nipātana*, relative to verbal root *vṛtI* terminating in *ṆiC*, used with the signification of *adhyayana* 'study'.

EXAMPLES:

vṛtto guṇo devadattena 'Devadatta has completed the study of *guṇa* (a study relative to *pada*, *krama* and *saṃhitā* recitations)'
vṛttaṃ pārāyaṇaṃ devadattena 'Devadatta has completed the study of *pārāyaṇa* (a set of texts)'

1. Note that *vṛt* is intransitive (*akarmaka*) which, when used with *ṆiC*, becomes transitive (*sakarmaka*). Affix *Kta*, with the denotatum of an object, is found after *vṛt*, as is attested by Pāṇini's own usage in rules 4.2.68 *tena nirvṛttam* and 5.1.79 *tena nirvṛttam*. That is, we can get *vṛttaḥ* of *vṛtto guṇo devadattena* from *vṛt*, anyway. This *nipātana* is thus not necessary to be stated. Some want to make sure that *varttitam*, a derivate of *vṛt* with *ṆiC* and *Kta*, is not used when the signification is *adhyayana* 'study'. For this, the *nipātana* must be stated to accomplish an absence of *iṬ* and *LUK*-deletion of *ṆiC*. This *LUK*-deletion, in turn, blocks applications relative to affixes (1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya*). Others, however, also desire *varttitaḥ*, as in *varttito guṇo devadattena*, with the signification of *adhyayana*.

7.2.27 वा दान्तशान्तपूर्णदस्तस्पष्टच्छन्नज्ञप्ताः

vā dāntaśāntapūrṇadastaspaṣṭacchannajñaptāḥ
/vā ϕ dānta-śānta-pūrṇa-dasta-spaṣṭa-cchanna-jñaptāḥ 1/3 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18 *ṇeḥ* #26)
'dam, śam, pūrī, das, spaś, chad, jñap' ity eteṣāṃ ṇyantānāṃ dhātūnāṃ vā aniṭatvaṃ nipātyate
The words *dānta*, *śānta*, *pūrṇa*, *dasta*, *spaṣṭa*, *channa*, and *jñapta* are derived, optionally, via *nipātana*, from verbal roots *dam* 'to be tamed, be calm', *śam* 'to be calm, tranquil', *pūrī* 'to fill, be filled', *das* 'to throw, toss', *spaś* 'to touch', *chad* 'to cover', and *jñap* 'to know, inform' when ending in *ṆiC*.

EXAMPLES:

dāntaḥ / damitaḥ
śāntaḥ / śamitaḥ
pūrṇaḥ / pūritaḥ

dastaḥ / dāsitaḥ
spaṣṭaḥ / spāśitaḥ
channaḥ / chāditaḥ
jñaptaḥ / jñāpitaḥ

1. This again is a *nipātana* rule. Verbal roots *dam, śam, pūr, das, spaś, chad,* and *jñap* receive *iṬ* in their derivates with affix *Kta,* optionally. Given *śam* + *Kta* and *dam* + *Kta,* the *a* of *śam* and *dam* gets replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart (6.4.15 *anunāsikasya . . .*). That is, when deletion of *ṆiC* and negation of *iṬ* is accomplished, via *nipātana.* Recall that *śam* and *dam* are considered *mit* 'marked with *M* as an *it*' (*DP: janijṝkṣna . . .*). The penultimate *vṛddhi* which they receive from 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ* is replaced with its short counterpart (6.4.92 *mitāṃ hrasvaḥ*). Rule 6.4.15 *anunāsikasya . . .* then replaces the same with its long counterpart. The short replacement of 6.4.92 *mitāṃ hrasvaḥ* is also seen in *śamitaḥ* and *damitaḥ.* The *t* of the *niṣṭhā* suffix *Kta,* in deriving *pūr* + *Kta* → *pūrṇa,* is replaced with *ṇ* (8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ . . .*). The penultimate *vṛddhi* of *das* + *Kta* = *dasta, spaś* + *Kta* = *spaṣṭa* and *jñap* + *Kta* = *jñapta* goes through shortening, via *nipātana.* An inclusion of *jñap* is made here to facilitate optional *iṬ* (7.2.49 *sanīvantardha . . .*), which would have been obligatorily negated by 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā.*

7.2.28 रुष्यमत्वरसङ्घुषास्वनाम्

ruṣyamatvarasaṅghuṣāsvanām
/ ruṣy-ama-tvara-saṅghuṣa-āsvanām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18 *vā* #27)
'*ruṣi, ama, tvara, saṅghuṣa, āsvana*' *ity eteṣāṃ niṣṭhāyāṃ vā iḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is, optionally, not introduced relative to an *aṅga,* namely *rusI* 'to be angry', *amA* 'to move, etc.', *tvarA* 'to hurry' and *ghuṣA* 'to make indistinct noise' used with the preverb *sam,* and *svanA* 'to sound' used with the preverb *ā,* when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows.

EXAMPLES:

ruṣṭaḥ
ruṣitaḥ
abhyāntaḥ
abhyamitaḥ
tūrṇaḥ
tvaritaḥ
saṅghuṣṭau
saṅghuṣitau (*pādau*)
āsvānto devadattaḥ
āsvanito devadattaḥ

1. Note that the *anuvṛtti* of *vā* is valid. Thus, there is no optional *iṬ* after

ruṣI, amA, tvarA, saṅghuṣA and *āsvanA*, when a *niṣṭhā* suffix follows. Inclusion of *ruṣI* is made here to facilitae optional *iṬ* against the obligatorily negation of 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā* which, in turn, goes against optional *iṬ* of 7.2.48 *tīṣasahalubharuṣariṣaḥ*. Deriving *abhyāmita*, from *abhi* + *am* + *Kta*, involves penultimate lengthening (*upadhādīrgha*; 8.3.4 *anunāsikasya . . .*), *yaÑ*, and *m→ṃ→n* (*anusvāra-parasavarṇa*, 8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*; 8.4.58 *anusvārasya yayi . . .*). A derivate with *iṬ* will be *abhyamita*. Deriving *tvar* + *Kta* = *tūrṇa* involves a replacement in *ūṬH* for which refer to notes under 6.4.20 *jvaratvarasrivya. . . .* Recall that this optional *iṬ* for *tvar* is made available against the obligatory negation of 7.2.16 *āditaś ca*. Deriving *saṅghuṣṭa* and *saṅghuṣita* also involves optional *iṬ*. Additionally, appropriate applications of *ṣtutva* (*t→ṭ*), *anusvāra* (*m→ṃ*) and *parasavarṇa* (*ṃ→ṅ*) are also needed. The *bhvādi* and *curādi* verbal roots both are included within the reference of *ghuṣIR*. Commentators explains that *ghuṣIR* of the *curādi* class, when not used with *sam*, falls within the scope of 7.2.23 *ghuṣir aviśabdane*. That is, when the signification is *aviśabdana* 'non-expression of intent with words'. This is how we get *ghuṣṭā rajjuḥ* and *ghuṣitau pādau*. This same *ghuṣIR* falls within the scope of our present rule when *sam* is used and the derivate denotes *viśabdana* 'expression of one's intent in words'. Thus, we get (*saṃghuṣitam*) / (*saṃghuṣṭam*) *vākyam āha*. Rule 7.2.23, and our present rule, both become applicable to *ghuṣIR* when it is used with *sam* and the derivate denotes *aviśabdana*. Our present rule blocks the earlier rule on the basis of *vipratiṣedha*. The penultimate *vṛddhi* is not applied in deriving *āÑ-svan* + *Kta* = *āsvanita*, when the option of *iṬ* is accepted. We get *āsvāntam* when this optional *iṬ* is not accepted. This optional *iṬ* blocks the *nipātana* of 7.2.18 *kṣubdhasvānta-tadhvānta . . .* on the basis of *paratva* 'subsequent order of enumeration'.

7.2.29 हृषेर्लोमसु

hṛṣer lomasu
/ hṛṣeḥ 6/1 *lomasu* 7/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18 *vā* #27)
lomasu vartamānasya hṛṣer niṣṭhāyāṃ vā iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is, optionally, not introduced relative to an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *hṛṣA* 'to rejoice', when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows and the signification is *loman* 'hair'.

EXAMPLES:

hṛṣṭāni / hṛṣitāni (*lomāni*) 'excited pores'
hṛṣṭāḥ keśāḥ / hṛṣitāḥ keśāḥ 'excited hairs'

1. This rule does not, optionally, allow *iṬ* to *hṛṣU* 'to be pleased', when a *niṣṭhā* affix follows and when *loman* 'hair, pores' is characterized. Example derivates describe a joyous or unhappy state of mind, as reflected by the

state of hair and pores on body. There are two verbal roots which are both covered by this rule: *hṛṣU alīke* 'to be displeased, deceive' and *hṛṣ* 'to be happy'. The first verbal root is marked with *U* as an *it*. It is offered optional *iṬ*-status of 7.2.56 *udito vā*. However, this *iṬ*-status becomes unavailable (*aprāpta*) to this root when it is used before a *niṣṭhā* suffix. The second verb, i.e., *hṛṣA* 'to be happy' is, of course, a root used with *iṬ* (*seṭ*; *prāpta*). The option of *iṬ* which was not available to *hṛṣU* (*aprāpta*) is here made available (*prāpta*). The status of usage with *iṬ* which was available to *hṛṣA* (*prāpta*) is here made optional (*aprāpta*). The option of this rule is thus characterized as *ubhayatra-vibhāṣā* 'an option, not made available, and made available, both'.

The word *loman* here refers to 'hair' on 'head' (*mūrdhā*) as well as on 'body' (*aṅga*; *Kāś*: *lomāni mūrdhajāni aṅgajāni ca sāmānyena gṛhyante*). How can a root having the signification of action is here spoken of as having its application in a substance (*dravya*), i.e., *loman*? It is stated that such an application of action is possible by way of meaning (*arthadvāreṇa*). Recall that it is the meaning of *hṛṣ* which *loman* accomplishes. Thus, action becomes part of the scope of 'hair'.

2. What is the purpose of specifying *lomasu*? Consider *hṛṣṭo devadattaḥ* 'Devadatta is unhappy' and *hṛṣito devadattaḥ* 'Devadatta is happy' where the first sentence uses *hṛṣU* with the signification of 'displeasure'. The second sentence uses *hṛṣA* with the signification of 'pleasure'. Since these two sentences do not have a common semantic scope of actions relative to *loman* they cannot be allowed optional *iṬ* of this rule. They will each have separate forms: *hṛṣṭa* and *hṛṣita*.

3. A *vārttika* proposal denies *iṬ*, optionally, when derivates share the scope of *vismita* 'shocked, startled' and *pratighāta* 'counter-attack'. Consider *hṛṣṭo devadattaḥ / hṛṣito devadattaḥ* 'Devadatta is shocked'. Now consider *hṛṣṭā dantāḥ/hṛṣitā dantāḥ* 'teeth broke'.

7.2.30 अपचितश्च

apacitaś ca
/apacitaḥ 1/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *neṭi* #8 *niṣṭhāyām* #18 *vā* #27)
'*apacitaḥ*' *iti vā nipātyate*
The word *apacita* is also derived, optionally, via *nipātana*.

EXAMPLES:

apacito' nena guruḥ 'the teacher was seen by him'
apacāyito' nena guruḥ 'the teacher was respected by him'

1. The word *apacita* is optionally derived, via *nipātana*. We thus get *apacito gurur anena* 'the teacher was seen by him' and *apacāyito gurur anena* 'the teacher was respected by him'. Note that verbal root *cāyṚ* has two meanings:

pūjā 'worship, respect' and *niśāmana* 'seeing'. The *nipātana* of this rule applies to derivates with the meaning of *niśāmana*. Thus, we get *cāy*(*Ṛ*) + *Kta*→ (*cāy*→*ci*) + *ta* = *cita*. Absence of *iṬ* and replacement of *cāy* with *ci* are accomplished via *nipātana*. We will get *apacāyita* with *iṬ* and no replacement of *cāy* with *ci* if optional *nipātana* is not accepted.

2. A *vārttika* proposal notes that *cāy* is obligatorily replaced with *ci*, via *nipātana*, when affix *KtiN* follows. Consider *cāy*→*ci* + (*K*)*ti*(*N*) = *citiḥ*, as in *apacitiḥ* 'praise, worship'.

7.2.31 हु ह्वरेश्छन्दसि

hru hvareś chandasi
/*hru* (1/1 deleted) *hvareḥ* 6/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *niṣṭhāyām* #18)
hvarater dhātor niṣṭhāyāṃ chandasi 'hru' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
The form *hru* comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *hvṛ* 'be crooked', in the Vedic, when an affix termed *niṣṭhā* follows.

EXAMPLES:

hrutasya cāhrutasya ca 'of that which is crooked and that which is not'
ahrútamasi havirdhānam

1. Note that a specification of verbal root *hvṛ* 'be crooked' is here made with its modified *guṇa* form *hv*(*ṛ*→*ar*) = *hvar*. Note further that this monosyllabic verbal root is marked with *anudātta*. Consequently, it cannot avail augment *iṬ* (cf. 7.2.10 *ekāc upadeśe' nudāttāt*), anyway. This rule is then intended for purposes of replacement in *guṇa* only. Thus, (*hvar*→*hru*) + (*K*) *ta* → *hruta*, etc., with no *iṬ*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *chandasi*? Consider the classical usage *hvṛtam*, where the root does not go through any replacement.

7.2.32 अपरिह्वृताश्च

aparihvṛtāś ca
/*aparihvṛtāḥ* 1/3 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *niṣṭhāyām* #18 *chandasi* #31)
'*aparihvṛtāḥ*' *nipātyante chandasi viṣaye*
The word *apahvṛtā* is derived, via *nipātana*, in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

apárihvṛtāḥ sanuyāma vājám

1. A specification with *aparihvṛtāḥ* indicates that this Vedic usage is always found in plural. What is accomplished here, via *nipātana*? An absence of replacement in *hru*, as could be expected from application of the preceding rule.

7.2.33 **सोमे ह्वरितः**

some hvaritaḥ
/some 7/1 *hvaritaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *niṣṭhāyām* #18 *chandasi* #31)
'*hvaritaḥ*' *iti hvarater niṣṭhāyām iḍāgamo guṇaś ca nipātyate chandasi viṣaye, somaś ced bhavati*
The word *hvarita* is derived in the Vedic, via *nipātana*, when the derivate is to denote *soma*.

EXAMPLES:

mā naḥ somo hvaritaḥ 'let our Soma not be stolen'

1. This rule derives *hvaritaḥ*, a *niṣṭhā* (1.1.28 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) derivate of *hvṛ* 'to be crooked', via *nipātana*, in the Vedic. Recourse is here taken to *nipātana* for *iṬ* and *guṇa*. Thus, *hvṛ* + *Kta* → *hvṛ* + *iṬ* + *Kta* → *hv*(*ṛ*→*ar*) + *iṬ* + *Kta* → *hvarita*.

7.2.34 **ग्रसितस्कभितस्तभितोत्तभितचत्तविकस्ताविशस्तृशंस्तृ-**
शास्तृतरुतृतरूतृवरुतृवरूतृवरूत्रीरुज्ज्वलितिक्षरितिक्षमितिवमित्यमितीति च

grasitaskabhitastabhitottabhitacattavikastā viśastṛśaṃstṛśāstṛtarutṛtarūtṛvarutṛvarūtṛvarūtrīrujjvalitikṣaritikṣamitivamityamitīti ca
/grasitaḥ-skabhita-stabhita-uttabhita-catta-vikastāḥ 1/3 (*itar. dv.*); *viśastṛ, śaṃstṛ, śāstṛ, tarutṛ, tarūtṛ, varutṛ, varūtṛ* (1/1 deleted in all seven); *varutrīḥ* (1/3), *ujjvaliti, kṣariti, vamiti, amiti* (1/1 also deleted in these four); *iti* ϕ *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *niṣṭhāyām* #18 *chandasi* #31)
The words *grasita* 'devoured', *skabhita* 'arrested', *stabhita* 'fixed, stupefied', *uttabhita* 'stopped', *catta* 'hidden', *vikasta* 'blown', *viśastṛ* 'dissector', *śaṃstṛ* 'a reciter of praise', *śāstṛ* 'instructor', *tarutṛ* 'he who goes across', *tarūtṛ, varutṛ* 'chooser, protector', *varūtṛ, varūtrīḥ, ujjvaliti* 'flares up', *kṣariti* 'tickles down, drips', *vamiti* 'vomits, emits', and *amiti* 'proceeds' are also derived, in the Vedic, via *nipātana*.

EXAMPLES:

grasitám vā etát sómasya
viṣkábhite ajaré
yena svástabhitam
satyenottábhitā bhūmiḥ
catā varṣeṇa vidyut
utānáyā hṛdáyaṃ yád vikastam
ekastvaṣṭur aśvásyāviśastā
uta śaṃstā suvipraḥ

práśāstā
tarutāraṃ rathānām
tarūtāram
varūtāram
várūtrīṣṭvā devīr viśvadevyāvatī
agnir ujjvaliti
stokaṃ kṣariti
stomaṃ kṣamiti
yaḥ somaṃ vamiti
abhyamiti varuṇaḥ
ravim abhyamīti varuṇaḥ

1. Note that *grasita, skabhita, stabhita, uttabhita* involve introduction of augment *iṬ*, via *nipātana*. Verbal roots *grasU* 'to eat', *skambhU* 'to obstruct' and *stambhU* 'to become stiff, stupefied' are marked with *U* as an *it* (*udit*; 7.2.56 *udito vā*). Consequently, rule 7.2.56 *udito vā* offers augment *iṬ*, optionally. This, however, gets negated by rule 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā*. Our present rule offers it again, via *nipātana*. The nasal of *skambhU* and *stambhU* is deleted by 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala upadhāyāḥ knīti*. Now consider *uttabhita* where *s* of the root is changed similar to the preceding homogeneous *t*. Thus, *ut* + *sta*(*m*→ϕ) *bh* + *iṬ* + *Kta* → *uttabhita*. Recall that the classical language does not allow *iṬ*. Thus we get *grastam, viṣkabdham* and *stabdham*. The *t*→*dh* and *bh*→*b* (*jaśtva*) replacements in *viṣkabdha* is accomplished by 8.2.40 *jhaṣastathordho' dhaḥ* and 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*, respectively.

Now consider our next two examples, *catta* (*cat* 'to beg') and *vikasta* (*kas* 'to move'), where *cat* + *Kta* and *vi-kas* + *Kta* are not allowed *iṬ*, again via *nipātana*. The classical language has *catitā* and *vikastam* as parallel forms. Examples such as *vi-śas* + *tṛC* = *viśastṛ, śams* + *tṛ* = *śaṃstṛ* (*śaṃs* 'to praise') and *śās* + *tṛ* = *śāstṛ* (*śās* 'to instruct') also involve non-introduction of *iṬ*, via *nipātana*. The classical language has *viśasitā, śaṃsitā* and *praśāsitam* as parallel forms.

Examples such as *tarutṛ, tarūtṛ, varutṛ, varūtṛ*, and *varūtrīḥ* are forms of *tṝ* 'to float', *vṛṄ* and *vṛÑ* 'to choose, select' where augments *uṬ* and *ūṬ* are introduced via *nipātana*. Thus, we get *tarutāraṃ rathānām*, etc. The classical language has *taritāram* and *tarītāram* with optional lengthening of *i*. We similarly get *varutāram* and *varūtāram* with corresponding classical forms *varitāram* and *varītāram*. Note that *v*(*ṛ*→*ar*) *ūṬ* + *tṛC* = *varūtṛ* gets *ṄīP* of 4.1.5 *ṛnnebhyo ṅīp*. Or else, one can also accept *ṄīP*, via *nipātana*. Examples such as *ujjvaliti, kṣariti, kṣamiti, vamiti*, and *amiti* are present indicative active forms of *ud-jval* 'to be aflame', *kṣar* 'to move', *kṣam* 'to endure', *vam* 'to vomit' and *am* 'to move' where *a* of *ŚaP* is replaced by *i*, again via *nipātana*. The classical language has forms such as *ujjvalati, kṣarati, kṣamati, vamati*, and *amati*, respectively. The Vedic examples can also be derived by deleting *ŚaP* and introducing *iṬ*, via *nipātana*.

The word *iti*, at the end of this rule, is used to indicate how similar operations can also be performed in the Vedic, via *nipātana*. Consider *ravim abhyamīti varuṇaḥ* where a long *ī* replaces the *a* of *śaP*.

7.2.35 **आर्धधातुकस्येड्वलादेः**

ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ
/ārahadhātukasya 6/1 *iṭ* 1/1 *valādeḥ* 6/1 = *val ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya/* (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
ārdhadhātukasya valāder iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to an affix which is termed *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārddhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*) and which begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *vaL* (*Śs.* 5-14).

EXAMPLES:

lavitā 'he will cut'
lavitum 'to cut'
lavitavyam 'ought to be cut'
pavitā 'he will cleanse'
pavitum 'to cleanse'
pavitavyam 'ought to be cleansed'

1. Note that *chandasi* is no longer carried over. This rule introduces augment *iṬ* to an affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*) which begins with a sound denoted by *vaL* (*valādiḥ*; *Śs.* 5-14). Refer to *pavitaḥ*, etc., in the appendix (II:441-42) of rule 1.2.22 *pūṅaḥ ktvā ca*, for operations similar to deriving *tṛC*, *tumUN* and *tavyaT* derivates of this rule.

2. Why does Pāṇini use *iṬ* in this rule when he could have easily carried it, via *anuvṛtti*, from rule 7.2.8 *neḍ vaśi kṛti*? Recall that 7.2.5 *neḍ vaśi kṛti* makes a negative provision in association with *iṬ*. Carrying *iṬ* from this earlier rule will also involve carrying the negation of *iṬ* (*Kāś*: *iḍ iti vartamāne punar iḍ grahaṇaṃ pratiṣedhanivṛtyartham*)? But since a negative provision makes sense only when a positive provision is already made, why can we still not anticipate this positive provision, via *anuvṛtti*? That this rule will be making a positive provision against the negative provision of *iṬ* is also clear from the qualification of *valādeḥ*. Since no provision of *iṬ* is made in the context of an *ārdhadhātuka* affix beginning with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *vaL*, this rule can be interpreted as making a provision for *iṬ*. This, however, cannot be accepted. The negative provision of 7.2.8 *neḍ vaśi kṛti* can itself indicate that a positive provision exists (cf. *PM* ad *Kāś*).

3. Why do we have the condition of *ārdhadhātukasya*? Consider *āste*, *śete* and *vaste* where augment *iṬ* cannot be introduced to *te*, an affix termed *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*).

It is argued that no purpose can be served by making a specification in

this rule with the word *ārdhadhātuka.* For, 7.2.76 *rudādibhyaḥ sārvadhātuke* makes a restrictive (*niyama*) provision of *iṬ* only after verbal roots *rud,* etc., when a *sāravdhātuka* affix follows. That is, since *iṬ* will be introduced only when a *sārvadhātuka* affix follows verbal roots *rud,* etc., we will get *iṬ,* elsewhere, when an *ārdhadhātuka* affix follows. This arguement is well taken though this restrictive provision causes prolixity of understanding (*jñānagaurava*). A specification with *ārdhadhātuke* here saves us from this prolixity of understanding. Why can we not interpret this specification with *ārdhadhātuka* to block introduction of *iṬ* to an *aṅga*? After all, this is the domain of *aṅgasya* and an *aṅga* can easily qualify for such introduction. This interpretation is not proper. If this introduction of *iṬ* was intended for an *aṅga,* negating the introduction of *iṬ* to an affix by 7.2.10 *ekāc upadeśe anudāttāt* would not make any sense? Why? Why offer a negation when a positive provision would not be there. A negation of *iṬ* by 1.2.18 *na ktvā seṭ* and 1.2.10 *niṣṭhā śīṅsvidimidi* . . . would also not make any sense, either. Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kās*) further illustrates this point with other examples and rules. I omit this discussion for lack of interest.

What is the significance of using *valādeḥ*? Consider *lavyam, pavyam, lavanīyam* and *pavanīyam* where affix *yaT* does not begin with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *vaL.* We, therefore, do not get augment *iṬ.*

Why do we have *iṬ* expressly mentioned here when the same can be carried over, via *anuvṛtti,* from rule 7.2.8 *neḍ vaśi kṛti*? That *iṬ* is connected with negation indicated by *na* 'not'. An *anuvṛtti* of that *iṬ* (of 7.2.8 *neḍ vaśi kṛti*) would also have occasioned the *anuvṛtti* of negation. The *iṬ* of our present rule makes a positive provision. But the question of negating *iṬ* by its *anuvṛtti* from 7.2.8 does not arise since no positive provision for *iṬ* is made. Well, this rule itself, if it had to make a negative provision, will also make a positive provision. The *iṬ* of this rule is then used to cancel a negative provision.

7.2.36 स्नुक्रमोरनात्मनेपदनिमित्ते

snukramor anātmanepadanimitte
/snukramoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*); *anātmanepadanimitte* 7/1 = */ātmanepadasya nimitte* (*ṣāṣ. tat.*); *nātmanepadasya nimitte* (*nañ.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* #35)
snukramor ārdhadhātukasya valāder iḍ āgamo bhavati, na cet snukramau ātmanepadasya nimittaṃ bhavataḥ
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix which begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *vaL,* and is introduced relative to an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *snu* 'to flow, drip' and *kramU* 'to move', provided *snu* and *kramU* do not condition the use of an affix termed *ātmanepada.*

EXAMPLES:

prasnavitā 'a *tṛC*-derivate of (*pra-snu + iṬ + tṛC*) = *prasnavitṛ + sU* = *prasnavitā*'
prasnavitum 'a *tumUN*-derivate of (*pra-snu + iṬ + tumUN = prasnavitum*)'
prasnavitavyam 'a derivate of (*pra-snu-iṬ + tavyaT*) = *prasnavitavya + sU* = *prasnavitavyam*'
prakramitā 'a derivate of (*pra-kram + iṬ + tṛC*) + *sU*'
prakramitum 'a derivate of *tumUN* . . .'
prakramitavyam 'a derivate of *tavyaT* . . .'

1. This rule is restrictive (*niyama*) in nature. That is, augment *iṬ* is introduced to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix which begins with a sound denoted by *vaL*, and is introduced relative only to an *aṅga* constituted by *snu* and *kram*. Additionally, *snu* and *kram* must not condition the use of affixes termed *ātmanepada*. Where do we find *snu* and *kram* which condition an affix termed *ātmanepada*? Where actions denoted by these roots are treated as forming the basis for introduction of affixes termed *ātmanepada*. For example, *ātmanepada* affixes are introduced after verbal roots *snu* and *kramU* relative to denotation of their *bhāva* 'root-sense', *karman* 'object', *kartṛkarman* 'agent as object' and *karma-vyatihāra* 'reciprocal action'. Rule 1.3.38 *vṛttisargatāyaneṣu kramaḥ* introduces *ātmanepada* in the context of *kram* when what is signified is *vṛtti* 'uninterrupted movement', *sarga* 'enthusiasm' and *tāyana* 'expansion, growth'.

This rule can also be treated as making a somewhat negative (*niṣedha*) provision. For, *snU* and *kramU* are included within the enumeration of roots with *anudātta* in *upadeśa* 'initial citation'. Consequently, *iṬ* is already made available to them. This rule then negates *iṬ* in contexts where the use of *ātmanepada* is conditioned. Thus, we get *prakramitā*, *prakramitum* and *prakramitavyam* where we get *iṬ*, *guṇa* and a replacement in *av*. Of course, when an affix termed *ātmanepada* is not conditioned.

2. Why when the use of *ātmanepada* affixes is not conditioned after these roots (*anātmanepadanimitte*)? The locative of *anātmanepade* with no *nimitte* could have then been interpreted as *parasaptamī* 'a locative which follows'. That is, augment *iṬ* could not be made available when an *ātmanepada* affix followed. This interpretation, since it will accept *ātmanepada* as a qualifier to *snu* and *kram*, would also require the *ātmanepada* affix to follow these roots immediately. This may allow the derivation of *prasnoṣīṣṭa* and *prakraṃsīṣṭa* but may not allow the derivation of *prasnoṣyate* and *prakraṃsyate*. For, *ātmanepada* affixes in these derivates are intervened by *sya*. If *ātmanepada* is accepted as a qualifier to *ārdhadhātuke* we can then account for *prasnoṣyate* and *prakraṃsyate*. However, we may not be able to derive *prasnoṣīṣṭa* and *prakraṃsīṣṭa*. For, augment *sīyUṬ* is part of *ātmanepada* and there will not be any *ārdhadhātuka* affix to follow. If one accepts both of these views, one will

have problems in deriving the desiderative form: *pracikraṃsiṣyate.* For, *ātmanepada* does not follow the *sārvadhātuka* affix immediately.

3. Why do we have to specify the word *nimitta* 'cause, condition'? So that negation could apply to that which begins with *sīyUṬ* (*sīyuḍādi*) and also that, i.e., *saN,* after which there occurs that (*sya*) followed by that (*ātmanepada; tatparaparaḥ*). Consider *prasnoṣīṣṭa* and *prakraṃsīṣṭa* as examples of *sīyuḍādi.* An example of *tatparaparaḥ* 'that, followed by that, followed by that' is offered in the form of *pracikraṃsiṣyate* where *saN,* followed by *sya,* is followed by *ātmanepada.* Refer to the earlier paragraph, especially relative to the interpretation of locative as *parasaptamī,* for understanding the negation in this view. For example, the *iṬ* of *saN* cannot be negated if locative of *ātmanepade* is interpreted as *parasaptamī* 'that which follows'. For, *sya* will be intervening. We can get this negation of *iṬ* if *nimitte* is used in relation to *snu* and *kramU.* For, we will then get *snu* and *kramU* as *nimmitta* of *ātmanepada* everywhere in examples such as *prasnoṣīṣṭa, prakaṃsīṣṭa; prasnoṣyate, prakraṃsyate; prasusnūṣiṣyate* and *pracikraṃsiṣyate* (*Kāś. sarvatraivātra snautiḥ kramiś cātmanepadasya nimittam*).

4. A *vārttika* proposal also desires negation (*pratiṣedha*) of *iṬ* when *kramU,* with the scope of *ātmanepada,* is not used with *ātmanepada,* and an affix termed *kṛt* with the denotation of agent (*kartṛ*) follows. Thus, we do not get *iṬ* in (*prakram* + *tṛC*) + *sU* → *prakrantā*; and (*upakram* + *tṛC*) + *sU* → *upakrantā.* Consider *prakramitavyam* and *upakramitavyam* where affix *tavyaT* is used with the signification of *bhāva* or *karman.* Since the denotation is not *kartṛ* 'agent', we do not get the negation of *iṬ.* Also consider *niṣkramitā* where negation cannot apply because the root has scope for active endings (*parasmaipada*) only.

Note further that a negation of *iṬ* can be accomplished after *snu* by rules 7.2.12 *śryukaḥ kiti* and 7.2.12 *sani grahaguhoś ca,* especially when *saN,* or an affix marked with *K* as an *it,* follows.

7.2.37 ग्रहोऽलिटि दीर्घः

graho' liṭi dīrghaḥ
/grahaḥ 5/1 *aliṭi* 7/1 = *na liṭ* (*nañ.*), *tasmin; dīrghaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* #35)
graha uttarasya iṭaḥ aliṭi dīrgho bhavati
An *iṬ* which occurs after verbal root *grah* 'to seize, hold' and is introduced to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix beginning with the abbreviatory symbol *vaL* (*Śs.* 5-14), though other than one replacing a *LIṬ,* is replaced with a long *ī.*

EXAMPLES:

grahītā 'he will seize'
grahītum 'for seizing'
grahītavyam '. . . ought to be seized'

1. This rule introduces long *ī* as a replacement for the short of *iṬ*, introduced to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix other than one replacing *LIṬ*. Thus, we get *grah* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *tṛ*(*C*) → *grah* + (*i*→*ī*) + *tṛ* = *grahītṛ*, etc. This rule allows a long replacement only for that *iṬ* which is specified here in this section. That is, it must be an *iṬ* which begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *vaL*. It cannot replace an *iṬ* which is gotten under the provision of *ciṇvadbhāva* 'treatment similar to when *CiṆ* follows' (*Kāś*: *prakṛtasyeṭo dīrghatvam, idaṃ ciṇvad iṭo na bhavati*). See my notes under 6.4.62 *syasicsīyuṭ* . . . for additional details. Thus, the *iṬ* of *grāhitā* and *grāhiṣyate* cannot be replaced with its long counterpart, clearly because *iṬ* is not introduced, here, after *grah*. It is introduced after the causal root *grāhi*. It is to make clear that *iṬ* is introduced after *grah* that *Kāśikā* states: *graha uttarasya* 'in place of that which occurs after *grah*'. Incidentally, the *iṬ* which is carried over here, via *anuvṛtti*, is speicifed with the nominative in rule 7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*. It is here transformed into genitive in view of the ablative of *grahaḥ*, with support from 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*.

The condition of *aliṭi* 'when a non-*LIṬ* . . .' is specified so that this long replacement does not apply to the first personal dual and plural forms of *LIṬ*, i.e., *jagṛhiva* and *jagṛhima*.

7.2.38 वृतो वा

vṝto vā

/vṝtaḥ 5/1 = *vṛ ca ṝt ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tasmāt*; *vā* ϕ/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* #35 *aliṭi dīrghaḥ* #37)

'*vṛ*' *iti vṛñvṛñoḥ sāmānyena grahaṇam*; *tasmād uttarasya, ṝkārāntebhyaś ceṭo vā dīrgho bhavati*

An *iṬ* which, when introduced to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix beginning with *vaL*, after verbal root *vṛ* (*VṛṄ* 'to choose'/*vṛÑ* 'to cover'), and also after roots which end in *ṝ* (long), is optionally replaced with its long counterpart (*ī*).

EXAMPLES:

varitā/*varītā* '*tṛC*-derivates of *vṛ* 'to choose''

prāvaritā/*prāvarītā* '*tṛC*-derivates of *vṝ* 'to cover used with the preverb *pra*''

taritā/*tarītā* '*tṛC*-derivates of *tṝ* 'to float''

āstaritā/*āstarītā* '*tṛC*-derivate of *ā-stṝ* 'to cover''

1. The *vṛ* of *vṛtaḥ* makes a general reference to both *vṛṄ* and *vṛÑ*, especially since this rule lacks any particular specification to the contrary (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *sāmānyenagrahaṇam iti viśeṣānupādānāt*). It also includes references to roots which end in *ṝ*. Thus, the *i* (of *iṬ*) which occurs after such roots is optionally replaced with its long counterpart.

2. Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kāś*) considers five possible interpretations of *vṛtaḥ*, based on which this rule could have been formulated:

(*i*) *vṛtaḥ* refers to *vṝ* where the root signifies the action of *varaṇa* 'to choose'.
(*ii*) *vṛtaḥ* refers to (*i*) plus other roots ending in *ṝ*.
(*iii*) *vṛtaḥ* refers to (*i*) plus other roots ending in a short *ṛ*.
(*iv*) *vṛtaḥ* refers to *vṛṄ* and *vṛÑ* plus other roots ending in a short *ṛ*.
(*v*) *vṛtaḥ* refers to *vṛṄ* and *vṛÑ* plus other roots ending in a long *ṝ*.

If the first interpretation is accepted, this rule should have specified *vṛtaḥ* as *vraḥ* with a replacement in *yaṄ* similar to the specification of *graḥ* (8.2.20 *gro yaṅi*). Interpretation (*ii*) could not be accepted since a separate mention of *vṝ* will be useless. Roots which end in *ṝ* will account for it. The third interpretation is also faulty. For, a specification with *vṛtaḥ* (cf. 7.4.10 *ṛtaś ca saṃyogādeḥ*) where *ṛ* is short, will become unnecessary. One can carry the *anuvṛtti* of short *ṛ* from this rule. Interpretation (*iv*) will also render the inclusion of *vṛ* as vacuous (*vyartha*). For, a specification with *ṛ* can easily account for it. It is in view of this process of elimination (*pāriśeṣyāt*) that the author of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* accepts the fifth interpretation: *vṛṅvṛñoḥ sāmānyena grahaṇam; tasmād uttarasya ṛkārāntebhyaś ca* '*vṛ* refers to both *vṛṄ* and *vṛÑ* in general; an *iṬ* which occurs after that (*vṛ*) and also after roots which end in *ṝ*...'.

2. Why do we have the condition of *vṛtaḥ*? Consider *kariṣyati* and *hariṣyati* which serve as counter-examples. The roots of these two examples end in a short *ṛ*. Their *iṬ* is also introduced by 7.2.70 *ṛddhanoḥ sye*. This rule requires a root to end in a long *ṝ*.

Why do we have the condition of *aliṭi* 'when a non-*LIṬ* follows'? Consider *vavaritha* and *teritha* where we do not get a replacement in long *ṝ* because the examples are both derivates of *LIṬ*. That is, the *i* of *iṬ* is not replaced with its long counterpart when *LIṬ* follows.

7.2.39 न लिङि

na liṅi
/na ϕ lini 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *dīrghaḥ* #37 *vṛtaḥ* #38)
vṝt uttarasya iṭo liṅi dīrgho na bhavati
An *iṬ* which occurs after verbal root *vṛ* (*vṛṄ*/*vṛÑ*), and also after roots which end in *ṝ*, is not replaced with a long *ī* when *LIṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

vivariṣīṣṭa 'third singular *LIṄ*-derivate of *vṛ* used with the preverb *vi*'
prāvariṣīṣṭa 'third singular *LIṄ*-derivate of *vṛ* used with the preverb *pra*'

āstariṣīṣṭa 'third singular *LIṄ*-derivate of *stṝ* used with the preverb *āṄ*'
vistariṣīṣṭa 'third singuar *LIṄ*-derivate of *stṝ* used with the preverb *vi*'

1. This rule extends the negation of a long replacement of *iṬ*, also to derivates of *LIṄ* introduced after *vṛṄ/vṛÑ*, and to roots which end in *ṝ*. Consider *vivariṣīṣṭa* and *prāvariṣīṣṭa*, etc., where *iṬ* is introduced by 7.2.42 *liṅsicor ātmanepadeṣu*. Refer to *saṃgaṃsīṣṭa* (II:438; under 1.2.13 *ā gamaḥ*) for derivational details. Derivates of this rule involve *iṬ* and *guṇa* of *vṛ*. Our present rule negates the provision of the preceding rule. Note that the *ātmanepada* suffix in *vistariṣīṣṭa* is introduced with the signification of *karman* 'object'.

7.2.40 सिचि च परस्मैपदेषु

sici ca parasmaipadeṣu
/sici 7/1 *ca* ϕ *parasmaipadeṣu* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *dīrghaḥ* #37 *vṛtaḥ* #38 *na* #39)
parasmaipadapare sici vṛta uttarasya iṭo dīrgho na bhavati
An *iṬ* which occurs after verbal root *vṛ* (*vṛṄ/vṛÑ*), and also after roots which end in *ṝ*, is not replaced with a long vowel, namely *ī*, when a *sIC* introduced relative to an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows.

EXAMPLES:

prāvāriṣṭām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate of *vṛ* used with the preverb *pra*'
prāvāriṣuḥ 'third person plural active . . .'
atāriṣṭām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate of *tṛ* used with the preverb *āṄ*'
atāriṣuḥ 'third person plural . . .'
āstāriṣṭām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate of *stṝ* used with the perverb *āṄ*'
āstāriṣuḥ 'third person plural . . .'

1. This rule negates a long replacement of *iṬ*, also when *sIC*, followed by an active (*parasmaipada*) ending, follows *vṛṄ/vṛÑ* and roots which end in *ṝ*. Thus, we get *prāvāriṣṭām*, a derivate of *LUṄ*, from *pra* + *aṬ* + *vṛ* + *iṬ* + *sIC* + (*tas*→*tām*), where *ṛ* of *vṛ* goes through *vṛddhi* (7.2.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu*) and *tas* is replaced with *tām* (3.4.101 *tasthasthamipām . . .*). Refer to additional derivational details under the appendix of rules 3.4.77 *tiptasjhi . . .*, 3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .* and 3.4.101 *tasthasthamipāṃ . . .* etc. The *Jus* replacement for *jhi*, of *pra-vṛÑ* + (*LUṄ*→*jhi*→*jus*) → *pra-vṛ* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *s*(*IC*) + (*J*)*us* → *prāvāriṣuḥ*, is accomplished by 3.4.109 *sijabhyastavidibhyaś ca*. Note that verbal root *stṝ* is used with the preverb *āṄ* in *āstāriṣṭām* and *āstāriṣuḥ*. Forms of *tṝ* are derived with similar rule applications.

Why do we have the condition of *parasmaipadeṣu*? Consider *prāvariṣṭa* and

prāvarīṣṭa, where replacement in long *ī* becomes optional on account of the middle (*ātmanepada*; 7.2.42 *liṅsicor ātmanepadeṣu*) ending.

7.2.41 इट् सनि वा

iṭ sani vā
/iṭ 1/1 *sani* 7/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛtaḥ* #38)
vṛtaḥ sano vā iḍāgamo bhavati
An *iṬ* is optionally introduced to affix *saN*, an *ārdhadhātuka*, which occurs after verbal root *vṛ* (*vṛṄ*/*vṛÑ*), and also after roots ending in *ṝ*.

EXAMPLES:

vuvūrṣate 'third singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *vṛ* ending in *saN*'
vivariṣate 'ibidem; with *iṬ*'
vivarīṣate 'ibidem; with *iṬ* replaced with *ī*'
prāvuvūrṣati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vṛ* ending in *saN* and used with the preverb *prā*'
prāvivariṣati 'ibidem; with *iṬ*'
prāvivarīṣati 'ibidem; with *iṬ* replaced with *ī*'
titīrṣati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *tṝ* ending in *saN*'
titariṣati 'ibidem; with *iṬ*'
titarīṣati 'ibidem; with *iṬ* replaced with *ī*'
ātistīrṣati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *stṝ* ending in *saN* and used with the preverb *ā*'
ātistariṣati 'ibidem; with *iṬ*'
ātistarīṣati 'ibidem; with *iṬ* replaced with *ī*'

1. This rule allows optional *iṬ* to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix, namely *saN*, which occurs after *vṛ* (*vṛṄ*/*vṛÑ*), or after a root ending in *ṝ*. Consider *vuvūrṣate* (the active form *vuvūrṣati* is a suspect) where the root derives from *vṛÑ* + *saN*, and *saN* is treated as marked with *K* as an *it* (1.2.9 *iko jhal*). Rule 6.4.16 *ajjhanagamāṃ sani* then replaces the *ṛ* with *ṝ*. This *ṝ*, however, is replaced with *u* (7.1.102 *udoṣṭhyapūrvasya*), followed by *r* (*rapara*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*). Reduplication, and operations related with it, produce (*vuvūrṣa* + *LAṬ*) → *vuvūrṣate*. Refer to derivational details of *cikīrṣakaḥ* and *jihīrṣakaḥ*, under the appendix (II:407-8) of 1.1.58 *na padānta* . . . for some general applications. Recall that this introduction of *iṬ* was obligatorily denied by 7.2.12 *sani grahaguhoś ca*. Our present rule makes it optionally available. The *i*-replacement (*itva*) in *ātistīrṣati* is accomplished by 7.1.100 *ṛta iddhātoḥ*. The optional long replacement of *iṬ* is accomplished by 7.2.38 *vṛto vā*. Thus, we get three forms: *ātistīrṣati*, *ātistariṣati* and *ātistarīṣati*. Incidentally, Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kās*) questions the active (*parasmaipada*) reading of *ātistīrṣati* (*ātistīrṣatīti parasmaipadapāṭho na yuktaḥ*).

Why do we not get the introduction of *iṬ* in *cikīrṣati* and *jihīrṣati*? Because *kṛ* and *hṛ* do not take *iṬ*. But they can qualify for *iṬ* after *ṛ* is replaced with long (6.4.16 *ajjhanagamāṃ sani*). We can still not get *iṬ* since *ṝ* is not original (*aupadeśika*) with the root. It is gotten via application of a rule (*lākṣaṇika*).

7.2.42 लिङ्सिचोरात्मनेपदेषु

liṅsicor ātmanepadeṣu
/liṅsicoḥ 7/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ātmanepadeṣu* 7/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛtaḥ* #38 *vā iṭ* #41)
vṛto liṅi sici ca ātmanepadapare vā iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced, optionally, to a *LIṄ* and *sIC* which occurs after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *vṛ* (*vṛṄ*/*vṛÑ*), and after roots which end in *ṝ*, provided *LIṄ*, or *sIC*, followed by an *ātmanepada* 'middle' affix follows.

EXAMPLES:

vṛṣīṣṭa
variṣīṣṭa
prāvṛṣīṣṭa
prāvariṣīṣṭa
āstariṣīṣṭa
āstīrṣīṣṭa
avṛta
avariṣṭa
avarīṣṭa
prāvṛta
prāvariṣṭa
prāvarīṣṭa
āstīrṣṭa
āstariṣṭa
āstarīṣṭa

1. This rule allows *iṬ*, optionally, when a replacement of *LIṄ*, or affix *sIC*, followed by an *ātmanepada* affix follows verbal roots *vṛṄ*, *vṛÑ*, or roots which end in a long *ṝ*. Thus, we get *vṛṣīṣṭa*/*variṣīṣṭa*; *prāvṛṣīṣṭa*/*prāvariṣīṣṭa*, etc. Refer to derivational details of examples under the appendix (II:436-37) of rules 1.2.11-1.2.12 *liṅsicāv* . . . and 1.2.12 *uś ca*. A derivate of *LIṄ* will not get a long replacement in view of 7.2.39 *na liṅi*. However, an optional *iṬ*, in the context of *sIC*, will get a replacement in long. Note that rule 8.2.27 *hrasvād aṅgāt* deletes *sIC*, via *LUK*, when the option of *iṬ* is not accepted. An option of *iṬ*, when accepted, leads to optional long replacement (7.2.33 *vṛto vā*), subsequent to the application of *guṇa*, etc. Consider *āstīrṣṭa* and *āstīriṣṭa* where optional long replacement is applied with *iṬ*. Now consider *āstarīṣṭa* where the option of *iṬ* is not accepted.

2. Why do we have the condition of *ātmanepada*? Consider (*pra-vṛ* + (*LUṄ* →*tas*→*tām*)) = *prāvāriṣṭām* and (*pra-vṛ* + (*LUṄ*→*jhi*→*us*)) = *prāvāriṣuḥ*, where (cf. 7.2.40 *sici ca parasmaipadeṣu*) augment *iṬ* is introduced, obligatorily (*nityam*). Counter-examples of *LIṄ* are impossible to find (*asambhavāt*). Since affix *yāsUṬ* does not begin with *vaL* (7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*), the question of introducing *iṬ* does not arise. There is no question of an option when the provision itself is missing.

7.2.43 ऋतश्च संयोगादेः

ṛtaś ca saṃyogādeḥ
/ṛtaḥ 5/1 *ca* ϕ *saṃyogādeḥ* 5/1 = *saṃyoga ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya/* (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vā iṭ* #41 *liṅsicor ātmanepadeṣu* #42)
ṛdantād dhātoḥ saṃyogāder uttarayor liṅsicor ātmanepadeṣu vā iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is also introduced, optionally, to a *LIṄ* and *sIC* which occurs after an *aṅga*, namely a verbal root ending in *ṛ* and beginning with a conjunct (*saṃyoga*), provided, of course, affixes *LIṄ* and *sIC* are related to the *ātmanepada* affix which follows.

EXAMPLES:

dhvṛṣīṣṭa/ dhvariṣīṣṭa
smṛṣīṣṭa/ smariṣīṣṭa
adhvṛṣātām/ adhvariṣātām
asmṛṣātām/ asmariṣātām

1. Follow derivational details of examples already discussed. Note, however, that verbal roots *dhvṛ* 'to be crooked' and *smṛ* 'to remember, think' are active (*parasmaipada*). Their derivates with middle endings are possible only when they are introduced with the denotata of *bhāva* 'action' and *karman* 'object' (1.3.13 *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ*). As usual, there is no *guṇa* because of the *kit*-status of *sIC* (1.2.12 *uś ca*).

Why do we have the condition of *ṛdanta* 'ending in *ṛ*'? Consider *cyoṣīṣṭa* (*cyu*), *ploṣīṣṭa* (*plu*) and *acyoṣṭa* and *aploṣṭa* where, because the roots do not end in *ṛ*, augment *iṬ* is not introduced.

Why do we have the condition of *saṃyogādi* 'conjunct-initial'? Consider *kṛṣīṣṭa*, *hṛṣīṣṭa* and *akṛta*, *ahṛta*, where the roots can be used with active as well as middle endings. However, *iṬ* cannot be introduced since the roots do not begin with a conjunct.

Why do we have the condition of *ātmanepadeṣu*? Consider *adhvārṣīt/ asmārṣīt*, where we do not get augment *iṬ* when an active ending (*parasmaipada*) follows.

How come we get *iṬ* when *kṛ*, used with the preverb *sam*, becomes conjunct-initial as a result of addition of augment *sUṬ*. That is, given *sam* + *sUṬ* + *kṛ* +

Kta. This rule requires conjunct-initial status of roots in *upadeśa* 'initial citation'. Besides, *sUṬ* does not become part of the root (*abhāktatvāt*). Consequently, augment *iṬ* cannot be introduced (*Kāś: saṃskṛṣṭa/samaskṛta ity atropadeśādhikārāt abhaktatvāc ca suḍ iḍāgamo na bhavati*).

7.2.44 स्वरतिसूतिसूयतिधूञूदितो वा

svaratisūtisūyatidhūñūdito vā
/svarati-sūti-sūyati-dhūñ-uditaḥ 5/1 = *ūd it yasya* = *ūdit* (*bv.*); *svaratiś ca sūtiś ca sūyatiś ca dhūñ ca udic ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* #35)
'*svarati, sūti, sūyati, dhūñ*' *ity etebhyaḥ ūdidbhyaś cottarasya valāder ārdhadhātukasya vā iḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix which begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *vaL* (*Śs.* 5-14), provided the same occurs after an *aṅga*, namely verbal roots: *svarati* (*svṛ* 'resound, heat, torture'), *sūti* (*ṣūṄ* 'give birth to'; *adādi*), *sūyati* (*ṣūṄ* 'give birth to'; *divādi*), *dhūÑ* 'to shake' (*svādi, kryādi* and *curādi*), and roots marked with *ū* as an *it*.

EXAMPLES:

svarttā/svaritā
prasotā/prasavitā
sotā/savitā
dhotā/dhavitā (forms of *dhūÑ*)
vigāḍhā/vigāhitā (forms of *gāhŪ* 'to churn')
goptā/gopitā (*guhŪ* 'to protect, preserve')

1. This rule allows *iṬ* after enumerated verbal roots, plus roots which may be marked with *ū* as an *it* (*ūd-it*). Note that *svṛ*, *ṣūṄ* and *sūÑ* are all *anudātta*. Consequently, they had negation of *iṬ* applicable to them. Verbal root *dhūÑ* is *udātta*. It thus has obligatory *iṬ* already made available. Remember here that this specification of *dhū* (with *Ñ* as an it; *sānubandhaka*) does not include any reference to *dhū* (used without any *it*; *niranubandhaka*). Thus, *svartā/svaritā*; *prasotā/prasavitā*; *sotā/savitā*; *dhotā/dhavitā* (two forms each with, and without, *iṬ*); *vigāḍhā/vigāhitā* and *goptā/gopitā*. Note that *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* is also carried to this rule. Most of the cited examples involve *guṇa* and, where applicable, a replacement in *av*. Of course, in addition to *iṬ*. Examples of *gāhÚ*, i.e., *vigāhā/vigāhitā*, involve *h→ḍh* (*ḍhatva*; 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*), *ṭi*-deletion (6.4.155 *ṭeḥ*), *t→dh* (*dhatva*), and deletion of *ḍh* (*ḍhalopa*; 8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ*). Thus, *vi-gāh* + (*LUṬ→ti→Ḍā*) → *vi-gāh* + *t* (*ās* →ϕ) + *ā* → *vi-gā* (*h→ḍh*) + (*t→dh→ḍh*) + *ā* → *vi-gā*(*ḍh→ϕ*) + *ḍh* + *ā* = *vigāḍhā*.

Recall here that as *tāsI* is introduced when *LUṬ* follows, we get *sya* when *LUṬ* and *LṚṬ* (3.1.33 *syatāsī* . . .) follow. The *sya* which may occur after *svṛ*

will avail *iṬ*, optionally. Rule 7.2.70 *ṛddhanoḥ sye* will block this optional provision of *iṬ*. However, 7.2.11 *śryukaḥ kiti* will block this option by way of *pūrva-vipratiṣedha* 'resolution of conflict among two rules where the preceding wins'. This, of course, will happen under the condition of an affix treated as if marked with *K* as an *it*. We will thus get *svṛtvā*. *Kāśikā* also observes that *svṛ* will get *iṬ*, obligatorily, against the optional one of our present rule based on *vipratiṣedha* 'conflict among two rules of equal strength where the subsequent rule wins'. Thus, our present rule has its independent scope of application relative to two forms of *svṛ*: *svartā* and *svaritā*. Forms such as *kariṣyati* and *hariṣyati* justify the independent scope of 7.2.70 *ṛddhanoḥ sye*. But given *svṛ* + *sya* + *ti*, we find both rules applicable. Rule 7.2.70 *ṛddhanoḥ sye* will win the conflict in view of 1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam*. We will thus get *svariṣyati*. Some here claim that *param* of 1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam* means *iṣṭa* 'desired'.

Recall that *gupŪ* 'to hide, protect' is marked with *anudātta* as an it. Thus, it would allow *iṬ*, optionally, when an *ārdhadhātuka* affix beginning with *vaL* follows. Recall also that forms of *LUṬ* also involve *tās* (3.1.33 *syatāsī* . . .). This also involves introduction of *āya* (3.1.31 *āyādaya* . . .). Thus, we will get the *āya* forms of *gup* with *iṬ*, such as *gopāyitā* 'he will protect'. This *iṬ* will become optional in the absence of *āya*. Thus, *gopitā, gopitārau, gopitāraḥ*, with *iṬ* and no *āya*. We get *goptā, goptārau, goptāraḥ*, with no *āya* and no *iṬ*.

2. Why use *vā* again when the same can be carried, via *anuvṛtti*, from 7.2.41 *iṭ sani vā*. But since the *vā* of the earlier rule is associated with *LIṄ* and *sIC*, its *anuvṛtti* will also bring *LIṄ* and *sIC* to this rule. This, of course, is not desired. The *vā* of this rule is used to cancel the *anuvṛtti* of *LIṄ* and *sIC*.

Refer to notes under rule 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛvṛstu* . . . for details of restrictive provision generally referred to as *krādi-niyama*.

7.2.45 रधादिभ्यश्च

radhādibhyaś ca
/radhādibhyaḥ 5/3 = *radha ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *tebhyaḥ*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* #35 *vā* #44)
'*radha hiṃsāsaṃsidhyoḥ*' *ity evam ādibhyo' ṣṭābhya uttarasya valāder ārdhadhātukasya vā iḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is also introduced, optionally, to an affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* when this same begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *vaL* (*Śs.* 5-14), and occurs after the set of verbal roots enumerated beginning with *radhA* 'to accomplish, harm'.

EXAMPLES:

raddhā/radhitā
naṃṣṭā/naśitā

mogdhā/ moḍhā/ mohitā
snegdhā/ sneḍhā/ snehitā

1. Eight roots which are enumerated beginning with *radhA* 'to harm, oppress, accomplish' are allowed to have *iṬ* introduced to their following *ārdhadhātuka* affix beginning with a sound denoted by *vaL* (*Śs.* 5-14). The enumerated roots are: *radhA*, *ṇaś* 'to disappear', *tṛpA* 'to be pleased', *dṛpA* 'to be pleasant, be infatuated', *druhA* 'to wish harm to', *muhA* 'to be perplexed', *snuhA* 'to throw up, vomit', and *snihA* 'to be affectionate'. An optional *iṬ* offers two forms for each one of the listed verbs. Thus, *raddhā, radhitā*; and *naṃṣṭā, naśitā*, etc., all derivates of *tṛC*. Recall that augment *aM* is optionally introduced to roots which are marked with *anudātta* and contain *ṛ* in their *upadhā* 'penultimate position'. We thus get three forms (cf. 6.1.59 *anudāttasya ca . . .*) each for *tṛpA* and *dṛpA*, i.e., *traptā/ tarpitā/ tarptā* and *draptā/ darpitā/ darptā*. Verbal root *ṇaśA* receives *nUM* (7.1.60 *masjinaśor jhali*) where *m* is also replaced with *anusvāra*. The *ś* of *ṇaśA* also goes through *ṣṭutva* (8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjasṛja . . .*). We thus get *naṃṣṭā* and *naśitā* (cf. 7.1.60 *masjinaśor jhali*).

We get three forms each of verbal roots *druhA, muhA, snuhA* and *snihA*: *drogdhā/ droḍhā/ drohitā*; *mogdhā/ moḍhā/ mohitā*; *snogdhā/ snoḍhā/ snohitā* and *snegdhā/ sneḍhā/ snehitā*. These roots, in the absence of optional *iṬ*, receive an optional replacement of their *h* with *gh* (8.2.33 *vā druhadruhamuha . . .*). The following *t* then goes through a replacement in *dha* (*dhatva*; 8.2.40 *jhaṣastathordho' dhaḥ*). The *gh*, for example of *dr*(*u*→*o*)*h* → *dro*(*h*→*gh*), is further repaced with *g* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.52 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). Thus, we get *drogdhā, mogdhā, snogdhā* and *snegdhā*. We can similarly get *droḍhā, moḍhā*, etc., when optional replacement of *h* with *gh* (*ghatva*; 8.2.33 *vā druhamuha . . .*) is not accepted. We will then get *h* replaced with *ḍh* (*ḍhatva*; 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*). An acceptance of optional *iṬ* will similarly produce *drohitā* and *mohitā*, etc. That is, *druhA, muhA, ṣṇuhA* and *ṣṇihA* produce three forms each.

2. Rule 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛvṛstudrusruśruvo liṭi* offers a restrictive provision: 'verbal roots *kṛ, sṛ, bhṛ, vṛ, stu, dru, sru*, and *śru*, alone, are not allowed to have *iṬ* introduced when *LIṬ* follows'. This is what generally is known as the *krādi-niyama* 'restrictive provision with reference to roots specified beginning with *kṛ*' (cf. notes under 7.2.13). Some state that roots of this rule could not be allowed *iṬ* in consonance with *krādi-niyama*. However, since this rule is subsequent in order (*para*), its optional *iṬ* must prevail. Others state that the *krādi-niyama* is a restrictive negation (*pratiṣedha*) of *iṬ*. Since a *niyama* 'restrictive provision' is more powerful (*balavattara*), this rule must offer *iṬ*, obligatorily. They will thus get *rarandhiva* and *rarandhima*. I omit further details of these views.

7.2.46 निरः कुषः

niraḥ kuṣaḥ

/niraḥ 5/1 *kuṣaḥ* 5/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* #35 *vā* #44)
'*nir*' *ity evam pūrvāt kuṣa uttarasya valāder ārdhadhātukasya vā iḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is, optionally, introduced to an affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* when the same begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *vaL* and occurs after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *kuṣ* 'to squeeze out' used with the preverb *nir*.

EXAMPLES:

niṣkoṣṭā/ niṣkoṣitā
niṣkoṣṭum/ niṣkoṣitum
niṣkoṣṭavyam/ niṣkoṣitavyam

1. This rule allows *iṬ* to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix which begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *vaL* and is used after *kuṣ* 'to squeeze out, hurt', used after *nir*. Thus, we get *niṣkoṣṭā, niṣkoṣitā*, etc. Note here that the non-affixal *visarga* of *ni*(*r*→*ḥ*), in *niḥ* + *koṣṭā*, etc., is replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣatva*; 8.3.41 *idupadhasya* . . .).

2. Why do we state the condition of *niraḥ* 'occurring after *nir*'? Consider *koṣitā, koṣitum* and *koṣitavyam* where, because of *kuṣ* not occurring after nir, we get *iṬ*, obligatorily. The *iṬ* where *kuṣ* occurs after *nir* is optional (7.2.46 *niraḥ kuṣaḥ*).

Why was this specification with the preverb not made as *nisaḥ*? So that one can identify a reference to this *nir*, a different preverb. It is this *nir* whose *r* is replaced with *l* in *nilayanam*, etc., by rule 8.2.19 *upasargasyāyatau*. The *r* of *nis* cannot be replaced with *l* since *r* will become *asiddha* 'suspended' (8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*).

7.2.47 इण्निष्ठायाम्

iṇ niṣṭhāyām
/iṭ 1/1 *niṣṭhāyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *niraḥ kuṣaḥ* #46)
niraḥ kuṣo niṣṭhāyām iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to an affix termed *niṣṭhā* (1.1.28 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) which occurs after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *kuṣ* used with the preverb *nir*.

EXAMPLES:

niṣkuṣitaḥ
niṣkuṣitavān

1. Why use *iṬ* explicitly here when the same is available from *anuvṛtti*? So that this provision of *iṬ* could be made obligatorily. Thus, (*nir* + *kuṣ* + *iṬ* +

Kta) + sU→ ni(r→ḥ →ṣ) kuṣitaḥ = niṣkuṣitaḥ and *niṣkuṣitavān.* In the absence of this explicit mention of *iṬ*, the provision of this rule could have become optional, in view of 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā.* It is thus intended to block application of 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā* (*Kāś: idgrahaṇaṃ nityārtham. ārambho hi 'yasya vibhāṣā' ity asya bādhakaḥ; anyathā hi vikalpārtha eva syād. atraiva nityam idāgamaḥ, uttaratra vikalpa eveti*). The provisions of this rule alone are accepted as obligatory. Provisions of *iṬ* which follow are optional.

7.2.48 तीषसहलुभरुषरिषः

tīṣasahalubharuṣariṣaḥ
/ti 7/1 *iṣa-saha-lubha-ruṣa-riṣaḥ* 5/1 = *iṣaś ca sahaś ca lubhaś ca ruṣaś ca riś ca iṣ ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ* #35 *vā* #44)
takārādāv ārdhadhātuke 'iṣu, saha, lubha, ruṣa, riṣa' ity etebhyo vā iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced, only optionally, to an affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* when the same begins with *t* and occurs after an *aṅga*, namely verbal roots *iṣU* 'to desire', *ṣahA* 'to endure', *lubhA* 'to be greedy', *ruṣA* 'to harm' and *riṣA* 'to harm'.

EXAMPLES:

preṣitā/ preṣitum/ preṣitavyam
soḍhā/ sahitā
lobdhā/ lobhitā
roṣṭā/ roṣitā
reṣṭā/ resitā

1. This rule introduces augment *iṬ*, optionally, to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix which begins with a *t* and occurs after verbal roots *iṣU, ṣahA, lubhA, ruṣA* and *riṣA*. Thus, (*iṣ* + *iṬ* + *tṛC*) + *sU* → *eṣitā* and *eṣṭā*, with a replacement in *s*→*ṣ* (*ṣatva*) and *t*→*ṭ*(*ṣṭutva*). Commentators note that this optional *iṬ* is desired for *iṣU* 'to desire'. Augment *iṬ* is obligatorily introduced in the context of *iṣ* 'to move', as in *preṣitā* and *preṣitavyam.* The *kryādi* root *iṣA* 'to do something over and over again' also has a single form. This is the reason why *iṣ* of this rule is cited as *iṣU.* Verbal root *sahA* will have two forms: *soḍhā* and *sahitā* where *sah* + *tṛC*, with no *iṬ*, will have to go through replacements such as *h*→*dh*→*ḍh.* The *a* of *sa* will also be replaced with *o* (6.3.112 *sahivahor od . . .*). Similar rules apply in deriving (*lubh* + *tṛC*) + *sU* → *lobdhā* and *lobhitā*; *roṣṭā* and *roṣitā*; a *reṣṭā* and *reṣitā.*

2. Why do we have the condition of *t*-initial (*takārādi*)? Consider *eṣiṣyati* where augment *iṬ* is introduced, obligatorily. For, there is no *t*-initial (*takārādi*) affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* to follow.

7.2.49 सनीवन्तर्धभ्रस्जदम्भुश्रिस्वृयूर्णुभरज्ञपिसनाम्

sanīvantardhabhrasjadambhuśrisvṛyūrṇubharajñapisanām
/sani 7/1 *ivantardhabhrasjadambhuśrisvṛyūrṇubharajñapisanām* 6/3 = *iva ante yeṣāṃ te* = *ivantāḥ* (*bv.*); *ivantāś ca ṛdhaś ca bhrasjaś ca dambhuś ca śriś ca svā ca yuś ca ūrṇuś ca bharaś ca jñapiś ca saṃś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *sani* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vā* #44 *iṭ* #47)
ivantānāṃ dhātūnām 'ṛdhu, bhrasja, dambhu, śri, svṛ, yū, ūrṇu, bhara, jñapi, san' ity eteṣāṃ ca sani vā iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced, optionally, to affix *saN* when the same occurs after roots ending in *iva*, or after verbal roots *ṛdhU* 'to grow', *bhrasjA* 'to cook', *dambhU* 'to cheat', *śri* 'to serve', *svṚ* 'to be noisy, to heat, pain', *yu* 'to mix', *ūrṇuÑ* 'to cover', *bhṛÑ* 'to bear, provide for', *jñapI* 'to inform', and *san* 'to give, gain'.

EXAMPLES:

dideviṣati/ dudyūṣati (forms of *div*)
siseviṣati/ susyūṣati (forms of *siv*)
ardidhiṣati/ īrtsati (forms of *ṛdh*)
bibhrajjiṣati/ bibhrakṣati
bibharjjiṣati/ bibharkṣati (forms of *bhrasj*)
didambhiṣati/ dhipsati/ dhīpsati (forms of *dambhU*)
ucchiśrayiṣati/ ucchiśrīṣati (forms of *ut-śri*)
sisvariṣati/ susvūrṣati (forms of *svṛ*)
yiyavisati/ yuyūṣati (forms of *yu*)
prorṇunaviṣati/ prorṇunuvisati/ prorṇunūṣati (forms of *urṇU*)
bibhariṣati/ bubhūrṣati
(forms of the *bhvādi* root *bhṛÑ*)
jijñapayiṣati/ jñīpsati (forms of *jñapI*)
sisaniṣati/ siṣāsati (forms of *san*)

1. This rule offers optional *iṬ* to roots which end in *iv*, or to roots such as *ṛdhU, bhrasj, dambhU, śri, svṛ, yū, ūrṇU, bharA, jñapI,* and *san,* when affix *saN* follows. Verbal root *san* here refers to *ṣaṇ* 'to give' and *ṣaṇ* 'to divide, distribute' both. Thus, we get (*div* + *saN*) + *LAṬ* → *didiv*+ *iṬ* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *a* + *LAṬ*) → *didiviṣa* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*) → *didiviṣati.* This, of course, when optional introduction of *iṬ* is accepted. We will get *div* + *saN*→ *di*(*v*→*ūṬH*) + *saN*→ *d*(*i*→*y*) + *ū*(*ṬH*) + *sa*(*N*) = *dyū* + *sa,* where, in the absence of optional *iṬ,* augment *ūṬH* (6.4.19 *cchvoḥ śūḍ anunāsike*) is introduced. Affix *saN,* for this purpose, is treated as if marked with *K* as an *it* (*kitvat*; 1.2.10 *halantāc ca*). A subsequent application of 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci* produces *dyū* + *sa.* Operations such as doubling (6.1.9 *sany aṅoḥ*), retention of a unit formed with the first consonant (*halādiśeṣa* (7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*)), shortening (7.4.59 *hrasvaḥ*) and *s*→*ṣ*

(*ṣatva*) produce *dyū + sa → dyū + dyū + sa → d(y→ɸ) (ū→u) + dyū + sa → du + dyū + (s→ṣ) a = dudyūṣa + (LAṬ→tiP) → dudyūṣa + ŚaP + tiP = dudyūṣati.* Forms of verbal root *siv*, i.e., *siseviṣati* and *susyūṣati*, follow similar derivational steps.

2. Some offer a modified reading of this rule as follows: . . . *bharajñapisanitanipatidaridrāṇām.* This then additionally accounts for forms of *tani* 'to stretch', *pati* 'to fall' and *daridrā* 'to be poor'. Thus, *titaniṣati, titaṃsati, titāṃsati; pipatiṣati, pitsati*; and *didaridriṣati, didaridrāsati.*

3. Why do we have the condition of *sani* 'when *saN* follows'? Consider *devitā* where *iṬ* is introduced obligatorily. Now consider *bhraṣṭā* where it is not available (*abhāva*). Of course, augment *iṬ* will be optional where *saN* follows and all other conditions are also met.

7.2.50 **क्लिशः क्त्वानिष्ठयोः**

kliśaḥ ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ
/kliśaḥ 5/1 *ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ* 6/2 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vā* #44 *iṭ* #47)
kliśaḥ ktvāniṣṭhayor vā iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced, optionally, to affix *Ktvā*, and also to an affix termed *niṣṭhā*, when these affixes occur after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *kliśA* 'to torment'.

EXAMPLES:

kliṣṭvā/kliśitvā
kliṣṭaḥ/kliṣṭavān
kliśitaḥ/kliśitavān

1. This rule introduces augment *iṬ*, optionally, after verbal root *kliś* when *Ktvā*, and an affix termed *niṣṭhā* (1.1.26 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*), follows. Note that *kliś* here refers to both *kliś* 'torment' and *kliśŪ* 'refute, harass'. We will get *kliś + i(Ṭ) + (K) tvā) = kliśitvā.* The *guṇa* of *i* of *kliś* is blocked on the basis of *Ktvā* being treated as if marked with *K* (*kitvat*; 1.2.7 *mṛḍamṛdagudha . . .*). Not accepting optional *iṬ* will produce (*kli(ś→ṣ) + (t→ṭ) vā)) = kliṣṭvā*, with *ś→ṣ* (*ṣatva*; 8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjasṛja . . .*) and *t→ṭ* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). Similar optional forms can also be derived with *iṬ* and affixes *Kta* and *KtvatU.* Thus, *kliśitaḥ, kliṣṭaḥ*; and *kliśitavān, kliṣṭavān.*

Why do we state *Ktvā* in the wording of this rule when 7.2.44 *svartisūtisūyati . . .* already offers optional *iṬ* in the context of *kliśŪ* before affix *Ktvā*? But this optional *iṬ* gets negated in *niṣṭhā* by 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā.* This rule is then necessary to offer optional *iṬ* there. We get obligatory *iṬ* in the contetxt of *kliś* 'to torment' before *Ktvā* and *niṣṭhā* both. The *Ktvā* of this rule turns that obligatory *iṬ* into optional (*Kāś: kliśa upatāpe ity asya tu ktvāyām niṣṭhāyāṃ ca nityam iḍāgamaḥ prāpnoti tadarthaṃ ktvāgrahaṇaṃ kriyate*).

7.2.51 पूङश्च

pūṅaḥ ca
/pūṅaḥ 5/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vā* #44 *iṭ* #47 *ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ* #50)
pūṅaṣ ca ktvāniṣṭhayor vā iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced optionally to affix *Ktvā*, and to an affix termed *niṣṭhā*, also when these affixes occur after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *pūṄ* 'to cleanse'.

EXAMPLES:

pūtvā/pavitvā/somo' tipavitaḥ
pūtavān/pavitavān

1. This rule offers optional *iṬ* after *pūṄ* when *Ktvā*, or an affix termed *niṣṭhā*, follows. This optional provision of *iṬ* is made against its obligatory negation by 7.2.11 *śryukaḥ kiti*. Thus, *pūṄ* + *Ktvā* = *pūtvā*. Recall that 1.2.22 *pūṅaḥ ktvā ca* negates the *kit* '*K* as an *it*' status of *Ktvā*, *Kta* and *KtvatU*. That is why we get *guṇa*, and subsequent *av*, in *pūṄ* + *iṬ* + *Ktvā* → *p*(*ū*→*o*→*av*) + *iṬ* + *Ktvā* = *pavitvā*. We similarly get *pūtaḥ*, *pavitaḥ*; and *pūtavān*, *pavitavān*.

7.2.52 वसतिक्षुधोरिट्

vasatikṣudhor iṭ
/vasati-kṣudhoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*); *iṭ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ* #50)
vasateḥ kṣudheś ca ktvāniṣṭhayor iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to affix *Ktvā*, and also to an affix termed *niṣṭhā*, when these affixes occur after an *aṅga*, namely verbal roots *vas* 'to dwell, stay' and *kṣudh* 'be hungry'.

EXAMPLES:

uṣitvā/uṣitaḥ/uṣitavān
kṣudhitvā/kṣudhitaḥ/kṣudhitavān

1. This rule offers *iṬ* to *vasA* and *kṣudhA* when *Ktvā*, or an affix termed *niṣṭhā*, follows. These roots both are marked with *anudātta*. Consequently, they were thus obligatorily blocked from availing *iṬ*. Why use *iṬ* explicitly in this rule when the same could be brought, via *anuvṛtti*, from the earlier rule. Since *iṬ* of the earlier rule is associated with an optional provision, this rule must use *iṬ* to make the provision obligatory (*nitya*). We thus get *vas* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + (*K*)*tvā* → (*v*→*u*)*as*) + *i*(*Ṭ*) + (*K*)*tvā* → (*ua* →*u*)*s* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + (*K*)*tvā* → *u*(*s*→*ṣ*) + *i*(*Ṭ*) + (*K*)*tvā* = *uṣitvā*. Note that the *samprasāraṇa* in the root is accomplished by 6.1.15 *vacisvapiyajādīnām*. . . . The *s* is replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣatva*) by 8.3.60 *śāsivasighasīnām*. . . . Deriving *kṣudhitvā*, *kṣudhitaḥ* and *kṣudhitavān* with

iṬ does not offer anything new. Recall, however, that 1.2.26 *ralo vyupadhādd halādeḥ saṃś ca*, optionally, negates *kit*-status of *Ktvā*. This optional negation then blocks *guṇa*.

2. Note that the root in *vasateḥ*, since it is here specified with *ŚaP*, refers to the *bhvādi* root *vas* 'to dwell'. That is, this *iṬ* is not relatable to *vasA* of any other class. Verbal root *vasA* 'to cover' should have *iṬ* available just on the basis of being marked with *udātta*. An explicit mention of *iṬ* in this rule is intended for making an obligatory provision. For, the *iṬ* of the earlier rule is intended for making an optional provision.

7.2.53 अञ्चेः पूजायाम्

añceḥ pūjāyām
/añceḥ 5/1 *pūjāyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ* #50 *iṭ* #52)
añceḥ pūjāyām arthe ktvāniṣṭhayor iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to affix *Ktvā*, and also to an affix termed *niṣṭhā*, when these occur after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *añcU*, provided *pūjā* 'respect' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

añcitvā jānu juhoti 'offers the sacrifice with bent knee'
añcitā asya guravaḥ 'respected is (are) his teacher'

1. This rule offers *iṬ* after verbal root *añcU* when *Ktvā*, or an affix termed *niṣṭhā*, follows. Note that *añcU* is marked with *U* as an it (*udit*). It thus receives optional *iṬ* from 7.3.56 *udito vā*. This rule offers *iṬ*, obligatorily. Verbal root *añcU* is denied augment *iṬ* when a *niṣṭhā* affix follows (7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā*). Our present rule offers *iṬ*, again, obligatorily.

Why do we have the condition of *pūjāyām* 'when the derivate denotes praise'? Observe: (*ud-añc* + *Kta*) = *udakta* of *udaktam udakaṃ kūpāt* 'fetched water from the well', where *udakta* denotes the sense of *uddhṛta* 'drawn, taken out'. That is why we do not get augment *iṬ*.

7.2.54 लुभो विमोहने

lubho vimohane
/lubhaḥ 5/1 *vimohane* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ* #50 *iṭ* #52)
lubho vimohane' rthe vartamānāt ktvāniṣṭhayor iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to affix *Ktvā*, and also to an affix termed *niṣṭhā*, when these occur after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *lubh*, provided *vimohana* 'confusion, perplexity' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

lubhitvā/ lobhitvā 'having become perplexed'
vilubhitāḥ keśāḥ 'disordered hairs'

1. This rule offers augment *iṬ* to *lubh* when *Ktvā*, or an affix termed *niṣṭhā*, follows and the derivate denotes *vimohana*. The word *vimohana* is explained as the state of *ākulīkaraṇa* 'agitation, perplexity, disorder'. Thus, we get *lubhitvā* and *vilubhitaḥ*. An optional *kit*-status (1.2.26 *ralo vyupadhād . . .*) may facilitate *guṇa* to yield *lobhitvā*.

2. Note that 7.2.48 *tīṣasahalubha . . .* offers optional *iṬ*. Rule 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā* denies *iṬ* before affixes termed *niṣṭhā*. This rule blocks all those provisions in favor of an obligatory *iṬ*.

3. Why do we state the condition of *vimohane*? Consider *lubdho vṛṣalaḥ* 'this lowly *śūdra* is tormented by cold' where we do not get *iṬ* since the sense is not *vimohana*. What the derivate denotes is: '*śītena pīḍitaḥ* 'tormented by cold'. Now consider *lubdhvā*, *lubhitvā* and *lobhitā* where augment *iṬ* is optionally introduced in consonance with 7.2.48 *tīṣasahalubharuṣa. . . .* The third form goes through *guṇa* in consonance with optional *kit*-status of *Ktvā* (1.2.26 *ralo vyupadhād . . .*). What the derivate denotes here is *gārdhya* 'greed'.

7.2.55 जृव्रश्च्योः क्त्वि

jṝvraścyoḥ ktviḥ
/jṝ-vraścyoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*); *ktviḥ* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #52)
'*jṝ, vraści*' *ity etayoḥ ktvā pratyaye iḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is introduced after an *aṅga*, namely verbal roots *jṝ* 'to decay, be old' and *vraścI* 'to cut', when affix *Ktvā* follows.

EXAMPLES:

jaritvā/jarītvā
vraścitvā

1. This rule offers *iṬ* after verbal roots *jṝ* and *OvraścŪ* when affix *Ktvā* follows. Thus, we get *jṝ* + *Ktvā* → *jṝ* + *iṬ* + *Ktvā* → (*jṝ*→*jar*) + *i*(*Ṭ*) + (*K*)*tvā*)) → *jaritvā*, with application of replacement in *guṇa*. An optional long replacement for the short *i* of *jari* can be availed by 7.2.38 *vṛto vā*. This will give us *jarītvā*. One can similarly derive *vraścitvā* with *Ktvā* and *iṬ*. Note that, because of negation (*pratiṣedha*) of *kit*-status of *Ktvā* (1.2.18 *na ktvā seṭ*), *samprasāraṇa* of 6.1.16 *grahijyāvayi . . .* will be blocked.

2. Note that *iṬ*, in the context of *jṝ*, is negated by 7.4.11 *śryukaḥ kiti*. Verbal root *vraścŪ* is marked with *Ū* as an *it*. Consequently, an optional *iṬ* is made available by 7.2.44 *svaratisūti. . . .* Our present rule blocks these provisions in favor of an obligatory *iṬ*.

3. Why is *Ktvā* used again explicitly? So that the *anuvṛtti* of *niṣṭhā* could be canceled. Or else, this obligatory *iṬ* is intended only when *Ktvā* follows.

7.2.56 उदितो वा

udito vā
/uditaḥ 5/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #52 *ktvi* #55)
udito dhātoḥ ktvāpratyaye parato vā iḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is, optionally, introduced to affix *Ktvā* when it follows an *aṅga*, namely a verbal root marked with *u* as an *it*.

EXAMPLES:

śamitvā/śāntvā '*Ktvā*-derivate of *śamU* 'to be tranquil''
tamitvā/tāntvā '*Ktvā*-derivate of *tamU* 'to faint''
damitvā/dāntvā '*Ktvā*-derivate of *damU* 'to tame, control''

1. This rule allows optional *iṬ* after verbal roots which are marked with *U* as an *it* (*udit*). Of course, when *Ktvā* follows them. Thus, *śamU* + *iṬ* + *Ktvā* → *śamitvā*. Rule 6.4.15 *anunāsikasya kvij* . . . will order a long replacement for the short penultimate vowel (*upadhādīrgha*) if the option of *iṬ* is not accepted. Thus, *ś*(*a*→*ā*)*m* + *tvā* → *śā*(*m*→*ṃ*→*n*) + *tvā* = *śāntvā*, with *m*→*ṃ* (*anusvāra*; 8.3.23 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*) and *ṃ*→*n* (8.4.58 *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ*). We will similarly get *tamitvā*; *tāntvā* and *damitvā*; *dāntvā*.

7.2.57 सेऽसिचि कृतचृतच्छृदतृदनृतः

se' sici kṛtacṛtacchṛdatṛdanṛtaḥ
/se 7/1 *asici* 7/1 = *na sic* = *asic* (*nañ.*), *tasmin*; *kṛta-cṛta-chṛda-tṛda-nṛtaḥ* 5/1 (*sam. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasya* #35 *iṭ* #52 *vā* #56)
sakārādāv asicyārdhadhātuke '*kṛta, cṛta, chṛda, tṛda, nṛta*' *ity etebhyo dhātubhyo vā iḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to an affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* which begins with *s*, though not with *sIC*, and occurs after an *aṅga*, namely verbal roots *kṛtİ* 'to cut', *cṛtİ* 'inflict harm to', *UchṛdIR* 'glow . . .', *UtṛdIR* 'inflict harm, to offer' and *nṛtİ* 'to dance'.

EXAMPLES:

kartsyati 'third person singular *LṚṬ*-derivate of *kṛt*'
akartsyat 'third person singular *LṚṄ*-derivate of *kṛt*'
cikṛtsati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *kṛt* ending in *saN*'
acartsyat 'third person singular *LṚṄ*-derivate of *cṛt*'
cicṛtsati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *cṛt* ending in *saN*'
acchartsyat 'third person singular *LṚṄ*-derivate of *chṛd*'

cichṛtsati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *chṛt* ending in *saN*'
tartsyati 'third person singular *LṚṬ*-derivate of *tṛd*'
atartsyat 'third person singular *LṚṄ*-derivate of *tṛd*'
titṛtsati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *tṛd* ending in *saN*'
nartsyati 'third person singular *LṚṬ*-derivate of *nṛt*'
anartsyat 'third person singular *LṚṄ*-derivate of *nṛt*'
ninṛtsati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *nṛt* ending in *saN*'

1. This rule offers an optional *iṬ* to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix which begins with *s*, though not with that of *sIC*, and follows verbal roots *kṛtA*, *cṛtA*, *chṛdA*, *tṛdA* and *nṛt*. These roots are all marked with *udātta* as their *it* (*udāttet*). This rule is formulated to offer *iṬ*, optionally. We will thus get *kar'syati*, *akartsyat* and *cikṛtsati*, etc., where augment *iṬ* is not introduced before *LṚṬ*, *LṚṄ* and *saN*. We will get *kartiṣyati*, *akartiṣyat* and *cikartiṣyati*, instead, when the option of *iṬ* is accepted. Refer to derivational details under the appendix (II:497-98) of 1.3.92 *vṛdbhyaḥ syasanoḥ*. Note that when the option of *iṬ* is accepted, *guṇa* is blocked at the strength of the non-*kit* status of *saN*.

2. Note that the *a* of *sa* in *se* of this rule is not intended as particularly important. It can be simply accepted as used for ease of articulation (*uccāraṇārtham*). It is not intended to serve any other purpose (*avivakṣitatvāt*). This facilitates optional *iṬ* also before *sya*. We know that *a* is not *tantra* 'principal' on the basis of the accompanying negation of *asici*. If the use of *a* is non-principal (*atantra*) then why did Pāṇini not formulate the wording of this rule with *s*(*i*→*y*) + *asici* = *syasici*? He did not use *syasici* for fear of confusion. Such a formulation could also be interpreted as: 'before *sya* and *sIC*'. Using *se* and *asici*, side by side in the locative, will clearly give the intended meaning of 'beginning with a *s* which is not of *sIC*'. Even then doubts may persist about whether it meant 'before a *sIC*', or 'something other than a *sIC*'. If it is said that 'also when *sIC* follows', this may be viewed as an useless specification. He should then have said only *si* (*Nyāsa*: *yadi hi sicy api syāt adupādānam anarthakaṃ syāt, sīty evaṃ brūyāt*). Refer to *Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā* under this rule for further details.

3. Why do we have the twin conditions of *se* and *asici*? Consider *kṛt* + (*LUṬ*→*tās*) → *k*(*ṛ*→*ar*) *t* + *iṬ* + *tās*) = *kartitā* where *iṬ*, because of no *s*-initial suffix, cannot be introduced optionally. It must be introduced, obligatorily. Now consider *akartīt* where, because of *sIC* before *LUṄ*, we also get an obligatory *iṬ*.

7.2.58 गमेरिट् परस्मैपदेषु

gamer iṭ parasmaipadeṣu
/*gameḥ* 5/1 *iṭ* 1/1 *parasmaipadeṣu* 7/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasya* #35 *se* #57)
gamer dhātor sakārāder ārdhadhātukasya parasmaipadeṣv iḍ āgamo bhavati

Augment *iṬ* is introduced to an affix termed *ārdhadhātuka*, which begins with *s* occurring after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *gamḶ* 'to go', provided an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows.

EXAMPLES:

gamiṣyati 'third person singular *LṚṬ*-derivate of *gam*'
agamiṣyat 'third person singular *LUṄ*-derivate of *gam*'
jigamiṣati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *gam* ending in *saN*'

1. This rule introduces augment *iṬ* to an *ārdhadhātuka* affix which begins with *s*, provided an affix termed *parasmaipada* occurs to follow verbal root *gam*. Note that *parasmaipadeṣu* is not strictly used for ensuring the occurrenee of affixes termed *parasmaipada*. It is, instead, used for negating the occurrence of affixes termed *ātmanepada*. This is how augment *iṬ* could be introduced to affix *saN* in *jigamiṣitum*, *jigamiṣā* and *jigamiṣitā*, where affixes termed *kṛt* follow. As against this, we do not get *iṬ* in deriving *gaṃsyate* where *te* is an affix termed *ātmanepada*. Augment *iṬ* could thus be desired anywhere outside the context of an *ātmanepada* affix. It can even be introduced in contexts where a *parasmaipada* affix has gone through deletion, via *LUK*. Thus, we get *sañjigamiṣitā/ adhijigamiṣatā vyākaraṇasya* 'intense desire to learn grammar'. These two examples both are derivates of *tṛC*. Of course, this introduction of *iṬ* is limited to affixes which begin with *s*.

Note that *gamḶ* 'to go' is treated as marked with *anudātta*. This condition of *se* is important. We do not get *iṬ* in *gantāsmi/ gantāsvaḥ/ gantāsmaḥ* where the following affixes begin with *m* and *v*. This rule facilitates *iṬ* with express mention of *iṬ* under the condition of an affix which begins with *s*. This provision of *iṬ* is thus obligatory.

Example derivates illustrate introduction of *iṬ* when (replacements of) *LṚṄ*, *LUṄ*, and *saN* follow. The *gam*-replacement of *iṄ* gets a replacement in long by rule 6.4.16 *ajjhanagamāṃ sani*. Refer to derivational details of *jigamiṣati* under the appendix (III:700) of 2.4.47 *sani ca*. Other derivates do not offer anything new.

Why after *gam* (*gameḥ*)? Consider *ceṣyati* where, since the root is not *gam*, we do not get *iṬ*.

7.2.59 न वृद्भ्यश्चतुर्भ्यः

na vṛdbhyaś caturbhyaḥ
/ na ϕ vṛdbhyaḥ 5/3 *caturbhyaḥ* 5/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasya* #35 *iṭ* #35 *se* #57)
vṛtādibhyaś caturbhya uttarasya sakārāder ārdhadhātukasya parasmaipadeṣu iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced to an affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* which begins with *s* occurring after an *aṅga*, namely the four verbal roots *vṛtU*

'to turn', *vṛdhŪ* 'to grow', *śṛdhŪ* 'to reproach' and *syandŪ* 'to drip, ooze, move', provided an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows.

EXAMPLES:

vartsyati 'third person singular *LṚṬ*-derivate of *vṛt*'
avartsyat 'third person singular *LṚṬ*-derivate of *vṛt*'
vivṛtsati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *vṛt* ending in *saN*'
vartsyati/ avartsyat/ vivṛtsyati '. . . derivates of *vṛdhŪ*'
śartsyati/ aśartsyat/ śiśṛtsati '. . . derivates of *śṛdhŪ*'
syantsyati/ asyantsyat/ sisyantsati '. . . derivates of *syandŪ*'

1. This rule blocks the introduction of *iṬ* to a *s*-initial *ārdhadhātuka* affix when an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows *vṛtU, vṛdhU, śṛdhU* and *syandŪ*. Refer to derivational details under the appendix (II:497-98) of 1.3.92 *vṛdbhyaḥ syasanoḥ*.

2. Note that the plural in *vṛdbhyaḥ* is used for indicating the meaning of *ādi* 'and its like, etc.' All these four roots are *udātta*. The first three roots have *iṬ* made available to them obligatorily. Verbal root *syandŪ* gets *iṬ*, optionally, since it is marked with *Ū* as an *it*. This rule offers negation to these obligatory and optional provisions of *iṬ*, both.

It is stated that *caturbhyaḥ* 'after the four' should not be stated in the wording of this rule (*Kāś*: *caturbhyaḥ iti na vaktavyam*). For, *vṛt* of *vṛdbhyaḥ*, is used for indicating the end of the listing of roots forming a class headed by *dyut*. It is further said that since *vṛt* means 'end, finish', and is read at the end of the class headed by *dyut*, it should indicate 'the end' of the class listing'. But there are four verbal roots also used after *vṛt*. It is stated that *vṛt* can still indicate the end of their listing. Does this mean we do not need *caturbhyaḥ*? Commentators say that it is still needed. They say that an optional *iṬ*, based upon the status of roots as marked with *ŪT* as an *it*, is internally conditioned. The word *caturbhyaḥ* is used so that the negation of this rule could also block this optional *iṬ*. That is, negation (*pratiṣedha*) becomes more powerful against the option. This is why *syandŪ* also does not get optional *iṬ*. This is what the word *caturbhyaḥ* is used for.

3. Recall that this negation applies only when an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows. This negation also applies before *kṛt* affixes, and also where *LUK*-deletion of a *parasmaipada* affix is accomplished (*Kāś*: *anyatra sarvatra pratiṣedhaḥ kṛty api hi parasmaipadaluki ca pratiṣedho bhavati*). This statement of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* is confusing. For, if the negation applies everywhere else, how could it not apply to *vivṛtsitā* with *iṬ*, and *vivṛtsa* (*tvam*) without *iṬ*? The *Mahābhāṣya* discusses the scope of this negation separately with reference to affixes termed *parasmaipada, ātmanepada*, i.e., *tiṄ*, and *kṛt*. *Kāśikā* combines these two sets of derivates and ends up creating confusion.

4. *Nyāsa* tries to answer the question: 'how do we get an *iṬ* specified with

parasmaipadeṣu, also when *kṛt*, or a *LUK*-deletion of *parasmaipada* follows'. Jinendrabuddhi accepts rule-splitting whereby we get two rules:

(*i*) *gamer iṬ* which, with the *anuvṛtti* of *se* from the preceding rule, yields the interpretation: *sakārādāv ārdhadhātuke iḍāgamo bhavati* 'augment *iṬ* is introduced when an *ārdhadhātuka* affix beginning with *s* follows'.

(*ii*) *parasmaipadeṣu* 'when *parasmaipada* follows'. This split-rule is intended for making a restrictive provision. If this restrictive provision is made without any particular qualification, then the earlier rule will become vacuous. It is therefore suggested that this restrictive provision be made with reference to an affix similar in class. That similar-in-class affix could only be a *tiṄ*. Thus, the restrictive provision will read: 'if augment *iṬ* is to be introduced within the scope of a *tiṄ*, it must be introduced only when a *parasmaipada*, and not an *ātmaenpada*, affix follows.' This enables *iṬ* to be introduced before a *kṛt* and *LUK*-deletion of *parasmaipada*, especially since this restrictive provision will not cover it.

Jinendrabuddhi further observes: 'as we get *iṬ* after *gam* when an affix beginning with *s* follows, that same way we will not get *iṬ* after verbal roots *vṛt*, etc. Consequently, as we get *iṬ* everywhere with the exception of where *ātmanepada* follows, that same way we get the negation of *iṬ* after verbal roots *vṛt*, etc.' (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *gameḥ sakārādau yena prakāreṇa iṭ tenaiva prakāreṇa vṛdādibhyo neḍ iti. tena yathā gamer ātmanepadavarjam anyatra sarvatraiveḍ bhavati, tathā vṛdādibhyo' pi pratiṣedha iti.*)

7.2.60 तासि च क्लृपः

tāsi ca klṛpaḥ
/tāsi (deleted 6/1) *ca* ϕ *klṛpaḥ* 5/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ārdhadhātukasya* #35 *se* #57 *iṭ* #35 *na* #59)
kṛpa uttarasya tāseḥ sakārādeś cārdhadhātukasya parasmaipadeṣu iḍ āgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced to *tās*, and to an affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* which begins with *s*, when they occur after an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *kṛpṺ* 'to be capable, to adapt', and when an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows.

EXAMPLES:

śvaḥ kalptā '. . . will adapt tomorrow'
kalpsyati '. . . will adapt'
akalpsyat '. . . adapted'
ciklpsati '. . . wishes to adapt'

1. This rule negates introduction of augment *iṬ* also to *tās*, or an *ārdhadhātuka* affix beginning with *s*, when an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows an *aṅga* constituted by *kṛpŪ* 'to be capable'. Thus, *kalptā, kalpsyati* and *cikḷpsati.* Refer to the appendix (II:498-99) under 1.3.93 *luṭi ca kḷpaḥ* for derivational details. Note, however, that *kḷpŪ* is marked with *Ū* as an *it* and, hence, is qualified for an optional *iṬ*. This rule negates that optional provision. Refer also to notes under the preceding rule.

It is noted that *iṬ* is desired to be introduced, also, after a root when the same occurs in a *pada* before an *ārdhadhātuka* affix termed *ātmanepada.* Elsewhere, *iṬ* is negated. That is, it is negated in the context of a *kṛt* affix and an affix termed *parasmaipada.* Thus, we get *cikḷpsitā* (with *tṛC*) and *cikḷpsa tvam,* second person singular in *LOṬ* 'imperative'.

7.2.61 अचस्तास्वत्थल्यनिटो नित्यम्

acas tāsvat thaly aniṭo nityam
/acaḥ 5/1 *tāsvat* ϕ *thali* 7/1 *aniṭaḥ* 5/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *na* #59)
tāsau ye nityāniṭo dhātavo' jantāḥ tebhyas tāsāv iva thalīḍāgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced after roots which end in a vowel in *upadeśa,* and obligatorily remain non-*iṬ* before *thās,* when *thaL,* in a manner similar to *thās,* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pātā 'he will protect'
papātha 'he protected'
yātā 'he will go'
yayātha 'he went'
cetā 'he will heap'
cicetha 'he heaped . . .'
netā 'he will lead'
ninetha 'he led . . .'
hotā 'he will perform the sacrifice'
juhotha 'he performed the sacrifice'

1. This rule extends blocking of augment *iṬ* after roots which, in *upadeśa* 'initial citation', end in a vowel and obligatorily remain non-*iṬ* before *thās,* provided when *thaL* 'second person singular active replacement of *siP* in perfect (*LIṬ*; 3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*)' follows specified roots in a manner similar to *thās* 'second person singular middle replacement of *LA*' (3.4.78 *tiptasjhisipthas . . .*).

Note that *upadeśe* is carried over from here to the next rule as a qualifier to *acaḥ.* If *upadeśe* was not carried over, negation of *iṬ* in (*hṛ→har*) + *thaL* = *jahartha* could not be accomplished. For, a replacement in *guṇa,* i.e., *ar,* for

ṛ of *hṛ* would apply first on the basis of being obligatory (*nitya*) and subsequent (*para*). Given this, an introduction of augment *iṬ* in *har* + *tha*, made available under the restrictive provision of *krādiniyama* (cf. notes under 7.2.13), could not be stopped. For, the root will no longer end in a vowel. But reading *upadeśe* can save the situation, and this rule could apply. So long as we meet the condition of *upadeśe*. It does not make any difference whether the root now ended in a consonant. Haradatta rightly remarks:

> *upadeśagraho' py atra vakṣyamāṇo' pakṛṣyate/*
> *guṇe nitye kṛte' py eṣa ṛdante prāpnuyāt katham//*
> 'this presently stated *upadeśa* is also carried over here; how could this introduction of *iṬ* then apply to a root ending in *ṛ*'

The word *acaḥ* is a qualifier to *dhātoḥ* which must be supplied here from 7.2.59 *na vṛdbhyaś* . . . and interpreted via *tadantavidhi* 'treating *x* as ending in *x*'. For, *thaL* is possible only after a verbal root. We thus get the interpretation: *ajantād dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal root ending in a vowel in *upadeśa*'. Not carrying the *anuvṛtti* of *acaḥ* could also yield undesired forms. That is, correct forms of *bhid* 'to pierce' and *chid* 'to cut' with *thaL*, i.e., *bibheditha / cicchedítha*, could not be derived with augment *iṬ*. The *iṬ*, made available under the restrictive provision of *krādi-niyama*, could have been blocked.

The word *tāsvat* is a derivate of *vatI* introduced after a *pada* ending in *saptamī* 'locative'. We then get the meaning: *tāsau iva* = *tāsvat* 'simialr to *tās*'. That is, we do not get *iṬ* in *thaL* in a manner similar to *iṬ* in *tās*. This rule is a partial exception to the *iṬ* made available under the restrictive provision relative to *krādi* (see notes under 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛvṛstu* . . .).

Examples such as *yātā*, etc., are given to illustrate the obligatory non-*iṬ* status of specified roots. Refer to *kaṇitā* (II:343-44) and *goptā* (III:715) for derivational details of derivates of *LUṬ*. Refer to *pecitha* and *śekitha* (III:787) for derivational details of forms deriving with *thaL*, where *thaL* is a replacement of *siP* introduced to replace *LIṬ*.

Note that *aniṭ* is here specified for qualification by *nityam* 'obligatorily'. In the absence of *aniṭ*, *nityam* could only qualify negation (*pratiṣedha*). The word *aniṭ* is not used here for canceling the *iṬ*-status (*seṭ*). For, *tāsvat* is already used. Thus, '*iṬ* does not apply when *thaL* follows exactly as it does not when *tās* follows'. That is, if *iṬ* is optionally allowed when *tās* follows, it cannot be negated when *thaL* follows. Augment *iṬ* is obligatorily allowed, instead. Thus, consider *vidhotā*, *vidhavitā* and *vidudhavitha* (also see notes under 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛvṛ* . . .).

Why do we use the specification with *vatI* in *tāsvat*? So that that which applies (non-*iṬ*) to a form when *tās* follows could be negated when *thaL* follows. For, roots which are not specified to occur before *tās*, and are thus obligatorily non-*iṬ*, cannot be denied *iṬ* when *thaL* follows. A specification with *vatI* is made to indicate complete similarlity (*sarva-sādṛśya*). A specifica-

tion with locative (*saptamī*), i.e., *tāsau*, could not account for it. Consider *jaghasitha* and *uvayitha*, etc., where *ghas* and *vay* are replacements of *ad* and *veÑ*. This rule cannot apply here since these forms of *LUṬ* are not similar to forms when *tās* follows. Verbal roots *ad* 'to eat' and *veÑ* 'to weave' do not get replaced with *ghas* and *vay* in *LUṬ* where *tās* is introduced. The negative provision of this rule is thus not accepted there. That is, *iṬ* is introduced. Consider the following *kārikā* verse:

tāsvad ity ucyamāne tu vateḥ sādṛśyagocarāt
yathābhūtasya tāsau neṭ tathābhūtasya thaly api//
iṭā na bhāvyam ity eṣa doṣo naiva prasajyate
iṭas tāsy asato dhātor niṣedhe vihite thali
abhāvaḥ sadṛśo na syāt thali tāsy asato bhavet//

7.2.62 उपदेशेऽत्वतः

upadeśe' tvataḥ
/upadeśe 7/1 *atvataḥ = akāro' sminn astīti = atvān, tasmāt/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *na* #59 *tāsvat thaly aniṭo nityam* #61)
upadeśe yo dhātur akāravān tāsau nityāniṭ tasmāt tāsāv iva thalīḍāgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is not introduced after a root which ends in a vowel in *upadeśa*, and obligatorily remains non-*iṬ* before *thās*, when *thaL*, in a manner similar to *thās*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

paktā 'he will cook'
papaktha 'he cooked'
yaṣṭā 'he will perform the sacrifice'
iyaṣṭha 'he performed the sacrifice'
śaktā 'he will go'
śaśaktha 'he went'

1. This rule further extends the blocking of *iṬ* after roots which contain an *a* in *upadeśa*, all other conditions remain similar to the preceding rule. Consider *pac* + (*LUṬ→ti*) = *pac* + (*ti→*(*Ḍ*)*ā*)) = *pac* + *tās* + *ā* → *pac* + *t*(*ās→*ϕ) + *ā* = *pa*(*c→k*) + *t* + *ā* = *paktā*, where *tiP* is replaced with (*Ḍ*)*ā* (2.4.85 *luṭaḥ prathamasya . . .*), *tās* goes through *ṭi*-deletion of *ās* (6.4.143 *ṭeḥ*) and *c* of *pac* goes through a replacement in *k* (*kutva*; 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*). The *j* of verbal root *yaj* is similarly replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣatva*; 8.2.36 *vraścabhrasj . . .*). We get *ya*(*j→ṣ*) + *t* + *ā* = *yaṣ* + (*t→ṭ*) + *ā* = *yaṣṭā*, through a replacement in *ṭ* for *t* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). Deriving *iyaṣṭha*, from *yaj* + (*LIṬ→siP→thaL*), involves iteration (*dvitva*) and operations relative to the assignment of the term *abhyāsa*. We thus get *yaj* + *tha* → *ya* + *yaj* + *tha*. An application of *samprasāraṇa* and *pūrvarūpa* 'a single replacement similar to what precedes in a sequence' produces (*y→i*) *a*

+ yaj + tha → *(i+a→i) + yaj + tha = i + yaj + tha.* The *j* of *yaj* is again replaced with *ṣ* followed by *ṣṭutva*, i.e., *i + ya(j→ṣ) + (th→ṭh) a = iyaṣṭha.* Note here that our present rule negates the introduction of augment *iṬ.* Refer to additional details of these derivations under the preceding rule.

2. Why do we have the condition of *atvataḥ* 'containing *a* in *upadeśa*'? Consider *kṛṣ + (LUṬ→ti→Ḍā) = k(ṛ→ar)ṣ + t(ās→ϕ) + ā = karṣ (t→ṭ) ā = karṣṭā* and *cakarṣitha* with iteration, *k→c* and *iṬ*, where an absence of *a* in *upadeśa* cannot negate *iṬ* before *thaL.* The *a* of *kṛṣ→karṣ* which is gotten through application of *guṇa* is not any part of *upadeśa.* Negation of *iṬ* in *thaL* will thus not apply. Similar non-negation of *iṬ* is witnessed in deriving *bibheditha* where *bhid* does not contain *a* in *upadeśa.* Why do we have the condition of *a* followed by *t* (*tapara*)? Consider *rādh + LUṬ→tiP→Ḍā → rāddhā,* and *rādhitha* where the root contains a long *ā*, instead. The *iṬ* in *rādhitha* can thus not be negated. It will apply obligatorily in view of the restrictive provision of *krādi* (7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛvṛ . . .*).

The condition of *tāsvat* 'non-*iṬ* in a manner similar to when *tās* follows' is also important. Consider *jighṛkṣati* and *jagrahitha* where *grah* is allowed *iṬ* before *tās* but is not allowed before *saN* (7.2.12 *sani grahguhoś ca*). This negation cannot apply before *thaL* since it is not similar to the provision of *iṬ* when *tās* follows. That is, *iṬ* is introduced. Finally, the condition of *aniṭo nityam* 'obligatorily non-*iṬ*' must also be satisfied. Thus, *iṬ* cannot be negated before *thaL* in *ānañjitha* where verbal root *añj* is marked with *ū* as an *it.* This allows optional *iṬ* to its forms before *tās.* Thus, we get *aṅktā* and *añjitā.* A negative provision of *iṬ* cannot be accepted before *thaL* since it is made against an optional, and not an obligatory, non-*iṬ.*

7.2.63 ऋतो भारद्वाजस्य

ṛto bhāradvājasya
/ṛtaḥ 5/1 *bhāradvājasya* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *it* #35 *na* #59 *tāsvat thaly aniṭo nityam* #61)
ṛkārāntād dhātor bhāradvājasyācāryasya matena tāsāv iva nityāniṭas thali iḍāgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṬ*, in the opinion of Bhāradvāja, is not introduced obligatorily to *thaL*, in a manner similar to *tās* after a verbal root termed an *aṅga* ending in *ṛ*, when *thaL* follows.

EXAMPLES:

smarttā 'he will remember'
sasmartha 'he remembered'
dhvarttā 'he will be crooked'
dadhvartha 'he was crooked'

1. Note that a negation of *iṬ* for roots which end in *ṛ* is already made

available by rule 7.2.61 *acas tāsvat*. . . . The non-*iṬ* provision of this rule then becomes restrictive. For, a provision made against one already made available is made for restrictive purposes (*siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*). That is, non-*iṬ* status of roots, in the opinion of Bhāradvāja, applies only to those roots which end in *ṛ* (*Kāś*: *ṛta eva bhāradvājasya nānyeṣāṃ dhātūnām*). We thus get examples such as *yayitha, vavitha, pecitha* and *śekitha*. Roots which do not end in *ṛ* will, in the opinion of Bhāradvāja, receive *iṬ*. That is, this rule can then be treated as making an optional provision of *iṬ* against provisions of the preceding two rules (*Kāś*: *tad ayam arthāt pūrvayor yogayor vikalpaḥ*).

Recall that verbal roots *vṛN̐* and *vṛÑ* have been enumerated as *udātta* among roots which end in *ā*. We cannot find *thaL* after *vṛN̐* since this root occurs only before middle endings (*ātmanepada*). Verbal root *vṛÑ*, since it is allowed the negation of *iṬ* in the Vedic, via *nipātana*, can be accepted as allowing *iṬ* in the classical usage. This rule is thus not formulated for blocking augment *iṬ* of these two roots. This rule cannot be accepted as formulated for blocking augment *iṬ* of roots which end in *ṛ*. Such roots are *anudātta* and hence, they qualify as non-*iṬ*, obligatorily, before *tās*. Their *iṬ* can be negated by 7.2.61 *acas tāsvat*. . . . This rule could not have been formulated for them. It is true that these roots may become *anajanta* 'not ending in a vowel', especially when they yield forms with the application of *guṇa* followed by *r* (*rapara*). This, however, cannot take them out of the scope of the preceding rule. For, the condition of *ajanta* 'ending in *a*', requires *aC* in *upadeśa*. Thus, this rule is formulated for restrictive purposes, especially since its provision can be accounted for by existing rules.

2. Note that *T*, at the end of *ṛ* in *ṛtaḥ* (*taparakaraṇa*), is intended for excluding roots which may end in a long *ṝ*. This rule is thus saved from becoming an operational rule (*vidhi-sūtra*) for roots ending in long *ṝ*. That is, it is blocked from making operational proivisions for roots ending in long *ṝ*. Since no provision is made for such roots by any earlier rule, and also since this rule does not make any operational provision for them, this rule is restrictive, as against operational. This restrictive provision for roots ending in a short *ṛ* thus becomes more powerful (*PŚ*:109) *vidhiniyamsambhave vidhir eva jyāyān*).

3. The following *kārikā* verse summarizes provisions of rules 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛvṛstudrusruśruvo liṭi*, 7.2.61 *acastāsvatthaly aniṭo nityam*, 7.2.62 *upadeśe' tvataḥ* and 7.2.63 *ṛto bhāradvājasya*:

> *ajanto' kāravān yas tāsy aniṭ thali vedeyam/*
> *ṛdanta īdṛṅ nityāniṭ krādyanyo liṭi seḍ bhavet//*
> 'a verbal root is allowed *iṬ*, optionally, before *thaL* if the root is obligatorily non-*iṬ* before *thās*, and it either (*i*) ends in an *aC* which is not a short *ṛ*, or (*ii*) it contains a short *a*; a root such as this which ends in a short *ṛ* and which remains obligatorily non-*iṬ* before *tās*, also remains non-*iṬ*, obligatorily, before *thaL*; roots other than those enumerated

as *krādi* (7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛ*. . .), obligatorily, remain *seṭ* 'with the provision of *iṬ*' before *LIṬ*'

Bhaṭṭoji offers a *kārikā* verse summarizing provisions of rules 7.2.61 *acas tāsvat*. . . through 7.2.63 *ṛto bhāradvājasya*, especially as they operate in view of the restrictive provision known as *krādi-niyama*:

ajanto' akāravān vā yas tāsy aniṭ thali veḍ ayam/
ṛdanta īdṛṅ nityā' niṭ krād anyo liṭi seḍ bhavet//
'augment *iṬ* is introduced, optionally, before *thaL* when the same occurs after a root which ends in a vowel, or contains a short *a*, and is obligatorily non-*iṬ* before *tās*; a similar root which ends in short *ṛ* is obligatorily non-*iṬ* before *thaL*'

Bhīmasena Śāstrī (II:167) offers a three-way summation:

(1) Augment *iṬ* will become optional in case of a root which remains non-*iṬ* obligatorily before *tās*, if this root ends in a vowel (other than *ṛ*) or contains a short *a*. For, 7.2.61 *acsa tāsvat*. . . and 7.2.63 *upadeśe*. . . negate *iṬ* after these roots when *thaL* follows. But Bhāradvāja accepts the introduction of *iṬ* after such roots (7.2.63 *ṛto bhāradvājasya*). This then means an optional *iṬ* in *thaL*. Examples of roots ending in a vowel: *kṣi* 'to decay': *cikṣayitha / cikṣetha*.
Examples of roots with a short *a*, for example *pac* and *śak*, with optional *iṬ* in *thaL*: *pecitha / papaktha*; *śekitha / śaśaktha*.

(2) Augment *iṬ* can never be introduced before *thaL* after a root which remains non-*iṬ*, obligatorily, in *thaL*, but ends in a short *ṛ*. For, 7.2.61 *acas tāsvat*. . . and 7.2.62 *ṛto bhāradvājasya* both negate *iṬ* after such a root before *thaL*. Consider *jahartha*, a derivate of *hṛ* ending in *ṛ* with no *iṬ*.

(3) The restrictive provision of *krādi* (7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛvṛ*. . .) offers *iṬ* after all *anudātta* roots in *LIṬ*, with the exception of eight roots listed as *kṛ*, etc. Consider forms of *bhid* and *chid* as examples of roots which are *anudātta* but which are not listed in the eight roots beginning with *kṛ*: *bibheditha / bibhidiva / bibhidima*; *ciccheditha / cicchidiva cicchidima*. Note that roots not listed under the eight roots of 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛ*. . ., if qualified for application of preceding two provisions, will have optional *iṬ* in *thaL* of *LIṬ*. Of course, no *iṬ* after the enumerated eight roots when used elsewhere, in *LIṬ*.

7.2.64 बभूथाततन्थजगृम्भववर्थेति निगमे

babhūthātatanthajagṛmbhavavartheti nigame
/babhūtha-ātatantha-jagṛmbha-vavartha (1/1 deleted after all constituent bases) *iti* ϕ *nigame* 7/1/

'babhūva, ātatantha, jagṛmbha, vavartha' ity etāni nipātyante nigamaviṣaye
Forms such as *babhūtha, ātatantha, jagṛmbha* and *vavartha* are derived, via *nipātana*, in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

tvaṃ hi hotâ prathamo babhūthá 'you indeed were the first officiating priest . . .'
yenāntarikṣamūrvâtatanthá 'the power by means of which you expanded . . .'
jagṛmbhā te dakṣiṇamindra hastam 'O Indra! we grasped your right hand . . .'
vavartha tvaṃ hi jyotiṣā 'you indeed enveloped yourself with light . . .'

1. Here again the negation of *iṬ* is already made available under the restrictive provision of *krādi* (7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛvṛ . . .*). Stating it again turns this rule into a restrictive provision. That is, *iṬ* is negated here only in the context of the Vedic. Classical usage, of course, will not be affected (*Kāś: nigama eva, na bhāṣāyām iti*). Thus, we get *babhūtha, ātatantha, jagṛmbha* and *vavartha*, where *babhūtha* lacks *iṬ* which was made available by *krādi-niyama* (7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛ...*). Refer to *babhūva* (II:429) for relevant derivational details. We get *bhū* + (*LIṬ→siP→thaL*) = *babhūvitha*, with *iṬ* and augment *vUK* (II:430), in the classical usage. Now consider *ātatantha*, a second person singular *LIṬ*-derivate of *tanU* 'to expand' used with *āṄ*. We will get *ātenitha* with *iṬ* where deletion of the *abhyāsa* and replacement of *a* with *e* (*etva*) must be accomplished (6.4.121 *thali ca seṭi*). We get *grah* + (*LIṬ→mas→ma*) → *jigṛmbhā*, where *ma* replaces *mas* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānām . . .*) and *samprasāraṇa* is accomplished by 6.1.16 *grahijyāvayi. . . .* The *h* of *grah*, subsequent upon doubling (*dvitva*), is replaced with *bh* (*vt: hṛgrahor bhaś chandasi hasyeti vaktavyam*; ad 8.2.35 *hṛgrahorbhaś . . .*). The final *a* is then replaced with *ā* to produce *jigṛmbhā*. We get *jagṛhima* in the classical language. Recall that *iṬ* after *vṛÑ* 'to choose' in *vavartha* is already negated (7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛ . . .*). A repeat negation of *iṬ* is here made for restrictive purposes. That is, a negation of *iṬ* after *vṛÑ* with *thaL* is limited, only to the Vedic usage. Thus, we get *vavaritha* in the classical usage with *iṬ* and *guṇa*.

7.2.65 विभाषा सृजिदृशोः

vibhāṣā sṛjidṛśoḥ
/vibhāṣa 1/1 *sṛji-dṛśoḥ* (*itar. dv.*) 6/2/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *na* #59 *thali* #61)
'sṛji, dṛśi' ity etayos thali vibhāṣā iḍāgamo na bhavati
Augment *iṭ* is, optionally, not introduced to *thaL* when it follows an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *sṛj* 'to create, project' and *dṛśIR* 'to see'.

EXAMPLES:

sasraṣṭha 'he created . . .'
sasarjitha 'ibidem'
dadraṣṭha 'he saw . . .'
dadarśitha 'ibidem'

1. Note that *iṬ*, in view of restrictive provision of *krādi-niyama* (7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛ . . .*), is, obligatorily, made available to these two roots. Our present rule renders that obligatory provision optional. Thus, *sṛj* + (*LIṬ*→*siP*→*thaL*) → *sasraṣṭha* and *dṛś* + (*LIṬ*→*siP*→*thaL*) → *dadraṣṭha* where, after operations relative to doubling (*dvitva*), the *j* of *sṛj* is replaced with *ṣ* (8.2.36 *vraśca-bhrasj . . .*). Augment *aM* (6.1.57 *sṛdṛśor . . .*) is then introduced to derive *sasraṣṭha* with application of *yaÑ* and *ṣṭutva* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). Similar applications are also seen in deriving *dadraṣṭha*. We will get *sasarjitha* and *dadarśitha*, with *iṬ* and *guṇa*, when the optional *iṬ* provision of this rule is accepted.

7.2.66 इडत्यर्तिव्ययतीनाम्

iḍ attyartivyayatīnām
/*iṭ* 1/1 *atty-arti-vyayatīnām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *thali* #61)
'*atti, arti, vyayati*' *ity eteṣāṃ thalīḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to *thaL* of an *aṅga* relative to verbal roots *ad* 'to consume', *ṛ* 'to go' and *vyeÑ* 'to cover'.

EXAMPLES:

āditha 'second person singular *ad*-derivate of *LIṬ*'
āritha 'second person singular *LIṬ*-derivate of *ṛ*'
saṃvivyayitha 'second person singular *LIṬ*-derivate of *veÑ*, used after *sam* and *vi*'

1. Note that *iṭ* is explicitly used here for clarity (*Kāś*: *atreḍ grahaṇaṃ vispaṣṭārtham*). Why could it not be accepted as making an optional provision (*vikalpa*)? For, that would have made the use of *arti* and *vyayati* as vacuous (*vyartha*). Their optional *iṬ* has already been made available by 7.2.63 *ṛto bhāradvājasya*. Is this explicit use of *iṭ*, then, made for negating *iṬ*? This could hardly be the purpose. Specification of *arti* in this rule will again become vacuous. For, this negation is already made available by 7.2.63 *ṛto bhāradvājasya*. Since this rule could not make any optional, or negative, provision, its provision must be accepted as obligatory (*nitya*). An explicit use of *iṭ* makes it clearly known that the *anuvṛtti* of *na* (7.2.59 *na vṛdbhyaś . . .*) and *vibhāṣā* (7.2.65 *vibhāṣā sṛjidṛśoḥ*) is canceled.

2. This rule introduces *iṬ* to *thaL* of an *aṅga* constituted by *adA* 'to consume', *ṛ* 'to go' and *vyeÑ* 'to cover'. Thus, *ad* + (*LIṬ*→*siP*→*thaL*) = *āditha*, *ṛ* + (*LIṬ*→*siP*→*tha*) = *āritha* and *vyeÑ* + (*LIṬ*→*siP*→*thaL*) = *vyayitha*, where an

optionally available *iṬ* is made obligatory. The *a* of the *abhyāsa* (in *āditha* and *āritha*) is replaced with its long counterpart (*ātva*; 7.4.70 *ata ādeḥ*), subsequent upon doubling (*dvitva*). This *ā*, however, is negated in the context of *vyeÑ*. Refer to derivational details of *saṃvyayitha* under 6.1.45 *na vyo liṭi*. Recall that rule 7.2.63 *ṛto bhāradvājasya* allows optional *iṬ* in connection with *ad* (*atti*) and *vyeÑ* (*vyayati*). It also negates *iṬ* in connection with roots ending in *ṛ*. This rule is formulated for making the introduction of *iṬ* obligatory.

7.2.67 वस्वेकाजाद्घसाम्

vasv ekājādghasām
/vasu 1/1 (deleted) *ekājādghasām* 6/3 = *eko' c yasmin sa ekāc* (*bv.*), *ekāc ca āt ca ghaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #66)
kṛtadvirvacanānāṃ dhātūnām ekācām ākārāntānām ghaseś ca vasāv iḍāgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to *vasU* when it occurs after a root which, after doubling, either consists of a single syllable, or ends in *ā*, or else, is constituted by *ghas* 'to eat'.

EXAMPLES:

ādivān 'he ate'
āśivān 'ibidem'
pecivān 'he cooked'
śekivān 'he left'

1. Note that roots which are specified here as consisting of a single syllable, or ending in *ā*, or else, constituted by *ghas*, must be understood as those which yield such forms after going through doubling and related operations (*Kāś*: *kṛtadvirvacanānāṃ dhātūnām ekācām akārāntānām*). A specification with *vasU* is here made to refer to *KvasU* (3.2.107 *kvasuś ca*), a replacement of *LIṬ*. Thus, verbal roots *ad* and *aś* yield their monosyllabic forms *ād* and *āś* after going through doubling (*ad+ad*), *halādiśeṣa* 'retention of that which begins with initial consonant' (*a+ad*; 7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*), replacement in *ā* (*ātva*; *a→ā+ad*; 7.4.70 *ata ādeḥ*) and 'replacement in homogeneous long' (*savarṇadīrgha*; (*ā+a→ā*) *d*; 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*). Verbal root *aś* follows the same pattern. Verbal roots *pac* and *śak* go through deletion of their reduplicate (*abhyāsa*; 6.4.120 *ata ekahalmadhye . . .*) in deriving *pecivān* and *śekivān*. Their *a* is also replaced concurrently with *e* (*etva*). Refer to *jakṣivān* in the appendix of 3.2.107 *kvasuś ca* (III:745) for derivational details.

2. Note that this provision of *iṬ* must be restrictive (*niyamārtha*) since roots specified by this rule should have received *iṬ* from rule 7.2.13 *kṛsṛbhṛ. . . .* For, a provision made in view of one already made available is

accepted as restrictive. That is, augment *iṬ* is introduced to *vasU* only when it occurs after these specified roots, and not when it occurs after any other root (*Kāś: siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ, ekājādghasām eva vasāv iḍāgamo bhavati nānyeṣām*). It is for this reason that *iṬ* cannot be introduced in deriving *bibhidvān, cicchidvān, babhūvān* and *śiśrivān*. This restrictive provision of *iṬ* becomes applicable as a result of the *krādi-niyama*, or for an absence of any other negative provision (*pratiṣedhābhāva*).

Why do we need a specification with *āt* 'after that which ends in *ā*' when the *ekāc* condition of 'containing a single vowel' can already account for it? Roots which are specified here with *āt* also become monosyllabic, after doubling and operations relative to *abhyāsa* 'reduplicated syllable' are performed. A separate specification with *āt* is made for roots which do not consist of a single vowel (*ekāc*). Consider *yeyivān* where the root is *yayā* + (*LIṬ→KvasU*) before augment *iṬ* is introduced. Since such roots become monosyllabic only after their final *ā* is deleted and also since this deletion is accomplished only after *iṬ* is introduced, these roots cannot be covered by *ekāc*. That is, they will still be consisting of more than one vowel when *iṬ* will be introduced. A specification with *āt* is thus necessary.

But accepting this explanation of *āt* will make *iṬ* available to *vasU* after *daridrā* 'to be poor'. Recall that *daridrā* also receives *ām* (*vt. kāsy anekāc . . .* ad 3.1.35 *kāspratyayād ām amantre*). Rule 2.4.81 *āmaḥ* then causes deletion of *LIṬ*. How could one introduce *iṬ* to a replacement of *LIṬ*, i.e., *vasU*, when *LIṬ* is already deleted? Augment *iṬ* is thus not available to *daridrā*. It could not be made available in the context of *daridrā*, even when one does not introduce *ām*. For, the *ā* of *daridrā* will then be deleted, prior to the introduction of *KvasU*. This deletion will clearly remove the condition of *ādanta* 'ending in *āt*'. Augment *iṬ* will thus be blocked again.

Is it necessary to include a reference to *ghas*? Yes. For, in its absence, doubling of *ghas* will be blocked. Note that 6.4.100 *ghasibhasor hali ca* is subsequent in order to rules which accomplish doubling. If this rule applies first to delete the penultimate (*upadhā*) *a*, of *gh*(*a*→ϕ)*s* = **ghs*, on the basis of its subsequent order (*paratva*), doubling cannot be accomplished. The form will simply not have any vowel (*anacka*). A specification of *ghas* in this rule enables *iṬ* to block penultimate deletion (*upadhālopa*) on the basis of *paratva* 'subsequent in order' (1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe . . .*). Rule 6.4.98 *gamahanajanaghasām . . .* accomplishes penultimate deletion after *iṬ* is introduced. This deletion becomes *sthānivat* 'similar to what it replaced' (1.1.59 *dvirvacane' ci*) in view of application of doubling. This is how one derives *jakṣivān*. It is thus important that *ghas* be specified here separately.

7.2.68 विभाषा गमहनविदविशाम्

vibhāṣā gamahanavidaviśām
/*vibhāṣā* 1/1 *gamahanavidaviśām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*)/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #66 *vasu* #67)
'*gama, hana, vida, viśa*' *ity eteṣāṃ dhātūnāṃ vasau vibhāṣā iḍāgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is optionally introduced to *vasU* when it occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *gam* 'to go', *han* 'to harm, kill', *vid* 'to gain, profit' and *viś* 'to enter'.

EXAMPLES:

jagmivān '. . . went'
jaganvān 'ibidem'
jaghnivān '. . . killed'
jaghanvān 'ibidem'
vividivān '. . . gained'
vividvān 'ibidem'
viviśivān '. . . entered'
viviśvān 'ibidem'

1. This rule introduces *iṬ* to *vasU* after verbal roots *gam, han, vid* and *viś*. Note that *vid* here refers to the *tudādi* root meaning *lābha* 'gain'. We know it from its associated (*sahacarita*) listing, here, with *viś* which is also a root of the *tudādi* class. Verbal root *vid*, which has the signification of *jñāna* 'knowledge', is also not specified here. For, it receives *iṬ* obligatorily (*nityam*), as is attested by its single form *vividvān*. Verbal root *vid* with the signification of *sattā* 'existence' and *vidA* 'to think' could not be included here either. For, they are middle verbs (*ātmanepadī*) where *KvasU* is not introduced.

2. Derivational details of *jagmivān / jaganvān* and *jaghnivān / jaghanvān* are similar to examples of the preceding rules. We get *gam* + *LIṬ* → *jagam* + *ivas* with *KvasU, iṬ*, doubling and operations relative to *abhyāsa*. Note that doubling is accomplished in view of 1.1.59 *dvirvacane' ci*. Deletion of the penultimate *a* of *jagam* is accomplished by 6.4.98 *gamahana*. . . . An introduction of *nUM* then derives *jagmivān* (cf. III:745; under 3.2.107 *kvasuś ca*). The *m* of *gam*, in *jaganvān*, is replaced with *n* (8.2.65 *mvoś ca*). The *h* of *jaghnivān* will go through a replacement in *gh* (*kutva*; 7.3.55 *abhyāsāc ca*). Remaining examples follow similar derivational applications.

3. A *vārttika* proposal is also made for an optional introduction of *iṬ* in connection with *dṛś* 'to see'. Thus, we get *dadṛśivān* and *dadṛśvān*.

7.2.69 सनिंससनिवांसम्

saniṃsasanivāṃsam
/*saniṃsasanivāṃsam* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #66 *vasu* #67)
sanoteḥ sanater vā dhātoḥ '*saniṃsasanivāṃsam*' *iti nipātyate*
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to *vasU* when it occurs after *san*, used in conjunction after *sanim*, in deriving *saniṃsasanivāṃsam*, via *nipātana*.

EXAMPLES:

saniṃsasanivāṃsam

1. This word is derived, via *nipātana*, only as an accusative singular. Since this form is only found in the Vedic, and also since the example in the classical language (*bhāṣā*) is *senivāṃsam*, commentators restrict this *nipātana* to the Vedic.

2. Note that *saniṃsanivāṃsam* could be derived, either from the *bhvādi* root *ṣaṇA* or the *tudādi* root *ṣaṇU* 'to give', used in construction preceded by *sanim*. This derivate does not replace the *a* of *saN* with *e* (*etva*; 6.4.120 *ekahalmadhye* . . .). It also does not accept deletion of its *abhyāsa* before *vas*, used with *iṬ*. We get *senivāṃsam* in the classical usage with the application of replacement in *e* (*etva*), introduction of *iṬ* and deletion of *abhyāsa*.

7.2.70 ऋद्धनोः स्ये

ṛddhanoḥ sye
/ṛddhanoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*) *sye* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35)
ṛkārāntānāṃ dhātūnāṃ hanteś ca sye iḍāgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to *sya* when occurring after an *aṅga* constituted, either by roots ending in *ṛT* or by verbal root *han*.

EXAMPLES:

kariṣyati 'he will do'
hariṣyati 'he will carry'
haniṣyati 'he will kill'

1. Note that *T* (*taparakaraṇa*) of *ṛT* is used for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*). Recall that 7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe* . . . will negate *iṬ* in connection with a root which ends in a short *ṛ*, or is constituted by *han*, since they contain a single vowel and are also marked with *anudātta*. Rule 7.2.44 *svaratisūtisūyati* . . ., especially in connection with *svṛ*, makes this negative provision optional. Our present rule, since it makes a provision against one which already exists, makes *iṬ* available, obligatorily. This obligatory provision is accepted against optional *iṬ* on the basis of *vipratiṣedha* (1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam*). This preceding explanation, as Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kās*) claims, is made out of compassion for those who may be forgetful (*vismaraṇaśīla*).

2. Why specify *ṛ* with a following *t* (*taparakaraṇa*)? This specification is made for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*). That is, it is made for excluding any reference to long *ṝ*. For, a root which ends in *ṝ* will avail *iṬ* on the basis of its *udātta*. A specification with *ṛt* will also make clear that *ṛ* refers to a sound. It does not, for example, refer to verbal root *ṛ* 'to go'.

7.2.71 अञ्जेः सिचि

añjeḥ sici
/añjeḥ 5/1 *sici* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35)
añjeḥ sici iḍāgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to a *sIC* which occurs after an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *añj* 'anoint'.

EXAMPLES:

āñjīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *añj*'
āñjiṣṭām 'third person dual active . . .'
āñjiṣuḥ 'third person plural active . . .'

1. Note that 7.2.44 *svaratisūti* . . . allows optional *iṬ* to *añjŪ* at the strength of its *Ū* as an *it* (*Kāś*: *ūditvād vibhāṣā bhavati*). This rule is then formulated for making that provision obligatory (*nitya*). But since this rule further conditions its provision with *sIC*, we will get *iṬ*, obligatorily, only in derivates of *LUṄ*. Elsewhere, because of no introduction of *sIC*, we will get an optional *iṬ*. Thus, we will get *aṅktā* and *añjitā*. Incidentally, our example derivates will receive their *āṬ* from 6.4.72 *āḍ ajādīnām*. Refer to the appendix of 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī* for derivational details of many *LUṄ*-derivates (II:333-34).

7.2.72 स्तुसुधूञ्भ्यः परस्मैपदेषु

stusudhūñbhyaḥ parasmaipadeṣu
/stusudhūñbhyaḥ 5/3 (*itar. dv.*); *parasmaipadeṣu* 7/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *sici* #71)
'*stu, su, dhūñ*' *ity etebhyaḥ sici parasmaipade parata iḍāgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to *sIC* when it occurs after an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *stu* (*ṣṭuÑ*) 'to praise', *suÑ* (*ṣuÑ*) 'to press out' and *dhūÑ* 'to shake', provided an affix termed *parasmaipada* follows.

EXAMPLES:

astāvīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *stu*'
asāvīt 'third person singular active . . . of *suÑ*'
adhāvīt 'third person singular active . . . of *dhūÑ*'

1. Note that 7.2.10 *ekāc upadeśe* . . . will obligatorily negate *iṬ* in the context of verbal roots *ṣṭuÑ* and *ṣuÑ*. For, they are both marked with *anudātta* as an *it*. Verbal root *dhūÑ* qualifies for an optional *iṬ* in view of 7.2.44 *svaratisūtisūyati*. . . . Our present rule makes its provision of *iṬ*, obligatory. It is thus an exception to both 7.2.10 and 7.2.44. Refer to *astāvīt* under the appendix (II:334) of 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī* for derivational details.
2. Why do we have the condition of *parasmaipadeṣu* 'when affixes termed

parasmaipada follow'? Consider *astoṣṭa, asoṣṭa* and *adhoṣṭa* which are third person singular middle (*ātmanepada*) derivates of *ṢṭuÑ, ṢuÑ* and *dhūÑ*, respectively. Since these roots are marked with *Ñ*, they can be derived with both the active and middle endings (*ubhayapadī*). We will not get *iṬ* in their derivates with the middle endings.

7.2.73 यमरमनमातां सक् च

yamaramanamātāṃ sak ca
/yamaramanamātām 6/3 (*yama ca rama ca nama ca āc ca = yamaramanamāt, teṣām; itar. dv.*); *sak* 1/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *sici* #71 *parasmaipadeṣu* #72)
'*yama, rama, nama*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānām, ākārāntānāṃ ca sagāgamo bhavati parasmaipade sici iḍāgamaś ca*
Augment *saK*, and *iṬ* as well, is introduced to an *aṅga* which is constituted by *yamA* 'to restrain', *ramU* 'to sport', *ṇamA* 'to bend, bow', and to a root ending in *ā*, when *sIC*, followed by an affix termed *parasmaipada*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

ayaṃsīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *yamA*'
ayaṃsiṣṭām 'third person dual . . .'
ayaṃsiṣuḥ 'third person plural . . .'
vyaraṃsīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *ramU*'
vyaraṃsiṣṭām 'third person dual . . .'
vyaraṃsiṣuḥ 'third person plural . . .'
anaṃsīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *ṇamA*'
anaṃsiṣṭām 'third person dual . . .'
anaṃsiṣuḥ 'third person plural . . .'
ayāsīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *yā* 'to reach''
ayāsiṣṭām 'third person dual . . .'
ayāsiṣuḥ 'third person plural . . .'

1. This rule introduces two augments, i.e. *saK* and *iṬ*, concurrently. Recall that these roots are all marked with *anudātta*. Consequently, their *iṬ* remains negated by 7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe*. . . . Our rule not only allows *iṬ* but also makes a concurrent (*sanniyoga-śiṣṭa*) provision of augment *saK*. Since *saK* is marked with *K* as an *it*, and also since verbal roots *yamA*, etc., are specified here with *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive', *saK* is introduced at the end (1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*) of *yamA*, etc. Augment *iṬ*, since it is marked with *Ṭ* as an *it*, will be introduced at the beginning of *sIC*.

Consider *yam* + (*LUṄ→tiP*) which, after the introduction of *aṬ* and *sIC*, produces *aṬ* + *yam* + *sIC* + *tiP*. Augment *īṬ* (7.3.93 *bruva īṭ*, etc.) must also be introduced to *tiP*, a *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit* . . .) affix which begins with a

consonant and is marked with *P* as an *it*. This, with *saK*, *iṬ* and *īṬ*, will give us: (*aṬ* + (*yam* + *saK*) + (*iṬ* + *sIC*) + (*īṬ* + *tiP*)). The *s* of *sIC* will get deleted by 8.2.28 *iṭ īṭi*. Refer to *akārṣīt* (II:332) for full derivational details. Incidentally, active endings in *vyaraṃsīt* are introduced by 1.3.83 *vyāṅparibhyo*. . . .

Note that *yamA*, *ramU* and *ṇamA* also qualify for *vṛddhi* conditioned by their terminal consonant (*halanta-lakṣaṇā*; 7.2.3 *vadavraja* . . .). However, this *vṛddhi* is blocked by rule 7.2.4 *neṭi*.

The condition of *parasmaipadeṣu* 'when affixes termed *parasmaipada* follow' is still valid. Consider *āyaṃsta*, *āraṃsta* and *anaṃsta* which derive from (*āṄ-yamA* + (*LUṄ* →*ta*)), (*ā-ramU* + (*LUṄ*→*ta*)) and (*ā*-(*ṇ*—→*n*)*amA*) + (*LUṄ*→*ta*)). The first string replaces *LUṄ* with a middle (*ātmanepada*) ending in view of 1.3.28 *āṅo yamahanaḥ*. The second string has *ramA*, a root marked with *anudātta* as its *it*. The third string must accept middle in view of the denotation of *karmakartṛ* 'object turned agent'. Recall, in this connection, that *CiṆ* is blocked here by 3.1.89 *na duhasnunamāṃ yakciṇau*. These strings must fall outside the scope of this rule on account of not meeting the condition of *parasmaipadeṣu*.

7.2.74 स्मिपूङ्रञ्ज्वशां सनि

smipūṅrañjvaśāṃ sani
/*smipūṅrañjvaśām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*); *sani* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35)
'*smiṅ, pūṅ, ṛ, añjŪ, aśŪ*' *ity eteṣāṃ dhātūnāṃ sanīḍāgamo bhavati*
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to affix *saN* when the same occurs after an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *smiṄ* 'to smile', *pūṄ* 'to purify, cleanse', *ṛ* 'to go, reach', *añjŪ* 'to anoint', and *aśŪ* 'to pervade'.

EXAMPLES:

sismayiṣate '. . . wishes to smile'
pipaviṣate '. . . wishes to cleanse'
aririṣati '. . . wishes to go'
añjijiṣati '. . . wishes to smear'
aśiśiṣate '. . . wishes to pervade'

1. Note that *Ṅ* as an *it* in *pūṄ* is used to rule out any reference to verbal root *pūÑ* 'to purify, cleanse'. This root gets a form such as *pupūṣati*. Verbal root *aśŪ* 'to pervade', a member of the *svādi* group, is referenced with *Ū* as an *it* (*ūdit*) to similarly block any reference to *aśA* 'to eat' of the *kryādi* group. This latter involves *iṬ*, obligatorily, on the basis of its *udātta* as an *it* (*Kāś*: *ṅakāragrahaṇaṃ pūño mā bhūt*. . . . *aśer ūdito grahaṇād aśnoter nityam iḍāgamo' sty eva*).

Recall that roots which are marked with *ū* as an *it* (*ūdit*) receive *iṬ*, optionally (7.2.44 *svaratisūtisūyati* . . .). Augment *iṬ* is negated in the context

of *smiṄ* by 7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe*. . . . It is obligatorily negated in connection with other roots on the basis of a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *uK* as their *it* (*uganta*; 7.2.12 *saniguhoś ca*). Our present rule makes *iṬ* available after specified roots when *saN* follows.

2. Note that (*pū* + *saN*) + *LAṬ* will produce *pipaviṣate* where the *saN*-derivate, *pipavisa*, will be derived via doubling, i.e., *pū* + *pav* + *i* + *saN*. That is, in view of 1.1.59 *dvirvacane' ci*, subsequent to replacement in *guṇa* and subsequent *o*→*av*. Thus, *pū* + *saN*→ *pū* + *iṬ* + *saN*→ *pū* + *p*(*ū*→*o*→*av*) + *saN*→ *pū* + *pav* + *i* + *saN*. The *ū* of the *abhyāsa* will be replaced with *i* (7.4.80 *oḥ puyaṇyajjyapare*). Doubling of *aririṣati*, i.e., *ṛ* + *saN*→ *ṛ* + *iṬ* + *saN*→ *ar* + *iṬ* + *saN*→ *a* + *ris* + *ris* + *a*→ (*ari* + *risa*) + *LAṬ*)), is accomplished by 6.1.2 *ajāder dvitīyasya*. Doubling in *añjijiṣati* will exclude *n* (6.1.3 *na ndrāḥ saṃyogādayaḥ*) and thus yield *ajis* + *jis* + *a*.

7.2.75 किरश्च पञ्चभ्यः

kiraśca pañcabhyaḥ
/*kiraḥ* 5/1 *ca* ϕ *pañcabhyaḥ* 5/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *sani* #74)
kirādibhyaḥ pañcabhyas sani iḍāgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to affix *saN* when the same occurs after an *aṅga* constituted by five verbal roots listed beginning with *kṝ* 'to scatter'.

EXAMPLES:

cikariṣati '. . . wishes to (*kṝ*+*saN*) scatter'
jigariṣati '. . . wishes to (*gṝ*+*saN*) swallow'
didariṣate '. . . wishes to (*dṛṄ*+*saN*) insult'
didhariṣate '. . . wishes to (*dhṛṄ* + *saN*) be inattentive'
pipracchisati '. . . wishes to (*pracch* + *saN*) ask'

1. A set of five roots of the *tudādi* group headed by *kṝ* forms the operational focus of this rule. Recall that verbal roots *dṛṄ* and *dhṛṄ*, because they end in *uK* (*uganta*), are denied *iṬ* when *saN* follows (7.2.12 *sani grahaguhoś ca*). Our present rule offers *iṬ* against that negation. Augment *iṬ* is negated in connection with remaining roots since they are marked with *anudātta*. Our present rule offers *iṬ* against that negation. Refer to *pipṛcchiṣati* (II:432) for derivational details. Other examples can be similarly derived.

2. Why do we have the limitation of *pañcabhyaḥ* 'after five verbal roots'? Consider *sisṛkṣati* where *iṬ* is not allowed because *sṛj* is not included within the set of five specified roots.

3. Note that 7.2.41 *iṭ sani vā* allows optional *iṬ* to *kṝ* and *gṝ*. An optional long replacement is also made available by 7.2.33 *vṛto vā*. A desideratum of the *Mahābhāṣya* finds this long replacement undesired (*asyeṭo dīrghatvaṃ necchanti*).

7.2.76 रुदादिभ्यः सार्वधातुके

rudādibhyaḥ sārvadhātuke
/rudādibhyaḥ 5/3 *sārvadhātuke* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *valādeḥ iṭ* #35 *sārvadhātuke* #76 *pañcabhyaḥ* #75)
rudādibhya uttarasya valādeḥ sārvadhātukasya iḍāgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to a *sārvadhātuka* affix which begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *vaL* (*Śs*.5-14; a consonant other than *y*) and occurs after an *aṅga* constituted by five verbal roots beginning with *rud* 'to cry'.

EXAMPLES:

roditi '. . . cries (*rud*)'
svapiti '. . . reclines, sleeps (*svap*)'
śvasiti '. . . breathes (*śvas*)'
prāṇiti '. . . idibem (*pra-an*)'
jakṣiti '. . . eats (*jakṣ*)'

1. Note that five verbal roots headed by *rud* are: *rud* 'to cry', *svap* 'to sleep', *śvas* 'to breathe', *an* 'to breathe' and *jakṣ* 'to eat'. Since *jāgṛ* 'to wake up, be awake' falls outside this set of five, we do not get *iṬ* in *jāgarti*. This is what the specification of *pañcabhyaḥ* 'after the five . . .' does. A condition of *sārvadhātuke* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*) similarly rules out *iṬ* in contexts where an affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*) may be involved. Consider *svaptā* 'who will sleep', a derivate of *svap* with *tās* (3.1.33 *syataāsī* . . .), an *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*). Finally, the condition of *valādeḥ* '. . . beginning with a consonant denoted by the abbreviatory term *vaL*' must also be met. Augment *iṬ* will be blocked in examples such as *rudanti* where, obviously, the affix which follows *rud* does not begin with a sound denoted by *vaL*.

7.2.77 ईशः से

īśaḥ se
/īśaḥ 5/1 *se* (deleted 6/1)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *sārvadhātuke* #76)
īśa uttarasya 'se' ity etasya sārvadhātukasya iḍāgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to an affix termed *sārvadhātuka*, namely *se*, when the same occurs after *īś* 'to be master'.

EXAMPLES:

īśiṣe 'second person singular middle *LAṬ*-form of *īś*'
iśiṣva 'second person singular middle *LOṬ*-form . . .'

1. Note that the specification of *se* is made here by deleting the genitive

ending after it (*luptaṣaṣṭhyantanirdeśa*) by rule 7.1.36 *supāṃ suluk*. . . . Or else, this specification of *se* is made with no nominal ending (*avibhaktiko' yaṃ nirdeśaḥ*), at all.

The form *se* itself is a replacement for *thās*, per 3.4.80 *thāsaḥ se*. Note also that *e* of *se*, when replaced with *va*, under the provision of 3.4.91 *savābhyāṃ vāmau*, yields *sva*. This can also be included within the reference of *se*, especially in view of the *paribhāṣā* (37): *ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavad bhavati* 'modification in a part does not make the modified any different from the original'. Consequently, *īśiṣva* also involves introduction of augment *iṬ*.

7.2.78 ईडजनोर्ध्वे च

īḍajanordhve ca
/īḍajanoḥ 6/2 *dhve* (deleted 6/1) *ca* ϕ*/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iṭ* #35 *sārvadhātuke* #76 *se* #77)
'īḍa, jana' ity etābhyām uttarasya 'dhve' ity etasya 'se' ity etasya ca sārvadhātukasya iḍāgamo bhavati
Augment *iṬ* is introduced to *sārvadhātuka* affixes *dhve*, and *se*, when these occur after an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *īḍA* and *janA*.

EXAMPLES:

īḍidhve 'second person plural middle *LAṬ*-form of *īḍ*'
īḍidhvam 'second person plural middle *LOṬ*-form . . .'
īḍiṣe 'second person singular middle *LAṬ*-form . . .'
īḍiṣva 'second person singular middle *LOṬ*-form . . .'
janidhve 'second person plural middle *LAṬ*-form of *jan*'
janidhvam 'second person plural middle *LOṬ*-form . . .'
janiṣe 'second person singular middle *LAṬ*-form . . .'
janiṣva 'second person singular middle *LOṬ*-form . . .'

1. This rule introduces augment *iṬ* to *sārvadhātuka* affixes, namely *dhve* (*dhvam* with replacement in *e* (*etva*); 3.4.78 *tiptasjhi* . . .; 3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ* . . .) and *se* (3.4.80 *thāsaḥ se*), when these affixes occur after an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *īḍA* 'to praise' and *janA* 'to be born'. Note that *dhve* refers to the second plural middle ending *dhvam*, with its *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*) replaced with *e* (*etva*; 3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ* . . .). A similar specification is made to the second person singular middle ending *thās* with its replacement in *se* (3.4.80 *thāsaḥ se*). Thus, *īḍA* + (*LOṬ*→*dhvam*) → *īḍ* + *dhv*(*am*→*e*) → *īḍ* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *dhve* → *īḍidhve*. We similarly get *janA* + (*LOṬ*→*thās*→*se*) → *jan* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *se* → *janiṣe*. The *s* of *se* is then replaced with *ṣ* (8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*). Recall that 3.4.91 *savābhyāṃ vāmau* replaces an *e*-replacement relative to *LOṬ* with *va* and *am*, provided *e* occurs after *s* and *v*. Thus we get *īḍidhvam* and *īḍidhve*; *janidhvam* and *janiṣe*. Recall that these forms are treated as optional. For, *sarve vidhayaḥ chandasi vikalpyante* 'all operations in the Vedic are made optional'.

2. Note that *janA* is a root of the *div-ādi* class. Consequently, we get the introduction of *ŚyaN* (3.1.69 *divādibhyaḥ śyan*) after verbal root *janA*. This *ŚyaN*, however, goes through deletion by *LUK* in the Vedic. The penultimate deletion (*upadhālopa*) of 6.4.98 *gamahanajanakhana . . .* is also blocked.

This rule, with its specification of *janA*, also refers to *janA* 'to be born', a root of the *juhotyādi* class. We thus get *vyatijañiṣe / vyatijaniṣva* and *vyatijanidhve / vyatijanidhvam*, its derivates with the signification of *karmavyatihāra* 'reciprocal action' (1.3.14 *kartari karmavyatihāre*). Recall that the *juhotyādi* class of roots have *ŚLU* as their marker. This *ŚLU* is subsequently deleted (2.4.76 *bahulaṃ chandasi*). The root, however, is subjected through doubling (6.1.10 *ślau*) and operations relative to their *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*).

3. *Kāśikā* states that *iṬ* is also desired after *īś* when *dhve* follows. Thus, we get *īṣidhve* and *īśidhvam*. For this, some read this rule as: *īḍijanoḥ sdhve ca*. Since *s*-initial *se* thus becomes included within the rule, *ca* is interpreted as used for attracting *īś*. That is, *ca* is not relatable to *sdhve*. It, instead, is used for bringing *īś* from the preveious rule. Why did Pāṇini not employ brevity (*lāghava*) and read the *sūtra*, jointly, as: *īśīḍijanāṃ sedhvayoḥ*? This would have saved two usage of the nominal endings, and also of *ca*. Pāṇini's formulation of rule(s) is indeed wonderful (*vicitrā hi sūtrasya kṛtiḥ pāṇineḥ*).

4. Since this specification with *dhve* is made with *e* as a replacement for the *ṭi* of *dhvam*, a derivate of *LAṄ* with *dhvam* should not receive *iṬ*. But *dhvam* of *LOṬ* could still receive *iṬ*, based on the maxim: *ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat* 'that which is modified in one place is not any different from the original'.

7.2.79 लिङः सलोपोऽनन्त्यस्य

liṅaḥ salopo' nantyasya
/ liṅaḥ 6/1 *salopaḥ* 1/1 *anantyasya* 6/1 (*na ante bhavaḥ* (*naÑ. tat.*), *tasya*) / (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sārvadhātuke* #76)
sārvadhātuke yo liṅ tasya anantyasya sakārasya lopo bhavati
The non-final *s* of a *sārvadhātuka* replacement of affix *LIṄ* goes through deletion by *LOPA*.

EXAMPLES:

kuryāt 'third person singular active (potential) *LIṄ*-form of *kṛ*'
kuryātām 'third person dual active . . .'
kuryuḥ 'third person plural active . . .'
kurvīta 'third person singular middle (potential) *LIṄ*-form of *kṛ*'
kurvīyātām 'third person dual middle . . .'
kurvīran 'third person plural middle . . .'

1. Note that *sārvadhātuke* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*) is still carried over.

Thus, the non-final *s* of a replacement of *LIṄ*, when occurring before a *sārvadhātuka* affix, goes through deletion via *LOPA*. What is this non-initial *s* of *LIṄ*? A reference is here made to the *s* of *yāsUṬ*, *sUṬ* and *sīyUṬ* which, in turn, are introduced as augments to *LIṄ* before a *parasmaipada* 'active' verbal ending termed *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.102 *liṅaḥ sīyūṭ*-3.4.107 *suṭ tithoḥ*). It is stated that a *LIṄ*, when qualified with *sārvadhātuka*, refers only to injunctional (*vidhi*) *LIṄ*. The benedictive *LIṄ* is, of course, *ārdhadhātuka* in view of 3.4.116 *liṅ āśiṣi*.

Refer to derivational details of *kuryāt*, *kuryātām* and *kuryuḥ* under 3.4.103 *yāsuṭ* . . . (III:784). Similar deletion of *s* of *sīyUṬ* and *sUṬ* is witnessed in *kurvīta*, *kurvīyātām* and *kurvīran*. Consider *kuru* + *sīy*(*UṬ*) + *ta* → *kuru* + (*s*→ϕ)*īy* + *ta* → *kuru* + *ī*(*y*→ϕ) + *ta* → *kur*(*u*→*v*) + *ī* + *ta* = *kurvīta*, where *y*-deletion is accomplished by 6.1.64 *lopo vyor vali*. There is no *y*-deletion in *kuryātām*. Refer to *paceran* for deriving *kurvīran* (III:785).

2. Why do we state the condition of *anantyasya* 'of a non-final'? Consider *kuryuḥ* and *kuryāḥ* where the final *s* is replaced with *visarga*.

Why do we have the condition of *sārvadhātuke* 'when an affix termed *sārvadhātuka* follows'? Consider *kriyāstām* and *kriyāsuḥ* where *s*-deletion cannot apply. For, a benedictive *LIṄ* becomes *ārdhadhātuka* under the provision of 3.4.116 *liṅ āśiṣi*. Similar non-deletion of *s* can also be found in *kṛṣīṣṭa*, *kṛṣīyāstām* and *kṛṣīran*.

7.2.80 अतो येयः

ato yeyaḥ
/ataḥ 5/1 *yā* (6/1 deleted) *iyaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sārvadhātuke* #76)
akārāntād aṅgād uttarasya '*yā*' *ity etasya sārvadhātukasya* '*iy*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
The *yā* of a *sārvadhātuka* affix is replaced with *iy* when the same occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *a*.

EXAMPLES:

pacet 'third person singular active *LIṄ*-form of *pac*'
pacetām 'third person dual active . . .'
paceyuḥ 'third person plural active . . .'

1. This rule offers *iy* as a replacement for *yā* of a *sārvadhātuka* affix when the same occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *a*. Consider *pac* + (*LIṄ*→*ti*(*P*)) → *pac* + (*Ś*)*a*(*P*) + *ti* → *pac* + *a* + *yās*(*UṬ*) + *ti* → *pac* + *a* + *yās* + *t*(*i*→ϕ) → *pac* + *a* + *yā*(*s*→ϕ) + *t* → *pac* + *a* + *yā* + *t* → *pac* + *a* + (*yā*→*iy*) + *t* → *pac*(*a*+*i*→*e*)*y* + *t* → *pace*(*y*→ϕ) + *t* = *pacet*. Note that *yāsUṬ* is introduced by 3.4.103 *yāsuṭ parasmaipade*. . . . The *i* of *ti* goes through deletion of 3.4.100 *itaś ca*. The *s* of *yāsUṬ* gets deleted by 7.2.79 *liṅaḥ salopo* . . ., and our present rule replaces

yā with *iy*. A single replacement in *guṇa*, similar to the following *i* of the sequence *a+i* of *pac* + *a* + *iy* + *ta*, is then offered by 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*. We thus get *pac* + *ey* + *t*, where *y* gets deleted by 6.1.66 *lopo vyor vali*. We similarly derive *pacetām* and *paceyuḥ*, where the third personal dual verbal ending, *tas* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhi* . . .), and the plural, *jhi*, get replaced with *tām* and *Jus*, respectively (3.4.101 *tasthasthamipāṃ* . . .; 3.4.108 *jherjus*). Why do we not get a single replacement similar to the following (*pararūpa*) *i* of the vocalic sequence *a+i* in *pac* + (**a+i*) *y* + *us*? This single replacement is here blocked by 6.1.96 *usy apadāntāt*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *ataḥ* 'after the *a*-final *aṅga*'? Consider *cinuyāt* and *sunuyāt*, where *yā* occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *u*. This *yā* cannot be replaced with *iy*.

Why is *a* specified with a following *t* (*taparakaraṇa*)? So that this replacement in *iy* does not apply in *yāyāt*, where *yā* occurs after the long *ā* of *yā*.

Recall that the condition of *sārvadhātuke* is still valid. That is why we do not get *iy* in *cikīrṣyāt*, a derivate of benedictive *LIṄ* where the root ends in *saN* and the *ārdhadhātuka* affix *yāsUṬ* follows.

3. Now consider the derivation of *cikīrṣ*(*a*→ϕ) + *yā*(*s*→ϕ) + *t* → *cikīrṣyāt*, where 6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ* deletes the *a* of *cikīrṣa* before the *ārdhadhātuka* affix *yās*. A replacement in *iy* for *yā* of this rule is also blocked because *yās* is not a *sārvadhātuka* affix. An objection is made against carrying the *anuvṛtti* of *sārvadhātuke*. Why bring *sārvadhātuke* when, after the deletion of *a* (6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*) under the condition of *ārdhadhātuke*, the *aṅga* will not end in *a*. The applicational condition of this rule will then be removed. The *anuvṛtti* of *sārvadhātuke* is thus not necessary to block application of this rule. But this view will create problems with *pacet* and *yajet*, where 7.3.101 *ato dīrgho yañi* may apply to replace the short *a* of *paca* with its long counterpart. A long counterpart will then not permit the application of this rule. Our present rule, hence, blocks the application of 7.3.101 *ato dīrgho yañi*. That is how we get *pacet* and *yajet*. If the word *sārvadhātuke* is not carried over to this rule, it will also block application of *a*-deletion (6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*). Carrying the *anuvṛtti* of *sārvadhātuke* will not permit *iy* to replace *yā*. For, *yā* is an *ārdhadhātuka*.

4. It is further argued that 7.3.101 *ato dīrgho yañi* also carries the *anuvṛtti* of *tiṅi* (7.3.88 *bhūsuvos tiṅi*). This would enable our present rule to only block the application of 7.3.101 *ato dīrgho yañi*. It cannot block the application of 6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*. For, *iy* blocks *dīrgha* 'long vowel-replacement' by way of beocoming *niravakāśa* 'without any scope of application'. It is because of this *niravakāśatva* 'scopelessness' that *iy* blocks *dīrgha* by way of being an exception (*apavāda*). This *iy* cannot be accepted as an exception to *a*-deletion, because *iy* will apply whether *a*-deletion applied or not. This is supported by the maxim of (*PŚ*:58) *yena nāprāpte yo vidhir ārabhyate* . . . 'a rule whose scope of application removes the condition of application of another is blocked by the other'. Also, (*PŚ*:61) *madhye' pavādān pūrvān vidhīn bādhante*

nottarān 'exceptions read in between only block operations which precede, and not any others which follow'. Our present rule will thus block the application of 6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*. It cannot block the application of 7.3.101 *ato dīrgho yañi*. Carrying over the *anuvṛtti* of *sārvadhātuke* will block the application of this rule in *cikīrṣyāt*. For, its *yā* is an *ārdhadhātuka*.

5. A question is raised as to how we get *yeyaḥ*? We have two interpretations:

(*i*) *yā* + *Ṅas* + *iya* + *sU* → *yā* + *iyaḥ*, where the genitive goes through *LUK*-deletion and *y*(*ā*+*i*→*e*)*ya* yields *yeya* + *sU* = *yeyaḥ*, through a single *guṇa*-replacement. This single replacement is then considered *ārṣa*: accomplished by the sage Pāṇini in this rule.

(*ii*) *yā* + *Ṅas* + *iya* + *sU*, where *ā* of *yā* (*ato dhātoḥ*) is deleted and *s* of *Ṅas* is replaced with *y*, via *rU* (8.3.17 *bhobhagoagho . . .*). We thus get *y*(*ā*→ϕ) + *a*(*s*→*rU*→*y*)) + *iyaḥ* = *y* + *ay* + *iyaḥ*, where *y* of *ay* goes through deletion of 8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya*. Rule 6.1.97 *ād guṇaḥ* then applies on *ya* + *iyaḥ* to yield *y*(*ī*+*i*→*e*)*yaḥ* = *yeyaḥ*, through a single replacement in *guṇa*. Is this single replacement in *guṇa* accomplished by accepting *y*-deletion as suspended by 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*? Since this specification is part of a rule, *y*-deletion is not considered *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of application of *guṇa* (*Nyāsa*: '*chandovat sūtrāṇi bhavanti*' *iti, tasmāt sautratvād asya nirdeśasyāsiddhatvam anāśritya* '*ād guṇaḥ*' *kṛtaḥ*).

6. Some read this rule as: *ato yāsiyaḥ*. They recognize *yās* as the substituendum (*sthānī*) replaced with *iy*. They also interpret *yās* + *Ṅas* + *iya* + *sU* = *yāsiya* as a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound (*Kāś*: *kecid atra* '*ato yāsiyaḥ*' *iti sūtraṃ paṭhanti. teṣāṃ sakārāntaḥ sthānī, ṣaṣṭhī samāsaś ca*).

Varadarāja does not accept *yā* as the substituendum replaced by *iy*. He accepts *yās*, instead (*Laghukaumudī* (428: *ato yeyaḥ*: *ataḥ parasya sārvadhātukāvayavasya yāsa ity asya iy . . .*)). It is stated that (Bhīmasena Śāstrī, II:68) considering *yā* as the substituendum will create difficulties in deriving *bhava* + *yā* + *us* = *bhaveyuḥ*. Given . . . *yā* + *us*, rule 6.1.96 *usy apadāntāt* will apply to accomplish a single replacement in *u* for the vocalic sequence *ā*+*u*. This single replacement cannot be blocked in favor of a replacement in *iy* of this rule. Bhīmasena Śāstrī argues against invoking *vipratiṣedha* (4.1.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam*). He recognizes that *iyādeśa* 'replacement in *iy*' has its independent scope of application in *bhavet*, etc. An independent scope of application of 6.1.96 *usy apadāntāt* is also established by *apuḥ* 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derive of *pā* (to drink)'. This application of *iyādeśa* (7.2.80 *ato yeyaḥ*) and *y*(*ā* +*u*)*s* →*us*, a single replacement similar to what follows in a vocalic sequence i.e., (*bhava* + *y*(*ā*+*u*→*us*); (*pararūpa*; 6.1.96 *usy apadāntāt*) is simultaneously applicable to *yā* + *us* of *bhava* + *yā* + *us*. This is a context where two rules of equal strength both become applicable simultaneously

(*yugapat*). Śāstrī argues that *pararūpa* is internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) because it is only applicabe to the affix. Replacement in *iy*, since it is dependent upon an *aṅga* ending in *aT*, is externally (*antaraṅga*) conditioned. Since an internally conditioned operation takes precedence over an externally conditioned operation ((*PŚ*:51) *asiddhaṃ bahiraṅgam antaraṅge*)), *iyādeśa* cannot be applied on the basis of *vipratiṣedha*. That is, *yās* must be accepted as the substituendum for replacement with *iy*, against *pararūpa*. Recall that *Kāśikā* mentions *yās* as a substituendum for *iy* with *kecit* 'in the opinion of some scholars'. Obviously, *Kāśikā* does not accept *yās* as the substituendum.

7.2.81 आतो ङित:

āto ṅitaḥ
/ātaḥ 6/1 *ṅitaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sārvadhātuke* #76 *ataḥ iyaḥ* #80)
ākārasya ṅidavayavasya akārāntād aṅgād uttarasya sārvadhātukasya 'iy' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
An *ā* which forms part of a *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*, and occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *a*, is replaced with *iy*.

EXAMPLES:

pacete 'third person dual middle *LAṬ* form of *pac*'
pacethe 'second person dual middle *LAṬ*-form of *pac*'
pacetām 'third person dual active imperative of *pac*'
pacethām 'second person dual active imperative of *pac*'
yajete 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-form of *yaj*'
yajethe 'second person singular middle *LAṬ*-form of *yaj*'
yajetām 'third person dual active imperative of *yaj*'
yajethām 'second person dual active imperative of *yaj*'

1. Note that the *aṅga* must end in *a* in view of the *anuvṛtti* of *ataḥ*, ending in the ablative (*pañcamī*). Since *ataḥ* is used here as a qualifier to *aṅga*, a qualifier-qualified relationship between *ataḥ*, ending in the ablative, and *aṅgasya*, availed, via *anuvṛtti*, ending in the genitive, is impaired. The genitive of *aṅgasya* is hence transformed into the ablative (*pañcamī*) to facilitate this qualifier-qualified relationship. This is how we get the meaning: 'after an *aṅga* ending in *a*'. We also get a qualifier-qualified relationship in *ātaḥ* and *ṅitaḥ*, both ending in the genitive. But this relationship is not co-referential (*samānādhikaraṇa*). It is, instead, interpreted as *vyadhikaraṇa*, denoting different loci. The genitive of *ātaḥ* is interpreted as *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* 'in place of' in connection with replacement (*ādeśa*) in *iy*. The genitive of *ṅitaḥ*, in connection with the genitive of *ātaḥ*, is interpreted as denoting *avayava* 'part of a whole'. The genitive of *ātaḥ ṅitaḥ* thus yileds the meaning: *ākārasya ṅidavayavasya* 'in place of an *ā* which is part of that (a *sārvadhātuka* affix)

which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*'. Thus, the *ā* which is to be replaced with *iy* must also be a part of the *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*.

Refer to derivational details of *pac* + *a* + *ātām* = *pacete* 'third person dual middle *LAṬ*-form of *pac*' and *pac* + *a* + *thās* = *pacethe* 'second persaon dual middle *LAṬ*-form of *pac*' under rule 1.1.11 *īdūded dvivacanaṃ* . . . (II:346-47). Similar rules apply in deriving *yajete* and *yajethe*. Deriving *pacetām* 'third person dual active imperative of *pac*' and *pacethām* 'second person dual active imperative of *pac*' from *pac* + *a* + (*LOṬ*→*ātām*) → *pac* + *a* + (*ā*→*iy*) *tām* and *pac* + *a* + (*LOṬ*→*āthām*) → *pac* + *a* + (*ā*→*iy*) *thām* would, in addition to replacement in *iy* for *ā* of *ātām* and *āthām*, require two applications: 3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ ṭer e* and 3.4.90 *ām etaḥ*. This second rule will block application of the first and retain *ām*. Rule 6.1.97 *ād guṇaḥ* will apply on *pac* + (*a*+*i*→*e*) *y* + *tām* and *pac* + (*a*+*i*→*e*) *y* + *thām* to yield *pac* + *ey* + *tām* and *pac* + *ey* + *thām*. The *y* of *iy* will, of course, be deleted by *lopo vyor vali*. We will thus get *pacetām* and *pacethām*. Similar rules apply in deriving *yajetām* and *yajethām*.

Recall that *Ṅit* '*Ṅ* as an *it*' serves a condition for *sārvadhātuka* affixes used in these examples. Affixes such as *ātām* and *āthām* are not marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. How do they meet the requirement of *Ṅ* as an *it*. Actually, they are offered extensional (*ātideśika*) status as marked with *Ṅ* by rule 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*. That is, a *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiśit sārvadhātukam*) affix not marked with *P* as an *it* (*apit*) is considered marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *ātaḥ* 'in place of an *ā*'? Consider the dual sets of third person plural active and middle forms of *pac* and *yaj*: *pacanti*/ *yajanti* and *pacante* / *yajante*, where the affix does not have an *ā*. The question of a replacement with *iy* thus does not arise.

Why do we have the condition of *ṅitaḥ* 'of a part of that which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*'? Consider the first person dual and plural present middle forms of *pac*: *pac* + *a* + (*LAṬ*→*vahi*) → *pac* + *a* + (*āṬ* + *vahi*) → *pacāvahai* and *pac* + *a* + (*LAṬ*→*mahi*(*Ṅ*)) → *pac* + *a* + (*āṬ* + *mahi*) → *pacāmahai*, where the suffix begins with *ā*, but is not marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. Recall that augment *āṬ* is introduced by 3.4.92 *āḍ uttamasya pic ca*, whereby it will concurrently be extended the status of 'marked with *P* as an *it* (*pit*)'. The question of *iy*-replacement for *ā*, again, does not arise. Incidentally, *vahi* and *mahi* produce *vahe*, through *e*-replacement of *ṭi* (3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānām ṭer e*). This *e* is futher replaced by *ai* of 3.4.93 *et ai*, thereby yielding *pac* + *a* + *āvah* (*i*→*e*→*ai*) = *paca* + *āvahai* and *pac* + *a* + *āmahai*. An application of homogeneous long vowel-replacement (*savarṇadīrgha*; 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*) then produces: *pac* + (*a*+*ā*→*ā*) *vahai* = *pacāvahai* and *pacāmahai*.

The condition of *ātaḥ* 'after an *aṅga* ending in *ā*' is still valid. Consider *cinvāte* and *sunvāte*, where *cinu* and *sunu* end in *u*. The *ā* of *āte*, hence, cannot be here replaced with *iy*.

Why do we have this specification made with *ṭ*? Consider *māṄ* + (*ŚaP*→*ŚLU*) + (*LAṬ*→*ātām*) = *mimāte* and *māṄ* + (*ŚaP* →*ŚLU*) + *āthām*) =

mimāthe, the third and second person dual forms of *māṄ* 'to measure'. We get $m(\bar{a}\rightarrow i)$ + *mā* + *ātām* = *mi* + *mā* + *ātām* and $m(\bar{a}\rightarrow i)$ + *mā* + *āthām* = *mi* + *mā* + *āthām*, where *ā* of the *abhyāsa* 'reduplicated syllable' is replaced with *i* (7.4.76 *bhṛñām it*). The *ā* of the *abhyasta* 'both elements of ruduplicated form' then goes through deletion, via *LOPA* (6.4.112 *śnā' bhyastayor ātaḥ*) to produce: *mi* + $m(\bar{a}\rightarrow\phi)$ + *ātām* and *mi* + $m(a\rightarrow\phi)$ + *āthām*. The *e*-replacement of *ṭi*, i.e., *ām*, of *ātām* and *āthām* (3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ ṭer e*), will finally produce *mimāt*$(\bar{a}m\rightarrow e)$ = *mimāte* and *mimāth*$(\bar{a}m\rightarrow e)$ = *mimāthe*.

7.2.82 आने मुक्

āne muk
/*āne* 7/1 *muk* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ataḥ* #80)
ato parato' ṅgasyāto mug āgamo bhavati
Augment *mUK* is introduced to the *a* of an *aṅga* when affix *āna* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pacamānaḥ 'cooking'
yajamānaḥ 'performing a sacrifice'

1. Note that the two examples both derive with *LAṬ* replaced with *āna* (*ŚānaC*; 3.2.124 *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv . . .*). The *pañcamī* 'ablative' of *ataḥ*, because of the *saptamī* 'locative' of *āne*, is transformed into *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive' in view of 1.1.65 *tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya*. Augment *mUK* is thus introduced here to the *a*, i.e., here *ŚaP*, of the *aṅga* before *āna*. Refer to derivational details of *pacamāna* (III:751) under 3.2.124 *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv. . . .*

2. Note that a *LA*-affix which is assigned the term *sārvadhātuka* is assigned *udātta*. Augment *mUK* is here introduced to the short *a* (*aT*) of the *aṅga*. That is, *mUK* is considered part of *a* to which it is introduced. Since it is not introduced to the final *a* of an *aṅga*, it is not considered a part of the *aṅga*. If it was considered a part of the *aṅga*, it would have intervened between *a* which is part of the *aṅga* and the *LA* affix which is termed *sārvadhātuka*. The *anudātta* of 6.1.186 *tāsy anudātten . . .* would have thus been blocked. Augment *mUK* cannot be considered intervening between *a* and the *LA* affix termed *sārvadhātuka*. Why? Because it becomes part of *a*. But this may create another problem.

Augment *mUK*, since it becomes part of *a*, may be referred to as *a*. It will thus not be an intervening element. This being the case, 7.2.81 *āto ṅitaḥ* may cause the *ā* of *ān* to be replaced with *iy*. This problem can be easily resolved. The *aṅga*, there, is specified as ending in *a*. Augment *mUK*, when considered as *a*, will add its half duration to the *a* and *a*+*mUK* = *a* will carry the duration of one and a half mora. Recall that the specification of *a* in 7.2.81 is made with *t* (*taparakaraṇa*). That *a* carries the duration of only one

mora. Since the *a* to which *mUK* is introduced carries the duration of more than one mora, replacement in *iy* will be blocked. If this is blocked then *anudātta* of a *LA* termed *sārvadhātuka* must also be blocked. No. The specification of *anudātta* is made with reference to *a* in *upadeśa* 'initial citation'. A difference in duration incurred after initial citation does not affect the accent. Note that *iy* is not a citation in *upadeśa*. Consequently, 7.2.81 *āto ṅitaḥ* does not apply. This is why, even after 7.3.101 *ato dīrgho yañi* has applied to replace the *a* of *ŚaP* with *ā*, the *anudātta* accent of the *LA* termed *sārvadhātuka* in *pacāvaḥ* and *pacāmaḥ* is not blocked.

7.2.83 ईदासः

īd āsaḥ
/īt 1/1 *āsaḥ* 5/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *āne* #82)
āsa uttarasyānaśabdasya īkārādeśo bhavati
Affix *āna* which occurs after *ās* is replaced with *ī*.

EXAMPLES:

āsīno yajate 'sitting he performs the sacrifice'

1. Note that the *saptamī* 'locative' of *āne* which occurs after the *pañcamī* 'ablative' of *āsaḥ* will be transformed into *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive' (*ṣaṣṭhī*), in view of the interpretive provision of 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya* (*Kāś. atra pañcamyāḥ parasya ṣaṣṭhī kalpyate*). That is, an *ā* which is part of *āna* and occurs after that which ends in *a* is replaced with *ī* (*Kāś. atra pañcamyāḥ parasya ṣaṣṭhī kalpyate*). Refer to derivational details of *āsīnaḥ* in the appendix (II:391).

7.2.84 अष्टन् आ विभक्तौ

aṣṭan ā vibhaktau
/aṣṭanaḥ 6/1 *āḥ* 1/1 *vibhaktau* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
aṣṭano vibhaktau parata ākārādeśo bhavati
The final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *aṣṭan* 'eight', is replaced with *ā* when an affix termed *vibhakti* follows.

EXAMPLES:

aṣṭabhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *aṣṭan*'
aṣṭabhyaḥ 'dative/ablative plural . . .'
aṣṭānām 'genitive plural . . .'
aṣṭāsu 'locative plural . . .'

1. Note that *n* of *aṣṭan* is replaced with *ā* in view of 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*. The substitute (*ādeśa*) is specified here in particular (*vyakti*), against one made in view of the class (*jāti*). If this specification was made in view of *jāti*, we will

get a nasalized *ā̃* as replacement. This would have been the choice in view of close similarity with the item to be replaced (*Kāś*: *'ā' iti vyaktinirdeśo' yam. ākṛtinirdeśe tu nakārasthāne' nunāsikākāraḥ syāt*).

The formulation of 6.1.169 *aṣṭano dīrghāt* makes known (*jñāpayati*) that this replacement is optional. There was no need to specify *ā* at the end of *aṣṭan* with *dīrghāt*. That is, *ā* will always remain a *dīrgha* 'long'. The optionality of this replacement is also indicated by *aṣṭābhyaḥ* of 7.1.21 *aṣṭābhya auś* where *aṣṭa* is specified after replacing *a* with *ā* (*Kāś*: *kṛtātvasya nirdeśāt*). This is why we get *aṣṭābhyaḥ* and *aṣṭabhyaḥ*, both. Note that *tadantavidhi* 'a specification made with *x* also refers to that which ends in *x* is also desired (*iṣyate*). Thus, we also get *priyāṣṭānaḥ* and *priyāṣṭau*, as in *priyā aṣṭau yeṣ̄m = priyāṣṭānaḥ* 'those to whom eight are dear'.

Consider *aṣṭa*(*n*→*ā*) + *bhis* → *aṣṭābhiḥ*, where *s* of *bhis* goes through a replacement in *rU*→*ḥ* (*rutva-visarga*). Deriving *aṣṭānām*, from *aṣṭa*(*n*→*ā*) + *nUṬ* + *ām*, involves introduction of augment *nUṬ* (7.1.55 *ṣaṭcaturbhyaś ca*).

7.2.85 रायो हलि

rāyaḥ hali
/rāyaḥ 6/1 *hali* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ā vibhaktau* #84)
rai iti etasya halādau vibhaktau parata ākārādeśo bhavati
The final sound of an *aṅga*, namely *rai* 'wealth', is replaced with *ā* when a consonant-initial affix termed *vibhakti* follows.

EXAMPLES:

rābhyām 'instrumental dual of *rai*'
rābhiḥ 'instrumental plural . . .'

1. Consider *rai* + *bhyām* → *r*(*ai*→*ā*) *bhyām* = *rābhyām* and *r*(*ai*→*ā*) + *bhis* → *rābhis* → *rābhiḥ*, where *bhyām* and *bhis* begin with a consonant.

2. Why do we state the condition of *hali* 'consonant initial . . .'. Consider *rai* + *au* → *rāyaḥ*, where *ā* is blocked in favor of *āy* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*). We similarly get *rai* + *Jas* → *rāyas*→ *rāyaḥ*. That is, the nominal endings here begin with a vowel.

Why do we have the condition of *vibhaktau* 'when a nominal ending . . .'? Consider *rai* + *tva* → *raitva* + *sU* → *raitvam* and *rai* + *taL* → *raitā*, where *tva* and *taL* (5.1.119 *tasya bhāvas tvatalau*) are not termed *vibhakti*.

3. Note that *vibhaktau* is carried through rules enumerated prior to 7.2.114 *mṛjer vṛddhiḥ*.

7.2.86 युष्मदस्मदोरनादेशे

yuṣmadasmador anādeśe
/yuṣmadasmadoḥ 6/2 = *yuṣmac ca asmac ca* = *yuṣmadasmadī*, *tayoḥ* (*itar.*

dv.); *anādeśe = na ādeśaḥ, tasmin (nañ. tat.)/*
(aṅgasya #6.4.1 *āḥ vibhaktau* #84)
yuṣmadasmad ity etayor anādeśe vibhaktau parata ākārādeśo bhavati
An *ā* comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, provided an affix termed *vibhakti* which has not gone through any replacement follows.

EXAMPLES:

yuṣmābhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *yuṣmad*'
asmābhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *asmad*'
yuṣmāsu 'locative plural of *yuṣmad*'
asmāsu 'locative plural of *asmad*'

1. This rule offers *ā* as a replacement for the final sound segment of *yuṣmad* 'second personal pronominal' and *asmad* 'first personal pronominal' when a nominal ending which has not gone through any replacement (*anādeśe*) follows. Thus, *yuṣma(d→ā) + bhis → yuṣm(a+ā→ā) + bhis → yuṣmā + bhi(s→rU→ḥ) → yuṣmābhiḥ* and *asma(d→ā) + bhis → asm(a+ā→ā) + bhis → asmābhiḥ.*

2. What is the purpose of stating *anādeśe* 'when not replaced'? Consider *yuṣmad + (bhyas →at) → yuṣmat* and *asmad + (bhyas→at) → asmat*, where this replacement cannot be applied. Notice that *bhyas* is here replaced with *at* (7.1.10 *pañcamyā at*). The *d* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* is replaced with *a* (7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*). Rule 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* then applies to yield *yuṣm(a+a→a)t = yuṣmat* and *asmat.*

Note that this replacement, before a consonant-initial ending, can be easily blocked by the *anuvṛtti* of *hali* 'when a consonant follows'. This, therefore, cannot be the purpose of stating *anādeśe.* Commentators note that the purpose of stating *anādeśe* becomes clear in the application of rule 7.2.89 *yo' ci.* For, that rule requires a vowel-initial nominal ending which has not gone through any replacement. That purpose is stated here in this rule by using the word *anādeśe.*

7.2.87 द्वितीयायां च

dvitīyāyāṃ ca
/dvitīyāyām 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(aṅgasya #6.4.1 *āḥ vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #86)
dvitīyāyāṃ ca parato yuṣmadasmador ākārādeśo bhavati
An *ā* also comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, when a *vibhakti* termed *dvitīyā* 'second; accusative' follows.

EXAMPLES:

yuvām 'accusaive dual of *yuṣmad*'

āvām 'accusative dual of *asmad*'
yuṣmān 'accusative plural *yuṣmad*'
asmān 'accusative plural *asmad*'

1. Note that our earlier rule requires the following *vibhakti* to be one which did not go through any replacement (*anādeśe*). Our present rule is formulated to allow this replacement where a replacement of *dvitīyā* 'accusative' follows (*Kāś*: *ādeśārthaṃ vacanam*). Consider (*yuṣm→tva*) *ad* + *am* → *tva* + *a* + (*d→ā*) + *am* → *tv*(*a*+*a→a*) + *ā* + *am* → *tv*(*a*+*ā→ā*) + *am* → *tv*(*ā*+*a→ā*) *m* = *tvām*, where *yuṣm* is replaced with *tva* (7.2.97 *tvamāv ekavacane*) and *a*+*a* is replaced with *a*, via *pararūpa* (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*). The *d* is then replaced with *ā* of this rule. The *a*+*ā* sequence is then replaced with *ā* (6.1.101 *akaḥ savarṇe . . .*), whereby we get *tvā* + *am*. Rule 6.1.107 *ami pūrvaḥ* then applies to yield *tv*(*a*+*ā→ā*) *m* = *tvām*. We similarly get (*asm→ma*) *ad* + *am* → *m*(*a*+*a→a*) *d* + *am* → *ma*(*d→ā*) + *am* → *mā* + *am* → *mām*.

Recall that 7.1.28 *ṅe prathamayor am* offers *am* as a replacement for *sU*, *au*, *Jas*, *am* and *auṬ* which, in case of the accusative, yields *yuṣmad* + (*au→am*) = *yuṣmad* + *am*. We similarly get *asmad* + *am*. Forms of *Jas* will similarly yield *yuṣmad* + *am* and *asmad* + *am*. A replacement in *yuva* and *āva* (7.2.92 *yuvāvau dvivacane*) for *yuṣm* and *asm*, followed by *ā*-replacement of *d*, will produce *yuva* + *a* + *ā* + *am* and *āva* + *a* + *ā* + *am*. These, with subsequent applications, will produce *yuvām* and *āvām*. We can also derive *yūyam* and *vayam* in the nominative plural from *yūya* + *ad* + *am* and *vaya* + *ad* + *am*, where *yuṣm* and *asm* get replaced with *yūya* and *vaya* (7.3.93 *yūyavayau jasi*), and *Jas* gets replaced with *am*.

This rule is thus formulated to allow *ā*-replacement when replaced nominal endings follow (*Kāś*: *ādeśārthaṃ vacanam*).

7.2.88 प्रथमायाश्च द्विवचने भाषायाम्

prathamāyāś ca dvivacane bhāṣāyām
/*prathamāyāḥ* 6/1 *ca* ϕ *dvivacane* 7/1 *bhāṣāyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *āḥ vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #86)
prathamāyāś ca dvivacane parato bhāṣāyāṃ viṣaye yuṣmadasmador ākārādeśo bhavati
The final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, is also replaced with *ā* in the classical usage (*bhāṣāyām*), when a *vibhakti* termed *prathamā* 'nominative' follows with the signification of two (*dvivacana*) follows.

EXAMPLES:

yuvām 'nominative dual of *yuṣmad*'
āvām 'nominative dual of *asmad*'

1. Refer to derivational details under the preceding rule. What is the

purpose of stating *prathamāyāḥ* 'of a nominative'? Consider *yuvayoḥ* and *āvayoḥ* where this replacement in *ā* is not allowed before the genitive and locative dual nominal ending *os*.

Why do we have the condition of *dvivacane* 'when the sense of two is denoted'? Consider *tvam, yūyam* and *aham, vayam*, where this replacement is not allowed when the sense of one (*ekavacana*) and many (*bahuvacana*) 'plural' is denoted.

Why do we have the condition of *bhāṣāyām* 'in the classical usage'? Consider *yuvam*, as in *yuvaṃ vastrāṇi pīvasā vásāthe*, where we do not get this replacement since the usage is Vedic.

7.2.89 योऽचि

yo' ci
/yaḥ 1/1 *aci* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmador anādeśe* #86)
ajādāv vibhaktāv anādeśe yuṣmad asmador yakārādeśo bhavati
The final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, is replaced with *y* when a vowel-initial (*ajādi*) affix termed *vibhakti*, with no replacement of its original, follows.

EXAMPLES:

tvayā 'instrumental singular of *yuṣmad*'
mayā 'instrumental singular of *asmad*'
tvayi 'locative singular of *yuṣmad*'
mayi 'locative singular of *asmad*'
yuvayoḥ 'genitive-locative dual of *yuṣmad*'
āvayoḥ 'genitive-locative dual of *asmad*'

1. This rule offers *y* as a replacement for *d* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. Consider *(yuṣm→tva) ad + (ṭ) ā → tva + a(d→y) + ā = tvayā* and *(asm→ma) + ad + (ṭ) ā → ma + a(d→y) + (ṭ) ā = mayā*. Deriving *yuvayoḥ* and *āvayoḥ* with *d→y* and further replacements in *yuva* and *āva*, for *yuṣm* and *asm* (7.2.92 *yuvāvau dvivacane*), does not pose any problem.

Note here that *d*, or *ad*, can both be replaced with *y*. Refer to my notes under 7.1.28 *ṅe prathamayor am*. Replacing *d* with *y* would require application of 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*, etc. We can similarly get *tvayi* and *mayi*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *aci* 'when a vowel-initial . . .'? Consider *yuvābhyām* and *āvābhyām*, where this replacement is blocked since *bhyām* does not begin with a vowel.

If one carries over *hali*, via *anuvṛtti*, to 7.2.86 *yuṣmadasmador anādeśe*, *aci* of this rule is not needed. It then becomes used for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*).

The condition of *anādeśe* 'when not replaced' is still carried over. That is

why we do not get this replacement in *tvad* and *mad* of *tvad gacchati* '. . . goes away from me' and *mad gacchati* '. . . goes away from me'. These are ablative singular forms where *ṄasI* is replaced with *at* (7.1.10 *pañcamyā at*).

7.2.90 शेषे लोपः

śeṣe lopaḥ
/śeṣe 7/1 *lopaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *yuāṣmadasmadoḥ* #86)
śeṣe vibhaktau yuṣmadasmador lopo bhavati
LOPA applies to the final of an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, when an affix termed *vibhakti*, not enumerated thus far by the preceding, follows.

EXAMPLES:

tvam 'nominative singular of *yuṣmad*'
aham '. . . of *asmad*'
yūyam 'nominative plural of *yuṣmad*'
vayam '. . . of *asmad*'
tubhyam 'dative singular of *yuṣmad*'
mahyam 'dative singular of *asmad*'
yuṣmabhyam 'dative plural of *yuṣmad*'
asmabhyam '. . . of *asmad*'
tvat 'ablative singular of *yuṣmad*'
mat '. . . of *asmad*'
yuṣmat '. . . of *yuṣmad*'
asmat '. . . of *asmad*'
tava 'genitive singular of *yuṣmad*'
mama '. . . of *asmad*'
yuṣmākam 'genitive plural of *yuṣmad*'
asmākam '. . . of *asmad*'

1. This rule offers deletion of the final sound segment of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* when the nominal endings, not enumerated thus far, follow. The word *śeṣa* is used in the sense of *uktād anyaḥ* 'other than that which is already stated'. The nominal endings which remain to be stated are: singular and plural of nominative (*prathamā: sU/Jas*), dative (*caturthī: Ṅe/bhyas*), ablative (*pañcamī: ṄasI/bhyas*) and genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī: Ṅas/ām*). The following verse summarizes it:

pañcamyāś ca caturthyāś ca ṣaṣṭhīprathamayor api/
yāny advivacanāny atra teṣu lopo vidhīyate//
'this provision of deletion by *LOPA* is made in the context of non-dual nominal endings of ablative (*pañcamī*), dative (*caturthī*), genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*) and nominative (*prathamā*)'

Consider *tvam* and *aham* where *yuṣm* and *asm* get replaced with *tva* and *aha* (7.2.91 *tvāhau sau*). Rule 7.1.28 *ṅe prathamayor am* replaces *sU, au, Jas; am, auṬ* and *Ṅe* with *am*. Our present rule deletes *d*, or *ad*. Thus, (*yuṣm→tva*) *ad* + *sU* → *tva* + (*ad* →ϕ) + *sU* → *tva* + (*sU→am*) → *tva* + *am* → *tv*(*a+a→a*) *m* = *tvam*. We similarly get *aham* with *asm* replaced with *aha*. We get *yūyam* and *vayam*, in the plural, when *d*, or *ad*, is deleted after *yuṣm* and *asm* are replaced with *yūya* and *vaya* (7.2.93 *yūyavayau jasi*). We can also get *tubhyam* and *mahyam* where *Ṅe* is replaced with *am*. Rule 7.2.95 *tubhyamahyau ṅayi* offers *tubhya* and *mahya* as replacements for *yuṣm* and *asm*. We thus get *tubhyam* and *mahyam*. The dative and ablative plural forms will have their *bhyas* replaced with *bhyam* (7.1.30 *bhyaso bhyam*). This will give us *yuṣmabhyam* and *asmabhyam*. The deletion of *d* is accomplished only after replacement in *bhyam* is accomplished. We will get a replacement in *bhyam* if *ad* alone is deleted. It will be *abhyam* if *d* alone is deleted. The ablative singular and plural endings get replaced with *at* (7.1.10 *pañcamyā at*). Thus, we get *tvat, mat*; and *yuṣmat* and *asmat*. The genitive singular ending *Ṅas* is replaced with *aŚ* (7.1.27 *yuṣmadasmadbhyāṃ ṇaso' śˆ*). The deletion of *d* is accomplished after rule 7.2.96 *tavamamau ṅasi* replaces *yuṣm* and *asm* with *tava* and *mama*. The genitive plural forms are derived with the introduction of *sUṬ* followed by *ākam* (7.1.34 *sāma ākam*). We thus get *yuṣmākam* and *asmākam*.

2. Why do we have to make a specification with *śeṣe* 'when the remainder . . .'? It is used for clarity, especially since different replacements are offered in other contexts.

Why is affix *ṬāP* not introduced to denote feminine after this deletion has applied? Why do we have *tvaṃ brāhmaṇī* and *ahaṃ brāhmaṇī*? The feminine affix is not introduced because an operation marked with proximity cannot cause the destruction of the condition under which it applied ((*PŚ*:86) *sannipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tadvighātasya*). One can even accept the use of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* without any denotation of gender.

3. Some claim that *śeṣe* can also refer to the remainder of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* after they are replaced with *yuṣm* and *asm*. What is left is *ad*. It is claimed that this *ad* should form the focus of deletion. This view would require the application of *ṭi*-deletion on *ad*. If this deletion is applied after replacements of bases and endings have applied, deletion of *d*, or *ad*, will not create any difficulty. Deleting *d* may require rules such as 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*, 6.1.101 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* and 6.1.107 *ami pūrvaḥ* to apply. Deleting *ad* will require fewer rule applications.

7.2.91 मपर्यन्तस्य

maparyantasya

/maparyantasya 6/1 = *maḥ paryanto yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya/*

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1, *vibhaktau* #84)

'*maparyantasya*' *ity ayam adhikāraḥ. yad ita ūrdhvam anukramiṣyāmaḥ*

'maparyantasya' ity evaṃ tad veditavyam
In place of that which extends up to (and including) *m*.

EXAMPLES:

yuvām 'nominative-accusative dual of *yuṣmad*'
āvām 'nominative-accusative dual of *asmad*'
tvayā 'instrumental singular of *yuṣmad*'
mayā 'instrumental singular of *asmad*'

1. Note that this is a governing rule (*adhikāra*). Whatever is stated hereafter prior to 7.2.79 *tricaturoḥ* . . . must include the reading of *maparyantasya* 'in place of that which extends up to (and including) *m*'. This reference to a formal unit extending up to *m* is construed as *yuṣm* and *asm* of *yuṣmad* 'second personal pronominal' and *asmad* 'first personal pronominal', respectively. Consider the following rule (7.1.92 *yuvāvau dvivacane*) whereby *yuva* and *ava* are offered as replacements. Our present rule, when read with the following, will specify *yuṣm* and *asm* as forms of an *aṅga* constituted by *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. These, in turn, will be replaced with *yuva* and *ava*, respectively. Carrying the *anuvṛtti* of *maparyantasya* helps specify items (*sthānī*) which go through the process of replacement (*ādeśa*). Thus, *yuṣmad* + (*au*→ *am*) → (*yuṣm*→*yuva*) *ad* + *am* → *yuva* + *a*(*d*→*ā*) + *am* → *yuv*(*a*+*a*→*a*) + *ā* + *am* →*yuv*(*a*+*ā*→*ā*) + *am* → *yuv* (*ā*+*a*→*ā*) *m* = *yuvām*, where *yuva* replaces *yuṣm* and *d* of *ad* is replaced with *ā* of 7.2.88 *prathamāyāś ca dvivacane bhāṣāyām*. The vocalic sequence of *a*+*a* in *yuv*(*a* + *a*) *ā* + *am* then goes through a *guṇa*-replacement similar to what follows (*pararūpa*; 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*). The resultant vocalic sequence *a*+*ā* is replaced with a single long homogeneous vowel *ā* (*savarṇa-dīrgha*; 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*). The next sequence *ā*+*a* goes through a replacement similar to the *ā* which precedes (*pūrvarūpa*; 6.1.107 *ami pūrvaḥ*). Recall that the nominal ending *au* is replaced with *am* of 7.1.28 *ṅe prathamayor am*. Similar rules apply in deriving *āvām* from *asmad* + *au*.

The replacement in *ā* for accusative is accomplished by 7.2.87 *dvitīyāyāṃ ca*. The final *d* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* is replaced with *y*, instead, when a vowel-initial non-replaced nominal ending follows.

2. Why do we have the condition of *maparyantasya*? So that a replacement could not be ordered for that which includes *akAC* (5.3.71 *avyayasarvanāmnāṣṃ* . . .). Consider *yuvakām* and *āvakām* which end in a nominal ending (*sUP*) and are derivates of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* where *akAC* is introduced prior to the *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*, i.e., *ad*) of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. In the absence of a specification with *maparyanta*, we may find *yuva* and *ava* coming as replacements in place of the entire pronominal stem augmented with *akAC*. We could thus not get the desired forms *yuvakām* and *āvakām*.

Now consider rule 7.2.97 *tvamāv ekavacane* whereby *yuṣm* and *asm* are replaced with *tva* and *ma*. We thus get (*yuṣm*→*tva*) *ad* + (*Ṭ*) *ā* → *yuṣmad* + *ā* and *asmad* + (*Ṭ*) *ā* → (*asma*→*ma*) + *ad* + *ā*, where *Ṭā* is the singular ending of

instrumental (*tṛtīyā*). Rule 7.2.97 *tvamāv ekavacane* then requires *yuṣm* and *asm* to be replaced with *tva* and *ma*. We now have *tva* + *ad* + *ā* and *ma* + *ad* + *ā*. Rule 7.2.89 *yo' ci* then applies to replace the final *d* with *y* before *ā*, a nominal ending which has not gone through any replacement (*anādeśe*). Given *tva* + *a*(*d*→*y*) + *ā* = *tva* + *ay* + *ā* and *ma* + *ay* + *ā*, 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* applies to replace the sequence *a*+*a* with a single *guṇa* vowel *a*, a replacement similar to what follows (*pararūpa*). We thus get *tv*(*a*+*a*→*a*)*y* + *ā* → *tvay* + *ā* = *tvayā* and *m*(*a*+*a*→*a*)*y* + *ā* → *may* + *ā* → *mayā*. If we do not limit the extent (*avadhi*) of items to be replaced with *tva* and *ma* with a specification made by *maparyantasya*, *yuṣmad* and *asmad* will then be replaced, in toto, with *tva* and *ma*. For, these replacements consist of more than one sound segment (1.1.55 *anekālśit sarvasya*). If replacements come in place of forms with *akAC*, the *a* of *tva* and *ma* will then be replaced with *y* of 7.2.89 *yo' ci*. These all will produce wrong forms. A specification with *maparyantasya* will yield desired results. If we replace *yuṣma* and *asma* with *tva* and *ma*, against the condition of *maparyantasya*, the *a* of *tva* + *ā* and *ma* + *ā* will then be replaced with *y* (7.2.89 *yo' ci*). We will now get wrong forms: (*yuṣm*→*tv*(*a*→*y*)) + *ā* = **tvyā* and *asm* →*m*(*a*→*y*) + *ā* = **myā*. We get correct derivational results if *maparyantasya* remains stated.

Why include *pari* in *maparyantasya* when *māntasya* (*ma* + *antasya*) alone could account for desired forms? A specification with *māntasya* would mean: 'in place of that which ends in *m*'. This may or may not include *m* as part of the specified form. Pāṇini included *pari* to state a relative limit (*avadhi*). That is, a form of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* which extends up to, and includes, '*m* which occurrs before *a*'. It is stated that *pari* in this rule is included for blocking over-application of this replacement (*prasakti-vāraṇa*). Consider *yuṣmi* and *asmi* which are causal roots, derived with a *vārttika* (*vt*: *tat karoti tad ācaṣṭe*; 3.1.26 *hetumati ca*) parallel to (*yuṣmān*/*asmān*) *ācaṣṭe* with *ṆiC*. The *ad* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* gets deleted in view of *ṇāv iṣṭhavat prātipadikasya* (cf. 6.4.155 *ṭeḥ*). This rule uses *pari* to indicate the extent of the form of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, so that a replacement could not apply to a form of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* ending in *m* (*mānta*). We get such a form before *ṆiC* of *yuṣm*(*ad*→ϕ) + *i* + *KvIP* and *asm*(*ad*→ϕ) + *i* + *KvIP*. Recall that *ṆiC*, for example in *yuṣmi* + *KvIP* and *asmi* + *KvIP*, also gets deleted. This deletion cannot be accepted as *sthānivat* 'similar to that which it replaced', in view of the statement: *kvau lupte na sthānivat* 'deletion of *KvI* is not considered *sthānivat*'. A replacement for (*yuṣm* + (*ṆiC*→ϕ) + (*KvIP*→ϕ)) = *yuṣm* and (*asm* + (*ṆiC*→ϕ) + (*KvIP*→ϕ)) = *asm*, which ends in *m*, cannot be ordered before a nominal ending (*vibhakti*). Pāṇini uses *pari*, in *maparyantasya*, to thus block any over application of replacement. The use of *pari* is intended to determine the extent with reference to which replacements could be made. That extent is marked with *m* (*Mbh*: *māntasyety eva siddhe asmin yat parigrahaṇaṃ kṛtam avadhidyotanārthaṃ tat mānte mā bhūt*).

7.2.92 युवावौ द्विवचने

yuvāvau dvivacane
/yuvāvau 1/2 = *yuvaś ca āvaś ca* (*itar. dv.*); *dvivacane* 7/1 = *dvayoḥ vacane* (*ṣaṣ tat*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #86 *maparyantasya* #91) *dvivacane ye yuṣmadasmadī* (*dvyayarthābhidhānaviṣaye*) *tayor maparyantasya sthāne* '*yuva, āva*' *ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ*
LOPA applies to part of an *aṅga* extending up to *m*, namely that of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, when the pronominals occur with the signification of two.

EXAMPLES:

yūyam 'nominative plural of *yuṣmad*'
vayam 'nominative plural of *asmad*'

1. This rule offers replacements in *yuva* and *āva*, for *yuṣm* and *asm* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, when they are used (before a dual nominal ending) with the signification of two (*dvivacane*). Thus, *yuṣmad* + *au* → (*yuṣm*→*yuva*) *ad* + *au* = *yuva* + *ad* + *bhyām* and *āva* + *ad* + *bhyām*. Recall that *d* of *ad* is replaced with *ā* (7.2.86 *yuṣmadasmador anādeśe*). An application of *savarṇa-dīrgha* produces: *yuva* + *a* (*d*→ϕ) + *bhyām* → *yuv*(*a*+*a*→*ā*) + *bhyām* = *yuvābhyām* and *āva* + *a*(*d*→ϕ) + *bhyām* → *āv*(*a*+*a*→*ā*) + *bhyām* = *āvābhyām*. The *d* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* is replaced with *ā* before a vowel initial nominal ending which is not a replacement (7.2.89 *yo' ci*). Thus, we get (*yuṣm*→*yuva*) *a*(*d*→*y*) + *os*)) → *yuvayoḥ* and *āvayoḥ*.

Note that the use of *dvivacane* requires *yuṣmad* and *asmad* to be used with the signification of two. Consequently, they may be subject to replacements when used with the signification of two. Why was *dvivacane* 'when the signification is two' not used with the straight technical sense of dual number. The 'signification of two', instead of technical dual number, was used so that *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, even in a compound, could avail this replacement. Recall that *yuṣmad* and *asmad* can be used in compounds as constituents with the signification of two, but the resultant compound is not necessarily going to be used with the signification of two. Thus, *dvivacane* facilitates *yuṣmad* and *asmad* to be replaced with *yuṣm* and *asm* when they are used with the signification of two. Of course, when these replacements are not blocked by rules such as 7.2.94 *tvāhau sau*, etc. Consider the following compound derivates: *atikrāntaṃ yuvām* = *atiyuvām, atikrāntaṃ āvām* = *atyāvām; atikrāntān yuvān* = *atiyuvān* and *atikrāntān āvām* = *atyāvān; atikrāntena yuvām* = *atiyuvayā, atikrāntena āvām* = *atyāvayā; atikrāntair yuvām* = *atiyuvābhiḥ, atikrāntaiḥ āvām* = *atyāvābhiḥ; atikrāntebhyo yuvām* = *atiyuvabhyam, atikrāntebhyaḥ āvām* = *atyāvabhyam; atikrāntād yuvām* = *atiyuvat, atikrāntād āvām* = *atyāvat; atikrāntebhyo yuvām* = *atiyuvat, atikrāntebhyo āvām* = *atyāvat; atikrāntānām yuvām* = *atiyuvākam*.

atikrāntānām āvām = atyāvākam; atikrānte yuvām = atiyūvayi, atikrānte āvām = atyāvayi; and *atikrānteṣu yuvām = atiyuvāsu, atikrānteṣu āvām = atyāvāsu.*

These preceding allow replacements in *yuva* and *āva* before dual endings. But rules such as 7.2.93 *yūyavayau jasi*, 7.2.94 *tvāhau sau*, 7.2.95 *tubhyamahyau ṅayi* and 7.2.96 *tavamamau ṅasi* block these replacements in favor of *yūva, vaya; tva, aha; tubhya, mahya*; and *tava, mama.* Thus we get: *atikrāntaḥ yuvām = atitvam, atikrāntaḥ āvām = atyāham*, etc. This, as commentators explain, is accomplished in view of conflict among rules of equal strength (*vipratiṣedha*). That is, the rule which is subsequent in order (*para*) wins (1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe . . .*). How is this conflict established? It is stated that *tva, aha*, etc., find their independent scope of application when *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used with the signification of 'many' (*bahvartha*). An independent scope of application of *yuva* and *āva* is clearly established when they are used with the signification of 'two' (*dvyarthe*). We get the application of both under the condition of *sau* (7.2.94 *tvāhau sau*) 'when *sU* follows'.

Recall that one may find *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, used with the signification of 'two', in a compound. However, the compound as a whole may be used with the signification of 'one' or 'many'. What if *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used with the signification of 'one' and 'many', but the compound is used with the signification of 'two'? A replacement in *yuva* and *āva* will then be blocked. Thus, *atikrāntau tvām = atitvām, atikrāntau mām = atimām*; and *atikrāntau yuṣmān = atiyuṣmān, atikrāntau asmān = atyasmān*, etc.

The following *kārikā* verses capture the complexity of these replacements:

> *samasyamāne dvyekatvavācinī yuṣmadasmadī*
> *samāsārtho' nyasaṃkhyaś cet sto yuvāvau tvamāv api//1//*
> 'when, in a compound-formation, *yuṣmad* and *asmad* denote a meaning qualified with two or one, but may be denoting a different number in the predicated compound, even then they are replaced with *yuva* and *āva* in the dual, and *tva* and *ma* in the singular'

> *sujasṅeṅassu parata ādeśāḥ syuḥ sadaiva te*
> *tvāhau yūyavayau tubhyamahyau tavamamāv api//2//*
> 'if, in a compound, *yuṣmad* and *asmad* occur before *sU, Jas, Ṅe* and *Ṅas*, *yuṣmad* is replaced with *tva, yūya, tubhya* and *tava*, respectively; *asmad* is replaced with *aha, vaya, mahya* and *mama*, respectively'

> *ete paratvād bādhante yuvāvau viṣaye svake*
> *tvamāv api prabādhante pūrvavipratiṣedhataḥ//3//*
> 'these replacements of *yuṣmad*, i.e., *tva/yūya/tubhya/tava*, and of *asmad*, i.e., *aha/vaya/mahya/mama*, being offered subsequently (*para*) in the context of nominal endings *sU, Jas, Ṅe* and *Ṅas*, block replacements is *yuva* and *āva*; additionally, they also block *tva* and *ma* on the basis of *pūrvavipratiṣedha* 'conflict of equal strength where a prior rule wins'

dvyekasaṃkhyaḥ samāsārtho bahvyarthe yuṣmadasmadī
tayor advyekatārthatvān na yuvāvau tvamau na ca//4//
'when, after the formation of a compound, its sense is denoted by singular or dual, and *yuṣmad* and *asmad* as constituents of the compound are used with the denotation of 'many', replacements in *tva* and *yuva*, and *ma* and *āva*, are not accomplished'

7.2.93 यूयवयौ जसि

yūyavayau jasi
/yūyavayau 7/2 = *yūyaś ca vayaś ca* = *yūyavayau* (*itar. dv.*); *jasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #86 *maparyantasya* #91)
yuṣmadasmador maparyantasya jasi parato 'yūya, vaya' ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ
yūya and *vaya* come in place of that part of the *aṅga* which extends up to *m* of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, provided the nominative plural ending *Jas* follows.

EXAMPLES:

yūyam 'nominative plural of *yuṣmad*'
vayam 'nominative plural of *asmad*'

1. This rule offers a replacement in *yūya* and *vaya* for that part of an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, which extends up to *m*, provided the nominative plural ending *Jas* follows. Thus, (*yuṣm*→*yūya*) *ad* + (*J*) *as* → *yūya* + *ad* + (*as*→*am*) → *yūya* + (*ad*→ϕ) + *am* =*yūy*(*a*+*a*→*a*) *m* → *yūyam*, where *ad*, in other's view *d* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*), goes through deletion (7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*; ṭi-deletion). One must apply 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* where *d* alone is deleted by 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ*. Thus: *yūya* + *a*(*d*→ϕ) + *am* → *yūy*(*a*+*a*→*a*) *m* = *yūyam*, through additional application of 6.1.106 *ami pūrvaḥ*. Note here that *Jas* is replaced with *am* of 7.1.28 *ṅe prathamayor am*. Deleting *ad* will not require application of 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*. Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* under 7.2.90 *śeṣe lopaḥ* for further discussion.

Kāśikā states that, in the domain of 6.4.1 *aṅgasya*, we find operations applicable to both the *aṅga* as well as what follows it (*Kāś*: *aṅgādhikāre tasya ca taduttarapadasya ca*). That is, a specification with *yuṣmad* and *asmad* also includes references to what ends in them, or what they follow. Consider *paramayūyam*/*paramavayam* and *atiyūyam*/*ativayam*, where *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used as final compound constituents. These replacements obviously invoke *tadantavidhi* 'interpreting *x* as also that which ends in *x*', whereby *yuṣmad* and *asmad* could also be interpreted as referring to what ends in them. Of course, *maparyantasya* 'extending up to, and including, *m*' is still valid. Refer also to 7.1.28 *ṅe prathamayor am* for derivational details.

7.2.94 त्वाहौ सौ

tvāhau sau

/tvāhau 1/2 (*itar. dv.*); *sau* 7/1/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #86 *maparyantasya* #91)

yuṣmadasmador maparyantasya sau pare 'tva, aha' ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ

tva and *aha* come in place of a part of the *aṅga* extending up to *m*, namely of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, respectively, when the nominative singular (*prathamā*) ending *sU* follows.

EXAMPLES:

tvam 'nominative singular of *yuṣmad*'

aham 'nominative singular of *asmad*'

paramatvam 'nominative singular of a compound with *yuṣmad* as its final constituent, introduced with *sU*'

paramāham 'nominative singular of a compound with *asmad* as its final constituent, introduced with *sU*'

atitvam 'nominative singular of a compound with *yuṣmad* as its final constituent, introduced with *sU*'

atyaham 'nominative singular of a compound with *asmad* as its final constituent, introduced with *sU*'

1. This rule is an exception to the subsequently stated rule 7.2.97 *tvamāv ekavacane*. A question is raised as to why *tva* was stated in this rule. Besides, a replacement in *tva* is already made available by 7.2.97 *tvamāv ekavacane*. Why not just offer here the replacement in *aha*. Why did Pāṇini not formulate this rule simply as: *ahaḥ sau* '*aha* comes as a replacement in place of *asmad* when *sU* follows'? Formulating this rule as *ahaḥ sau* will still include *yuṣmad* within its scope of replacement. That is, *aha* could still replace *yuṣm*. It is therefore impossible to formulate this rule as *ahaḥ sau*. Why then not formulate this rule as *asmado' haḥ sau* '*aha* comes as a replacement in place of *asmad* when *sU* follows'? This formulation will be prolix (*gaurava*). Consequently, this rule should be left the way it is formulated (*Nyāsa*: *atha tvagrahaṇaṃ kimartham, na 'ahaḥ sau' ity evocyeta, tvādeśo hi 'tvmāv ekavacane' ity evaṃ bhaviṣyati. aśakyam eva vaktum. asati tvagrahaṇe yuṣmado' py ahādeśasyāt. athavā atra 'asmado' haḥ sau' ity evocyeta. evam api gauravaṃ syāt. tasmād yathānyāsam evāstu*).

2. This rule offers *tva* and *aha* as replacements for that part of the *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad* which extends up to, and includes *m*, provided when *sU* follows. Thus, we get *tvam* and *aham*. Acceptance of *tadantavidhi* (cf. 7.2.93) also allows these replacements in compounds such as *paramatvam* 'you (are) the best', *paramāham* 'I (am) the best' and *atitvam* 'you, who excelled' *atyaham* 'I, who excelled', where *yuṣmad* and *asmad* combine in a compound ending in *sU*. Recall that 7.2.97 *tvamāv ekavacane* offers *ma* as a

replacement for *asm*. This rule constitutes an exception to that, based on *pūrva-vipratiṣedha* 'conflict between two rules where the preceding in order of enumeration wins'. Note that *paramatvam* and *paramāham* are *tatpuruṣa* compounds which are termed *karmadhāraya*. Also refer to 7.1.28 *ṅe prathamayor am* for additional derivational details.

7.2.95 तुभ्यमह्यौ ङयि

tubhyamahyau ṅayi
/tubhyamahyau 1/2 (*itar. dv.*); *ṅayi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #89 *maparyantasya* #91)
yuṣmadasmador maparyantasya '*tava, mama*' *ity etāv ādeśau bhavato ṅayi parataḥ*
tubhya and *mahya* come in place of *yuṣm* and *asm*, the part of an *aṅga*, namely of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* extending up to *m*, provided when the dative (*caturthī*) singular ending *Ṅe* follows.

EXAMPLES:

tubhyam 'dative singular of *yuṣmad*'
mahyam 'dative singular of *asmad*'
paramatubhyam 'dative singular of a compound with *yuṣmad* as its final constituent'
paramamahyam 'dative singular of a compound with *asmad* as its final constituent'
atitubhyam 'dative singular of a compound with *yuṣmad* as its final constituent'
atimahyam 'dative singular of a compound with *asmad* as its final constituent'

1. This rule offers *tubhya* and *mahya* as replacements for *yuṣm* and *asm* of an *aṅga* when the dative singular nominal ending *Ṅe* follows *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. Thus, we get *tubhyam, mahyam*; *paramatubhyam, paramamahyam*; *atitubhyam, atimahyam*. Recall that *Ṅe* is here replaced with *am* (7.1.28 *ṅe prathamayor am*). Operations specific to *ṭi*-deletion and *tadantavidhi* 'treating *x* as also that which ends in *x*' are similar to many preceding derivates. Also refer to 7.1.28 *ṅe prathamayor am* for additional details.

7.2.96 तवममौ ङसि

tavamamau ṅasi
/tavamamau 1/2 (*itar. dv.*) *ṅasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #89 *maparyantasya* #91)
yuṣmadasmador maparyantasya '*tava, mama*' *ity etāv ādeśau bhavato ṅasi parataḥ*

tava and *mama* come in place of *yuṣm* and *asma*, parts of an *aṅga* extending up to *aṅga*, namely of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, respectively, provided the genitive singular nominal ending *Ṅas* follows.

EXAMPLES:

tava 'genitive singular of *yuṣmad*'
mama 'genitive singular of *asmad*'
paramatava 'a compound with *yuṣmad* as its final constituent ending in the genitive'
paramamama 'a compound with *asmad* as its final constituent ending in the genitive'
atitava 'a compound with *yuṣmad* as its final constituent ending in the genitive'
atimama 'a compound with *asmad* as its final constituent ending in the genitive'

1. This rule offers *tava* and *mama* as replacements for *yuṣm* and *asm* when *Ṅas* 'genitive singular' follows *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. Thus, we get *tava* and *mama*. Compound derivates will similarly be: *paramatava, paramamama; atitava* and *atimama*. Recall that *Ṅas* is here replaced with *aŚ* (7.1.27 *yuṣmadasmadbhyām . . .*). Operations such as *ṭi*-deletion and *pararūpa* 'single replacement similar to the second in a vocalic sequence' also apply here. Compound derivates are derived in view of *tadantavidhi*, as explained.

7.2.97 त्वमावेकवचने

tvamāv ekavacane
/ tvamau 1/2 (*itar. dv.*); *ekavacane* 7/1 (*ṣaṣ tat*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #89 *maparyantasya* #91)
ekavacane ye yuṣmadasmadī ekārthābhidhānaviṣaye tayor maparyantasya sthāne 'tva, ma' ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ
tva and *ma* come in place of part of an *aṅga* extending up to *m*, namely of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, respectively, when an affix termed *vibhakti* with the signification of one (*eka*) follows.

EXAMPLES:

tvām 'accusative singular of *yuṣmad*'
mām 'accusative singular of *asmad*'
tvayā 'instrumental singular of *yuṣmad*'
mayā 'instrumental singular of *asmad*'
tvat 'ablative singular of *yuṣmad*'
mat 'ablative singular of *asmad*'
tvayi 'locative singular of *yuṣmad*'
mayi 'locative singular of *asmad*'

1. This rule offers *tva* and *ma* as replacements for *yuṣm* and *asm* of an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, provided when *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used with the signification of 'one'. Recall that the *d* of *ad* in these derivates is replaced with *ā* (*ātva*; 7.2.87 *dvitīyāyāṃ ca*). The *y* of *tvayā* and *mayā* has its source in the application of 7.2.89 *yo' ci*. Note that *tva* and *ma* also replace *yuṣm* and *asm* in compounds where *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used with the signification of 'one' and the compound itself may be used with the signification of 'two' (*dvitva*) and 'many' (*bahutva*). Replacements such as *tva* and *aha* (7.2.94 *tvāhau sau*; 7.2.95 *tubhyamahyau ṅayi*; 7.2.96 *tavamamau ṅasi*), etc., are offered in view of conflicts where the preceding rule wins (*pūrva-vipratiṣedha*). Thus, *atikrāntau tvām = atitvām* and *atikrāntau mām = atitimām*, as against *atitvam* and *atyaham*, etc. Refer to *Nyāsa* for full scope of derivational examples.

7.2.98 प्रत्ययोत्तरपदयोश्च

pratyayottarapadayoś ca
/pratyayaottarapadayoḥ 7/2 = *pratyayaś ca uttarapadaṃ ca = pratyayottarapade* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #89 *maparyantasya* #91 *tvamāvekavacane* #97)
pratyaye uttarapade ca parata ekavacane vartamānayor yuṣmadasmador maparyantasya 'tva, ma' ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ
tva and *ma* come in place, respectively, of that part of an *aṅga*, namely *yuṣmad* and *asmad* which extends up to their *m*, when an affix, or some other constituent, follows, and *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used with the signification of one.

EXAMPLES:

tvadīyaḥ 'this is yours'
madīyaḥ 'this is mine'
tvattaraḥ 'better than you'
mattaraḥ 'better than me'
tvadyati '. . . desires you'
madyati '. . . desires me'
tvadyate '. . . acts like you'
madyate '. . . acts like me'
tvatputraḥ 'your son'
matputraḥ 'my son'
tvannāthaḥ 'he whose master you are'
mannāthaḥ 'he whose master I am'
yuṣmadīyam 'your own'
asmadīyam 'my own'

yuṣmatputraḥ 'your son'
asmatputraḥ 'my son'

1. This rule offers *tva* and *ma* as replacements for *yuṣm* and *asm* when the *aṅga*, *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, are followed by an affix (*pratyaya*), or a compound constituent, provided *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used with the signification of 'one'. Consider *tava ayam = tvadīyaḥ* and *mama ayam = madīyaḥ*, where *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are considered *vṛddha* (1.1.74 *tyadādīni ca*) and affix *cha* (4.2.114 *vṛddhāc chaḥ*) is introduced. Thus, *yuṣmad + Ṅas + cha →* (*yuṣm →tva*) *ad + Ṅas +* (*cha →īya*) *= tv*(*a + a→a*) *d + Ṅas + īya → tvad +* (*Ṅas→ϕ*) *+ īya = tvadīya*, through *yuṣm→tva*, *cha→īya* (7.1.2 *āyaneyīnīyiyaḥ . . .*) and *a+a→a* (*pararūpa*; 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*). Refer to *śālīyaḥ* ((II:326-27); 1.1.1 *vṛddhir ādaic*) for additional derivational details. One can similarly derive *madīyaḥ*.

Now consider *atiśayena tvam = tvattaraḥ* and *atiśayena aham = mattaraḥ* where *tva + ad + taraP* yields *tva + a*(*d→t*) *+ taraP = tvattara*, through affix *taraP* (5.3.57 *dvivacanavibhajyopapade*), *yuṣm→tva*, *pararūpa* (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*) and *tva*(*d→t*) *+ tara*(*P*) *= tvattara* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*) Affix *KyaṄ* (3.1.8 *supa ātmanaḥ kyac*) is introduced in deriving *tvām ātmana icchati = tvadyati* and *mām ātmana icchati = madyati*, where *yuṣmad + am + KyaṄ* and *asmad + am + KyaṄ* have *yuṣm* and *asm* replaced with *tva* and *mama*. Recall that affix *LAṬ→tiP* is introduced after *tv*(*a+a→a*) *d +* (*K*) *ya*(*Ṅ*) *→ tvadya* to finally yield *tvadyati* and *madyati*. We similarly get *tvadyate* and *madyate*, parallel to *tvam iva ācarati* and *aham iva ācarati*, with the introduction of *KyaṄ* (3.1.11 *karttuḥ kyaṅ salopaś ca*) and subsequent *LAṬ→te* (1.3.12 *anudāttaṅit ātmanepadam*).

Examples such as *tava putraḥ = tvatputraḥ*, *mama putraḥ = matputraḥ*, *tvaṃ nāthaḥ asya = tvannāthaḥ* and *ahaṃ nāthaḥ asya = mannāthaḥ* illustrate the specification of *uttarapade* 'when a following (final) compound constituent . . .'. These are *bahuvrīhi* compounds where *tva* and *ma* replace *yuṣm* and *asm* after deletion of *sUP* contained within individual compounds. Operations such as *d→t* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*), *a+a→a* (*pararūpa*; 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*) and *d→n* (*parasavarṇa*; 8.4.44 *yaro' nunāsike . . .*) apply where required.

2. Note that *ekavacane* 'when signification of one' still carries. Why? So that we do not get these replacements where *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used with the signification of 'many'. Thus, *yuṣmākam idam = yuṣmadīyam* 'this is yours (plural)', *asmākam idam = asmadīyam* 'this is ours'; and *yuṣmākaṃ putraḥ = yuṣmatputraḥ* 'your(plural) son', *asmākaṃ putraḥ = asmatputraḥ* 'our son'.

3. Note that these rules are placed within the domain (*adhikāra*) of *vibhaktau* (7.2.84 *āṣṭan ā vibhaktau*). Our present rule is formulated so that *yuṣm* and *asm* could be replaced , even when an affix other than *vibhakti*, or a constituent in combination, follows.

A question is raised as to why these replacements cannot be accomplished before *vibhakti* 'nominal ending'? After all, these examples do have nominal endings contained within their derivational strings. That is, why can we not replace *yuṣm* and *asm* before 2.4.71 *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ* accomplishes

LUK-deletion of nominal endings contained within derivational strings. That is, at the time when the condition of *vibhaktau* 'when a nominal ending follows' could be satisfied. This, however, cannot be done. A *LUK*-deletion is considered externally conditioned because it is caused by assignment of terms such as *dhātu* 'verbal root' (3.1. 32 *sanādyantā dhātavaḥ*) and *prātipadika* 'nominal stem' (1.2.46 *kṛttaddhitasamāsāś ca*). Replacements of *yuṣm* and *asm* will be considered internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) because the base (*prakṛti*) must occur before a nominal ending (*vibhakti*). But since an externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) operation is also *nitya* 'obligatory', it should be blocked by the internally conditioned operation. Besides, an internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) operation is considered more powerful than one which is externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*; *PŚ*:39: *pūrvaparanityāntaraṅgāpavādānām uttarottaro balīyaḥ*). A replacement of *yuṣm* and *asm* can still not be accomplished prior to *LUK*-deletion of *sUP*. This is one of the reasons why this rule is formulated. In summary, an internally conditioned operation may be blocked by an externally conditioned deletion by means of *LUK* (*Kāś*: *antaraṅgān api vidhīn bahiraṅgo' pi lug bādhate*). Replacement operations of this rule thus become an indicator (*jñāpaka*) for this. This is why *nUM*, etc., are blocked by *LUK*-deletion in examples such as *gomān priyaḥ asya = gomatpriyaḥ* 'he to whom rich-in-cows is dear'.

If this *jñāpaka* is accepted then replacements in *tava* and *aha* (7.2.94 *tvāhau sau*) will also not be accepted before a non-*vibhakti* affix and a following constituent (*pratyayottarapadayoś ca*). Thus, *tvaṃ pradhānaṃ eṣām = tvatpradhānaḥ* 'you are the head of these people' and *ahaṃ pradhānam eṣām = matpradhānaḥ* 'I am the head of these people' where we will get *tva* and *ma*. We will similarly get *yūya* and *vaya* in: *yūyaṃ putrā asya = yuṣmatputraḥ* and *vayaṃ putrā asya = matputraḥ*. Accepting this *jñāpaka* will not allow replacements of 7.2.95 *tubhyamahyau ṅayi* in *tubhyaṃ hitam = tvaddhitam* and *mahyaṃ hitam = maddhitam*. It will also not allow replacements of 7.2.96 *tavamamau ṅasi* in *tava putraḥ = tvatputraḥ* and *mama putraḥ = matputraḥ*.

Why do we have to accept this *jñāpaka* for blocking an internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) operation by an externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) *LUK*-deletion? Why can we not accept this *jñāpaka* to block replacements such as *tva, aha*, etc.? A *jñāpaka* should be accepted in view of desired goals. That which can account for comparatively larger goals should be accepted (*Kāś*: *jñāpakārthe hy etasmin bahutaram iṣṭam saṃgṛhyate*).

7.2.99 त्रिचतुरोः स्त्रियां तिसृचतसृ

tricaturoḥ striyāṃ tisṛcatasṛ
/ tricaturoḥ 6/2 = *triś ca catur ca = tricaturau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *striyām* 7/1
tisṛ-catasṛ 1/1 (deleted) = *tisṛ ca catasṛ ca* (*itar. dv.*)*/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84)

'tri, catur' ity etayoḥ striyāṃ vartamānayos 'tisṛ, catasṛ' ity etāv ādeśau bhavato vibhaktau parataḥ

tisṛ and *catasṛ* come in place of an *aṅga*, namely *tri* 'three' and *catur* 'four' used with the signification of feminine (*striyām*), when an affix termed *vibhakti* follows.

EXAMPLES:

tisraḥ 'three; (nominative/accusative) plural'
catasraḥ 'four; (nominative/accusative) plural'
tisṛbhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *tṛ* 'three''
catasṛbhiḥ '. . . of *catur* 'four''

1. This rule offers *tisṛ* and *catasṛ* as replacements for *tri* and *catur* when they are used with the signification of feminine. Thus, we get (*tisṛ* + (*J*)*as*/(*Śas*) = *tisraḥ* where *ṛ* is repalced with *r* (7.2.100 *aci ra ṛtaḥ*). We similarly get *catur* + (*J*)*as*/(*Ś*)*as* → *catasraḥ*. Strings with (*tri*→*tisṛ*) + *bhis* and (*catur*→*catasṛ*) + *bhis* will produce *tisṛbhiḥ* and *catasṛbhiḥ*, without replacing *ṛ* with *r*.

2. Why when used with the signification of *strī* 'feminine'? Consider *trayaḥ*/*catvāraḥ* and *trīṇi*/*catvāri* where bases used with the signification of masculine and neuter do not avail these replacements. Note that *striyām* 'when feminine . . .' is used here as a modifier to *aṅgasya*, and not to *tri* and *catur*. Consequently, it is not necessary that the *aṅga* derived with *tri* and *catur* must also be used in the feminine. That is, these replacements should apply when *tri* and *catur* are used with the signification of feminine and the derived *aṅga* may be used with the signification of something other than feminine. Consider *priyā trisraḥ brāhmaṇyaḥ asya brāhmaṇasya saḥ* = *priyatisā brāhmaṇaḥ* 'a brāhmaṇa to whom three brāhmaṇa women are dear', where *tri* of *priyatisṛ* is used with the signification of feminine but the derived *aṅga*, i.e., *priyatisṛ*, is used with the signification of something other than a feminine. We similarly get *priyāḥ tisraḥ asya tat brāhmaṇakulam* = *priyatisṛ brāhmaṇakulam* 'a brāhmaṇa-clan to whom three (people; masculine) are dear'. Note further that the *samāsānta* 'end of compound' affix *kaP* (5.4.153 *nadyṛtaś ca*) cannot be introduced in these examples because *tisṛ* and *catasṛ* are replacements externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) by *vibhakti*. What if the *aṅga* is feminine and *tri* and *catur* refer to something other than a masculine or neuter? These replacements will not be allowed. Consider *priyās trayo' syāḥ brāhmaṇyāḥ* 'the three (masculine) who are dear to this brāhmaṇī' and *priyāṇi trīṇi asyāḥ brāhmaṇyāḥ* 'the three (neuter) which are dear to this brāhmaṇī', where we will get *priyatriḥ*. We similarly get *priyacatvāḥ* 'a *brāhmaṇa* woman for whom four are dear'.

3. A *vārttika* proposal is made to allow *tri* to be replaced with *tisṛ* when affix *kaN* is introduced. Thus, *tisṛkā nāma grāmaḥ* 'a village named Tisṛkā'.

A similar proposal is made for *catasṛ* to be marked *udātta* at the beginning. Thus, *catasraḥ paśya*.

7.2.100 अचि र ऋतः

aci ra ṛtaḥ
/aci 7/1 *raḥ* 1/1 *ṛtaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *tisṛcatasṛ* #99)
'*tisṛ, catasṛ*' *ity etayor ṛtaḥ sthāne rephādeśo bhavaty ajādau vibhaktau parataḥ*
A *r* comes in place of *ṛ* of an *aṅga*, namely one constituted by *tisṛ* and *catasṛ*, when a vowel-initial (*ajādi*) affix termed *vibhakti* follows.

EXAMPLES:

tisras tiṣṭhanti 'these three are sitting'
tisraḥ paśya 'see these three'
catasras tiṣṭhanti 'these four are sitting'
catasraḥ paśya 'see these four'
priyatisra ānaya 'O you who are dear to three, bring!'
priyacatasra ānaya 'O you who are dear to four, bring!'
priyatisraḥ svam 'the property of one who is dear to three'
priyacatasraḥ svam 'property of one who is dear to four'
priyatisri nidhehi 'place your trust in one who is dear to three'
priyacatasṛ nidhehi 'place your trust in one who is dear to four'

1. This rule allows the *ṛ* of *tisṛ* and *catasṛ* to be replaced with *r* when a nominal ending beginning with a vowel follows. Why is this rule formulated when *r*, as a replacement for *ṛ*, can be gotten with the application of 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*? So that a single replacement similar to what precedes in a sequence of two vowels could be blocked before the accusative plural nominal ending *Śas* (6.1.101 *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇaḥ*). It is also formulated so that a replacement in *u* (*utva*; 6.1.110 *ṛta ut*) before the ablative and genitive singular nominal endings *ṄasI* and *Ṅas* could be blocked. Finally, this rule is also formulated so that a replacement in *guṇa* (7.3.110 *ṛto ṅi*) before the locative singular ending *Ṅi* and the nominative plural ending *Jas* could be blocked. Our present rule is thus an exception to all these rules. Note in this connection that 7.3.110 *ṛto ṅi* is placed subsequently (*para*) in order.

2. Note that *ṛtaḥ* of this rule refers to the *ṛ* of *tisṛ* and *catasṛ*. It does not refer to an *aṅga* ending in *ṛ*. For, in that case, *ṛ* would have been replaced with *r* to give the form of the rule as: *aciraḥ*. This new specification would then have enabled *r* to replace the final *ṛ* of *tisṛ* and *catasṛ*.

7.2.101 जराया जरसन्यतरस्याम्

jarāyā jaras anyatarasyām
/jarāyāḥ 6/1 *jaras* 1/1 *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *aci* #100)
'*jarā*' *ity etasya* '*jaras*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati anyatarasyām ajādau vibhaktau parataḥ*

jaras comes, optionally, in place of an *aṅga*, namely *jarā* 'old age', when a vowel-initial affix termed *vibhakti* follows.

EXAMPLES:

jarasā dantā śīryante
'tooth decay because of old age'
jarayā dantā śīryante 'ibidem'
jarase tvā paridadyuḥ 'they abandoned you to old age'
jarāyai tvā paridadyuḥ 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers *jaras* as an optional replacement for *jarā* when a *vibhakti* beginning with a vowel follows. Thus, (*jarā* → *jaras*) + *au* → *jarasau*. We will get *jarā* + (*au*→*Śī*) → *jarā* + *ī* (7.1.18 *aūṅ āpaḥ*) when the option of replacing *jarā* with *jaras* is not accepted. This, with the application of 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*, gives us *jar*(*ā*+*ī*→*e*) = *jare*. We similarly get (*jarā*→*jaras*) + *Ṭā* → *jarasā* in the instrumental singular. Not accepting the option of *jaras* will yield *jar*(*ā*→*e*) + (*Ṭ*) *ā* = *jare* + *ā*, where 7.3.105 *āṅi cā' paḥ* offers a replacement in *e* (*etva*). An application of *e*→*ay* (*ayādeśa*; 6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*) will give us *jar*(*e*→*ay*) + *ā* → *jarayā*. The dative singular form *jarāyai* derives from *jarā* + *yā*(*Ṭ*) + (*Ṅ*) *e* → *jarā* + *yā* + *e*, with introduction of augment *yāṬ* (7.3.113 *yād āpaḥ*). We get *jarā* + *y*(*ā*+*e*→*ai*) = *jarāyai* through application of 6.1.88 *vṛddhir eci*. We will get *jarase* if optional replacement of *jaras* is accepted.

Now consider *atijarāṃsi brāhmaṇakulāni* and *atijarasaṃ brāhmaṇakulaṃ paśya* where *atijara* is a compound termed neuter (*napuṃsaka*). The accusative singular string *atijara* + *am* finds three rules applicable: 7.1.23 *svamor napūṃsakāt* '*sU* and *am* go through deletion, via *LUK*, after an *aṅga* used with the signification of neuter'; 7.1.24 *ato' m* '*sU* and *am* are replaced with *am* after an *aṅga* which ends in *a* and is used with the signification of neuter'; 7.2.101 *jarāyā jaras anyatarasyām*.

Rule 7.1.24 blocks 7.1.23 by way of being an exception (*apavāda*). Our present rule then replaces *jara* with *jaras*. Thus, we get *atijara* + (*sU*→*am*) = *atijara* + *am* → *ati*(*jara*→*jaras*) + *am* = *atijarasam*. We cannot apply *LUK*-deletion on *atijaras* + *am*, again, since 7.1.23 *svamor napuṃsakāt* cannot be revived.

The *Mahābhāṣya* discusses *atijaram* and *atijaraiḥ* as the nominative singular and instrumental plural form of *atijara*, respectively, in the opinion of Gonardīya (Patañjali?). Others hold that these forms with replacement of *jara* with *jaras* cannot be accepted since *am*←*sU* and (*ais*←*bhis* (7.1.9 *ato bhis ais*)) were introduced after *atijara* under the condition of *atijara* ending in *a*. These same nominal endings cannot be allowed to condition the replacement of *jara* with *jaras* since it will destroy the *a* which conditioned them (*PŚ* (86): *sannipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tadvighātasya*). Others argue back that this *paribhāṣā* is *anitya* 'non-obligatory'. That is, *jara* can still be replaced with *jaras*. Now a question: how can one replace *jara* with *jaras* when the replacement rule specifies *jarā* to be replaced with *jaras*? For, a replacement

should come in place of that which is specifically given (*PŚ* (13): *nirdiśyamānasyādeśā bhavanti*). The answer: a form which is modified in one place should still be accepted as its unmodified original (*PŚ* (38): *ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat*).

Let us now consider *atijarāṃsi* which derives from (*atijara* + (*Jas*/*Śas*)) where *Jas* and *Śas* are replaced with (*Ś*)*i* (7.1.20 *jaśśasoḥ śi*). Our present rule also introduces *jaras* as a replacement for *jara*. Rule 7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya jhaly acaḥ*, read with 1.1.47 *mid aco' ntyāt paraḥ*, then introduces augment *nUM*. We thus get: *ati*(*jara*→*jaras*) + (*Jas*/*Śas*→(*Ś*)*i*)) → *atijara* + *nUM* + *s* + *i* = *atijarans* + *i*. The final short *a* is then replaced with its long counterpart: *atijar*(*a*→*ā*)*ns* + *i* = *atijarā*(*n*→*ṃ*)*s* + *i* = *atijarāṃsi*. Recall here that *jara* must be replaced with *jaras* before augment *nUM* is introduced. For, *nUM* will intervene between *atijara* and the nominal ending, if it is introduced prior to *jaras* replacing *jara*. Besides, 7.2.101 *jarāyāḥ jaras* . . . should apply first since it happens to be subsequent in the order of enumeration.

7.2.102 त्यदादीनामः

tyadādīnām aḥ
/*tyadādīnām* 6/3 = *tyad ādir yeṣām* (*bv*), *teṣām*; *aḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84)
'*tyad*' *ity evamādīnām akārādeśo bhavati vibhaktau parataḥ*
The final sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by items enumerated in the list headed by *tyad* 'that' is replaced with *a* when an affix termed *vibhakti* follows.

EXAMPLES:

syaḥ/*tyau*/*te* 'nominative singular/dual/plural of *tyad*'
saḥ/*tau*/*te* 'nominative singular/dual/plural of *tad*'
yaḥ/*yau*/*ye* 'nominative singular/dual/plural of relative *yad* 'he who'''
eṣaḥ/*etau*/*ete* 'nominative singular/dual/plural of *etad*'
ayam/*imau*/*ime* 'nominative singular/dual/plural of *idam*'
asau/*amū*/*amī* 'nominative singular/dual/plural of *adas*'
dvau/*dvābhyām* 'nominative/instrumental dual of *dvi*'

1. Note that items enumerated in the list headed by *tyad* 'that' include *tyad, tad, yad, etad, idam, adas,* and *dvi*. That is, a replacement in *a* is desired only for items enumerated beginning with *tyad* and up to (and including) *dvi* (*Kāś*: *dviparyantānāṃ tyadādīnām atvam iṣyate*). Thus, *bhavān* 'nominative singular of *bhavat* 'you (polite)'' does not qualify for this replacement. This is a sub-list included within the general listing of pronominals (1.1.27 *sarvādīni sarvanāmāni*).

2. A replacement in *a* must come in place of the final sound segment of these enumerated items termed an *aṅga* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*). Thus, *tyad* + *sU*

→ *tya*(*d*→*a*) + *s* → (*t*→*s*)*ya* + *a* + *s* → *ty*(*a*+*a*→*a*)*s* → *tya* + (*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *tyaḥ*, where *d* (7.2.102) and *t* are replaced with *a* and *s* (7.2.106 *tado saḥ . . .*), respectively. Rule 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* applies to replace the vocalic sequence *a*+*a* with a single *a* (*pararūpa*). Similar applications are also involved in deriving *tad* + *sU* → *saḥ*. Refer to *sarve* (II:360) for derivational details of plural forms such as *tye*, etc. Deriving *eṣaḥ* from *etad* + *sU* involves several replacement operations subsequent to *eta*(*d*→*a*) + *sU* of this rule. First, the vocalic sequence *a*+*a* goes through a single *guṇa* (*pararūpa*; 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*) replacement. Rule 6.2.102 *tadoḥ saḥ . . .* then replaces the non-final *t* with *s*: *et*(*a*+*a*→*a*) + *s*(*U*) → *e*(*t*→*s*)*a* + *s* = *esa* + (*s*→*ḥ*) = *esa* + *ḥ*. Rule 8.3.55 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* finally produces *e*(*s*→*ṣ*)*a* = *eṣa*. The final *sU* of this string produces a *visarga*: *eṣa* + (*s*→*rU*→*ḥ*) = *eṣaḥ*. It may also be deleted (6.1.131 *etattadoḥ . . .*) to produce *eṣa* under certain conditions. Thus, we may get *eṣa karoti*.

Note here that items affected by this replacement are also termed *sarvanāman* 'pronominal' (1.1.27 *sarvādīni sarvanāmāni*). This, in turn, may have additional implications. This replacement will be blocked where *tyad*, etc., are used with the signification of a name (*saṃjñā*). It will also be blocked when *tyad*, etc., are used as secondary members of a compound. This replacement will apply where they are used as principal compound constituents. Finally, there are implications relative to rules contained within the domain of 5.4.1 *prāg diśo vibhaktiḥ*. Consider the introduction of affixes after items termed *sarvanāman* (5.1.2 *kiṃsarvanāma . . .*) for illustration.

7.2.103 **किम: क:**

kimaḥ kaḥ
/*kimaḥ* 6/1 *kaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84)
'*kim*' *ity etasya* '*ka*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati vibhaktau parataḥ*
ka comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *kim*, when an affix termed *vibhakti* follows.

EXAMPLES:

kaḥ 'nominative singular of *kim* (who)'
kau 'nominative dual'
ke 'nominative plural'

1. This rule offers *ka* as a replacement for an *aṅga*, namely *kim*, when a nominal ending follows. Note that, in view of 1.1.55 *anekālśit sarvasya*, *ka* replaces *kim* in toto (*sarvādeśa*). Thus, (*kim*→*ka*) + *sU* = *kaḥ*. Refer also to *kaḥ* and *ke* (II:400- 401) for derivational details. Why not formulate this rule as *kimo' t*, thereby replacing *m* with *a*, and *i* with *a*: *ki*(*m*→*a*) + *sU* → *k*(*i*→*a*)*a* + *sU* = *k*(*a*+*a*→*a*) + *sU* → *kaḥ*. Refer to notes under 5.3.1 *kimo' at* and 5.3.13 *vā ha ca cchandasi* for additional perspective.

7.2.104 कु तिहोः

ku tihoḥ
/ku 1/1 *tihoḥ* 7/2 = *tiś ca haś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *kimaḥ* #103)
takārādau hakārādau ca vibhaktau parataḥ '*kim*' *ity etasya* '*ku*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
ku comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *kim*, when an affix termed *vibhakti*, beginning with *t* or *h*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

kutaḥ 'from whence'
kutra 'where'
kuha 'where'

1. This rule offers *ku* as a replacement for *kim* when a nominal ending which begins with *t*(*tI*) and *h* follows. Thus, (*kim* + *Ṅi* + *traL* → (*kim*→*ku*) + *Ṅi* + *tra*(*L*) = *ku* + (*Ṅi*→ϕ) + *tra* = *kutra*. Recall that *traL* is an affix termed *vibhakti* (5.3.1 *prāgdiśo vibhaktiḥ*) which is introduced after a string ending in *saptamī* 'locative' (5.3.10 *saptamyās tral*). Rule 1.1.38 *taddhitaś cāsarvavibhaktiḥ* assigns the term *avyaya* 'indeclinable' to forms thus derived. Nominal endings contained within these forms are then deleted by 2.4.82 *avyayād āpsupaḥ*. Our next example *kutaḥ* derives from (*kim* →*ku*) + *ṄasI* + *tas*(*IL*) = *ku* (*ṄasI*→ϕ) *tas* → *kuta*(*s*→*rU*→*ḥ*) = *kutaḥ*. Affix *tasIL*, a *vibhakti*, is introduced by 5.3.7 *pañcamyās tasil*. Our last example *kuha* derives from *kim* + *Ṅe* + *ha*, of 5.1.13 *vā ha cchandasi*, where *ha* is a *vibhakti*. Refer to the appendix (II:370-71) for additional derivational details.

7.2.105 क्वाति

kvāti
/kva 1/1 (deleted) *ati* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *kimaḥ* #103)
'*ati*' *ity etasyāṃ vibhaktau parataḥ* '*kim*' *ity etasya* '*kva*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
kva comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *kim*, when an affix termed *vibhakti* constituted by *aT* follows.

EXAMPLES:

kva gamiṣyasi 'when will you go'
kva bhokṣyase 'when will you eat'

1. This rule offers *kva* as a replacement for *kim* where *aT* follows. Consider *kim* + *Ṅe* + *a*(*T*) = *kva*. Refer to the appendix (II:446) for derivational details.

Why introduce a new substitute (*ādeśa*) when *ku* of the preceding rule

could account for *kva*, with an additional application of replacement in *yaṆ*? This replacement is added so that the *guṇa* application of 6.4.146 *or guṇaḥ* could be blocked. For, a *guṇa* application would have been accepted as more powerful than a replacement in *yaṆ*. Why not formulate the rule as *kimo ḍvat*, thereby accounting for *kva* after deletion of *u* on the basis of *Ḍ* as an *it* in *ḌvaT* (6.4.143 *ṭeḥ*). This formulation can account for *kva* from *kim* + *Ṅe* + *ḌvaT*. It cannot account for forms where *kim* may be used with affix *akAC* (5.3.71 *avyayasarvanām . . .*). An *akAC* form of *kim* with *ḌvaT* will produce an undesired form **kakva*, as a result of *ṭi*-deletion of *im*. This is another reason for offering *aT* as a replacement against *ku*.

7.2.106 तदोः सः सावनन्त्ययोः

tadoḥ saḥ sāvanantyayoḥ
/ tadoḥ 6/2 = *taś ca daś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *saḥ* 1/1 *sau* 7/1 *anantyayoḥ* 6/2 = *na antyau* (*nañ. tat.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *tyadādīnām aḥ* #102)
tyadādīnāṃ takārādakārayor anantyayoḥ sakārādeśo bhavati sau parataḥ
s comes in place of the non-final *t* and *d* of an *aṅga* constituted by items enumerated in the list headed by *tyad* when an affix termed *vibhakti*, particularly *sU*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

syaḥ 'nominative singular 'that' '
saḥ 'nominative singular 'he' '
eṣaḥ 'nominative singular; this person'
asau 'nominative singular; that person'

1. This rule offers *s* as a replacement for a non-final (*anantya*) *t* and *d* of an *aṅga*, namely of *tyad*, etc., when the nominal ending *sU* follows. Refer to notes under 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ* for derivational details.

2. Why do we state the condition of 'non-final' (*anantyayoḥ*)? Consider *he* (*tyad* + *sU*) = *he saḥ* where, if *anantyayoḥ* is not accepted as a condition, this rule will block the application of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ* on the basis of *paratva* (1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe . . .*). We will then get (*t*→*s*) *ya*(*d*→*s*) = *s*(*y*→ϕ) *as* = *sas* = *he* **sas*. Affix *ṬāP* cannot be introduced after **sas* since it will no longer end in a vowel (4.1.4 *ajādyataṣ ṭāp*). It is to remove this difficulty that *anantyayoḥ* has been used in the wording of this rule.

Tattvabodhinī (ad *SK*) notes that the derived final *s* can be replaced with *a*, and with the application of *pararūpa* 'single replacement similar to what follows in a vocalic sequence', we can still get the desired form. We will have to resort to *punaḥ prasaṅgavijñāna* 'applying a rule when its context reappears'. That is, *anantyayoḥ* can be dropped from the wording of this rule. The *Tattvabodhinī* prefers changing the order of rules against accepting *anantyayoḥ* as part of the wording of this rule.

7.2.107 अदस औ सुलोपश्च

adasa au sulopaś ca
/ adasaḥ 6/1 *au* 1/1 *sulopaḥ* 1/1 = *sor lopaḥ* (*ṣaṣ tat*); *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *sau* #106)
adasaḥ sau parataḥ sakārasya aukārādeśo bhavati
au comes in place of the *s* of an *aṅga*, namely *adas* 'that one', when an affix termed *vibhakti*, particulalry *sU*, follows; additionally, *sU* also gets deleted by *LOPA*.

EXAMPLES:

asau 'that'

1. This rule offers *au* as a replacement for *adas* when *sU* follows. Additionally, *sU* goes through deletion by *LOPA*. This replacement comes in place of the final *s* of *adas* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*). Refer to notes under the preceding rule for illustration.

2. The following *vārttika* proposals have been made in the *Mahābhāṣya* under this rule:

(*i*) *au* is optionally negated in favor of introducing *u* in place of *a* which occurs after *s* of *adas*, provided when *adas* is used with *akAC*. Thus, *ad*(*akAC*+ *as*) + *sU* → *ad*(*a*→*u*) *kas* + *sU* → *adukas* + (*sU*→ϕ) = *a*(*d*→*s*) *ukas* → *asuka*(*s*→*rU*→*ḥ*) = *asukaḥ*. A non-negation of *au* will produce: *adakas* + *sU* → *adaka*(*s*→*u*) + *sU* → *adakau* + (*sU*→ϕ) → *a*(*d*→*s*) *akau* = *asakau* (*vt. autvapratiṣedhaḥ sākackād vā vaktavyaḥ sād utvaṃ ca*).

(*ii*) A replacement stated for *tyad*, etc., when used in combination with a following constituent, applies prior to combining them with *sandhi*. Thus, *paramāham*, *paramāyam* and *paramānena* (*vt. uttarapadabhūtānāṃ tyadādīnām akṛtasandhīnām ādeśā vaktavyāḥ*).

3. The following *kārikā* verses of the *Mahābhāṣya* sum up an interesting discussion:

adasaḥ sor bhaved autvaṃ kiṃ sulopo vidhīyate/
hrasvāl lupyeta sambuddhir na halaḥ prakṛtaṃ hi tat//
āpa etvaṃ bhavet tasmin na jhalīty anuvartanāt/
pratyayasthāc ca kād itvaṃ śībhāvaś ca prasajyate//

'*sU* after *adas* should be replaced with *au*. Why are we offering deletion of *sU* by *LOPA*? There will then be deletion of *sambuddhi* (2.3.49 *ekavacanaṃ sambuddhiḥ*) after a short vowel (*hrasvāt*). But how could that happen when *hal* is carried there? We will then get a replacement in *e* (*etva*) for *āp*. This will not happen since *jhali* is carried over. Rule 7.3.44 *pratyayasthāt*. . . will cause a replacement in *i* (*itva*) for that which occurs before *k*. But we will still get *śī* for *au* (7.1.18 *auṅ āpaḥ*)'

Note that we can get *asau* from *adas* + *sU*→ *ada*(*s*→*a*) + *sU*→ *ad*(*a*+*a*→*a*) + *sU*→ *a*(*d*→*s*) *a* + *au* → *as*(*a*+*au*→*au*) = *asau*, with *s*→*a*, *sU*→*au* and *pararūpa*. Why then offer deletion of *sU*? We will run into problem with *adas* + (*sU*→*au*) where *sU* is that of *sadbuddhi* 'address' (6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt* . . .). That is, we will get deletion of *sU* turned *au*. Thus, *au* should not replace *sU*. This, however, will not happen since *hal* is carried there. That is, *sU*→*au* cannot be deleted since it is no longer constituted by a consonant. But, given *asā* + (*sU*→*au*), where *asā* ends in the feminine affix *ṬāP*, rule 7.3.106 *sambuddhau ca* will replace *ā* with *e* (*etva*) in *he khaṭve*. But this is not a problem. We get the *anuvṛtti* of *jhali* in 7.3.1 *sambuddhau ca*. Thus, this replacement in *e*, since it applies only before a *sambuddhi* which begins with a consonant denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*, will be blocked.

This solution still has problems. We will get *i* before *k*, for example, in *asakā* + *au*, where *akAC* is involved. If *au* is introduced as a replacement to the base we will not get *ṬāP*, and hence, a replacement in *i*. Thus, *sU* cannot be replaced with *au*. But strings such as *asā* + *au* will then have their *ā* go through a replacement in *Śi*. This will produce wrong forms. It is, therefore, advised to have *s* replaced with *au* with concurrent deletion of *sU*.

4. It is argued that this rule should be formulated simply as *adasa au*. We can carry over *sau* from 7.2.106 *tadoḥ saḥ sāv anantyayoḥ*. The locative of *sau* in 7.2.106 *tadoḥ* . . . will be transformed into genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*). For, it has served its purpose in 7.2.106 *tadoḥ* . . ., and *adasaḥ* of 7.2.107 is specified in the ablative (*pañcamī*). The *sūtra* will then mean: 'let *au* replace *sU* which occurs after *adas*'. Thus, given *adas* + *sU*, we will get *au* in place of *sU*. The *s* will be replaced with *a* by 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*. We will finally get the form *asau* with the application of *pararūpa* 'single replacement similar to what follows', *vṛddhi*, and replacement of *d*→*s* (7.2.106 *tadoḥ saḥ* . . .).

But this view creates problems in derivates such as *he asau*, where *sU* occurs after a short vowel. Rule 6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt sambuddhau* will thus apply to delete *sU*. This is what is stated as a fault by *hrasvāt lupyeta sambuddhiḥ* of the *kārikā* quoted above. We cannot get *au* when *sU* has gone through deletion. The address form can thus not be derived as *he' sau*. A solution to this problem is offered by: *na halaḥ prakṛtaṃ hi tat*. It is explained that 6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt sambuddhau* deletes the consonant (*haL*) of *sambuddhi*. We do not find the consonantal *sambuddhi* here since *sU* has been replaced with *au*. Since *au* is a vowel, it cannot go through deletion. But for this interpretation of 6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt sambuddheḥ*, one must read *halaḥ* in the wording of rule 6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt*. . . . We do not need to read *halaḥ* in the wording of rule 6.1.69 since *halaḥ* of 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo dīrghāt* . . . is already there. But *halaḥ* of 6.1.68 is specified in the nominative (*prathamā*) and we need it here in the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*). This should pose no problem. The ablative (*pañcamī*) of 6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt* . . . will be transformed into genitive at the strength of 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*. Thus, there is no problem in deriving *he asau*.

But there is another problem. We cannot derive *he asau* in the feminine, because similar to *he rame* in the feminine, we will get a replacement in *-e* by 7.3.106 *sambuddau ca.* That is, we will end up with the form *he *asayau.* Given *adas + sU,* and after the application of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ, pararūpa,* and the feminine affix *ṬāP,* we will get *he adā + sU.* This *sU* will then get replaced with *au,* and the *ā* of *ṬāP* will be replaced with *e.* Of course, the *d* will be replaced with *s.* Given *he ase + au,* we should get *he *asayau* through *ay* replacement of *e.* A resolution to this problem is being offered in the verse: *na jhaly ity anuvartanāt.* It is stated that *jhali* will be carried over to 7.3.106 *sambuddhau ca* from 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et.* The meang will be: a replacement in *e* offered by 7.3.106 *sambuddhau ca* applies when a *sambuddhi* beginning with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* follows. Since *au* does not begin with a sound denoted by *jhaL,* replacement in *e* is blocked. The verse states: to state that a replacement in *e* by 7.3.106 *sambuddhau ca* will become applicable is not appropriate. For, that carries the *anuvṛtti* of *jhali.*

Yet another fault is brought to notice by the *kārikā* phrase: *pratyayasthāc ca kād itvam.* It is stated that, given *adas + sU,* and a desire to express the sense of 'not known', etc., parallel to *asakau brāhmaṇī,* rule 5.3.71 *avyayasarvanāmnām akac prāk . . .* will introduce *akAC* before the *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*). This will give us *adakas + sU.* A replacement in *a* of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ, pararūpa* (*a*), and introduction of *ṬāP,* will now yield *adakā + sU.* A replacement in *i* must now be introduced for *a* before *k* of the affix. The result will be: *adikā + sU* which, through the application of 7.2.107 *adasa au sulopaś ca,* will yield **asikau,* and not the desired *asakau.* A similar problem can also be faced in deriving *asau brāhmaṇī* where we will get a *śī*-replacement by 7.1.18 *auṅa āpaḥ* for resolution of this problem.

7.2.108 इदमो मः

idamo maḥ
/idamaḥ 6/1 *maḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *sau* #106)
idamaḥ sau parato makāro antādeśo bhavati
m comes in place of the final *m* of an *aṅga,* namely of *idam* 'this', when an affix termed *vibhakti,* particularly *sU,* follows.

EXAMPLES:

iyam 'this (feminine)'
ayam 'this (masculine)'

1. A replacement in *m* for the final *m* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) of *idam* is recommended here so that *idam* can be saved from replacement in *a* (*atva*) of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ* (*Kāś: idamo makārasya makāravacanaṃ tyadādyatva*

bādhanārtham). Recall that *id* of *idam* is replaced with *ay* in the masculine (7.2.11 *ido' ay puṃsi*). Thus, *idam* + *su* → (*id*→*ay*) *am* + *sU* → *ayam* + (*sU*→ϕ) = *ayam*. We get *i*(*d*→*y*) *am* + *sU* → *iyam* + (*sU*→ϕ) = *iyam*, in the feminine with *y* as a replacement for its *d* (7.2.110 *yaḥ sau*).

7.2.109 दश्च

daś ca
/*daḥ* 6/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *idamo maḥ* #108)
idamo dakārasya sthāne makārādeśo bhavati vibhaktau parataḥ
m also comes in place of *d* of an *aṅga*, namely of *idam*, when a nominal ending follows.

EXAMPLES:

imau/*ime* 'nominative dual and plural of *idam*'
imam/*imau*/*imān* 'accusative singular/dual/ plural . . .'

1. What is the purpose of explicitly stating *sU* in the next rule when the same could be carried, via *anuvṛtti*, from this rule. Pāṇini does not want *sU* to be read in the wording of this present rule. He explicitly states it in the next rule because he needs it there. We have to read *vibhakti* 'nominal endings', in general, for purposes of this rule.

This rule offers *m* as a replacement for *d* of *idam* before a nominal ending. Thus, *ida*(*m*→*a*) + *au* → *iḍa* + *a* + *au* → *i*(*d*→*m*) *a* + *a*) + *au* → *im*(*a*+*a*→*a*)+ *au* → *im*(*a*+*au*→*au*) = *imau*. Applications such as *tyadādyatva* (*m*→*a*; 7.2.102 *tyadādīnāmaḥ*), *d*→*m* (7.2.109 *daś ca*), *pūrvarūpa* (*a*+*a*→*a*; 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*) and single replacement in *vṛddhi* (*a*+*au*→*au*; 6.1.88 *vṛddhir eci*) are easy to understand. Note, however, that *imān*, accusative plural, will get a replacement in *n* (*natva*; 6.1.102 *tasmāc chaso . . .*).

7.2.110 यः सौ

yaḥ sau
/*yaḥ* 6/1 *sau* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *idamaḥ* #108 *daḥ* #109)
idamo dakārasya yakārādeśo bhavati sau parataḥ
y comes in place of *d* of an *aṅga*, namely of *idam*, when an affix termed *vibhakti*, namely *sU*, follows (and feminine is denoted).

EXAMPLES:

iyam 'this'

1. Note that this replacement applies only in the feminine. Why? Because our next rule specifies a replacement in the masculine (*puṃsi*). Why can

this replacement not be meant for neuter (*napuṃsaka*). That is impossible (*asambhava*), since *sU* gets deleted there in view of 7.1.23 *svamor napuṃsakāt*. We cannot invoke 1.1.62 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam* to still accomplish this replacement. Rule 1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya* will block any such effort. Our example *iyam* gets *m* as a replacement for the final *m* of *idam*. This, as explained, is an exception to the *a* (*tyadādityatva*) of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*.

2. Some edition of *Kāśikā* reads the *vṛtti* as *idamo makārasya yakārādeśo bhavati*. . . . This is wrong. A replacement in *y* for *m* of *idam* will make it hard to derive *iyam*. I, therefore, follow Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita (cf. *SK*: *idamo dasya yaḥ syāt sau*) in presenting the *vṛtti* of this rule: *idamo dakārasya yakārādeśo bhavati*. S.C. Vasu also writes his *vṛtti* with *makārasya*, although his English translation is correct.

7.2.111 इदोऽय् पुंसि

ido' y puṃsi
/idaḥ 6/1 *ay* 1/1 *puṃsi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *idamaḥ* #108 *sau* #110)
idam idrūpasya puṃsi sau parataḥ 'ay' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
ay comes in place of *id* of an *aṅga*, namely of *idam*, when an affix termed *vibhakti*, namely *sU*, follows and the derivate signifies masculine (*puṃsi*).

EXAMPLES:

ayaṃ brāhmaṇaḥ 'this is a brāhmaṇa'

1. Why do we state *puṃsi* 'when masculine'. Note that *id* is not replaced with *ay* in the feminine. Consequently, we get *iyaṃ brāhmaṇī* 'this is a brāhmaṇa woman' where *d* of *idam* is replaced with *y* (7.2.110 *yaḥ sau*).

7.2.112 अनाप्यकः

anāpy akaḥ
/an 1/1 (deleted) *āpi* 7/1 *akaḥ* 6/1 = *na vidyate kakāro yasmin tat* (*bv.*), *tasya/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *idamaḥ* #108 *sau* #110 *idaḥ* #111)
idamo' kakārasya idrūpasya sthāne 'ana' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati āpi vibhaktau parataḥ
ana comes in place of *id*, namely a *k*-less form of an *aṅga* constituted by *idam*, when an affix termed *vibhakti* denoted by the abbreviatory term *āP* follows.

EXAMPLES:

anena 'instrumental singular of *idam* 'this'''
anayoḥ 'genitive and locative dual of *idam*'

1. Note that *āP* is accepted as an abbreviatory term denoting nominal endings *Ṭā* 'instrumental singular' through *suP* 'locative plural'. Our next rule offers deletion of *id* before a nominal ending beginning with a consonant (*halādi*). This rule then applies in contexts where a nominal ending begins with a vowel and is denoted by *āP*. It generally applies when nominal endings *Ṭā* 'instrumental singular' through *os* 'locative dual' follow. A negation with *akaḥ* '. . . other than *k*' is given so that this rule does not apply when *akAC* (5.3.71 *avyayasarvanāmnām . . .*) is used after *id* of *idam*. Consider *idam* + *Ṭā* → *anena*, where *id* is replaced with *ana* (7.2.112 *anāpy akaḥ*) and 7.1.12 *ṭāṅasiṅasāmi . . .* replaces *Ṭā* with *in*. Thus, (*id*→*ana*) *a* + (*Ṭā*→*ina*)) = *ana* + *a* + *ina*. A single replacement in *a* for *a*+*a* is offered in consonance with 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*. We can similarly get *ana* + *os*, where 7.3.104 *osi ca* replaces the final *a* of *ana* with *e*. A replacement in *ay* for the resultant *e*, followed by *rU*→*ḥ* (*rutva-visarga*), produces *anayoḥ*.

2. Note that we do not find *ana* as a replacement, for example in *imakena* and *imakayoḥ*, since their *idam* is introduced with *akAC*, and thus becomes a form with *k*.

7.2.113 **हलि लोपः**

hali lopaḥ
/hali 7/1 *lopaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vibhaktau* #84 *idamaḥ* #108 *idaḥ* #111 *akaḥ* #112)
halādau vibhaktau parata idamo' akakārasya idrūpasya lopo bhavati
LOPA comes in place of the non-*k* form of an *aṅga*, namely *id* of *idam*, when an affix termed *vibhakti* beginning with a consonant follows.

EXAMPLES:

ābhyām 'instrumental, dative and ablative singular form of *idam* (this)'
ebhiḥ 'instrumental plural form of *idam*'
ebhyaḥ 'dative and ablative plural form of *idam*'
eṣām 'genitive plural form of *idam*'
eṣu 'locative plural form of *idam*'

1. Refer to derivational details of *ābhyām* (appendix, II:354-55). Forms with the instrumental plural ending *bhis*, and the dative-ablative nominal ending *bhyas*, after *m*→*a* and single replacement similar to what follows in a vocalic sequence (*pararūpa*), involve a replacement in *e* (*etva*; 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et*). Thus, (*a*→*e*) + *bhis* = *ebhis* and (*a*→*e*) + *bhyas* = *ebhyas*. Recall that augment *sUṬ* (7.1.52 *āmi sarvanāmnaḥ . . .*) is introduced in deriving *eṣām*. The *s* of the derivate is then replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣatva*; 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*).

2. Why can we not delete the final *d* of *id* in accord with 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*? Because this interpretive convention (*paribhāṣā*) does not apply where a speci-

fication (here *id*) does not have any meaning (*Kāś.* '*nānarthake' lontyavidhiḥ' iti sarvasyāyam idrūpasya lopaḥ*). Consequently, *id* is deleted in its entirety. An application of 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya* can be made possible only when one carries the *anuvṛtti* of *an* from 7.2.112 *anāpya kaḥ*. That will then facilitate deletion of *n* of *an* which replaces *id*. Refer to derivational details of *ābhyām* (II:354-55).

7.2.114 मृजेर्वृद्धिः

mṛjer vṛddhiḥ
/mṛjeḥ 6/1 *vṛddhiḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *iko guṇavṛddhī* #1.1.3)
mṛjer aṅgasya iko vṛddhir bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK*, of an *aṅga* constituted by *mṛjI* 'to wipe, cleanse'.

EXAMPLES:

mārṣṭā 'purifier'
mārṣṭum '. . . for wiping'
mārṣṭavyam '. . . ought to be wiped'

1. Note that *mṛjeḥ* specifies a verbal root (*dhātu*) in the genitive. Consequently, this rule will apply to a verbal root which constitutes an *aṅga* when an affix follows. Thus, *kaṃsaparimṛj + bhyām* will not involve this rule application. For, *bhyām* is an affix which is not introduced after a verbal root. Refer to derivationals details of *cetā* (II:329) for deriving a derivate with affix *tṛC*. Our examples are derivates of affixes *tṛC*, *tumUN* and *tavyaT*. Thus, *mṛj + tṛ(C)* → *m(ṛ→ār)j + tṛ* → *mār(j→ṣ) + tṛ* → *mārṣ + (t→ṭ)ṛ = mārṣṭṛ*, etc., with *vṛddhi* (*ṛ→ār*; 7.2.114), *j→ṣ* (*ṣatva*; 8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjasṛjamṛja . . .*) and *t→ṭ* (*ṣṭutva*). Other rule applications are similar to *cetā* where *ṛ* of *tṛC* receives *anAṄ* (7.1.93 *anaṅ sau*). Examples with *tumUN* and *tavyaT* do not offer anything new.

7.2.115 अचो ञ्णिति

aco' ñṇiti
/acaḥ 6/1 *ñṇiti* 7/1 = *ñaś ca ṇaś ca = ñṇau* (*dv.*); *ñṇāv itau yasya* (*bv* with int. *dv*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #114)
ajantasyāṅgasya ñiti ṇiti ca vṛddhir bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of the vowel denoted by *iK* of an *aṅga* which ends in *aC*, when an affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

ekas taṇḍulaniścāyaḥ 'one heap of rice'

dvau śūrpaniṣpāvau 'two winnowing basketful of rice'
kāraḥ 'doer'
hāraḥ 'carrier'
gauḥ/gāvau/gāvaḥ 'nominative singular/dual/plural of *go* (cow)'
sakhāyau/sakhāyaḥ 'nominative dual and plural of *sakhi* 'companion''
jaitram 'victory'
yautram 'mixing'
cyautnaḥ 'moving'

1. Refer to derivational details of *niṣpāvau* (appendix, III:762). Similar rules apply in deriving *nicāyaḥ* from *nisci* + *GHaÑ*, where the *vṛddhi*-vowel *ai* is replaced with *āy*, and *s* of *nis* goes through a replacement in *ś* (*ścutva*; 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*). Deriving *kāra* and *hāra*, from *kṛ* + *GHaÑ* and *hṛ* + *GHaÑ*, with replacement in *vṛddhi* is easy. The *vṛddhi*-replacement of *g*(*o*→*au*), in *go* + *sU*, *go* + *au*, *go* + *Jas*; and *sakhi* + *au* and *sakhi* + *Jas*, is acccomplished via extensional operations (*atideśa-kārya*) applied in the context of *sarvanāmasthāna* (1.1.43 *śi sarvanāmasthānam*; 1.1.44 *suṭ anapuṃsakasya*), similar to that which is marked with *Ṇ* as an *it* (*ṇidvadbhāva*; 7.1.90 *goto ṇit*; 7.1.92 *sakhyur asambuddhau*). Refer to derivational details of most examples under rules 7.1.90 and 7.1.92. Deriving *jaitra* and *yautra*, from *ji* + *ṢṭraN* and *yu* + *ṢṭraN*, via *ṇit*, through *bāhulaka* 'variously' and *vṛddhi* (3.3.1 *uṇādayo bahulam*) is not difficult. Deriving *cyautna*, from *cyu* + *tnaṆ* (*Uṇādi*), follows the same pattern of derivation.

7.2.116 **अत उपधाया:**

ata upadhāyāḥ
/*ataḥ* 6/1 *upadhāyāḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #114 *ñṇiti* #115)
aṅgopadhāyā akārasya sthāne ñiti ṇiti ca pratyaye vṛddhir bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of next to the last *a* (1.1.65 *alo' ntyāt pūrva upadhā*) of an *aṅga* when an affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pākaḥ 'cooking'
tyāgaḥ 'renunciation'
yāgaḥ 'sacrifice'
pācayati 'he has someone cook'
pācakaḥ 'cook'
pāṭhayati 'he has someone recite; teaches'
pāṭhakaḥ 'reciter'

1. The first three examples are derivates of *GHaÑ*, introduced after *pac*, *tyaj* and *yaj*. Replacements in *k* and *g*, for *c* and *j*, respectively, are gotten

after the penultimate *vṛddhi* of 7.3.52 *cajoḥ ku*. . . . The last four examples are derivates of *ṆiC* (3.1.26 *hetumati ca*), where penultimate *vṛddhi* is also applied. The *ṆvuL* of *pācakaḥ* and *pāṭhakaḥ* yields *aka* (7.1.1 *yuvor anākau*).

2. The condition of *ataḥ* 'in place of *a*' is imposed so that *bhedayati* and *bhedakaḥ*, with no *a* in the penultimate position (*upadhā*), could be excluded from getting a replacement in *vṛddhi*. This *aT* must be penultimate (*upadhā*) so that *cakāsayati* 'illuminates' and *takṣakaḥ* 'carpenter' which, because of no *aT* in the *upadhā*, could be excluded from getting this *vṛddhi*. Recall that *a* of *takṣakaḥ* will be termed *guru* before the conjunct (1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*).

7.2.117 तद्धितेष्वचामादेः

taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ
/taddhiteṣu 7/3 *acām* 6/3 *ādeḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #114 *aco ñṇiti* #115)
taddhite ñiti ṇiti ca pratyaye vṛddhir bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of initial among vowels of an *aṅga* when an affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

gārgyaḥ 'a *gotra*-descendant of Garga'
vātsyaḥ 'a *gotra*-descendant of Vatsa'
dākṣiḥ 'son of Dakṣa'
plākṣiḥ 'son of Plakṣa'
aupagavaḥ 'a descendant of Upagu'
kāpaṭavaḥ 'a descendant of Kapaṭu'

1. Note that *gārgya* and *vātsya* are derivates of the *taddhita* affix *yaÑ* (4.1.105 *gargādibhyo* . . .). Our next two examples are derivates of *iÑ* (4.1.95 *ata iñ*). The last two examples are derivates of *aṆ* (cf. appendix, under 1.1.1 *vṛddhir* . . .).

2. Commentators explain that an initial *vṛddhi* blocks the application of penultimate (*upadhā*) and final *vṛddhi*. Consider *tvāṣṭraḥ* and *jāgataḥ* where their bases derive from *tvaṣṭṛ* + *aṆ* and *jagat* + *aṆ* with application of initial *vṛddhi*.

7.2.118 किति च

kiti ca
/kiti 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #114 *acaḥ* #115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #117)
kiti ca taddhite parato' ṅgasyācām āder acaḥ sthāne vṛddhir bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of initial among vowels of an *aṅga*, also when a *taddhita* affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

nāḍāyanaḥ 'a descendant of Naḍa'
cārāyaṇaḥ 'a descendant of Cara'
ākṣikaḥ 'he who plays with a dice; gambler'
śālākikaḥ 'he who plays with a *śalākā* '(ivory) stick'; gambler''

1. The first two examples are derivates of affix *phaK* (4.1.99 *naḍādibhyaḥ phak*). The last two are derivates of affix *ṭhaK* (4.4.1 *prāg vahateṣ ṭhak*; 4.4.2 *tena dīvyati* . . .). Note that *pha* and *ṭha* yield replacements in *āyana* and *ika* (7.1.2 *āyaneyīnīyiyaḥ* . . .; 7.3.50 *ṭhasyekaḥ*), respectively.

PĀDA THREE

7.3.1 देविकाशिंशपादित्यवाड्दीर्घसत्रश्रेयसामात्

devikāśiṃśapādityavāḍdīrghasattraśreyasām āt
/ devikā-śiṃśapā-dityavāṭ-dīrghasattra-śreyasām 6/3 (*itar dv*); *āt* 1/1/ (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco' ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.116 *kiti* #7.2.117)
'*devikā, śiṃśapā, dityavāṭ, dīrghasattra, śreyas' ity eteṣām aṅgānām āder acaḥ sthāne vṛddhiprasaṅge ākāro bhavati ñiti ṇiti kiti taddhite parataḥ*
An *ā* comes in place of initial among vowels of an *aṅga*, namely *devikā, śiṃśapā, dityavāṭ, dīrghasattra* and *śreyas*, when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows, and the context is that of replacement in *vṛddhi*.

EXAMPLES:

dāvikam udakam 'water of river Devikā'
dāvikākūlāḥ śālayaḥ 'a variety of rice grown on the banks of river Devikā'
pūrvadāvikaḥ 'someone born at a village named Pūrvadevikā'
śāṃśapaścamasaḥ 'a ritual vessel made with Śiṃśapā leaves'
śāṃśapāsthalāḥ 'found at a place named Śiṃśapāsthala'
pūrvaśāṃśapaḥ 'someone born in Pūrvaśiṃśapā'
dātyauham 'this belongs to Dityavāṭ'
dārghasattram 'that which is found in the soma sacrifice of Dīrghasattra'
śrāyasam 'that which is found in the best'

1. Note that *aṅgasya* (6.4.1) is carried over. It thus shares a qualifier-qualified relationship (*viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣyabhāva*) with *devikā*, etc. Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kāśikā*) discusses four interpretational possibilities of this rule, depending upon:

(*i*) whether *devikā*, etc., are accepted as qualifiers to *aṅgasya*; or
(*ii*) *aṅgasya* is accepted as a qualifier to *devikā*, etc.; and
(*iii*) whether coreferentiality (*sāmānādhikaraṇya*); or

(*iv*) non-coreferentiality (*vaiyadhikaraṇya*), forms the basis of such a qualifier-qualified relationship.

If we accept *devikā*, etc., as qualifiers to *aṅga* based on coreferentiality, then, via *tadantavidhi* 'interpreting *x* as one which also ends in *x*', we get the following interpretation: the first among vowels of an *aṅga* which ends in *devikā*, etc., is replaced with *ā*. This interpretation will block *ā* from replacing the first vowel of *devikā*, etc., where they constitute an *aṅga* by themselves. For, *devikā*, etc., can then not be interpreted as ending in *devikā*, etc.

Treating *devikā*, etc., as principal, and thereby also accepting them as ending in themselves, via *vyapadeśivadbhāva* 'treating something secondary as principal', is not possible. For, *vyapadeśivadbhāva* is ruled out in case of nominal stems. If, however, such a negation of *vyapadeśivadbhāva* is restricted only to affixes introduced after nominal stems then replacement in *ā* could apply only to *devikā*, etc., when used alone. This replacement in *ā* could not apply to *devikā*, for example, of *dāvikākūlāḥ śālayaḥ*, paraphrased as *devikākūle bhavāḥ śālayaḥ* 'rice produced on the bank of the river Devikā'. This replacement will cause an over-application (*atiprasaṅga*) in *saudevikam*, paraphrased as *sudevikādau bhavaḥ* 'that which is produced in *sudevikā*, etc.' We will, thus, end up having the *u* of *su* replaced with *ā*. Haradatta finds problems with all these interpretations.

A non-coreferential paraphrase of this qualifier-qualified relationship will accept *ā* as a replacement for the initial vowel of an *aṅga* which may be part of *devikā*, etc. That is, this interpretation will accept *devikā*, etc., as a whole of which an *aṅga* will become a part. This interpretation will not permit *ā* to replace an initial vowel where *devikā*, etc., may constitute an *aṅga* by themselves. For, how could a whole by itself constitute its part(s). Recall that treatment of a part as its corresponding whole, via *vyapadeśivadbhāva* (*PŚ* 31: *vyapadeśivad ekasmin*), is ruled out in case of a nominal stem. If this negation is, however, limited to the context of affixes, then *ā*-replacement will be possible only where *devikā*, etc., constitute an *aṅga* by themselves. This interpretation will also encounter problems relative to *tadantavidhi* 'treating *x* as referring, also, to that which ends in *x*' and *vyapadeśivadbhāva* 'treating something secondary as principal'. There should be no problem where *devikā*, etc., are used alone, or where they constitute the initial constituent of an *aṅga*. This interpretation, however, will create problems by introducing *ā* as a replacement in *devikā*, etc., when the same are used as the following constituent of an *aṅga*. This *ā* will be desired in *prāggrāme* and *pūrvaśāmśapaḥ*. It will be undesired in *sudevikā*, etc., where the context is not *grāma* 'village'. One may try to resolve this problem by carrying the *anuvṛtti* of *prācāṃ grāmanagarāṇām* (7.3.14) and by resorting to split-interpretation of the rule, via *yogavibhāga*, in two rules: (*i*) *prācāṃ grāmanagarāṇām uttarapadasyāder aco vṛddhir bhavati* 'a *vṛddhi* vowel comes in place of the initial vowel of the following (final) compound-constituent used with the denotation of an eastern

village, or city'; (*ii*) *ā* comes in place of initial among vowels of *devikā*, etc., when used as a following constituent. Haradatta does not accept it as the intent of the author of the *vṛtti*. For, the *vṛtti* should then have also stated the *anuvṛtti* of *uttarapadavṛddhau* (7.3.14). Haradatta concludes that what is carried over, i.e., *ā*, should be related primarily to *devikā*, etc. Thus, *ā* comes in place of the initial vowel of *devikā*, etc. That is, when the context is *vṛddhi* and *devikā*, etc., constitute an *aṅga*. Whether they constitute an *aṅga* as part of an initial, or following constituent, does not matter. The following verses summarize Haradatta's view:

> *kastarhi vṛttikārasya pakṣo' yam abhidhīyate*
> *paribhāṣeyam āntaryaparibhāṣā' pavādinī/*
> *devikāder acām āder yatra vṛddhiḥ prasajyate*
> *tatropatiṣṭhate tena sarvam iṣṭaṃ prasiddhyati//*
> 'how is *this* identified as the intent of the author of the *vṛtti*; this interpretive convention is offered as an exception to that which favors the interpretive convention of proximity; it applies where the *vṛddhi*-replacement of first among vowels of *devikā*, etc., becomes applicable; and, thus, all which is desired is accomplished by it'

Jinendrabuddhi also presents three interpretations for which refer to *Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*. I accept the interpretation offered by the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

2. Note that *pūrvadevikā, pūrvaśiṃśapā*, etc., are names of villages in the east. A derivate of these with the signification of 4.3.53 *tatra bhavaḥ* 'born, or found, there' will qualify for replacement in *vṛddhi* of 7.3.14 *prācāṃ grāmanagarāṇām*. This rule offers replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) as an exception. A derivate such as *śāṃśapaścamasaḥ* involves introduction of affix *aṆ* (4.3.139 *palāśādibhyo vā*; or 4.3.138 *anudāttādeś ca*). This rule offers *ā* against the *vṛddhi* of 7.2.117 *so taddhite*. . . . Similar explanations can be offered for other examples.

3. A *vārttika* proposal is made to ensure *i* as a replacement (*itva*) for initial among vowels of *vahīnara*. Thus, *vahīnara* + *iÑ* → *v*(*a*→*i*) *hīnara* + *iÑ* = *v*(*i*→*ai*) *hīnara* + *iÑ* = *vaihīnari* 'son of Vahīnara'.

7.3.2 केकयमित्रयुप्रलयानां यादेरियः

> *kekayamitrayupralayānāṃ yāder iyaḥ*
> */kekaya-mitrayu-pralayānām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *yādeḥ* 6/1 = *ya ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *iyaḥ* 1/1/
> (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣu* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118)
> '*kekaya, mitrayu, pralaya*' *ity eteṣāṃ yakārādeḥ* '*iya*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ*
> *iy* comes in place of the *y*-initial part of an *aṅga*, namely *kekaya, mitrayu* and *pralaya*, when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

kaikayaḥ 'an offspring of Kekaya'
maitreyikayā ślāghate '. . . praises with the sentiment of a friend'
prāleyam udakam 'devastating floods'

1. This rule replaces *ya* and *yu* with *iy* of *kekaya, mitrayu* and *pralaya.* We thus get *kaikeya,* from *kekaya* + *Ṅas* + *aÑ* (4.1.166 *janapadaśabdād . . .*), with *vṛddhi*-replacement of the initial vowel: *k(e→ai)kaya . . .*); replacement in *iy*: *kaika(ya→iy)a;* replacement in *guṇa*: *kaik(a+i→e)ya; kaikeya* + *aÑ;* 6.1.94 *ād guṇaḥ;* and deletion of *a* (*kaikey(a →ϕ)* + *aÑ* = *kaikeya* (6.4.148 *yasyeti ca*). Similar rules apply in deriving *maitreyikayā,* with the feminine affix *ṬāP* and related *i* (*itva;* 7.3.44 *pratyayasthāt . . .*), parallel to *maitreyikayā ślāghate* '. . . praises with the sentiment of a friend'. We find affix *vuÑ→aka* (5.1.133 *gotracaraṇāc . . .*) introduced after *mitrayu.* Affix *aṆ* is similarly introduced after *prāleya,* with the signification of 4.3.74 *tata āgataḥ* 'arrived from there', to derive *prāleya.*

7.3.3 न य्वाभ्यां पदान्ताभ्यां पूर्वौ तु ताभ्यामैच्

na yvābhyāṃ padāntābhyāṃ pūrvau tu tābhyām aic
/ na ϕ yvābhyām 5/2 = *y ca vaś ca yvau* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām; padāntābhyām* 5/2 = *padasya antau* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tābhyām; pūrvau* 1/2 *tu ϕ tābhyām* 5/2 *aic* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118)
yakāravakārābhyām uttarasya acām āder acaḥ sthāne vṛddhir na bhavati, tābhyāṃ tu yakāravakārābhyāṃ pūrvam aijāgamo bhavato ñiti ṇiti kiti ca taddhite parataḥ
A replacement in *vṛddhi* does not come in place of the first among vowels which occurs after *y* and *v* at the end of a *pada;* a vowel denoted by *aiC,* instead, is introduced before *y* and *v,* provided a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ, Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

vaiyasanam = *vyasane bhavam* 'found in a vice'
vaiyākaraṇaḥ = *vyākaraṇam adhīte* 'a grammarian; he who studies grammar'
sauvaśvaḥ = *svaśvasyāpatyam* 'a son of Svaśva'

1. Note that *aiC* is an abbreviatory term which denotes *ai* and *au,* and is assigned equivalency in consonance with the order of enumeration of *y* and *v.* That is, *ai* must precede *y* and *au* must precede *v.* Thus, we get (*v(i→y)* + *asana* + *aṆ*)) → (*v* + *ai*)*y* + *asana* + *aṆ*)) = *vaiyasana.* Similar derivational applications are involved in deriving *v(i→y)* + *ākaraṇa* + *aṆ*)) → *v(ai)y* +

ākaraṇa + aṆ)) = vaiyākaraṇa, where *aṆ* is introduced with the signification of 4.2.58 *tad adhīte tad veda*. The *aṆ* (4.1.112 *śivādibhyo . . .*) of (*s(u→v) + aśva + aṆ)) → s(au)v + (aśva + aṆ)) = sauvaśva* denotes an *apatya* 'offspring', where *au* is inserted before replacement in *u→v*. Note that *vy* and *sv* which end in *y* and *v* after *i→y* and *u→v* replacements are considered *pada*.

2. The condition of a *pada*-final *y* and *v* is required so that *nṛ + artha = nr + artha + iÑ = nrārthi* is blocked from availing the *ai* and *au* inserts of this rule. What we find here is an *r* at the end of a *pada*. Consequently, initial *vṛddhi* applies.

Now consider *yāṣṭīkaḥ*, paraphrased as *yaṣṭiḥ praharaṇam asya* 'he whose weapon is a stick'. Affix *īkaK* (4.4.59 *śaktiyaṣṭyor īkak*) is introduced after *yaṣṭi* 'stick', where *y* occurs at the beginning of a *pada*. Thus, we get a replacement in *vṛddhi*, and not an insert in *ai*.

3. Note that the negative provision of this rule is made to exactly define the scope of inserts denoted by the abbreviatory term *aiC*. Thus, consider *dādhyaśviḥ* 'son of Dadhyaśva' and *mādhvaśviḥ* 'son of Madhvaśva', where *iÑ* is introduced after *dadhyaśva + Ṅas* and *madhvaśva + Ṅas*. There is no occasion here for *vṛddhi* before *y* and *v* of *dadhy* and *madhv*. Consequently, there is no negation of *vṛddhi* and introduction of *aiC*. This rule concurrently does two things: negation of *vṛddhi* and introduction of *aiC*. Since a negation makes sense only when a positive provision obtains, and also since negation of *vṛddhi* concurrently inserts *aiC*, there is no *vṛddhi* of *i* after *y* and *v* in *dādhyaśvi* and *mādhyaśvi*. There is also no insert in *aiC*.

4. Commentators indicate that this negation of *vṛddhi* is also desired for a following (final) compound constituent (*uttarapada*). Consider *pūrvatraiya-lindaḥ* which derives from *pūrvatry + alinda + aṆ*. Rule 7.3.13 *diśo' madrāṇām* may now cause initial *vṛddhi* of *alinda*, a following constituent. But since the *a* of *alinda* occurs after *y*, this rule negates *vṛddhi*. Additionally, it inserts *ai* before *y*. Thus, *pūrvatr(i→y) + alinda + aṆ → pūrvatr(ai)y + alinda = pūrvatraiyalinda*.

Note, however, that this negation and *aiC* will be applicable to a following constituent only when the resultant *y* and *v* are relatable to the following constituent. This negation and *aiC* is thus not desired where *y* and *v* do not result relative to the following constituent. Consider *dvyāśītikaḥ* which derives with affix *ṭhaK* (5.1.80 *tam adhīṣṭo . . .*) introduced after *dv(i→y) + aśīti = dvy + aśīti* 'eighty-two'. The *vṛddhi* of *a* of *aśīti*, made available here by 7.3.15 *saṃkhyāyāḥ saṃvatsara . . .*, can thus not be negated. For, *y* comes as a replacement relatable to the initial constituent *dvi*. Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya*, and *PM* ad *Kāśikā*, for a detailed discussion.

7.3.4 द्वारादीनां च

dvārādīnāṃ ca

/dvārādīnām 6/3 = *dvāra ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣām*; *ca* ϕ/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *na yvābhyāṃ pūrvau tu tābhyām aic* #3)
'*dvāra*' *ity evamādīnām yvābhyām uttarapadasyācām āder acaḥ sthāne vṛddhir na bhavati, pūrvau tu tābhyām aijāgamau bhavataḥ*
A replacement in *vṛddhi* does not come in place of first among vowels which occurs after *y* and *v* of nominals enumerated in the list headed by *dvāra* 'door'; a vowel denoted by *aiC*, instead, is introduced before *y* and *v*, provided a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

dauvārapālam = *dvārapālasyedam* 'this belongs to the gate-keeper'
sauvaraḥ = *svaram adhikṛtya kṛto granthaḥ* 'a treatise on accentuation'
vaiyalkaśaḥ = *vyalkaśe bhavaḥ* 'born at Vyalkaśa'
sauvastikaḥ = *svastīty āha* 'he said *svasti* 'blessings''

1. This rule begins introducing *aiC* before a non-*pada* final *y* and *v*. A *tadādividhi* 'treating a specification made with *x* as also referring to that which begins with *x*' interpretation is also valid here. That is, *aiC* is also introduced where *dvāra*, etc., are used as initial compound constituents. Consider *dvāra* + (*ṭha*(*K*)→*ika*) = *d+au+vārika* + *sU* = *dauvārikaḥ* and *dvārapāla* + *aṆ* → *d+au+vārapāla* + *sU* = *dauvārapālam*. The first derives from *dvāra* + *ṭhaK* where *ṭhaK* is used with the signification of 4.4.69 *tatra niyuktaḥ* 'appointed there', with assignment of the term *bha* (1.4.18 *yaci bham*) and deletion of *a*. The second is a derivate of *aṆ* introduced after *dvārapāla*, with the signification of *tasyedam* (4.3.120). Derivates such as *svara* + *aṆ* → *sauvara* = *sauvara* + *sU* = *sauvaraḥ* and *vyalkaś* + *aṆ* → *vaiyalkaśa* = *vaiyalkaśa* + *sU* = *vaiyalkaśaḥ* involve affix *aṆ* with the signification of 4.3.116 *kṛte granthe* 'a treatise made . . .' and 4.3.53 *tatra bhavaḥ* 'born or found there', respectively. The *a* of *svara* goes through *ṭi*-deletion under assignment of the term *bha* (6.4.148 *yasyeti ca*). An additional example is given as *sauvastikaḥ* derived with *ṭhaK*. The signification of *tatra bhavaḥ* is also invoved in deriving *svauvaḥ* with *aṆ*, paraphrased as *svar bhavaḥ*.

7.3.5 न्यग्रोधस्य च केवलस्य

nyagrodhasya ca kevalasya
/ *nyagrodhasya* 6/1 *ca* ϕ *kevalasya* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *na yvābhyāṃ pūrvau tu tābhyām aic* #3)
nyagrodhaśabdasya kevalasya yakārād uttarasyācām āder acaḥ sthāne vṛddhir na bhavati, tasmāc ca pūrvam aikāra āgamo bhavati
A replacement in *vṛddhi* does not come in place of first among vowels which occurs after *y* and *v* of an *aṅga* constituted by *nyagrodha* itself; a vowel denoted by *aiC*, instead, is introduced before *y* and *v*, provided a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

naiyagrodhaś camasaḥ = *nyagrodhasya vikāraḥ* 'a ladle made with wood from the *nyagrodh* tree'

1. This rule negates initial *vṛddhi* and introduces *ai* before *y* of *nyagrodha* when the same is used by itself. All other conditions remain unchanged. Thus, *nyagrodhasya vikāraḥ* = *naiyagrodhaḥ* (*camasaḥ*), a derivate of *aṆ* with the signification of 4.3.134 *tasya vikāraḥ* 'a product of that'. But this negation of *vṛddhi* and introduction of *ai* will not be available in deriving *nyagrodhamūlā* (*śālayaḥ*) 'rice growing near the root of the *nyagrohda* tree'. For, *nyagrodha* is not used by itself.

It is argued that this rule is not needed. For, introduction of *aiC* could be easily accomplished by the general rule: 7.3.3 *na yvābhyāṃ padāntābhyām.* True. But we must then derive it as: *ni* + *añc* + *KvIN* = *nyak* and *nyak* + *ruh* + *aC* = *nyagrodha,* where deriving *nyak* would involve a replacement in *k* for *c* after total deletion of affix *KvIN.* The *h* of *ruh* will be replaced with *dh* of 7.3.53 *nyaṅkvādīdāṃ ca.* The *k* of *nyak* will also go through a replacement in *g* (*jaśtva*), and there will be a replacement in *guṇa* for the penultimate *u* of *nyagr*(*u*→*o*) *dh* + *a* = *nyagrodha.* A provision made against one already made available is then to be interpreted as restrictive (*niyama*). What is the restriction. The word *nyagrodha* should not only be used by itself, but should also be considered underived (*avyutpanna*). We thus need this rule for insertion of *aiC.*

7.3.6 न कर्मव्यतिहारे

na karmavyatihāre
/*na* ϕ *karmavyatihāre* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
karmavyatihāre yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
That which was stated does not happen in the context of *karmavyatihāra* 'reciprocal action'.

EXAMPLES:

vyāvakrośī vartate 'there is reciprocal action of shouting there'
vyāvalekhī vartate '. . . of scratching . . .'
vyāvavartī vartate '. . . of applying ointment . . .'
vyāvahāsī vartate '. . . of deriding . . .'

1. This rule blocks the negation of *vṛddhi* and introduction of *aiC* where derivates signify *karmavyatihāra* 'reciprocal action'. Recall that affix *ṆaC* (3.3.43 *karmavyatihāre* . . .) is introduced with the signification of feminine. Rule 5.4.14 *ṇacaḥ striyām* then makes a provision of *aÑ* as an exception to *ṆaC* in the signification of feminine. This *aÑ* then conditions insertion of

aiC as an exception to *vṛddhi*. Refer to derivational details of examples under the appendix (III:763) of 3.3.43 *karmavyatihāre. . . .*

7.3.7 स्वागतादीनां च

svāgatādīnāṃ ca
/svāgatādīnām 6/3 = *svāgata ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣām*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *na* #6)
'*svāgata*' *ity evamādīnāṃ yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati*
That which was stated for an *aṅga* enumerated in the list headed by *svāgata* 'welcome' also does not apply here.

EXAMPLES:

svāgatikaḥ = *svāgatam ity āha* 'he who says, "you are welcome"'
svādhvarikaḥ = *svadhvareṇa carati* 'he who performs rituals beautifully'
svāṅgiḥ = *svaṅgasyāpatyam* 'a son of Svaṅga; one whose limbs are beautiful'
vyāḍiḥ = *vyaḍasyāpatyam* 'son of Vyaḍa'
vyāvahārikaḥ = *vyavahāreṇa carati* 'he who conducts himself beautifully'
svāpateyaḥ = *svapatau sādhuḥ* 'he who is good to his master'

1. A negation of *vṛddhi*, and introduction of *aiC* (7.3.3 *na yvāvhyāṃ . . .*), also does not apply to an *aṅga* enumerated in the list headed by *svāgata*. That is, they go through *vṛddhi*. Thus, we get *svāgata* + *ṭhaK* = *svāgatika* (4.4.1 *prāg vahateṣ ṭhak*; *vt. tad āheti . . .*), *su* + *adhvara* = *svadhvara* + *ṭhaK* = *svādhvarika* (4.4.8 *carati*); and *su* + *aṅga* = *svaṅga* + *iÑ* = *svāṅgi* 'son of Svaṅga' and *vi* + *aṅga* = *vyaṅga* + *iÑ* = *vyāṅgi* 'son of Vyaṅga; one who has deformed limbs' (4.1.95 *ata iñ*). We also get (*vi* + *ava* + *hāra*) + *ṭhaK* = *vyāvahārika*, where, since *karmavyatihāra* is not the signification, our previous rule does not apply. Our last example, *svāpateyaḥ*, is a derivate of *ḍhaÑ*→*eya* (4.4.104 *pathyatithi . . .*), where initial *vṛddhi* is accomplished against the negation of *aiC*. The *i* of *pati* goes through *bha*-deletion of *i*. This negation of *aiC* is made necessary since *sva* is enumerated in the *dvārādi* group of nominals (7.3.4 *dvārādīnāṃ ca*).

7.3.8 श्वादेरिञि

śvāder iñi
/śvādeḥ 6/1 = *śvā ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *iñi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *na* #6)
śvāder aṅgasya iñi parato yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
That which was stated also does not apply to an *aṅga* beginning with a constituent listed in the group headed by *śvan* 'dog', provided *iÑ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

śvabhāstriḥ = *śvabhastrasyāpatyam* 'son of Śvabhastra'
śvādaṃṣṭriḥ = *śvadaṃṣṭrasyāpatyam* 'son of Śvadaṃṣṭra'

1. Here again we find *vṛddhi* accomplished and *aiC* (7.3.3 *na yvābhyāṃ . . .*) negated. Of course, when an *aṅga* beginning with *śvan*, etc., occurs before *iÑ*. Note that *śvan* is listed in the *dvārādi* (7.3.4 *dvārādīnāṃ ca*) group of nominals. It thus forms a sub-group. Recall also that *tadādividhi* 'interpreting *x* as also including reference to that which begins with *x*' applies in connection with nominals of the *dvārādi* group. Since nominals of the *śvādi* group are listed within the *dvārādi* group, *tadādividhi* will also apply to nominals of the *śvādi* group. This rule then becomes necessary to block *aiC* which, otherwise, would obtain here in connection with *tadādividhi*. It, i.e., negation of *aiC*, here, then becomes an indicator that *tadādividhi* applies in case of nominals of the *dvārādi* group (7.3.4 *dvārādīnāṃ ca*). For, this negation cannot make sense unless there was some positive provision already made.

2. A *vārttika* proposal requires this rule to apply when a *taddhita* affix beginning with *i* follows. Of course, when an *aṅga* beginning with *śvan* occurs before such affixes. Thus, *śvagaṇena carati* = (*śvagaṇa* + *ṭhaK→ika*) + *sU*)) = *śvāgaṇikaḥ* 'he who wanders about with a group of dogs' and *śvayūthena carati* = *śvāyūthikaḥ* 'ibidem'.

Yet another proposal is made to apply *vṛddhi* and negate *aiC* when an *aṅga* ends in *i* (*iÑ*) and a *taddhita* affix other than *iÑ* follows. Thus, *śvābhastrer idam* = (*śvābhastri* + *Ṅas* + *aṆ*) + *sU*)) = *śvābhastram* 'this belongs to Śvābhastri', where *aṆ* is introduced by 4.2.112 *iñaś ca*.

7.3.9 पदान्तस्यान्यतरस्याम्

padāntasyānyatarasyām
/*padāntasya* 6/1 = *padaśabda ante yasya tat* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *na* #6 *śvādeḥ* #8)
śvāder aṅgasya padaśabdāntasyānyatarasyāṃ yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
That which was stated for an *aṅga* beginning with *śvan* also, optionally, does not apply to an *aṅga* which begins with *śvan*, etc., and ends in *pada* 'foot'.

EXAMPLES:

śvāpadam = *śvāpadasya idam* 'this belongs to Śvāpada'
śauvāpadam 'ibidem'

1. Note that *śvapada* is a *bahuvrīhi* compound paraphrased as *śuna iva padam asya* 'he whose foot is similar to a dog's foot'. Affix *aṆ* (4.3.120 *tasyedam*)

is then introduced to derive the two example derivates, i.e., with *vṛddhi* and optional *au*. The long *ā*-replacement of *śauv*(*a*→*ā*)*pada* is accomplished by a *vārttika* (ad 6.3.130 *mitre carṣau; vt. śuno danta . . .*). This optional provision then applies in connection with introduction of *aiC*.

7.3.10 उत्तरपदस्य

uttarapadasya
/uttarapadasya 6/1 = *uttaraṃ ca tat padaṃ ca* (*karm tat*), *tasya/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
'*uttarapadasya*' *ity ayam adhikāraḥ*, '*hanasto*' *ciṇṇaloḥ*' *iti prāg etasmāt yad ita ūrdhvam anukramiṣyāmaḥ* '*uttarapadasya*' *ity evaṃ tad veditavyam*
That which follows (from here on prior to 7.3.32 *hanasto*' *ciṇṇaloḥ*) applies to the following constituent of an item termed *aṅga*.

EXAMPLES:

Look under subsequent rules.

1. This is a governing rule (*adhikāra*) That is, *uttarapadasya* 'of a (final) constituent which follows' should be read in all rules enumerated prior to 7.3.32 *hanasto*' *ciṇṇaloḥ*. This *adhikāra* 'governing domain' is stated against the *vṛddhi* of first among vowels of an *aṅga* (*PM*: *aṅgasyācām āder aco vṛddhau prāptāyām idam ucyate*). What is the use of stating *uttarapadasya* when a specification with *pañcamī* 'ablative', as in 7.3.11 *avayavād ṛteḥ*, can facilitate this *vṛddhi* of the final compound constituent in accord with 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*? This *adhikāra* is stated to facilitate *vṛddhi* in contexts such as 7.3.10 *je proṣṭhapadānām*, where no specification is given in *pañcamī*. Even in contexts where a specification is offered in *pañcamī*, this *adhikāra* offers clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*) and facilitates application of *vṛddhi*. Consider 6.2.105 *uttarapadavṛddhau sarvaṃ ca*, whereby a *pada* constituted by *sarva* 'all' is marked with *udātta* at the end. This accentuation is conditioned by a following (final) constitutent with an application of *vṛddhi*. Such a condition will be difficult to comprehend if *uttarapadasya* was not given as an *adhikāra* for application of *vṛddhi*.

7.3.11 अवयवादृतोः

avayavād ṛtoḥ
/avayavāt 5/1 *ṛtoḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10)
avayavavācina uttarasya ṛtuvācina uttarasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of the following constituent of an *aṅga* which signifies *ṛtu* 'season' and is used

in combination after a constituent signifying *avayava* 'part of a whole', provided a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pūrvavārṣikam 'that which happens in the first part of the rainy season'
pūrvahaimanam 'that which happens in the first part of the winter season'
aparavārṣikam 'that which happens in the second part of the rainy season'
aparahaimanam 'that which happens in the second part of the winter season'

1. This rule allows *vṛddhi* to first among vowels of the following constituent of an *aṅga*, used with the signification of *ṛtu*, where its preceding constituent denotes *avayava* 'part of a whole'. Of course, the *aṅga* must be followed by an affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* as an *it*. Thus, *pūrva* 'prior' combines with *varṣa* 'rain' to form an *ekadeśi-samāsa* 'a *tatpuruṣa* formed with constituents denoting part of a whole' (2.2.1 *pūrvāparādharottaram* . . .). Affix *ṭhaK* is then introduced with the signification of 4.3.53 *tatra bhavaḥ*. We thus get *pūrvavārṣikaḥ*, paraphrased as *pūrvaṃ varṣāṇām, tatra bhavaḥ* 'prior part of the rainy season, born in there', with *vṛddhi* of *a* of *varṣa*. Other derivates involve similar rule applications. Derivates with *hemanta* 'first two months of winter' receive *aṆ* (4.3.21 *hemantāc ca*; 4.3.22 *sarvatrāṇ talopaś ca*) with deletion of *ta*. The specification of *avayavāt* 'after that which denotes a part' indicates that *tadantavidhi* 'treating *x* as that which also ends in *x*' is acceptable here. That is, an affix can also be introduced after a nominal which ends in a constituent denoting 'season'. Recall that a specification made with a nominal stem (as in 4.3.21 *hemantāc ca*) does not permit *tadantavidhi* (*PŚ* (32): *grahaṇavatā prātipadikena* . . .). Why is this *tadantavidhi* not applicable in case of *pūrvāsu varṣāsu bhavaḥ* = *paurvavarṣikam* 'that which happened during earlier rains'? This *tadantavidhi* only applies when the preceding constituent denotes a part. Obviously, *pūrvā* of this derivate of *ṭhaÑ* (4.3.11 *kālāṭ ṭhañ*) does not denote any part of a whole. It denotes an entirely different whole, instead.

7.3.12 सुसर्वार्धाज्जनपदस्य

susarvārdhāj janapadasya
/susarvārddhāt 5/1 *suś ca sarvaś ca arddhañ ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt*; *janapadasya* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10)
'*su, sarva, ardha*' *ity etebhya uttarasya janapadavācina uttarapadasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ*

A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of that following constituent of an *aṅga* which signifies a *janapada* 'principality, district' and is used in combination after *su* 'good', *sarva* 'all' and *ardha* 'half', when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

supāñcālakaḥ 'born in the beautiful principality of Pañcāla'
sarvapāñcālakaḥ 'found everywhere in the Pañcāla'
ardhapāñcālakaḥ 'found in half of the Pañcāla'

1. Note that examples are all derivates of *vuÑ* (*Ñit*; 4.2.124 *avṛddhād api* . . .). These compounds are formed by 2.2.18 *kugati* . . . (*supāñcālakaḥ*), 2.1.48 *pūrvakālaika* . . . (*sarvapāñcālakaḥ*) and 2.2.2 *arddhaṃ napuṃsakam* (*arddhapāñcālakaḥ*). Our present rule introduces *vṛddhi* to a following constituent, as against the initial. The *tadantavidhi* 'interpreting *x* as also that which ends in *x*' interpretation is also facilitated by a *vārttika* (ad 7.3.12 *susarvārdhāj* . . .): *susarvārdhadikśabdebhyo*. . . .

7.3.13 दिशोऽमद्राणाम्

diśo' madrāṇām
/diśaḥ 6/1 *amadrāṇām* 6/3 = *na madrāḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *teṣām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *janapadasya* #12)
digvācina uttarasya janapadavācino madravarjitasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of that following constituent of an *aṅga* which signifies a *janapada* 'a principality other than the *madra*', and is used in combination after a constituent signifying *diś* 'direction', when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pūrvapāñcālakaḥ 'born, or found, in a place located in the east, outside of the country of the Pañcālas'
aparapāñcālakaḥ 'born, or found, in a place located in the west, outside of the country of the Pañcālas'
dakṣiṇapāñcālakaḥ 'born, or found, in a place located in the south, outside the country of the Pañcālas'

1. Note that the example compounds are formed by 2.1.51 *taddhitārthottarapada*. . . . Affix *vuÑ*, and initial *vṛddhi* of the following constituent, are both similar to examples of the preceding rule. A *tadantavidhi* interpretation is also gotten from the *vārttika* cited under the preceding rule.
2. The condition of *diśaḥ* 'after that which denotes a direction' is imposed

so that initial *vṛddhi* could be accomplished in *paurvapañcālakaḥ* 'born, or found, in the eastern part of the Pañcālas' and *āparapañcālakaḥ* 'born, or found, in the western part of the Pañcālas', where the compound is formed by 2.2.1 *pūrvāparādharottaram* . . . with the signification of *avayava* 'part of a whole'. Affix *vuÑ* is here introduced with the signification of *tatra bhavaḥ* 'born, or found, in there'. Similar explanation can be offered for the condition of *amadrāṇām* 'of the country of the Madras' relative to *paurvamadraḥ* and *āparamadraḥ*, both derivates of *aÑ* (4.2.108 *madrebhyo añ*).

7.3.14 प्राचां ग्रामनगराणाम्

prācāṃ grāmanagarāṇām
/prācām 6/3 *grāmanagarāṇām* 6/3 = *grāmāś ca nagarāṇi ca = grāmanagarāṇi* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *janapadasya* #12 *diśaḥ* #13)
prācāṃ deśe grāmanagarāṇāṃ diśa uttareṣām acām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of that following constituent of an *aṅga* which signifies a *grāma* 'village' and *nagara* 'town' of an eastern *janapada* 'a principality, district', and is used in combination after a constituent signifying *diś* 'direction', when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pūrvaiṣukāmaśamaḥ = pūrveṣu iṣukāmaśamyāṃ bhavaḥ 'found in the east(ern; prior) part of Iṣukāmaśamī'
aparaiṣukāmaśamaḥ 'found in the western part . . .'
pūrvakārṣṇamṛttikaḥ 'found in the east(ern; prior) part of Kṛṣṇamṛttikā'
aparakārṣṇamṛttikaḥ 'found in the western part . . .'
pūrvapāṭaliputrakaḥ = pūrvasmin pāṭaliputre bhavaḥ 'found in the eastern part of Pāṭaliputra'
aparapāṭaliputrakaḥ 'found in the western part. . .'
pūrvakānyakubjaḥ 'found in the eastern part of Kānyakubja'
aparakānyakubjaḥ 'found in the western part . . .'

1. This rule allows *vṛddhi* of *i* of *iṣukāmaśamī*, the following constituent in the compound formed by 2.1.50 *diksaṃkhye saṃjñāyām*, parallel to *pūrvaś cāsau iṣukāmaśamī ca* 'that which is eastern and is also Iṣukāmaśamī'. This *vṛddhi* is accomplished when affix *Ña* (4.2.107 *dikpūrvapadād . . .*) is introduced to follow. Refer to derivational details of compound formation under the appendix of rule 2.1.5 *diksaṃkhye*. . . . The *vuÑ* of *pūrvapāṭaliputraka* is introduced by 4.2.122 *ropadhetoḥ*. . . . This provision of *vṛddhi* is made against initial *vṛddhi* of the first constituent.

2. It is argued that a separate mention of *grāma* and *nagara* is not needed. For, a *nagara* could also be treated as a cluster of villages. Commentators explain that *grāma* and *nagara* are used separately to clearly identify their inter-relationship. They inform that, in a compound, where the first constituent denotes direction (*diś*), the compound as a whole denotes a village. In the compound *pūrveṣukāmaśamī, iṣukāmaśamī*, cannot denote the village by itself. As against this, in a compound with the denotation of a city, a following constituent can denote the city (*nagara*) by itself. It is to make this clear that *grāma* and *nagara* are both used in this rule (*Kāś: grāmatvād eva nagarāṇām api grahaṇe siddhe bhedena yad ubhayor upādānaṃ tatsambandhi-pratipatyartham*).

3. It is stated that this *vṛddhi* must be accomplished before single replacement. That is, given *pūrva + iṣukāmaśamī + Ña*, the *i* of *iṣukāmaśamī* must be replaced with *ai*. A single replacement in *ai* for *a+ai* can then be accomplished. We know it from the negation of *vṛddhi* relative to both the initial and following constituents of a compound (7.3.22 *nendrasya parasya*). Consider *soma + indra + aṆ = suamendra*, where the final *a* of *indra* gets deleted. If a single *guṇa*-replacement in *e* for *a+i* of *som(a+ i→e) ndr + a* is accomplished, its following constituent will not have any vowel left. Consequently, negation of 7.3.22 *nendrasya parasya* will not make any sense. It is therefore suggested that *vṛddhi*, eventhough conditioned externally (*bahiraṅga*), should be performed first.

7.3.15 संख्यायाः संवत्सरसंख्यस्य च

saṃkhyāyāḥ saṃvatsarasaṃkhyasya ca
/ saṃkhyāyāḥ 5/1 *saṃvatsarasaṃkhyasya* 6/1 *= saṃvatsaraś ca saṃkhyā ca = saṃvatsarasaṃkhyam (sam. dv.), tasya; ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10)
saṃkhyāyā uttarapadasya saṃvatsaraśabdasya saṃkhyāyāś cācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of that following constituent of an *aṅga* which is constituted by *saṃvatsara* 'year', or signifies a number (*saṃkhyā*), and is used in combination after a constituent signifying *saṃkhyā* 'number', when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ, Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

dvisāṃvatsarikaḥ = dvau saṃvatsarāv adhīṣṭo
bhṛto bhūto bhāvī vā '. . .commissioned, hired, supported, etc., for two years'
dviṣāṣṭikaḥ = dve ṣaṣṭī adhīṣṭo bhṛto bhūto bhāvī vā 'commissioned, hired, supported, etc., for one hundred twenty years (days?)'

dvisāptatikaḥ 'commissioned, hired, supported, etc., for one hundred forty years (days?)'

1. Note that *ika* of these examples has its origin in *ṭhaK* (5.1.80 *tam adhīṣṭo bhṛto . . .*), introduced after compounds formed with the signification of a *taddhita* affix (2.1.51 *taddhitārthottarapada . . .*). A question is raised against introducing *ṭhaK*, an affix with the signification of time (*kāla*), after a word denoting number (*saṃkhyā*). The words *dviṣaṣṭī*, etc., do not denote time. They denote number, instead. How could one introduce an affix enumerated within the domain of time after a base which denotes number (*Nyāsa*: . . . *na dviṣaṣṭyādiḥ kālaśabdaḥ; kiṃ tarhi? saṃkhyāśabdaḥ; tatkatham kālādhikāravihitaṃ pratyayam utpādayati*). It is stated that these compounds do not denote number. They, instead, denote what is counted (*saṃkhyeya; varṣa* 'year', etc.).

2. Note that *saṃvatsara* 'year' is separately specified here to indicate that *parimāṇa* 'measure' of the next rule does not include reference to time as a measure (*kālaparimāṇa*). What is desired to be accomplished by stating that a specification made with *parimāṇa* 'measure' does not include any reference to *kālaparimāṇa* 'time as a measure'. This way, *dvaisamikaḥ* 'commissioned for two years' and *traisamikaḥ* 'commissioned for three years' do not get the initial *vṛddhi* of their following constituents. It also follows from this that *kāla* 'time' cannot be accepted as a measure in general (*sāmānyaparimāṇa*). Consequently, *dvivarṣā māṇavikā* 'a girl who is two years old', *trivarṣā māṇavikā* 'a girl who is three years old' do not come under the *paryudāsa* interpretation of negation of *aparimāṇa* 'non-measure' (4.1.22 *aparimāṇabistācita . . .*). That is, *varṣa*, etc., do not denote *parimāṇa* and the feminine affix *ṄīP* remains negated in deriving *dvivarṣā* 'two years old', etc.

7.3.16 वर्षस्याभविष्यति

varṣasyābhaviṣyati

/varṣasya 6/1 *abhaviṣyati* 7/1 = *na bhaviṣyat* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/* (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *saṃkhyāyāḥ* #15)

saṃkhyāyā uttarasya varṣaśabdasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ; sa cet taddhito bhaviṣyaty arthe na bhavati

A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of that following constituent of an *aṅga* which is constituted by *varṣa*, or signifies a number (*saṃkhyā*), and is used in combination after a constituent signifying *saṃkhyā* 'number', when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K*, but not used with the signification of *bhaviṣyat* 'future', follows.

EXAMPLES:

dvivārṣikaḥ = dve varṣe adhīṣṭo bhṛto bhūto bhāvī vā
trivārṣikaḥ

1. Note that derivates with the denotatum of *bhaviṣyat* 'future' will be *dvaivarṣikaḥ* and *traivarṣikaḥ*, with no *vṛddhi* of the initial vowel of *varṣa*. Thus, *yasya traivarṣikaṃ dhānyaṃ nihitaṃ bhṛtyavṛttaye, adhikaṃ vāpi vidyeta, sa somaṃ pātum arhati* 'he whose grains are enough, or more than enough, for supporting workers for three years, deserves to drink soma'. The negation of *abhaviṣyati* does not cover derivates with the sense of *adhīṣṭa* and *bhṛta* (5.1.80 *tam adhīṣṭo . . .*). For, sense of 'futurity' is not included there within the affixal meaning. Consider *dve varṣe adhīṣṭo bhṛto vā karma kariṣyati = dvivārṣiko manuṣyaḥ* 'a man who, when entrusted or supported for two years, will do the work'. The sense of future is here indicated by the sentence. The initial *vṛddhi* of the following constituent thus applies.

7.3.17 परिमाणान्तस्यासंज्ञाशाणयोः

parimāṇāntasyāsaṃjñāśāṇayoḥ
/parimāṇāntasya 6/1 = *parimāṇam ante yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *asaṃjñāśāṇayoḥ* 6/2 = *saṃjñā ca śāṇaṃ ca = saṃjñāśāṇe* (*dv.*); *na saṃjñāśāṇe* (*nañ. tat.* with int. *dv.*), *tayoḥ*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *saṃkhyāyāḥ* #15)
parimāṇāntasyāṅgasya saṃkhyāyāḥ paraṃ yad uttarapadaṃ tasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ, saṃjñāyāṃ viṣaye śāṇe cottarapade na bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of an *aṅga*-final constituent which denotes a measure (*parimāṇa*), but is not *śāṇa* 'a measure of weight for jewels', and which occurs in combination after a number word (*saṃkhyā*) constituting the initial constituent of the *aṅga*, provided a name (*saṃjñā*) is not denoted and an affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

dvikauḍavikaḥ = dvi kuḍavau prayojanam asya 'that whose purpose is to measure something equal in weight to one half of a Prastha'
dvisauvarṇikam = dvābhyāṃ suvarṇābhyāṃ krītam 'purchased with two gold coins'
dvisuvarṇam 'ibidem'
dvinaiṣkikam = dvābhyāṃ niṣkābhyāṃ krītam 'purchased with two Niṣkas (gold-coins)'
dviniṣkam 'ibidem'

1. This rule allows *vṛddhi* to the first vowel of the following constituent under specified conditions. Thus, we get *dvi* + *k*(*u*→*au*) *ḍava* + (*ṭhaÑ*→*ika*)) → (*dvikuḍav*(*a*→ϕ) + *ika*)) = *sU* = *dvikuḍavikaḥ*, etc., through *ṭhaÑ*, *vṛddhi*, *a*-deletion and *sU*. Affix *ṭhaÑ* is here used with the signification of (5.1.109)

prayojanam '. . . purpose, occasion, object'. Affix *ṭhaK* similarly occurs after *dvi* + *suvarṇa* and *dvi* + *niṣka* with the signification of 5.1.37 *tena krītam* 'purchased by that'. A *vārttika* (ad 5.1.29 *vibhāṣā kārṣāpaṇa* . . .) offers deletion of *ṭhaK*, optionally, after *suvarṇa*, against obligatory deletion of 5.1.28 *adhyardhapūrva*. . . . Thus, we get *dvisuvarṇam* with no *vṛddhi* and no replacement in *ika*. An optional deletion of *ṭhaK* after *dviniṣka* is accomplished with similar results by 5.1.30 *dvitripūrva*. . . .

2. The condition of *saṃjñā* is imposed so that *pāñcalohitikam* 'that whose measure is five Lohitī' and *pāñcakalāpikam* 'that whose measure is five Kalāpas' could be excluded from availing initial *vṛddhi* of their following constituents. These derivates denote a name. The condition of *śāṇa* similarly retains initial *vṛddhi* of the *aṅga*, against the provision of this rule. Thus, we get *dvaiśāṇam* and *traiśāṇam*. Some also wish to include *kulija* as part of negation specified by *asaṃjñāśāṇayoḥ*. They can thus account for *dvaikulijam* and *traikulijam*, where *kulija* is a measure of grains (*dhānya*).

7.3.18 जे प्रोष्ठपदानाम्

je proṣṭhapadānām
/je 7/1 *proṣṭhapadānām* 6/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10)
'je' iti jātārtho nirdiśyate. tatra yas taddhito vihitas tasmin ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ proṣṭhapadānām uttarasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of the final constituent of an *aṅga*, namely *proṣṭhapadā* 'name of a constellation', when a *taddhita* affix used with the signification of *jāta* 'born' marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

proṣṭhapādo māṇavakaḥ 'this boy was born when moon was in conjunction with the constellation *proṣṭhapadā*'
bhadrapādo māṇavakaḥ 'this boy was born when moon was in conjunction with the constellation *bhadrapadā*'

1. Note that *je* is used for referencing the sense of *jātaḥ* 'born'. That is, this *vṛddhi* is introduced to the following constituent of an *aṅga* when an affix with the signification of *jātaḥ* (4.3.25 *tatra jātaḥ*) follows. All other affixal conditions remain the same. Recall that *proṭṣṭhapada* is a *nakṣatra* 'constellation'. Affix *aṆ* is introduced after *proṣṭhapada* with the signification of 4.2.3 *nakṣatreṇa yuktaḥ kālaḥ* 'time in conjunction with a constellation' to derive *proṣṭhapada*, with affixal deletion accomplished by 4.2.4 *lub aviśeṣe*. Yet another *aṆ* is introduced by 4.3.16 *sandhivelādy* . . . to denote the sense of *tatra jātaḥ* 'born there'. This affix, by this rule, will cause *vṛddhi* of *a* of *pada* of *proṣṭha-*

pada. We thus get *proṣṭhapāda*. The plural specification of *proṣṭhapadānām* is made to ensure that *vṛddhi*, and *aṆ* as well, also apply to synonyms of *proṣṭhapada*. Thus, we also get *bhadrapadāsu jātaḥ = bhadrapādaḥ*. Commentators offer *prauṣṭhapadaḥ* as a counter-example to the condition of *je*. We thus get initial *vṛddhi* of the *aṅga* constituted by *proṣṭhapada*, where the sense of 4.3.53 *tatra bhavaḥ* 'found there' is denoted.

7.3.19 हृद्भगसिन्ध्वन्ते पूर्वपदस्य च

hṛdbhagasindhvante pūrvapadasya ca
/ hṛd-bhaga-sindhv-ante 7/1 = *hṛd ca bhagaṃ ca sindhuś ca* (*dv.*), *tad; hṛd-bhaga-sindhv ante yasya* (*bv.* with int. *dv.*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10)
'*hṛd, bhaga, sindhu' ity evam ante' ṅge pūrvapadasyottarapadasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ*
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of initial as well as final constituents of an *aṅga* when it ends in *hṛd* 'heart', *sindhu* 'river, sea' and *bhaga* 'auspicious, prosperity', and a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

sauhārdam = suhṛdayasya idam 'this belongs to one who is good-hearted (well-wisher; friend)'
sauhārdyam = suhṛdasya bhāvaḥ 'sense of being goodhearted; friendship'
saubhāgyam = subhagasya bhāvaḥ 'great luck'
daurbhāgyam 'misfortune'
saubhāgineyaḥ = subhagāyā apatyam 'son of Subhagā'
daurbhāgineyaḥ 'son of Durbhagā'
sāktusaindhavaḥ = saktupradhānā sindhavaḥ 'principalitiy of Sindhu where they mostly eat saktu'
pānasaindhavaḥ = pānapradhānā sindhavaḥ 'principality of Sindhu where people love to drink'

1. This rule, under special constituency relation, allows *vṛddhi* of both the preceding and following constituents of a compound termed *aṅga*. Recall that *hṛdaya*, for example in *hṛdaya + aṆ*, is replaced with *hṛd* (6.3.50 *hṛdayasya hṛllekha . . .*). We thus get *su(hṛdaya→hṛd) + aṆ = s(u→au) h(ṛ→ār) d + aṆ = sauhārda + sU = sauhārdam*. Affix *aṆ* of this example denotes *tasyedam* 4.3.120 'it is his'. Our next example, *sauhārdyam*, involves affix *ṢyaÑ* (5.3.123 *guṇavacana . . .*), where a replacement in *hṛd* for *hṛdaya* 'heart' of *sauhārdyam* is accomplished by 6.3.51 *vā śokaṣyañrogeṣu*. The next two examples are also derivates of *ṢyaÑ*. Deriving *saubhāgineya*, parallel to *subhagāyā apatyam* 'offspring of Subhagā' involves affix *ḍhaK* (4.1.126 *kalyāṇyādīnām . . .*). Thus,

given *subhagā* + *ḍhaK*, we get *subhagā* + (*ḍha→eya*) (7.1.2 *āyaneyīnīyiyaḥ . . .*). The *ā* of *subhagā* is also replaced with *inAṄ* which, subsequent to applications of dual *vṛddhi*, produces *subhag*(*ā→inAṄ*) + *ḍhaK* → *s*(*u→au*) *bh*(*a→ā*) *gin*)) + (*ḍha→eya*))) = *saubhāgineya*. This same is also applicable to *durbhagā* + *ḍhaK* = *daurbhāgineya*.

2. Recall that *subhaga-durbhaga* are read in the *kalyāṇyādi* (4.1.126 *kalyāṇyādīnām . . .*) group of nominals. Rule 5.1.129 *prāṇabhṛj . . .* also cites *subhaga* in the *udgātrādi* group. Since all operations may be made optional in the Vedic, we do not get initial *vṛddhi* of *bhaga* in *mahate saubhagāya* 'to the great auspicious one'.

Now consider *sāktusaindhava* which derives from *saktusindhu* + *aṆ* (4.2.133 *kacchādibhyaś ca*). The *sindhu* of the *kacchādi* group of nominals is here allowed at the end through *tadantavidhi* 'accepting *sindhu* as referring also to that which ends in *sindhu*'. The compound *saktusindhu* is formed by a *vārttika*, ad 2.1.69 *varṇo varṇena*. That is, it is a compound of the type of *śākapārthiva* (*vt. śākapārthivādīnāṃ siddhaye uttarapadalopasyopasaṃkhyānam*; ad 2.1.54 *upamānāni sāmānyavacanaiḥ*), where a middle constituent gets deleted. What is deleted here in *saktusindhu* is *pradhāna* 'principal'.

7.3.20 अनुशतिकादीनां च

anuśatikādīnāṃ ca
/*anuśatikādīnām* 6/3 = *anuśatika ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣām*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *pūrvapadasya* #19)
'*anuśatika*' *ity evamādīnāṃ cāṅgānāṃ pūrvapadasya cottarapadasya cācām āder acaḥ sthāne vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ*
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of both initial as well as following constituents of an *aṅga*, particularly those enumerated in the list headed by *anuśatika*, when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

ānuśātikam = *anuśatikasyedam* 'this belongs to Anuśatika'
ānuhauḍikaḥ = *anuhoḍena carati* 'this belongs to Anuhoḍa (he who wanders about with a girl)'
ānusāṃvaraṇam = *anusaṃvaraṇe dīyate* 'that which is given at the end . . .'
ānusāṃvatsarikaḥ = *anusaṃvatsare dīyate* 'that which is given in a year'
āṅgāravaiṇavaḥ = *aṅgāraveṇor apatyam pumān* 'son of Aṅgāraveṇu'
aihalaukikaḥ 'of this world'
pāralaukikaḥ 'of the world beyond'
sārvalaukikaḥ 'of all the worlds'
pārastraiṇeyaḥ 'a son from another woman (a woman of bad character)'

1. Note that *ānuśātika* is derived, paraphrased as *anuśatikasyedam*, with *aṆ* (4.3.120 *tasyedam*). The word *anuśatika*, where *śatika* derives with *ṭhaÑ*, signifying *krītaḥ* 'purchased with' (5.1.37 *tena krītam*), is paraphrased as *anugataḥ śatikaḥ* 'followed that which was purchased for a hundred'. Similar derivational details are offered for *hoḍena carati = hauḍikaḥ*; *anugataḥ hauḍena = ānuhauḍikaḥ*. We derive *anusaṃvareṇa dīyate = ānusāṃvaraṇam*, with *aṆ*, through extensional provision of *bhavavat* (5.1.96 *tatra ca dīyate kāryaṃ bhavavat*). The affixal provision of *ṭhaÑ*, in *ānusāṃvatsarikaḥ*, comes from 4.3.67 *bahvaco . . .*, again through the *bhavavat* 'similar to *bhavaḥ*' extension of 5.1.96 *tatra ca. . . .*

The *ṭhaÑ* of *aihalaukikaḥ* and *pāralaukikaḥ* is used with the signification of 5.3.53 *tatra bhavaḥ* 'found there'. The *ṭhaÑ* of *sārvalaukikaḥ* has its origin in a *vārttika* proposal (ad 5.1.44 *lokasarvalokāṭ ṭhañ*). The word *pārastraiṇeya* is a derivate of *ṭhaK* with *inAṆ* (4.1.126 *kalyāṇyādīnām inaṅ ca*). A *gaṇasūtra* proposal also recommends this double *vṛddhi* to derive *rājapauruṣyam* when affix *ṢyaÑ* (5.1.124 *guṇavacana . . .*) follows. This condition of *ṢyaÑ* is necessary in view of *rājapuruṣāyaṇiḥ* 'son of a king's man', where *phiÑ* (4.1.157 *udīcāṃ vṛddhād . . .*) cannot condition double *vṛddhi*.

2. Note that *anuśatikādi* is desired as an open-ended group (*ākṛtigaṇa*) of nominals. Thus, we also get *abhigamam arhati = ābhigamikaḥ* 'deserves to understand; deserves to have sexual relation'; *ādhideve bhavam = ādhidaivikam* 'that which happens by fate; destiny'; *ādhibhūte bhavam = ādhibhautikam* 'that which is rooted in material; material causation'; and *catasra eva vidyāḥ = cāturvidyam* 'four kinds of knowledge'.

7.3.21 देवताद्वन्द्वे च

devatādvandve ca
/devatādvandve 7/1 (*devatānāṃ dvandvaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *pūrvapadasya* #19)
devatādvandve ca pūrvapadasyottarapadasyācām āder acaḥ sthāne vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of both the initial as well as final constituents of a *dvandva* compound termed an *aṅga* with its constituents denoting divinity (*dvatā*), when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

āgnivāruṇīm 'a sacrifice whose divinities are Agni and Varuṇa'
āgnimārutam (*karma*) 'a sacrifice whose divinities are Agni and Marut'

1. Commentators restrict this rule to apply only where a *devatādvandva* 'a *dvandva* compound formed with constituents denoting divinity', either re-

lates to a hymn (*sūkta*) or to named recipients of an oblation (*haviṣya*). It is for this reason that we do not get dual *vṛddhi* in *skandaviśākhe devate yasya = skāndaviśākhaḥ* 'that of which the divinities are Skanda and Viśākha' and *brahmaprajāpatī devate asya = brāhmaprajāpatyam* 'that of which Brahman and Prajāpati are divinities', etc.

We get *agnīvaruṇau* where the final *i* of *agni* receives a replacement in *īT* (6.3.26 *īdagne somavaruṇayoḥ*). This rule applies dual *vṛddhi* when the compound base receives affix *aṆ* with the signification of 'that is its divinity' (4.2.24 *sāsya devatā*). The final of *agnī* is then replaced with *i* (6.3.28 *id vṛddhau*; or the introduction of *ī* is blocked by *i* of this rule) under the condition of this *vṛddhi* to yield *āgnivāraṇam*. Refer also to my note under 6.3.26 *īd agneḥ*. . . .

7.3.22 नेन्द्रस्य परस्य

nendrasya parasya
/ na ϕ indrasya 6/1 *parasya* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *devatādvandve* #21)
indraśabdasya parasya yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
That which was said to apply does not apply to an *aṅga* constituted by a *dvandva* compound with constituents denoting divinity and *indra* as its final constituent.

EXAMPLES:

saumendraḥ 'Soma and Indra'
āgnendraḥ 'Agni and Indra'

1. This rule negates initial *vṛddhi* of *indra*, when this same occurs as a following constituent in a *devatādvandva* compound. Rule 7.2.117 *taddhiteṣv acām* . . . then offers initial *vṛddhi* to the *aṅga*. Thus, given *soma + indra + aṆ*, we derive *s(o→au) m(ā+i→e) ndr(a→ϕ) + aṆ = saumendra*, through initial *vṛddhi*, single *guṇa*-replacement and *bha*-deletion of *a* (6.4.148 *yasyeti ca*).

2. A question is raised against offering this negation. That is, why state this negation when *i* of *indra*, having become part of a single replacement in *guṇa*, i.e., *e*, will not be available for this negation of *vṛddhi*. Commentators state that operations relative to preceding and following constituents, eventhough externally conditioned, are accomplished first. An internally conditioned operation, for example this single *guṇa*-replacement, is accomplished subsequently. This is what facilitates derivation of *pūrvaiṣukāmaśamaḥ*, etc. (7.3.114 *prācāṃ grāma* . . .). Thus, *soma + indra + aṆ* first receives *vṛddhi*. Our present rule is then needed to negate *vṛddhi* when *indra* happens to be the following constituent.

3. Why do we have the condition of *parasya* 'of a constituent which follows'?

So that this negation does not apply to *indra* which occurs as an initial constituent, for example, in *aindrāgnam* of *aindrāgnam ekādaśakapālaṃ caruṃ nirvapet* '. . . should offer oblation of *caru* in eleven bowls (to one whose) Indra and Agni are divinities'.

7.3.23 दीर्घाच्च वरुणस्य

dīrghāc ca varuṇasya
/dīrghāt 5/1 *ca* ϕ *varuṇasya* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *devatādvandve* #21)
dīrghād uttarasya varuṇasya yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
That which was stated to apply does not apply also to *varuṇa*, used in combination after a long (*dīrghāt*) vowel, of an *aṅga*.

EXAMPLES:

aindrāvaruṇam 'a ritual oblation whose divinities are Indra and Varuṇa'
maitrāvaruṇam 'a ritual oblation whose divinities are Mitra and Varuṇa'

1. This rule does not permit *vṛddhi* of initial vowel of *varuṇa* when the same combines as a following constituent after a long (*dīrgha*) vowel. Consider *aindrāvaruṇam* and *agnāvaruṇam* where *ānAṄ* is introduced in place of the final sound of the initial compound constituent (6.3.26 *devatādvandve ca*). This long *ā* then facilitates *vṛddhi* of initial vowel of *varuṇa*, the following compound constituent.

Why do we have the specification of *varuṇa* used in combination after a long vowel? Consider *agnivāruṇīm* where 6.3.27 *īd agenḥ somavaruṇayoḥ* offers *ī* as a replacement for the final vowel of *agni*. But this *ī* is blocked by 6.3.28 *id vṛddhau*. Consequently, initial *vṛddhi* of *varuṇa* cannot be accomplished. Obviously, the *i* of *agni* after which *varuṇa* combines to follow is not long.

7.3.24 प्राचां नगरान्ते

prācāṃ nagarānte
/prācām 6/3 *nagarānte* 7/1 = *nagarasya ante* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *pūrvapadasya* #19)
prācāṃ deśe nagarānte' ṅge pūrvapadasyottarapadasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of both initial as well as final constituent of an *aṅga* which ends in *nagara*, relative to usage in eastern part of the country, provided when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

sauhmanāgaraḥ = *suhmanagare bhavaḥ* 'a resident of the city of Suhmanagara'
pauṇḍranāgaraḥ 'a resident of the city of Puṇḍranagara'

1. This rule offers *vṛddhi* with reference to usage in the east. Why east? Consider *mādranagaraḥ* where this *vṛddhi* is blocked by initial *vṛddhi*. For, *madranagara* happened to be a northern city.

7.3.25 जङ्गलधेनुवलजान्तस्य विभाषितमुत्तरम्

jaṅgaladhenuvalajāntasya vibhāṣitam uttaram
/jaṅgaladhenuvalajāntasya 6/1 = *jaṅgalaś ca dhenuś ca valajañ ca* (*dv.*), *tad ante yasya* (*bv.* with int. *dv.*), *tasya*; *vibhāṣitam* 1/1 *uttaram* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *pūrvapadasya* #19)
'jaṅgala, dhenu, valaja' ity evamantasyāṅgasya pūrvapadasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of initial constituent of an *aṅga*, used in combination with a following *jaṅgala* 'forest', *dhenu* 'milk-giving cow' and *valaja* 'ornament', when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows; the first among vowels of the following compound constituent goes through *vṛddhi*, only optionally.

EXAMPLES:

kaurujāṅgalam = *kurujaṅgaleṣu bhavaḥ* 'born in Kurujāṅgala'
kaurujaṅgalam 'ibidem'
vaiśvadhainavam 'this belongs the universal cow'
vaiśvadhenavam 'ibidem'
sauvarṇajālajaḥ '. . . gold ornament'
sauvarṇajalajaḥ 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers dual *vṛddhi* but makes it optional in case of the following constituent. The word *uttaram* here refers to the following constituent. Thus, *kuruṣu jaṅgalam* = *kurujaṅgalam*; *kurujaṅgaleṣu bhavam* = (*kurujaṅgala* + *suP* + *aṆ*) + *sU* = *kaurujāṅgalam*; *kaurujaṅgalam*, etc.

7.3.26 अर्धात् परिमाणस्य पूर्वस्य तु वा

ardhāt parimāṇasya pūrvasya tu vā
/ardhāt 5/1 *parimāṇasya* 6/1 *pūrvasya* 6/1 *tu* ϕ *vā* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10)
ardhaśabdāt parasya parimāṇavācina uttarapadasyācām āder acaḥ sthāne vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ

A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of the following constituent of an *aṅga*, used after *ardha* 'half' with the signification of *parimāṇa*, when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows; the first among vowels of the initial constituent goes through *vṛddhi*, only optionally.

EXAMPLES:

ardhadrauṇikam = *ardhadroṇena krītam* 'purchased with half a Droṇa'
ārdhadrauṇikam 'ibidem'
ardhakauḍavikam 'purchased with half a Prastha'
ārdhakauḍavikam 'ibidem'

1. This rule makes the *vṛddhi* of an initial constituent optional. A specification with *pūrvasya* 'of that which precedes' is interpreted as referring to the initial compound constituent. The compound constituent which follows *ardha* is not allowed this option. Our example derivates receive *ṭhaÑ* of 5.1.136 *tena krītam*. These compounds are formed in consonance with 2.2.2 *ardhaṃ napuṃsakam*.

7.3.27 नातः परस्य

nātaḥ parasya
/ *na* ϕ *ataḥ* 5/1 *parasya* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *ardhāt parimāṇasya pūrvasya tu vā* #27)
ardhāt parasya parimāṇākārasya vṛddhir na bhavati pūrvasya tu vā bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* does not come in place of the first *a* of the following constituent of an *aṅga* which signifies *parimāṇa* and is used after *ardha*, when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows; the first *a* of the initial constituent is replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart, optionally.

EXAMPLES:

ardhaprasthikaḥ 'purchased with half a Prastha'
ārdhaprasthikaḥ 'ibidem'
ardhakaṃsikaḥ '. . . with half a Kaṃsa'
ārdhakaṃsikaḥ 'ibidem'

1. This rule allows *vṛddhi* of an initial constituent but disallows the same to initial *a* of the following constituent. Of course, when a constituent denoting *parimāṇa* 'measure' combines to follow *ardha*. Derivational details of example compounds are similar to those cited under the preceding rule.
2. Why do we state the condition of *ataḥ* 'in place of *a*'? So that the initial

u of *kuḍava* is allowed *vṛddhi* in deriving *ardhakuḍavena krītaḥ = ardhakauḍavikaḥ* 'purchased with half a Prastha', etc. Why do we have to specify *a* with *T* (*tarakaraṇa*)? So that *ardhakhāryāṃ bhavā = ardhakhārī* 'found in half a Khārī', because of the long *ā* of *khārī*, does not come within the scope of this rule. But this *ā* itself is a *vṛddhi*. Hence, negating *vṛddhi* by means of *taparakaraṇa* 'specifying *x* with a following *t*' is of no consequence to it. This negation by means of *taparakaṇa*, indeed, has its consequences. Consider *ardhakhārībhāryaḥ = ardhakhārī bhāryā yasya* 'he whose wife cooks food equal in measure to one half of a Khārī' and *vaiyākaraṇabhāryaḥ = vaiyākaraṇī bhāryā yasya* 'he whose wife is a grammarian'. These derivates cannot avail *puṃvadbhāva* 'masculine transformation' of *bhāryā* if *vṛddhi* is not negated by means of *tapara-karaṇa*. That is, rule 6.3.39 *vṛddhinimittasya ca* . . . cannot facilitate *puṃvadbhāva* 'masculine transformation'. It is argued that a *taddhita* affix which, when following, conditions negation of *vṛddhi*, cannot be accepted as a cause for *vṛddhi* (*vṛddhinimitta*). It will be accepted as a cause for absence (*abhāva*) of *vṛddhi*. If negation of *vṛddhi* is not specified with *aT* (*taparakaraṇa*), the *ā* of *khārī* in *ardhakhārī* will come under the scope of this rule. That is, *vṛddhi* will be negated, irrespective of whether this *ā* itself is a *vṛddhi*. The affix which then negates this *vṛddhi* cannot be accepted as cause for *vṛddhi*. This being the case, rule 6.3.39 *vṛddhinimittasya ca* . . . cannot allow *puṃvadbhāva* in *ardhakārībhāryaḥ* and *vaiyākaraṇībhāryaḥ*.

7.3.28 प्रवाहणस्य ढे

pravāhaṇasya ḍhe
/pravāhaṇasya 6/1 *ḍhe* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *acaḥ* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *pūrvasya tu vā* #27)
pravāhaṇasya ḍhe parata uttarapadasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati pūrvapadasya vā bhavati
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of the following constituent of an *aṅga*, namely *pravāhaṇa*, when a *taddhita* affix, namely *ḍhaK*, follows. The first among vowels of the initial compound constituent is, optionally, replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart.

EXAMPLES:

prāvāhaṇeyaḥ = pravāhaṇasyāpatyam 'son of Pravāhaṇa'
pravāhaṇeyaḥ 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers initial *vṛddhi* to the following constituent of an *aṅga*, namely *pravāhaṇa*, obligatorily. Of course, when the *taddhita* affix *ḍhaK* follows. The *vṛddhi* of the initial constituent is optional. The word *pravāhaṇa* is derived with affix *LyuṬ* (3.3.113 *kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam*), introduced with the signification of agent (*kartṛ*), after the causal form of *vah* 'to carry' (*ṇijanta*).

A replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) is accomplished by 8.4.29 *ṇer vibhāṣā*. Note that *pravāhaṇa* is an *upapada* compound. Affix *ḍhaK*, of *pravāhaṇeya* and *prāvāhaṇeya*, is introduced by 4.1.123 *śubhrādibhyaś ca*.

7.3.29 तत्प्रत्ययस्य च

tatpratyayasya ca
/tatpratyayasya 6/1 = *saḥ pratyayo yasmāt* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *pūrvasya tu vā* #27 *pravāhaṇasya* #28)
ḍhakpratyayāntasya pravāhaṇaśabdasya taddhiteṣu parata uttarapadasyācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati pūrvasya tu vā
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of the following constituent of an *aṅga*, namely *pravāhaṇa* terminating in affix *ḍhaK*, provided a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows; the first among vowels of the initial constituent is, optionally, replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart.

EXAMPLES:

prāvāhaṇeyiḥ = *pravāhaṇeyasyāpatyam* 'young male offspring of Pravāhaṇa'
pravāhaṇeyiḥ 'ibidem'
prāvāhaṇeyakam 'belonging to the offspring of Pravāhaṇa'
pravāhaṇeyakam 'ibidem'

1. Why state this rule when the initial vowel of the following constituent ending in *ḍhaK* will obligatorily go through *vṛddhi*? This could hardly be the purpose of formulating this rule. The formulation of this rule could not be accepted for offering initial *vṛddhi* to initial constituent of the compound, either. For, this externally conditioned initial *vṛddhi* will be blocked by internally conditioned optional *vṛddhi*, offered relative to *ḍhaK* of the preceding rule. Commentators argue that a dual *vṛddhi* which is conditioned by affixes *iÑ*, etc., cannot be blocked by such optional internal *vṛddhi*. For, how could an external *vṛddhi* conditioned by *iÑ* can be blocked by an internal *vṛddhi* conditined by *ḍhaK* when *iÑ* is not internal to the derivate of *ḍhaK*? That is, when *iÑ* is not part of *pravāhaṇeya*. This rule is therefore stated to block such externally conditioned optional *vṛddhi* (*Kāś*: *bāhyataddhitanimittā vṛddhir ḍhāśaryeṇa vikalpena bādhitum aśakyeti sūtrārambbhaḥ*). We thus get optional forms: *pravāhaṇeyiḥ* and *prāvāhaṇeyiḥ*, i.e., *pravāhaṇasyāpatyaṃ yuvā* 'young male offspring of Pravāhaṇa'. We similarly get two optional derivates of *vuÑ* (4.3.126 *gotracaraṇād vuñ*): *pravāhaṇeyakam* and *prāvāhaṇeyakam* (*Nyāsa*: *saivaṃ bāhyaṃ taddhitaṃ nimittam āśrtya bhavantī bahiraṅgā; prāgeva tu bāhyataddhitotpatter ḍhāśrayo vikalpo bhavann antaraṅgas tāṃ bādhituṃ na śaknoti*).

7.3.30 नञः शुचीश्वरक्षेत्रज्ञकुशलनिपुणानाम्

nañaḥ śucīśvarakṣetrajñakuśalanipuṇānām
/ nañaḥ 5/1 *śucīśvarakṣetrajñakuśalanipuṇānām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *pūrvasya tu vā* #27)
nañ uttareṣāṃ 'śuci, īśvara, kṣetrajña, kuśala, nipuṇa' ity eteṣām acām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati, pūrvapadasya vā bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* comes in place of first among vowels of the following constituent of an *aṅga*, namely *śuci* 'cleansed, pure', *īśvara* 'lord', *kṣetrajña* 'knower of fields', *kuśala* 'skilled' and *nipuṇa* 'clever, efficient', when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows; the initial vowel of the first constituent is, optionally, replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart.

EXAMPLES:

āśaucam 'state of impurity'
aśaucam 'ibidem'
ānaiśvaryam 'state of no lordship; non-prosperity'
anaiśvaryam 'ibidem'
ākṣaitrajñyam 'belonging to one who does not know the supreme soul'
akṣatraijñyam 'ibidem'
ākauśalam 'belonging to one who is not skilled'
akauśalam 'ibidem'
ānaipuṇam 'belonging to one who is not clever'
anaipuṇam 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers obligatory *vṛddhi* in case of a following constituent, and optional in case of initial. The *aṆ* of *āśaucam* and *aśaucam* is introduced by 5.1.131 *igantāc ca laghupūrvāt*. Of course, after negating the *bahuvrīhi* compound *śuciḥ = vidyate śucir yasya* with *naÑ* paraphrased as *na vidyate śucir yasya*. Derivates such as *ānaiśvaryam* and *anaiśvaryam* involve affix *ṢyaÑ* after *anīśvara* and *akṣetrajña*, read in the *brāhmaṇādi* group of nominals. Affix *ṢyaÑ* (5.1.124 *guṇavacana . . .*) is used here with the signification of *bhāva*. The last two examples, i.e., *ānaipuṇyam* and *anaipuṇyam*, are derivates of *aṆ* used with the signification of 4.3.120 *tasyedam*.

2. A question is raised against *vṛddhi* of initial constituents. Some argue that since an affix, with the exception of *tva* and *taL*, is not introduced after a negative *tatpuruṣa* compound with the denotatum of *bhāva* (5.1.121 *na nañpūrvāt . . .*), *vṛddhi* of *naÑ* is not available. For, *ṢyaÑ* is here blocked after the negative *tatpuruṣa* compounds, on hand. It is stated that the negative *tatpuruṣa* with *naÑ* and *śauca* is formed subsequent upon introduction of *ṢyaÑ*, after *śuci*. Our present rule then applies for *vṛddhi* of initial constituent. How do we know that *ṢyaÑ* is to be introduced prior to formation of the

negative *tatpuruṣa* compound? From this very rule, especially since its provision will otherwise become vacuous. Others still do not accept it, especially since they believe that negation of 5.1.121 *na nañpūrvāt . . .* is not universal (*sārvatrika*). Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* for further details.

7.3.31 यथातथयथापुरयोः पर्यायेण

yathātathayathāpurayoḥ paryāyeṇa
/yathātatha-yathāpurayoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *paryāyeṇa* 3/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *vṛddhiḥ* #7.2.114 *aco ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ* #7.2.117 *kiti* #7.2.118 *uttarapadasya* #10 *pūrvasya tu vā* #27 *nañaḥ* #30)
'yathātatha, yathāpura' ity etayor nañ uttarayoḥ paryāyeṇācām āder aco vṛddhir bhavati taddhite ñiti ṇiti kiti ca parataḥ
A vowel termed *vṛddhi* occurs in place of first among vowels of initial and following constituents of an *aṅga*, namely *yathātatha* and *yathāpura*, in turn (*paryāya*), provided *yathātatha* and *yathāpura* are used in construction after *naÑ*, and when a *taddhita* affix marked with *Ñ*, *Ṇ* and *K* follows.

EXAMPLES:

āyathātathyam 'not as what it should be'
āyāthātathyam 'ibidem'
āyathāpuryam 'not as what it previously was'
āyāthāpuryam 'ibidem'

1. Note that *ayathātathā* and *ayathāpura* are both read in the *brāhmaṇādi* (5.1.124 *guṇavacanabrāhmaṇādi . . .*) group of nominals. Consequently, negation of *ṢyaÑ* (5.1.121 *na nañpūrvāt . . .*) cannot apply here. The *vṛddhi* of *ayathā* applies in turn (*paryāya*). That is, the *a* of *yathā* goes through *vṛddhi* first. The *a* of *naÑ* then goes through optional *vṛddhi*, in turn. We thus get *ayāthātathyam* and *āyāthātathyam*, etc. A reference in this *sūtra* with *yathātathā* and *yathāpura* is made in view of their *avyayībhāva* formation. That is, after the compound-formation of *avyayībhāva* with *yathā*, used in the sense of *asādṛśya* 'non-similarity' (2.1.7 *yathā' sādṛśye*), there is shortening (*hrasva*) of *tathā* conditioned by neuter (*napuṃsaka*; 1.2.47 *hrasvo napuṃsake . . .*). The *Mahābhāṣya* seems to be favoring the compound-formation by 2.1.4 *saha supā*, as is clear from the illustration of *ayathātathābhāvaḥ*. Given this, shortening of the compound will be accomplished based upon Pāṇini's own usage in the rule (*sautratvāt*).

7.3.32 हनस्तोऽचिण्णलोः

hanas to' ciṇṇaloḥ
/hanaḥ 6/1 *taḥ* 1/1 *aciṇṇaloḥ* 7/2 = *ciṇ ca ṇal ca* = *ciṇṇalau* (*itar. dv.*);
na ciṇṇalau (*nañ. tat.* with int. *dv.*)/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ñṇiti* #7.2.115)
hanas takārādeśo bhavati ñṇiti pratyaye parataḥ ciṇṇalau varjayitvā
The final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *han*, is replaced with *t* when an affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ*, but other than *cIṆ* and *ṆaL*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

ghātayati '. . . has someone killed'
ghātakaḥ 'killer'
sādhughātī 'killer of a virtuous person'
ghātaṅghātam '. . . kills over and over again'

1. Note that *taddhiteṣu* and *kiti* are not carried over. This rule, however, accepts the *anuvṛtti* of *ñṇit* '*Ñit* and *Ṇit*' as part of the right context. Our first example *ghātayati* derives from *ghāti* + *LAṬ*, where the root is used with causal affix *ṆiC*. The *n* of *han* 'to kill' before *ṆiC* is replaced with *t* because of its status as marked with *Ṇ* as an *it* (*Ṇit*). The *h* of *han*, in all derivates, goes through a replacement in *gh* (*kutva*; 7.3.54 *ho hanter* . . .). The initial *vṛddhi* of these derivates is accomplished by 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*.

Our example *sādhughātin* is an *upapada* 'conjoined' compound formed under the cooccurrence condition of *sādhu* with affix *ṆinI*, introduced after *han* with the signification of *tācchīlya* 'this is his characteristic nature'. The *ghātaka* of our example is a derivate of (*han* + *ṆiC*) + *ṆvuL*)). We find affix *ṆamUL* (3.4.22 *ābhīkṣṇye ṇamul*) with the signification of *ābhīkṣṇya* 'doing something over and over again' introduced after *han* + *GHaÑ* = *ghāta*, itself a derivate of *GHaÑ*. A *vārttika* (ad 8.1.12: *ābhīkṣṇye dve bhavataḥ*) requires *ghātam* to be doubled up.

The condition of *aciṇṇaloḥ* is imposed so that we do not get *n* of *han* replaced with *t* before *CiṆ* and *ṆaL*. Thus, consider *aghāni* and *jaghāna*, third singular *LUṄ* and *LIṬ* derivates of *han*. Why do we not find this replacement of *n* with *t* in *vārtraghnam* 'this is his, the one who killed Vṛtra'? Actually, an operation stated for a root must apply when the root is followed by an affix (*Kāś*: *dhātoḥ kāryam ucyamānaṃ dhātoḥ pratyaye vijñāyate*). Since we derive *vṛtrahan* 'slayer of Vṛtra' with *KvIP* (gone through total deletion) and then introduce *aṆ* after the nominal stem, there is no replacement of *n* with *t*.

7.3.33 आतो युक् चिण्कृतोः

āto yuk ciṇkṛtoḥ
/*ātaḥ* 6/1 *yuk* 1/1 *ciṇ-kṛtoḥ* 7/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ñṇiti* #7.2.115)
ākārāntasyāṅgasya ciṇi kṛti ñṇiti yug āgamo bhavati
An augment, namely *yuK*, is introduced to an *aṅga* terminating in *ā*, when *CiṆ*, or a *kṛt* affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

adāyi 'third person singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *dā*'
adhāyi '. . . of *dhā*'
dāyaḥ 'a derivate of affix *kṛt*, (*dā* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*'
dāyakaḥ 'a derivate of *ṆvuL*, (*dā* + *ṆvuL*) + *sU*'
dhāyaḥ 'a derivate of affix *kṛt* (*dhā* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*'
dhāyakaḥ 'derivate of *ṆvuL*, (*dhā* + *ṆvuL*) + *sU*'

1. This rule introduces augment *yuK* to an *aṅga* which ends in *ā*, when *CiṆ*, or a *kṛt* affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ*, follows. Consider *adāyi* and *adhāyi* which are third singular middle derivates of *LUṄ*, introduced after *dā* and *dhā* with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense' or *karman* 'object'. Thus, *dā* + (*LUṄ→ta*) → *aṬ* + *dā* + *yUK* + *CiṆ* + (*ta→ϕ*) = *adāyi*, and *dhā* + (*LUṄ→ta*) = *adhāyi*, where 3.1.66 *ciṇ bhāvakarmaṇoḥ* introduces *CiṆ*. The third singular middle (*ātmanepada*) replacement of *LUṄ*, which occurs after *CiṆ*, is deleted (6.4.104 *ciṇo luk*).

2. The condition of *CiṆ*, or of a *kṛt* affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ*, is imposed so that derivates such as (*dadau* ← (*dā* + (*LIṬ* → (*tiP→ṆaL*))) and (*dhā* + (*LIṬ→tiP→ṆaL*) = *dadhau* could be kept out of applicational scope of this rule. This same is true of *cauḍiḥ* 'son of Cūḍa', *bālākiḥ* 'son of Balaka', and *jñaḥ* '. . . whose divinity is *jñā*', derivates of the *taddhita* affixes *iÑ* (4.1.96 *bāhvādibhyaś ca*), and *aṆ*, respectively.

7.3.34 नोदात्तोपदेशस्य मान्तस्यानाचमेः

nodāttopadeśasya māntasyānācameḥ
/na ϕ udāttopadeśasya 6/1 = *upadeśe udāttaḥ* (*sapt. tat.*), *tasya*; *māntasya* 6/1 = *mo' nte yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *anācameḥ* 6/1 = *na ācamiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *ciṇkṛtoḥ* #33)
udāttopadeśasya māntasyāṅgasyācamivarjitasya ciṇi kṛti ca ñṇiti yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
That which was stated for an *aṅga* when a *kṛt* affix, namely *CiṆ*, or one marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ*, followed, does not apply to an *aṅga* which is marked with *udātta* in *upadeśa* and ends in *m*, but is not *ācam* 'to sip'.

EXAMPLES:

aśami 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *ŚamU*'
atami '. . . of *tamU*'
adami '. . . of *damU*'
śamakaḥ 'derivate of (*śam* + *ṆvuL*) + *sU*'
tamakaḥ 'derivate of (*tam* + *ṆvuL*) + *sU*'
damakaḥ 'derivate of (*dam* + *ṆvuL*) + *sU*'
śamaḥ 'derivate of (*śam* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*'

tamaḥ 'derivate of (*tam* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*'
damaḥ 'derivate of (*dam* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*'

1. This rule disallows penultimate *vṛddhi* (7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*) of roots which are marked with *udātta* in *upadeśa*, or which end in *m*, with the exception of *āṄ+cam* = *ācam* 'to sip'. Consider the third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivates of *śamU* 'be tranquil, calm', *tamU* 'to faint, be exhausted' and *damU* 'to tame, restrain' which are all marked with *udātta* in *upadeśa* 'initial citation'. Thus, we get *aśami*, *atami* and *adami* where penultimate *vṛddhi* is blocked. This *vṛddhi* is also blocked in derivates of *ṆvuL* and *GHaÑ*. Thus, *śamakaḥ*, *tamakaḥ* and *damakaḥ*; and *śamaḥ*, *tamaḥ* and *damaḥ*, respectively.

2. The condition of *udāttopadeśa* is imposed so that this *vṛddhi* could not be blocked in *yāmakaḥ* and *rāmakaḥ*, etc., where *yamU* 'to be detached, desist' and *ramU* 'to sport' are marked *anudātta* in *upadeśa*. How come this *vṛddhi* is not blocked in derivates of *aḍA* 'to strive' and *yamA* 'to be detached'? This is done, via *nipātana*, necessitated by available usage. Why is *upadeśa* required as a condition? So that derivates of *GHinUṆ* (3.2.141 *śamityaṣṭābhyo* . . .), i.e., *śamī*, *tamī* and *damī*, do not avail *vṛddhi*. The roots of these derivates are marked with *udātta* in *upadeśa*. Since the affixal *i* of these derivates become *udātta* (3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*), their roots will now become *anudātta* (6.1.158 *anudāttaṃ* . . .). But since these roots were originally marked with *udātta*, this rule will be able to block penultimate *vṛddhi*. Now consider (*yam* + *ṆvuL*) + *sU* = *yāmakaḥ* and (*ram* + *ṆvuL*) + *sU* = *rāmakaḥ*, where *yam* and *ram* are marked with *anudātta* in *upadeśa*. They become *udātta* because of *L* as an *it* in *ṆvuL* (6.1.193 *liti*). Our present rule cannot block *vṛddhi* here.

Why do we have the condition of *mānta* 'ending in *m*'? Consider (*car* + *ṆvuL*) = *cārakaḥ* and (*paṭh* + *ṇvuL*) + *sU* = *pāṭhakaḥ*, where *vṛddhi* cannot be blocked because *car* and *paṭh* do not end in *m*.

3. Note that *ācāmaḥ*, a *GHaÑ*-derivate of *āṄ-cam* which ends in *m*, is excluded from this blocking of *vṛddhi*. A *vārttika* proposal is made to also exclude *kam* and *vam* of, for example *kāmaḥ* and *vāmaḥ*, where *GHaÑ* is introduced when the root does not take affix *ṆiṄ* (3.1.30 *kamer ṇiṅ*). The *vṛddhi* is thus allowed.

Finally, this rule negates *vṛddhi* only where *ṆiC*, or a *kṛt* affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ*, follows. Thus, we do not get this blocking in *śaśāma* and *tatāma* where *ṆaL* is marked with *Ṇ*, but is not a *kṛt* affix (3.1.93 *kṛd atiṅ*).

7.3.35 जनिवध्योश्च

janivadhyoś ca
/jani-vadhyoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*); *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ñṇiti* #7.2.115 *ciṇkṛtoḥ* #33 *na* #35)
'jani, vadhi' ity etayoś ciṇi kṛti ca ñṇiti yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
That which was stated for an *aṅga* when *CiṆ*, or a *kṛt* affix marked with

Ñ and *Ṇ*, follows, does not apply to an *aṅga* constituted by *janI* 'to come into existence; be born' and *vadhI* 'to kill, harm'.

EXAMPLES:

ajani 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *janI*'
janakaḥ 'derivate of (*jan* + *ṆvuL*) + *sU*'
prajanaḥ 'derivate of (*pra-jan* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*'
avadhi 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *vadh*'
vadhakaḥ 'derivate of (*vadh* + *ṆvuL*) + *sU*'
vadhaḥ 'derivate of (*vadh* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*'

1. This rule extends the negation of penultimate *vṛddhi*, also to derivates of *vadhI* and *janI*. Thus, consider their third singular middle *LUṄ*-deriavtes *avadhi* and *ajani* with *CiṆ*. We get similar derivates with *ṆvuL* and *GHaÑ*, i.e., *vadhakaḥ* / *janakaḥ*; and *vadhaḥ* / *prajanaḥ*, respectively.

2. Note that *vadh* of this rule does not refer to *vadha* which, in turn, is a replacement of *han* 'to kill' (2.4.42 *hano vadha liṅi*). This *vadh* ends in a consonant and refers to verbal root *vadh* 'to hurt, harm' of the *bhvādi* group. The negation of *vṛddhi* in *vadha* is automatically accomplished, via *sthānivad-bhāva* 'replacement treated as what it replaced' proposal of deleted *a*. Thus, consider the absence of *vṛddhi* in: *bhakṣakaś cen na vidyeta vadhako' pi na vidyate* 'if there is no *bhakṣaka* 'killer (he who eats)' then there is no *vadhaka* 'killer'.

3. Finally, the right condition of *CiṆ*, and a *kṛt* affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ*, is still operative. Thus, we do not get this negation in *jajāna garbhaṃ mahi-mānam indram* 'gave birth to glorious Indra'. Recall that *jajāna* is a *LIṬ*-derivate of *jan* where *ṆaL* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*), a non-*kṛt* affix marked with *Ṇ*, follows.

7.3.36 अर्तिह्वीव्लीरीक्नूयीक्ष्माय्यातां पुग् णौ

arttihrīvlīrīknūyīkṣmāyyātāṃ pug ṇau
/ artti-hrī-vlī-rī-knūyī-kṣmāyy-ātām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
'*artti, hrī, vlī, rī, knūyī, kṣmāyī*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānām ākārāntānāṃ ca pug āgamo bhavati ṇau parataḥ*
Augment *pUK* is introduced to an *aṅga* which is either constituted by *artti* (*ṛ*) 'to go; to reach', *hrī* 'to be shy, bashful', *vlī* 'to choose, accept', *rī* 'to move, flow', *knūyī* and *kṣmāyī* 'to shake, tremble', or ends in *ā*, when affix *Ṇi* follows.

EXAMPLES:

arpayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ṛ*'
hrepayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *hrī*'

vlepayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vlī*'
repayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *rī*'
knopayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *knūyī*'
kṣmāpayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *kṣmāyī* 'to shake, tremble''
dāpayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ḌUdāÑ* 'to cut, divide''
dhāpayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ḌUdhāÑ* 'to place, hold''

1. Note that *artti* refers here to both *ṛ* 'to move, reach' (*bhvādi*) and *ṛ* 'to move' (*juhotyādi*), both active. Thus, consider *arpayati* where we get (*ṛ→ar*) + *pUK* + *ṆiC* = *arpi*; *arpi* + *LAṬ→ arp* (*i→e→ay*) + *ŚaP* + *tiP* = *arpayati*, through *guṇa* and a replacement in *ay*. The *rī* of our rule refers to roots with the signification of 'moving' and 'wolf-cry' (*vṛkaśabda*), or 'noise'. Derivational details of other examples are not much different. Note, however, that *y* of *knūyī* and *kṣmāyī* is deleted (6.1.66 *lopo vyor vali*).

2. Why is augment *pUK* made final of what precedes (*atha kimartham puk pūrvāntaḥ kriyate*). That is, why is this augment not offered as *pUṬ* and thereby made initial of what follows? So that penultimate shortening (*upadhāhrasva*) of *dāp* + *ṆiC* + *LUṄ→ adīdapat*, could be accomplished. Note that *dāp* yields *dap*, through penultimate shortening (7.4.1 *ṇau caṅi . . .*), after *CaṄ* replaces *CLI*, and *ṆiC* gets deleted. This *dap* then goes through reduplication (*dvitva*). If *pUṬ* was introduced as an augment, it would then have become part of *ṆiC*. This would then have blocked penultimate shortening.

7.3.37 शाच्छासाह्वाव्यावेपां युक्

śācchāsāhvāvyāvepāṃ yuk
/śāc-chā-sā-hvā-vyā-ve-pām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*); *yuk* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau* #36)
'*śā, chā, sā, hvā, vyā, ve, pā*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānāṃ yug āgamo bhavati ṇau parataḥ*
Augment *yUK* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *śā←śo* 'to shape, fashion', *chā←cho* 'to cut, pierce', *sā←ṣo* 'terminate', *hvā←hveÑ* 'to call out, challenge', *vyeÑ→vā* 'to cover', *veÑ* 'weave' and *pā* 'to drink' when affix *Ṇi* follows.

EXAMPLES:

niśāyayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ni*(*śo→śā*) + *ṆiC* + *LAṬ*'
avacchāyayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ava*(*cho→chā*) + *ṆiC* + *LAṬ*'
avasāyayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ava*(*ṣo→sā*) + *ṆiC* + *LAṬ*'
hvāyayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of (*hve→hvā*) + *ṆiC* + *LAṬ*'
saṃvyāyayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *sam*(*vyeÑ→vyā*) + *ṆiC* + *LAṬ*'

vāyayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of (*veÑ→vā*) + *ṆiC* + *LAṬ*'
pāyayati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of (*pā* + *ṆiC*) + *LAṬ*'

1. Note that roots which are specified here as an *aṅga* will have their forms ending in *ā* (*ātva*). Thus, we will get *śo→śā*, *cho→chā*, *ṣo→sā*, *hve→hvā*, *vye→vyā*, *ve→vā* and *pā*, with application of rule 6.1.45 *ādeca upadeśe'śiti*. They, consequently, will come under the scope of *pUK* of the preceding rule. Accepting a form resulting from some rule application on a corresponding original indicates that the commonly known *paribhāṣā* (*PŚ* 114): *lakṣaṇapratipadoktayoḥ pratipadoktasyaiva grahaṇam* 'in conflicts between a form cited by a rule, or one derived by a rule-application, the form which is cited by a rule is favored' does not apply in this section. This is also true in case of introduction of *pUK* in deriving *adhyāpayati* and *jāpayati* where verbal roots *adhi-i* and *ji* yield their forms in *ā* (6.1.48 *krīṅjīnāṃ . . .*), i.e., *adhy-ā* and *jā*. Recall that *yUK* is offered here as an exception to *pUK*.

Our present rule introduces *yUK*, against *pUK*, when specified roots occur as an *aṅga* before *ṆiC*. Consider *śāyayati*, where 6.1.45 *ādeca upadeśe . . .* replaces a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *eC* with *ā*(*T*). That is, *ś*(*o→ā*) + *ṆiC* = *śā* + *i*. We get *śāyi* with introduction of augment *yUK*. Our example derivate *niśāyayati* derives from *ni-śāyi* + (*LAṬ→tiP*). The *ṣ* of *ṣo* is replaced with *s* by 6.1.64 *dhātvādeḥ. . . .* Deriving *avacchāyayati* from *ava-chāyi* + (*LAT→tiP*) also involves augment *tUK* (6.1.73 *che ca*), before *ch*. The *t* of *tUK* then goes through a replacement in *c* (*ścutva*; 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*). Similar applications are involved in deriving other examples.

2. Note that a reference with *pā* includes references to both *pā* 'to drink' and *pai* 'to dry'. This, however, does not include any reference to *pā* 'to protect', a root of the *ad* class (*adādi*) where *ŚaP* (3.1.68 *kartari śap*) gets deleted.

3. A *vārttika* proposal requires augment *lUK* in case of *pā* 'to protect' with a derivate in *pālayati* (*vt: lugāgamas tu tasya vaktavyaḥ*).

Yet another *vārttika* proposal introduces *nUK* in case of *dhūÑ* 'to shake' with its causal third singular present form *dhūnayati*. One can also get *prīṇayati* in case of *prīÑ* 'to please' (*vt: dhūñprīñor lug vaktavyaḥ*).

Kāśikā informs that these augments, i.e., *yUK*, *lUK* and *nUK*, are also made final parts of roots which precede. Thus, we get *nyaśīśayat*, *apīpalat*, *adūdhunat*, and *apipriṇat*, where shortening of the penultimate vowel is accomplished.

7.3.38 वो विधूनने जुक्

vo vidhūnane juk
/vaḥ 6/1 *vidhūnane* 7/1 *juk* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau* #36)
'vā' ity etasya vidhūnane' rthe vartamānasya jug āgamo bhavati ṇau parataḥ
An augment, namely *jUK*, is introduced to *vā*, an *aṅga*, used with the signification of *vidhūnana* 'agitation, shaking', when affix *ṆiC* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pakṣeṇopavājayati 'shakes (off water) with the (help of) wings'

1. This rule introduces augment *jUK* when *vai→vā* 'to dry' is followed by *ṆiC* and the signification is *vidhūnana* 'to cause to shake'. We thus get *upavājayati*, as in *pakṣeṇopavājayati* 'makes dry with the help of wing(s)', where *ṆiC* is introduced (after *upa-vā*).

How come *upavājayati* is not derived by introducing *ṆiC* after *vaj* 'to move', used with the preverb *upa*? This has been done to indicate that augment *pUK* is not introduced after *vā*. It is to accomplish the introduction of augment *jUK*, instead, that *ṆiC* is introduced after *vā*. Recall that *pUK* will be available to *vai* 'to dry' in view of *ā* (*ātva*; *vai →vā*).

Why do we state the condition of *vidhūnana*? Consider *āvāpayati keśān* 'has the hairs cut', where shaking is not the meaning. Consequently, augment *jUK* could not be introduced.

7.3.39 लीलोर्नुग्लुकावन्यतरस्यां स्नेहविपातने

līlor nuglukāv anyatarasyāṃ snehavipātane
/līloḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*); *nug-lukau* 1/2 (*itar. dv.*); *anyatarasyām* 7/1 *sneha-vipātane* 7/1 (*ṣaṣ tat*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau* #36)
'lī, lā' ity etayor aṅgayor anyatarasyāṃ 'nuk, luk' ity etāv āgamau bhavato ṇau parataḥ
Augments *nUK* and *lUK* are optionally introduced to *lī* and *lā*, respectively, when the derivate signifies *snehavipātana* 'melting of fat', and affix *ṆiC* follows.

EXAMPLES:

ghṛtaṃ vilāyayati 'causes the ghee to melt'
ghṛtaṃ vilīnayati 'ibidem'
. . . *vilālayati* 'ibidem'
vilāpayati 'ibidem'

1. Augments *nUK* and *lUK* are, optionally, introduced to an *aṅga* constituted by *lī* and *lā*, respectively, when *ṆiC* follows, and derivates denote 'melting of fat'. We get *vilīnayati* and *vilāyayati*, two forms of *lī* where *nUK* is optional. Thus, *vi-lī + ṆiC → vi-lī + nUK + i = vilīni + LAṬ = vilīnayati* and *vi-lī + ṆiC → vi-l(ī→ai) + i → vi-l(ai→āy) + i → vilāyi + LAṬ = vilāyayati*. We similarly get two forms of *lā* where *lUK* is introduced optionally with *pUK* at the strength of optional replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) of 6.1.51 *vibhāṣā līyateḥ*. Thus, *vilālayati* and *vilāpayati*.

Note that *ī* of *lī* is specified here as conjoined (*praśliṣṭa*) *ī+i→ī*. That is, *nUK* must be introduced only to a *lī* which ends in *ī*. It will not be introduced

to a *lī* which goes through optional *ā* of 6.1.51 *vibhāṣā līyateḥ*. This is the reason why we do not get an example of *nUK* where *lī* produces *lā*, through a replacement in *ā* (*ātva*). *Kāśikā* thus states: '*lī*' *iti līlīnor grahaṇam*; '*lā*' *iti lāteḥ kṛtātvasya ca līyateḥ*, *lī* is specified to refer to both the *kryādi* root *lī* 'to join, embrace' and the *divādi* root *līN* 'to join'. Since no formal difference results by using them with *ṆiC*, a reference is also desired to *lā* 'to bring' and *lī*, with replacement in *ā* (*kṛtātvasya*; 6.1.51 *vibhāṣā līyateḥ*).

Kāśikā offers *jatuḥ vilāpayati* 'melts the lac' and *jaṭābhir ālāpayate* 'frightens with matted hair' as counter-examples to the condition of *snehavipātana* 'melting of fat'. Augment *pUK* is introduced here since the signification is something other than 'melting of fat'.

7.3.40 भियो हेतुभये षुक्

bhiyo hetubhaye ṣuk
/ bhiyaḥ 6/1 *hetubhaye* 7/1 = *hetor bhayam* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *ṣuk* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇi* #36)
'*bhī*' *ity etasya hetubhaye' rthe ṣug āgamo bhavati ṇau parataḥ*
Augment *ṣUK* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *bhī* 'to fear', when the signification is *hetubhaya* 'fear from causal agent' and affix *Ṇi* follows.

EXAMPLES:

muṇḍo bhīṣayate 'the ascetic with his shaven head causes fear'
jaṭilo bhīṣayate 'the ascetic with his matted hair causes fear'

1. Here again we find *ī* of *bhī* resulting out of *praśleṣa* 'conjoined specification'. That is, *bh*(*ī*+*ī*→*ī*) = *bhī*. Such a *bhī* which goes through replacement in *ā* (*ātva*) will not be allowed *ṣUK*. We will, instead, get *bhāpayate* with *pUK*, as in *muṇḍo bhāpayate* 'the ascetic with his shaven head causes fear'. This *ātva* is accomplished by 6.1.55 *bibheter hetubhaye*.

2. Note that *hetubhaya* is explained as *bhaya* 'fear' caused by *hetu* 'causal agent'. The word *hetu* is interpreted as instigator of an independent agent (1.4.54 *tatprayojako hetuś ca*). *Kāśikā* offers *kuñcikayainaṃ bhāyayati* 'he causes fear in him with a broom', with *yUK*, as a counter-example to the condition of *hetubhaya* 'cause of fear; causal agent'. What is causing fear here is not the *hetu* but an instrument, i.e., *kuñcikā* 'broom'.

7.3.41 स्फायो वः

sphāyo vaḥ
/ sphāyaḥ 6/1 *vaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau* #36)
'*sphāy*' *ity etasyāṅgasya vakārādeśo bhavati ṇau parataḥ*
A replacement in *v* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *sphāy*, when affix *Ṇi* follows.

EXAMPLES:

sphāvayati '. . . fattens'

1. This rule offers *v* as a replacement for the final *y* of an *aṅga* constituted by *sphāyI* 'to fatten' when the same occurs before *ṆiC*. Thus, *sphā*(*y*→*v*) + *ṆiC* = *sphāv* + *i* = *sphāvi* + *LAṬ* = *sphāvayati*.

7.3.42 शदेरगतौ तः

śader agatau taḥ
/*śadeḥ* 6/1 *agatau* 7/1 = *na gatiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *taḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau* #36)
śader aṅgasyāgatāv arthe vartamānasya takārādeśo bhavati ṇau parataḥ
A replacement in *t* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *śadḶ*', used with the signification of *agatiḥ* 'non-motion', when affix *ṆiC* follows.

EXAMPLES:

phalāni śātayati '. . . is cutting (wasting) fruits'

1. The condition of *agatiḥ* is imposed so that we do not get this replacement in *gāḥ śādayati* '. . . is causing cows to run'. Obviously, *gati* 'movement' is part of the signification here.

7.3.43 रुहः पोऽन्यतरस्याम्

ruhaḥ po' nyatarasyām
/*ruhaḥ* 6/1 *paḥ* 1/1 *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau* #36)
ruher aṅgasya anyatarasyāṃ pakārādeśo bhavati ṇau parataḥ
The final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *ruh* 'to grow', is optionally replaced with *p* when affix *ṆiC* follows.

EXAMPLES:

vrīhīn ropayati '. . . plants rice'
vrīhīn rohayati 'ibidem'

1. We get two forms: *ropayati* and *rohayati* with optional replacement in *p* for the root-final *h*, and a replacement in *vṛddhi* for the penultimate *u*. Haradatta notes that this rule should not be stated. For, *rupI* 'to be confused' is enumerated in the *divādi* group. This, used with *ṆiC*, will yield the form *ropayati* with the signification of *janma* 'birth, coming into existence'. This signification of *janma* is possible because roots potentially denote many meanings (*anekārtha*). Verbal root *ruh* 'to grow', of course, will yield the form *rohayati* (*PM*: *ayaṃ yogaḥ śakyo' vaktum. katham. rupa 'vimohane' iti divādau*

paṭhyate, sa ṇyanto' tra janmani vartiṣyate, anekārthatvād dhātūnām, tasya ropayati. ruhes tv ārahoyatīti).

7.3.44 प्रत्ययस्थात्कात्पूर्वस्यात इदाप्यसुपः

pratyayasthāt kāt pūrvasyāta id āpy asupaḥ
/pratyayasthāt 5/1 = *pratyaye tiṣṭhati* (*upapada tat.*), *tasmāt; kāt* 5/1 *pūrvasya* 6/1 *ataḥ* 6/1 *it* 1/1 *āpi* 7/1 *asupaḥ* 5/1 = *na sup* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmāt/*
pratyayasthāt kakārāt pūrvasyākārasya ikārādeśo bhavati āpi parataḥ sa ced āp supaḥ paro na bhavati
A short vowel, namely *i*, comes in place of *a* which occurs before *k* within an affix, provided *āP*, when not used after a *sUP*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

jaṭilikā 'she who wears matted hairs'
muṇḍikā 'she who has her head shaven'
kārikā 'she who does'
hārikā 'she who carries away'
etikāś caranti '. . . are grazing'

1. Note that affix *ka* (5.3.70 *prāg ivāt kaḥ*) is introduced after *jaṭilā* and *muṇḍā* to derive *jaṭil*(*ā*→*a*) + *ka* = *jaṭila* + *ka* with shortening of *ā* (7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ*). We get a replacement in *i* for the *a* of *jaṭila* which occurs before *k* of affix *ka*. Of course, when *āP* (here affix *ṬāP*) follows. Thus, *jaṭil*(*a* →*i*) *ka* + *ṬāP* → *jaṭilik*(*a*+*ā*→*ā*) = *jaṭilikā*, through *savarṇadīrgha* 'homogeneous long vowel replacement'. We similarly get the feminine derivates of *ṆvuL*: *kāraka* + *ṬāP* → *kār*(*a*→*i*) *ka* + *ṬāP* = *kārik*(*a*+*ā*→*ā*) = *kārikā* and *hāraka* + *ṬāP* = *hārikā*, again through *savarṇadīrgha*. Now consider *etikā* which derives from *etad* + *ṬāP* with the introduction of *akAC* (5.3.71 *avyayasarvanāmnām akac . . .*). Given *et*(*akAC*) *ad* + *ṬāP* = *etakad* + *ā*, the *a* before *k* is replaced with *i*. The *d* of *et*(*a*→*i*) *kad* + *ā* is then replaced with *a* (7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*) to produce *etika*(*d*→*a*) + *ā* = *etika* + *a* + *ā*. Finally, we get *etikā* by first replacing *a*+*a* with *a* in accord with 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* and then applying homogeneous long vowel replacement (*savarṇadīrgha*). Thus, *etik*(*a*+*ā*→*ā*) = *etikā* + *Jas* = *etikāḥ*, as in *etikāś caranti*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *k* as part of an affix? So that if *a* does not precede *k* which is part of an affix, this replacement does not apply. Consider *śakā*, a derivate of *aC* (3.1.134 *nandigrahi . . .*), where (*śak* + *aC* → *śaka*) + *ṬāP*)) = *śak*(*a*+*ā*→*ā*) = *śakā*, through *savarṇadīrgha*, cannot avail this replacement. Obviously, because *k* is not a part of an affix. It is part of a verbal root, instead.

Why is *stha* used in *pratyayastha* 'located within an affix'? It is stated that *stha* is used for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*). Why could it not indicate the absence

of *i*-replacement where *kA* alone constitutes the affix? A specification with *kA* is made here to indicate a sound. The *a* of *ka* (in *kāt*) is used for facilitating articulation (*uccāraṇārtha*). There is no suffix constituted by *k*, alone, for which this negation with *stha* could be stated. That is why, *k* will be interpreted as nothing but part of an affix. Why make an explicit statement for what could easily be understood from *kāt*? The *stha* of *pratyayastha* is then used for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*).

Why do we state *kāt* 'after *k*'? Consider *maṇḍanā* and *ramaṇā* which derive from *maṇḍi* + (*Lyu*→*ana*) + *ṬāP* = *maṇḍan*(*a*+*ā* →*ā*) = *maṇḍanā* and *rami* + (*Lyu*→*ana*) + *ṬāP* = *ramaṇā*. What we find here is not *k* but *n*. Incidentally, *Lyu* (3.1.134 *nandigrahi* . . .) is introduced under the *pacādi* qualification of *maṇḍI* 'to decorate' and *ramU* 'to sport'. One can also introduce *ṬāP* after a base ending in *yuC* (3.3.107 *ṇyāsaśrantho yuc*) to derive *maṇḍanā* and *ramaṇā*.

Why do we have the condition of *pūrvasya* 'in place of that which precedes'? So that this replacement does not apply to *a* which occurs after *k* in (*paṭu* + *ka*) + *ṬāP* = *paṭukā* 'clever' and (*mṛdu* + *ka*) + *ṬāP* = *mṛdukā* 'tender'.

Why do we have *a* replaced with *i*? Consider *naukā* 'boat' and *gokā* 'cow' where this replacement does not apply. For, there is no *a* before *k*.

Why is this specification of *a* made with a following *t* (*taparakaraṇa*). So that its reference could be limited to a short *a*. That is, to block this replacement in *rākā* and *dhākā* where there is no short *a*.

Why do we have the condition of *āpi* 'when *āP* follows'? What does *āpi* qualify? It qualifies *k*. But this interpretation will block *i* in *kāraka* + *ṬāP* where *k* is not immediately followed by *ṬāP*. That is, *k* and *ṬāP* occur intervened by *a*. Since such intervening vowels are always going to occur in between *k* and *ṬāP*, this rule will not find any scope of application. It is to save this rule from becoming vacuous that intervention (*vyavadhāna*) of one sound segment is considered non-intervention (*avyavadhāna*).

What is the significance of the condition of *asupaḥ* 'not after that which does not end in a *sUP*'? This rule will not apply if *āP* is used with a following *sUP*. Consider *bahuparivrājakā* of *bahuparivrājakā mathurā* 'the city of Mathurā which is full of wandering ascetics'. This *āP* occurs after *parivrājaka* which ends in a *sUP*. Remember that *asupaḥ* is interpreted as a negation of the *prasajya* type. A *paryudāsa* interpretation will yield the meaning: '*supo*' *nyo*' *sup* 'a non-*sUP* is one which is other than a *sUP*'. That is, when *ṬāP* follows something which is similar to, but other than, a *sUP*. This will cause replacement in *i* (*itva*) and the form will be: **bahuparivrājikā*. This negation will consider *bahuparivrājaka* as a unit which *ṬāP* follows and which is other than *parivrājaka* + *Jas*, a form ending in a *sUP*. A *prasajya* interpretation will rule out *itva* when *ṬāP* follows a form ending in a *sUP*. Note that *ṬāP* of *parivrājaka* + *ṬāP* occurs after *Jas* which has been deleted. This deleted *Jas* can be manipulated to cancel negation of *itva* in view of 1.1.63 *na lumtāṅgasya*. For, this operation of *itva* is not to be accomplished on an *aṅga* with reference to

deleted *Jas.* It is to be accomplished with reference to *ṬāP*, instead.

3. There are two *vārttika* proposals under this rule:

(*i*) The *a* before *k* is not replaced with *i* when *ṬāP* follows *māmaka* and *naraka*. Consider *māmikā* and *narikā*.

(*ii*) This rule does not apply to an *aṅga* which ends in affix *tyakaN* (5.2.34 *upādhibhyāṃ tyakan . . .*).

7.3.45 **न यासयोः**

na yāsayoḥ
/ na ϕ yāsayoḥ 6/2 = *yā ca sā ca* (*itar. dv.*) /
(*pratyasthāt kāt pūrvasya id āpi asupaḥ* #44)
'*yā, sā*' *ity etayor ikārādeśo na bhavati*
A short vowel, namely *i*, does not come in place of *a*, used before *k* within an affix relative to *yad* 'that which' and *tad* 'that', provided *āP*, when not used after a *sUP*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

yakā 'derivate of *yad* with *akAC* and *ṬāP*'
sakā 'derivate of *tad* with *akAC* and *ṬāP*'

1. A specification with *yā* and *sā* should not be accepted as *tantra* 'principal'. That is, it does not refer to nominative singular forms only. It should be accepted as making reference to forms of *yad* 'that which' and *tad* 'that' in general (*Kāś*: '*yāsā*' *iti nirdeśo*' *tantram, yattador upalakṣaṇam etat*). For, this negation of *i* is also desired in *yakāṃ yakām adhīmahe* and *takāṃ takām adhīmahe*, etc. Recall that *yā* 'she who . . .' and *sā* 'she' are nominative singular feminine forms of *yad* and *tad*, ending in *ṬāP*.

2. This rule negates *i* as a replacement for *ā* of *yā* and *sā* when *ṬāP* follows. This goes against obligatory provision of 7.3.44 *pratyayasthāt kāt. . . .* Our derivates *yakā* and *sakā* are derived with augment *akAC*, introduced before *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*) of *yā* and *sā*. Thus, *yak*(*akAC*) *ā* = *yakā* and *sak*(*akAC*) *ā* = *sakā*. Incidentally, *yā* and *sā* both involve a replacement in *a* for the final *d* of *yad* and *tad* (*tyadādyatva*; 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*). The *s*, as a replacement for *t* of *tad*, is gotten from 7.2.106 *tadoḥ saḥ. . . .*

3. Several *vārttika* proposals are made to also state this negation as follows:

(*i*) When a form ending in *tyakaN* (5.2.34 *upādhibhyāṃ tyakan . . .*) occurs before *ṬāP*. Thus, we get *upatyakā* 'area around foot of a mountain' and *adhityakā* 'upper area of a mountain' (*vt*: *yāsayor itvapratiṣedhe tyakana upasaṃkhyānam*).

(*ii*) When *pāvaka* 'fire' occurs before *ṬāP* in the Vedic. A corresponding classical usage will be *pāvikā* (*vt*: *pāvakādīnāṃ chandasy upasaṃkhyānam*).

(*iii*) When derivates denote benediction (*āśīḥ*; *vt*: *āśiṣi copasaṃkhyānam*)). Thus, *nand* + (*ṆvuL→aka*) + *ṬāP* = *nandakā* and *bhuvakā*.

(*iv*) When a following constituent is deleted (*vt*: *uttarapadalope copasaṃkhyānam*). Thus, *deva* (*datta→ϕ*) + *ka*)) + *ṬāP* = *devakā*/ *devadattikā* and *yajñakā*/*yajñadattikā*. Incidentally, affix *kaN* (5.3.76 *anukampāyām* . . .) is introduced with the signification of *anukampā* 'compassion'. The deletion of *datta* is made optional by a *vārttika* proposal (*vt*: *anajādau ca vibhāṣā* . . .; ad 5.3.83 *ṭhājādāv ūrdhvaṃ* . . .).

(*v*) When *kṣipaka* and *dhruvaka* occur before *ṬāP* (*vt*: *kṣipakādīnāṃ copasaṃkhyānam*). Thus, *kṣipakā* and *dhruvakā*.

(*vi*) When *tāraka* occurs before *ṬāP* and the signification is *jyotiṣ* 'luminary' (*vt*: *tārakā jyotiṣi upasaṃkhyānam*). Thus, (*tṝ* + (*ṆvuL→aka*)) + *ṬāP* = *tārakā*.

(*vii*) When *varṇakā* is to be derived in the sense of a fiber product (*tāntava*; *vt*: *varṇakā tāntava upasaṃkhyānam*).

(*viii*) When *vartakā* is derived with the signification of a bird in eastern usage (*vt*: *vartakā śakunau prācām upasaṃkhyānam*). Thus, (*varttaka* + *ṬāP*) = *varttakā*.

(*ix*) When *aṣṭakā* is derived with the signification of *pitṛdaivatya* 'a Vedic ritual' (*vt*: *aṣṭakā pitṛdaivatye*).

(*x*) When *sūtakā*, *putrakā* and *vṛndārikā* are to be derived with optional negation of *i* (*vt*: *vā sutakāputrakāvṛndārakāṇām upasaṃkhyānam*). Thus, *sūtakā* / *sūtikā*; *putrakā* / *putrikā* and *vṛndārakā* / *vṛndārikā*.

7.3.46 उदीचामातः स्थाने यकपूर्वायाः

udīcām ātaḥ sthāne yakapūrvāyāḥ
/*udīcām* 6/3 *ātaḥ* 6/1 *sthāne* 7/1 *yakapūrvāyāḥ* = *yaś ca kaś ca* (*dv.*); *tau pūrvau yasyāḥ* (*bv.* with int. *dv.*), *tasyāḥ*/
(*pratyasthāt kāt pūrvasya id āpi asupaḥ* #44 *na* #45)
udīcām ācāryāṇāṃ matena yakārapūrvāyāḥ kakārāpūrvāyāś cātaḥ sthāne yo' kāras tasyātaḥ sthāne ikārādeśo na bhavati
A short vowel, namely *i*, does not, in the opinion of northern grammarians, come in place of an *a* which replaces *ā*, used before *k* and *y* relative to an affix, provided *āP*, when not used after a *sUP*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

ibhyikā 'young female elephant'
ibhyakā 'ibidem'
kṣattriyikā 'young kṣatriya female'
kṣattriyakā 'ibidem'
caṭakikā 'young sparrow'

caṭakakā 'ibidem'
mūṣikikā 'a little mouse'
mūṣikakā 'ibidem'

1. The *a* which is here allowed this replacement in *i* is itself a replacement of *ā*. This, of course, is the opinion of northern grammarians. This *a* must occur as a replacement of *ā* before *y* and *k* relative to an affix. The word *udīcya* is here used to denote an option (*vikalpa*). That is, this *itva* does not apply obigatorily in Pāṇini's own opinion. Thus, *ibham arhati* = *ibha* + *ya* (5.1.66 *daṇḍādibhyo yat*); *ibhy*(*ā*→*a*) + *ka* = *ibhyaka* (5.3.70 *prāg ivāt kaḥ*; 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ*) and *ibhyaka* + *ṬāP* = *ibhyikā* / *ibhyakā*. Similar derivational proposals are available for *kṣatriyikā* / *kṣatriyakā*; *caṭakikā* / *caṭakakā*; *mūṣikikā*/ *mūṣakakā*.

2. Why do we have the condition of an *a* which replaces *ā*? So that we do not get the obligatory *i*, only in *sāṅkāśye bhavā* = *sāṃkāśyikā* 'born in Sākāśya', where *a* before *k* is not a replacement of *ā*.

Why do we have to use *sthāne* 'in place of' when the genitive of *ātaḥ* 'in place of *ā*' itself can denote it? The word *sthāne* is used so that we could clearly understand the substituendum (*sthānī*). Thus, *ātaḥ* qualifies *ataḥ*, with *sthāne* clearly specifying '*aT* which, in turn, comes in place of *ā* used in the genitive'.

Why do we have the condition of *yakapūrvāyāḥ* 'in place of that which occurs before *y* and *k*'? So that this replacement in *i* (*itva*) could apply obligatorily in *aśvikā*.

Why is this specification made in the feminine with *yakapūrvāyāḥ*, as against neuter? So that the sense of feminine of *ā* which is replaced with *a* can be understood. This is why we do not get an optional *itva* in *śubhaṃ yāti* = *śubhaṃyāḥ* and *śubhaṃyikā*; *bhadraṃyāḥ* and *bhadraṃyikā*, etc.

3. A *vārttika* proposal is also made to negate the negation of *itva* where *ā*→*a* occurs before a root-final *y* and *k*. This, obligatorily, restores *itva* in *sunayikā*, *suśayikā*, *supākikā* and *suśokikā*.

7.3.47 भस्त्रैषाजाज्ञाद्वास्वा नञ्पूर्वाणामपि

bhastraiṣājājñādvāsvā nañpūrvāṇām api
/ *bhastrā-eṣā-ajā-jñā-dvā-svāḥ* 1/3 (used with the signification of 6/3; *itar. dv.*); *nañ-pūrvāṇām* 6/3 = *nañ pūrvo yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣām*; *api* ϕ/
(*pratyasthāt kāt pūrvasya id āpi asupaḥ* #44 *na* #45 *udīcām ātaḥ sthāne* #46)
'*bhastrā, eṣā, ajā, jñā, dvā, svā*' *eṣām ātaḥ sthāne yo' kāras tasya itvaṃ na bhavaty udīcām ācāryāṇāṃ matena*
A replacement in short *i*, in the opinion of northern grammarians, does not come in place of an *a* which replaces *ā* of *bhastrā, eṣā, ajā, jñā, dvā* and *svā*, irrespective of whether they are used in construction after *naÑ*.

EXAMPLES:

bhastrakā 'she who has a leather bag for carrying water'
bhastrikā 'ibidem'
abhastrakā 'she who does not have a leather bag for carrying water'
abhastrikā 'ibidem'
eṣakā 'desirous'
eṣikā 'ibidem'
ajakā 'she who has a goat'
ajikā 'ibidem'
anajakā 'she who does not have a goat'
anajikā 'ibidem'
jñakā 'she who knows'
jñikā 'ibidem'
ajñakā 'she who does not know'
ajñikā 'ibidem'
dvake 'she who has control over two'
dvike 'ibidem'
svakā 'she who has control over herself'
svikā 'ibidem'
asvakā 'she who does not have control over herself'
asvikā 'ibidem'

1. Note that this replacement in *i* (*itva*) does not apply in the opinion of northern grammarians. It still applies in the opinion of Pāṇini. Thus, we get *bhastrakā* and *bhastrikā*; *abhastrakā* and *abhastrikā*. Note further that *bhastrā* does not have a corresponding masculine form. Our following rule would have thus negated this replacement in *i* (*itva*). An inclusion of *bhastrā* in this rule is then made to restrict it to its usage as a compound constituent termed *upasarjana* 'secondary'. Thus, we get *avidyamānā bhastrā yasya = abhastraḥ* where *bhastrā* is a secondary constituent. A corresponding derivate of this *bahuvrīhi*, in feminine with *ṬāP*, will be: *abhastrā*. The assignment of the term *upasarjana* to *bhastrā* leads to shortening (*hrasva*; 1.2.48 *gostriyor upasarjanasya*) of the final *ā* of *bhastrā* in deriving *abhastraḥ*. The feminine affix *ṬāP*, which is introduced after the *bahuvrīhi* compound *abhastra* to derive *abahstrā*, parallel to *avidyamānā bhastrā yasyāḥ*, goes through shortening of 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ*. This happens when we introduce affix *ka* to derive *abhastrakā*, or *abhastrikā*, with optional replacement in *i* (*itva*).

Kāśikā clearly states that 'the short *a* in place of *ṬāP* which occurs after masculine *abhastra* is brought about by 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ*; this *a*-replacement of *ā* does not occur in place of a form which does not have a masculine counterpart' (*bhāṣitpuṃskād yaṣ ṭāb utpadyate tasya ke' ṇaḥ iti yo hrasvaḥ nāsāv abhāṣitpuṃskād vihitasyātaḥ sthāne bhavati*). This statement shows how the next rule cannot account for negation of *itva* in a *bahuvrīhi* compound used

with *ka* (5.3.85 *alpe*) to derive *abhastrikā* and *abhastrakā* with *ṬāP*, parallel to *avidyamānā bhastrā yasyāḥ sā*. Thus, (*abhastrā→a*) + *ka*) + *ṬāP* = *abhastrikā / abhastrakā*. We similarly get *ajā/ ajikā/ ajakā*; *anajā/ anajikā / anajakā*; and (*jñ*(*ā→i*)) + *ka*)) + *ṬāP*)) =*jñikā / jñakā*; *ajñikā / ajñakā*.

We get only one form *aneṣakā*, because of a lack of replacement in (*itva*) in (*naÑ* + *sU*) + (*eta*(*d→akAC*) *d* + *sU*)) *ṬāP*))). Since affix *ṬāP* here occurs after *sU*, whether or not a *nañ-tatpuruṣa* is formed before *akAC*, *asupaḥ* negates *itva*. We similarly get a single obligatory form *advake* with *dvi* 'two'. Recall here that a pronominal, for example *sva*, is not termed *sarvanāman* 'pronominal' when the denotatum is *jñāti* 'clansman' and *dhana* 'property'. We will get two forms *svikā* and *svakā*. A negative with affix *ka* will similarly yield two derivates of *ṬāP*: *asvikā* and *asvakā*.

This replacement in *i* (*itva*) of the northerners is available whether *naÑ* is used as a preceding constituent. Thus, *asvakā* and *asvikā*. The word *api* 'also, even' makes it possible for *itva* to also apply when something other than *naÑ* precedes, or does not precede at all. Thus, we get *nirbhastrikā / nirbhastrakā*; *bahubhastrikā / bahubhastrakā*. But we also get *svikā* and *svakā*. The phrase *nañpūrvāṇām api* 'also of those which are used with (or without) a preceding *naÑ*' is thus used in this rule for making things clearer to slow-wits (*mandabuddhi-pratipatyartham*).

PM ad *Kāś* presents a detailed discussion on whether *itva* applies to the same *ā* which goes through shortening. This discussion, especially, concerns interaction between *akAC* and *ṬāP*, on the one hand, and between *sUP* and *naÑ* on the other. Thus,

> *atrātaḥ sthāna ity etat svaśabdasya viśeṣaṇam/*
> *sambhavavyabhicārau hi tatra staḥ kākacoḥ satoḥ//*
> *dvyetadoḥ sambhavo nāsti nānyatra vyabhicārītā/*
> *sarvanāmnaḥ svaśabdasya tenāyaṃ vidhir bhavet//*
> 'from here on, *sthāne* 'in place of' is considered a qualifier to the word *sva*; given the presence of *ka* and *akAC*, this qualifier meaning will be present, or there will be a lack thereof; these both are not at all possible; we do not find absence, elsewhere; this operation, therefore, is applicable relative to the pronominal word *sva*'

7.3.48 अभाषितपुंस्काच्च

abhāṣitapuṃskāc ca
/ abhāṣitapuṃskāt 5/1 = *bhāṣitaḥ pumān yena* = *bhāṣitapuṃskaḥ* (*bv.*); *na bhāṣitapuṃskaḥ* (*nañ.* with int. *bv.*), *tasmāt*; *ca* ϕ/
(*pratyasthāt kāt pūrvasya id āpi asupaḥ* #44 *na* #45 *udīcām ātaḥ sthāne* #46 *nañpūrvāṇām api* #47)
abhāṣitapuṃskād vihitasyātaḥ sthāne yo' kāras tasyodīcām ācāryāṇāṃ matena ikārādeśo na bhavati

A replacement in short *i* does not, in the opinion of northern grammarians, come in place of an *a* which replaces *ā*, used before *k* of an affix of items which do not have a corresponding denotation of a male (*abhāṣitapuṃska*), irrespective of whether they are used in construction after *naÑ*.

EXAMPLES:

khaṭvakā 'she who has a cot'
khaṭvikā 'ibidem'
akhaṭvakā 'she who does not have a cot'
akhaṭvikā 'ibidem'
paramakhaṭvakā 'she who has the best cot'
paramakhaṭvikā 'ibidem'

1. Note that *khaṭvā* 'cot' is obligatorily feminine. That is, it does not have a corresponding masculine (*abhāṣitapuṃska*) form. The forms *khaṭvakā* and *khaṭvikā* are derived with affix *ka* introduced after *khaṭvā*. Rule 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ* orders shortening of the final *ā* of *khaṭvā* before *ka*. Affix *ṬāP* is then introduced to derive final bases where optional replacement in *i* (*itva*) also applies before *ka*. Affixal operations relative to *ka* and *itva* are also seen in *akhaṭvakā* and *akhaṭvikā*, where *akhaṭvā* is a negative (*nañ*) *tatpuruṣa* compound, paraphrased as *na khaṭvā*. Examples such as *paramakhaṭvakā* 'excellent cot' and *paramakhaṭvikā* involve the formation of a *karmadhāraya* compound (2.1.61 *sanmahat . . .*), paraphrased as *paramā cāsau khaṭvā ca* 'that which is excellent, and is also a cot'.

2. It is stated that this rule must apply with optional *i*-replacement (*itva*) when shortening applies before affix *kaP* (5.4.154 *śeṣād vibhāṣā*), introduced relative to a *bahuvrīhi* compound with no corresponding masculine. For, this shortening applies in place of an *ā* which occurs as part of a base with no corresponding masculine (*abhāṣitapuṃska*). Thus, we get two forms with optional replacement in *i*: *na khaṭvā = akhaṭvā; avidyamānā khaṭvā' syāḥ = akhaṭvakā / akhaṭvikā* 'she whose there is no cot'. The word *khaṭvā*, of *akhaṭvā* after which affix *ka* is introduced, is uniquely feminine. This same also applies to *paramakhaṭvakā* and *paramakhaṭvikā*, where *ka* is introduced after the *karmadhāraya* compound *paramakhaṭvā*, paraphrased as *paramā cāsau khaṭvā ca* 'that which is best, and is also a cot'. Here again, *paramakhaṭvā* is uniquely feminine. That is, in *paramakhaṭvakā* and *paramakhaṭvikā*, shortening of *ā* of *khaṭvā* (to *khaṭva*) has applied to a base which does not have a corresponding masculine. Consequently, optional replacement in *i* must apply. As against this, when shortening applies to an *ā* introduced after a base with a corresponding masculine, this optional *itva* must be blocked. Thus, *avidyamānā khaṭvā asyāḥ = akhaṭvā; alpā akhaṭvā = akhaṭvikā*. We cannot get optional *i*-replacement of this rule because the *ā* which goes through shortening in these examples has been introduced after a *bahuvrīhi* with a

corresponding masculine. We also get this same situation in *atikrāntā khaṭvām = akhaṭvā* 'she who has excelled . . .'; *alpā atikhaṭvā = atikhaṭvikā*. Here again, we find *ā* after that which has a corresponding masculine.

7.3.49 आदाचार्याणाम्

ād ācāryāṇām
/āt 5/1 *ācāryāṇām* 6/3/
(*pratyasthāt kāt pūrvasya id āpi asupaḥ* #44 *na* #45 *udīcām ātaḥ sthāne* #46 *nañpūrvāṇām api* #47 *abhāṣitapuṃskāt* #48)
abhāṣitapuṃskād ātaḥ sthāne yo' kāras tasyācāryāṇāṃ ākārādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ā*, in the opinion of all other grammarians, comes in place of an *a* which replaces *ā*, used before *k* of an affix of items which do not have a corresponding denotation of a male (*abhāṣitapuṃska*), irrespective of whether they are used in construction after *naÑ*.

EXAMPLES:

khaṭvākā
akhaṭvākā
paramakhaṭvākā

1. Note that the preceding rule negates *i*-replacement for an *a* which, in turn, is a replacement of *ā* introduced after a base not having a corresponding masculine. But since this negation is made in the opinion of northern grammarians, it becomes optional. That is, in the opinion of other grammarians, this *i*-replacement will apply, obligatorily. Recall also that the *a* which is here subjected to *i*-replacement, or its negation, is itself a short counterpart of *ā* ordered by rule 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ*. Our present rule introduces *ā*, as against *i* of the earlier rule made optional by way of negation in the opinion of northern grammarians. That is, what should have been *a* or *i*, is here replaced with *ā*. In this sense, it is an exception to the preceding rule. Of course, in the opinion of grammarians other than northerners. But since this replacement in *ā* goes against the *a* ordered by 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ*, this rule also becomes an exception to 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ* (*PM*: *itvāpavādo' yaṃ yogaḥ*; '*ke' ṇaḥ' iti hrasvāpavādaś ca*). One must also remember that all these proposals, i.e., replacement in *i* (7.3.44 *pratyayasthāt kātpūrvasyātaḥ* . . .), negation of *i* by northern grammarians in favor of retention of *a* (7.3.48 *abhāṣitapuṃskāc ca*), and replacement in *ā* against retention option of *a* (7.4.49 *ācāryāṇām*), are made in connection with an *ā* introduced after a base with no corresponding masculine. Consequently, we get three forms, exclusively, in the context of a base which does not have a corresponding masculine. Thus, *akhaṭvakā / akhaṭvikā / akhaṭvākā* (*PM*: *sarvathā abhāṣitapuṃskeṣu trairūpyam*).

Questions have also been raised against interpretation of the word *ācārya* 'preceptor' of *ācāryāṇām*. Since a reference to northern grammarians is

already made, these grammarians, here referred to in the plural by *ācāryāṇām*, must be non-northerns. But others say that *ācārya* refers to Pāṇini's own teacher, used in the plural for showing respect (*PM*: *apara āha: ācāryasya pāṇiner ya ācāryaḥ sa ihācāryaḥ*).

7.3.50 **ठस्येकः**

ṭhasyekaḥ
/ṭhasya 7/1 *ikaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
aṅgasya nimittaṃ yaṣ ṭhaḥ tasya pratyayaṭhasya ika ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ika* comes in place of *ṭha* of an affix which, when follows, conditions assignment of the term *aṅga*.

EXAMPLES:

ākṣikaḥ 'he who plays with die'
śālālikaḥ 'he who plays with ivory sticks'
lāvaṇikaḥ 'he whose item for sale is salt'

1. There could be two possible interpretations of the word-forms *ṭha* and *ika*. Shall we accept the *ṭha* of *ṭhasya*, simply as consonantal *ṭh* (*varṇa-mātra*), or as *ṭha*, a sequence (*saṃghāta*) with *a*? If we accept the first, we cannot justify the genitive specification with *ṭhasya* 'in place of *ṭha*'. If we accept the other, we find over-application (*atiprasaṅga*) in the *Uṇādi*-derivate (108: *kaṇeṣ ṭhaḥ*) *kaṇṭhaḥ*. This over-application, however, can be blocked by the *bāhulaka* 'variously' provision of 3.3.1 *uṇādayo bahulam*. Accepting *ṭh* of *ṭhasya*, simply as a consonant (*varṇa*), will occasion *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating a sound as what it replaced', thereby resulting in *ka*, as a replacement (7.3.51 *isusuktāntāt kaḥ*) for *ika*, which replaces *ṭh* in *māthitikaḥ*. Given, *mathita* + (*ṭha*→*ika*), rule 6.4.148 *yasyeti ca* deletes the *aṅga*-final *a* of *mathita*. Rule 1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo' nalvidhau* may then be invoked to, thereby, yield *ka* as a replacement for *ika*, viewed as *ṭha*. This will produce **māthitkaḥ*, a wrong form.

It is stated that an operation applicable to two relata cannot be invoked to impair their relationship. The *t* of *mathit* is brought about under the condition of a following vowel-initial *ika*. The *t*-final status of *mathit* cannot be accepted as destroying the vowel-initial status of the affix (*PŚ* 86: *sannipāta-lakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tadvighātasya*). This then blocks the replacement in *ka*. This *ka* can also be blocked if *sthānivadbhāva* is invoked by 1.1.57 *acaḥ parasmin pūrvavidhau*. That is, when *pūrvavidhau* 'operation on what precedes . . .' is interpreted as a *pañcamī-tatpuruṣa* compound paraphrased as *pūrvasmād uttarasya vidhau* 'when an operation on what follows, relative to what precedes, is to be performed'. This will remove the *t*-final status and, consequently, will block *ka*.

Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kāś*) states that *tadantavidhi* 'treating *x* as also that

which ends in *x*' can be accepted as operative in accepting a specification with sound (*varṇa-grahaṇa*). But since *anta* in 7.3.35 *isuktāntāt* . . . is used to emphasize *t*-final status in *upadeśa*, the *t*-final status which results out of the application of 6.4.148 *yasyeti ca* cannot form the basis for a replacement in *ka*. That is, *ṭh* and *ik* alone are given as *sthānī* 'that which is replaced' and *ādeśa* 'that which replaces'. The *a* of these forms, i.e., *ṭha* and *ika*, is then treated as given for 'ease of articulation' (*uccāraṇārtha*). If this position is accepted then it will also apply to affixes *ḍhaK*, etc., where *a* is not intended for ease of articulation. If *ṭha* as a whole is accepted as the affix to be replaced, this same interpretation must also apply to *ika*, the replacement. The first interpretation will make this replacement available to the final *ṭh* of verbal root *paṭh* in *paṭhitā*, etc. The second interpretation will make it apply to affix *aṭhaC* (5.2.35 *karmaṇi ghaṭo' ṭhac*) in *karmaṭha* 'diligent'. It is to correct problems encountered in either of these interpretations that the genitive of *ṭhasya* is interpreted as denoting *nimitta-sambandha* 'cause or condition relationship' and not the *avayava-sambandha* 'part (of a whole) relationship'. Thus, *ṭhasya* means '. . . *ṭha* which conditions assignment of the term *aṅga*'. Both of these interpretations are correct, depending on how problems relative to them are resolved. The affix is generally accepted as *ṭha* where *a* is not used for articulation.

Our first two examples, i.e., *ākṣikaḥ* and *śālālikaḥ*, are derivates of *ṭhaK* (4.4.1 *prāg vahateṣ ṭhak*), introduced after *akṣa* + *bhis* and *śalākā* + *bhis*, paraphrased as *akṣair dīvyati* 'plays with dice' and *śalākābhir dīvyati* 'plays with ivory sticks'. Operations such as replacement in *ika*, assignment of the term *bha*, and deletion of *a* and *ā*, are then performed to obtain final forms. Our last example, i.e., *lāvaṇikaḥ* 'he whose item of sale is salt', is a derivate of *ṭhaÑ* (4.4.52 *lavaṇāṭ ṭhañ*), paraphrased as *lavaṇaṃ paṇyam asya*.

7.3.51 इसुसुक्तान्तात् कः

isusuktāntāt kaḥ
/isusuktāntāt 5/1 = *is ca us ca uk ca tas ca* (*dv.*); *isusuktam ante yasya saḥ* (*bv.*), *tasmāt*; *kaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṭhasya* #50)
'*is, us*' *ity evamantānām ugantānāṃ tāntānāṃ cāṅgānām uttarasya ṭhasya* '*ka*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *ka* comes in place of *ṭha* which occurs after an *aṅga* terminating in *is*, *us*, *uK* and *t*.

EXAMPLES:

sārpiṣkaḥ 'he whose item for sale is ghee'
dhānuṣkaḥ 'he whose weapon is a bow'
yājuṣkaḥ 'he who enjoys sacrificial chants'

naiṣādakarṣukaḥ 'he who was born in Niṣādakarṣū'
śābarajambukaḥ 'he who was born in Śābarajambū'
mātṛkam 'that which is inherited from mother'
paitṛkam 'that which is inherited from father'
audaśvitkaḥ 'butter-milk'
śākṛtkaḥ 'a calf'

1. This rule offers *ka* as a replacement for *ṭha*, when the same occurs after some specified bases termed *aṅga*. We get *sārpiṣka*, from *sarpis* + *sU* + *ṭhaK* (4.4.51 *tad asya paṇyam*), where *ka* replaces *ṭha*. We similarly get *dhānuṣka* and *yājuṣka*, from *dhanus* + *Ṭā* + *ṭhaK* and *yajus* + *Ṭā* + *ṭhaK* (4.4.2 *tena dīvyati* . . .), where *ka* also replaces *ṭha*. The final *s* of these bases goes through *rutva-visarga* and is, subsequently, replaced with *ṣ* (8.4.39 *iṇaḥ ṣaḥ*).

Our next two examples, i.e., *naiṣādakarṣuka* and *śābarajambuka*, derive from *niṣādakarṣū* + *Ṅi* + *ṭhaÑ* and *śabarajambū* + *Ṅi* + *ṭhaÑ* (4.2.119 *or deśe ṭhañ*), where *ṭhaÑ* denotes the residual sense (*śaiṣika*) of *tatra jātaḥ* 'born in there', etc. These are examples where the *aṅga* ends in *uK*. The *aṅga*-final *ū* is replaced with its short counterpart by 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ*. Affix *ṭhaÑ* of *mātṛka* and *paitṛka*, where *mātṛ* and *pitṛ* constitute an *aṅga* ending in *ṛ*, is introduced by 4.3.37 *ṛtaṣ ṭhañ* with the signification of *tata āgataḥ* 'arrived (received) from there'. Our final two derivates involve bases which end in *t*. The first, *udaśvit* + *Ṅi* + *ṭhaK* = *audaśvitka*, receives *ṭhaK* with the signification of 4.2.15 *saṃskṛtaṃ bhakṣāḥ*. The second, *śakṛt* + *Ṭā* + *ṭhaK*, receives its *ṭhaK* with the signification of 4.4.22 *saṃsṛṣṭe* 'mixed with'.

2. Why do we not get this replacement in *āśiṣā carati* = *āśiṣikaḥ* and *uṣā carati* = *auṣikaḥ*? Because the bases, i.e., *āśiṣ* ← *āÑ* + *śās* and *uṣ* ← *vas*, which here qualify to serve as an *aṅga* are not originally given as such. They result out of rule applications (*lākṣaṇika*), instead. That is, they are not what the rule requires, via specific enumeration, of bases (*pratipadokta*). For example, *us* of *uṣā* results from *samprasāraṇa* of *vas*.

3. A proposal is also made here to allow *ka* after *doṣa* to derive *dorbhyāṃ carati* = *dauṣkaḥ*.

7.3.52 चजोः कु घिण्यतोः

cajoḥ ku ghiṇyatoḥ
/ *cajoḥ* 6/2 = *caś ca jaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ku* 1/1 *ghiṇyatoḥ* 7/2 = *gh it yasya* (*bv.*); *ghit ca ṇyac ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
cakārajakārayoḥ kavargādeśo bhavati ghiti ṇyati ca pratyaye parataḥ
The final *c* and *j* of an *aṅga* are replaced with their corresponding sounds denoted by *kU* 'consonants of *k*-series', when an affix marked with *GH* as an *it*, or one constituted by *ṆyaT*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

pākaḥ 'cooking'
tyāgaḥ 'renunciation'
rāgaḥ 'attachment, color'
pākyam 'that which is cooked'
vākyam 'that which is said; a sentence'

1. This rule allows *c* and *j* to be replaced with *k* and *g*, respectively. Of course, when an affix marked with *GH* as an *it*, or one constituted by *ṆyaT*, follows. Refer to the appendix under rule 1.1.1 *vṛddhir ādaic* for derivational details of examples with *vṛddhi*. Affix *ṆyaT*, of *pākyam* and *vācyam*, is introduced after *pac* and *vac* by 3.1.124 *ṛhalor yat*.

2. Can we invoke *yathāsaṃkhya* 'assignment of equivalency in the order of enumeration of elements', thereby to replace *c* with *k*, only before an affix marked with *GH*, and *j* with *g*, only before affix *ṆyaT*? No. Commentators note that *yathāsaṃkhya* is not accepted here. The *nipātana* provision of no replacement in *j* before *GHaÑ* serves as a *jñāpaka* 'indicator' (7.3.61 *bhujanyubjau pāṇyupatāpayoḥ*, 7.3.62 *prayājānuyājau yajñāṅge*). Some also cite 4.2.1 *tena raktaṃ rāgāt* as an indicator for no *yathāsaṃkhya*.

7.3.53 न्यङ्क्वादीनां च

nyaṅkvādīnāṃ ca
/ nyaṅkvādīnām 6/3 = *nyaṅkur ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*) *te, teṣām; ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ ku* #52)
'*nyaṅku*' *ity evamādīnāṃ kavargādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *kU* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* enumerated in the list headed by *nyaṅku* 'deer', when an affix marked with *GH* as an *it*, or one constituted by *ṆyaT*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

nyaṅkuḥ 'a deer'
madguḥ 'an acquatic bird'
bhṛguḥ 'name of a mythological race'
dūrepākaḥ 'cooking at a distance'
phalepākaḥ 'ripening of fruits on trees'
māṃsapākaḥ 'cooking of meat'
kapotapākaḥ 'cooking of pigeon meat'

1. This rule offers *kU*-replacements to items listed in the the group of nominal stems headed by *nyaṅku* (*nyaṅkvādi*). Thus, (*ni-añc* + *u*) → (*ni-añk* + *u*) → *n*(*i*→*y*) *a*(*ñ*→*ṅ*) *ku* = *nyaṅku*, where we introduce affix *u* (*Uṇādi*: I.17: *nāvañceḥ*). A replacement in *k*, followed by *yaṆ*, and *parasavarṇa* 'a single replacement homogeneous with what follows in a vocalic sequence', etc., of

ñ (8.4.57 *anusvārasya . . .*), produces desired forms. We similarly derive *masj* + *u* = *madgu*, with the *Uṇādi* affix *u* (I.7: *mṛśītācarit . . .*), through a replacement in *g* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*), via *k*. Thus, *mas*(*j*→*k*) + *u* → *ma*(*s*→*d*) (*k*→*g*) + *u* = *madgu*. A similar affix *u* (*Uṇādi*: I.28: *pathimradibhrasjāṃ salopaś ca*) is also introduced after *bhrasj* 'to roast' to derive *bhṛgu*, where *s* is deleted.

Derivates such as *dūre pacyate svayam eva* = *dūrepākaḥ* 'that which ripens at a distance' and *phale pacyate* = *phalepākaḥ* 'that which ripens in fruition', involve introduction of affix *aC* (3.1.134 *nandigrahi . . .*). These compounds retain their locative (6.3.14 *tatpuruṣe kṛti bahulam*) and receive *vṛddhi* of their penultimate (*upadhā*) vowels, via *nipātana*. Some also read *kṣaṇepākaḥ* 'that which ripens quickly' as an example. The last two examples, i.e., *māṃsapāka* 'meat-cooking' and *kapotapāka* 'pigeon-cooking', have *pāka* 'cooking' as a following constituent where *pac* reecives affix *aṆ* under the cooccurrence condition of *māṃsa* + *am* and *kapota* + *am* (3.2.1 *karmaṇy aṇ*).

7.3.54 हो हन्तेर्ञ्णिन्नेषु

ho hanter ñṇinneṣu

/haḥ 6/1 *hanteḥ* 6/1 *ñṇinneṣu* 7/3 = *ñaś ca ṇaś ca* = *ñṇau* (*itar. dv.*), *ñṇau itau yeṣāṃ te* (*bv.* with int. *dv.*); *ñṇitaś ca naś ca* = *ñinnāḥ* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu/*

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ku* #52)

hanter hakārasya kavargādeśo bhavati ñiti ṇiti pratyaye parato nakāre ca

A replacement in *kU* comes in place of *h* of an *aṅga*, namely *han* 'to harm, kill', when an affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ*, or simply *N*, as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

ghātayati '. . . kills'
ghātakaḥ 'killer'
sādhughātī 'killer of the righteous'
ghātaṅghātam 'killing over and over again'
ghāto vartate 'there is killing going on'
ghnanti 'they are killing . . .'
ghnantu 'let them kill'
aghnan 'they killed (*LUṄ*)

1. This rule replaces *h* with *gh*, its corresponding sound denoted by *kU*, when *n*, or an affix marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ*, follows. Refer to my notes under 7.3.32 *hanas . . .* for most derivational details. The *a* of *gh*(*a*→ϕ) *n* + *anti* is deleted by 6.4.98 *gamahan. . . .* Thus, (*h*→*gh*) *n* + (*a*→ϕ) *nti* = *ghnanti*. Similar applications are also witnessed in other examples. Derivates of *LOṬ* have their final *i* replaced with *u* by 3.4.86 *eruḥ*. This *i*, however, is deleted in examples of *LAṄ*, i.e., *aghnan*, etc. (3.4.100 *itaś ca*).

2. Why do we have to explicitly specify *h*? So that this replacement could be blocked from applying to the final *n* of *han* 'to kill', in view of 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya.*

Why should this *h* must be the *h* of *han*? So that we do not get this replacement in place of *h* of *pra-hṛ* + *GHaÑ* = *prahāra* 'attack' and *pra- hṛ* + *ṆvuL* = *prahāraka* 'attacker'.

3. Affixes *Ñit* and *Ṇit* are used as qualifiers to *han.* The *n* is similarly used as a qualifier to *h.* Note that this rule will not find any scope of application when *h* and *n* remain intervened. More directly, this rule cannot apply to replace *h* with *gh,* when an intervening sound is brought, via *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating a replacement sound as what it replaced'. Commentators state that this intervention is not acceptable. They, however, accept such interventions if the intervening item is necessary for desired results and also happens to be an original part of *han.* Thus, the *an* of *han* intervenes between *h* and *aka* in deriving *ghātaka.* This intervention should be accepted for replacing *h* with *gh* since *an* is part of the root. But consider *hananam icchati = hananīyati* 'wishes for killing' where intervention of *anīya* cannot be accepted.

7.3.55 अभ्यासाच्च

abhyāsāc ca
/abhyāsāt 5/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ku* #52 *ho hanteḥ* #53)
abhyāsād uttarasya hanter hakārasya kavargādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *kU* comes in place of *h* of an *aṅga,* namely *han,* even when the same occurs after that which is termed an *abhyāsa* 'reduplicated syllable (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*).

EXAMPLES:

jighāṃsati '. . . wishes to kill'
jaṅghanyate '. . . kills over and over again'
ahaṃ jaghana 'I killed'

1. This rule allows a replacement in *gh* when *han* occurs after an *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*). Consider *jighāṃsati,* a derivate of (*han* + *saN*) + (*LAṬ→tiP*), where the penultimate (*upadhā*) vowel of *han* is replaced with its long counterpart (6.4.16 *ajjhanagamāṃ sani*). Doubling (*dvitva*) and operations relative to *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*) apply on *ha* + *hān* + *sa.* The first *h* is replaced with *j* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *abhyāse car ca*), via *jh* (*cutva*; 7.4.62 *kuhoś cuḥ*). Thus, (*h→jh→j*) *a* + *hān* + *saN* → *j*(*a→i*) + *hān* + *sa* = *jihān* + *sa,* where *a* of *ja* is replaced with *i* (7.4.79 *sany ataḥ*). Our present rule applies to *jihān* + *sa* to replace *h* with *gh.* The *n* is replaced with *anusvāra* to produce *jighāṃsa,* a derived verbal root (3.1.32 *sanādyantā dhātavaḥ*) after which (*LAṬ→tiP*) can be introduced.

Similar rules apply in deriving *jaṅghanyate*, from (*han* + *yaṄ*) + (*LAṬ*→*te*)), where there is no *vṛddhi* of the penultimate (*upadhā*), but where augment *nUK* is introduced by 7.4.85 *nug ato' nunāsikāntasya*. The *jaghan* of *ahaṃ jaghan* is a derivate of *LIṬ* where *miP*-replacement of *LIṬ* is replaced with *ṆaL* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānām . . .*). The *kutva* 'replacement in a consonant of *k*-series' of this rule applies when *ṆaL* is optionally not treated as marked with *Ṇ* as an *it* (7.1.91 *ṇal uttamo vā*). Acceptance of a *Ṇit*-status would have enabled the preceding rule to accomplish replacement in a consonant denoted by *kU* (*kutva*).

2. Note that this *kutva* applies to *h* which occurs after the *abhyāsa* of *han* termed an *aṅga*. Of course, when the affix which conditions assignment of the term *aṅga* follows (*Kāś: abhyāsanimitte pratyaye hanter aṅgasya yo' bhyāsas tasmād evaitat kutvam*). This is why *kutva* is blocked in *hananīyitum icchati* = *jihananīyiṣati*, a derivate of (*hananīya* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*. For, it is *hananīya*, and not *han*, which is termed an *aṅga*. The term *aṅga* applies to *han* before *LyuṬ*.

7.3.56 हेरचडि

her acaṅi
/*heḥ* 6/1 *acaṅi* 7/1 = *na caṅ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ku* #52 *haḥ* #54 *abhyāsāt* #55)
hinoter hakārasyābhyāsād uttarasya kavargādeśo bhavati acaṅi
A replacement in *kU* comes in place of *h* of an *aṅga*, namely *hi* 'to go, incite', when an affix other than *CaṄ* (*acaṅi*; 3.1.48 *ṇiśri . . .*) follows.

EXAMPLES:

prajighīṣati 'third singular active derivate of (*pra-hi* + *saN*) = *prajighīṣa* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*)'
prajeghīyate 'third singular active derivate of (*pra-hi* + *yaṄ*) + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*))'
prajighāya 'a derivate of *pra*(*hi* + (*LIṬ*→*tiP*→*ṆaL*))'

1. This rule allows *h* of verbal root *hi*(*noti*) to be replaced with *gh* when an affix other than *CaṄ* (3.1.47 *ṇiśri . . .*) follows. Consider (*pra-hi* + *saN*) + *LAṬ* → *prajighīṣati*, where 7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe . . .* negates introduction of augment *iṬ* and 1.2.9 *iko jhal* negates *guṇa*, because *saN* is here treated as marked with *K* as an *it*. The long *ī*, of *pra-h*(*i*→*ī*) + *sa*, is gotten, via application of 6.4.16 *ajjhanagamāṃ sani*. Other operations, i.e., replacement in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*), doubling (*dvitva*) and *abhyāsa* 'reduplicated syllable', remain similar to many examples discussed. Our next example, i.e., (*pra-hi* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*, has the short of *hi* replaced with its long counterpart by 7.4.25 *akṛtsārvadhātu. . . .* The reduplicated syllable (*abhyāsa*) receives a *guṇa*-replacement by 7.4.82 *guṇo yaṅlukoḥ*. The *vṛddhi* and *āy*-replacements in (*pra-hi* + *yaṄ*) = *prajighāya* + (*LIṬ* →*tiP*→*ṆaL*)) is conditioned by *ṆaL*, a replacement of *LIṬ* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānām . . .*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *acaṅi* 'when an affix other than *CaṄ* follows', when this rule will not apply, anyway. That is, given (*pra-hi* + *ṆiC*) + *CaṄ* + *LUṬ*)), *hi* can be termed an *aṅga* before *ṆiC*, followed by *CaṄ* which conditions the *abhyāsa*. The condition of *acaṅi* is stated here to indicate that, elsewhere, in contexts other than those of *CaṄ*, *kutva* 'replacement in a consonant of *k*-series' applies to a form of *hi*, inclusive of *ṆiC*. Consider (*pra-hi* + *ṆiC* → *prahāyi*) + *saN*)) + *LAṬ*))) = *prajighāyayiṣati* 'wishes to have someone killed' where *kutva* applies after doubling, etc. If the condition of *acaṅi* is not stated, *prahāyi* would be treated as the *aṅga*, and *kutva* of *hi* would be blocked.

7.3.57 सन्लिटोर्जे:

sanliṭor jeḥ
/san-liṭoḥ 7/2 (*itar. dv.*); *jeḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ku* #52 *abhyāsāt* #55)
sani liṭi ca pratyaye jer aṅgasya yo' bhyāsas tasmād uttarasya kavargādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *kU* comes in place of *j* of *ji* 'to win' when occurring after the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga*, provided affixes *saN* and *LIṬ* followed.

EXAMPLES:

jigīṣati 'active derivate of (*ji* + *saN*) = *jigīsa* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*))'
jigāya 'a derivate of *ji* + *ṆiC* with (*LIṬ*→*tiP*→*ṆaL*)'

1. This rule allows a replacement in *ku* after the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by *ji*. Of course, when *saN* and *LIṬ* follow. Thus, consider *jetum icchati* = (*ji* + *saN*→*jig*(*i*→*ī*) *sa* + (*LAṬ* →*tiP*)) = *jigī*(*s*→*ṣ*) *ati* = *jigīṣati*, where *j* after the *abhyāsa* is replaced with *g* before *saN*. A similar application is also seen in the *ṆiC*-derivate of *ji* when *LIṬ*→*tiP*→*ṆaL* follows. Thus, (*ji* + *ṆiC*) = *j*(*i*→*ai*→*āy*) *i* + (*LIṬ*→*ṆaL*)) → *jigāya*.

Why do we have the condition of *sanliṭoḥ*? Consider *jejīyate* where *yaṄ* follows. Also, consider *jyā* + (*LIṬ*→*tas*→*atus*) →*jijyatuḥ* and *ji* + (*LIṬ*→*jhi*→*us*) = *jijyuḥ*, where verbal root *jyā* yields the form *ji* after the application of *samprasāraṇa* (6.1.16 *grahijyāvayi* . . .). But since this form results through application of rules (*lākṣaṇika*), as against given as original, this rule does not apply. We still get *jyā* + (*LIṬ*→*atus*) = *jijyatuḥ* and *jyā* + (*LIṬ*→*us*) = *jijyuḥ*, where a replacement in *yaṆ* is accomplished by 6.4.82 *er anekāco' saṃyogapūrvasya*.

7.3.58 विभाषा चे:

vibhāṣā ceḥ
/vibhāṣā 1/1 *ceḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ku* #52 *abhyāsāt* #55 *sanliṭoḥ* #57)

cinoter aṅgasya sanliṭor abhyāsād uttarasya vibhāṣā kavargādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *kU* comes, optionally, in place of *c* of verbal root *ciÑ* 'to gather, heap' when occurring after the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga*, provided affixes *saN* and *LIṬ* follow.

EXAMPLES:

cicīṣati 'derivate of (*ci* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*'
cikīṣati 'derivate of the preceding with no *kU*'
cikāya 'derivate of (*ci* + (*LIṬ*→*tiP*+*ṆaL*)'
cicāya 'derivate of the preceding with no *kU*-replacement'

1. A provision of *kU*-replacement, made for *ciÑ* by the preceding rule, is here made optional in case of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *ci* 'to gather, heap'. A replacement in *k* for *c* of *ciÑ* is made because this rule carries the *anuvṛtti* of *cajoḥ* 'in place of *c* and *j*' (7.3.52 *cajoḥ ku* . . .). Consider *cikīṣati*/ *cicīṣati*; and *cicāya*/ *cikāya*, optional forms of *LAṬ* (with *saN*) and *LIṬ* (with *ṆaL*), respectively.

This optional replacement in *k* (*kutva*) is not allowed in *cecīyate* 'heaps over and over again', a derivate of *LAṬ*, where *ci* occurs before affix *yaṄ*.

7.3.59 **न क्वादेः**

na kvādeḥ
/*na* ϕ *kvādeḥ* 6/1 = *kuḥ ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52)
kavargāder dhātoś cajoḥ kavargādeśo na bhavati
A replacement in *kU* does not come in place of *c* and *j* of a verbal root termed *aṅga*, when the same begins with *kU*.

EXAMPLES:

kūjaḥ 'nominative singular of (*kūj* + *GHaÑ*) = *kūja* + *sU*'
kharjaḥ 'nominative singular of (*kharj* + *GHaÑ*) = *kharja* + *sU*'
garjaḥ 'nominative singular of (*garj* + *GHaÑ*) = *garja* + *sU*'
kūjyam 'nominative singular of (*kūj* + *ṆyaT*) = *kūjya* + *sU*'
kharjyam 'nominative singular of (*kūj* + *ṆyaT*) = *kharjya* + *sU*'
garjyam 'nominative singular of (*garj* + *ṆyaT*) = *garjya* + *sU*'

1. This rule blocks a replacement denoted by *kU* (*kutva*) in case of an *aṅga* which consists of a verbal root beginning with a *kU* 'a consonant of *k*-series'. This negation is offered in view of the positive provision made by 7.3.52 *cajoḥ ku*. . . . Thus, consider *kūj* + *GHaÑ* (3.3.121 *halaś ca*) = *kūja* and *kūj* + *ṆyaT* (3.1.124 *ṛhalor* . . .) = *kūjya*, etc.

Incidentally, *kūj*, *kharjA* and *garjA* are used with the meanings of 'indistinct sound', 'be pained' and 'roar', respectively.

7.3.60 अजिव्रज्योश्च

ajivrajyoś ca
/ aji-vrajy-oḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*); *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52 *na* #59)
'*aji, vraji*' *ity etayoś ca kavargādeśo na bhavati*
A replacement in *kU* also does not come in place of *c* and *j* of an *aṅga*, namely verbal roots *ajI* 'movement, wander' and *vrajI* 'to go'.

EXAMPLES:

samājaḥ 'derivate of (*sam-aj* + *GHaÑ*) = *samāja* + *sU*'
udājaḥ 'derivate of (*ud-aj* + *GHaÑ*) = *udāja* + *sU*'
parivrājaḥ 'derivate of (*pari-vraj* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*'
parivrājyam 'derivate of (*pari-vraj* + *ṆyaT*) + *sU*'

1. This rule blocks *kutva* in case of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *ajI* 'wander' and *vṛjI* 'go'. Thus, *sam-aj* + *GHaÑ* = *samāja* and *ud* + *aj* + *GHaÑ* = *udāja* (3.3.69 *samudor . . .*). Here again, this negation is made against the positive provision of 7.3.52 *cajoḥ ku. . . .*

Now consider *parivrājaḥ* 'wandering ascetic' and *parivrājyaḥ* 'to be wandered about' where, because of a replacement in *vī* (3.2.56 *ajer vy aghañapoḥ*), we do not get a replacement in *kU* before affix *ṆyaT*.

7.3.61 भुजन्युब्जौ पाण्युपतापयोः

bhujanyubjau pāṇyupatāpayoḥ
/ bhuja-nyubjau 1/2 (*itar. dv.*), *pāṇy-upatāpayoḥ* 7/2 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52 *na* #59)
'*bhuja, nyubja*' *ity etau śabdau nipātyete pāṇau upatāpe ca*
bhuja and *nyubja* are derived, via *nipātana*, when the signification is *pāṇi* 'hand, arm' and *upatāpa* 'heat, affliction', respectively.

EXAMPLES:

bhujaḥ = *pāṇiḥ* 'hand'
nyubjaḥ = *nyubjitāḥ* (*adhomukhāḥ*) *śerate*' *sminn iti* 'that in which they recline face down; an affliction'

1. Consider *bhuja* (3.3.121 *halaś ca*), a derivate of *bhujyate*' *nena* = *bhuj* + *GHaÑ* 'that by which is consumed', where replacement in a consonant of the *k*-series (*kU*; *kutva*) is blocked, via *nipātana*. This same is also witnessed in *nyubjanty asmin* = *ni-ubj* + *GHaÑ*. Elsewhere, we will get *bhogaḥ* 'that which is consumed; food, pleasure', and *samudgaḥ* 'leaf-bowl, box' with different denotata.

7.3.62 प्रयाजानुयाजौ यज्ञाङ्गे

prayājānuyājau yajñāṅge

/prayājānuyājau 1/2 (*itar. dv.*) *yajñāṅge* 7/1 = *yajñasya aṅgam* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52 *na* #59)
'*prayāja, anuyāja*' *ity etau nipātyete yajñāṅge*
prayāja and *anuyāja* are derived, via *nipātana*, when their signification relates to part of a sacrifice (*yajñāṅga*).

EXAMPLES:

pañca prayājāḥ 'the five sacrificial rituals performed prior to the main ritual sacrifice'
pañcānuyājāḥ 'the five sacrificial rituals performed subsequent to the main ritual sacrifice'

1. Note that affix *GHaÑ*, in *pra-yaj* + *GHaÑ* and *anu-yaj* + *GHaÑ*, is introduced by 3.3.19 *akartari ca*. . . . An absence of replacement in *kU* (*kutva*) is again accomplished here, via *nipātana*.

Is this rule formulated only for two derivates, i.e., *prayāja* and *anuyāja*? No. These two are offered by way of illustration (*pradarśanārtham*). This blocking of replacement in *kutva*, via *nipātana*, indeed applies, elsewhere, in derivates such as *ekādaśopayājāḥ*, *upāṃśuyājam* and *patnīsaṃyājāḥ*, etc.

It is important that the meaning condition, i.e., *yajñāṅga* 'part of a ritual sacrifice', must be satisfied. For, elsewhere, we find *prayāgaḥ* 'name of a sacrifice' and *anuyāgaḥ* 'ibidem' with application of *kutva*.

7.3.63 वञ्चेर्गतौ

vañcer gatau
/vañceḥ 6/1 *gatau* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52 *na* #59)
vañcer aṅgasya gatau vartamānasya kavargādeśo na bhavati
A replacement in *kU* does not come in place of an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *vañcI*, when its signification is *gati* 'movement'.

EXAMPLES:

vañcyaṃ vañcanti vaṇijaḥ 'traders go where they should'

1. This rule blocks *kutva* when an *aṅga*, particularly *vañcU* 'be crooked, deceitful', is used with the signification of *gati* 'movement'. Consider *vañc* + *ṆyaT* = *vañcya*. A derivate of *GHaÑ* with the signification of a crooked piece of wood (*kuṭilaṃ kāṣṭham*). This, in turn, will have *kutva* to yield *vaṅkam* 'crooked'; and *vañcya* + *GHaÑ* = *vañcya* of *vañcyaṃ vañcayanti vaṇijaḥ* 'trader go to their destinations'.

7.3.64 ओक उचः के

oka ucaḥ ke

/okaḥ 1/1 *ucaḥ* 6/1 *ke* 7/1/
(*cajoḥ kuḥ* #52)
ucer dhātoḥ ke pratyaye 'okaḥ' iti nipātyate
oka is derived, via *nipātana*, when affix *ka* follows verbal root *ucA* 'be in cohesion'.

EXAMPLES:

nyokaḥ śakuntaḥ '*nyoka* is a bird'
nyoko gṛham '*nyoka* is a house'

1. What is accomplished here, via *nipātana*? It is replacement in *k* (*kutva*) and *guṇa*. Thus, *nyucanty asmin lokāḥ* = *ny-u*(*c*→*k*) + *ka* = *ny*(*u*→*o*) + *ka* = *nyoka* 'that in which people live', where 3.1.135 *igupadhajñā* . . . introduces affix *ka*.

2. Why do we not derive *ni* + *oka* = *nyoka* with *GHaÑ*? So that we do not get an initial *udātta* accent (6.1.197 *ñnityādir nityam*). Remember that *oka* is desired to be marked with *udātta* at the end (*antodātta*).

3. Note that this *nipātana* is also seen in deriving *divaukasa* 'god' and *jalaukasa* 'a leech' with the *Uṇādi* affix *asUN*, especially in view of 3.3.1 *uṇādayo bahulam*).

7.3.65 ण्य आवश्यके

ṇya āvaśyake
/ṇye 7/1 *āvaśyake* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52 *na* #59)
ṇye parataḥ āvaśyake' rthe kavargo na bhavati
A replacement in *kU* does not come in place of *c* and *j* of an *aṅga* with the signification of *āvaśyaka* 'urgent, necessary' when affix *ṆyaT* follows.

EXAMPLES:

avaśyapācyam 'must be cooked'
avaśyavācyam 'must be said'
avaśyarecyam 'must be cleared'

1. This rule blocks *c*→*k* and *j*→*g* of an *aṅga*, used with the signification of *āvaśyaka* 'necessary', when affix *ṆyaT* follows. Note that the example compounds are formed by 2.1.71 *mayūravyaṃsakādayaś ca*. Affix *ṆyaT* is introduced in view of 3.1.124 *ṛhalor ṇyat* with the signification of *āvaśyaka* (3.3.171 *kṛtyāś ca*). The *m* of *avaśyam* 'definitely' is deleted in consonance with a desideratum (*iṣṭi*) of the *Mahābhāṣya* (ad *lumped avaśyamaḥ kṛtye tumkāmamanasor api*; ad 6.1.144 *aparasparāḥ* . . .).

Remember that this replacement in *k* (*kutva*) cannot be blocked where the meaning is not *āvaśyaka*. Thus, consider *pākyam* 'to be cooked' and *vākyam* 'to be said; a sentence'.

7.3.66 यजयाचरुचप्रवचर्चश्च

yajayācarucapravacarcaś ca
/yaja-yāca-ruca-pravaca-ṛcaḥ 6/1 (*sam. dv.*), *tasya*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52 *na* #59 *ṇye* #65)
'yaja, yāca, ruca, pravaca, ṛca' ity eteṣāṃ ṇye parataḥ kavargādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *kU* does not come in place of *c* and *j* of an *aṅga*, namely verbal roots *yajA* 'to sacrifice', *yācA* 'to beg', *rucA* 'to like, be agreeable', *pravacA* 'to proclaim' and *ṛcA* 'to praise, adore', when affix *ṆyaT* follows.

EXAMPLES:

yājyam 'to be sacrificed'
yācyam 'to be begged'
rocyam 'to be liked'
pravācyam 'to be proclaimed'
arcyam 'to be praised, worshiped'

1. This rule further widens the scope of non-application of replacement in *kU* (*kutva*). A specification of *vac*, used with the preverb *pra*, is made to restrict the derivate to the meaning of a text with particular recitation (*pravacigrahaṇaṃ śabdasaṃjñārtham*). For, this negation of *kutva* could be available to *vac* from 7.3.67 *vaco' śabdasaṃjñāyām*. Some do not accept this reference to a particular text. They, however, insist that *pra-vac* is specified to restrict the derivate to the usage of *vac* with *pra*, alone. Thus, consider *avivākyam* where *kutva* applies since no *pra* is used. But this happens only when a special meaning, i.e., use on the tenth ritual of the tenth night, is denoted in addition. Thus, we also get *avivācyam* where no special meaning is intended.

Note also that affix *ṆyaT* could be introduced after a verbal root with *ṛ* in its *upadhā* 'penultimate position', at the strength of this very rule. That is, *KyaP* of 3.1.110 *ṛd upadhāc . . .* is not accepted.

2. A proposal is also made to include *tyaj* 'to abandon' in this list of negation of *kutva* before *ṆyaT*. Thus, consider *tyājyam* 'to be abandoned'.

7.3.67 वचोऽशब्दसंज्ञायाम्

vaco' śabdasaṃjñāyām
/vacaḥ 6/1 *aśabdasaṃjñāyām* 7/1 = *śabdasya saṃjñā* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *na śabdasaṃjñā* ((*nañ. tat.* with int. *ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasyām*)
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52 *na* #59 *ṇye* #65)
vaco' śabdasaṃjñāyām ṇyati parataḥ kavargo na bhavati
A replacement in *kU* does not come in place of *c* and *j* of an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *vac* 'to speak', when affix *ṆyaT* follows, provided *śabdasaṃjñā* 'assignment of name to a linguistic item' is not involved.

EXAMPLES:

vācyam āha 'he said what should be said'
avācyam āha 'he said what should not be said'

1. Consider *vākyam* 'a sentence' which, in turn, is name of this utterance (*śabdasaṃjñā*). This *kutva* of *c*, of *vac* before *ṆyaT*, cannot be blocked because *vākya* is a name. Thus, we also get *avaghuṣitaṃ vākyam āha* 'spoke very loudly'. Elsewhere, outside the meaning of *śabdasaṃjñā*, we get *vācya* 'worth saying' with no replacement in *kU* (*kutva*).

7.3.68 प्रयोज्यनियोज्यौ शक्यार्थे

prayojyaniyojyau śakyārthe
prayojya-niyojyau 1/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tau*; *śakyārthe* 7/1 = *śakyo' rthaḥ* (*karma. tat.*), *tasmin*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52 *na* #59 *ṇye* #65)
'*prayojya, niyojya*' *ity etau śabdau śakyārthe nipātyete*
prayojya and *niyojya* are derived, via *nipātana*, when *śakya* 'possible' is the signification.

EXAMPLES:

prayojyaḥ = *śakyaḥ prayoktum* 'fit to be used'
niyojyaḥ = *śakyo niyoktum* 'fit to be appointed'

1. Note that *ṆyaT* (3.3.124 *ṛhalor ṇyat*) is used here with the signification of *śakyam* 'possible', in view of 3.3.172 *śaki liṅ ca*. We will get *prayogyaḥ* 'deserving of usage' and *niyogyaḥ* 'deserving of appointment', outside the meaning of *śakyam* 'possible'.

7.3.69 भोज्यं भक्ष्ये

bhojyaṃ bhakṣye
/*bhojyam* 1/1 *bhakṣye* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *cajoḥ kuḥ* #52 *na* #59 *ṇye* #65)
bhojyaṃ nipātyate bhakṣye' *bhidheye*
A form such as *bhojya* is derived, via *nipātana*, when the signification is *bhakṣya* 'edible'.

EXAMPLES:

bhojya odanaḥ 'rice for eating'
bhojyā yavāgūḥ 'barley-gruel for eating'

1. The word *bhakṣya* is used here only in the sense of *abhyavahārya* 'that which is fit for eating; edible'. Thus, we will get *bhogyaḥ kambalaḥ* 'a blanket to be enjoyed', outside the meaning of *bhojyam*.

7.3.70 घोर्लोपो लेटि वा

ghor lopo leṭi vā
/ghoḥ 6/1 *lopaḥ* 1/1 *leṭi* 7/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
ghusaṃjñakānāṃ leṭi parato vā lopo bhavati
A deletion by means of *LOPA* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* termed *ghu* (1.1.20 *dādhā ghv adāp*) when *LEṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

dadhad ratnāni dāśuṣé 'let him give jewels to the donor'
somó dadad gandharvāyá 'let Soma offer (her) to Gandharva'

1. Consider (*dadhā* + (*ŚaP*→*ŚLU*) + (*LEṬ*→*tiP*)) = *dadhā* + *ti*, where *ŚaP*, after *ḌUdāÑ* 'to give', gets replaced with *ŚLU* and doubling is accomplished in view of 6.1.10 *ślau*. Introduction of *aṬ* (3.4.94 *lṭo' ḍāṭau*), deletion of *ā* (by this rule), and *i* of *ti* (by 3.4.100 *itaś ca*), produces *dadh*(*ā*→ϕ) + *a* + *t*(*i*→ϕ) = *dadhat*. We similarly get *dadat* from *dā* + *LEṬ*. Note that an introduction of augment *āṬ* will still produce *dadhāt* and *dadāt*. The *vā* 'option(al)' of this rule makes it clear.

7.3.71 ओतः श्यनि

otaḥ śyani
/otaḥ 6/1 *śyani* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *lopaḥ* #70)
okārāntasyāṅgasya śyani parato lopo bhavati
A deletion by means of *LOPA* comes in place of the final *o* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) of an *aṅga* ending in *oT*, when *ŚyaN* follows.

EXAMPLES:

niśyati '. . . sharpens'
avacchyati '. . . cuts'
avadyati '. . . divides'
avasyati '. . . terminates'

1. This rule deletes the final *o* of an *aṅga* before *ŚyaN* (3.1.69 *divādibhyaḥ śyan*). Thus, consider *ni-ś*(*o*→ϕ) + *ŚyaN* + (*LOṬ*→*tiP*) = *niśyati*. Similar derivational details can be offered for other examples. Incidentally, *taparakaraṇa* 'making *t* to follow' (1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*) in *ot*, of *otaḥ*, is used for ease of articulation (*mukhasukhārtham*).

7.3.72 क्सस्याचि

ksasya āci
/ksasya 6/1 *āci* 7/1/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *lopaḥ* #70)
ksasyājādau pratyaye lopo bhavati
A deletion by means of *LOPA* comes in place of *Ksa* of an *aṅga* when an affix beginning with a vowel follows.

EXAMPLES:

adhukṣātām 'third person dual middle form of *duh* 'to milk' in *LUṄ*; . . . those two milked' '
adhukṣāthām 'second person dual middle form of *duh* in *LUṄ*'
adhukṣi 'first person singular middle . . .'

1. Refer to derivational details of *adhukṣat* (appendix, III:719). Examples of this rule can be derived with third person dual middle ending *ātām* and second person dual middle ending *āthām*, following similar rule applications. The third example *adhukṣi* is derived with the first person singular middle ending *iṬ*. Note that *Ksa* is a replacement of *CLI* before *LUṄ* (3.1.45 *śala igupadhād . . .*).

2. Why do we have the condition of *aci* 'when an affix beginning with a vowel follows'? Consider *adhukṣat* where *Ksa* cannot be deleted because *tiP* follows beginning with a consonant.

Why is a specification with *sa* made preceded by *K*? So that this deletion does not apply in *utsa* + *au* → *utsau* and *utsa* + *Jas* = *utsāḥ* 'springs of water'; *vatsa* + *au* = *vatsau* 'two calves' and *vatsa* + *Jas* = *vatsāḥ* 'calves'. These derivates have affixes which begin with a vowel, but they do not have the *sa* of *Ksa*.

7.3.73 लुग्वा दुहदिहलिहगुहामात्मनेपदे दन्त्ये

lug vā duhadihalihaguhām ātmanepade dantye
/luk 1/1 *vā* ϕ *duha-diha-liha-guhām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*) *ātmanepade* 7/1 *dantye* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ksasya* #72)
'*duha, diha, liha, guha*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānām ātmanepade dantyādau parataḥ ksasya vā lug bhavati*
A deletion by means of *LUK* comes, optionally, in place of *ksa* of an *aṅga*, namely *duhA* 'to milk', *dihA* 'to smear', *lihA* 'to lick' and *gūh* 'to hide', when an *ātmanepada* affix beginning with a dental sound segment follows.

EXAMPLES:

adugdha 'third person singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *duh*'
adhukṣata 'ibidem; with no deletion of *Ksa*'
adugdhāḥ 'second person singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *duh*'
adhukṣathāḥ 'ibidem; with no deletion of *Ksa*'
adugdhvam 'second person plural middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *duh*'

adhukṣadhvam 'ibidem; with no deletion of *Ksa*'
aduhvahi 'first person singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *duh*'
adhukṣāvahi 'ibidem; with no deletion of *Ksa*'
adigdha 'third person singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *dih*'
adhikṣata 'ibidem; with no deletion of *Ksa*'
alīḍha 'third person singular middle. . . . of *lih*'
alikṣata 'ibidem; with no deletion of *Ksa*'
nyagūḍha 'third person singular middle . . . of *ni-gūh*'
nyadhukṣata 'ibidem; with no deletion of *Ksa*'

1. Refer to derivational details of (*aṬ* + (*d*→*dh*) *u*(*h*→*gh*) + (*CLI*→*Ksa*) + (*LUṄ*→*ta*) → *adugdha*, in the appendix (III:724). We will get *adhukṣata* if this optional deletion of *Ksa* is not accepted. Similar forms with *thās* 'second person dual middle' and *dhvam* 'second person plural middle' can be derived with optional deletion of *Ksa*. Thus, *adugdhāḥ / adhukṣathāḥ*; *adugdhvam adhukṣadhvam*. We get a long replacement (7.3.101 *ato dīrgho yañi*) in the first person dual middle with *vahi*, when *Ksa* is optionally not deleted. Thus, *aduhvahi* and *adhukṣāvahi*. Incidentally, *v*, a labio-dental, is accepted as dental for purposes of this rule (*dantyoṣṭhyo' pi vakāro dantya iti gṛhyate*). Forms of *dih*, *lih* and *gūh* follow similar derivational patterns. Note, however, that, given *aṬ* + *lih* + (*CLI*→*Ksa*→ϕ) + *ta*, we get *ali*(*h*→*ḍh*) + (*t*→*dh*→*ḍh*) *a* = *aliḍh* + *ḍha*. That is, *h* and *t* are replaced with *ḍh* (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*); and *t* (8.2.40 *jhaṣastathor*. . .). The *t* of *ta* is first replaced with *dh* and then replaced with *ḍh*, via *dh*, through *ṣṭutva* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). The first *ḍh* is deleted by 8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ*. The *i* of *li*(*ḍh*→ϕ) + *ḍha* is replaced with its long counterpart by 6.3.111 *ḍhralope pūrvasya*. . . .

2. Our rule uses *LUK*, as against *LOPA*, to indicate that deletion applies to the form, in toto (*sarvādeśa*). That is, especially in connection with *vahi* (*Kāś*: *lope iti vartamāne luggrahaṇaṃ, tac ca vahyartham*). Elsewhere, after deletion of the final *a*, *s* can be deleted by 8.2.26 *jhalo jhali*. One cannot here invoke the *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating the replacement as what it replaced' of deleted *a*. For, *sthānivadhbhāva* does not apply in this context of suspension (*asiddhatva*) by 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham* (*Kāś*: *lopa iti vartamāne luggrahaṇaṃ sarvādeśārtham, tac ca vahyartham; anyatra tv antyasyaiva lope kṛte 'jhalo jhali' iti sakāralopena siddhyati; sthānivadhbhāvo' pi akāralopasya nāsti- pūrvatrāsiddhe na sthānivad iti*).

7.3.74 शमामष्टानां दीर्घः श्यनि

śamām aṣṭānāṃ dīrghaḥ śyani
/*śamām* 6/3 *aṣṭānām* 6/3 *dīrghaḥ* 1/1 *śyani* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
śamādīnām aṣṭānāṃ dīrgho bhavati śyani parataḥ
A long vowel comes in place of the short of an *aṅga*, namely of those

eight enumerated in the list headed by *śam* 'be tranquil', when affix *ŚyaN* follows.

EXAMPLES:

śāmyati
tāmyati
dāmyati
śrāmyati
bhrāmyati
kṣāmyati
klāmyati
mādyati

1. A specification with plural of *śamām aṣṭānām* 'of eight enumerated beginning with *śam*, etc.' gives us the sense of *śamādi* 'beginning with *śam*'. Thus, we get *ś*(*a*→*ā*) *m* + *ŚyaN* + *ti* = *śāmyati*, etc. The eight roots enumerated here are: *śamU* 'to be tranquil'; *tamU* 'to be weary'; *damU* 'to subdue'; *śramU* 'to be fatigued'; *bhramU* 'to wander, be mistaken'; *kṣamU* 'to endure'; *klamU* 'be tired'; *madĪ* 'to be glad'.

2. Why just eight (*aṣṭānām*)? Consider *asyati* where *as* 'to throw' cannot qualify for this long replacement because it is not included within the enumerated eight. The *bhram* of *bhramati* can also not qualify for lengthening since there is no *ŚyaN* to follow. Note, however, that *ŚyaN* is here made optional by 3.1.70 *vā bhrāśabhlāśbhramu. . . .*

7.3.75 ष्ठिवुक्लम्याचमां शिति

ṣṭhivuklamyācamāṃ śiti
/*śṭhivu-klamv-ācamām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*); *śiti* 7/1 = *śakāra it yasya* (*bv.*), *tasmin*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *dīrghaḥ* #74)
'*ṣṭhivu, klamu, ācam*' *ity eteṣāṃ dīrgho bhavati śiti parataḥ*
A long vowel comes in place of the short of an *aṅga*, namely *ṢṭhivU* 'spit out', *klamU* 'to be tired', and *ācam* 'to sip', when an affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

ṣṭhīvati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *ṭhīv*'
klāmati '. . . of *klam*'
ācāmati '. . . of *a-cam*'

1. The long replacement of the earlier rule is extended to contexts where an affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows. Verbal root *klam* is here included so that a long replacement can be availed before *ŚaP*. For, it is already made available before *ŚyaN* by the preceding rule. Verbal root *cam* must be used

with the preverb *āṄ* (*ā-cam*) to qualify for this replacement. Elesewhere, we will still get *camati* and *vicamati.*

7.3.76 क्रमः परस्मैपदेषु

kramaḥ parasmaipadeṣu
/kramaḥ 6/1 *parasmaipadeṣu* 7/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *dīrghaḥ* #74)
kramaḥ parasmaipadapare śiti parato dīrgho bhavati
A long vowel comes in place of the short of an *aṅga*, namely *kram*, when a *parasmaipada* affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

krāmati 'derivate of *kram* + (*LAṬ→tiP*)'
krāmataḥ '. . . of *kram* + (*LAṬ* + *tas*)'
krāmanti '. . . of *kram* + (*LAṬ→jhi*)'

1. Note that these three are all third personal active *ŚaP* derivates of *kram* with *LAṬ*. We can also get three optional derivates with *ŚyaN*. For, *ŚyaN* is offered as an option to *ŚaP* (3.1.70 *vā bhrāśbhlāśabhramukramu . . .*).

2. Why do we have the condition of *parasmaipade* 'when an active ending follows'? Because this lengthening will be blocked when a middle (*ātmanepada*) ending follows. Consider *ākramate ādityaḥ* 'the sun is moving upward' where *ā-kram* qualifies for an *ātmanepada* replacement of *LAṬ*, in view of the meaning condition of *udgamana* 'moving upward' (1.3.40 *āṅ udgamane*).

It is stated that this lengthening cannot be blocked in deriving the second person singular present indicative middle forms *utkṛ*(*a→ā*) *m* + *ŚaP* + (*LAṬ→ si→hi→ϕ*) = *utkrāma* and *saṃkrāma.* For, the term *aṅga* is assigned relative to *ŚaP*, and not relative to *hi* which goes through deletion (6.4.105 *ato heḥ*).

7.3.77 इषुगमियमां छः

iṣugamiyamāṃ chaḥ
/iṣu-gami-yamām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *chaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śiti* #75)
'iṣu, gami, yama' ity eteṣāṃ śiti parataś chakārādeśo bhavati
A *ch* comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *iṣU* 'to desire', *gamI* 'to go' and *yamA* 'to strive', when an affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

icchati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *iṣ*'
gacchati '. . . of *gam*'
yacchati '. . . of *yam*'

1. This replacement comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga*

in consonance with 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya.* Note that *iṣ* should be accepted here as marked with *U* as an *it* (*udit*), a root listed in the class headed by *tud* (*tudādi*). Thus, we do not get this replacement in *iṣyati* and *iṣṇāti* (a root of the *divādi* or *kryādi* class) where *iṣ* is not accepted as marked with *U* as an *it.*

Those who do not read *iṣU* as marked with *U* as an *it,* carry *aci,* via *anuvṛtti* from 7.3.72 *ksasyāci.* They qualify *aci* with *śiti* to avail an interpretation as follows: 'an affix which is marked with *Ś* as an *it* (*Śit*) and is constituted by a vowel'. The final sound of the *aṅga* before such an affix is then replaced with *ch.* This interpretation does not allow *tadādividhi* 'interpreting a specified *x* as also referring to that which begins with that'. Consider *ŚānaC* which is marked with *Ś* as an *it* and begins with a vowel. It is because of non-acceptance of *tadādividhi* that we get (*iṣ* + (*Śnā*→*ŚānaC*) + (*siP*→*hi*))) = *iṣ* + *āna* + *hi* = *iṣāṇa* + *sU* = *iṣāṇaḥ.* That is, we get *Śnā* (3.1.81 *kryādibhyaḥ śnā*) replaced with *ŚānaC* (3.1.83 *halaḥ śnaḥ . . .*). The second person singular active ending *siP* is, of course, replaced with *hi* (3.4.87 *ser hy . . .*). Rule 6.4.105 *ato heḥ* subsequently applies *LUK*-deletion on *hi* to produce *iṣāṇa,* with an additional application of replacement in *ṇ* for *n.* Notice that we do not get *ch* as a replacement for the final of the *aṅga* when an affix marked with *Ś,* and beginning with a vowel, follows. That is, the replacement is blocked because an affix constituted by a vowel and marked with *Ś* as an *it* does not follow. It makes clear that *tadādividhi* is not possible with *aci* as a qualified principal.

Refer to *gacchanti* of *vyatigacchanti* (under 1.3.15 *na gati . . .*) for derivational details.

7.3.78 **पाघ्राध्मास्थाम्नादाण्दृश्यर्तिसर्तिशदसदां पिबजिघ्रधमतिष्ठमनयच्छपश्यर्च्छधौशीयसीदाः**

pāghrādhmāsthāmnādāṇdṛśyarttisarttiśadasadāṃ pibajighradhamatiṣṭhamanayacchapaśyarcchadhauśīyasīdāḥ
/pā-ghrā-dhmā-sthā-mnā-dāṇ-dṛśi-artti-sartti-śada-sadām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām; piba-jighra-dhama-tiṣṭha-mana-yaccha-paśya-ṛccha-dhau-śīya-sīdāḥ* 1/3 (*itar. dv.*), *te/*
'*pā, ghrā, dhmā, sthā, mnā, dāṇ, dṛśi, artti, śada, sada' ity eteṣāṃ 'piba, jighra, dhama, tiṣṭha, mana, yaccha, paśya, ṛccha, dhau, śīya, sīda' ity ete ādeśā bhavanti śiti parataḥ*
pibA, jighrA, dhamA, tiṣṭhA, manA, yacchA, paśyA, ṛcchA, dhau, śīyA and *sīdA,* come in place of an *aṅga,* namely *pā* 'to drink', *ghrā* 'to smell', *dhmā* 'to blow', *sthā* 'to stand, remain', *mnā* 'to think, meditate', *dāṇ* 'to give', *dṛśI* 'to see', *arttI* (*ṛ*) 'to go', *sṛ* 'to go', *śadA* 'to sharpen' and *sadA* 'to break in pieces', in this order of enumeration, when an affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pibati
jighrati

dhamati
tiṣṭhati
manati
yacchati
paśyati
ṛcchati
dhāvati
śīyate
sīdati

1. The examples, except for the middle *śīyate*, are all third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivates of respective verbs.

2. This rule offers eleven replacements to an equal number of specified roots when an affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows. Thus, *pā* gets replaced with *pib*, etc., following the order of enumeration in the two sets. Verbal root *sadA* here refers to *ṣadLṚ* of both the *bhvādi* and *tudādi* classes. Note also that *pib* may qualify for penultimate *guṇa* (*laghūpadhaguṇa*). But since its specification is made with *pibA*, and not *pebA*, this *guṇa* is not accomplished. Verbal root *sṛ* is desired to be replaced with *dhāvA* when the signification happens to be: *vegitāyāṃ gatau* 'moving with speed'. Elsewhere, we will not get this replacement.

Notice that only one *ātmanepada* example is offered here. This is needed in case of *śad*, as per the obligatory requirement of 1.3.60 *śadeḥ śitaḥ*.

7.3.79 ज्ञाजनोर्जा

jñājanor jā
/jñā-janoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *jā* 1/1 (deleted)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śiti* #75)
'*jñā, jana*' *ity etayor jādeśo bhavati śiti parataḥ*
A replacement in *jā* comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *jñā* 'to know' and *janA* 'to be born', when an affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

jānāti '. . . knows'
jāyate '. . . comes into existence'

1. Note that *jan* is here interpreted as the *divādi* root *janĪ prādurbhāve* 'to come into being'. Thus, (*jñā→jā*) + *Śnā* + (*LAṬ →tiP*)) = *jānāti* and (*jan→jā*) + *Śyan* + (*LAṬ→*(*ta→te*))) = *jāyate*.

7.3.80 प्वादीनां ह्रस्वः

pvādīnāṃ hrasvaḥ
/pv-ādīnām 6/3 = *pūḥ ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣām*; *hrasvaḥ* 1/1/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śiti* #75)
'*pū*' *ity evaṃādīnāṃ hrasvo bhavati*
A replacement in short (*hrasva*) comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely that which is listed beginning with *pŪ* 'to cleanse', when an affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

punāti '. . . cleanses'
lunāti '. . . cuts'
stṛṇāti '. . . covers'

1. The *pvādi* '*pūÑ* and others' are listed as part of the *kryādi* class. Some consider this *pvādi* listing to include roots enumerated through the end of this class. But this will then include *jan* which, with its specification with *jā*, will come into conflict with short replacement here. It is stated that the long *ā* of *jā* will prevail on the basis of this express mention of Pāṇini. Or else, *jan* will also have this replacement in short which, subsequently, will become long with the application of 7.3.101 *ato dīrgho yañi*. This can still derive (*jan*→ *ja*→*jāyate*).

7.3.81 मीनातेर्निगमे

mīnāter nigame
/*mīnāteḥ* 6/1 *nigame* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śiti* #75 *hrasvaḥ* #80)
mīnāter aṅgasya hrasvo bhavati nigamaviṣaye
A replacement in short comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *mīÑ* 'to injure, destroy', when an affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows and the usage is part of *nigama* 'Vedic utterance'.

EXAMPLES:

pramiṇanti vratāni

1. This rule allows shortening in the *nigama* (Vedic) usage when verbal root *mīÑ* 'to injure' occurs with a following affix marked with *Ś* as an *it*. Consider *pramiṇanti* from (*pra-mī* + (*LAṬ*→*jhi*→*anti*) →*pra-mī* + *Śnā* + *anti*)), where this rule causes the shortening of root-final long *ī*. Incidentally, the *ā* of *Śnā* is deleted by 6.4.112 *śnābhyastayor ātaḥ*. A replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) is then accomplished for the *n* of *Śnā* by 8.4.15 *hinumīnā*. We will get *pramīṇanti*, with no shortening, outside the usage of the *nigama*.

2. The word *nigama* is explained as 'that which makes the meaning of a *mantra* manifest'. It is thus used in the sense of Vedas in general and a Vedic utterance in particular.

7.3.82 मिदेर्गुणः

mider guṇaḥ

/ mideḥ 6/1 *guṇaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śiti* #75)
mider aṅgasyeko guṇo bhavati śiti pratyaye parataḥ
A replacement in *guṇa* comes in place of a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK* of an *aṅga*, namely *mid* 'to be oily, affectionate', when an affix marked with *Ś* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

medyati 'third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *mid*'
medyataḥ 'third dual active . . .'
medyanti 'third plural active . . .'
midyate 'third singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate with *yaK*'

1. Refer to derivational details of derivates with *guṇa* under the appendix of 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī* (1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*). Note that *mid* is here interpreted as a *divādi* root. That is, it is not the *mīṄ* of the *bhvādi*. For, the *bhvādi* root will get *ŚaP* and will avail the penultimate *guṇa* of 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*. The *mid* of the *divādi* group cannot qualify for *guṇa* because of its *ŚyaN* treated as marked with *Ṅ* (1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*; 1.1.5 *ṅiti ca*). This rule makes it possible for the *divādi* root to avail *guṇa*. This *guṇa* is blocked due mainly to *yaK* when the signification is *bhāva* 'root-sense' and *karman* 'object'. Thus, *m(i→e) d + ŚyaN + tiP = medyati, medyataḥ* and *medyanti*; and *mid + yaK + te = midyate*.

2. Why was this specification not made as *mīñaḥ*? It was made as a stylistic variation (*vaicitryārtham*), instead.

7.3.83 जुसि च

jusi ca
/ jusi 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *guṇaḥ* #82)
jusi ca pratyaye parata igantasyāṅgasya guṇo bhavati
A replacement in *guṇa* comes also in place of an *iK*-final *aṅga* when affix *Jus* follows.

EXAMPLES:

ajuhavuḥ 'third person plural active *LAṄ*-derivate of *hu* 'to call''
abibhayuḥ 'third person plural active *LAṄ*-derivate of *bhṛÑ* 'to fear''
abibharuḥ 'third person plural active *LAṄ*-derivate of *bhṛÑ* 'to support, hold''

1. This provision of *guṇa* is made against negation of 1.1.5 *ṅiti ca*, based on *Ṅ* as an *it* (*Ṅit*) status of *Jus* (1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*). Note that *Jus* (3.4.108 *jher jus*) here refers to a replacement of *jhi* (3.4.109 *sij abhyastavidibhyaś ca*). Refer to derivational details of *abibhayuḥ*, etc., under the appendix (III:785-86) of 3.4.109 *sij abhyastavidibhyaś ca*.

2. How come this *guṇa* does not apply in *ci* + (*LUṄ*→*ṅi*→*Jus*)) = *ci* + *Śnu* + *yāsUṬ* + *us* = *cinu* + *yās* + *us* and *su* + *nu* + *yās* + *us*? Note that there are two *Ṅit* statuses involved. One with reference to the *sārvadhātuka* affix *us* and the other with reference to *yāsUṬ*. The *Ṅitva* conditioned by the *sārvadhātuka* affix will apply everywhere to block *guṇa*. The *guṇa* provision, expressly made by this rule under the condition of *us*, will then only block negation of *guṇa* conditioned by the *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. It cannot block negation of *guṇa* conditioned by *yāsUṬ*. For, such a *guṇa* is conditioned by *prāpti* 'availability' and 'non-availability' (*aprāpti*), as in *cinuyuḥ* and *ajuhavuḥ*, respectively. A negation conditioned by *Ṅitva* of *yāsUṬ* is, thus, not blocked. Consequently, there is no *guṇa* (*Kāś*: *tatra nāprāpte sārvadhātukāśrayaṅitvanimitte pratiṣedhe jusi guṇa ārabhyamāṇas tam eva bādhate. yāsūḍāśryaṅitvanimittaṃ tu tatra na bādhate tatra hi prāpte cāprāpte cārabhyata iti*).

Incidentally, the *s* of *yāsUṬ* (3.4.103 *yāsuṭ parasmaipade* . . .) is deleted by 7.2.79 *liṅaḥ salopaḥ*. . . . The *ā* of *cinu* + *yā*(*s*→ϕ) + *us* = *cinu* + *y*(*ā* + *u*→*u*)*s*, goes through a single replacement in *u* (6.1.96 *usy apadāntāt*). Thus, *cinuyu* (*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *cinuyuḥ* and *sunuyuḥ*.

Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* for details on how carrying *aci* from 7.3.73 *ksasyāci* accounts for no *guṇa* in *cinuyuḥ* and *sunuyuḥ*.

7.3.84 सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः

sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ
/*sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* 7/2 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *guṇaḥ* #82)
sārvadhātuke ārdhadhātuke ca pratyaye parata igantasyāṅgasya guṇo bhavati
A replacement in *guṇa* comes in place of the *iK* vowel of an *aṅga* when an affix termed *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit* . . .), or *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ* . . .), follows.

EXAMPLES:

tarati '. . . floats'
nayati '. . . leads'
bhavati '. . . becomes'
kartā 'doer'
cetā 'he who heaps'
stotā 'he who praises'

1. An *aṅga* which ends in a sound denoted by *iK* receives a replacement in *guṇa* when an affix termed *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*) and *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*) follows. Refer to derivational details of examples under the appendix (II:327-30) of rule 1.1.2 *adeṅ guṇaḥ*.

2. Why is this specification made expressly with *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*? Because *guṇa* would have applied also in *agnitvam* and *agnikāmyati*

if this specification was made, for example, with *pratyaye* 'when an affix follows' and *saṅi* 'when an affix denoted by *saṄ* follows'. That is, when affixes *tva* and *kāmyaC* followed. Incidentally, *saṄ* of *saṅi* is an abbreviatory term referring to affixes enumerated beginning with *saN* (3.1.5 *guptijkidbhyaḥ . . .*) through *mahiṄ* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhi . . . mahiṅ*).

7.3.85 जाग्रोऽविचिण्णल्ङित्सु

jāgro' viciṇṇalṅitsu
/jāgraḥ 6/1 *aviciṇṇalṅitsu* 7/3 = *ṅ it yasya sa* = *ṅit* (*bv.*); *viś ca ciṇ ca ṇal ca ṅit ca* (*itar. dv.*); *na viciṇṇalṅitaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *teṣu/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *guṇaḥ* #82 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* #84)
'jāgṛ etasyāṅgasya guṇo bhavati aviciṇṇalṅitsu parataḥ
A replacement in *guṇa* comes in place of the *iK* of an *aṅga*, namely *jāgṛ* 'to remain awake', when an affix termed *sārvadhātuka* and *ārdhadhātuka*, with the exception of *vi* (*Uṇādi*), *CiṆ* (3.1.66 *ciṇ bhāvakarmaṇayoḥ*), *ṆaL* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*), or one marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

jāgarayati 'causal third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *jāgṛ*'
jāgarayataḥ 'causal third person dual . . .'
jāgarakaḥ 'nominative singular *ṆvuL*-derivate of causative *jāgṛ*'
sādhujāgarī '*upapada* compound with *sādhu+ ṆinI + jāgṛ*'
jāgaraṃjāgaram '*jāgṛ* + *ṆamuL* (with doubling)'
jāgaro (*vartate*) '(*jāgṛ* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*))'
jāgaritaḥ '(*jāgṛ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
jāgaritavān '*jāgṛ* + *KtavatU*'

1. Note that this *guṇa* applies in (*jāgṛ* + *ṆiC*) + *LAṬ* = *jāgarayati* 'wakes someone up', *jāgṛ* + *ṆvuL* = *jāgaraka* 'he who wakes' and *sādhu+jāgṛ* + *ṆinI* = *sādhujāgarī* 'beautiful wake' before affixes shown. A similar *guṇa* applies in *jāgṛ* + *ṆamUL* = *jāgaraṃjāgaram*, with doubling (*dvitva*), and *jāgṛ* + *GHaÑ* = *jāgara* 'waking up'. These all are instances of *guṇa* against *vṛddhi*. An application of this *guṇa* is made possible in *jāgṛ* + *Kta* = *jāgarita* 'awake' and *jāgṛ* + *KtvatU* = *jāgaritavat*, with augment *iṬ*, against negation of *guṇa* due mainly to affixal status of *K* as an *it* (*Kit*; 1.1.5 *ṅiti ca*).

Note that this *guṇa* of *jāgṛ* is proposed so that it could remain valid, specific to its scope of negation (*niṣedha*) and possible *vṛddhi*. Thus, *guṇa* is negated by this rule before *CiṆ* (3.1.66 *ciṇ bhāvakarmaṇoḥ*) and *ṆaL* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*). If the *vṛddhi* of 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ* is applied then *guṇa* and its accompanying negation would not make any sense. This also, in turn, shows why *vṛddhi* should not be applied after *guṇa* has applied.

2. Why do we have the condition of negation of *guṇa* before *vi*, *CiṆ*, *ṆaL*,

and an affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*? Consider *jāgṛviḥ, ajāgāri, jajāgāra,* and *jāgṛtaḥ / jāgṛthaḥ,* where *guṇa* is negated before *vi* (*viṄ*; *Uṇādi*(503): *vṛdṛjāgṛbhyo vin*), *CiṄ* and *ṆaL,* and *Ṅit* (1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*), respectively. Dharmakīrti (*Rūpāvatāraḥ* (II:165) quotes the following *kārikā*-verse and explains:

> *guṇo vṛddhir guṇo vṛddhiḥ pratiṣedho vikalpanam/*
> *punar vṛddhir niṣedho' to yaṇpūrvāḥ prāptayo nava//*
> (*yāvatā jāgro' viciṇṇalṅitsu iti jāgarter guṇo vṛddher apavādo vidhīyate, sā ca aco' ñṇiti yathā vṛddhiṃ bādhate tathā sici vṛddhim api bādhiṣyate. guṇe kṛte ato lrāntasya iti yā vṛddhiḥ prāpnoti sā pratiṣidhyatām. atha guṇavidhāna-sāmarthyād uttarakālabhāviny api vṛddhir bādhiṣyate . . .*).
> 'as the *guṇa* of *jāgṛ* (7.3.85 *jāgro' viciṇṇalṅitsu*) is offered to block the *vṛddhi* of 7.2.115 *aco' ñṇiti,* it will also block the *vṛddhi* of 7.2.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ . . .*; the *vṛddhi* (of 7.2.2 *ato lrāntasya*) which may become applicable should also be negated; a *vṛddhi* which may subsequently become applicable should be blocked at the strength of provision made for *guṇa.*'

Some accept that *i* in *vi* is used for articulation. Consequently, *guṇa* does not apply when a *v*-initial *KvasU* follows, for example, in deriving *jajāgṛvān.* Why is *guṇa* not negated in *ajāgaruḥ* and *ahaṃ jajāgara*? The *guṇa* is not negated since *aviciṇalṅitsu* is interpreted as a *paryudāsa* type of negation. A *prasajya* interpretation would negate the *guṇa.* This would also end up blocking *guṇa* in *LAṄ,* and derivates with *jhi* and *ṆaL.* Accepting the negation as *paryudāsa* would make the application of *guṇa* possible in contexts other than these. Consequently, *guṇa* will apply in the context of *Jus* and *ṆaL.* That is, if a rule becomes applicable.

Or else, one must accept that an operation, or related negation, applies to what is most immediate (*PŚ* 62: *anantarasya vidhir bhavati pratiṣedho vā*). That is, the negation of 7.3.85 *jāgraḥ . . .* applies only when *viciṇṇalṅit* followed. This will thus not negate the *guṇa* of 7.3.83 *jusi ca* and 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ.*

7.3.86 पुगन्तलघूपधस्य च

> *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*
> */pugantalaghūpadhasya* 6/1 = *puki antaḥ = pugantaḥ* (*sapt. tat.*); *laghvī cāsāv upadhā ca = laghūpadhā* (*kar. tat.*); *pugantaś ca laghūpadhā ca = pugantalaghūpadham* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya; ca* ϕ/
> (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *guṇaḥ* #82 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* #84)
> *pugantasyāṅgasya laghūpadhasya ca sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayor guṇo bhavati*
> A replacement in *guṇa* comes in place of the *iK* of an *aṅga* which ends in augment *pUK,* or contains a vowel termed *laghu* 'light, short' as

next to its last (*laghūpadha*) sound, when an affix termed *sārvadhātuka* and *ārdhadhātuka* follows.

EXAMPLES:

vlepayati 'causal third singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *vlī*'
hrepayati 'causal third singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *hrī*'
knopayati 'causal third singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *knūyī*'
bhedanam 'derivate of *bhid* with *LyuṬ*'
chedanam 'derivate of *chid* with *LyuṬ*'
bhettā '*tṛC*-derivate of *bhid*'
chettā '*tṛC*-derivate of *chid*'

1. Consider *vlepayati, hrepayati* and *knopayati* which are third singular causal (*ṆiC*) *LAṬ*-derivates of *vlī* 'crush, press', *hrī* 'to be shy' and *knūyī* to be wet'. These roots receive augment *pUK* (7.3.36 *artihrīvlī* . . .) at the end (1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*) before *ṆiC*. We thus get *guṇa* in (*vlī* + *pUK* + *ṆiC*) + *LAṬ*)) = *vlepayati*, (*hrī* + *pUK* + *ṆiC*) + *LAṬ*)) = *hrepayati* and (*knūyī* + *pUK* + *ṆiC*) + *LAṬ*)) = *knopayati*. These roots have a long vowel in their penultimate (*upadhā*) position. Now consider derivates of *bhid* and *chid*, *bhedanam/chedanam*, with *LyuṬ* (3.3.115 *lyuṭ ca*); and *bhettā/chettā* with *tṛC* (3.1.133 *ṇvultṛcau*), where a *laghu* (1.4.10 *hrasvaṃ laghu*) *i*, in *upadhā*, goes through a replacement in *guṇa*. Refer to derivational details of *bhettā* and *chettā* in the appendix (II:499). The *yu* of *LyuṬ* yields *ana* as a replacement (7.1.1 *yuvor anākau*).

2. *Kāśikā* cites three *kārikā*-verses of the *Mahābhāṣya* to illustrate difficulties and their resolutions in deriving forms under conditions of *puganta* 'that which ends in *pUK*' and *laghūpadha* 'that which has a light vowel (*laghu*; 1.4.10 *hrasvaṃ laghu*) in its penultimate position (*upadhā*; 1.1.65 *alo' ntyāt pūrva upadhā*):

saṃyoge gurusaṃjñāyāṃ guṇo bhettur na siddhyati/
vidhyapekṣaṃ laghoś cāsau kathaṃ kuṇḍir na duṣyati//1//
dhātor numaḥ kathaṃ rañjeḥ syandiśranthyor nipātanāt/
anallopaśidīrghatve vidhyapekṣe na sidhyataḥ//2//
abhyastasya yadāhāci laṅarthaṃ tatkṛtaṃ bhavet/
knusanor yatkṛtaṃ kitvaṃ jñāpakaṃ syāl laghor guṇe//3//

It is argued that a short penultimate vowel of an *aṅga* is accepted as *laghu* for purposes of this operation even when it occurs before a *saṃyoga* 'conjunct' formed with the final consonant of the *aṅga* and the initial consonant of the following affix. If Pāṇini did not accept this he would not have marked *Knu* (3.2.140 *trasigṛdhidhṛṣikṣipeḥ knuḥ*) with *K* as an *it*, and would not have extended this same status to affix *saN* (1.2.10 *halantāc ca*), for purposes of blocking *guṇa*. Not accepting *i*, of *bhid*, as *laghu* before a conjunct, i.e., *tt* formed with *d* of *bhid* and *t* of *tṛC*, will turn *i* into a *guru* (1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*).

Consequently, this rule cannot be applied to produce *guṇa* in *bhettā*. It becomes clear that *i* is still treated as *laghu*, and *guṇa* applies.

Further objection is raised with reference to (*ku* + *nUM* + *ḍ*) + *tṛC*)) + *sU*))) = *kuṇḍitā*. How come this guiding principle does not apply to the *u* of *kuṇḍi*? It is stated that an express mention of *dhātoḥ*, in 7.1.58 *idito num dhātoḥ*, requires introduction of *nUM* to *kuḍ*, right at the outset. Any subsequent introduction of an affix thus finds no *u* occurring in the penultimate position of the *aṅga*. To accept this raises further questions. How is the *vṛddhi* of penultimate *a* in *rañj* accomplished? Remember that it is only after deletion of *ñ* in *rañj* (6.4.26 *rañjeś ca*) that *a* becomes an *upadhā* 'penultimate sound' to qualify for *vṛddhi*. This *vṛddhi* is made possible at the strength of negation of *vṛddhi* in *syandi* and *śranthi* (6.4.28 *syado jave*; 6.4.29 *avodaidhoma* . . .), via *nipātana*. A negative provision cannot be made without anticipating a positive provision. The *vṛddhi* for such a root is thus anticipated, and hence, is carried out.

An objection is raised against accepting such operational anticipations (*vidhyapekṣā*) as universally valid. For, the *a* of *an* of *rājan*, a stem termed *bha*, is deleted. We thus get *rājñaḥ*. But this same cannot be accepted in case of the *a* of *anAṄ* (7.1.75 *asthidadhi* . . .), for example, in deriving *dadhnā* and *sakthnā*. Additionally, we will get penultimate long for the *a* of *sāman* before *Śi* (nominative plural), but not for *a* of *kuṇḍāni*, mainly because this *n* has a different source (7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya* . . .). If operational anticipation is not accepted as universal, we cannot get *guṇa* of *i* of *bhid* in deriving *bhetṛ*. But this *guṇa* is carried out by implication under the condition of a following consonant-initial affix. Refer to the next rule where *guṇa* is negated before a vowel-initial affix. Actually, *aci* of the following rule (7.3.87 *nābhyastasyāci*) negates *guṇa* of an *aṅga* which has a short vowel in its *upadhā*, and is followed by a vowel-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *P* as an *it*. This, in turn, makes known that, in *nij* + *ti* = *nenekti*, etc., we do not negate *guṇa* before a consonant-initial affix. Thus, this *jñāpaka* is to be accepted.

But this *jñāpaka* should not be accepted since the vowel-initial condition for negation of *guṇa* is imposed for the *abhyasta*-derivates of *LAṄ*, for example, *anenek*. There is no question of *ajādi* 'vowel-initial' or *halādi* 'consonant-initial'. The affix remains *halādi*, via *pratyayalakṣaṇa* (1.1.62 *pratyayalope* . . .). The negation of *guṇa* is thus retained. This *jñāpaka* should thus not be accepted. But still, the *kitva* 'marked with *K*' of *Knu* and *saN* (discussed at the beginning of this note) can serve as a *jñāpaka* 'indicator' in connection with *guṇa* of a short penultimate vowel (*laghūpadha-guṇa*).

3. The *upadhā* is here interpreted as constituted by *iK*. This is why *bhinatti*, etc., cannot avail *guṇa*. Others interpret: *puki antaḥ* = *pugantaḥ* 'a final before *pUK*'; *laghvī upadhā* = *laghūpadhā* 'an *upadhā* with a vowel termed *laghu*'; *pugantaś ca laghūpadhā ca* = *pugantalaghūpadham* 'that which ends in *pUK* and is also an *upadhā* with a vowel termed *laghu*'. This interpretation will rule out availability of *guṇa* in *bhinatti*.

4. A problem is raised in connection with the assignment of the term *saṃyoga* (1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*) in *bhid + tṛC + Ṅas* where the final consonant of verbal root *bhid* forms a conjunct with the immediately following consonant of affix *tṛC*. A rather clever interpretation of this rule is offered to resolve this problem:

The *guṇa* of the *iK* of an *aṅga* is accomplished before a *sārvadhātuka*, or an *ārdhadhātuka*, affix when such an affix is introduced relative to an *aṅga* with a short vowel in its penultimate position. But how do we get the sense of, 'introduced relative to an *aṅga*'. The word *laghūpadha* is given in the genitive, and not in the ablative (*pañcamī*). It is argued that since genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*) is introduced after a qualifier, we will interpret *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* as a qualified of *laghūpadha*. We will thus get the sense of *laghūpadhasya* 'of that which has a short in its penultimate position', or *laghūpadhasambandhī* 'that which is relative to that which has a short in its penultimate position'. Since the *ārdhadhātuka* affix *tṛC* is introduced relative to *bhid* with a short in its penultimate position, we will get the *guṇa* of *i*. But this solution is not free of problems either. This interpretation should then allow *guṇa* of *u* of *kuḍI + nUM + tṛC* in deriving *kuṇḍitā*. The phrase *dhātoḥ numaḥ* (cf. the *kārikā* verses above) offers a resolution to this problem. It is stated that, in deriving *kuṇḍitā*, augment *nUM* is introduced after the verbal root right at the outset, when its initial citation (*upadeśa*) is made. As a result, *tṛC* will be introduced after *kuṇḍ*, and not after *kuḍ* with a penultimate short. The problem of replacement in *guṇa* should thus not be raised in connection with derivation of *kuṇḍitā*.

Granted that the problem of *guṇa* in *kuṇḍitā* is resolved. But deriving *rāgaḥ* will be problematic, especially in accomplishing penultimate *vṛddhi*. The form may still be **ragaḥ*. That is, if the interpretation of 'relative to that which has a short in its penultimate position' is, similar to *laghūpadhasya*, also accepted in the interpretation of 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*. The problem is: *GHaÑ* after *rañj* 'to color' will then not be considered gotten from that which has *a* in its penultimate position. This will block *vṛddhi*, and the resultant form will be **ragaḥ*. A solution with reference to rule 6.4.29 *avodaidhodma praśrathahimaśrathāḥ* is offered in the form of *nipātana* similarly to verbal roots other than *syandI* and *śranthI*. Since a *nipātana* is not offered for a single purpose, this *nipātana* will account for both *n*-deletion and *vṛddhi*. This recourse to *nipātana* shows that the earlier stated interpretation of rule 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca* should not be accepted for interpreting 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*. I omit additional details of this point.

If the genitive in 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ* is interpreted to give the sense of, 'an affix which is marked with *Ñ* and *Ṇ* as an *it* and is introduced after that which has *a* in its penultimate position (*upadhā*), then deletion of *a* of *an*, and long replacement before *Śi*, cannot be accomplished. There will be deletion of *a* of *rājñaḥ*, but a deletion in *asthnā* and *dadhnā* will be blocked.

For, the genitive of *anaḥ* of 6.4.134 *allopo' naḥ* will be interpreted to give the sense of: *a* of *an* will go through deletion when a vowel-initial affix is introduced after that which ends in *an*. This deletion, of course, will require the assignment of the term *bha*. The vowel-initial affix *Ṭā*, in *asthnā* and *dadhnā*, is introduced after *asthi* and *dadhi* ending in a vowel denoted by *iK*. These words end in *n* only after introduction of *anAṄ*. Consequently, in the absence of a vowel-initial affix introduced after the base ending in *an*, application of 6.4.134 *allopo' naḥ* will be blocked. But it will apply in case of *rājñaḥ*. This same will be witnessed in *sāmāni*, etc., where *sāman* is introduced with the neuter nominal endings *Jas* and *Śas*, and 7.1.20 *jaśśasoḥ śiḥ* applies to introduce *Śi*. We will get the long replacement of the penultimate with application of 6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne cāsambuddhau*. But contexts where *nUM* happens to be introduced by 7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ*, or 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*, we will not get the long replacement of 6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne cāsambuddhau*. Thus, given *kuṇḍan* + (*Jas*→*Śi*), we cannot get the long replacement of 7.1.72 *sarvanāmasthāne cāsambuddhau*. For, this long replacement cannot apply in view of the given rule interpretation of, 'let there be a long replacement for the penultimate of that which ends in *n* when an affix introduced after that which ends in *n* follows'. Obviously, these faults arise under the interpretation of a genitive used as qualifier to affixes introduced to serve as right condition. If this view is abandoned, these problems will be resolved. But abandoning this interpretive view will block the *guṇa* in *bhid* + *tṛC*. For, by not abandoning this view, *tṛC* will follow *bhid* with a short vowel in its *upadhā*. The *guṇa* will be blocked if one tries to apply it under the following condition of a *sārvadhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* affix. For, there will not be an *aṅga* termed *laghūpadha* 'with a short vowel in its penultimate position'. The *i* of *bhid*, given the string *bhid* + *tṛC*, will be termed *guru* by 1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*. The condition of *laghūpadha* will thus be impaired.

A second resolution is offered in connection with *guṇa* in (*bhid* + *tṛC*) + *sU* = *bhettā*. It is stated that *aC* in 7.3.87 *nābhyastasyā' ci* . . . becomes vacuous and thus indicates that the negation of *guṇa* does not apply, for example in *nenekti*, before a consonant-initial affix marked with *P* as an *it*. If *aci* was not stated, negation of *guṇa* could have also applied to a consonant-initial affix marked with *P* as an *it*, as in *nenijati* ←*nij-nij-ti*. Given *nenekti*, derived from *ne-nij-ti*, a conjunct of *j* with *t* will bring assignment of the term *saṃyoga* and the condition of *laghūpadha* will be removed. The *guṇa* will thus not be available. It does not seem appropriate to resurrect this absence of application of *guṇa* on the basis of specification with *aci* of 7.3.87 *nābhyastasyāci*. . . . A specification with *aci* will still be vacuous, and thus will indicate that *guṇa* of a short vowel will apply even when the term *guru* is assigned to it before a conjunct. The *guṇa* of *bhid* + *tṛC* will thus apply. But this indicative purpose (*jñāpaka*) of *aci* is still not appropriate. The function of *aci* is recognized as facilitating *LAṄ* (*abhyastasya yad āhāci laṅartham tat kṛtam bhavet*). The use of

aci will thus not be vacuous, and cannot serve as a *jñāpaka*. For, we can derive *anenek* with deletion of *i* by 3.4.100 *itaś ca*. Thus, *nij* + (*LAṄ*→*tiP*) →*nij* + (*ŚaP*→*ŚLU*) + *ti* = *ni-nij* + *ti* (6.1.10 *ślau*); *aṬ* + *ninij* + *ti* = *aninij* + *t*(*i*→ϕ) = *an*(*i*→*e*) *nij* + *t* (7.4.75 *nijāṃ trayāṇām . . .*). Rule 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo dīrghāt . . .* will now delete *t*. The *i* of *anenij* will also be replaced with its *guṇa* counterpart *e*. We will finally get *anenek* with a *k*-replacement of *j*. Recall here that *aci* is used so that, after *pratyaya-lakṣaṇa* (1.1.62 *pratyayalope . . .*) revival of operations relative to *tiP*, negation of *guṇa* is blocked, even under the condition of a consonant initial affix marked with *P* as an *it*. But since *pratyaya-lakṣaṇa* will not bring back *t* in the string, we cannot get the assignment of the term *saṃyoga*. The condition of *laghūpadha* will thus not be impaired.

But the preceding simply explains that *aci* is used for facilitating *guṇa* in derivates of *LAṄ*. The question of *guṇa* of (*bhid* + *tṛC*) + *sU* still remains. Here is the final solution: *knusanor yat kṛtaṃ kitvaṃ jñāpakaṃ syāl laghor guṇe* 'let the status of *K* as an *it* of *Knu* and *saN* serve as an indicator (*jñāpaka*) for the *guṇa* of a short'. Affix *Knu* is introduced by 3.2.140 *tasigradhidhṛṣikṣipeḥ knuḥ*. A *saN* which begins with a sound denoted by *jhaL* and occurs after a consonant (*haL*), used in close proximity after *iK*, is treated as marked with *K* as an *it* by 1.2.10 *halantāc ca*. This status of *K* as an *it* of *saN* introduced after verbal roots ending in a consonant, and having a vowel denoted by *iK* in their *upadhā*, indicates *guṇa* under the danger of becoming vacuous. How does it become vacuous? Consider *gṛdh* + *Knu*→ *gṛdh* + *nu*, where *K* goes through *it*-deletion. Recall that the purpose of assigning status as marked with *K* as an *it* is to block *guṇa*. We get *bhitsati* after introducing *saN* after *bhid*. There, too, we find the purpose of *K* as an *it* in blocking *guṇa* of the penultimate short. This status as *K* as an *it* will facilitate *guṇa* in *bhettā*. How? It will establish the availability (*prāpti*) of *guṇa*. Haradatta (*PM*) does not recognize it as a *jñāpaka*. Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa*) accepts it as a *jñāpaka*.

7.3.87 नाभ्यस्तस्याचि पिति सार्वधातुके

nābhyastasyāci piti sārvadhātuke
/ na ϕ *abhyastaya* 6/1 *aci* 7/1 *piti* 7/1 *sārvadhātuke* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *guṇaḥ* #82 *laghūpadhasya* #87)
abhyastasaṃjñakasyāṅgasya laghūpadhasyājādau piti sārvadhātuke guṇo na bhavati

A *guṇa* vowel does not come in place of next to the last *iK*-vowel termed *laghu* of an *aṅga* termed *abhyasta* 'reduplicated syllable', when a *sārvadhātuka* affix which begins with a vowel and is marked with *P* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

nenijāni 'second singular active *LOṬ*-derivate of *ṇijIR* 'to cleanse, nourish''

vevijāni 'second singular active *LOṬ*-derivate of *vijIR* 'to be separated' '
parivevişāṇi 'second singular active *LOṬ*-derivate of *viṣU* 'to pervade' '
anenijam 'second singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *ṇijIR*'
avevijam 'second singular active . . . of *vijIR*'
paryavevişam 'second singular active . . . of *viṣU*'

1. This negation is offered against positive provision of the earlier rule. Consider (*ṇ→n*) *ijIR* + (*LOṬ→miP*) = *nij* + (*mi →ni*), where *ṇ* of *ṇijIR* is replaced with *n* (6.1.65 *ṇo naḥ*) and *miP*-replacement of *LOṬ* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhi . . .*) yields *ni* (3.4.89 *merniḥ*). Augment *āṬ* (3.4.92 *āḍ uttamasya . . .*), *ŚLU* (2.4.75 *juhotyādibhyaḥ . . .*) of *ŚaP* (3.1.68 *kartari śap*), doubling (*dvitva*; 6.1.10 *ślau*) and operations relative to *abhyasta* produce: *ni* + *nij* + *āṬ* + *ni* = *ninij* + *āni*. We get (*ni→e*) + *nij* + *āni* = *nenijāni*, through *guṇa* of the *abhyāsa* (7.4.75 *ṇijāṃ trayāṇāṃ . . .*; 6.41.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*). Note that *guṇa* of the penultimate *i* of *nij* before *āni*, a replacement of the *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *P* as an *it*, is thus negated by our present rule. Similar applications are involved in deriving *viṣU* + *LOṬ* = *veviṣāṇi* and *vijIR* + *LOṬ* = *vevijāni*. Derivates of *LAṄ*, i.e., *anenijam*, etc., can be similarly derived with augment *aṬ*. Recall that *miP* in *anenijam* is replaced with *am* (3.4.101 *tasthasthamipāṃ . . .*). The penultimate *guṇa* is here negated.

2. Why do we have to state the condition of *abhyasta*? Consider *vid* + (*LOṬ →miP*) = *v*(*i→e*)*d* + *āni* = *vedāni*, where, because of no assignment of the term *abhyasta*, *guṇa* of the *upadhā* cannot be stopped. Incidentally, *ŚaP* is deleted by 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ. . . .*

Why when a vowel-initial affix (*aci*) follows? Consider *nij* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) = *nenekti*, where penultimate *guṇa* cannot be blocked before a consonant-initial affix. Incidentally, a replacement in *k* (*kutva*) for *j* is accomplished by 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*.

Why do we have the condition of *sārvadhātuke*? So that this negation does not apply before an *ārdhadhātuka* affix, for example, in *nineja* (3.4.115 *liṭ ca*).

Why does this negation apply only to a penultimate *laghu* vowel? Consider second person singular *LOṬ* and *LAṄ* forms of *hū*, i.e., *juhavāni* and *ajuhavam*, where, given *juhū* + *ā* + *ni* and *juhū* + *a* + *am*, replacement in *guṇa* applies to the final *iK*. This *guṇa* cannot be blocked because of the condition of *laghūpadha*.

Why do we have to specify *pit* '*P* as an *it*' when 1.1.5 *knīti ca* can negate *guṇa* at the strength of *Ṅ* as an *it* of a non-*pit* affix termed *sārvadhātuka* (1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*). This *pit* is used here for subsequent rule(s).

3. This provision should be stated to apply in the Vedic, variously (*bahulam*). Thus, it applies in *jujoṣat*, a third singular *LEṬ* form of *juṣĪ*, where *parasmaipada* is used contrarily (*vyatyayena*). The *tudādi* marker *Śa* (3.1.77 *tudādibhyaḥ śaḥ*) is deleted with *ŚLU* and operations relative to doubling are performed before penultimate *guṇa*. Also consider *paspaśāte*, *cākaśīti* and *vāvaśti* where, in the

Vedic usage, penultimate shortening should be accepted before a vowel-initial affix, subsequent upon *LUK*-deletion. The shortening in case of *paspaśāte* applies to what is termed an *abhyāsa.*

7.3.88 भूसुवोस्तिङि

bhūsuvos tiṅi
/bhū-suvoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *tiṅi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *guṇaḥ* #82 *na piti sārvadhātuke* #87)
'*bhū, sū*' *ity etayos tiṅi sārvadhātuke guṇo na bhavati*
A *guṇa* vowel does not come in place of an *iK* termed *laghu* of an *aṅga*, namely *bhū* 'to be, become' and *sū* 'to give birth to' when a *sārvadhātuka* affix classed as *tiṄ* and marked with *P* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

abhūt 'third singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *bhū*'
abhūḥ 'second singular active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
abhūvam 'first singular active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
suvai 'first person singular middle *LOṬ*-derivate of *sū*'
suvāvahai 'first person dual middle *LOṬ*-derivate . . .'
suvāmahai 'first person plural middle *LOṬ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule denies *guṇa* when *bhū* and *sū* are followed by a *sārvadhātuka* affix denoted by *tiṄ*. Consider *abhūt, abhūḥ* and *abhūvam*, where *sIC*-replacement of *CLI*, i.e., (*aṬ* + *bhū* + (*CLI*→*sIC*)) + (*LUṄ*→(*tiP*) / (*si*)*P* / (*miP*))), goes through *LUK*-deletion (3.1.44 *cleḥ sic*; 2.4.77 *gātisthā* . . .). This rule blocks a *guṇa* which becomes applicable after deletion of *sIC*. For, a *tiṄ* affix marked with *P* as an *it* follows. Recall that 6.4.88 *bhuvo vugluṅliṭoḥ* offers augment *vUK* in *abhūvam*, where *miP* is also replaced with *am.*

Verbal root *ṣū* here refers to the *adādi* root after which *ŚaP* is deleted. It does not refer to its *tudādi* or *divādi* counterparts where augments *Śa* and *ŚyaN* are introduced. There is no need to negate the *guṇa* of these roots since these augments will intervene between the root and the following *tiṄ* affix. The locative of *tiṅi* requires that this negation of *guṇa* applies when the root is directly followed by a *tiṄ* affix. Moreover, absence of *guṇa* in their context will be easily accomplished in view of the *Ṅit* status of *Śa* and *ŚyaN* (1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*; *Kāśikā*: *sūyatyor vikaraṇena tiṅo vyavadhānam. vikaraṇasyaiva ṅitvād guṇābhāva siddhaḥ*). Deriving *suvai*, i.e., the first singular middle derivate of *LOṬ*, from (*ṣ*→*s*)*u* + *ŚaP* + (*LOṬ*→*i*) will require the *etva* of *ṭi* (3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ* . . .). This *e*, *su* + *ŚaP* + (*i*→*e*), will then be replaced with *ai* (3.4.93 *eta ai*). The *ŚaP*, of course, will be deleted on account of the root being *adādi* (*adāditvāt*; 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ* . . .). Augment *uvAṄ* will then be introduced to *su* to produce *s*(*u*→*uvAṄ*) + (*ŚaP*→ϕ) + (*i*=*e*→*ai*))) = *suvai.* Similar processes are also involved in deriving the dual and plural

first personal forms *suvāvahai* and *suvāmahai* with *vahi* and *mahiṄ*, respectively.

2. Note that this negation of *guṇa* applies only when a *sārvadhātuka* affix follows. It cannot be applicable when an *ārdhadhātuka* affix followed. Thus, consider *vyatibhaviṣīṣṭa*, a third singular middle derivate of benedictive *LIṄ* (*āśiṣi*), where *ātmanepada* is introduced under the signification of reciprocal action (1.3.14 *kartari karmavyatihāre*). The term *ārdhadhātuka* is here assigned by 3.4.116 *liṅāśiṣi*.

Why is *guṇa* of *bhū* not negated in *bobhavīti* after *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*? Recall that the *abhyāsa* of this derivate goes through *guṇa* (7.4.82 *guṇo yaṅlukoḥ*). The negation of *guṇa* in *bobhūtu* (7.4.65 *dādharttidardhartti* . . .), after *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*, indicates it. That is, if the negation of *guṇa* also applied in the context of *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ* resorting to *nipātana* for indicating that absence of *guṇa* was not needed. But since this resort has been taken we understand that this negation does not apply when *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ* takes place (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś. yadi yaṅluky api pratiṣedhaḥ syāt guṇābhāvārthaṃ nipātanaṃ na kuryāt, kṛtañ ca tasmād eva jñāpayati-yaṅluky ayaṃ pratiṣedho na bhavatīti*).

7.3.89 उतो वृद्धिर्लुकि हलि

uto vṛddhir luki hali
/utaḥ 6/1 *vṛddhiḥ* 1/1 *luki* 7/1 *hali* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *piti sārvadhātuke* #87)
ukārāntasyāṅgasya vṛddhir bhavati luki sati halādau piti sārvadhātuke
A *vṛddhi*, instead, comes in place of an *aṅga* which ends in *u* followed by deletion by *LUK*, when a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *P* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

yauti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *yu*'
yauṣi 'second person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
yaumi 'first person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
nauti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *nu*'
nauṣi 'second person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
naumi 'first person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
stauti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
stauṣi 'second person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
staumi 'first person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule, subsequent upon *LUK*-deletion, introduces *vṛddhi* to an *aṅga* which ends in *u*, provided when a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *P* as an *it* follows. Our example derivates represent the third, second, and first singular forms of *yu* 'to mix, combine', *ṇu* 'to praise' and *stu* 'to

praise'. Note that this *vṛddhi* applies after *LUK*-deletion of *ŚaP* (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ . . .*). Consider (*stu* + (*ŚaP→LUK*)) + *ti*)) = *st*(*u→au*) + *ti* = *stauti*. Other forms, except for the dual inolving *ṣatva* (*s→ṣ*), are similarly derived.

2. Why do we have this specification made with a short *u* (*utaḥ*)? Consider *eti*, *eṣi* and *emi*, corresponding first, second and third personal singular *LAṬ*-derivates of *i* 'to go', where *vṛddhi* does not apply because of no short *u*. This *vṛddhi* is also blocked in *sunoti*, *sunoṣi* and *sunomi* where *Śnu*, and no *LUK*-deletion, is involved. Finally, we find the absence of this *vṛddhi* in *yavāni* and *ravāṇi*, the first singular *LOṬ*-derivates of *yu* 'to mix, combine' and *ru* 'to sound' where *mi* gets replaced with *ni* (3.4.89 *mer niḥ*). Augment *āṬ* (3.4.92 *āḍ uttamasya pic ca*), additionally marked with *P* as an *it*, then makes the affix *ajādi* 'vowel-initial'. Refer to *yu* + (*LAṬ→tas*) = *yutaḥ* and *ru* + (*LAṬ→tas*) = *rutaḥ*, where *vṛddhi* is not allowed because *tas* is not marked with *P* as an *it*. This shows why the condition of *piti* is important. Also consider *stuyāt*, of *api stuyād rājānam*, where *pit*-status of *tiP* is canceled by *Ṅit*-status of *yāsUṬ* (3.4.103 *yāsuṭ . . . ṅic ca*). Consequently, this *vṛddhi* is blocked.

3. Commentators indicate that *nābhyastasya* is also carried to this rule. That is, the *vṛddhi* of an *abhyasta* (6.1.5 *ubhe abhyastam*) is also blocked. Thus, consider *yoyoti* and *roroti* where *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ* has applied. We get *guṇa*, instead.

7.3.90 ऊर्णातेर्विभाषा

ūrṇāter vibhāṣā
/ūrṇāteḥ 6/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *piti sārvadhātuke* #87 *vṛddhiḥ hali* #89)
ūrṇāter vibhāṣā vṛddhir bhavati halādau piti sārvadhātuke
A *vṛddhi* vowel, optionally, comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *ūrṇuÑ* 'to cover', when a consonant-initial *sarvadhātuka* affix marked with *P* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

prorṇauti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *pra-urṇuÑ*'
prorṇoti 'ibidem; with no *vṛddhi*'
prorṇauṣi 'second person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *urṇuÑ*'
prorṇoṣi 'ibidem; with no *vṛddhi*'
prorṇaumi 'first person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *pra-urṇuÑ*'
prorṇomi 'ibidem; with no *vṛddhi*'

1. This rule makes the obligatory *vṛddhi* of the preceding rule optional, in favor of *guṇa*. Thus, *pra* + *ūrṇu* + (*ŚaP→LUK*) + (*LAṬ→tiP*)) = *pra* + *urṇ*(*ū→o*) + *ti* = *pr*(*a*+*ū→o*) *rṇo* + *ti* = *prorṇoti*. Incidentally, the *a* of *pra* and the *ū* of *ūrṇu*, are replaced with a single replacement in *guṇa* (6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*).

This optional *vṛddhi*, however, applies only before a consonant-initial affix. Consider the first person singular *LOṬ*-derivate *prorṇavāni* where, because of augment *āṬ*, *āni* becomes vowel-initial. This, or the preceding rule, can then no longer apply.

7.3.91 गुणोऽपृक्ते

guṇo' pṛkte
/guṇaḥ 1/1 *apṛkte* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *piti sārvadhātuke* #87 *vṛddhiḥ hali* #89 *ūrṇāteḥ* #90)
ūrṇāter dhātor apṛkte hali piti sārvadhātuke guṇo bhavati
A *guṇa* vowel comes in place of an *aṅga*, namely *ūrṇuÑ* 'to cover', when a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix termed *apṛkta* marked with *P* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

prorṇot 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *pra-urṇuÑ*'
prorṇoḥ 'second person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'

1. The optional *vṛddhi* of the preceding rule is here blocked in favor of an obligatory (*nitya*) replacement in *guṇa*. Consider (*pra-urṇu* + (*ŚaP→LUK*) + (*LAṄ→tiP*))) = *pra-urṇu* + *āṬ* + *ti* where, after the introduction of *āṬ* (6.4.72 *āṭaś ca*) and deletion of *i* of *ti* (3.4.100 *itaś ca*), *t* is termed an *apṛkta* (1.2.41 *apṛkta ekāl pratyayaḥ*). We get *pr*(*a*+*u→au*)*rṇu* + *t* = *praurṇu* + *t*, through single replacement in *vṛddhi* (6.1.90 *āṭaś ca*). The *guṇa* of this rule then gives us *praurṇ*(*u→o*) + *t* = *praurṇot*. We similarly get the second person singular form with *siP*: *praurṇo*(*s→r→ḥ*) = *praurṇoḥ*. The first person singular form *aurṇavam*, where *miP* gets replaced with *am*, the final *u* of *urṇu* does not get the *guṇa* in *o* from this rule. For, eventhough *am* is marked with *P* as an *it* (*pit*), it does not begin with a consonant and is not termed *apṛkta*. The *guṇa* in *o* is accomplished by the general rule under the condition of *sārvadhātuke* (7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*).

2. Why do we have to specify this operational provision with *apṛkte* when *hali* '. . . a consonant follows' is already made available. After all, these affixes begin with a consonant. This specification with *apṛkte* is made to indicate as follows:

> 'an operation specified by a following sound segment (*aL*) obtains when what begins with that sound segment follows (*yasmin vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇe*)'

That is, such operations obtain when 'that which begins with a sound denoted by *aL* (any sound) follows'. The word *apṛkta* is thus used to go beyond the condition of *halādi* 'beginning with a consonant'. Note that *t* and *s* of *tiP* and *siP* alone qualify as *sārvadhātuka* affixes which are (*i*) termed

apṛkta, (*ii*) begin with a consonant (*halādi*) and (*iii*) are marked with *P* as an *it*.

7.3.92 तृणह इम्

tṛṇaha im
/tṛṇahaḥ 6/1 *im* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *piti sārvadhātuke* #87 *hali* #89)
'*tṛṇaha*' *ity etasyāṅgasya im āgamo bhavati hali piti sārvadhātuke*
Augment *iM* is introduced to an *aṅga*, namely *tṛṇaḥA*, when a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *P* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

tṛṇeḍhi 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *tṛh* 'crush, bruise' '
tṛṇekṣi 'second person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
tṛṇehmi 'first person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
atṛṇeṭ 'third person singular active imperfect *LAṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. Note that *tṛṇaha*, with its final *a* used for articulation, is a form of verbal root *tṛh* 'to crush, bruise' with *ŚnaM* (3.1.78 *rudhādibhyaḥ śnam*). Why is this specification made with *ŚnaM*? So that *iM* could be introduced only after *ŚnaM* has been introduced. An introduction of *iM*, prior to the introduction of *ŚnaM*, may create confusion. That is, *iM* may be accepted as an exception to *ŚnaM*, or else, a wrong form may result. Since *iM* is marked with *M* as an *it*, it is introduced after the final vowel of *tṛṇah*. Thus, given *tṛ* + *ŚnaM* + *h* + *ti* = *tṛnah* + *ti*, we get *tṛnah* + *iM* + *ti*. Rule 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* then applies to yield *tṛn*(*a*+*i*→*e*) *h* + *ti* = *tṛneh* + *ti*. The *h* then goes through a replacement in *ḍh* (*ḍhatva*; 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*). The *t* of *ti* similarly goes through a replacement in *ḍh* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*), via *dh* (8.2.40 *jhaṣastatho' rdho . . .*). We thus get *tṛne*(*h*→*ḍh*) + *ḍhi*. The first *ḍh* is now deleted by 8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ*. A *vārttika* proposal (ad 6.4.84 *ṛvarṇān nasya ṇatvaṃ vācyam*) then offers a replacement in *ṇ* for *n*. Thus, *tṛ*(*n*→*ṇ*) *e*(*ḍh*→ϕ) + (*t*→*dh*→*ḍh*) *i* = *tṛṇeḍhi*. We get *tṛṇekṣi* with second person singular active ending *siP*, where *h* turned *ḍh* of *tṛne*(*h*→*ḍh*) + *si* is replaced with *k* (8.2.41 *ṣaḍhoḥ kaḥ si*). The *s* of *tṛnek* + *si* then goes through a replacement in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*; 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*) to produce *tṛṇek*(*s*→*ṣ*) *i* = *tṛṇekṣi*. The first person singular form *tṛṇehmi* is similarly derived with no *ḍhatva* of *h* before the first personal active verbal ending *miP*.

The derivation of third person singular *LAṄ* form, i.e., *atṛṇeṭ*, begins with *atṛnah* + *t*(*i*→ϕ), subsequent to deletion of *i* (3.4.100 *itaś ca*). The initial *a* is that of augment *aṬ*. The final *t* of this string is deleted under the assignment of the term *apṛkta* (1.2.41 *apṛkta ekāl . . .*; 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*).

Introduction of *iM* is here accomplished through *pratyaya-lakṣaṇa* (1.1.63 *pratyayalope . . .*). It is for this reason that *Kāśikā* states: *varṇāśraye' py atra*

pratyayalakṣaṇam iṣyate 'operations relative to the (following) affix is desired to be performed even when operational specification is made relative to a sound segment'. The *h* of *atṛṇeh* then goes through a replacement in *ḍ* (8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*), via *ḍh* (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*). The *ḍ* then goes through an optional replacement in *ṭ* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *vā' vasāne*). We thus also get *atṛṇeḍ*.

2. Note that since the condition of *hali* is still valid and also since introduction of *āṬ*, before *miP* 'second person active singular ending' in the imperative (*LOṬ*), has turned the affix into one beginning with a vowel, introduction of augment *iM* in *tṛṇahāni* is blocked.

The condition of *piti* requires a following affix also to be marked with *P* as an *it*. Thus, in the absence of such a following affix, we do not get *iM* in the third person dual (*tas*) form *tṛṇḍhaḥ* in *LAṬ*.

7.3.93 ब्रुव ईट्

bruva īṭ
/ bruvaḥ 5/1 *īṭ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *piti sārvadhātuke* #87 *hali* #89)
'*brū*' *ity etasmād uttarasya halādeḥ pitaḥ sārvadhātukasya īḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *īṬ* is introduced to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix which occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *brū* 'to speak', and is marked with *P* as an *it*.

EXAMPLES:

bravīti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *brū*'
bravīṣi 'second person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
bravīmi 'first person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate . . .'
abravīt 'third person singular imperfect *LAṄ*-derivate of *brū*'

1. Augment *īṬ* is introduced here optionally to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *P* as an *it*. Of course, when such an affix follows *brū*. Thus, *brū* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*) = *brū* + (*ŚaP*→*LUK*) + *ti* = *brū* + *īṬ* + *ti*. Recall that 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ* . . . causes *LUK*-deletion of *ŚaP*. Augment *īṬ*, since it is marked with *Ṭ* as an *it*, is introduced as initial of the *sārvadhātuka* affix *ti*. We thus get *br*(*ū*→*o*→*av*) + *īṬ* + *ti* = *bravīti*, through application of *guṇa* (7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdha* . . .) and subsequent *av* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*). Note that a dual ending does not have *P* as an *it*. Consequently, *īṬ*, and for that matter *guṇa*, does not take place. Recall here that 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit* assigns such affixes the status of *Ṅit*. This, in turn, blocks *guṇa* (1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*). We similarly get the second and first personal singular forms *bravīṣi* (with *ṣatva*) and *bravīmi*. Deriving the third singular *LAṄ*-derivate *abravīt* from *aṬ* + *brū* + (*ŚaP*→ϕ) + *tiP* → *a* + *br*(*ū*→*o*→*av*) + *īṬ* + *t*(*i*→ϕ) = *abravīt*, additionally involves augment *aṬ* and *i*- deletion of *ti* (3.4.100 *itaś ca*).

2. Note that the condition of *hali* still applies. Thus, we do not get *īṬ* in

bravāṇi, first person singular imperative (*LOṬ*) with augment *āṬ* and *ni*- replacement of *mi*. We also do not get *īṬ* in *brūtaḥ* where affix *tas* is not marked with *P* as an *it*.

7.3.94 **यङो वा**

yaṅo vā
/*yaṅaḥ* 5/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *piti sārvadhātuke* #87 *hali* #89 *īḍ* #93)
yaṅa uttarasya halādeḥ pitaḥ sārvadhātukasya īḍ āgamo bhavati vā
Augment *īṬ* is introduced, only optionally, to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātukā* affix which occurs after *yaṄ* and is marked with *P* as an *it*.

EXAMPLES:

śākuniko lālapīti 'the bird chirps again and again'
dundubhir vāvadīti 'the drum beats again and again'
tridhā baddho vṛṣabho roravīti 'the three-way tied bull cries again and again'

1. This rule offers *īṬ*, optionally, to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *P* as an *it*, provided it follows an *aṅga* which ends in affix *yaṄ*. Consider *punaḥ punaḥ atiśayena vā lapati/vadati/rauti* = *lālapīti/vāvadīti/rauti* 'chirps/speaks/cries, over and over again' from (*lap* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*, (*vad* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ* and (*ru* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*. Affix *yaṄ* is here introduced by 3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco*. . . . Rule 2.4.74 *yaṅo' ci ca* subsequently deletes it. All examples are offered here with deleted *yaṄ* (*yaṅluṅanta*). Refer to derivational details of *loluvaḥ/ popuvaḥ* (appendix, II:334) and *lālapīti / pāpaṭhīti* (appendix, III:706) for relevant derivational details. Note, however, that the *guṇa* of *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*) in *roravīti* is accomplished by 7.4.82 *guṇo yaṅluko*ḥ. Examples such as (*vṛÑ* + (*yaṄ*→ϕ) + *tiP* = *varyati* and (*kṛÑ* + (*yaṄ*→ϕ) + *tiP*) = *carkati* illustrate optional absence of *īṬ*. Application of 7.4.66 *ur at*, and operations relative to *abhyāsa*, are applied as usual. The first *r* of these derivates has its source in augment *rUK* (7.4.92 *ṛtaś ca*).

2. Why do we get examples where *yaṄ* goes through deletion by *LUK*? Why could we not have examples where an *aṅga* terminates in affix *yaṄ*? Since a derived root which ends in *yaṄ* receives an *ātmanepada* termination (1.3.12 *anudāttaṅita* . . .), it is not possible to find a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix marked with *P* as an *it* to follow. That is, we do not get *tiP*, *siP* and *miP* in *ātmanepada* 'middle'. Thus, a selection of derivates with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ* is made (*Kāś*: *halādeḥ pitaḥ sārvadhātukasya yaṅantād abhāva iti yaṅlugantasyodāharaṇam*). Incidentally, *carkarīta* is a term used by earlier grammarians for *yaṅluganta* 'that which ends in *yaṄ* deleted by *LUK* (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *carkarītam iti yaṅlugantasya pūrvācāryasaṃjñā*)'.

7.3.95 तुरुस्तुशम्यमः सार्वधातुके

turustuśamyamaḥ sārvadhātuke
/ tu-ru-stu-śamy-amaḥ 5/1 = *tuś ca ruś ca stuś ca śamiś ca am ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt; sārvadhātuke* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hali* #89 *īṭ* #93 *vā* #94)
'*tu*' *iti sautro*' *yaṃ dhātuḥ*, '*ru śabde, ṣṭuñ stutau*', *śama upaśame, ama gatyādiṣu*' *ity etebhyaḥ parasya sārvadhātukasya halāder vā īḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *īṬ* is, optionally, introduced to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix which is marked with *P* as an *it* and occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *tu* 'to move, harm', *ru* 'to cry', *ṣṭuÑ* 'to praise', *śamI* 'to be calm, contain' and *am* 'to go'.

EXAMPLES:

uttauti 'derivate of *ut-tu* + (*LAṬ→tiP*)'
uttavīti 'ibidem; with no *īṬ*'
uparauti 'derivate of *upa-ru* + (*LAṬ→tiP*)'
uparavīti 'ibidem; with no *īṬ*'
upastauti 'derivate of *upa-ṣṭuÑ* + (*LAṬ→tiP*)'
upastavīti 'ibidem; with no *īṬ*'
śāmyadhvam 'derivate of *śam* + (*LAṬ→tiP*)'
śamīdhvam 'ibidem; with no *īṬ*'
abhyamati 'derivate of *abhi-am* + (*LAṬ→tiP*)'
abhyamīti 'ibidem; with no *īṬ*'

1. Why do we explicitly state *sārvadhātuke* here when the same is available from *anuvṛtti*. The *sārvadhātuke* of the *anuvṛtti* is also associated with *piti* (7.3.87 *nābhyastasyāci piti sārvadhātuke*). If one (*piti*) is carried, via *anuvṛtti*, the other (*sārvadhātuke*) must also be carried. It is to cancel the *anuvṛtti* of *piti* that *sārvadhātuke* is used here explicitly. That is, *sārvadhātuke* is explicitly used here to allow optional *īṬ* before *sārvadhātuka* affixes, irrespective of whether they are marked with *P* as an *it*. This facilitates *īṬ* in deriving *stuvīta* and *śamīdhvam*.

2. Note that verbal root *tu* 'to grow, move, harm' is available only in the *sūtra* literature (*sautra*). Consider (*ut-tu* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) where an application of *īṬ* (optional), *guṇa* (7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdha . . .*) and its subsequent replacement in *av* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*) produces *ut-t*(*u→o*) + *īṬ* + *ti* = *ut-t*(*o→av*) + *ī* + *ti* = *uttavīti*. Not accepting the option of *īṬ* will produce *ut-t*(*u→au*) + (*LAṬ→tiP*)) = *uttauti*, through application of *vṛddhi* (7.3.89 *uto vṛddhir luki hali*). The *ŚaP* of these derivates goes through deletion by *LUK* (2.4.73 *bahulaṃ chandasi*). This same derivational procedure is followed for derivates of *ru* and *stu*. The second person middle plural optional derivates of *śamI* with (*LOṬ→dhvam*) are *śamīdhvam* (with *īṬ*) and *śāmyadhvam* (with no *īṬ*). Note that *ātmanepada*, i.e., *dhvam*, and *ŚaP* are used here, via *vyatyaya*

'transposition, violation'. Affix *ŚaP* is again deleted by 2.4.73 *chandasi bahulam*. This *vyatyaya* of *ŚaP*, or for that matter the inhered sense of *ṆiC* in the root, does not apply in case of a non-*īṬ* derivate. We will thus get *śāmyadhvam* with *ŚyaN* since *śamI* is a root of the *divādi* class. The lengthening of *a* of *śam* in *śāmyadhvam* will then be accomplished by 7.3.74 *śamām aṣṭānām*. . . . Deriving *abhi-am* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*) = *abhyam* + *īṬ* + *tiP* = *abhyamīti* and *abhyamati*, with optional *īṬ*, and no deletion of *ŚaP* in the non-*īṬ* form, is not difficult.

3. Note that *śam* and *am* are roots of the *divādi* and *bhvādi* group, respectively. Since a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix is not possible to find immediately after *śam* and *am*, mostly due to their intervening *vikaraṇas*, i.e., *ŚyaN* and *ŚaP*, we must delete them. Such a *LUK*-deletion can be made possible by accepting these usages as Vedic (2.4.73 *bahulaṃ chandasi*).

7.3.96 अस्तिसिचोऽपृक्ते

astisico' pṛkte
/astisicaḥ 5/1 = *asti ca sit ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt*; *apṛkte* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hali* #89 *īṭ* #93 *sārvadhātuke* #95)
aster aṅgāt sijantāc ca parasyāpṛktasya (*halaḥ*) *sārvadhātukasya īḍ āgamo bhavati*
Augment *īṬ* is introduced to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix which is termed *apṛkta* and occurs after an *aṅga*, either constituted by *asti* (*as* 'to be') or terminating in *sIC*.

EXAMPLES:

āsīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *as*'
āsīḥ 'second person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *as*'
akārṣīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *kṛ* 'to do''
alāvīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *lūÑ* 'to cut''
apāvīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *pū* 'to cleanse''

1. Refer to derivational details of *akārṣīt* and *alāvīt* in the appendix (II: 332-36). They illustrate an *aṅga* which ends in *sIC*. Examples of *as* are offered as *āsīt* and *āsīḥ*. The first is derived with *LAṄ*→*tiP* where augment *āṬ* (6.4.72 *āḍ ajādīnām*) is introduced. Thus, we get: *āṭ* + *as* + *ŚaP* + *tiP*. This *ŚaP*, however, goes through *LUK*-deletion of 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ*. . . . The *ā* of *āṬ* and the *a* of *as* is also replaced with a single *vṛddhi* vowel *ā* (6.1.90 *āṭaś ca*). Thus, (*ā*+*a*→*ā*) *s* + (*ŚaP*→ϕ) + *ti*)) = *ās* + *ti*. The *i* of *ti* is also deleted by 3.4.100 *itaś ca*. An introduction of *īṬ* by this rule will produce: *ās* + *īṬ* + *t*(*i*→ϕ) = *āsīt*. We similarly get the second person singular form: *as* + (*LUṄ*→*siP*) = (*ā*+*as*→*ās*) + *ī* + *s*(*i*→ϕ)) = *āsī*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *āsīḥ*.

2. Why do we need the condition of *apṛkte*? Consider *asti* and *akārṣam* where *ti* and *am* are constituted by two sound segments. Thus, we do not have *īṬ*.

3. A *vārttika* proposal (*vt: āhibhuvor īṭi pratiṣedhaḥ*) is made to negate *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating a replacement as what it replaced' in connection with *īṬ* of *āha* and *bhū*. That is, we do not get *īṬ* in *āttha* and *abhūt*. Recall that, given *brū* + (*LAṬ* →*ṆaL*), rule 3.4.84 *bruvaḥ . . .* replaces *brū* with *āh*. Our present rule may offer *īṬ* by treating *āh* as *brū*, via *sthānivadbhāva*. Similar situation will arise by treating *as* as *bhū* in its *LUṄ*-derivate *āttha*. A proposed negation of *sthānivadbhāva* blocks *īṬ*.

4. The wording of this rule has generated considerable debate in the literature. *Kāśikā* begins its paraphrase as follows:

> *aster aṅgāt sijantāc ca parasya apṛktasya sārvadhātukasya īḍ āgamo bhavati* 'augment *īṬ* becomes part of the consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix termed *apṛkta* which occurs after an *aṅga* constituted by *asti*, and also after a form ending in affix *sIC*'

Kāśikā arrives at this paraphrase with the understanding that the locative of *apṛkte hali*, in view of the ablative of *astisicaḥ*, should be changed into genitive. For, a specification made with ablative is considered more powerful than one made with the locative (*ubhayanirdeśe pañcamīnirdeśo balīyaḥ*)'. This changed genitive must then denote part (*avayava*) of a whole (*avayavin*). This is how *īṬ*, marked with *Ṭ* as an *it* (*ādyantau ṭakitau*), is made initial to the *sārvadhātuka* affix termed *apṛkta*. *Kāśikā* further interprets the nominal stem in *astisicaḥ* as a *samāhāra-dvandva* compound where *asti* is interpreted as verbal root *as* 'to be'.

This interpretation, however, is problematic. Kātyāyana proposes a *vārttika* which negates *īṬ* by negating *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating the replacement as what it replaced' of *bhū* as *as* (*vt: āhibhuvor īṭ pratiṣedhaḥ*). This is how *īṬ* is stopped in *abhūt* 'third singular past imperfect active of *as*'. But this negation of *sthānivadbhāva* creates problems elsewhere. Consider 2.4.77 *gati-sthā-ghu-pā-bhūbhyaḥ sicaḥ parasmaipadeṣu*, whereby deletion of *sIC*, in the context of a select list of verbal roots, is accomplished. Now a question: why can we not attach *īṬ* in the context of these verbal roots by reviving *LUK*-deletion of *sIC*, either by *pratyayalakṣaṇa* (1.1.62 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam*) or by *sthānivadbhāva*? We know that introducing *īṬ* will create problems in deriving *LUṄ*-derivates *abhūt* (of *bhū*), *agāt* (of *gam*), *asthāt* (of *sthā*), etc.

Note that negation of *īṬ* by the *vārttika*, based on *sthānivadbhāva* proposal concerning *bhū*, can account for negation of *īṬ* in *abhūt*. Haradatta thinks that introduction of *īṬ* can also be blocked in *agāt*, *apāt* and *asthāt*, etc., by extension at the strength of the *vārttika* itself. But there is no proposal for stopping *īṬ* obtaining at the strength of *pratyayalakṣaṇa* (*PM: sthānivadbhāvapratiṣedhād astyāśrayatvād īṇ na bhavati/ sijāśrayo' pi na bhavati sthānivadbhāvapratiṣedhasāmarthyāt*). Nāgeśa, based on the *Mahābhāṣya* statement of *dvisakārako nirdeśaḥ* 'this specification is made with two *s* sounds' (*Mbh* on 1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*), accepts the wording of *astisico' apṛkte* with

two *s* sounds: *astissico' pṛkte.* This additional ('placed-in-the middle') *s* sound, like a lamp at the doorstep, illuminates both sides, in and out. Consequently, we get *īṬ* attached to *apṛkta* occurring after *as* and *sIC*, both ending in *s*. This resolves all difficulties. This interpretation will block *īṬ* in all instances where *as* is replaced with *bhū*, and *sIC* goes through deletion. The question of *sthānivadbhāva*, or its negation by the *vārttika* and *pratyayalakṣaṇa*, will then not arise.

Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita comes out with his own interpretation. He accpets *asti* as an imitation of verbal form *asti*, used as an indeclinable (*avyaya*) in the sense of *vidyamāna* 'present'. He interprets *astisicas* as a *karmadhāraya* compound paraphrased as: *asti* (*vidyamānaṃ*) *ca tat sicaḥ*. Bhaṭṭoji deletes the ablative after *astisicas*, via *LUK*, on the basis of rule-formulation (*sautratvāt*). He thus gets the meaning: 'after a *sIC* and *as* which is present . . .'. The question of replacement of *as* with *bhū*, and also of *LUK*-deletion of *sIC*, arises here. This interpretation takes care of all problems. It does not have to accept the *vārttika* of Kātyāyana, or its extensional application. It does not have to accept the *Mahābhāṣya*-statement of *dvisakārako nirdeśaḥ* in this context. Finally, it does not have to wrestle with application, or non-application, of *pratyayalakṣaṇa* and *sthānivadbhāva*. Varadarāja, in his *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī* accepts Bhaṭṭoji's interpretation. Here is his *vṛtti*: *vidyamānāt sicaḥ asteś ca parasyāpṛktasya hala iḍ āgamaḥ* 'augment *īṬ* is attached to a consonantal *apṛkta* which occurs after a non-deleted *sIC* and *asti*'.

The interpretation of the old school of grammar (*prācīna-vyākaraṇa*) is flawed because it has to take recourse to *vārttika* and *sthānivadbhāva*, and has to wrestle with *pratyayalakṣaṇa*. Interpreters of the new school of grammar (Nāgeśa; *navya-vyākaraṇa*)) take recourse to Patañjalian ingenuity of *dvisakārako-nirdeśaḥ*. Bhaṭṭoji takes recourse to *asti* as an indeclinable. His interpretation appears more interesting, and is widely accepted. But his formation of the compound *astisicas* with internal *samāhāra-dvandva*, non-application of *sandhi* (*kutva* and *jaśtva*), and deletion of ablative after *astisicas*, makes his reader rather weary of intellectual maneuvers. His interpretation thus suffers from *jñāna-gaurava* 'prolixity of knowledge'.

7.3.97 बहुलं छन्दसि

bahulaṃ chandasi
/ bahulam 1/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hali* #89 *īṭ* #93 *sārvadhātuke* #95 *astisico' pṛkte* #96)
astisicor apṛktasya sārvadhātukasya iḍ āgamo bhavati bahulaṃ chandasi
Augment *īṬ* is variously introduced, in the Vedic, to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix termed *apṛkta*, when this affix occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *asti*, or one which terminates in *sIC*.

EXAMPLES:

sálilaṃ sarvámā ídam

áha̱rvā́vá tárhyāsī̱nná rā́tri̱ḥ
gobhírakṣā̱ḥ
pra̱tyañcámatsāḥ

1. Consider *āḥ* of *āpa evedaṃ salilaṃ sarvam āḥ* which replaces *āsīt*, the third singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *as*. We get *ās* after deletion of *i* (3.4.100 *itaś ca*) and *t* (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*). The *ā* results through *vṛddhi*-replacement of *ā+a* of *āṬ* and *as* (6.1.90 *āṭaś ca*). We finally get *ā*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *āḥ*, through *rutva-visarga*. We get *āsīt* in *ahar eva āsīt*. . . . Similar applications produce *akṣāḥ* and *atsāḥ*, the two derivates of *kṣar* and *tsar* in *LUṄ*. Note that these forms have augment *aṬ*, and the *a* of *kṣar* and *tsar* goes through *vṛddhi* (7.2.2 *ato lrāntasya*). These illustrate examples of *sIC*. An absence of *īṬ* is dictated by the Vedic usage (*chāndas*). The *s* after *r* is here deleted by 8.2.24 *rātsasya*. The *r* then goes through *rutva-visarga*. Incidentally, these forms are parallel to *akṣarīt* and *atsarīt* of the classical usage.

7.3.98 रुदश्च पञ्चभ्यः

rudaś ca pañcabhyaḥ
/*rudaḥ* 5/1 *ca* ϕ *pañcabhyaḥ* 5/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hali* #89 *īṭ* #93 *sārvadhātuke* #95 *apṛkte* #96)
rudādibhyaḥ parasya sārvadhātukasya halāder apṛktasya īḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *īṬ* is introduced to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix termed *apṛkta* when the same occurs after an *aṅga*, namely one of the five enumerated in the list headed by *rud* 'to cry'.

EXAMPLES:

arodīt '. . . third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *rud* 'to cry' '
arodīḥ 'second person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
asvapīt 'thrid person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *svap* 'to recline, sleep' '
asvapīḥ 'second person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
aśvasīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *śvas* 'to breathe' '
aśvasīḥ 'second person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
prāṇīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *an* 'to breathe' '
prāṇīḥ 'second person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
ajakṣīt 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *jakṣ* 'to laugh' '
ajakṣīḥ 'second person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. Consider *aṬ* + *rud* + (*ŚaP*→ϕ) + *īṬ* + (*LUṄ*→*t*(*i*→ϕ)*P*)) = *ar*(*u*→*o*) *d* + *īt* = *arodīt*, where penultimate *guṇa* of *u* is accomplished. All derivates involve deletion of *ŚaP* by 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ*. . . . The *n* of *pra-an* goes through *ṇatva* of 8.4.10 *aniter antaḥ*. The example derivates are offered before the third and second singular active endings *tiP* and *siP*.

Why after five only? Consider *ajāgar* of *ajāgar bhavān* where *jāgṛ*, because

of not being one of five, does not allow *īṬ*. The condition of *apṛkte* is still valid. Thus, we do not get *īṬ* in *roditi*, because *ti* consists of two sound segments.

2. The singular in *rudaḥ* is used for plural. It denotes the plural meaning when read with *pañcabhyaḥ* 'after the five . . .'.

7.3.99 अड् गार्ग्यगालवयोः

aḍ gārgyagālavayoḥ
/aḍ 1/1 *gārgya-gālavayoḥ* 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hali* #89 *sārvadhātuke* #95 *apṛkte* #96 *rudaḥ pañcabhyaḥ* #98)
rudādibhyaḥ pañcabhyaḥ parasya apṛktasya sārvadhātukasyāḍ āgamo bhavati gārgyagālavayor matena
Augment *aṬ*, instead, is introduced, in the opinion of Gārgya and Gālava, to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix termed *apṛkta* when the same occurs after an *aṅga*, namely one of the five enumerated in the list headed by *rud*.

EXAMPLES:

arodat
arodaḥ
asvapat
asvapaḥ
aśvasat
aśvasaḥ
prāṇat
prāṇaḥ
ajakṣat
ajakṣaḥ

1. This rule introduces *aṬ*, instead, to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix termed *apṛkta*. Thus, we get *aṬ* + *rud* + *aṬ* + *t* → *ar*(*u*→*o*) *d* + *a* + *t* = *arodat*. Derivational details of these examples are similar to those given under the preceding rule.

2. Note that mention of *Gārgya* and *Gālava* is made for showing respect (*pūjārtham*). We do not need this specification for option. For, introduction of *aṬ* and *īṬ*, both marked with *Ṭ* as an *it*, cannot be made concurrently. The option is thus clear.

7.3.100 अदः सर्वेषाम्

adaḥ sarveṣām
/adaḥ 6/1 *sarveṣām* 6/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hali* #89 *sārvadhātuke* #95 *apṛkte* #96 *aṭ* #99)

'ada bhakṣaṇe' asmād uttarasyāpṛktasya sārvadhātukasyāḍ āgamo bhavati sarveṣām ācāryāṇāṃ matena
Augment *aṬ*, in the opinion of everyone (*sarveṣām*), is introduced to a consonant-initial *sārvadhātuka* affix termed *apṛkta* when the same occurs after an *aṅga* constituted by *ad* 'to consume'.

EXAMPLES:

ādat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate'
ādaḥ 'second person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate'

1. Note that *sarveṣām* is used here for making the provision of this rule obligatory (*nitya*). There may be some confusion about its optional status, especially in the context of *gārgyagālavayoḥ*. That is, if *sarveṣām* was not used. Thus, *āṬ + ad + tiP = ādat*, through deletion of *ŚaP*, *i*-deletion (of *tiP*) and a single *vṛddhi*-replacement for the sequence *ā+a*. Deriving the *siP*-derivate *ādaḥ* offers nothing new.

Remember that the condition of *apṛkte* still applies. Thus, we do not get this *aṬ* in the context of *LAṬ*-derivates *ad + ti = atti* and *ad + si = atsi*. The affixes here consist of more than one sound segment.

7.3.101 अतो दीर्घो यञि

ato dīrgho yañi
/ataḥ 6/1 *dīrghaḥ* 1/1 *yañi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sārvadhātuke* #95)
akārāntasyāṅgasya dīrgho bhavati yañādau sārvadhātuke parataḥ
A long vowel comes in place of the final *a* of an *aṅga* when a *sārvadhātuka* affix beginning with sounds denoted by the abbreviatory term *yañ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pacāmi 'I cook'
pacāvaḥ 'we (two) cook'
pacāmaḥ 'we (all) cook'
pakṣyāmi 'I will cook'
pakṣyāvaḥ 'we (two) will cook'
pakṣyāmaḥ 'we (all) will cook'

1. This rule offers a corresponding long replacement to an *aṅga* which ends in *aT*. That is, when the *aṅga* is followed by a *sārvadhātuka* affix which begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *yañ* (*Śs.* 5-8). Consider *pac + ŚaP + miP = pacāmi*, *pac + ŚaP + vas = pacāvaḥ* and *pac + ŚaP + mas = pacāmaḥ*, where the *sārvadhātuka* affixes begin with *m* and *v*. We similarly get the first singular, dual and plural *LṚṬ*-derivates *pakṣyāmi*, *pakṣyāvaḥ* and

pakṣyāmaḥ, where *c* is replaced with *k* (8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*). Augment *iṬ* is here negated by 7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe*. . . .

2. Why do we have the condition of *ataḥ* 'in place of *a*? Consider *cinuvaḥ* and *cinumaḥ* where *u*, because it is not *a*, cannot be allowed this long replacement. The condition of *yañi* similarly blocks this lengthening of *a* in *pac* + *a* + *tas* = *pacataḥ* and *pac* + *a* + *thas* = *pacathaḥ*. Obviously, *t* and *th* are not included within the denotatum of *yaÑ*. Finally, this long replacement must also be accomplished before a *sārvadhātuka* affix. For, we do not get it in deriving *aṅganā* 'wife, woman' and *keśava* 'Kṛṣṇa' with affixes *ta* and *va* introduced after *aṅga* and *keśa* 'hair'.

Some read *tiṅi* 'when an affix denoted by *tiṄ* follows', via *anuvṛtti*, from rule 7.3.88 *bhūsuvos tiṅi*. This explains why, according to them, there is no lengthening at the end in *bhava* of *bhavavān*, a derivate where *KvasU*, and no *tiṄ*, replaces *LIṬ*. Thus, *bhū* + (*LIṬ*→*KvasU*) → *bhū* + *ŚaP* + *vas* → *bh*(*ū*→*o*→*av*) + *a* + *va*(*nUM*)*s* → *bhavav*(*a*→*ā*)*ns* → *bhavavān* (*s*→ϕ) = *bhavavān*. Recall that *KvasU* is assigned the term *sārvadhātuka* under the 'either way' (*ubhayathā*) option of 3.4.117 *chandasy ubhyathā*. Since the form is Vedic, others explain *bhavavān* as a Vedic anomaly.

7.3.102 सुपि च

supi ca
/supi 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ato dīrgho yañi* #101)
supi ca yañādau parato' kārāntasyāṅgasya dīrgho bhavati
A long vowel comes in place of the final *a* of an *aṅga*, also when an affix termed *sUP* beginning with sounds denoted by the abbreviatory term *yaÑ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣāya
vṛkṣābhyām
plakṣāya
plakṣābhyām

1. This rule allows a long replacement for the final short of an *aṅga* when a *sUP* affix beginning with a sound denoted by *yaÑ* follows. Thus, we get *vṛkṣa* + (*Ṅe*→*ya*) = *vṛkṣ*(*a*→*ā*)*ya* = *vṛkṣāya*, and (*plakṣa* + *Ṅe*) = *plakṣāya*. Note that *Ṅe* is replaced with *ya* by 7.1.33 *ṅer yaḥ*. Refer to derivational details of *vṛkṣāya* and *plakṣāya* in the appendix (II:365). Deriving *vṛkṣābhyām* and *plakṣābhyām* with lengthening of *a* before *bhyām* is easy.

2. This lengthening does not apply when the *aṅga* does not end in *a* (*ataḥ*). Thus, consider *agnibhyām* where *agni* ends in *i*. The condition of *yañi* must also be met. Thus, we cannot get a long replacement in *vṛkṣa* + *Ṅas* →

vṛkṣa + sya = vṛkṣasya and *plakṣasya*. Recall that *s* of *sya* is not included within the denotata of *yaÑ*.

3. Note that *yañi*, carried over from the preceding rule, is a qualifier to *supi*. But *yañi* also denotes *aL* 'sound segments'. Consequently, in view of *tadādividhi* 'treating a specification made with *x* as also denoting that which begins with *x*', will yield the interpretation: *yayādau supi* 'when a *sUP* beginning with a sound denoted by *yaÑ* follows'. The word *ataḥ* is a qualifier to *aṅgasya*. Hence, in view of *tadantavidhi* 'treating a specification made with *x* as that which ends in *x*', we get the interpretation: *adantasya aṅgasya* 'an *aṅga* which ends in *a*'.

7.3.103 बहुवचने झल्येत्

bahuvacane jhaly et
/ bahuvacane 7/1 *jhali* 7/1 *et* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ataḥ* #101 *supi* #102)
bahuvacane jhalādau supi parato' kārāntasyāṅgasya ekārādeśo bhavati
An *e*, instead, comes in place of the final *a* of an *aṅga* when an affix termed *sUP* beginning with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* follows with the signification of plural.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣebhyaḥ
plakṣebhyaḥ
vṛkṣeṣu
plakṣeṣu

1. This rule allows a replacement in *e* (*etva*) to the final *a* of an *aṅga*, when the same is followed by a plural *sUP* affix beginning with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* (*Śs.* 8-14). Thus, we get *vṛkṣ*(*a*→*e*) + *bhyas* = *vṛkṣebhya*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *vṛkṣebhyaḥ* and *plakṣebhyaḥ*. We similarly get the locative plural forms *vṛkṣeṣu* and *plakṣeṣu*. Given *vṛkṣ*(*a*→*e*) + *su* = *vṛkṣe* + *su*, the *s* of *su* is replaced with *ṣ* (8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*).

Why do we have the condition of *bahuvacane* 'when 'many' is the denotation'. Consider *vṛkṣābhyām* and *plakṣābhyām*, where *e* cannot replace *a* since *bhyām* denotes two (dual). The condition of *jhalādi* 'beginning with a sound denoted by *jhaL*' similarly blocks *e* in *vṛkṣāṇām* and *plakṣāṇām*, where the genitive plural *ām*, or *nām* with augment *nUṬ*, does not begin with a *jhaL*. Finally, the *jhaL*-initial suffix must also be a *sUP*. Thus, we cannot get this replacement in *e* (*etva*) in *yaj* + *a* + *dhvam* = *yajadhvam* and *pacadhvam*, where *dhvam* is an affix denoted by *tiÑ*.

7.3.104 ओसि च

osi ca

/osi 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ataḥ* #101 *et* #103)
osi parato' kārāntasyāṅgasya ekārādeśo bhavati
An *e*, also, comes in place of the final *a* of an *aṅga* when *os* 'genitive-locative dual' follows.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣayoḥ
plakṣayoḥ
vṛkṣayoḥ
plakṣayoḥ

1. This rule allows *e* as a replacement for the final *a* of an *aṅga* when genitive and locative dual ending *os* follows. Thus, *vṛkṣa* + *os* = *vṛkṣayoḥ*, as in *vṛkṣayoḥ svam* and *vṛkṣayor nidhehi*. Similarly, *plakṣayoḥ svam* and *plakṣayor nidhehi*. Note that the *e* which replaces *a* is further replaced with *ay* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*). The final *s* of *os* then goes through a replacement in *ḥ*, via *rU* (*rutva-visarga*; 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ*).

7.3.105 आङि चापः

āṅi cāpaḥ
/āṅi 7/1 *ca* ϕ *āpaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *et* #103 *osi* #104)
'āṅ' iti pūrvācāryanirdeśena tṛtīyaikavacanaṃ gṛhyate, tasminn āṅi parataś cakārād osi ca ābantasyāṅgasyaikārādeśo bhavati
An *e* comes in place of the final *āP* of an *aṅga* when *āṄ* 'instrumental singular', and *os* as well, follows.

EXAMPLES:

khaṭvayā 'instrumental singular of *khaṭvā* 'cot''
mālayā 'instrumental singular of *mālā* 'garland''
khaṭvayoḥ 'genitive/locative dual of *khaṭvā*'
mālayoḥ 'genitive/locative dual of *mālā*'
bahurājayā 'instrumental singular of *bahurājā* 'a place with many kings''
kārīṣagandhyayā 'instrumental singular of Kārīṣagandhyā'
bahurājayoḥ 'genitive/locative dual of *bahurājā*'
kārīṣagandhyayoḥ 'genitive/locative dual of Kārīṣagandhyā'

1. This rule allows *e* as a replacement for the final *ā* of an *aṅga* which ends in a feminine affix marked with *āP*, provided the *aṅga* is followed by *āṄ*, and *os* as well. Note that *āṄ* is a term used by earlier grammarians for *Ṭā* 'instrumental singular'. Thus, *khaṭvā* + *Ṭā* → *khaṭv*(*ā*→*e*→*ay*) = *khaṭvay* + *ā* = *khaṭvayā* and *khaṭv*(*ā*→*e*→*ay*) + *os* = *khaṭvayo*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *khaṭvayoḥ*, etc. As usual, the final *ā* will be replaced with *e*.

2. Why is *āP* used with *P* as an *it*? Consider *kīlālaṃ pibati* 'he who drinks liquor' = *kīlālapā* + *Ṭā*, where the root-final *ā* gets deleted (6.4.140 *āto dhātoḥ*). This *ā* cannot be replaced with *e* since it is not marked with *P* as an *it*. Incidentally, *kīlālapā* is a derivate of affix *vIC* introduced after *pā* and introduced in construction with a cooccurring *pada*, namely *kīlāla* + *am* (3.4.74 *āto manin . . .*). This same happens also when *os* follows *kīlālapā*.

Why do we not get this *e* in *atikhaṭva* + *Ṭā* = *atikhaṭvena*? Because, the *ā* of *khaṭvā* gets replaced with its short counterpart after compound-formation. A *Mahābhāṣya* statement does not allow a specification with *ṄI* and *āP* to also include references to their counterparts gone through shortening (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *ṅyābgrahaṇe dīrghagrahaṇam ity etad vacanaṃ kartavyam, tena hrasvatve kṛte na bhavati*). Thus, *ā* cannot be brought back, via *sthānivadbhāva*, for application of this rule. Recall that *khaṭvā* is an *upasarjana* 'secondary constituent' (1.2.48 *gostriyor upasarjanasya*).

7.3.106 सम्बुद्धौ च

sambuddhau ca
/ sambuddhau 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *et* #103 *āpaḥ* #105)
sambuddhau ca parata ābantasyāṅgasya etvaṃ bhavati
An *e* comes in place of the final *āP* of an *aṅga*, also when an affix termed *sambuddhi* follows.

EXAMPLES:

he khaṭve 'O, Khaṭvā'
he bahurāje 'O, Bahurājā'
he kārīṣagandhye 'O, Kārīṣagandhyā'

1. Note that *sambuddhi* is defined as an address (*sambodhana*) form in the (nominative) singular (*ekavacanam*; 2.3.49 *ekavacanaṃ sambuddhiḥ*). The *sU*, nominative singular, after *khaṭvā*, etc., is deleted by 6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt sambuddheḥ*.

7.3.107 अम्बार्थनद्योर्ह्रस्वः

ambārthanadyor hrasvaḥ
/ ambārtha-nadyoḥ 6/2 = *ambā artho yasya* (*bv.*); *ambarthaś ca nadī ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *hrasvaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sambuddhau* #106)
ambārthānām aṅgānāṃ nadyantānāṃ hrasvo bhavati sambuddhau parataḥ
A replacement in short (*hrasvaḥ*) comes in place of the final sound of an *aṅga*, used with the signification of *ambā* 'mother', or ending in an item termed *nadī* 'river', when an affix termed *sambuddhi* follows.

EXAMPLES:

he amba 'O, Ambā'
he akka 'O, Akkā'
he alla 'O, Allā'
he kumāri 'O, Kumārī'
he śārṅgaravi 'O, Śārṅgaravī'
he brahmabandhu 'O, brahmabandhu'
he vīrabandhu 'O, vīrabandhu'

1. Note that *kumārī*, etc., are termed *nadī* by 1.4.3 *yūstryākhyau nadī*. The *sU* after these bases is deleted by 6.1.69 *eṅ hrasvāt*. . . . This rule is an exception to the preceding.

2. A *vārttika* proposal is made to exclude forms which are termed *nadī* and which terminate in *ḍa*, *la* and *ka*. That is, *ambāḍā*, *ambālā* and *ambikā*, all used with the signification of mother, receive a replacement in *e* (*etva*; 7.3.106 *sambuddhau ca*) at the end. Thus, *he ambāḍe*, *he ambāle* and *he ambike*.

A proposal is also made to make this shortening optional to *e*, in the Vedic (*chandasi vā*). Thus, *he ambāḍa / he ambāḍe*, etc.

Yet another proposal makes this shortening optional, also when *Ṅi* 'locative singular' and *sambuddhi* follow a feminine *aṅga*, ending in affix *taL*. Thus, *devatā* + *Ṅi* = *devat*(*ā*→*a*) + *i* = *devate*; and *devatāyām*. Similarly, *devatā* + *sU* = *devata* and *devate*. This option, however, is again restricted to the Vedic.

A proposal is also made to replace *mātṛ* 'mother' with *mātaC*, provided *mātṛ* occurs before a nominal ending termed *sambuddhi* and the derivate denotes a son deserving to be named after his illustrious mother. Thus, *he gārgīmāta* 'O, you, whose mother is Gārgī'. This replacement proposal of *mātaC* is made as an exception to affix *kaP* (5.4.153 *nadyṛtaś ca*). The *C* of *mātaC* makes the compound marked *udātta* at the end (6.1.163 *citaḥ*).

7.3.108 **ह्रस्वस्य गुणः**

hrasvasya guṇaḥ
/ hrasvasya 6/1 *guṇaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *sambuddhau* #106)
hrsvāntasyāṅgasya guṇo bhavati sambuddhau parataḥ
A replacement in *guṇa* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* which ends in *hrasva* 'short (vowel)' when an affix termed *sambuddhi* follows.

EXAMPLES:

he agne 'O, Agni'
he vāyo 'O, Vāyu'
he paṭo 'O, Paṭu'

1. This rule offers a replacement in *guṇa* to the final vowel of an *aṅga* which ends in a short vowel, provided what follows is a *sambuddhi*. Thus, *agn*(*i*→*e*) + (*sU*→ϕ)) = *agne*, *vāy*(*u*→*o*) + (*sU*→ϕ)) = *vāyo* and *paṭ*(*u*→*o*) + (*sU*→ϕ)) = *paṭo*. The *sU* gets deleted as usual.

Why does this *guṇa* not apply to *i* and *u* of *kumārī* + *sU* and *brahmabandhū* + *sU* after application of shortening by 7.3.107 *ambārthanadyor hrasvaḥ*? To offer shortening and then to offer *guṇa* will be a lengthy derivational procedure (*prakriyā-gaurava*). Besides, if Pāṇini wanted this *guṇa* to apply, he would have formulated 7.3.107 as *ambārthānāṃ hrasvaḥ*. He would then have formulated this present rule as *nadīhrasvayor guṇaḥ*. But since Pāṇini did not formulate these rules as suggested, we conclude that *guṇa* does not apply after shortening (*hrasva*) has applied.

7.3.109 जसि च

jasi ca
/jasi 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hrasvasya guṇaḥ* #108)
jasi parato hrasvāntasyāṅgasya guṇo bhavati
A replacement in *guṇa* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* which ends in a *hrasva*, also when *Jas* 'nominative plural' follows.

EXAMPLES:

agnayaḥ 'nominative plural of *agni*'
dhenavaḥ '. . . of *dhenu*'
paṭavaḥ '. . . of *paṭu*'
buddhayaḥ '. . . of *buddhi*'

1. Consider *agn*(*i*→*e*→*ay*) + (*J*)*as* → *agnaya*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *agnayaḥ*, and *vāy*(*u*→*o*→*av*) + *Jas* → *vāyava*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *vāyavaḥ*, etc. Similarly, *paṭavaḥ* and *dhenavaḥ*, etc.

2. A *vārttika* proposal makes these operations, i.e., *hrasva* 'replacement in short', *etva* 'replacement in *e*' and *guṇa*, optional in the Vedic when affixes *Jas*, etc., follow. I omit any further discussion on this *vārttika* since its scope is confusing.

7.3.110 ऋतो ङिसर्वनामस्थानयोः

ṛto ṅisarvanāmasthānayoḥ
/ṛtaḥ 6/1 *ṇi-sarvanāmasthānayoḥ* 7/2 = *ṅi ca sarvanāmasthanañ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *guṇaḥ* #108)
ṛkārāntasyāṅgasya ṇau parataḥ sarvanāmasthāne ca guṇo bhavati
A replacement in *guṇa* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* which ends in *ṛ*, when *Ṅi*, and an affix termed *sarvanāmasthāna* (1.1.42 *śi sarvanāmasthānam* . . .), follows.

EXAMPLES:

mātari 'locative singular of *mātṛ* 'mother' '
pitari 'locative singular of *pitṛ* 'father' '
bhrātari 'locative singular of *bhrātṛ* 'brother' '
kartari 'locative singular of *kartṛ* 'doer' '
kartārau 'nominative dual of *kartṛ*'
kartāraḥ 'nominative plural of *kartṛ*'
mātarau 'nominative dual of *mātṛ*'
pitarau 'nominative dual of *pitṛ*'
bhrātarau 'nominative dual of *bhrātṛ*'

1. Consider *māt*(*ṛ*→*ar*) + *Ṅi* = *mātari*, *pitṛ* + *Ṅi* = *pitari*, *bhrātṛ* + *Ṅi* = *bhrātari* and *kartṛ* + *Ṅi* = *kartari*. Example derivates for *sarvanāmasthāna* (1.4.43 *suṭ anapuṃsakasya*) are: *māt*(*ṛ*→*ar*) + *au*) = *mātarau*, *pitarau* and *bhrātarau*. Note that the *a* of *kart*(*a*→*ā*) *r* + *au* and *kart*(*a*→*ā*) *r* + (*J*) *as*, etc., is replaced with its long counterpart (6.4.11 *aptṛntṛc* . . .). Thus, we get *kartārau* and *kartāraḥ*, etc.

2. The *t* of *ṛt* in *ṛtaḥ* is used for ease of articulation (*Kāś*: *taparakaraṇaṃ mukhasukhārtham*). Besides, it is impossible to find a form ending in a long *ṝ* used before *Ṅi*, or an affix termed *sarvanāmasthāna*.

7.3.111 घेर्ङिति

gher ṅiti
/*gheḥ* 6/1 *ṅiti* 7/1 = *ṅakāra it yasya* (*bv.*), *tasmin*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *guṇaḥ* #108 *supi* #102)
ghyantasyāṅgasya ṅiti pratyaye parato guṇo bhavati
A replacement in *guṇa* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* which ends in a *ghi* (1.4.7 *śeṣo ghy asakhi*), provided when a *sUP* affix marked with *Ṅ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

agnaye 'dative singular of *agni*'
vāyave 'dative singular of *vāyu*'
agneḥ (*āgacchati*) '. . . comes from Agni; ablative singular of *agni*'
vāyor (*āgacchati*) '. . . comes from; ablative singular of *vāyu*'
agneḥ svam 'Agni's own; genitive singular'
vāyoḥ svam 'Vāyu's own; genitive singular'

1. Recall that 1.4.7 *śeṣo ghy asakhi* assigns the term *ghi*. The nominal endings which are marked with *Ṅ* as an *it* are: *Ṅe* 'dative singular', *ṄasI* 'ablative singular', *Ṅas* 'genitive singular' and *Ṅi* 'locative singular'. Refer to derivational details of *agneḥ* and *vāyoḥ* under 6.1.108 *eṅaḥ padāntād*. . . . The dative singular form *agn*(*i*→*e*→*ay*) + (*Ṅ*) *e* = *agnaye* is gotten through *guṇa* and *ay*-

replacement. These examples illustrate *guṇa* with *pūrvarūpa* 'single replacement similar to the preceding of a vocalic sequence (6.1.108)', or *guṇa* with replacement in *ay*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *ghi*? Consider *sakhi* + *Ṅe* and *pati* + *Ṅe* where *guṇa* is blocked because *sakhi* 'friend' is excluded from receiving the term *ghi* (*asakhi*; 1.4.7 *śeṣo ghy asakhi*). The word *pati* is assigned this term only when used in a compound (1.4.8 *patiḥ samāsa eva*).

Why do we have the condition of *ṅiti* 'when an affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it* follows'? Consider *agnibhyām* where *bhyām* is not marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. Consequently, there is no *guṇa* for *i* of *agni*.

Why do we have the condition of *supi* 'when a *sUP* follows'? Consider *paṭu* + *ṄīṢ* and *kuru* + *tas* where *guṇa* of the final *u* of *paṭu* and *kuru* will be blocked since *ṄīṢ* and *tas* are affixes not denoted by *sUP*.

7.3.112 **आण्नद्याः**

āṇ nadyāḥ
/*āṭ* 1/1 *nadyāḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṅiti* #111)
nadyantād aṅgād uttarasya ṅitaḥ pratyayasyāḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *āṬ* is introduced to an affix marked with *Ṅ* when it occurs after an *aṅga* termed *nadī*.

EXAMPLES:

kumāryai 'dative singular of *kumārī*'
brahmabandhvai 'dative singular of *brahmabandhū*'
kumāryāḥ 'genitive singular of *kumārī*'
brahmabandhvāḥ 'genitive singular of *brhmabandhū*'

1. This rule introduces augment *āṬ* to the beginning of an affix (1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*) which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it* and occurs after an *aṅga* terminating in a form termed *nadī*. Thus, *kumārī* + *Ṅe* → *kumārī* + (*āṬ* + *Ṅe*) → *kumārī* + (*ā*+*e*→*ai*) → *kumār*(*ī*→*y*) + *ai*, where 6.1.90 *āṭaś ca* offers a single *vṛddhi* replacement for the sequence *ā*+*ī*. Refer to derivational details of feminine forms under rules governed by 4.1.3 *striyām*.

7.3.113 **याडापः**

yāḍ āpaḥ
/*yāṭ* 1/1 *āpaḥ* 5/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṅiti* #111)
ābantād aṅgād uttarasya ṅitaḥ pratyayasya yāḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *yāṬ* is introduced to an affix which is marked with *Ṅ* as an *it* and occurs after an *aṅga* terminating in *āP*.

EXAMPLES:

khaṭvāyai 'dative singular of *khaṭvā*'
bahurājāyai 'dative singular of *bahurājā*'
kārīṣagandhyāyai 'dative singular of *kārīṣagandhyā*'
khaṭvāyāḥ 'genitive singular of *khaṭvā*'
kārīṣagandhyāyāḥ 'genitive singular of *kārīṣagandhyā*'
bahurājāyāḥ 'genitive singular of *bahurājā*'

1. This rule introduces augment *yāṬ* to an affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*, when the same follows an *aṅga* ending in the feminine affix *āP*. This *āP* refers to the *āP* of *ṬāP* (*khaṭvā*), *CāP* (*kārīṣagandhyā*) and *ḌāP* (*bahurājā*). Thus, *khaṭvā* + *Ṅe* → *khaṭvā* + *yāṬ* + *Ṅe* → *khaṭvā* + *y*(*ā*+*e*→*ai*) = *khaṭvāyai*. A single *vṛddhi*-replacement for the sequence *ā*+*e* is here offered by 6.1.88 *vṛddhir eci*. Note that *khaṭvā* + *yāṬ* + *Ṅas* → *khaṭvā* + *yā* + *as* produces *khaṭvāy*(*ā*+*a*→*ā*) *s* = *khaṭvāyā*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *khaṭvāyāḥ*, through *savarṇadīrgha* (6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe . . .*) 'homogeneous long vowel replacement' and *s*→*r*→*ḥ* (*rutva-visarga*).

2. A question is raised as to why, given *atikhaṭva* + (*Ṅ*)*e* where *ā* of *khaṭvā* has gone through shortening (1.2.48 *gostriyor upasarjanasya*), we cannot get *yāṬ* by treating *atikhaṭva* as ending in *āP*, via *sthānivadbhāva*? This *yāṬ* is blocked on grounds that 'a non-long is not accepted when the specification is made with *Ṅī* and *āP* (*ṅyābgrahaṇe dīrghagrahaṇam*; also note (2) under 7.3.105 *āṅi cāpaḥ*). Why can we still not introduce *yāṬ* to *ya* (7.1.13 *ṅer yaḥ*) of *atikhaṭva* + *ya*, after the final *a* of *atikhaṭva* has been replaced with its long counterpart (7.3.102 *supi ca*)? Because this *ā* results out of a rule-application (*lākṣaṇika*). Recall that a specification made by enumeration of individual forms (*pratipadokta*), alone, is accepted when a conflict arises in connection with forms derived via rule applications (*PŚ* 114: *lakṣaṇapratipadoktayoḥ pratipadoktasyaiva grahaṇam*). Augment *yāṬ* thus cannot be introduced here.

7.3.114 सर्वनाम्नः स्याड्ढ्रस्वश्च

sarvanāmnaḥ syāḍḍ hrasvaś ca
/*sarvanāmnaḥ* 5/1 *syāṭ* 1/1 *hrasvaḥ* 1/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṅiti* #111 *āpaḥ* #113)
sarvanāmna ābantād aṅgād uttarasya ṅitaḥ pratyayasya syāḍ āgamo hrasvaś ca bhavati
Augment *syāṬ* is introduced to an affix which is marked with *Ṅ* and occurs after an *aṅga* termed *sarvanāman* ending in *āP*, with an additional provision that a *hrasva* 'short vowel' replace the final of the *aṅga*.

EXAMPLES:

sarvasyai 'dative singular of *sarvā*'
viśvasyai 'dative singular of *viśvā*'

yasyai 'dative singular of *yā*'
tasyai 'dative singular of *sā*'
kasyai 'dative singular of *kā*'
anyasyai 'dative singular of *anyā*'
sarvasyāḥ 'genitive singular of *sarvā*'
viśvasyāḥ 'genitive singular of *viśvā*'
yasyāḥ 'genitive singular of *yā*'
kasyāḥ 'genitive singular of *kā*'
anyasyāḥ 'genitive singular of *kā*'

1. This rule introduces augment *syāṬ* to an affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*, when the same follows an *aṅga* ending in *āP*. The long final of the *aṅga* is additionally replaced with its short counterpart. Thus, *sarvā* + *Ṅe* → *sarv*(*ā*→*a*) + (*syāṬ* + *e*)) → *sarva* + *sy*(*ā*+*e*→*ai*) = *sarvasyai*, with the application of 6.1.85 *vṛddhir eci*. Similar applications are witnessed in other derivates. We get the application of *savarṇadīrgha* (6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*) and *rutva-visarga* in *sarvā* + *Ṅas* → *sarv*(*ā*→*a*) + *syā*(*Ṭ*) + *as* = *sarvasy*(*ā*+*a*→*ā*)*s* → *sarvasyā* (*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *sarvasyāḥ*.

2. Note that this rule applies only when the *aṅga* ends in *āP*. Thus, it does not apply, for example, in *bhavat* + *Ṅi* = *bhavati* 'locative singular of *bhavatī*' and *bhavat* + *Ṅe* = *bhavate* 'dative singular of *bhavat*'. This same also applies to *bhavatī* + *Ṅe* = *bhavatyai* 'dative singular of *bhavatī*' and *bhavatī* + *Ṅas* = *bhavatyāḥ* 'genitive singular of *bhavatī*'.

7.3.115 विभाषा द्वितीयातृतीयाभ्याम्

vibhāṣā dvitīyātṛtīyābhyām
/*vibhāṣā* 1/1 *dvitīyā-tṛtīyābhyām* 5/2 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṅiti* #111 *syāḍ hrasvaś ca* #114)
'*dvitīyā, tṛtīyā*' *ity etābhyām uttarasya ṅitaḥ pratyayasya vibhāṣā syāḍ āgamo bhavati dvitīyātṛtīyayoś ca hrasvo bhavati*
Augment *syāṬ* is optionally introduced to an affix which is marked with *Ṅ* and occurs after an *aṅga*, namely *dvitīyā* 'second, other' and *tṛtīyā* 'third, other', with an additional provision that a *hrasva* 'short vowel' replace the final of the *aṅga*.

EXAMPLES:

dvitīyasyai 'dative singular of *dvitīyā* 'second, other'
dvitīyāyai 'ibidem; with no *syāṬ*'
tṛtīyasyai 'dative singular of *tṛtīyā* 'third' '
tṛtīyāyai 'ibidem; with no *syāṬ*'

1. This provision of optional shortening, and *syāṬ*, was not available to *dvitīyā* and *tṛtīyā*. Obviously, because they are not pronominal (*sarvanāman*). This rule makes this non-available option (*aprāpta*) possible (*prāpta*). Short-

ening will thus apply when the option of *syāṬ* is availed. There will not be any shortening when *syāṬ* is not introduced. Refer to *uttarapūrvasyai* 'dative singular of *uttarapūrvā* 'north-east' and *uttarapūrvāyai* (appendix, II:363-65) for derivational details.

7.3.116 ङेराम् नद्यामीभ्यः

ṅerām nadyāmnībhyaḥ
/ṅeḥ 6/1 *ām* 1/1 *nadyāmnībhyaḥ* 5/3 = *nadī ca āp ca nīś ca = nadyāmnaḥ* (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
nadyantād ābantān nīty etasmāc cottarasya ṅer ām ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ām* comes in place of affix *Ṅi* when the same occurs after an *aṅga* termed *nadī* (1..43 *yūstryākhyau nadī*), or after an *aṅga* terminating in *āP*, or else, after an *aṅga* terminating in *nī*.

EXAMPLES:

kumāryām 'locative singular of *kumārī*'
gauryām 'locative singular of *gaurī*'
brahmabandhvām 'locative singular of *brahmabandhū*'
dhībandhvām 'locative singular of *dhībandhū*'
khaṭvāyām 'locative singular of *khaṭvā*'
bahurājāyām 'locative singular of *bahurājā*'
kārīṣagandhyāyām 'locative singular of *kārīṣagandhyā*'
rājanyām 'locative singular of *rājanī*'
senānyām 'locative singular of *senānī*'

1. Refer to 4.1.2 *svaujasmauṭ . . .*, etc., for derivational details (appendix, IV:764-67). Note that *rājanī* and *senānī* are derivates of *KvIP*, for which see the appendix (III:730-40) under 3.2.61 *satsūdviṣa. . . .* The term *nadī* is assigned by 1.4.3 *yūstryākhyau nadī*.

7.3.117 इदुद्भ्याम्

idudbhyām
/id-ud-bhyām 5/1 (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.1.1 *nadyāḥ, ṅer ām* #116/
ikārokārābhyāṃ nadīsaṃjñakābhyām uttarasya ṅer ām ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ām* comes in place of affix *Ṅi* when the same occurs after an *aṅga* termed *nadī* terminating in *i* and *u*.

EXAMPLES:

kṛtyām 'locative singular of *kṛti*'
dhenvām 'locative singular of *dhenu*'

1. This rule applies to an *aṅga* which ends in *i* and *u* and is termed *nadī* (1.4.6 *ṅiti hrasvaś ca*). Thus, *kṛti* + (*Ṅi*→*ām*) = *kṛt*(*i*→*y*) + *ām* = *kṛtyām* and *dhenu* + (*Ṅi*→*ām*) = *dhen*(*u*→*v*) + *ām* = *dhenvām*. A question is raised against formulating this rule, especially since our earlier rule can account for its derivates. The word *nadī* is thus carried here to qualify *i* and *u* to get: *nadīsajñakau yāv idudau* 'forms which are termed *nadī* and end in *iT* and *uT*'. Obviously, this rule is useless. But it is not. The *au* of the next rule will block *ām* on the basis of *paratva* 'subsequent in order of enumeration'. If this rule is formulated, *ām* alone will be introduced. This rule could not have been formulated as *idudbhyām aut*. For, *kṛti* and *dhenu* could then have received *au* on the basis of *paratva*. Note that *ām*, characterized with the term *nadī*, could have found its independent scope in *kumāryām*. The *au* could have found its independent scope in *patyau* and *sakhyau*. They both could have been available to *kṛti* when termed *nadī*. The *au* could have won on the basis of *paratva*.

Note that, in the absence of the term *nadī*, we get the assignment of the term *ghi* (1.4.7 *śeṣo ghy asakhi*). Rule 7.3.119 *ac ca gheḥ* then applies to produce *kṛt*(*i*→*a*) + (*i*→*au*) = *kṛt*(*a* + *au* → *au*) = *kṛtau* and *dhenau*.

7.3.118 औत्

aut
/*aut* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṅeḥ ām* #116 *idudbhyām* #117)
idudbhyām uttarasya ṇer aukārādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *au* comes in place of *Ṅi* when the same occurs after an *aṅga* which terminates in *i* and *u*, but is not a *nadī*, or *ghi*.

EXAMPLES:

sakhyau 'locative singular of *sakhi*'
patyau 'locative singular of *pati*'

1. This rule applies to an *aṅga* which ends in *i* and *u*, but is not a *nadī*, or *ghi* (1.4.7 *śeṣo ghy asakhi*). Thus, we get *sakhi* + (*Ṅi* → *au*) = *sakh*(*i*→*y*) + *au* = *sakhyau* and *pati* + *Ṅi* → *patyau*.

2. Note that this is a general rule. Rule 7.3.118 *acca gheḥ* is its exception. There is no example of *u* available. It is here used for facilitating derivates of the following rule (*uttarārtham*). Incidentally, *t* in *aut* is not an *it*. It is here used for *taparakaraṇa* 'making *t* follow' (1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*).

7.3.119 अच्च घेः

ac ca gheḥ
/*at* 1/1 *ca* ϕ *gheḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṅeḥ* #116 *aut* #118)

ghisaṃjñakād uttarasya ṅer aukārādeśo bhavati tasya ca gher akārādeśo bhavati

A replacement in *au* comes in place of affix *Ṅi* when the same occurs after *i* and *u* of an *aṅga* termed *ghi*, with an additional provision that *a*(*T*) comes in place of the final of an *aṅga* termed *ghi*.

EXAMPLES:

agnau 'locative singular of *agni*'
vāyau 'locative singular of *vāyu*'
kṛtau 'locative singular of *kṛti*'
dhenau 'locative singular of *dhenu*'
paṭau 'locative singular of *dhenu*'

1. The *Mahābhāṣya* lists this and the preceding rule as one: *aud ac ca gheḥ*. It then resorts to a split interpretation (*yogavibhāgha*) as follows:
   (*i*) *aut* (with *idudbhyām* read via *anuvṛtti*): '*auT* comes in place of *Ṅi* occurring after an *aṅga* ending in *i* and *u*';
   (*ii*) *ac ca gheḥ* (read with *aut*): '*auT* comes in place of *Ṅi* occurring after an *aṅga* termed *ghi*; additionally, the final of the *aṅga* termed *ghi* is replaced with *a*'. *Kāśikā* reads these two split-rules separately. A joint listing of these two creates problem. That is, *au*(*tva*) and *a*(*tva*), since they are both offered concurrently (*sanniyogaśiṣṭa*), will also apply concurrently. That is, we will find *autva* where *atva* will apply. A single formulation, for resolving problems of application, will treat the *a*-replacement (*atva*) of an *aṅga* termed *ghi* (which ends in *i* and *u*) as *anvācaya-śiṣṭa* 'secondarily taught'. Thus, it will only apply where possible. It is similar to the application of deletion of *s* (*salopa*) in 3.1.11 *kartuḥ kyaṅ salopaś ca*. Recall that *KyaṄ* is a primary provision there. The deletion of *s* is taught secondarily.

2. The *t* of *at* (*taparakaraṇa*) is used to block introduction of the feminine affix *ṬāP* (*Kāś: ad iti taparakaraṇaṃ striyāṃ ṭāpo nivṛtyartham*). That is, *ṬāP* cannot be introduced after a base which has received a replacement in *a*.

7.3.120 आङो नाऽस्त्रियाम्

āṅo nā' striyām

/*āṅaḥ* 6/1 *nā* 1/1 *astriyām* 7/1 = *na strī* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasyām*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *gheḥ* #119)

gher uttarasyāṅo nābhāvo bhavati

A replacement in *nā* comes in place of affix *Ṭā*, when the same occurs after an *aṅga* termed *ghi*, provided the scope is other than feminine (*astriyām*).

EXAMPLES:

agninā 'instrumental singular of *agni*'
vāyunā 'instrumental singular of *vāyu*'
paṭunā 'instrumental singular of *paṭu*'

1. Note that the term *ghi* will be assigned by 1.4.7 *śeṣo ghy asakhi*. Its derivates must be restricted to masculine and neuter. Why was the specification not made with *puṃsi* 'with the scope of masculine'. Consider *amunā* 'instrumental singular of *idam*' of *amunā brāhmaṇakulena* 'by this clan of the brāhmaṇas' where *nā* in the neuter derivate could have been blocked. Other neuter forms could be derived with no problem under the specification of *puṃsi* 'masculine'. How? By introducing *nUM* of 7.1.73 *iko' ci vibhaktau*. Thus, we can derive *trapuṇā* 'instrumental singular of *trapu*' and *jatunā* 'instrumental singular of *jatu*'. But *amunā* will still create problems. It is for this reason that *astriyām* 'other than feminine' is employed to specify the exclusion.

2. Why do we state this exclusion of *astriyām*? Consider *kṛti* + *Ṭā* → *kṛtyā* 'instrumental singular of *kṛti*' and *dhenu* + *Ṭā* → *dhenvā* 'instrumental singular of *dhenu*' where, because of the feminine scope of the derivate, we do not get *nā*.

PĀDA FOUR

7.4.1 णौ चङ्युपधाया ह्रस्वः

ṇau caṅy upadhāyā hrasvaḥ
/ṇau 7/1 *caṅi* 7/1 *upadhāyāḥ* 6/1 *hrasvaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
caṅpare ṇau yad aṅgaṃ tasyopadhāyā hrasvo bhavati
A short vowel comes in place of the penultimate (*upadhā*) long of an *aṅga* when *CaṄ*, occurring in construction after *ṆiC*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

acīkarat 'he had it made by someone'
ajīharat 'he had it carried by someone'
alīlavat 'he had it cut by someone'
apīpavat 'he had it drunk by someone'

1. Note that a specification with *saptamī* 'locative' of *ṇau* 'when *ṆiC* follows' and *caṅi* 'when *CaṄ* follows' facilitates this interpretation: *caṅpare ṇau yad aṅgam* 'the *aṅga* which, when followed by *ṆiC* is followed by *CaṄ*'. The penultimate long of such an *aṅga* is replaced with its short counterpart. Refer to the appendix (II:507-9) for derivational details of *acīkarat* and *ajīharat*. These derivates of *kāri* + *LUṄ* and *hāri* + *LUṄ* include *kāri* and *hāri* which, in turn, derive from *kṛ* + *ṆiC* and *hṛ* + *ṆiC* (3.1.26 *hetumati ca*). Given *kāri* +

(*LUṄ*→*t*(*i*→ϕ)) → *kāri* + *CaṄ* + *t*, the penultimate *ā* of *kār* is replaced with its short counterpart. The *aṅga*, i.e., *kār*, which occurs followed by *ṆiC* is followed by *CaṄ* (3.1.48 *ṇiśridruśrubhyaḥ . . .*). Affix *ṆiC* is then deleted by 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*. Reduplication (*dvitva*), and operations relative to *abhyāsa*, then apply to *aṬ* + *kar* + *a* + *t* to produce the final derivate.

Refer to derivational details of *apīpaṭhat* (notes, 6.1.11 *caṅi*), for deriving (*lūÑ* + *ṆiC*)→ *lāvi* → *lāvi* + (*LUṄ*→*tiP*)) = *alūlavat*. Note that we get replacement in *i* (*itva*) of 7.4.80 *oḥ pūyaṇjy apare* after shortening of *ā* of *lāvi* 'to have someone cut'. Similar applications are also involved in deriving (*pū* + *ṆiC* → *pāvi*) + (*LUṄ*→*tiP*)) = *apīpavat*.

2. Commentators note that *dvitva* 'reduplication' and *upadhāhrasva* 'shortening of the penultimate' both become applicable concurrently on *kār* + *i* + *a* + *t*. The shortening of the penultimate vowel wins this applicational conflict on the basis of *paratva* 'subsequent in order of enumeration'. Application of reduplication (*dvitva*) follows after shortening. Now consider the derivation of *āṭiṭat* (appendix, (II:416-17)) where, given *āṭ* + *i* + *a* + *t*, this rule applies to yield (*ā*→*a*) *ṭ* + *i* + *a* + *t*, through penultimate shortening. Recall that reduplication of 6.1.2 *ajāder dvityasya* is obligatory (*nitya*), because it will apply irrespective of whether it applies before or after penultimate shortening. If this obligatory reduplication is applied, we will get *āṭi* + *ṭi* + *a* + *t*. But this will no longer enable *ā* to qualify as *upadhā* 'penultimate'. Consequently, shortening will be blocked.

It is stated that the *ṛdit*-status '*ṛT* as an *it*' of verbal roots, for example the *bhvādi* root *oṇṚ* 'to remove', will become useless if reduplication applies prior to shortening. That is, given *oṇ*(*Ṛ*) + *i* + *a* + *t*, reduplication will yield *oṇi* + *ṇi* + *a* + *t*. The question of penultimate shortening (*upadhā-hrasva*) will thus not arise. For, *o* will no longer be an *upadhā*. Why then negate (7.4.2 *nāgliṭi . . .*) it by making *oṇ* characterized as *ṛdit*? This, in turn, indicates that obligatory reduplication applies even after shortening has applied. The *ṛdit*-status of *oṇ* is justified only when shortening is applied prior to reduplication (*Kāś: atra dvirvacanopadhāhrasvatvayoḥ prāptayoḥ paratvād upadhāhrasvatvam, tatra kṛte dvirvacanam . . . oṇer ṛditkaraṇaṃ jñāpakam: nityam api dvirvacanam upadhāhrasvatvena bādhyate*).

3. Why do we have the condition of *ṇau* 'when *ṇi* follows'? Why not formulate this rule with *caṅy upadhāyā hrasvaḥ* 'short of the penultimate when *CaṄ* follows'. Such a formulation will create problems in deriving *alūlavat*. Thus, given *lū* + *ṆiC* + *CaṄ* + *t* = *lū* + *i* + *a* + *t*, this shortening will block internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) *vṛddhi* (*lū*→*au*) and replacement in *āv* (*au*→*āv*). Note that *vṛddhi* and *āv* are internally conditioned by *ṆiC*. The short replacement is externally conditioned by *CaṄ*. The internally conditioned *vṛddhi* and *āv*, therefore, must precede shortening. A formulation such as *caṅy upadhāyā hrasvaḥ*, without *ṇau*, would also create problems in deriving *adīdapat* from *aṬ* + *dā* + *ṆiC* + *CaṄ* + *t*. If shortening is applied first,

we cannot get augment *pUK* (7.3.36 *arttihrī . . .*). For, *dā* will then not end in *ā*. The shortening will also be blocked in *apīpacat* if *ṇau* is not stated along with *caṅi*. For, we get *ā* in the *upadhā* before *Ṇi*.

Why do we have the condition of *caṅi*? Consider *kāri* + *a* + *ti* = *kārayati* and *hāri* + *a* + *ti* = *hārayati* where, in the absence of *CaṄ*, there is no shortening of the penultimate.

Why do we have the condition of *upadhāyāḥ* 'in place of the penultimate'? Consider *acakāṅkṣat* and *avavāñchat* where, after deletion of *i* of *kāṅkṣi* and *vāñcchi*, *nUM* (7.1.58 *iditoḥ num dhātoḥ*) is introduced. We get the forms *kāṅkṣ* and *vāñch*, through *anusvāra* and *parasavarṇa* 'single replacement similar to what follows in a vocalic sequence', where *ā* is not in the *upadhā* 'next to the last'. One may be tempted to apply shortening because of provision of this rule (*sūtrārambha-sāmarthya*). This shortening is blocked because of specification made with *upadhā*. Note that this specification with *upadhā* is also needed in subsequent rules.

4. A *vārttika* proposal is also made to state *upadhā-hrasva* 'shortening of the penultimate' when *ṆiC*, followed by *Ṇi*, follows (*vt: upadhāhrasvatve ṇer ṇicy upasaṃkhyānam*). Thus, consider *avīvadad vīṇāṃ parivādakena*, where we get (*vad* + *ṆiC*) = (*vādi* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*)) = *vāditavantaṃ prayojitavān* = *avīvadat vīṇām parivādakena* 'the accompanist inspired him being inspired to play (the lute)'. Note that the first *ṆiC* is deleted by 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*. The *aṅga* then does not go through a replacement in short (*hrasva*) because of *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating a replacement as what it replaced' of *ṆiC*-deletion, and also deletion of *aK* (*aglopa*). It is debatable whether this *vārttika* is needed at all. The *Bhāṣya* does not accept this *vārttika*. Patañjali considers the two *ṆiC* affixes as one and the same. He accepts their specification made as *jāti* 'general class; universal'. This way *upadhāhrasva* becomes possible. The *vārttika*, however, is not accepted.

7.4.2 नाग्लोपिशास्वृदिताम्

nāglopiśāsvṛditām

/ na ϕ aglopiśāsvṛditām = ako lopaḥ (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *aglopa asyāstīti = aglopī* (affix *inI* with the signification of *matUP*); *ṛt it yasya* (*bv.*); *aglopī ca śāsuś ca ṛd it ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau caṇy upadhāyā hrasvaḥ* #1)

aglopinām aṅgānāṃ śāser ṛditāṃ ca ṇau caṅy upadhāyā hrasvo na bhavati

A short vowel does not come as a replacement for the penultimate (*upadhā*) vowel of an *aṅga* which goes through deletion of a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *aK* (*Śs.* 1-2), or an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *śās* 'to instruct', or else, an *aṅga* constituted by a root marked with *ṛ* as an *it*, provided when *CaṄ*, occurring in construction after *ṆiC*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

amamālat = *mālām ākhyat* 'named (described) the garland'
amamātarat = *mātaram ākhyat* 'said 'mother' '
atyararājat = *rājānam atikrāntavān* 'excelled the king'
anvalulomat = *lomāny anumṛṣṭavān* 'cleansed the pores'
aśaśāsat '. . . instructed'
ababādhat '. . . has become agitated'
ayayācat '. . . has begged'
aḍuḍhaukat '. . . has reached, presented'

1. This rule disallows penultimate shortening of three types of *aṅgas*: (*i*) an *aṅga* which goes through deletion of one of its sounds denoted by *aK* (*a, i, u, ṛ, ḷ*); (*ii*) an *aṅga* constituted by *śās* 'to instruct' and (*iii*) an *aṅga* constituted by roots, for example *bādhṚ* 'to agitate, churn', *ḍhaukṚ* 'to reach, present', etc., which are marked with *Ṛ* as an *it*. Consider *mālām ākhyat* = *amamālāt*, a third singular active derivate of *LUṄ* introduced after *māli*. This root is causal where affix *ṆiC* is introduced after *mālām* in view of a *gaṇasūtra* proposal (under *curādi* listings: *tatkaroti tad ācaṣṭe* 'does that, says that'). Also refer to *paṭayati* (appendix, II:400-401). Given *mālā* + (*Ṇ*)*i*(*C*) → *mālā* + *i*, *ā* will go through *ṭi*-deletion (6.4.155 *ṭeḥ*; also *iṣṭhavadbhāva* (*vt*: *ṇāv iṣṭhavat prādipadikasya* . . .). Since *mālā* has gone through deletion of its *ā*, a sound denoted by *aK*, *māl* becomes an *aṅga* characterized as *aglopin* 'that which has gone through its deletion of *aK*). Note that *māli* + *LUṄ* will subsequently produce *aṬ* + *māl* + *CaṄ* + *t* where *i* will get deleted and *CaṄ* (similar to many *LUṄ*-derivates already discussed) will be introduced. This rule will block shortening of the penultimate *ā* of *māl*. Reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*, etc., will finally produce *amamālat*. We get *mātaram ākhyat* = *amamātarat* and *rājānam atikrāntavān* = *atyararājat* 'excelled the king'. These derivates involve causal forms *mātṛ* + *ṆiC* and *atirājan* + *ṆiC* which produce *māt*(*ṛ*→ϕ) + *i* and *atirāj*(*an* →ϕ) + *i*, through *ṭi*-deletion. Once again, a penultimate shortening will not be allowed in case of these *aṅga*-elements when *CaṄ*, occurring after *ṆiC*, follows. Thus, we also get *anvalulomat* from *anulomi* + *LUṄ*, where *ṆiC* is introduced after *anuloman* (3.1.25 *satyāpapāśa* . . .). Needless to say, we get *ṭi*-deletion of *an* of *anuloman* before *ṆiC*. Examples of *śās* and roots marked with *ṛ* as an *it* are: *aśaśāsat*, third singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *śās* 'to instruct, govern'; and third singular active *LUṄ*-derivates of *bādhṚ*: *ababādhat*; of *yācṚ*: *ayayācat*; and of *ḍhaukṚ*: *aḍuḍhaukat*.

It is stated that question of shortening does not arise where *aglopa* 'deletion of *aK*' has taken effect. For, *sthānivadbhāva* (1.1.57 *sthānivad ādeśo* . . .) of deletion can automatically block shortening. But in instances (such as *rājan*) where a sequence of consonant and vowel goes through *ṭi*-deletion, negation of shortening cannot be established automatically. We thus need this rule.

7.4.3 भ्राजभासभाषदीपजीवमीलपीडामन्यतरस्याम्

bhrājabhāsabhāṣadīpajīvamīlapīḍām anyatarasyām
/ bhrāja-bhāsa-bhāṣa-dīpa-jīva-mīla-pīḍām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*); *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau caṅy upadhāyāḥ hrasvaḥ* #1)
'*bhrāja, bhāsa, bhāṣa, dīpa, jīva, mīla, pīḍa*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānāṃ ṇau caṅy upadhāyā hrasvo bhavaty anyatarasyām*
A short vowel, optionally, comes as a replacement for the penultimate (*upadhā*) vowel of an *aṅga*, namely one constituted by *bhrājA* 'to glow', *bhāsA* 'to shine', *bhāṣA* 'to speak', *dīpA* 'to glow', *jīvA* 'to live', *mīlA* 'to shut eyes' and *pīḍA* 'to torment', provided when *CaṄ*, occurring in construction after *ṆiC*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

abibhrajat '. . . had (it) glowed'
ababhrājat 'ibidem'
abībhaṣat '. . . had (it) shined'
ababhāṣat 'had (it) spoken'
adīdipat 'had (it) glowed'
adidīpat 'ibidem'
ajījivat 'had (it) lived'
ajījīvat 'ibidem'
amīmilat 'had (someone) sleep'
amimīlat 'ibidem'
apīpiḍat 'had someone harmed'
apipīḍat 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers optional penultimate vowel-shortening (*upadhāhrasva*), to a select list of roots termed *aṅga*. Consider (*bhrāj* + *ṆiC*) + (*LUṄ→tiP*)) = *bhrāj* + *i* + (*CLI→CaṄ*) + *t* = *aṬ* + *bhrāji* + *CaṄ* + *t* where deletion of *ṆiC*, reduplication (*dvitva*) and operations relative to *abhyāsa* will take place. Given *a* + (*bh→ba*) + *bhraj* + *a* + *t* = *a* + *ba* + *bhraj* + *a* + *t*, rule 7.4.93 *sanval laghuni caṅpare* . . . applies to offer *sanvadbhāva* 'operations similar to when *saN* follows'. The *a* of the *abhyāsa* 'reduplicated syllable', i.e., *ba*, is thus replaced with *i* to yield: *a* + *b*(*a→i*) + *bhraj* + *a* + *t* = *abibhrajat*. Note that this *sanvadbhāva* (II:214) and its related replacement in *i* (*itva*) will be blocked if the option of *upadhāhrasva* is not accepted. Thus, not accepting *upadhāhrasva* will give us *a* + *ba*+ *bhrāj* + *a* + *t*→ *ababhrājat*, with no *sanvadbhāva* and replacement in *i* (*itva*). We similarly get *abībhasat* and *ababhāsat*, where the long *ī* of *abībhasat* is a replacement of its short counterpart (7.4.94 *dīrgho laghoḥ*). Similar derivational details can be offered for *abībhaṣat* and *ababhāṣat*; *adīdipat* and *adidīpat*; *ajījivat* and *ajijīvat*; *amīmilat* and *amimīlat*; and *apīpiḍat* and *apipīḍat*.

Incidentally, the practice of marking *bhrāj* and *bhās* with *ṛ* as an *it* (*ṛT*) is un-Pāṇinian (*Kāś*: *bhrājbhāsor ṛditkaraṇam apāṇinīyam*).

2. A *vārttika* proposal is made for an optional shortening of the penultimate, especially when *kāṇi* is an *aṅga*. Thus, *kāṇi* + *LUṄ* → *acakāṇat* and *acīkaṇat*.

7.4.4 लोपः पिबतेरीच्चाभ्यासस्य

lopaḥ pibater īc cābhyāsasya
/lopaḥ 1/1 *pibateḥ* 6/1 *īt* 1/1 *ca* ϕ *abhyāsasya* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau caṅy upadhāyāḥ* #1)
pibater aṅgasya ṇau caṅy upadhāyā lopo bhavati abhyāsasyekārādeśo bhavati
LOPA replaces the penultimate vowel of an *aṅga*, namely verbal root *pib* (*pā* 'to drink'), with the additional provision that final sound segment of *abhyāsa* be replaced with *ī*, provided when *CaṄ*, used in construction after *ṆiC*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

apīpyat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of causal *pā* 'to drink''
apīpyatām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
apīpyan 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule allows two operations concurrently: (*i*) penultimate deletion (*upadhālopa*) and (*ii*) long *ī* as a replacement for the final vowel of the *abhyāsa*. These operations are both given in the context of an *aṅga*, namely *pib*. Consider the third person singular, dual, and plural active forms of *LUṄ* where deletion of the penultimate vowel is offered against shortening provision of 7.4.1 *ṇau caṅy*. . . . Thus, we get *pā* + *ṆiC* → *pā* + *yUK* + *ṆiC* = *pā* + *y* + *i*, where *yUK* is introduced by 7.3.37 *śācchāsāhvā*. . . . An introduction of *LUṄ*, and its replacements with the third singular active verbal ending *tiP*, dual *tas*→*tām* and plural (*jh*→*ant*) *i* = *anti*, precedes *CLI*→*CaṄ*, deletion, reduplication, etc., to produce: *aṬ* + *pāy* + (*ṆiC*→ϕ) + *a* + *t* → *a* + *p*(*ā*→ϕ) *y* + *a* + *t* → *a* + *pāy* + *py* + *a* + *t* → *a* + *pā* + *py* + *a* + *t*. Note here that *pāy* is reduplicated in view of extension of form (*rūpātideśa*) of 1.1.58 *dvirvacane' ci*. Thus, we get *pāy* + *py* as a result of reduplication (*dvitva*). A subsequent application of 7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ* gives us *pā*(*y*→ϕ) + *py*. The *ā* of *pā* in *a* + *pā* + *py* + *a* + *t* is replaced with *īT* to produce: *a* + *p*(*ā*→*ī*) + *py* + *a* + *t* = *apīpyat*. The dual and plural forms, *apīpyatām* and *apīpyan*, are not very different in derivational details.

2. A question is raised against applying *dvirvacana* 'reduplication' after penultimate vowel-deletion (*upadhālopa*). Thus, given *pāy* + *i* + *a* + *t*, deletion of *ā* leaves *py*, a unit formed with no vowel (*anacka*). This will make reduplication impossible, especially in view of *ekācaḥ prathamaḥ* (6.1.1 *ekāco dve prathamasya*). Commentators state that *upadhālopa* 'deletion of the penultimate' applies first because it is not only subsequent in order but it is also obligatory (*paratvān nityatvāc ca*). But this deletion before *ṆiC* is accpeted as not having applied (via *sthānivadbhāva*), as far as reduplication is concerned.

A *LOPA* before *ṆiC* is treated as not having taken effect, via *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating a substitute as what it replaced'. We know it from the application of 7.4.80 *oḥ puyaṇjy apare.* Thus, we can still get *pā*, via *sthānivadbhāva*, for purposes of reduplication.

Commentators explain that the genitive singular *abhyāsasya* is used so that *LOPA* and replacement in *ī* (*ītva*) do not become applicable to the *upadhā* 'penultimate vowel', in turn (*paryāya*).

7.4.5 तिष्ठतेरित्

tiṣṭhater it
/tiṣṭhateḥ 6/1 *it* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau caṅy upadhāyāḥ* #1)
tiṣṭhater aṅgasya ṇau caṅy upadhāyā ikārādeśo bhavati
A short *i* comes in place of the penultimate sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *sthā* 'to stay, stand' when *CaṄ*, used in construction after *ṆiC*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

atiṣṭhipat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *sthāpi* 'to have someone stay, stand, establish''
atiṣṭhipatām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
atiṣṭhipan 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule is also an exception to the penultimate shortening of 7.4.1 *ṇau caṅy upadhāyāḥ hrasvaḥ.* Consider *atiṣṭhipat, atiṣṭhipatām* and *atiṣṭhipan*, the active third person singular, dual and plural derivates of *sthā* 'to stay, stand' used with *ṆiC*, i.e. *sthāpi*, in *LUṄ*. Thus, we get *sthā* + *pUK* = *ṆiC* = *sthāpi* + *LUṄ*, where *pUK* is introduced by 7.3.36 *arttihrīvlī*. . . . Given *aṬ* + *sthāp* + *i* + *CaṄ* + *t*(*iP*→ϕ), *ṆiC* gets deleted and our present rule introduces *i* as a replacement for the penultimate *ā* of *sthāp*. We thus get: *a* + *sthip* + *a* + *t*. Reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*, especially with the application of 7.4.61 *śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ*, yield *a* + *thi* + *sthip* + *a* + *t*. An application of 8.4.53 *abhyāse car ca* produces *a* + (*th*→*t*) *i* + *sthip* + *a* + *t*. The *s* of *sthip* then goes through replacement in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*). A following *ṭh*-replacement (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*) of *th* produces: *a* + *ti* + (*s*→*ṣ*) (*th*→*ṭh*) *ip* + *a* + *t* = *atiṣṭhipat.* Note that the dual form has *tas* replaced with *tām*. The plural (*anti*), after *jh* is replaced with *ant*, loses *i* and *t* both. Thus, we get *atiṣṭhipatām* and *atiṣṭhipan.*

7.4.6 जिघ्रतेर्वा

jighrater vā
/jighrateḥ 6/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau caṅy upadhāyāḥ* #1 *it* #5)
jighrater aṅgasya ṇau caṅi upadhāyā ikārādeśo vā bhavati

A short *i*, optionally, comes in place of the penultimate sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by *ghrā* 'to smell', when *CaṄ*, used in construction after *ṆiC*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

ajighripat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of causal *ghrā*'
ajighrapat 'ibidem; with no *i*'
ajighripatām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
ajighrapatām 'ibidem; with no *i*'
ajighripan 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
ajighrapan 'ibidem; with no *i*'

1. Follow the derivational pattern of *atiṣṭhipat* of the earlier rule, where option of short *i* is accepted. Our derivates will go through *upadhāhrasva* 'penultimate shortening' (7.4.1 *ṇau caṅy . . .*), *sanvadbhāva* 'treatment similar to when *saN* follows', and replacement in *i* (*itva*; 7.4.79 *sany ataḥ*) of the *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*), if short *i* provision is not accepted. Recall here that reduplication of *ghrā* 'to smell', subsequent to *pUK* and shortening, or a replacement in *i*, will produce *jighra* through a replacement in *j* for *gh*, through *jh* (7.4.62 *kuhoś cuḥ*; 8.4.53 *abhyāse car ca*).

7.4.7 उर्ऋत्

ur ṛt
/uḥ 6/1 *ṛt* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau caṅy upadhāyāḥ* #1 *vā* #6)
ṇau caṅy upadhāyā ṛvarṇasya sthāne vā ṛkārādeśo bhavati
A short *ṛ*, optionally, comes in place of the penultimate *ṛ* of an *aṅga* when affix *CaṄ*, used in construction after *ṆiC*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

acikīrttat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of causal *kṛti* 'to have someone chant''
acīkṛtat 'ibidem'
avavarttat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of causal *vṛti* 'to have someone conduct, turn''
avīvṛtat 'ibidem'
amamārjat 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate of causal *mṛji* 'to have cleansed, wiped''
amīmṛjat 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers short *ṛ* (*ṛT*) as a replacement for the penultimate *ṛ* of an *aṅga* when *Ṇi*, followed by *CaṄ*, follows. A replacement in short *ṛ* for *ṛ*? Not exactly. This optional provision is made against *itva* 'replacement in *i* (7.1.101 *upadhāyāś ca*)', *guṇa* (*ar*; 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*) and *vṛddhi*

(*ār*; 7.1.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*) provisions of *ṛ*, read with 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*. The *taparakaraṇa* 'specification with a following *t*' (1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*) of *ṛT* is intended for replacing even the long *ṝ* with its short counterpart (*Kāś*: *taparakaraṇaṃ dīrghe' pi sthānini hrasva eva yathā syāt*). Recall that, in the absence of *taparakaraṇa*, a long vowel must be replaced with a long in view of close similarity (*āntaratamya*) requirement of substitutes (*ādeśa*) and their corresponding substituenda (*sthānī*). This replacement provision does not involve bringing about anything (*bhāvyamāna*) new. It is made here for canceling any other replacement (*Kāś*: *na cāyaṃ bhāvyamānaḥ kiṃ tu ādeśāntaranivṛtyarthaṃ svarūpam evaitad abhyanujñāyate*). *Kāśikā* calls this replacement in *ṛT* an exception to *ir*, *ar* and *ār* (*Kāś*: *irarārām apavādaḥ*).

Consider *acīkṛtat* which derives from $(kṝt + \dot{N}iC) + LU\dot{N} \rightarrow kṝt + i + (LU\dot{N} \rightarrow t(iP \rightarrow \phi)) = aṬ + k(ṝ \rightarrow ṛ)\,t + i + Ca\dot{N} + t \rightarrow a + kṛt + (i \rightarrow \phi) + a + t \rightarrow a + kṛt + a + t$. Note that an option to replace *ṝ* with *ṛT* is accepted. Reduplication (*dvitva*), and operations relative to reduplicated syllable (*abhyāsa-kārya*), which also includes application of 7.4.66 *ur at*, will yield: $a + ka + kṛt + a + t$. Rule 7.4.79 *sany ataḥ* then applies (via *sanvadbhāva*) to yield: $a + k(a \rightarrow i) + kṛt + a + t$. This *i* is then replaced with its long counterpart of 7.4.94 *dīrgho laghoḥ*. Thus, we get $a + k(i \rightarrow ī) + kṛt + a + t$. An application of 8.4.54 *abhyāse car ca* (*cartva*) will then replace *k* with *c*; $a + (k \rightarrow c)\,ī + kṛt + a + t = acīkṛtat$.

Not replacing *ṝ* with *ṛ* (*ṛT*) will mean to accept application of 7.1.101 *upadhāyāś ca*. This will offer us *ir* (*rapara*; 2.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*) as a replacement for the penultimate $ṝ = a + k(ṝ \rightarrow ir)\,t + a + t$. Application of reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa* will produce $a + ki + kir + t + a + t$. The short *i* of the penultimate will be replaced with its long counterpart (8.2.78 *upadhāyāṃ ca*) and *k* of the *abhyāsa* will, of course, go through a replacement in *c* (*cartva*). This gives us: $a + (k \rightarrow c)\,i + kīrt + a + t = acikīrtat$. Also, optionally, $a + c(a \rightarrow i \rightarrow ī) + kṛt + a + t = acīkṛtat$. Similar options and derivational details can be offered for *avīvṛtat*, *avavartat*; and *amīmṛjat*, *amamārjat*. These derivates of *vṛt* 'to turn' and *mṛj* 'to cleanse' are offered to illustrate this replacement in *ṛT* as an exception to *ar* (*guṇa*; 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*) and *ār* (*vṛddhi*; 7.2.114 *mṛjer vṛddhiḥ*), respectively. Note that we do not get *sanvadbhāva* (II:214) in the context of *ār* since there is no *laghu* 'light, short' vowel in the root to follow.

7.4.8 नित्यं छन्दसि

nityaṃ chandasi
/*nityam* 1/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṇau caṅy upadhāyāḥ* #1 *ur ṛt* #7)
chandasi viṣaye ṇau caṅy upadhāyā ṛvarṇasya sthāne ṛkārādeśo bhavati nityam
A short *ṛ*, in the Vedic, comes obligatorily in place of penultimate *ṝ* of an *aṅga* when *CaṄ*, used in construction after *ṆiC*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

avīvṛdhat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *vṛdh* 'to grow' '
avīvṛdhatām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
avīvṛdhan 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule makes the preceding provision of *ṛT* obligatory in the context of Vedic usage (*chandasi*). Thus, we get *avīvṛdhat*, etc., similarly to *acīkṛtat* (7.4.7 *uḥ ṛt*).

2. Incidentally, *nityam* 'obligatorily' indicates that the *anuvṛtti* of *vā* 'optionally' is valid in the preceding rule. For, this obligatory provision must be made against that optional.

7.4.9 दयतेर्दिगि लिटि

dayater digi liṭi
/dayateḥ 6/1 *digi* 1/1 (deleted) *liṭi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
dayater aṅgasya liṭi parato digi ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *digi* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *deṄ* 'to protect, guard' when affix *LIṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

avadigye 'third person singular middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *deṄ* 'to protect' '
avadigyāte 'third person dual middle *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'
avadigyire 'third person plural *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule offers *digi* as a replacement for an *aṅga* constituted by *deṄ*, provided when *LIṬ* follows. Note that *daya* of this rule does not refer to verbal root *dayA* 'to give'. For, that root is already offered *ām* before *LIṬ* (3.1.37 *dayāyāsaś ca*).

Commentators explain that *digi* is offered as a replacement with a desire to block reduplication (6.1.8 *liṭi dhātor . . .*; *Kāś. digyādeśena dvirvacanasya bādhanam iṣyate*). For, reduplication is obligatorily available for application (*avaśyakartṛkaprāpti*). Thus, consider *ava-deṄ* + (*LIṬ*→*ta*) → *ava*(*deṄ*→*digi*) + *ta* → *ava-digi* + (*ta*→*eŚ*) = *avadigi* + *e*, where *ta* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhi . . .*) is replaced with *eŚ* (3.4.81 *liṭastajhayor . . .*). We will get *avadig* (*i*→*y*) + *e* = *avadigye*. The dual and plural forms will have a replacement in *āt* and *ireC* (3.4.81 *liṭastajhayor . . .*), respectively.

7.4.10 ऋतश्च संयोगादेर्गुणः

ṛtaś ca saṃyogāder guṇaḥ
/ṛtaḥ 6/1 *ca* ϕ *saṃyogādeḥ* 6/1 = *saṃyoga ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *guṇaḥ* 1/1/

(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *liṭi* #9)
ṛkārāntasya aṅgasya saṃyogāder guṇo bhavati liṭi parataḥ
A *guṇa* vowel comes in place, also, of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* which ends in a *ṛ* and begins with a conjunct (*saṃyoga*), when affix *LIṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

sasvaratuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *svṛ* 'to sound, be pained' '
sasvaruḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'
dadhvaratuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *dhvṛ* 'to injure' '
dadhvaruḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'
sasmaratuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *smṛ* 'to remember' '
sasmaruḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'

1. Consider *sasmaratuḥ* and *sasmaruḥ*, where the *parasmaipada* 'active' dual and plural third personal replacements of *LIṬ* are further replaced with *atus* and *us* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ* . . .). This rule causes the *aṅga*-final *ṛ* to be replaced with its *guṇa* counterpart *a*, followed by *r* (*raparа*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*). This same also happens in case of derivates of *svṛ* and *dhvṛ*.

Now consider some *LIṬ*-derivates of *hvṛ*: *jahvāra / jahvaratuḥ / jahvaruḥ*, again third person singular, dual and plural active forms. Given *hvṛ* + (*LIṬ→tiP→ṆaL*) → *hvṛ* + *a*, reduplication applies first in view of 1.1.59 *dvirvacane' ci*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *ṛT* 'ending in *ṛ*'? Consider *cikṣiyituḥ* and *cikṣiyuḥ*, the corresponding derivates of *cikṣi*, where *guṇa* is blocked in favor of *iyAṄ*. Obviously, *kṣi* 'to decay' begins with a conjunct but does not end in *ṛ*. The condition of *saṃyogādi* 'beginning with a conjunct' similarly blocks *guṇa* in *cakratuḥ* and *cakruḥ*, where *kṛ* ends in *ṛ* but does not begin with a conjunct.

3. This rule is formulated so that *guṇa* can be accomplished even where it is negated due to *K* as an *it* (*kit*; 1.1.5 *ṅiti ca*) status of a *LIṬ*, not marked with *P* as an *it* (1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*). The negation of this *guṇa* is, of course, desired on the basis of *pūrvaviprатiṣedha* 'conflict of equal strength where a prior rule wins' when the context is *vṛddhi*. Thus, consider the derivates of *smṛ* and *svṛ* with *ṆaL* and *vṛddhi*, i.e., *sasmāra* and *sasvāra*. Note, however, that the *guṇa* applies only when *LIṬ* follows. Consequently, there is no *guṇa* in *smṛtaḥ* and *smṛtavān*.

4. A *vārttika* proposal recommends interpreting *saṃyogādi* 'that (an *aṅga*) which has a conjunct at its beginning' as *saṃyogopadha* 'that (an *aṅga*) which has a conjunct in its penultimate position'. Consider *sañcaskaratuḥ* and *sañcaskaruḥ* which derive from *sam-kṛ* + (*LIṬ→atus/us*). Commentators note that a preverb (*upasarga*), i.e., here *sam*, is combined with *kṛ* after reduplica-

tion is accomplished. This facilitates introduction of augment *sUṬ* (6.1.136? *aḍ abhyāsavyavāye' pi*). Note here that because an externally conditioned *sUṬ* becomes *asiddha* 'suspended' in *saṃskṛṣīṣṭa* and *upaskṛṣīṣṭa* (*kṛṣīṣṭa*; II:437-38), augment *iṬ* (7.2.43 *ṛtaś ca saṃyogādeḥ*) is not introduced.

There are two positions on when and how a verbal root is combined with an *upasarga*: (*i*) *dhātuḥ pūrvam upasargeṇa yujyate* 'a verbal root is combined with the preverb first' and (*ii*) *pūrvaṃ dhātuḥ sādhanena yujyate* 'a verbal root is joined first with the means (*sādhana, kartṛ*, etc.)'. The second view is followed in the context of our present rule. This facilitates *guṇa* of the *saṃyogopadha* in *sañcaskaratuḥ*, etc. This view also makes augment *sUṬ* externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*). That is why, *sUṬ* gets suspended in the context of an *iṬ* which is yet to be accomplished (*Kāś: atra hi 'pūrvaṃ dhātuḥ sādhanena yujyate paścād upasargeṇa' ity atra hi darśane, liṭi kṛte tadāśraye ca dvirvacane paścād upasargayoge sati 'aḍ abhyāsavyavāye' pi' iti suṭ kriyate. evaṃ ca kṛtvā 'saṃskṛṣīṣṭa, upaskṛṣīṣṭa' ity atra suṭo bahiraṅgalakṣaṇasyāsiddhatvād ṛtaś ca saṃyogādeḥ iti iḍ āgamo na bhavati*).

7.4.11 ऋच्छत्यृताम्

ṛcchatyṛtām
/ṛcchatyṛtām 6/3 = *ṛcchatiś ca ṛ ca ṛt ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *liṭi* #9 *guṇaḥ* #10)
ṛcchater aṅgasya, ṛ ity etasya, ṛkārāntānāṃ ca liṭi parato guṇo bhavati
A *guṇa* vowel comes in place of the final sound of an *aṅga*, particularly one constituted by *ṛcch* and *ṛ* 'to go', or those which end in *ṝT*, provided when *LIṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

ānarccha 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *ṛcch*'
ānarcchatuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'
ānarcchuḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'
āratuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *ṛ*'
āruḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate of *ṛ*'
nicakaratuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *ni-kṛ*'
nicakaruḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'
nijagaratuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *ni-jāgṛ*'
nijagaruḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule allows *guṇa* to *ṛcch* which is not available to it because of the condition of *laghūpadha* 'penultimate short' (7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadasya ca*). That is, it does not have a *laghu* 'short' vowel in its *upadhā*. Recall that *ṛ* is termed *guru* before its *cch*, the conjunct (1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*). This rule also allows *guṇa* of *ṛ* 'to go' and also of those which end in a long *ṝ* (*ṝT*). For, these roots are denied *guṇa* because of the *kit*-status of a select list of

replacements of *LIṬ* marked with *P* as an *it* (1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*). Our present rule allows it.

2. Consider *ānarccha, ānarcchatuḥ* and *ānarcchuḥ*, where the root is *ṛch*. We get the form *ṛcch* by introducing augment *tUK* of 6.1.73 *che ca*, via *t→c* (*cutva*). Given *ṛcch + LIṬ*, we get *archha + arccha + (LIṬ→tiP→ṆaL)* → *a + ṛcch + a*, after reduplication and *guṇa* of the *abhyāsa* (7.4.66 *ur at*), and application of *halādiśeṣa* 'retention of a unit formed with consonant' (7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*). An application of rule 6.1.94 *ato guṇe* is blocked here by 7.4.70 *ata ādeḥ*. The *a* of the *abhyāsa* is replaced with its long counterpart. We now have *ā + ṛcch + a*, where *ṛ* of the root goes through a replacement in *guṇa* to yield *ā + (ṛ→ar) cch + a = ā + arcch + a*. Augment *nUṬ* is then introduced (7.4.71 *tasmān nuḍ dvihalaḥ*) to an *aṅga* which contains two consonants occurring after the *ā* of its *abhyāsa*. Thus, *ā + n(UṬ) + arcch + a = ānarccha*. A question is raised here against application of *nUṬ*. It is stated that rule 7.4.71 *tasmān nuḍ dvihalaḥ* requires two consonants. What we have here are three consonants. This problem is resolved by interpreting *dvi* as denoting more than one, by implication (*upalakṣaṇa*). Similar rule application is also available to other derivates. Deriving *āratuḥ* from *ṛ + LIṬ*, where *tas* gets replaced with *atus*, also involves application of *savarṇa-dīrgha* 'homogeneous long vowel' (6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*). Thus, *ā + ar + atus → āratu(s→r→ḥ) = āratuḥ*. Similar applications are also seen in derivates of *kṝ=ni-cakaratuḥ* and *ni-cakaruḥ*.

Recall, though, that an application of *guṇa* against *vṛddhi* (before *ṆaL*) is blocked, via *pūrvaviprati*ṣ*edha* 'conflict between two rules of equal strength where the preceding prevails'. Thus, an independent scope of *guṇa* can be established in deriving *ni-cakaratuḥ* and *ni-cakaruḥ*. A similar independent scope of *vṛddhi* can be established in deriving *kārakaḥ* and *hārakaḥ*, both derivates of affix *ṆvuL*. But we find both *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* applicable in *ni-cakāra* and *ni-jagāra*, where *vṛddhi* alone is desired.

7.4.12 शृदृप्रां ह्रस्वो वा

śṝdṝprāṃ hrasvo vā
/śṝ-dṝpṛām 6/3 = *śṝ ca dṝ ca pṝ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām; hrasvaḥ* 1/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *liṭi* #9)
'*śṝ, dṝ, pṝ*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānāṃ liṭi parato vā hrasvo bhavati*
A short vowel, optionally, comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *śṝ* 'to harm', *dṝ* 'to tear apart', and *pṝ* 'to nourish, protect' when affix *LIṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

viśaśratuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *vi-śṝ*'
viśaśaratuḥ 'ibidem'
viśaśruḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'

viśaśaruḥ 'ibidem'
vidadratuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *vi-dṝ*'
vidadaratuḥ 'ibidem'
vidadruḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate of *vi-dṝ*'
vidadaruḥ 'ibidem'
nipapratuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *ni-pṝ*'
nipaparatuḥ 'ibidem'
nipapruḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'
nipaparuḥ 'ibidem'

1. Note that, since these roots end in a long *ṝ*, the preceding rule will offer *guṇa*, obligatorily (*nitya*). Our present rule offers optional shortening against the obligatory *guṇa*. Consider *viśaśṝ* + *atus* which we get after reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*. An optional shortening, followed by *yaN*-replacement of *ṛ* and *rutva-visarga*, will offer *viśaś*(*ṝ*→ *ṛ*→*r*) + *atus* → *viśaśr* + *atu*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *viśaśratuḥ*. We will similarly get *viśaśaratuḥ*. A *guṇa*-repalcement, with its following *r*, will yield *viśaśaratuḥ* and *viśaśaruḥ*. Similar applications will produce *vidadratuḥ*, *vidadruḥ* and *vidadaratuḥ*, *vadadaruḥ*, etc.

2. This provision of shortening is necessary for blocking replacements in *i* (*itva*; 7.1.100 *ṛta id dhātoḥ*) and *u* (*utva*; 7.1.102 *ud oṣṭhyapūrvasya*). That is, if shortening was not stated along with *vā*, replacements in *i* (*itva*) and *u* (*utva*) will apply, optionally, against the *guṇa* of the preceding rule. It is to cancel replacements in *i* (*itva*) and *u* (*utva*) that *hrasvaḥ* 'short' is stated in this rule. These replacements do not apply when *hrasva* is applied (*Kāś*: *hrasvavacanam itvotvanivṛtyartham*).

3. Some scholars refute this rule claiming that *śṝ*, *dṝ* and *pṝ* are here specified to refer to roots having similar significations. They thus accept specified roots as *śrā* 'to cook', *drā* 'to censure' and *prā* 'to fill'. They further claim that *viśaśratuḥ*, etc., can be easily derived by deleting *ā* (6.4.64 *āto lopa iṭi ca*). That is, they can get *viśaśravā* + *atus* after reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*. The *ā* of *viśaśravā* can then be deleted. But this refutation is problematic. For, given *viśaśravā* + *KvasU*, we cannot get *viśaśṛvas*. An application of *guṇa*, in the absence of *hrasva*, will produce a wrong form **viśaśarvas*.

7.4.13 केऽणः

ke' ṇaḥ
/*ke* 7/1 *aṇaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hrasvaḥ* #12)
ke pratyaye parato' ṇo hrasvo bhavati
A short vowel comes in place of sounds denoted by *aN* of an *aṅga* when affix *ka* follows.

EXAMPLES:

jñakā 'she who knows little'
kumārikā 'a little girl'
kiśorikā 'an adolescent girl'

1. This rule offers shortening to a long vowel denoted by *aṆ*, provided affix *ka* follows. Consider *jānātīti jñaḥ* 'he who knows', where verbal root *jñā* 'to know' receives affix *Ka* (3.1.135 *igupadhajñā . . .*) to produce *jña*. Affix *ṬāP* is then introduced to derive *jñā*. If we now introduce affix *ka* (5.3.70 *prāg ivāt kaḥ*), with the signification of *alpa* 'little', etc., we will get *jñ*(*ā*→ϕ) + *ka* → *jñaka*. A reintroduction of *ṬāP* will then produce *jñakā*. Similar applications of shortening are also involved in derivates such as *kumārikā* and *kiśorikā*.

Why do we have the restriction of *aṆ*? Consider *gokā* and *naukā* where, because of *o* and *au* of *go* 'cow' and *nau* 'boat', this rule cannot apply. Obviously, because *o* and *au* are not included within the denotata of *aṆ*.

Why is this shortening not applied in *rākā* 'night of the full-moon day' and *dhākā* 'support, receptacle, food'? It is because of the provision of *bahulam* 'variously' (3.3.1 *uṇādayo bahulam*). Besides, negation of 7.4.14 *na kapi* also applies to *kaN*. That is, our next rule negates shortening also when *ka* with *N* as an *it* follows.

7.4.14 न कपि

na kapi
/*na* ϕ *kapi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hrasvaḥ* #12 *aṇaḥ* #13)
kapi pratyaye parato' ṇo hrasvo na bhavati
A short vowel does not come in place of the final *aṆ* of an *aṅga* when affix *kaP* follows.

EXAMPLES:

bahukumārīkaḥ 'he who has many young daughters'
bahuvadhūkaḥ 'he who has many wives'
bahulakṣmīkaḥ 'he who has plentiful wealth'

1. A sound denoted by *aṆ* is not replaced with its short counterpart when affix *kaP* follows an *aṅga*. This negation goes against the positive provision of shortening made before affix *ka* of the preceding rule. Recall that a *taddhita* affix, here *kaP*, is introduced after a *bahuvrīhi* compound which either ends in a constituent termed *nadī*, or in *ṛ* (5.4.153 *nadyṛtaś ca*). Our derivate *bahkumārī* ends in a constituent termed *nadī* (1.4.3 *yūstryākhyau nadī*). This rule negates shortening of *ī* of *kumārī* before affix *kaP* of *bahukumārīka*. Similar rules apply in deriving other examples.

2. Commentators note that shortening of an *upasarjana* 'secondary constituent' (1.2.48 *gostriyor upasarjanasya*) also does not apply when *kaP* follows. It is argued that a compound base, i.e., *bahukumārī*, is not a nominal stem, especially since it ends in a feminine affix (1.4.14 *arthavad-adhātur-apratyayaḥ prātipadikam*). Recall that 1.2.48 *gostriyor upasarjanasya* carries the *anuvṛtti* of *prātipadikasya* 'of a nominal stem'. A form which ends in a feminine affix does not qualify for assignment of the term *prātipadika* 'a nominal stem'. Since affix *kaP* becomes part of the nominal compound, it can no longer condition shortening. That is, it cannot facilitate shortening of the final vowel of *bahukumārī*. For, this compound should be formed with the constituency of *bahu* + *Jas* and *kumārī* + *Jas*, where *kaP* (5.3.153 *nadyṛtaś ca*) should be introduced after the final constituent *kumārī*, prior to compound-formation (*Kāś*: *gostriyor upasarjanasya ity ayam api hrasvaḥ na bhavati. samāsārthe hy uttarapade kapi kṛte paścāt kabantena saha samāsena bhavitavyam iti strīpratyayāntasamāsaprātipadikaṃ na bhavati*). That is, the compound should be formed with a constituent ending in affix *kaP*. Since a form ending in a feminine affix is not termed nominal stem, we do not get shortening of *ī* of *kumārī* in *bahukumārī* before affix *kaP*. It thus becomes clear that a form which ends in a feminine affix is termed nominal stem only after formation of a compound. What precedes *kaP* in *bahukumārīka* is neither a ompound nor a nominal stem.

7.4.15 आपोऽन्यतरस्याम्

āpo' nyatarasyām
/āpaḥ 6/1 *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hrasvaḥ* #12 *guṇaḥ* #13 *na kapi* #14)
ābantasyāṅgasya kapi hrasvo na bhavaty anyatarasyām
A short vowel does not, optionally, come in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* ending in the feminine affix *āP*, when affix *kaP* follows.

EXAMPLES:

bahukhaṭvākaḥ 'he who has many cots'
bahukhaṭvakaḥ 'ibidem'
bahumālākaḥ 'he who has plentiful garlands'
bahumālakaḥ 'ibidem'

1. Note that affix *kaP* of these examples is introduced by 5.4.154 *śeṣād vibhāṣā*. A non-introduction of *kaP* facilitates shortening. Thus, we get *bahukhaṭvakaḥ* and *bahumālakaḥ*. Affix *kaP* is here introduced after compound-formation of *bahuvrīhi*. Elsewhere, we will get *bahukhaṭvākaḥ* and *bahumālākaḥ*.

7.4.16 ऋदृशोऽङि गुणः

ṛdṛśo' ṅi guṇaḥ

/ṛ-dṛśaḥ 6/1 (*sam. dv.*), *tasya*; *aṅi* 7/1 *guṇaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
ṛvarṇāntānāṃ dṛśeś ca aṅi parato guṇo bhavati
A replacement in *guṇa* comes in place of the final vowel of an *aṅga*, namely one which ends in *ṛ*, or that which is constituted by *dṛśIR* 'to see', provided when affix *aṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

akarat 'third person singular active past imperfect (*LUṄ*) derivate of *kṛ*'
akaram 'first person singular active past imperfect . . .'
asarat 'third person singular active past imperfect derivate of *sṛ*'
ārat 'third person singular active past imperfect derivate of *ṛ*'
jarā 'old age; (*jṝ*(*Ṣ*) + *a*(*Ṅ*)) + *ṬāP*'
adarśat 'third person singular active past imperfect derivate of *dṛś*'
adarśatām 'third person dual active past imperfect . . .'
adarśan 'first person singular active past imperfect . . .'

1. Note that *aṄ* (3.1.56 *sarttiśāstyartti* . . .) is an affixal replacement of *CLI*, marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*. A *guṇa* replacement thus gets negated by 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*. Our present rule makes this *guṇa* possible. Consider *akarat* and *akaram*, the third, and first, singular *LUṄ*-derivates, respectively, of *kṛ*, where *aṄ* is introduced as a replacement of *CLI* (3.1.59 *kṛmṛdṛruhi* . . .). Refer to derivational details of *akarat* and *akaram*, under the appendix (III:776) of rule 3.4.6 *chandasi luṅlaṅliṭaḥ*. The *aṄ* in *asarat* is introduced by 3.1.56 *sarttiśāstyarttibhyaś ca*. Refer to the appendix under this rule (III:723) for derivational details. Our next example *jarā*, a feminine derivate ending in *ṬāP* (4.1.41 *ṣid gaurādibhyaś ca*), has affix *aṄ* (3.3.104 *ṣidbhidādibhyo' ṅ*) introduced after verbal root *jṝ* 'to be old, decay'. Derivational details of *adarśat* are offered under the appendix (III:720) of 3.1.47 *na dṛśaḥ*. The *aṄ*, in place of *CLI* in *adarśat*, is introduced by 3.1.57 *irito vā*.

7.4.17 अस्यतेस्थुक्

asyates thuk
/asyateḥ 6/1 *thuk* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *aṅi* #15)
asyater aṅgasya thug āgamo bhavaty aṅi parataḥ
Augment *thUK* is introduced to an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *as* when affix *aṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

āsthat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *as*'
āsthatām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
āsthan 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule introduces augment *thUK* to an *aṅga* constituted by *asU* 'to hurl' when *aṄ* follows. Refer to the appendix under rule 3.1.52 *asyativakti* . . . where *CLI* is replaced with *aṄ* after *asU* in deriving *āsthat* of *pary-āsthat.*

7.4.18 **श्वयतेरः**

śvayater aḥ
/śvayateḥ 6/1 *aḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *aṅi* #16)
śvayater aṅgasyākārādeśo bhavaty aṅi parataḥ
An *a* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *ṬUOśvi* 'to move, grow' when affix *aṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

aśvat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *ṬUOśvi*'
aśvatām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate of *ṬUOśvi*'
aśvan 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule replaces the *aṅga*-final *i* of *ṬUOśvi* 'to grow, go' with *a.* Refer to derivational details of *aśvat* under the appendix of 3.1.49 *vibhāṣā dheṭśvyoḥ* (III:720-21), whereby *CLI* after *śvi* is replaced with *aṄ.* Other examples are similarly derived.

7.4.19 **पतः पुम्**

pataḥ pum
/pataḥ 6/1 *pum* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *aṅi* #16)
pater aṅgasya pum āgamo bhavaty aṅi parataḥ
Augment *pUM* is introduced to an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *pat* 'to fall' when affix *aṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

apaptat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *pat* 'to move, fall' '
apaptatām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
apaptan 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule introduces augment *pUM* to an *aṅga* constituted by *pat* when *aṄ* follows. Recall that *aṄ* replaces *CLI* under the condition of *pat* being marked with *Ḷ* as an *it* (3.1.55 *puṣādidyutādi* . . .). This rule introduces *pUM* after the last vowel of *pat* (1.1.46 *mid aco' ntyāt paraḥ*). Thus, we get *aṬ* + *pa* + (*pa* + *PUM* + *t*) + *a* + *t* = *apaptat,* etc., through reduplication and operations relative to the *abhyāsa.* Refer to derivational details of similar derivates under the appendix of 3.1.55 *puṣādidyutādi* . . ., etc.

7.4.20 वच उम्

vaca um
/vacaḥ 6/1 *um* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *aṅi* #16)
vacer aṅgasya aṅi parata um āgamo bhavati
Augment *uM* is introduced to an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *vac* 'to speak' when affix *aṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

avocat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *vac*'
avocatām 'third person dual active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'
avocan 'third person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. Refer to the appendix of 3.1.52 *asyativakti* . . . (III:722) for derivational details of *avocat*, etc.

7.4.21 शीङः सार्वधातुके गुणः

śīṅaḥ sārvadhātuke guṇaḥ
/śīṅaḥ 6/1 *sārvadhātuke* 7/1 *guṇaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
śīṅo' ṅgasya sārvadhātuke parato guṇo bhavati
A *guṇa* vowel comes in place of the final vowel of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *śīṄ* 'to recline, lie down' when an affix termed *sārvadhātuka* follows.

EXAMPLES:

śete 'third person singular middle *LAṄ*-derivate of *śīṄ*'
śayāte 'third person dual middle *LAṄ*-derivate . . .'
śerate 'third person plural middle *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. Recall that *guṇa* before a *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*) affix marked with *P* as an *it* is already made available (7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*). But this *guṇa* is blocked by 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*, read with 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*. The *guṇa* of this rule cannot be blocked since it is a special provision. Refer to derivational details of *śerate* under 7.1.6 *śīṅo ruṭ*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *sārvadhātuke* 'when an affix termed *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*) follows'? Consider *śiśye* where a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LIṬ* is uniquely termed *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*). Consequently, *guṇa* of this rule is blocked before an affix other than *sārvadhātuka*.

7.4.22 अयङ् यि क्ङिति

ayaṅ yi kṅiti

/ ayaṅ 1/1 *yi* 7/1 *kṅiti* 7/1 = *kaś ca ṅaś ca kaṅau* (*itar. dv.*); *tau itau yasya* (*bv.*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *śīṅ* #21)
yakārādau kṅiti pratyaye parataḥ śīṅo' ṅgasya 'ayaṅ' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ayaṅ* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by *śīṄ* 'to recline' when a *y*-initial affix marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

śayyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *śīṄ* with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense' '
śāśayyate 'third person dual middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *śīṄ* ending in affix *yaṄ*...'
praśayya 'absolutive derivate of (*upa-śīṄ*) + *Ktvā→LyaP*'
upaśayya 'derivate of (*upa-śīṄ*) + *Ktvā→LyaP*'

1. This rule introduces *ayAṄ* to the final vowel of *śīṄ*, provided, of course, when an affix, beginning with *y* and marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it*, follows. Consider *śayyate* which derives from *śī* + (*LAṬ→te*) → *śī* + *yaK* + *te*, where *yaK* (3.1.67 *sārvadhātuke yak*) is introduced before *te* with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense'. We get *ś*(*ī→ayAṄ*) + *yaK* + *te* → *śayyate*, where *ayAṄ* replaces *ī* in view of 1.1.53 *ṅic ca*. Note that *śāśayyate* derives from (*śī* + *yaṄ*) + (*LAṬ→te*)), with reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*. Since *ayAṄ* is subsequent (*para*), and obligatory (*nitya*), it applies first to *śī* + *yaṄ*. Doubling and retention of the unit formed with initial consonant (7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*) follow. The *a* of the *abhyāsa*, namely the *śa* of *śa* + *śayya* + *ta*, then goes through a replacement in long (7.4.83 *dīrgho' kitaḥ*). The *Ktvā* of *pra* + *śī* + *Ktvā* and *upa* + *śī* + *Ktvā* goes through a replacement in *LyaP* (7.1.37 *samāse*...; 2.2.22 *ktvā ca*). Of course, in addition to introduction of *ayAṄ* to *ī* of *śī*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *y*-initial (*yakārādi*)? Consider *śī* + (*LIṬ→ta→te*) = *śiśye* where, after reduplication, *ī* before *e* goes through a replacement in *y* (*yaṆ*). Consider *śeya* (of *śeyam*) which derives from *śī* + *yaT* as a counter-example for the condition of *kṅiti*. Obviously, we get a replacement in *guṇa* because *yaT* is not marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it*.

7.4.23 **उपसर्गादृह्रस्व ऊहते:**

upasargād hrasva ūhateḥ
/upasargāt 5/1 *hrasvaḥ* 1/1 *ūhateḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yi kṅiti* #22)
upasargād uttarasya ūhater aṅgasya hrasvo bhavati yakārādau kṅiti pratyaye parataḥ
A short vowel comes in place of the long of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *ūhA* 'to reason, suspect', used in construction after a preverb, when a *y*-initial affix marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

samuhyate 'derivate of *sam-ūh* + *yaK* + (*LAṬ→te*)'
samuhya 'derivate of *sam-ūh* + (*Ktvā→LyaP*)'
abhyuhyate 'derivate of *abhi-ūh* + *yaK* + (*LAṬ→te*)'
abhyuhya 'derivate of *abhi-ūh* + *yaK* + (*LAṬ→te*)'

1. This rule offers a short vowel as a replacement for the long of *ūhA*, when used as an *aṅga* in construction after a preverb. Of course, when a *y*-initial affix marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it* follows. Thus, we get *sam-*(*ū→u*) *h* + *yaK* + (*LAṬ→te*)) = *samuhyate* and *sam-*(*ū→u*) *h* + (*Ktvā→LyaP*)) = *samuhya*. Similar applications are also involved in deriving *abhyuhate* and *abhyuhya*.

2. Note that an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *ūh* alone does not qualify for this shortening. Thus, we cannot derive (*ū→u*) *h* + *yaK* + *te* = **uhyate*. The correct form must be *ūhyate*. This explains why we have the condition of *upasargāt* 'after a preverb'. Consider *samūhitam* where we cannot get this shortening because *Kta* begins with a consonant other than *y*. Recall that *aṇaḥ* is carried over to this rule, via *anuvṛtti*, from 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ*. Consequently, this shortening must apply to a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *aṆ*. We do not get shortening of *o* in *sam* + *ā* + *ūhyate→ sam* (*ā*+*ū→o*) *hyate* = *samohyate*.

7.4.24 एतेर्लिङि

eter liṅi
/eteḥ 6/1 *liṅi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yi kṅiti* #22 *upasargad hrasvaḥ* #23)
eter aṅgasyopasargād uttarasya liṅi yakārādau kṅiti parato hrasvo bhavati
A short comes in place of the long final vowel of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *iṆ* 'to go', used in construction after a preverb, when a *y*-initial affix marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

udiyāt 'derivate of *ud-iṆ* + (*LIṄ→ta*)'
samiyāt 'derivate of *sam-iṆ* + (*LIṄ→ta*)'
anviyāt 'derivate of *anu-iṆ* + (*LIṄ→ta*)'

1. This rule allows a short replacement for the long of an *aṅga*, namely *iṆ* 'to go', when the *aṅga* is used after a preverb and when a *y*-initial replacement of *LIṄ* 'benedictive' marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it* follows. This shortening applies to the long vowel resulting out of application of 7.4.25 *akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ* (*Kāś: āśiṣi liṅi 'akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ' iti dīrghatve kṛte hrasvo' nena bhavati*). Recall that a *parasmaipada* replacement (by way of an augment) of *LIṄ*, namely *yāsUṬ*, is treated as marked with *Ṅ* and *K* (3.4.103 *yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣū . . .*; 3.4.104 *kidāśiṣi*) as an *it*. Thus, *ud* + *i* + (*LIṄ→t*(*i→ϕ*) →

ud + i + yā(s→ϕ) + t = udi + yāt, where *s* of *yāsUṬ*, and *sUṬ* as well, gets deleted by 8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ca*. The *i* of the string is replaced with its long counterpart by rule 7.4.25 *akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ dīrghaḥ*. Thus, we get *ud + (i→ī) + yāt = udīyāt*. Our present rule then replaces the long vowel with its short (*hrasvaḥ*) counterpart. Thus, *ud(ī→i)yāt = udiyāt*. A similar example will be *abhi + (ī→i)yāt → abhi + iyāt*. Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa*) and Haradatta (*PM*) both clearly state that a long replacement for *i* of *iṄ* is not possible when a *sārvadhātuka* replacement of *LIṄ* follows. This rule cannot apply there. This shortening applies to a long which results through the application of 7.4.25 *akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ*. It is argued that, given *abhi + iyāt* and *prati + iyāt*, we can get *abhīyāt*, *pratīyāt* and *parīyāt* and *pratīyāt* through homogeneous long vowel replacement (*savarṇa-dīrgha*; 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*). But still this shortening cannot apply, as it has been explained by the *Mahābhāṣya* with *ā + īyāt* and *ā + ūhyate*, via *antādivadbhāva* 'treatment of the final as initial of what follows'. I choose not to discuss it any further.

The short replacement, however, will apply only when the *aṅga* is used after a preverb (*upasargād eva*). Elsewhere, we will get *īyāt* with long *ī*. Additionally, this shortening applies only to a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *aṆ*. Thus, we do not get shortening of *e* in *ā + īyāt = eyāt* and *sam + ā + īyāt = sameyāt*.

7.4.25 अकृत्सार्वधातुकयोर्दीर्घः

akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ
/ akṛt-sārvadhātukayoḥ 7/2 = *kṛc ca sārvadhātukaṁ ca* (*itar. dv.*); *na kṛtsārvadhātuke* (*nañ. tat.*), *tayoḥ*; *dīrghaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yi kṅiti* #25)
akṛdyakāre asārvadhātukayakāre ca kṅiti parato' jantasyāṅgasya dīrgho bhavati
A short comes in place of the final vowel of an *aṅga* when a non-*Kṛt* and non-*sārvadhātuka* affix beginning with *y*, and marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

bhṛśāyate 'derivate of *bhṛśa + KyaṄ + ŚaP + ta*'
sukhāyate 'derivate of *sukha + KyaṄ + ŚaP + ta*'
duḥkhāyate 'derivate of *duḥkha + KyaṄ + ŚaP + ta*'
cīyate 'derivate of *ci + yaK + ta*'
cecīyate 'derivate of *ci + yaṄ + ta*'
stūyate 'derivate of *stu + yaK + ta*'
toṣṭūyate 'derivate of *stu + yaṅ + ta*'
cīyāt 'third person singular *LIṄ*-derivate of *ci*'
stūyāt '. . . of *stu*'

1. This rule allows a long replacement for the final short vowel of an *aṅga* when a non-*kṛt* (*akṛt*; 3.1.93 *kṛd atiṅ*) and non-*sārvadhātuka* affix (*asārvadhātuka*; 3.4.114 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*) beginning with *y*, and marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it*, follows. Recall here that, in view of 1.2.28 *acaś ca*, only a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *aC* gets replaced with it short (*hrasva*), long (*dīrgha*) and extra-long (*pluta*) counterpart. Consider *bhṛśāyate*, *sukhāyate* and *duḥkhāyate* where the short final vowel of *bhṛśa*, *sukha* and *duḥkha* gets replaced with its long counterpart under the condition of a following *KyaṄ* (3.1.12 *bhṛśādibhyo . . .*; 3.1.18 *sukhādibhyo . . .*). Recall that *cīyate* and *stūyate* are middle (*ātmanepada*) derivates of *ciÑ* 'to heap' and *ṣṭuÑ* 'to praise' where *yaK* is introduced with the signification of *karman* 'object' (3.1.67 *sārvadhātuke yak*). Derivates of *yaṄ* (3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco . . .*), for example *toṣṭuyate*: (*ṣṭu* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*)) and *cecīyate*: (*ciÑ* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*)), involve *dvitva* 'reduplication' (6.1.1 *ekāco dve prathamasya*). Rule 7.4.61 *śarapūrvāḥ khayaḥ* requires that only a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *khaY*, when used in an *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*) after a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *śaR*, is retained. This applies to the *abhyāsa* of *toṣṭuyate*. Derivates such as *cīyāt* and *stūyāt* illustrate how, in the benedictive (*āśīrliṅ*), *ci* and *stu* get a long replacement for their final short *i* before *yāsUṬ*.

Notice that all *y*-initial affixes which condition the long replacement of this rule are non-*kṛt* and non-*sārvadhātuka*. Consider *prakṛtya* and *prahṛtya*, as counter-examples, where *Ktvā*→*LyaP* is an affix marked with *K* as an *it*. But since this affix is a *kṛt*, we do not get a long replacement. Recall that a long replacement is here ordered for an *aṅga* which ends in a vowel (*ajanta*). Such a long replacement will be automatically blocked in derivates such as *prakṛtya* and *prahṛtya*, because of introduction of *tUK* (6.1.71 *hrasvasya pitikṛti . . .*) causing impairment of the vowel-final status (*ajantatā*) of an *aṅga*. Why make a specific provision by specifying *akṛt* to block long replacement? Commentators state that if *akṛt* is not specified, long replacement of this rule will block augment *tUK* on the basis of being subsequent (*paratva*; *Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *asaty akṛdgrahaṇe paratvād dīrghatvena tug bādhyeta*). Incidentally, *tUK* finds its independent scope of application in *agnicit* and *somasut*. The long replacement has its own independent scope of application in *cīyate*. It is *prakṛtya* and *prahṛtya* where *tUK* and *dīrgha*, both, become applicable simultaneously. We must have *akṛt* so that *tUK* is not blocked by *dīrgha* on the basis of *paratva*.

A specification with *asārvadhātuke* is also needed so that this long replacement does not apply in deriving *cinuyāt* and *sunuyāt* where verbal endings of the potential (*vidhiliṅ*) are termed *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*). A specification with *ṅiti* is also required so that *uruyā* and *dhṛṣṇuyā* do not get this long replacement. Recall that *Ṭā* of *uru* + *Ṭā* and *dhṛṣṇu* + *Ṭā* is replaced with *yā* by 7.1.39 *supāṃ suluk*. . . . This long replacement is blocked because *yā* is not marked with *K* or *Ṅ* as an *it*.

7.4.26 च्वौ च

cvau ca
/cvau 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *dīrghaḥ* #25)
cvipratyaye parato' jantasyāṅgasya dīrgho bhavati
A short comes in place of the long final vowel of an *aṅga* also when affix *CvI* follows.

EXAMPLES:

śucīkaroti 'that which was not pure becomes pure'
śucīsyāt 'ibidem'
paṭūkaroti 'he who was not clever becomes clever'
paṭūbhavati 'ibidem'
paṭūsyāt 'ibidem'

1. This rule allows a long replacement for the short final vowel of an *aṅga* when affix *CvI* follows. Recall that *CvI* goes through total deletion, and is introduced with the signification of *abhūtatadbhāva* '*x* becoming *y* which it previously was not' (5.4.50 *abhūtatadbhāve* . . .). Thus, *śucīkaroti*, *śucībhavati* and *śucīsyāt*, etc., where this rule offers a long replacement for the final vowel of the *aṅga*.

7.4.27 रीङ् ऋतः

rīṅ ṛtaḥ
/rīṅ 1/1 *ṛtaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yi* #22 *akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ* #25 *cvi* #26)
ṛkārāntasyāṅgasya akṛdyakāre' sārvadhātuke yakāre cvau ca parataḥ 'rīṅ' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *rīṅ* comes in place of the final *ṛ* of an *aṅga* when a *y*-initial non-*Kṛt* and non-*sārvadhātuka* affix, and also *CvI*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

mātrīyati 'wishes a mother for himself'
mātrīyate 'ibidem'
pitrīyati 'wishes a father for himself'
pitrīyate 'ibidem'
cekrīyati 'wishes to do over and over again'
mātrībhūtaḥ 'a mother which she was not'
pitryam 'that which came from father'

1. This rule allows a replacement in *rīṄ* for the final short *r* (*ṛT*) of an *aṅga* when a *y*-initial non-*kṛt* and non-*sārvadhātuka* affix, or affix *CvI*, follows. Consider *mātrīyati*/*mātrīyate*, *pitrīyati* / *pitrīyate*, *cekrīyate* and *mātrībhūtaḥ*. We

can get *ātmanaḥ mātaram icchati* = *mātrīyati* 'wishes a mother for himself' by introducing *LAṬ* after *mātrīya*, a root derived with *KyaC* (3.1.8 *supa ātmanaḥ kyac*). Recall that *KyaC* will be introduced after *mātṛ* + *am*, under the condition of a conjoined word with the denotatum of object (*karman*). We will get *māt*(*ṛ*→*rī*) + (*K*)*ya*(*C*) = *mātrīya*, a root (3.1.32 *sanādyantā dhātavaḥ*). The *sUP*, i.e., *am*, will be deleted by 2.4.71 *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ*. An introduction of *KyaṄ* (3.1.11 *kartuḥ kyaṅ salopaś ca*) for deriving *mātrīya* will require *ātmanepada* (1.3.12 *anudāttaṅita ātmanepadam*) endings. Thus, we will get *mātrīyate*, parallel to *mātā iva ācarati* 'acts like mother'. We will similarly get other examples. Note that *cekrīyate*, a derivate of (*kṛ* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*)), involves doubling and the *guṇa* (7.4.82 *guṇo yaṅlukoḥ*) of the unit termed *abhyāsa*. Of course, it also involves a replacement in *rīṄ* for the final *ṛ* of the *aṅga*. Our example *mātrībhūtaḥ* is derived with *CvI* and is used parallel to *amātā mātā bhūtaḥ* 'she who was not a mother became one'. Affix *yaT* is used in deriving *pitryam* 'that which came from father' (4.3.79 *pitur yac ca*). The *ī* of *rīṄ* in *pitryam* is deleted by 6.4.148 *yasyeti ca*. Incidentally, 1.1.52 *ṅic ca* would require that *rīṄ* replaces the final sound segment of the *aṅga*. The requirement of affixes marked with *K* and *Ṅ* is dropped here. That is why, we get *pituḥ āgatam* = *pitryam*. The *taparakaraṇa* of *ṛT* is required so that this replacement does not apply to *kṝ* and *gṝ* of, for example, *cekīryate* and *nijegilyate*. Obviously because they end in a long *ṝ*.

7.4.28 रिङ् शयग्लिङ्क्षु

riṅ śayagliṅkṣu
/*riṅ* 1/1 *śayagliṅkṣu* 7/3 = *śaś ca yak ca liṅ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yi* #22 *asārvadhātukayoḥ* #25 *ṛtaḥ* #27)
ṛkārāntasyāṅgasya '*śa, yak*' *ity etayor liṅi ca yakārādāv asārvadhātuke parataḥ* '*riṅ*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *riṅ* comes in place of the final *ṛ* of an *aṅga* when affixes *Śa* and *yaK*, or a non-*sārvadhātuka* replacement of *LIṄ* beginning with *y* and marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it*, follow.

EXAMPLES:

ādriyate '. . . is repected'
ādhriyate '. . . is supported, held'
kriyate '. . . is made, done'
hriyate '. . . is carried'
kriyāt 'let him do'
hriyāt 'let him carry'

1. Note that *riṄ* is introduced here so that a long replacement (*dīrgha*) could be canceled (*Kāś*: *riṅvacanaṃ dīrghanivṛtyartham*). *Kāśikā* offers *ādriyate* and *ādhriyate* as examples for replacement in *riṅ*. Thus, (*āṄ* + *dṛṄ*) + *LAṬ*))

→ (*ādṛ* + (*Ś*)*a*)) + (*LAṬ*→*ta*))) → *ād*(*ṛ*→*ri*(*Ṅ*)) + *a* + *ta*, where 3.1.77 *tudādibhyaḥ śaḥ* introduces *Śa* and the *i* of *ri* is replaced with *iyAṄ* (6.4.77 *aci śnudhātubhruvām*). Thus, *ādr*(*i*→*iy*) + *a* + *ta* = *ādriyate*, through replacement in *e* (*etva*; 3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ ṭer e*) of *a* of *ta*. Similar rules apply in deriving *ādhriyate*. Derivates such as *kriyate* and *hriyate* do not pose any problem. They derive with *yaK* introduced with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense' and *karman* 'object'. The benedictive *kriyāt* and *hriyāt* are derived with *riṄ* and *yāsUṬ*. Refer to *stūyāt* under 7.4.25 *akṛtsārvadhātukayor* . . . for additional details.

2. Note that the condition of *asārvadhātuke* is still valid. Thus, we do not get this replacement in *bibhriyāt* of *bhṛÑ* 'to provide for'. This form is potential (*vidhiliṅ*). This replacement also has the right condition of *y*-initiality (*yakārādi*). Thus, we do not get it in *kṛṣīṣṭa* and *hṛṣīṣṭa* for a lack of *y*-initial right condition. Refer to the appendix (II:437-38) for derivational details.

7.4.29 गुणोऽर्तिसंयोगाद्योः

guṇo' rti saṃyogādyoḥ
/*guṇaḥ* 1/1 *artti-saṃyogādyoḥ* 6/2 = *saṃyoga ādir yeṣāṃ te* (*bv.*); *arttiś ca saṃyogādiś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yi* #22 *asārvadhātukayoḥ* #25 *ṛtaḥ* #27 *yaki liṅi* #28)
guṇo bhavaty artteḥ saṃyogādīnāṃ ṛkārāntānāṃ yaki parato liṅi ca yakārādau sārvadhātuke
A *guṇa* vowel comes in place of the final of an *aṅga* which is either constituted by verbal root *ṛ* 'to go', or by a conjunct-initial root terminating in *ṛ*, provided when *yaK*, or a *y*-initial *LIṄ* affix other than *sārvadhātuka*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

aryate
aryāt
smaryate
smaryāt

1. Note that *Śa* is introduced after the roots of the *tudādi* class. Since this class does not have any roots specified here, no purpose can be served by carrying *Śa* to this rule (*Kāś*: '*śa*' *ity atrāsambhavān nivṛttam*).

The example derivates involve *yaK* and *LIṄ* which are marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it*. This would have blocked *guṇa* (1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*) which our present rule allows. This *guṇa* constitutes an exception to the *riṄ* of the preceding rule. Consider *aryate*/*aryāt*; and *smaryate*/*smaryāt*, from *ṛ* + *yaK* + *ta*/*ṛ* + *yāsUṬ* + (*LIṄ*→*tiP*), where *ṛ* goes through *guṇa*, followed by *r* (*rapara*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*). This same also happens in case of *smaryate* and *smaryāt*.

2. Why do we not get this *guṇa* in *saṃskriyate* and *saṃskriyāt*? Because *skṛ*,

which appears to be a root beginning with a conjunct, is actually a combination of *sUṬ* with *kṛ*. The *guṇa* is internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*), as against augment *sUṬ* which is externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*). The *sUṬ* is thus considered 'suspended' (*asiddha*) in view of the *guṇa* application. This application of *guṇa* is blocked since the *aṅga* no longer contains a conjunct (*saṃyoga*) in its initial position. Recall here that 6.1.135 *suṭ kātpūrvaḥ* introduces *sUṬ* before *k*. A question is raised against making this specification since *sUṬ* is introduced before *k*, anyway. That is, why state the obvious. It is then made clear that *kātpūrvaḥ* is used to indicate that *sUṬ* does not become part of the root. That is, *kṛ* does not become a conjunct-initial root *skṛ*. Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* ad 6.1.135 *suṭ kātpūrvaḥ* for additional details. Also refer to details of 7.4.10 *ṛta ca saṃyogāder guṇaḥ* where, with reference to *sañcaskaratuḥ*, etc., *kṛ* is treated as a conjunct-initial root. Note, however, that *sUṬ* is still considered externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) for purposes of introducing augment *iṬ*.

The condition of *y*-initial (*yakārādi*) is still valid. Thus, we do not get *guṇa* in the benedictive *svṛṣīṣṭa* and *dhvṛṣīṣṭa*. The condition of *asārvadhātuke* is also valid. Consequently, we do not get *guṇa* in potential (*vidhi-liṅ*) forms such as *iyṛyāt*, etc.

7.4.30 यङि च

yaṅi ca
/yaṅi 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ṛtaḥ* #27 *guṇo' rttisaṃyogādyoḥ* #29)
yaṅi ca parataḥ artteḥ saṃyogādeś ca ṛto guṇo bhavati
A *guṇa* vowel comes in place of the final of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *ṛ*, or by a conjunct-initial root terminating in *ṛ*, also when affix *yaṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

arāryate
sāsvaryate
dādhvaryate
sāsmaryate

1. Here again a *guṇa*, which was negated before an affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*, is allowed to apply before *yaṄ*. Consider *arāryate* which derives from (*ṛ* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*)). A *guṇa* of *ṛ*, followed by *r*, produces *ar* + *ya*. Rule 6.1.2 *ajāder dvityasya* then applies to reduplicate *rya*. Note here that 6.1.3 *na ādrāḥ saṃyogādayaḥ* should not permit this reduplication. Patañjali, since he does not consider *r* followed by *y* covered by the negation of 6.1.3, allows reduplication of *rya*. The result then is: *aryarya*. The first *y* of *aryarya* is then deleted (7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*). Rule 7.4.83 *dīrgho' kitaḥ* then applies on *ararya* to produce

ar(*a*→*ā*) *rya* → *arārya*. Our final derivate *arāryate* derives from *arārya* + *LAṬ*, through the *ātmanepada* replacement *ta*→*te*. Refer to derivational details of *āṭaṭyate* under 6.1.9 *sanyaṅoḥ*. Incidentally, affix *yaṄ* is introduced with reference to a *vārttika* proposal (ad 3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco . . .*: *sūcisūtrimūtryaṭyartyaśurṇotīnām*).

2. A *vārttika* proposal, as discussed earlier, is made to disallow negation of *ya* in reduplication (cf. 6.1.3 *na ndrāḥ saṃyogādayaḥ*; *Kāś*: *dvirvacanapratiṣedho yakārasya neṣyate*).

An additional proposal is made for *han*, when meaning *hiṃsā* 'to harm', to be replaced with *ghnī*, provided *yaṄ* followed. Thus, we will get *jeghnīyate*. We will get *jaṅghanyate* with no *ghnī*, outside the meaning of *hiṃsā*.

7.4.31 ई घ्राध्मोः

ī ghrādhmoḥ
/ī 1/1 (deleted) *ghrādhmoḥ* 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *yaṅi* #30)
'*ghrā, dhmā*' *ity etayor yaṅi parata īkārādeśo bhavati*
A long *ī* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* which is constituted by verbal roots *ghrā* 'to smell' and *dhmā* 'to beat', provided when affix *yaṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

jeghrīyate 'a derivate of (*ghrā* + *yaṄ*) + (*LAṬ*→*ta*))'
dedhmīyate 'a derivate of (*dhmā* + *yaṄ*) + (*LAṬ*→*ta*))'

1. Note that this *ī*-replacement is applied to the final sound segment of an *aṅga* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*). Our derivates, where final *ā* before *yaṄ* gets replaced with *ī*, go through reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*. The way is thus made clear for application of *guṇa* of 7.4.82 *guṇo yaṅlukoḥ*. Haradatta suggests that specifying a short replacement in *i* could also have served the purpose. An application of 7.4.26 *akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ* (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *ikārvidhāv api* '*akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ*') could then have applied to replace short *i* with its long counterpart. This, however, will not be economical.

7.4.32 अस्य च्वौ

asya cvau
/asya 6/1 *cvau* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ī* #31)
avarṇāntasyāṅgasya cvau parata īkārādeśo bhavati
A long *ī* comes in place of the final *a* of an *aṅga* when affix *CvI* follows.

EXAMPLES:

śuklībhavati
śuklīsyāt
khaṭvīkaroti
khaṭvīsyāt

1. Note that this rule is an exception to a long replacement of the short *aṅga*-final vowel (7.4.25 *cvau ca*). Recall also that *CvI* (5.4.50 *abhtatadbhāve . . .*) is introduced with the signification of *abhūtatadbhāva* 'the sense of *x* becoming *y* which it previously was not'. Affix *CvI*, of course, goes through total deletion. Thus, what would have become *khaṭvāsyāt* now becomes *khaṭvīkaroti* 'that which was not a *khaṭvā* 'cot' is now made into a cot' with a replacement in long *ī*. Similar replacements are also involved in deriving other derivates.

7.4.33 क्यचि च

kyaci ca
/kyaci 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ī* #31 *asya* #32)
kyaci parato' varṇāntasyāṅgasya īkārādeśo bhavati
A long *ī* comes in place of the final *a* of an *aṅga* also when affix *KyaC* follows.

EXAMPLES:

putrīyati 'wishes a son for himself'
ghaṭīyati 'wishes a pitcher for himself'
khaṭvīyati 'wishes a cot for himself'
mālīyati 'wishes a garland for himself'

1. This rule is an exception to the long (*dīrgha*) vowel-replacement of 7.4.25 *akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ*. Why was this rule not formulated jointly with the preceding one? A separate formulation of this rule is needed for the following rule. The *anuvṛtti* of *KyaC* alone is required there (*Kāś*: *pṛthagyogakaraṇam uttarārtham*). A joint formulation would have also required the *anuvṛtti* of *cvau* 'when *cvi* follows'. Deriving examples such as *putrīyati* 'wishes a son for himself' is easy.

7.4.34 अशनायोदन्यधनाया बुभुक्षापिपासागर्धेषु

aśanāyodanyadhanāyā bubhukṣāpipāsāgardheṣu
/aśanāyodanya-dhanāyāḥ 1/3 (*itar. dv.*) *bubhukṣā-pipāsā-gardheṣu* 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *kyaci* #33)
'aśanāya, udanya, dhanāya' ity etāni nipātyante 'bubhukṣā, pipāsā, gardha' ity eteṣv artheṣu

Forms such as *aśanāya, udanya* and *dhanāya* are derived, via *nipātana*, when *KyaC* follows and the signification is *bubhukṣā* 'desire to eat; hunger', *pipāsā* 'desire to drink; thirst' and *gardha* 'to wish for much more; greed', respectively.

EXAMPLES:

aśanāyati 'hungry, he wants to eat'
udanyati 'thirsty, he wants a drink of water'
dhanāyati 'rich, but he still wants money'

1. This provision of *nipātana* produces *aśan*(*a*→*ā*) + *am* + *KyaC* = *aśanāya* + *LAṬ* = *aśanāyati*, parallel to *bubhukṣamāṇo' śanam icchati* '. . . is hungry so he wants to eat'. A long *ā* comes as a replacement for the final of *aśana*, via *nipātana*. This same also happens in case of *dhanāyati*, parallel to *saty eva dhane bhūyo' pi dhanam icchati* = *dhanāyati* 'he has money but still wants much more'. The word *udaka* 'water' is similalry replaced with *udan*, via *nipātana*, to produce *udanya*. We thus get *udanyati*, parallel to *pipāsito' yaṃ pānārtham udakam icchati* 'he is thirsty so he wishes to drink water', where *udaka* is replaced with *udan*, again via *nipātana*. Elsewhere, when the meaning is not *bubhukṣā* 'hunger', *pipāsā* 'thirst' or *gardha* 'greed', we get *aśanyati, udakīyati* and *dhanīyati*, with no changes, via *nipātana*.

7.4.35 न च्छन्दस्यपुत्रस्य

na chandasy aputrasya
/na ϕ chandasi 7/1 *aputrasya* 7/1 = *na putraḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya/* (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *asya* #32 *kyaci* #33)
chandasi viṣaye putravarjitasyāvarṇāntasyāṅgasya kvacid yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
That which is stated here for an *aṅga*, terminating in *a* and occurring before *KyaC*, does not apply on Vedic usage, except when the *aṅga* is constituted by *putra* 'son'.

EXAMPLES:

mi̱tráyuḥ 'seeker of friendship'
saṃsvedayuḥ 'perspiring'
de̱vāñjígāti su̱mna̱yu̱ḥ 'devotee praising the divinity'

1. What is stated here for an *aṅga* which terminates in *a* is: replacement in a long vowel in general (7.4.25 *akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ*), or a replacement in *ī* (7.4.33 *kyaci ca*), in particular. These replacements do not apply to the Vedic usage, except when the *aṅga* is constituted by *putra* 'son'. We derive *mitra* + *am* + *KyaC* → *mitraya*, where 3.2.170 *kyāc chandasi* introduces affix *u*, after *mitraya*, to produce *mitrayu*. Our final form *mitrayuḥ* can then be derived from *mitrayu* + *s*(*U*) through *s*→*r*→*ḥ* (*rutva-visarga*). A replace-

ment in *ā*, or in *ī*, which may be available to the final *a* of *mitraya* is here negated. Similar derivational details could be offered for deriving *sam* + *svid* + *KyaC* = (*saṃsvedaya* + *u*) + *sU*)) = *saṃsvedayuḥ* 'perspiring' and *sumnayu* + *sU* → *sumnayuḥ* 'favoring'.

2. Why do we have to state *aputrasya*? So that we could account for a long replacement in *ī* for the final *a* of *putra*. That is, *putra* alone should be allowed to go through this replacement. We thus get *putrīyantaḥ sudānavaḥ*.

A *vārttika* states that this exclusion should not be stated just as *aputrasya*. It should instead be stated as *aputrādīnām* '. . . does not apply to those which are other than *putra* and its likes'. This will enable us to get *ātmanaḥ janam* (*janīm* = *vadhūm*) *icchanti* = *janīyanti* 'wish for a man (or a bride) . . .' as in *janīyanto' nvagravaḥ*.

7.4.36 दुरस्युर्द्रविणस्युर्वृषण्यति रिषण्यति

durasyurdraviṇasyurvṛṣaṇyati riṣaṇyati
/*durasyuḥ* 1/1 *draviṇasyuḥ* 1/1 *vṛṣaṇyati* (verbal *pada*) *riṣaṇyati* (verbal *pada*)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *kyaci* #33 *chandasi* #35)
'*durasyuḥ, draviṇasyuḥ, vṛṣaṇyati, riṣaṇyati*' *ity etāni chandasi nipātyante*
Forms such as *durasyuḥ* / *draviṇasyuḥ* and *vṛṣaṇyati* / *riṣaṇyati* are derived, via *nipātana*, when the usage is Vedic and affix *KyaC* follows.

EXAMPLES:

aviyonā durasyuḥ
draviṇasyurvípaṇyayā́
vṛṣaṇyati
riṣaṇyati

1. This rule allows *duṣṭa* 'corrupt, wicked', *draviṇa* 'wealth', *vṛṣa* 'bull' and *riṣṭa* 'wounded' to be replaced in the Vedic, via *nipātana*, with *duras, draviṇas, vṛṣaṇ*, and *riṣaṇ*, respectively. Note that affix *u* (3.2.170 *kyāc chandasi*) is introduced in deriving *durasyuḥ* 'wicked' and *draviṇasyuḥ* 'wealthy'. These *nipātana* provisions are made in view of available usage (*dṛṣṭānuvidhi*). Elsewhere, we will get a replacement in *ī*, as in *duṣṭīyati, draviṇīyati, vṛṣīyati*, and *riṣṭīyati*.

7.4.37 अश्वाघस्यात्

aśvāghasyāt
/*aśvāghasya* 6/1 = *aśvaś ca aghañ ca* = *aśvāgham* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya*; *āt* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *kyaci* #33 *chandasi* #35)
'*aśva, agha*' *ity etayoḥ kyaci parataś chandasi viṣaye akārādeśo bhavati*

A long *ā* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *aśva* and *agha*, when affix *KyaC* follows and the usage is Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

aśvāyanto maghavan
mā tvā vṛkā aghāvayo vidan

1. This *ī* is an exception to *ā*-replacement of the *aṅga*-final *a* of *aśva* 'horse' and *agha* 'sin, impurity', in the Vedic. Of course, when affix *KyaC* follows. Affix *KyaC*, for example in *aśvāyantaḥ*, is used in the sense of *aśvam icchanti* '. . . wish for a horse'. This replacement in *ā* also indicates that other words do not go through this replacement in the Vedic.

7.4.38 देवसुम्नयोर्यजुषि काठके

devasumnayor yajuṣi kāṭhake
/devasumnayoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *yajuṣi* 7/1 *kāṭhake* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *kyaci* #33 *chandasi* #35 *āt* #36)
'*deva, sumna*' *ity etatyoḥ kyaci parata ākārādeśo bhavati kāṭhake yajuṣi*
A long *ā* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *deva* and *sumna*, when affix *KyaC* follows and the usage relates to the *kāṭhaka* branch of the *yajurveda.*

EXAMPLES:

devāyanto yajamānāya
sumnāyantā havāmahe

1. This *ā* is an exception to the *ī*-replacement (*ītva*), especially in relation to *deva* and *sumna* used in the *Kāṭhaka-saṃhitā* of the *Yajurveda.* Elsewhere, we will get *sumnuyuḥ*, as is witnessed by the (non-*Yajurvedic*) *kaṭha* and *taittirīya* usage.

7.4.39 कव्यध्वरपृतनस्यर्चि लोपः

kavyadhvarapṛtanasyarci lopaḥ
/kavyadhvarapṛtanasya 6/1 = *kaviś ca adhvaraś ca pṛtanā ca* = *kavya-dhvarapṛtanam* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya*; *ṛci* 7/1 *lopaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *kyaci* #33 *chandasi* #35)
'*kavi, adhvara, pṛtanā*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānāṃ kyaci parato lopo bhavati ṛci viṣaye*
Deletion by *LOPA* comes in place of the final of an *aṅga*, namely *kavi* '(becoming) wise', *adhvara* 'sacrifice' and *pṛtanā* 'army', when affix *KyaC* follows and the usage is a quartered hymn.

EXAMPLES:

kavyantaḥ sumanasaḥ

adhvaryantaḥ
pṛtanyantastiṣṭhanti

1. This deletion will also apply to the final sound segment (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) of an *aṅga*. All example derivates are plural present active participial (*ŚatṚ*) forms. Thus, (*kavya* + *ŚaP* + *ṣatṚ*) + *Jas* → (*kavy*(*a*→ϕ) + (*a* + *a*→*a*) *nt*)) + *as*))) → *kavyant* + *as* = *kavyantaḥ*. A single replacement for *a*+*a* is ruled here by 6.1.94 *ato guṇe*. Similarly, *adhvaryantaḥ* and *pṛtannyantaḥ*, where the *aṅga* of the second, i.e., *pṛtanā*, goes through deletion of its final *ā* before *KyaC*.

7.4.40 द्यतिस्यतिमास्थामित्ति किति

dyatisyatimāsthām itti kiti
/ dyati-syati-mā-sthām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *eteṣām*;
it ϕ *ti* 7/1 *kiti* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
'*dyati, syati, mā, sthā*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānām ikārādeśo bhavati takārādau kiti pratyaye parataḥ*
A short *i* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *do* 'to cut', *ṣo* 'to end, terminate', *mā* 'to measure' and *sthā* 'to stay, remain', when a *t*-initial affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

nirditaḥ 'a derivate of (*nir-do* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
nirditavān 'a derivate of (*nir-do* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
avasitaḥ 'a derivate of *ava-so* + *Kta*'
avasitavān 'a derivate of *ava-so* + *KtavatU*'
mitaḥ 'a derivate of (*mā* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
mitavān 'a derivate of (*mā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
sthitaḥ 'a derivate of (*sthā* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
sthitavān 'a derivate of (*sthā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'

1. This rule allows a replacement in *i* for the final vowel of an *aṅga* constituted by *dyati*, i.e., *do* 'to split, break', *syati*, i.e., *ṣo* 'to end, terminate', *mā* 'to measure' and *sthā* 'to stay, stand', provided when a *t*-initial suffix marked with *K* as an *it* follows. Thus, consider *nir-do* + *Kta* = *nirdita*, where *o* of *do* gets replaced with *i*. We similarly get *nirditavān*, a derivate with *KtavatU*. Other examples, i.e., *avasita*, *avasitavat*, etc., are similarly derived.

2. Why do we have the condition of *takārādi* '*t*-initial'? Consider *avadāya* where we do not get the final vowel replaced with *i*. For, what follows is *LyaP*, a suffix not beginning with *t*. A similar counter-example for the condition of *kit* '*K* as an *it*' is offered as *avadātā*, where the nominal base is a derivate of *ava-dā* + *tṛC*.

7.4.41 **शाच्छोरन्यतरस्याम्**

śācchor anyatarasyām
/śāc-choḥ 6/2 = *śāc ca chāś ca* = *śācchau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *it ti kiti* #40)
'*śā, chā*' *ity etayor anyatarasyām ikārādeśo bhavati takārādau kiti*
A short *i* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by *śā* 'sharpen, whet, hone' and *chā* 'cut', only optionally, when a *t*-initial affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

niśitam 'a derivate of (*ni-śā* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
niśātam
niśitavān 'a derivate of (*ni-śā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
niśātavān
avacchitam 'a derivate of (*ava-chā* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
avacchātam
avacchitavān 'a derivate of (*ava-chā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
avacchātavān

1. This rule makes an optional provision against what the preceding rule makes as obligatory. Thus, we get *ni-ś*(*o*→*i*) + *Kta* = *niśita*. Note that the *o* of *śo* 'to plane, shape' and *cho* 'to pierce' goes through a replacement in *ā* (*ātva*; 6.1.71 *ādeca upadeśe* . . .) before *i* replaces the final sound segment, i.e., *ā*. Since this provision is optional, we also end up retaining the form with *ā*. Thus, *ni-ś*(*o*→*ā*) + *Kta* = *niśāta*. Similar rules apply in deriving other examples.

2. A *vārttika* proposal makes *i*-replacement obligatory (*nityam*) when *vrata* 'vow' is denoted. Thus, we get *sam-ś*(*ā* →*i*) + *Kta* = *saṃśita* of *saṃśitavrataḥ* = *yatnena samyak pratipāditaṃ vrataṃ yasya yena vā* 'he (whose) or (by whom a) vow was diligently pursued'. This *vārttika* proposal, however, is not needed. This example can be covered by interpreting *anyatarasyām* 'optionally' of this rule as *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā* 'fixed option'. That is, the option is made obligatorily in some cases and is not made in others, at all. The *Mahābhāṣya* states that derivates of *ŚatṚ* and *ŚānaC*, and *gavākṣa* and *saṃśitavrata* as well, are not optional to each others. They are obligatory in view of their specific context of usage. Thus, the *Mahābhāṣya*:

devatrāto galo grāha itiyoge ca sadvidhiḥ /
mithas te na vibhāṣyante gavākṣaḥ saṃśitavrataḥ //

7.4.42 **दधातेर्हिः**

dadhāter hiḥ

/dadhāteḥ 6/1 *hiḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ti kiti* #40)
dadhāter aṅgasya 'hi' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati takārādau kiti pratyaye parataḥ
hi comes in place of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *ḌUdhāÑ* 'to bear, support' when a *t*-initial affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

hitaḥ
hitavān
hitvā

7.4.43 जहातेश्च क्त्वि

jahāteś ca ktvi
/jahāteḥ 6/1 *ca* ϕ *ktvi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *hiḥ* #42)
jahāter aṅgasya 'hi' tiy ayam ādeśo bhavati ktvā pratyaye parataḥ
hi comes also in place of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *OhāK* 'to abandon' when affix *Ktvā* follows.

EXAMPLES:

hitvā rājyaṃ vanaṃ gataḥ
'abandoning the kingdom he went to the forest'
hitvā gacchati 'abandoning he goes'

1. Note that since this rule makes its specification by *jahāteḥ* it cannot include any reference to *jihīteḥ*. That is, this replacement will not be applicable to a derivate of *OhāṄ* 'to go, move'. Thus, we will only get *hātvā*. A derivate such as *hitvā* can only refer to verbal root *OhāK* 'to abandon'.

7.4.44 विभाषा छन्दसि

vibhāṣā chandasi
/vibhāṣā 1/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
hi, in the Vedic, comes optionally in place of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *OhāK* 'to abandon' when affix *Ktvā* follows.

EXAMPLES:

hitvā śarīraṃ yātavyam
hātvā

1. The provision of earlier rule is here made optional in case of Vedic usage. Thus, (*hitvā / hātvā*) *śarīraṃ yātavyam* 'one should go having abandoned the body (by means of yoga)'.

7.4.45 सुधितवसुधितनेमधितधिष्वधिषीय च

sudhitavasudhitanemadhitadhiṣvadhiṣīya ca
/ sudhita-vasudhita-nemadhita-dhiṣva-dhiṣīya 1/3 (deleted)/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *chandasi* #44)
'*sudhita, vasudhita, nemadhita, dhiṣva, dhiṣīya*' *ity etāni chandasi viṣaye nipātyante*
Forms such as *sudhita, vasudhita, nemadhita, dhiṣva* and *dhiṣīya* are derived, in the Vedic, via *nipātana.*

EXAMPLES:

sudhitam 'well placed'
vasudhitam 'possessing wealth'
nemadhitam 'half-supported'
dhiṣva 'bear!'
dhiṣīya 'may I place!'

1. Note that *nipātana* accounts for augment *iṬ* before *Kta* when *dhā* 'to place' is used in combination after *su, vasu* and *nema.* That is, *i* of *iṬ* replaces the *ā* of *dhā.* If we try to derive *sudhita,* etc., by introducing *iṬ,* then, given *sudhā + iṬ + Kta,* 6.4.64 *āto lopa iṭi ca* will delete the final *ā* of *dhā.* The compound bases of *sudhitam* 'well placed', *vasudhitam* 'wealthy' and *nemadhitam* 'half supported' are formed by 2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ,* 2.1.56 *viśeṣaṇaṃ viśeṣyea bahulam* and 2.1.26 *sāmi,* respectively. The *itva* 'replacement in *i*' of *dhā* in *dhiṣva* 'second singular imperative (*LOṬ*) of *dhā*' is accomplished, via *nipātana,* before *thās* (3.4.77 *tiptasjhi . . .*) with augment *iṬ* introduced to the affix. This, and blocking of reduplication (6.1.10 *ślau*) as well, is accomplished via *nipātana.* A replacement in *se* for *thās* (3.4.80 *thāsaḥ se*), and in *va* for *se* (3.4.91 *savābhyāṃ vāmau*), does not come within the scope of this *nipātana* provision of *dhiṣva.* Now consider *dhiṣīya,* first person singular benedictive (*āśīrliṅ*) middle derivate of *dhā,* where *ī*-replacement of *dhā* and introduction of augment *iṬ* to the affix are both accomplished via *nipātana.*

Recall that these derivates can follow two routes: (*i*) introduction of *i* as a replacement for *ā* of *dhā;* or (*ii*) introduction of augment *iṬ* to the affix, in which case, deletion of *ā* of *dhā* is accomplished. Incidentally, *dhiṣīya* is a benedictive middle first person singular. We would have *dhāsīya* in the classical language, against this *nipātana* provision of the Vedic.

7.4.46 दो दद् घोः

do dad ghoḥ
/ daḥ 6/1 *dad* 1/1 *ghoḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ti kiti* #40)

'dā' ity etasya ghusaṃjñakasya 'dad' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati takārādau kiti pratyaye parataḥ
A replacement in *dad* comes in place of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *dā* termed *ghu*, when a *t*-initial affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

dattaḥ 'a derivate of *dā* + *Kta*'
dattavān 'a derivate of *dā* + *Kta*'
dattiḥ 'a derivate of *dā* + *KtiN*'

1. This rule offers *dad* as a replacement of an *aṅga* constituted by *dā*, termed *ghu* (1.1.20 *dādhāghv adāp*), when a *t*-initial affix marked with *k* as an *it* follows. Thus, we get (*dā*→*dad*) + *Kta* = *da*(*d*→*t*) + *ta* = *datta*, via *d*→*t* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*).

2. A specification with *daḥ* is made so that we do not get this replacement in *dhātaḥ* and *dhātavān* where the root is *dheṬ* 'to drink, suck'. A condition with *ghoḥ* is specified so that derivates of *dāP* 'to cut' and *daiP* 'to cleanse', i.e., *dāta* of *dātaṃ barhiḥ* 'the Kuśa grass is cut' and *avadāta* of *avadātaṃ mukham* 'beautiful face', could not avail this replacement in *dad*.

3. What is the exact form of this replacement? For, given the use of *dad* before *gh* of *ghoḥ*, especially in view of possible *sandhi* changes, one may think of its form as (*i*) *dat*, ending in *t* (*tānta*); (*ii*) *dadh*, ending in *dh* (*dhānta*; and (*iii*) *dath*, ending in *th* (*thānta*). The *Mahābhāṣya* suggests that accepting the replacement as ending in *th* (*thānta*; *dath*) is free of problems. Accepting it as ending in *t* (*tānta*; *dat*) will create problems due to application of 6.3.124 *dasti ca*. This rule will demand that the final vowel of *su* of *sudattam* be replaced with its long counterpart when *dat* is to be the replacement. We will end up with a wrong form **sūdattam*. If the replacement is accepted as *dānta* (*dad*), we will get a wrong form **dannam*, against the correct form *dattam*. For, 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto naḥ* would require the *t* of the *niṣṭhā* (1.1.28 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) suffix to be replaced with *n*. If we accept the replacement as ending in *dh* (*dhānta*; *dadh*) then, given (*dā*→*dadh*) + *ta*)), rule 8.2.40 *jhaṣas tathordhoḥ* would require *t* to be replaced with *dh*. Thus, the *Mahābhāṣya* accepts the form of replacement as *dath* (*thānta*):

tānte doṣo dīrghatvaṃ syād dānte doṣo niṣṭhānatvam/
dhānte doṣo dhatvaprāptis thānte' doṣas tasthātmāntam //

In this view, *datta* can be derived from (*dā*→*dath*) + *ta* → *da*(*th*→*t*) + *ta* = *datta*, via *cartva* (8.4.55 *khari ca*). Note, however, that commentators also find *dat* (*tānta*) as a problem-free replacement. But it will make the derivational process prolix, especially because of reliance on the *sannipāta-paribhāṣā* (*PŚ* 86). I omit these details for fear of expatiation.

I, however, must mention that *avadatta*, *vidatta*, *pradatta*, *sudatta*, *anudatta* and *nidatta* are desired (*iṣṭa*) forms, especially when *Kta* is introduced with

the signification of *ādikarman* 'onset of action'. It is required that *dā* should not be replaced with *dad*. Rule 7.4.47 *aca upasargāt taḥ* should then replace *ā* of *dā* with *t*.

avadattaṃ vidattaṃ ca pradattaṃ cādikarmaṇi/
sudattam anudattaṃ ca nidattam iti ceṣyate//

7.4.47 **अच उपसर्गात्तः**

aca upasargāt taḥ
/acaḥ 5/1 *upasargāt* 5/1 *taḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *ti kiti* #40 *daḥ ghoḥ* #46)
ajantād upasargād uttarasya 'dā' ity etasya ghusaṃjñakasya 'ta' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati takārādau kiti
tA comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by *dā* termed *ghu*, when used in construction after a vowel-final preverb, provided a *t*-inital affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

prattam 'a derivate of *pra-dā* + *Kta*'
avattam 'a derivate of *ava* + *dā* + *Kta*'
nīttam 'a derivate of *ni-dā* + *Kta*'
parīttam 'a derivate of *pari-dā* + *Kta*'

1. This rule allows a replacement in *t* for the *ā* of *dā* termed *ghu* (1.1.20 *dādhā ghv adāp*). This is an exception to replacement in *dad*. Thus, *pra* + *d*(*ā*→*t*) + (*K*)*ta* = *pratta, avattam, nīttam* and *parīttam*. A long-replacement for the short *i* of *pari* is obtained from application of 6.3.124 *dasti*.

Note that, given (*pra-d*(*ā*→*t*) + *Kta*)) + (*sU*→*am*))) = *prad* + *t* + *ta* + *am*, rule 8.4.54 *khari ca* will apply to yield *pra*(*d*→*t*) + *t* + *ta* + *am* = *prat* + *t* + *ta* + *am*. Rule 8.4.46 *anaci ca* will then apply to yield *prat* + (*t*→*tt*) + *ta* + *am* = *prat* + *tt* + *ta* + *am*. We now have four *t* sound segments. The two medial *t*-segments will then have to be deleted by 8.4.64 *jharo jhari savarṇe* to yield *prat* (*t*+*t*→ϕ) + *ta* + *am* = *pratta*. An application of 6.1.107 *ami pūrvaḥ* will then produce *pratt*(*a*+*a*→*a*) *m* = *prattam*.

2. A specification by *upasargāt* 'after a preverb' in the ablative (*pañcamī*) requires that, in accord with 1.1.54 *ādeḥ parasya*, *t* should replace *d* of *dā*. For this, commentators require that *acaḥ* should be read twice in this rule, via repetition (*āvṛtti*). One *acaḥ* will be interpreted as an adjective to *upasargāt* to yield the meaning: *ajantād upasargāt* 'after a preverb ending in a vowel'. The second *acaḥ* will then be interpreted as the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*) with the meaning 'in place of'. This is what would specify the item to be replaced (*sthānī*). This is how we can get *t* as a replacement for *ā* of *dā*. One can otherwise also interpret this replacement as consisting of two *t*-segments. This way, because of consisting of more than one sound segment (*anekāl*), it

can replace *dā*, in toto. This process is economical because it would not require using *acaḥ* twice.

The *acaḥ* which carries from here on to the next rule is interpreted as ending in the ablative. This way, '*t* replaces *p* which occurs immediately after *aC*' (1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*).

3. A proposal is also made to replace *o* (*aC*) of *do* (*dyati*) with *t*. A replacement in *i* is to be blocked in favor of *t* on the basis of being subsequent (*paratva*). Thus, we will get *avattam* and *prattam*. See the *Mahābhāṣya* for further details.

7.4.48 अपो भि

apo bhi
/*apaḥ* 6/1 *bhi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *taḥ* #47)
'*ap*' *ity etasyāṅgasya bhakārādau pratyaye parataḥ* '*ta*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
tA comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga*, namely *ap*, when a *bh*-initial affix follows.

EXAMPLES:

adbhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *ap* 'water' '
adbhyaḥ 'dative-ablative plural of *ap*'

1. Note that *t* will replace the final sound segment of *ap* 'water'. The *a* of *tA* is used for ease of articulation (*mukhasukhārtham*). Thus, we get *ap* + *bhis*→ *at* + *bhis* = *adbhiḥ*, where *t* is replaced with *d* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhasi*) and *s* goes through *s*→*r*→*ḥ* (*rutva-visarga*; 8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ*; 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor . . .*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *bhi* 'when a *bh*-initial suffix follows'? Consider *ap* + *su* = *apsu*, where *p* cannot be replaced with *t* because *su* 'locative plural ending' begins with *s*.

3. A proposal informs us that this replacement in *t* is desired in *svavas*, *svatavas*, *māsa* and *uṣas* when the usage is Vedic. Thus, we should get *svavadbhiḥ*, *stavadbhiḥ*, *mādbhiḥ* and *samuṣadbhiḥ*.

7.4.49 सः स्यार्धधातुके

saḥ sy ārdhadhātuke
/*saḥ* 6/1 *si* 7/1 *ārdhadhātuke* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *taḥ* #47)
sakārāntasyāṅgasya sakārādāv ārdhadhātuke paratas takārādeśo bhavati
tA comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* which ends in *s*, when a *s*-initial affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*), follows.

EXAMPLES:

vatsyati 'third person singular *LṚṬ* derivate of *vas*'
avatsyat 'third person singular *LṚṄ* derivate of *vas*'
vivatsati 'a derivate of (*vas* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*'
jighatsati 'a derivate of (*ad*→*ghas* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*'

1. This rule replaces an *aṅga*-final *s* with *t* when a *s*-initial affix termed *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*) follows. Thus, we get *vas* + *sya* + *ti* → *vat* + *sya* + *ti* = *vatsyati* and *avas* + *sya* + (*LṚṬ*→*t*) → *avat* + *sya* + *t* = *avatsyat*, the two derivates of *LṚṬ*→*tiP* and *LṚṄ*→*tiP*, respectively. An example with affix *saN* is offered in *vivatsati*. Refer to the appendix (III:697) of 2.4.37 *lṛṅsanor ghasl* for derivational details of *jighatsati*.

2. Why is the *aṅga*-final *s* alone replaced with *t*? Consider *vac* + *sya* + (*LṚṬ*→*ti*) = *vakṣyati*, where *vac* is the *aṅga*, and replacing *c* with *t* would produce wrong results.

Why do we have the condition of an affix beginning with *s*? Consider *ghas* + *GHaÑ*, where we get *vṛddhi* of the penultimate (*upadhā*). The *s* of the *aṅga* cannot be replaced with *t* since there is no suffix beginning with *s* to follow.

Why do we have the condition of *ārdhadhātuke*? Consider *ās* + (*LAṬ*→*thās*→*se*) = *āsse*))) and *vas* + (*LAṬ*→*thās*→*se*) = *vasse*))), where a replacement in *t* is not possible because what follows is a *sārvadhātuka* suffix.

7.4.50 **तासस्त्योर्लोपः**

tāsastyor lopaḥ
/*tāsastyoḥ* 6/2 = *tasaś ca astiś ca* = *tāsastī* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *lopaḥ* 1/1/ (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *saḥ si* #49)
tāser asteś ca sakārasya sakārādau pratyaye parataḥ lopo bhavati
A deletion by *LOPA* comes in place of *s* of *tās* and *as* 'to be' when an affix beginning with *s* follows.

EXAMPLES:

karttāsi 'a derivate of *kṛ* + (*LUṬ*→*siP*)'
karttāse 'a derivate of *kṛ* + (*LUṬ*→*thās*)'
tvam asi 'you are'
vyatise

1. This rule allows deletion of the *aṅga*-final *s* of *tās* (3.1.33 *syatāsī lṛluṭoḥ*) and *as* when an affix beginning with *s* follows. Thus, we get *kṛ* + (*LUṬ*→ *siP*) → *kṛ* + *tās* + *siP* = (*kṛ*→*kar*) + *tās* + *siP* = *karttāsi*, where *s* of *tās* will be deleted before *s* of the second personal active verbal ending *siP*. Note that augment *iṬ* is here negated by 7.2.10 *ekāc upadeśe* . . ., and reduplication of *t* is accomplished by 8.4.54 *aco rahābhyāṃ dve*. We similarly get *kar* + *tās* + (*thās*→*se*)) = *kartā*(*s*→ϕ) + *se* = *karttāse*, where the second person singular middle ending

thās (3.4.78 *ṭiptasjhi . . .*) is replaced with *se* (3.4.80 *thāsaḥ se*). Now consider *asi* derived from (*as* + (*LAṬ→siP*))→(*as* + (*ŚaP→ϕ*)) + *si*))) → (*a*(*s→ϕ*)) + *si*))) = *asi*, where *a* of the root alone is retained. We can get a complete deletion of *as* in *vi-ati-as* + (*LAṬ→thās*) → *vya-as* + (*ŚaP→ϕ*) + (*thās→se*))) = *vyati-a*(*s→ϕ*) + *se→ vyti-*(*a→ϕ*) + *se* = *vyatise*. The *a* of *as* is deleted by 6.4.111 *śnasor al lopaḥ*. Note that the second person singular middle (*ātmanepada*) ending is here introduced under the condition of *karmavyatihāra* 'reciprocal action' (1.3.14 *kartari karmavyatihāre*). The *s* of *vyatise* is not replaced with its retroflex counterpart by 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ. . . .* For, the root has gone through total deletion and what is left is merely the affix.

7.4.51 रि च

ri ca
/*ri* 7/1 *ca ϕ*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *saḥ* #49 *tāsastyor lopaḥ* #50)
rephādau ca pratyaye parataḥ tāsastyoḥ sakārasya lopo bhavati
A deletion by *LOPA* comes in place of the final *s* of *tās* and *as* 'to be' when a *r*-initial affix follows.

EXAMPLES:

kartārau
kartāraḥ
adhyetārau
adhyetāraḥ
vyatire

1. Refer to derivational details under 2.4.85 *luṭaḥ prathamasya. . . .* We get *kartārau* and *kartāraḥ* from (*kṛ→ kar*) + *tās* + (*LUṬ→ rau*))) and (*kṛ→ kar*) + *tās* + (*LUṬ→ ras*))), respectively. Note that *adhyetārau* and *adhyetāraḥ* involve a replacement in *rau* and *ras* for the *ātmanepada* suffixes *ātām* and *jha*. Examples of *as* before *r*-initial suffixes are not possible to find (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *aste rephādipratyayo na sambhavatīti nāsty udāharam*). *Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā* offers a Vedic example, namely *vyati* + *as* + (*LIṬ→ire→re*) = *vyati* + *as* + *re→* (*vyati* + (*a→ϕ*) (*s→ϕ*))) = *vyatire*. Recall here that *eŚ* and *ireC* are replacements of the *ātmanepada* affixes *ta* and *jha* which replace *LIṬ* (3.4.81 *liṭas tajhayor . . .*).

7.4.52 ह एति

ha eti
/*haḥ* 1/1 *eti* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *saḥ* #49 *tāsastyor lopaḥ* #50)
tāsastyoḥ sakārasya hakārādeśo bhavati eti parataḥ
A replacement in *h* comes in place of the final *s* of *tās*, and *as* as well, when *e* follows.

EXAMPLES:

kartāhe 'a derivate of *kṛ* + *tās* + (*LUṬ→iṬ*)'
vyatihe 'a derivate of *vy-ati-as* + (*LUṬ→iṬ*)'

1. This rule allows *h* as a replacement for *s* of *tās* and *as* when *e* follows. Consider *kṛ* + *tās* + *iṬ*, where *iṬ* is the first person singular middle (*ātmanepada*) ending replaced with *e* (*etva*; 3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānām . . .*). We thus get *kartāhe* from *k*(*ṛ→ar*) + *tās* + *e*, where *s* of *tās* gets replaced with *h*. Now consider *vyatihe*, an example of *as* derived from *vi-ati-as* + (*iṬ→e*). This string not only goes through replacement in *e* (*etva*), and replacement in *h* for *s* of *as*, it also goes through deletion of *a* of *as* (6.4.111 *śnasor al lopaḥ*).

7.4.53 **यीवर्णयोर्दीधीवेव्योः**

yīvarṇayor dīdhīvevyoḥ
/yīvarṇayoḥ 6/2 = *yi ca ivarṇaś ca* = *yīvarṇau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *dīdhīvevyoḥ* = *dīdhīś ca vevīś ca* = *dīdhīvevyau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *lopaḥ* #50)
yakārādāv ivarṇādau ca parato dīdhīvevyor lopo bhavati
A deletion by *LOPA* comes in place of the final sound segment of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *dīdhīṄ* 'to shine' and *vevīṄ* 'to move, go' when an affix beginning with *y*, or simply an *i*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

ādīdhya 'a derivate of *dīdhī* + (*Ktvā→LyaP*)'
āvevya 'a derivate of *vevī* + (*Ktvā→LyaP*)'
ādīdhyate 'a derivate of *āṄ* + *dīdhī* + *yaK* + *te*'
āvevyate 'a derivate of *āṄ* + *dīdhī* + *yaK* + *te*'
ādīdhitā 'a derivate of *āṄ* + *dīdhī* + *iṬ* + *tṛC*'
āvevitā 'a derivate of *āṄ* + *vevī* + *iṬ* + *tṛC*'
ādīdhīta 'a derivate of *āṄ* + *dīdhī* + *sīyUṬ* + *ta*'
āvevīta 'a derivate of *āṄ* + *vevī* + *sīyUṬ* + *ta*'

1. Note that the *ī* of *yī* (in *yīvarṇayoḥ*) is used for ease of articulation. Thus, we interpret *y* as *yakārādi* 'that which begins with *y*'. This deletion applies to final sound segment *ī* of *ddhīṄ* and *vevīṄ* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*). Consider *ā-dīdhī* + (*Ktvā→LyaP*) = *ā-dīdhī* + *ya*, and similarly *ā-vevī* + *ya*, where the root-final *ī* is deleted to yield *ādīdhya* and *āvevya*.

Our next two examples derive from *ā-dīdhī* + *yaK* + (*LAṬ→te*) and *ā-vevī* + *yaK* + *te*, where *yaK* (3.1.67 *sārvadhātuke yak*) is introduced with the signification of *karman* 'object'. We get *ādīdhyate* and *āvevyate*, through deletion of *ī*. Our next two examples, i.e., *ādīdhitā* and *āvevitā*, are derivates of *tṛC*. Thus, (*ā-dīdh*(*ī→ϕ*) + *iṬ* + *tṛC*)) + *sU* = *ādīdhitā*, with deletion of *ī*. Similar rules apply in deriving *āvevitā*. Now consider *ādīdhīta* and *āvevīta*, both derivates

of *LIṄ*, derived from: *ā-dīdhī* + *ŚaP* + (*LIṄ→ta*)) → *ādīdhī* + (*ŚaP→ϕ*) + *sīyUṬ* + *sUṬ* + *ta* and *ā-vevī* + (*ŚaP→ϕ*) + *sīyUṬ* + *sUṬ* + *ta*, respectively. Deletion of *ŚaP* (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ*) and those of two *s*-sounds (7.2.79 *liṅaḥ salopo . . .*) and *ī*, produces: *ādīdh* + *īy* + *ta* and *āvev* + *īy* + *ta*. We get *ādīdhīta* and *āvevīta* subsequent to deletion of *y* by 6.1.64 *lopo vyor vali*.

2. Why is this replacement contstrained by conditions of *yīvarṇayoḥ* 'when followed by *y*-initial and *i*? Consider *ādīdhyanam* and *āvevyanam* which are both derivates of (*LyUṬ→ana*). It is because of condition of *y*-initial, and *i*, that we do not get deletion of *ī*. Instead, we get it replaced with *y*.

7.4.54 सनि मीमाघुरभलभशकपदपदामच इस्

sani mīmāghurabhalabhaśakapadapadām aca is
/sani 7/1 *mī-mā-ghu-rabha-labha-śaka-pata-padām* 6/3 *acaḥ* 6/1 *is* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *si* #46)
sani pratyaye sakārādau parato 'mī, mā, ghu, rabha, labha, śaka, pata, pada' ity eteṣām aṅgānām acaḥ sthāne is ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *is* comes in place of the *aC* of an *aṅga* constituted by *mī, mā*, a verbal root termed *ghu* (1.1.20 *dādhāgh adāp*), and *rabhA* 'to seize, grasp', *ḌUlabhaṢ* 'to obtain, gain', *śakḶ* 'to be able to', *patḶ* 'to fall', and *padA* 'to go' as well, when affix *saN*, beginning with *s*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

mitsati 'a derivate of *mā* + *saN*→ *mitsa* +(*LAṬ→te*)'
pramitsati 'a derivate of *pra-mā* + *saN* → *pramits* + (*LAṬ→te*)'
mitsate 'a derivate of *mī* + *saN*→ *mitsa* + (*LAṬ→te*)'
apamitsate 'a derivate of *apa-mī* + *saN* → *apamitsa* + *LAṬ→te*)'
ditsati 'a derivate of (*dā* + *saN*) + *LAṬ→tiP*)'
dhitsati 'a derivate of (*dhā* + *saN*) + *LAṬ→tiP*)'
āripsate 'a derivate of (*ā-rabh* + *saN*) + *LAṬ→te*)'
ālipsate 'a derivate of (*ā-labh* + *saN*) + *LAṬ→te*)'
śikṣati 'a derivate of (*ā-śak* + *saN*) + *LAṬ→te*)'
pitsati 'a derivate of (*pat* + *saN*) + *LAṬ→te*)'
prapitsate 'a derivate of (*pra-pat* + *san*) + *LAṬ→te*)'

1. Why specify *saN* beginning with *s* when *saN* begins with *s*? It is stated so that this rule does not apply where augment *iṬ* is introduced to *saN*. For, affix *saN* will then be beginning with *iṬ*. Verbal root *mī* refers here to both *mīÑ* 'to harm' and *ḌUmiÑ* 'to hurl'. Verbal root *mā*, similarly, refers to three roots: *mā, māṄ* 'to measure' and *meṄ* 'barter, exchange'. This rule introduces *is* as a replacement for the *aC* 'vowel' of a specified *aṅga* before affix *saN*, beginning with *s*. Thus, consider *mitsati* which derives from (*mī* + *saN*) + (*LAṬ→tiP*)). We get *m*(*ī→is*) + *sa*(*N*) = *mis* + *sa*, where 7.4.49 *sya sārvadhātuke* applies to yield: *mi*(*s→t*) + *sa* = *mit* + *sa*. Reduplication and operations relative

to it will subsequently produce *mi*(*t*→ϕ) + *mit* + *sa* = *mimit* + *sa*. We get *mitsati* through deletion of *abhyāsa* (7.4.58 *atra lopo' bhyāsasya*), namely *mi*. This gives us *mitsa* which, after the introduction of *LAṬ* and other relevant operations, produces *mitsati*. Similar operational steps are to be followed in deriving *mitsate / apamitsate*; and *ditsati / dhitsati*. Recall in this connection that *meṄ* goes through a replacement in *ā* (*ātva*; 6.1.44 *ādeca upadśe . . .*). We get *ā-rabh* + *sa* → *ā-r*(*a*→*is*) *bh* + *sa* = *ā-ris* + *bh* + *sa*, through replacement in *is*. The *bh* then goes through a replacement in *p* (*cartva*; 8.4.54 *khari ca*). The *s* of *is* is then deleted by 8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyoḥ* to produce *āripsate*. We similarly get *ālipsate* from (*ā-labh* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*. Other derivates follow similar patterns. Deletion of the *bhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*), as usual, applies in all these examples.

2. Note that this replacement in *is* applies only when a *saN* is used beginning with *s*. Thus, we do not get it in *pipitiṣati* '. . . wishes to fall', a *saN*-derivate of *pat*, where augment *iṬ* is introduced to *saN*. That is, *saN* begins with *i*. Recall here that augment *iṬ*, in connection with *pat*, is made optional by a *vārttika* proposal (*vt. tanipatidaridrāṇāṃ upasaṃkhyānam*).

Yet another *vārttika* proposal is made to introduce *is* as a replacement when *rādh* is used with the signification of *hiṃsā* 'harm' and *saN* follows. Thus, we get *pratiratsati*. A derivate of *rādh*, when not used with the signification of *hiṃsā*, will be *ārirātsati*. The sense of *rādh* in this counter-example is *gati* 'movement, etc.'

7.4.55 आप्ज्ञप्यृधामीत्

āpjñapyṛdhām īt
/āp-jñapy-ṛdhām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *īt* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *saḥ* #49 *acaḥ sani* #54)
'*āp, jñapi, ṛdha*' *ity eteṣām aṅgānām aca īkārādeśo bhavati sani sakārādau parataḥ*
A long *ī* comes in place of *aC* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *āp* 'to pervade', *jñapi* '(causative) to know' and *ṛdhA* 'to thrive, prosper' when a *saN* affix beginning with *s* follows.

EXAMPLES:

īpsati 'a derivate of (*āp* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*→*tiP*'
jñīpsati 'a derivate of (*jñapi* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*→*tiP*'
īrtsati 'a derivate of (*ṛdhA* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*→*tiP*'

1. This rule allows *ī* to replace the vowel of an *aṅga*, namely *āp* 'to pervade', *jñapi* 'to inform, report' and *ṛdhA* 'to grow' when a *saN* affix beginning with *s* follows. We will get *āp* + *saN* → (*ā*→*ī*) *p* + *sa* = *īpsa*, through this replacement in *ī*. Deriving *īpsati*, from *īpsa* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*), is easy. Note, however, that deriving *īpsa* involves *dvitva* 'reduplication' and deletion of *abhyāsa*, as explained

in earlier rules. This deletion, and deletion of *ṆiC* as well, applies also to *jñapi + sa*. This deletion of *ṆiC* is accomplished by 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*, prior to replacement of *a* with *ī*. Thus, *ñap(i→ϕ) + sa → ñ(a→ī)p + sa = ñīpsa*. Introduction of *LAṬ→tiP* and reduplication and deletion of *abhyāsa* then follows to yield *ñīpsati*. We similarly get *ītsati* which is a non-causal desiderative of *ṛdhA*. Given *ṛdh + sa(N) = (ṛ→īr) + dh + sa = īrdh*, where replacement in *ī* for *ṛ* is made with a following *r* (*rapara*; 1.1.51 *ur a raparaḥ*), *dh* goes through a replacement in *t* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*). We get *īrtsati* through introduction of (*LAṬ→tiP*), *dvitva* 'reduplication' and deletion of *abhyāsa*.

2. It is explained that *jñapi* has two vowels. The *i* of *ṆiC* is deleted on the basis of *pūrva-vipratiṣedha*, conflict of equal strength where a prior rule wins its application. The other vowel is, of course, replaced with *ī* (*Kāś*: *jñaper dvāv acau; tatra ṇeḥ pūrvavipratiṣedhena lopaḥ; itarasya tv ītvam*).

3. That this replacement applies only when a *saN* follows is made clear by the counter-example *prāpsyati* where no *saN* follows. Counter-examples for condition of a *saN* beginning with *s* are offered by *jiñapayiṣati* and *ardidhiṣati*, where both *jñapi* and *ṛdhA* are used with an optional *iṬ* (7.2.49 *sanīvantardha . . .*).

7.4.56 दम्भ इच्च

dambha ic ca
/dambhaḥ 6/1 *it* 1/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *saḥ* #49 *acaḥ sani* #54 *īt* #56)
dambher aca ikārādeśo bhavati cakārād īc ca sani sakārādau parataḥ
A short *i*, and a long as well, occurs in place of the *aC* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *dambhI*, when a *saN* affix beginning with *s* follows.

EXAMPLES:

dhīpsati 'a derivate of *dambh + saN*'
dhipsati

1. Note that this rule applies where optional introduction of augment *iṬ* (7.2.49 *sanīvantardha . . .*) is not availed by *dambh + saN*. The *m*, since *saN* can be interpreted as marked with *k* (*kit*; 1.2.10 *halantāc ca*), is then deleted by 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hal. . . .* Reduplication and deletion of *abhyāsa* (7.4.58 *atra lopo . . .*) will then yield (*di→ϕ*) *+ dibh + sa = dibh + sa*. The *d* of *dibh* will then be replaced with *dh* (8.2.37 *ekāco baśo . . .*). The final *bh* will also be replaced with *p* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*). This will give us *dhipsati*, where *LAṬ* is replaced with *tiP*. A long replacement in *ī* will offer us *dhīpsati*.

Here again, we do not find these replacements in *i* or *ī* when a *saN* affix beginning with *s* does not follow. Thus consider *didimbhiṣati* where *saN* is introduced with augment *iṬ*. Refer to examples under 7.2.49 *sanīvantardha . . .* for additional derivational details.

7.4.57 मुचोऽकर्मकस्य गुणो वा

muco' karmakasya guṇo vā
/ mucaḥ 6/1 *akarmakasya* 6/1 *guṇaḥ* 1/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *saḥ* #49 *sani* #54)
muco' karmakasya guṇo vā bhavati sani sakārādau parataḥ
A *guṇa* vowel comes in place of the *iK* vowel of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *mucLṚ* 'to release' when a *saN* affix beginning with *s* follows.

EXAMPLES:

mokṣate vatsaḥ svayam eva 'the calf gets freed from his fetters by himself'

mumukṣate vatsaḥ svayam eva 'the calf wishes to be free from his fetters by himself'

1. Note that this optional *guṇa* applies to verbal root *muc* 'to be free, released', used intransitively. An object becomes an *agent* when it becomes conducive toward accomplishing the action (*karmakarttā*). The calf of our example sentences is a *karmakartṛ* 'object turned agent'. Verbal root *muc* is, under the circumstances, intransitive (*akarmaka*).

2. Note that 1.2.10 *halantāc ca* extends the status of *kit* 'marked with *K* as an *it*' to *saN* since it begins with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* (*Śs* 8-14). This, in turn, blocks *guṇa* made available by 7.3.86 *puganta-laghūpadhasya ca*. Our present rule makes that negation of *guṇa* optional. Thus, (*muc* + *sa*) → (*m*(*u*→*o*) *c*)) + *sa*))) → (*mo*(*c*→*k*)) + *sa*)) → *mok* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *a* = *mokṣa*, through *c*→*k* (*kutva*; 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*) and *s*→*ṣ* (*ṣatva*; 8.3.57 *iṃ koḥ*). Note here that reduplication (*dvitva*) will produce *mu* + *muc* + *sa* where *mu*, the *abhyāsa*, will be deleted (7.4.58 *atra lopo' bhyāsasya*). Thus, *mokṣa* + (*LAṬ*→*te*) → *mokṣate*. We will get *mumukṣate* when the option of *guṇa* is not accepted. The *abhyāsa* in that case will not be deleted.

2. Note that *muc* must here be interpreted as an intransitive (*akarmaka*). For, we will get *mumukṣati vatsaṃ devadattaḥ* 'Devadatta wishes the calf to be free'.

–7.4.58 अत्र लोपोऽभ्यासस्य

atra lopo' bhyāsasya
/ atra ϕ *lopaḥ* 1/1 *abhyāsasya* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1)
yad etat prakrāntam 'sani, mīmā' ityādi 'muco' karmakasya' iti yāvat atrābhyāsalopo bhavati
A deletion by *LOPA*, in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga*, applies here in this context when *saN* follows.

EXAMPLES:

Look under preceding rules.

1. The *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*), here in the context (*atra*) of rules 7.4.54 *sani mīmādhura . . .* through 7.4.57 *muco' karmakasya*, gets deleted. Refer to preceding rules for examples.

2. Why state *atra* 'here' when the context of *saN* is already given? Why not just state *lopo' bhyāsasya*. Some state that *atra* is here used so that deletion of *abhyāsa* could be accomplished only in this context. Elsewhere, eventhough *sanvadbhāva* 'operation similarly to when *saN* follows' may suggest, this deletion cannot be allowed. The word *atra* is, thus, used for restricting the deletion of an *abhyāsa*.

Others claim that *atra* is used to indicate total deletion of *abhyāsa*. That is, deletion does not apply just to the final sound segment of the *abhyāsa*. It is for this reason that *traL* is interpreted here as introduced after a genitive, as against a locative, to derive *atra*. That is, *atra* is used in the sense of *asya* so that we can get the meaning: *asya abhyāsasya lopaḥ* 'deletion of this *abhyāsa*'. Yet others think that since the word *abhyāsa* is meaningful only when taken as a whole, its deletion should also be understood as total.

7.4.59 ह्रस्वः

hrasvaḥ
/hrasvaḥ 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58)
hrasvo bhavaty abhyāsasya
A short comes in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga*.

EXAMPLES:

ḍuḍhaukiṣate 'a derivate of (*ḍhauk* + *saN*) + (*LAṬ→te*)'
tutraukiṣate 'a derivate of (*trauk* + *saN*) + (*LAṬ→te*)'
ḍuḍhauke 'a derivate of *ḍhauk* + *LIṬ→ta→eŚ*'
tutrauke 'a derivate of *trau* + *LIṬ→ta→eŚ*'
aḍuḍhaukat 'a derivate of *ḍhauk* + (*LUṬ→tiP*)'
atutraukat 'a derivate of *trauk* + (*LUṬ→tiP*)'

1. This rule requires the final vowel of an *abhyāsa* to be replaced with its short counterpart. Thus, consider *ḍhauk* + *saN* and *trauk* + *saN* where 6.1.9 *sany aṅoḥ* applies for *dvitva* 'reduplication'. The *au* of *ḍhau* of *ḍhau* + *ḍhauk* + *sa* is then replaced with its short counterpart *o*. We thus get *ḍhu* + *ḍhauk* + *sa*. We similarly get *tu* + *trauk* + *sa*. An application of replacement in *ḍ* for *ḍh* (*jaśtva* 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhai*) of *ḍhu* + *ḍhauk* + *sa* produces (*ḍh→ḍ*) *u* + *ḍhauk* + *sa*. Introduction of augment *iṬ* and replacement in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*) of *s* of *saN* then produces *ḍuḍhaukiṣa*. We similarly get *tutraukiṣa*. We get *ḍuḍhaukiṣate* and *tutraukiṣate* with third person singular middle (*ātmanepada*; 1.3.62 *pūrvavat sanaḥ*) affix *ta*, as a replacement for *LAṬ*, introduced after *ḍuḍhaukiṣa* and *tutraukiṣa*. A derivate of *LIṬ*, with *ātmanepada* replacement in *ta*, will be

ḍuḍhauke and *tutrauke*, where, in addition to reduplication and shortening of *abhyāsa*, *ta* will be replaced with *eŚ* (3.4.81 *liṭas tajhayor . . .*).

We similarly get *aḍuḍhaukat* and *atutraukat*, third person singular active forms of *LUṄ*, where *CLI*, *CaṄ*, reduplication (*dvitva*) and shortening of *abhyāsa* apply.

2. A proposal is made in the *Mahābhāṣya* to restrict operations relative to an *abhyāsa* to contexts where a vowel does not follow (*abhyāsasyānaci*). Thus, consider *carācaraḥ*, *calācalaḥ*, *patāpataḥ* and *vadāvadaḥ* where, because a consonant follows, the *abhyāsa* does not get deleted. The *abhyāsa* of these examples receives augment *āK* (*vt. vā caricalipativadīnām acy abhyāsasya*).

7.4.60 **हलादिः शेषः**

halādiḥ śeṣaḥ
/*halādiḥ* 1/1 = *hal cāsau ādiś ca* (*karm. tat.*); *śeṣaḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58)
abhyāsasya halādiḥ śiṣyate anādir lupyate
That which is constituted by initial consonant of an *abhyāsa*, alone, is retained.

EXAMPLES:

jaglau 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *glai*'
mamlau 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *mlai*'
papāca 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *pac*'
papāṭha 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *paṭh*'
āṭa 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *aṭ*'
āṭatuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *aṭ*'
āṭuḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate of *aṭ*'

1. Note that *śeṣa* means 'residual, remainder'. The word *halādi* is generally interpreted as a *karmadhāraya*, paraphrased as *halaś cāsāv ādiś ca* 'that which is a consonant and is also initial'. A genitive *tatpuruṣa* interpretation, parallel to *halānāṃ ādiḥ* 'initial among consonants' may create problems. Consider *ānakṣatuḥ* and *ānakṣuḥ*, third personal dual and plural active *LIṬ*-derivates of *akṣ* 'to pervade'. Notice that the verb begins with a vowel. That is, reduplication of such roots applies with reference to their second syllable (6.1.2 *ajāder dvitīyasya*). But since there is no second vowel, the unit formed by the first goes through reduplication to produce: *ak* + *akṣa*. The *k* of *ak* cannot be accepted as forming initial (*abhyāsādi*) of the *abhyāsa*. That is, in the *karmadhāraya* interpretation. However, it can be accepted as *halādi* in view of genitive *tatpuruṣa* interpretation of the compound *halādi*. Retaining this *k* will then create derivational difficulties. It is to remove such difficulties that *halādi* is here interpreted as a *karmadhāraya*. The *k* of *ak*, in this view, cannot be accepted as initial of the *abhyāsa*.

karmadhārayapakṣe syād ādiśabdasya pūrvatā /
ṣaṣṭhīsamāse tv ānakṣetyādau śeṣaḥ prasajyate //

2. Note that this deletion of non-initial has retention of the initial as its purpose (*Kāś: ādiśeṣanimitto' yam anāder lopo vidhyate*). That is, the initial (or first) consonant of an *abhyāsa*, whether it is at the beginning, or somewhere else in the middle, of *abhyāsa* causes deletion of non-initial consonantal units. The focus of this rule is thus not on retention of the initial consonant but on deletion of what is other than initial. It thus becomes a restrictive provision. Others accept the deletion (*nivṛtti*) as principal. For, it is part of the predicate (*vidheya*). The rule is thus interpreted as: 'non-initial consonant of an *abhyāsa* is deleted'. This interpretation will not permit retention of initial consonant to become part of predication. Consequently, if there is any initial consonant of the *abhyāsa* it is retained. The non-initial consonantal units are deleted. The *k* and *ṣ* of *akṣ*, since they are not initial, are both deleted. The *Mahābhāṣya* also discusses yet another proposal, via split-interpretation (*yoga-vibhāga*) of this rule. I omit that discussion here.

3. Refer to derivational details of *papau* (notes, 7.1.34 *āta au alaḥ*). Deriving *jaglau* from (*gl*(*ai*→*ā*) + (*LIṬ*→*tiP*→*ṆaL*→*au*)) = *glā* + *a*, involves *ātva* 'replacement in *ā*', in addition to *au* as a replacement for *ṆaL*. Reduplication will produce *glā* + *glā* + *au* which, after the non-initial deletion of this rule, will produce *gā* + *glā* + *au*. We will get *gā* + *gl*(*ā*+*au*→*au*) = *gāglau* and *g*(*ā*→*a*) + *glau* = *gaglau*, through a single *vṛddhi* replacement (76.1.88 *vṛddhir eci*) and shortening (7.4.59 *hrasvaḥ*). Rule 7.4.62 *kuhoś cuḥ* will then replace *g* (of *ga*, the *abhyāsa*) with *j* (*cutva*) to produce *jaglau*. Similar rules apply in deriving *mamlau* from *mlai* + *LIṬ*. The third singular *LIṬ*-derivates of *pac* and *paṭh* follow similar rules. The *a* of *pac* and *paṭh*, i.e., of *pa* + *pac* + *a* and *pa* + *paṭh* + *a*, goes through penultimate *vṛddhi* (*upadhā-vṛddhi*; 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*). Deriving *āṭa* / *āṭatuḥ* / *āṭuḥ* from *aṭ* + *LIṬ*, where *LIṬ* is subsequently replaced with *ṆaL* / *atus* / *us* (*parasmaipadānām . . .*), also involves reduplication and retention of initial consonant. Given *a*(*ṭ*→ϕ) + *aṭ* + *a* → *a* + *aṭ* + *a*, we will get the short *a* of the *abhyāsa* replaced with its long counterpart (7.4.70 *ata ādeḥ*). An application of *savarṇa-dīrgha* 'homogeneous long vowel-replacement' (6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*) will then produce (*ā*+*a*→*ā*) *ṭ* + *a* = *āṭa*. We will similarly get *āṭatuḥ* and *āṭuḥ*.

7.4.61 शर्पूर्वाः खयः

śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ
/*śarpūrvāḥ* 1/3 = *śar pūrvo yeṣām* (*bv.*), *te*, *khayaḥ* 1/3/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *śeṣaḥ* #60)
abhyāsasya śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ śiṣyante anye halo lupyante
That consonant of the *abhyāsa* which is denoted by the abbreviatory term *khaY*, and which occurs preceded by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *śaR*, alone, is retained.

EXAMPLES:

cuścyotiṣati '*saN*-derivate in (*LAṬ→tiP*) of verbal root *ścyutIR* 'to drip' '
tiṣṭhāsati '*saN*-derivate in (*LAṬ→tiP*) of verbal root *sthā* 'to stand' '
pispandiṣate '*saN*-derivate in (*LAṬ→tiP*) of verbal root *spadI* 'to move a little' '

1. This rule allows retention of only that consonant of an *abhyāsa* which is denoted by the abbreviatory term *khaY* (*Śs*: 11-12) and which occurs preceded by a consonant denoted by the abbreviatory term *śaR*. All other consonants of the *abhyāsa* go through deletion. This rule is an exception to the preceding. Consider *ścyutIR* 'to drip' which, when used before *saN*, will yield *ścyut* + *ścyut* + *saN*, via reduplication (*dvitva*; 6.1.9 *sanyaṅoḥ*). The *cu* alone of the *abhyāsa*, i.e., *ścyut*, will be retained under the provision of this rule. Thus, (*cyut→cu*) + *ścyut* + *saN* = *cu* + *ścyut* + *sa*. An introduction of augment *iṬ* and replacement in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*) will produce *cuścyutiṣa*. This, with *LAṬ→tiP* and subsequent operations, will produce *cuścy*(*u→o*) *tiṣa* + *ŚaP* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *cuścyotiṣati*. Similar rules also apply in deriving *tiṣṭhāsati* from *sthā* + *saN* → *sthā* + *sthā* + *saN* → (*s→ϕ*) *thā* + *sthā* + *saN* → *th*(*ā→i*) + *sthā* + *saN* → (*th→t*) *i* + *sthā* + *saN* → *ti* + (*s→ṣ*) *thā* + *saN* → *ti* + *ṣ*(*th→ṭh*) *ā* + *saN* → *tiṣṭhāsa* which, with the introduction of *LAṬ* and related operations, produces *tiṣṭhāsati*. Notice how *sthā* is able to retain only *thā* with the application of 7.4.61 *śarpūrvā khayaḥ*. The *ā* of *sthā* then goes through a replacement in *i* (*itva*; 7.4.79 *sany ataḥ*). Rule 8.4.54 *abhyāse car ca* then replaces *th* of *thi* with *t*. The *s* of *sthā* is then replaced with *ṣ* (8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*). This, in turn, causes the following *th* to be replaced with *ṭh* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). Similar steps can be taken to derive third person singular present middle form *pispandiṣate* from *pispandisa* + (*LAṬ→te*). Note that *pispandisa* is derived from *spand* + *saN*, obviously with the introduction of augment *nUM* to *spadI*.

2. Why do we have the condition of a preceding consonant denoted by the abbreviatory term *śaR*? Consider *papāca* 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *pac*' where there is no preceding *śaR* involved. What is the significance of retaining only a sound denoted by *khaY*? Consider *sasnau*, derived from (*ṣnā* + (*LIṬ→tiP→ṆaL→au*)), where the initial consonant *s* alone is retained (7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*). Obviously, *snā* 'to bathe' does not have a sound denoted by *khaY*.

3. A *vārttika* suggests that the rule should state: *kharpūrvāḥ khayaḥ* '*khaY* preceded by *khaR*'. It is stated that, in deriving *ucchiṣa* of *ucicchiṣati* from *uch* + *iṬ* + *saN*, reduplication (*dvitva*) and augment *tUK* both become applicable. Augment *tUK* is introduced first since it happens to be internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*). We then get reduplication (*dvitva*) and replacement in a palatal (*cutva*; 8.4.40 *stoś ścunā ścuḥ*). The *cutva* of 8.4.40 applies since it is internally conditioned. But this *cutva* becomes suspended (*asiddha*; 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*) in view of application of reduplication (*dvitva*). Reduplica-

tion will then apply to *ut* + *chiṣ*. The initial *t* will then be retained and *ch* will be deleted because there is no sound denoted by *śaR* to precede. If one accepts the *vārttika*, *ch* will be replaced with *c*.

Commentators add that this *vārttika* becomes necessary when one does not accept the suspension proposal (*asiddhatva*) of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*, applying outside the context of reduplication. Otherwise, one can get initial *c* in the *abhyāsa* subsequent to *cutva* in *ucchiṣ*.

7.4.62 कुहोश्चुः

kuhoś cuḥ
/kuhoḥ 6/2 = *kuś ca ha ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *cuḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58)
abyāsasya kavargahakārayoś cavargādeśo bhavati
A consonant of the *k*-series (*kU*), and a *h*, when forming part of an *abhyāsa*, is replaced with a consonant of the *c*-series (*cU*).

EXAMPLES:

cakāra 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *ḌUkṛÑ* 'to do''
cakhāna 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *khan* 'to dig''
jagāma 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *gam*'
jaghāna 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *haṇ*'
jahāra 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *hṛ* 'to fetch, carry''
jihīrṣati 'third person singular active *saN*-derivate in *LAṬ* of verbal root *hṛ*'
jahau 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *OhāK* 'to abandon''

1. This rule allows *kU* 'a consonant of the *k*-series', and also *h*, of an *abhyāsa* to be replaced with *cU* 'a consonant of the *c*-series'. Notice that there are six sounds which are offered here to be replaced with five. Since the number of items in two sets are not equal, we cannot decide equivalency in view of the order of enumeration (*yathāsaṃkhya*). We must decide equivalency in view of close similarity between sounds (1.1.50 *sthāne' ntaratamaḥ*). There is no problem in deciding equivalency between consonants of the *k* and *c*-series. The problem is basically between *h*, and a consonant of the *c*-series. It is argued that *jh* comes closest to *h* as a replacement from among consonants of the *c*-series (palatal).

2. Consider *cakāra* '. . . made' and *cakhāna* '. . . dug', both third singular perfect derivates where, subsequent to reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*, we get *kṛ* + (*LIṬ*→*tiP*→*ṆaL*)) → *ca* + *kṛ* + *a* and *ca* + *khan* + *a*. We get *c* from *kh*, via *ch* (8.4.53 *abhyāse car ca*). An application of penultimate (*upadhā*) *vṛddhi* produces *cakāra* and *cakhāna*. We similarly get *jaghāsa* from *ad* + *LIṬ* for which refer to the appendix (III:698) of 2.4.40 *lity anyatarasyām*. The *gh* of *ghas*, which is a replacement for *ad* 'to eat', is here replaced with *j*

(*jaśtva*), again via *jh*, in deriving *jahāra* from *hṛ* + *LIṬ*. Refer to the appendix (III:750) of 3.2.115 *parokṣe liṭ* for derivational details of *jahāra*. Derivational details of *jihīrṣati* are similar to those of *cikīrṣati* (II:435), under the appendix of 1.2.9 *iko jhal*. Also refer to *jihīrṣakaḥ* (II:407) under the appendix of 1.1.58 *na padānta*. . . . Note, however, that the *ṆaL*-replacement of *tiP*, in *jahau*, is replaced with *au* (7.1.34 *āt au ṇalaḥ*).

7.4.63 न कवतेर्यङि

na kavater yaṅi
/ na ϕ kavateḥ 6/1 *yaṅi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *cuḥ* #62)
kavater abhyāsasya yaṅi parataś cur na bhavati
A sound denoted by *cU* does not come in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *kuṄ* when affix *yaṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

kokūyate uṣṭraḥ 'the camel cries in pain'
kokūyate kharaḥ 'the donkey cries in pain'

1. This rule blocks a palatal replacement for the *abhyāsa* of *kuṄ* 'noise' when affix *yaṄ* follows. Thus, given *ku* + *yaṄ*, we get *ku* + *ku* + *yaṄ* through reduplication. The *u* of *ku* + *ku* + *yaṄ* then goes through a replacement in long (*dīrgha*; 7.4.25 *akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ* . . .). The *u* of the *abhyāsa* also goes through a replacement in *guṇa* (7.4.82 *guṇo yaṅlukoḥ*). Note that a specification of verbal root *kuṄ* 'noise' of the *bhvādi* group is here made in *kavateḥ* with the use of *Śtip*, i.e., class-marker *ŚaP* and *tiP*. A reference to the *adādi* verbal root *ku*, or one to the *curādi* verbal root *kuṄ*, is thus ruled out. They both cannot escape a replacement in *c* (*cutva*). Thus, we will get *cokūyate*.

7.4.64 कृषेश्छन्दसि

kṛṣeś chandasi
/ kṛṣeḥ 6/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *cuḥ* #62 *na yaṅi* #63)
kṛṣeś chandasi viṣaye yaṅi parato' bhyāsasya cur na bhavati
A sound denoted by *cU* does not come, in the Vedic, in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *kṛṣA* 'to draw, drag', when affix *yaṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

karīkṛṣyate yajñakuṇapaḥ
'ritual corpse is drawn over and over again'

1. What was made available by the preceding rule is here denied in the

context of the Vedic usage. Thus, *kṛṣ + yaṄ → kṛ + kṛṣ + yaṄ → k(ṛ→a) + rīK + kṛṣ + yaṄ = karīkṛṣ + ya.* Note that *rīK* is an augment introduced to the *abhyāsa* (7.4.90 *rīgṛdupadhasya ca*). Deriving *karīkṛṣyate,* from (*karīkṛṣa + ŚaP + (LAṬ→te)*) = *karīkṛṣyate,* should pose no problem. Remember that we will get a replacement in *c* (*cutva*) in the classical usage. Thus, *carīkṛṣyate kṛṣīvalaḥ* 'the farmer is ploughing over and over again'.

7.4.65 दाधर्तिदर्धर्तिदर्धर्षिबोभूतुतेतिक्तेऽलर्ष्यापनीफणत्संसनिष्यदत्करिक्रत्कनिक्रदद्भरिभ्रविध्वतोदविद्युतत्तरित्रतःसरीसृपतंवरीवृजन्मर्मृज्यागनीगन्तीति च

dādhartidardhartidardharṣibobhūtutetikte' larṣyāpanīphaṇatsaṃsaniṣyadat-karikratkanikradadbharibhraddavidhvatodavidyutattaritrataḥsarīsṛpataṃva-rīvṛjanmarmṛjyāganīgantīti ca
/ dādharti-dardharti-dardharṣi-bobhūtu-tetikte-alarṣi-āpanīphaṇat-saṃ-saniṣyadat-karikrat-kanikradat-bharibhrat-davidhvataḥ-davidyutat-taritra-taḥ-sarīsṛpatam-varīvṛjat-marmṛjya-āganīganti (separetely specified *padas*)*; ca ϕ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *chandasi* #64)
'*dādharti, dardharti, dardharṣi, bobhūtu, tetikte, alarṣi, āpanīphaṇat, saṃsaniṣyadat, karikrat, kanikradat, bharibhrat, davidhvataḥ, davidyutat, taritrataḥ, sarīsṛpatam, varīvṛjat, marmṛjya, āganīganti*' *ity etāni aṣṭādaśa chandasi viṣaye nipātyante*
Forms such as *dādharti, dardharti, dardharṣi, bobhūtu, tetikte, alarṣi, āpanīphaṇat, saṃsaniṣyadat, karikrat, kanikradat, bharibhrat, davidhvataḥ, davidyutat, taritrataḥ, sarīsṛpatam, varīvṛjat, marmṛjya,* and *āganīganti* are derived, via *nipātana,* when the usage is Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

dādharti
dardharti
dardharṣi
bobhūtu
tetikte
alarṣi
āpanīphaṇat
saṃsaniṣyadat
karikrat
kanikradat
bharibhrat
davidhvataḥ
davidyutat
taritrataḥ
sarīsṛpatam
varīvṛjat

marmṛjya
āganīganti

1. Note that these eighteen forms are to be treated as derived, irrespective of details concerning rules and respective stages of their application. Whatever details are offered by commentators are to be accepted as purely pedagogical. Thus, *dādhartti* can be explained as derived, either via deletion of *ŚLU*, or via *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*, after the causal form of *dhṛÑ* 'to hold'. The *ŚLU*-deletion of (*dhṛÑ* + *ṆiC*) + *ŚaP* + *tiP*)) will be accomplished by 2.4.76 *bahulaṃ chandasi*. Lengthening of the *abhyāsa*, and deletion of *ṆiC*, will then be accomplished via *nipātana*. Deriving *dādhartti* with *dhṛṄ*, used with the signification of *avasthāna* 'staying', will involve lengthening of the *abhyāsa* and *parasmaipada* 'active ending', again via *nipātana*, under the condition of a following *ŚLU*-deletion. If one accepts *dhṛṄ* as a root of the *tudādi* class, augment *Śa* must be replaced with *ŚaP*, via transposition (*vyatyaya*). We can then proceed with *ŚLU*.

Accepting the derivation of *dādhartti* with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*, introduced after the causal *dhāri*, will entail facilitating *yaṄ*. Recall that *yaṄ* may not be available to *dhāri*, a causal root, for reasons of being *anekāc* 'consisting of more than one vowel'. The *yaṄ* after *dhāri* will have to be brought via *nipātana*. The shortening of the *upadhā* 'penultimate' will then also have to be realized via *nipātana*. Note that, in this view, deletion of *ṆiC* (6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*) and lengthening of the *abhyāsa* (7.4.83 *dīrgho' kitaḥ*) will then be accomplished via regular rules. That is, recourse to *nipātana* need not be taken here for these two operations. The derivation of *dardhartti*, in addition to *ŚLU* and deletion of *ṆiC*, involves augment *rUK*, all via *nipātana*. The option of *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ* will imply non-lengthening of *abhyāsa* and, for that matter non-availability of *yaṄ* due to *dhāri* consisting of more than one vowel, again via *nipātana*. Augment *rUK* in *dardhartti* is, of course, available from 7.4.92 *ṛtaś ca*. Derivational details of *dardharṣi*, with *siP* as against *tiP*, are similar to *dardhartti*. The idea behind all these derivations is: *yal lakṣṇenānupapannaṃ tat sarvaṃ nipātanāt siddham* 'all that which could not be accomplished by specific rule application is accomplished by *nipātana*'. Refer to *Nyāsa* and *Padamañjarī* for further such details.

2. Now consider *bobhūtu*, third singular active imperative of *bhū* 'to be, become', which involves *yaṄ* and its subsequent deletion by *LUK*. Doubling in this derivate is accomplished at the strength of 1.1.62 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam*. Notice that, given the string *bobhū* + *ti*, the *ū* of *bhū* does not go through a replacement in *guṇa*, again via *nipātana*. This, however, should not be treated as the purpose of making a *nipātana* provision. For, *guṇa* can be readily blocked by 7.3.88 *bhūsuvos tiṅi*. This recourse to blocking *guṇa*, via *nipātana*, then becomes an indicator (*jāpaka*). That is, elsewhere in intensives where *yaṄ* goes through deletion via *LUK*, we do not find any negation of *guṇa*. Consider, thus, *bobhoti* and *bobhavīti*. Incidentally, the first

of these two forms does not accept the option of augment *īṬ* (7.3.94 *yaño vā*).

3. The derivation of *tetikte* also involves *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*, where we get *tetiṅ + te* after *LAṬ→ta→te*, via *nipātana*, reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*. An application of *kutva* finally produces *teti(ṅ→g→k) + te = tetikte* (8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*; 8.2.55 *khari ca*). Why do we have to take recourse to *nipātana* for middle (*ātmanepada*) endings? Why can we not get the middle ending at the strength of *Ṅ* as an *it* (*Ṅit*) status of *yaṄ* (1.3.12 *anudāttaṅita ātmanepadam*)? This *nipātana* then indicates that, elsewhere, we get *ātmanepada* after that which ends in *yaṄ*, but not after that which *yaṄ* has gone through deletion by *LUK*.

4. Deriving *alarṣi*, from *ṛ + (LAṬ→siP) → ṛ + (ŚaP→ŚLU) + si = ṛ + ŚLU + si*, involves reduplication (*dvitva*; 6.1.10 *ślau*), and application of 7.4.66 *ur at*, to produce *ar + ṛ + si*. The *ṛ* will then also go through *guṇa* to, thereby, yield: *ar + ar + si*. Our present rule, mostly as an exception to 7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*, will replace *r* of the *abhyāsa* with *l*. Thus, we will get *al + ar + si = alarsi* which, after *ṣ*-replacement of *s*, will produce *alarṣi*. Note that a specification by *siP* of *alarṣi* does not mean that we do not get examples, for instance, with *tiP*. Thus, consider *alarti*, where *nipātana* is supposed to accomplish a lack of *i*-replacement (*itva*) applicable to the *abhyāsa* (cf. *artipipartyoś ca*).

5. *Kāśikā* offers *āpanīphaṇat* as an example where augment *nīK* is introduced to the *abhyāsa* of verbal root *phaṇ* 'to move', used with the preverb *āṄ*. Note here that affix *yaṄ* has gone through deletion by *LUK* and the present active participial suffix *ŚatṚ* follows the *aṅga* which, in turn, has gone through operations relative to reduplication. We thus get *āphaṇ + (yaṄ→LUK) → āpha + phaṇ → ā(ph→p) a + phaṇ + (LAṬ→ŚatṚ) = āpa + phaṇ + at*. Augment *nīK* can now be introduced to produce *āpa + phaṇ + at → āpa + nī + phaṇ + at = āpanīphaṇat*.

6. Note that *sasaniṣyadat* derives similarly to *āpanīphaṇat*, from verbal root *syandA* 'to drip, flow, ooze', used with the preverb *sam*. Operations similar to introduction and deletion of *yaṄ*, via *LUK*, and reduplication, follow. We similarly get the introduction of affix *ŚatṚ*. The augment which will here be introduced, via *nipātana*, is *niK*. Thus, we get *sam + sa + syand + at → sam + sa + ni + syand + at*. The *n* of *syand* is deleted by 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hal*. . . . Of course, we get the *s* of *syad* replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣatva*), via *nipātana*. Here again, it is not necessary that the example be limited to *syand*, used with the preverb *sam*. We also get *āsaniṣyadat*, with *āṄ*.

7. A similar example with deletion of *yaṄ* by *LUK* is offered in *karikrat*. A palatal replacement (*cutva*) corresponding with the velar *k* of the *abhyāsa* is here blocked via *nipātana*. This same *nipātana* is also responsible for introducing augment *niK*. Thus, *kṛ + (yaṄ→LUK) → k(ṛ→ar) + kṛ → ka(r→ϕ) + kṛ + Śat = ka + k(ṛ→r) + at → ka + riK + kr + at = karikrat*.

8. Now consider *kanikradat* which derives from *krand + (LUṄ→tiP) →*

krand + ti. An introduction of *CLI*, with its subsequent replacement with *aṆ*, produces *krand + a + ti.* This string, after reduplication and operation relative to *abhyāsa*, produces *ka + krand + a + ti.* Augment *niK* is then introduced with the understanding that, similar to the preceding example, no palatal will replace the velar but *n* of *krand* will go through deletion, similar to our earlier example. Note that an absence of augment *aṬ*, at the beginning of *kanikradat*, is again due to *nipātana.* We find *akrandīt* in the classical language.

9. Note that *bharibhrat* derives from *bhṛÑ + (yaṀ→LUK) → bha + bhṛ + ŚatṚ.* The *abhyāsa* is, here, not allowed a replacement in *i* (*itva*; 7.4.76 *bhṛñām it*). The *b*-replacement (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *abhyāse car ca*) of *bh* of the *abhyāsa* is also blocked via *nipātana.* The introduction of augment *riK* is also made via *nipātana.* Thus, we get *bha + bhṛ + at → bha + bh(ṛ→r) + at → bha + riK + bhr + at = bharibhrat.*

10. A similar example with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṀ*, and a following *ŚatṚ*, is given as *davidhvataḥ.* Of course, this form of the base ending in *ŚatṚ* is used with the nominative plural ending *Jas.* Note that the *ṛ* of *dhvṛ + (yaṀ→LUK) + at* is deleted via *nipātana.* This same *nipātana* is also responsible for introduction of augment *viK.* Rule 7.1.78 *nābhyastāc chatuḥ* blocks the introduction of *nUM* made available by 7.1.70 *ugid acām. . . .*

11. One can also consider *davidyutat*, yet another form with *ŚatṚ*, where *yaṀ* has gone through deletion via *LUK.* The *abhyāsa* of verbal root *dyut*, in the string *du + dyut + at*, does not go through *samprasāraṇa.* It, instead, goes through a replacement in *a* (*atva*), subsequent to which augment *viK* is introduced. All this is accomplished, via *nipātana.* Thus, *d(u→a) + dyut + at → da + viK + dyut + at = davidyutat.*

12. Deriving *taritrataḥ*, from *(tṝ + (ŚaP→ŚLU)) + ŚatṚ))*, entails operations similar to earlier examples. Augment *riK* is here introduced to the *abhyāsa.* Thus, *tṝ + tṝ + ŚatṚ* yields *ta + tṝ + at*, via application of 7.4.66 *ur at*, etc. Augment *riK* is then introduced to produce *ta + riK + tṝ + at.* An application of *yaṀ* will finally produce *tarit(ṝ→r) + at = taritrat.* Recall that *taritrataḥ* is the genitive singular form of this base ending in *ŚatṚ.*

13. Recall that the purpose of replacing *ŚaP* with *ŚLU* is to accomplish reduplication. Forms ending in *ŚatṚ* then facilitate introduction of augments to the *abhyāsa.* Thus, consider the introduction of *rīK* to the *abhyāsa*, of *sṛpḶ* 'to move, crawl', in *sarīsṛpatam*, the accusative singular form of a base ending in *ŚatṚ.* We similarly get *varīvṛjat* of verbal root *vṛjĪ* 'to abandon, exclude'.

14. The *abhyāsa* of verbal root *mṛj* 'to cleanse', used in *LIṬ* where its *tiP* replaced with *ṆaL*, is introduced with augment *rUK.* The root itself is introduced with augment *yUK.* Thus, we get *ma + mṛj + a* after reduplication and *ma + rUK + mṛj + yUK + ṆaL = marmṛjya*, at the end of derivation. The *ṛ* of *mṛj*, because of introduction of *yUK*, becomes *guru* 'long, heavy' before the conjunct *jy*. That is, it no longer contains a short vowel in its *upadhā* 'penultimate position'. This blocks the *vṛddhi* of *ṛ* (7.2.114 *mṛjer vṛddhiḥ*).

15. Deriving *āganīganti* from *gam* + (*ŚaP→ŚLU*) + *tiP* with reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa* will produce *gagam* + *ti*. We will get the introduction of augment *nīK* to the *abhyāsa*, though the *cutva* of 7.4.62 *kuhoś cuḥ* will be blocked. This will produce: *ganīga*(*m→ṃ→n*) *ti* = *ganīganti*, with *anusvāra* (*m→ṃ*) and *parasavarṇa* (*ṃ→n*) 'single homogeneous replacement similar to the following'.

7.4.66 उरत्

ur at
/uḥ 6/1 *at* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58)
ṛvarṇāntasyābhyāsasyākārādeśo bhavati
The *ṛ* of an *abhyāsa* is replaced with *aT*.

EXAMPLES:

narnarti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *nṛt* 'to dance' with *yaṄ*-deletion and augment *rUK*'
narinarti '. . . with *yaṄ*-deletion and augment *riK*'
narīnarti '. . . with *yaṄ*-deletion and augment *rīK*'

1. This rule offers a short *a* (*at*) as a replacement for the final *ṛ* of an *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*). Thus, consider *vavṛte, vavṛdhe* and *śaśṛdhe*, the third singular middle *LIṬ* forms of *vṛt* 'to turn', *vṛdh* 'to grow' and *śṛdh* 'to reproach, rebuke', respectively. The third person singular present middle ending *ta* is replaced with *eŚ* (3.4.81 *liṭas tajhayor eśirec*). The *ṛ* of the *abhyāsa*, of course, after reduplication (*dvitva*), is replaced with *r* followed by *r* (*rapara*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*). This *r*, however, goes through deletion of 7.4.60 *halādiśeṣaḥ*. We get *narnarti, narinarti* and *narīnarti*, as forms of *nṛt* 'to dance' where *yaṄ* goes through deletion by *LUK*. We then get augments *rUK, riK* and *rīK* (7.4.91 *rugrikau ca luki*), introduced to the *abhyāsa* to derive *narnarti, narinarti* and *narīnarti*.

2. A question is raised about introducing *a* as a replacement of *ṛ* of the *abhyāsa* in these examples. That is, given *nṛ* + *nṛt* + *ti*, rules 7.4.90 *rīg ṛd upadhasya ca* and 7.4.91 *rugrikau ca luki* will introduce augments *rUK, riK* and *rīK*, instead, on the basis of being subsequent (*paratva*). Once the augments are introduced, the *abhyāsa* can no longer be ending in *ṛ*. Consequently, the question of replacing the final *ṛ* of the *abhyāsa* with *a* does not arise. Commentators state that replacement in *a* (*atva*) is applied first since, in contexts where an *abhyāsa* goes through a modification (as we find here), a general rule cannot be blocked by its related exceptions (*Kāś*: *abhyāsavikāreṣu apavādo notsargān vidhīn bādhate*). Our present rule must apply before introduction of augments.

7.4.67 द्युतिस्वाप्योः सम्प्रसारणम्

dyutisvāpyoḥ samprasāraṇam
/dyuti-svāpyoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *samprasāraṇam* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58)
'*dyuti, svāpi*' *ity etayor abhyāsasya samprasāraṇaṃ bhavati*
A vowel termed *samprasāraṇa* comes in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *dyutA* 'to shine, glow' and *svāpi* 'to have someone sleep', the causal form of *svap* 'to sleep'.

EXAMPLES:

vididyute 'third person singular middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *dyut* used with the preverb *vi*'
vyadidyutat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *dyut* used with the preverb *vi*'
vididyotiṣate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *dyut* used with the preverb *vi* and affix *saN*'
videdyutyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *dyut* used with the preverb *vi* and affix *yaṄ*'
suṣvāpayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of the causal verbal root *svāpi* used with affix *saN*'

1. This rule offers a replacement in *samprasāraṇa* denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK*, for the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by *dyut* 'to shine, glow' and *svāpi* 'causative of *svap* (to sleep)'. We thus get *vididyute*, from *vi-dyut* + *LIṬ*, where *LIṬ* is replaced with *eŚ*, via third person singular middle ending *ta* (3.4.81 *liṭas tajhayor . . .*). An application of reduplication *dyut* + *dyut* + *e*, *samprasāraṇa* of *y*, in *d(y→i) ut* + *dyut* + *te* = *diut* + *dyut* + *e*, followed by *pūrva-rūpa* 'single replacement similar to the preceding' of 6.1.108 *samprasāraṇāc ca* (*d(i+u→i) t* + *dyut* + *e*) and 7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ* (*di(t→ϕ)* + *dyut* + *e*) produces *vi* + *didyut* + *e* = *vididyute*. We similarly get *vididyotiṣate*, from *vidyut* + *saN*, after reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*. Since *saN* is treated as marked with *K* as an *it* (*kit*), only optionally (1.2.26 *ralo vyupadhādd halādeḥ . . .*), we will also get a form without *guṇa*, i.e., *vididyutiṣate*. Refer to many *CaṄ*-derivates (cf. notes, 7.4.101 *ṇau caṅy upadhāyā hrasvaḥ*) for derivational details of *vyadidyutat*, from *vi-dyut* + *LAṄ*. Note here that *CaṄ* serves as a condition for *abhyāsa* (*caṅi*) but does not follow the *abhyāsa* immediately. That is, it is intervened by *ṆiC*. This intervening *ṆiC*, however, does not block *samprasāraṇa* which is desired (*iṣyate*). Deriving *videdyutyate*, a derivate with *yaṄ*, from (*vi-dyut* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*)) should pose no difficulty.

2. Verbal root *svap* 'to sleep' is here specified with the causal suffix *ṆiC*. That is, (*ÑIṣvap* + *ṆiC*) → *svāpi*, with replacement in *s* for *ṣ* and penultimate (*upadhā*) *vṛddhi*. This serves as an *aṅga* before the affix which, in turn, con-

ditions the *abhyāsa*. Thus, consider *svāpi* + *iṬ* + *saN* which produces *svap* + *svāpi* + *i* + *sa*, through reduplication (*dvirvacana*). The *samprasāraṇa* of *v* of the *abhyāsa*, i.e., *svap*, subsequently yields *u*, via *pūrvarūpa* (6.1.108 *samprasāraṇāc ca*) of *ā*+*u* of *s*(*v*→*u*) *ap*→ *s*(*u*+*a*→*u*) *p*. An application of 7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ* will produce *su*(*p*→ϕ) + *svāpi* + *i*+ *sa* → *su* + *svāpi* + *i* + *sa*. An application of *guṇa*, followed by *ay* before *i*, will, after the *s*→*ṣ* of 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*, produce *susvāp*(*i*→*e*→*ay*) + *i* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *a* = *susvāpayiṣa*. The *s* which occurs after the *abhyāsa* will be replaced with *ṣ* of 8.3.61 *stautiṇyo*. . . . We will finally derive *suṣvāpayiṣati* from *suṣvāpayiṣa* + *ŚaP* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*).

Note that verbal root *svāpi* is here accepted as ending in affix *ṆiC* (*ṇyanta*). An application of *samprasāraṇa* is desired in its context only when an affix conditioning its *abhyāsa* follows in close proximity. The *samprasāraṇa* of the preceding example will thus not be available to the *abhyāsa* of *sasvāpaka*, a derivate of *svāpi* with *ṆvuL*, in deriving *siṣvāpakīyiṣati* from (*svāpi* + *ṆvuL*) + *KyaC*)) = *svāpakīya* and (*svāpikīya* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*→*tiP* = *svāpikīyiṣati*. The *samprasāraṇa* of the *abhyāsa* of *sasvāpakīya* is blocked because *saN* does not follow the *abhyāsa*. There is an intervention of *ṆvuL* and *KyaC*. Consequently, after the application of 7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*, the *a* of the *abhyāsa* is replaced with *i* (7.4.79 *sany ataḥ*) to produce *S*(*a*→*i*) *svāpakīyiṣa*.

7.4.68 व्यथो लिटि

vyatho liṭi
/*vyathaḥ* 6/1 *liṭi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *samprasāraṇam* #67)
vyather liṭi parato' bhyāsasya samprasāraṇaṃ bhavati
A vowel termed *samprasāraṇa* comes in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *vyathA* when affix *LIṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

vivyathe 'third person singular middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *vyath* 'to fear, move, tremble''
vivyathāte 'third person dual middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *vyath*'
vivyathire 'third person plural middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *vyath*'

1. This rule allows *samprasāraṇa* to the *abhyāsa* of verbal root *vyath* 'to fear, move' when *LIṬ* follows. Thus, *vyath* + (*LIṬ*→*ta*→*eŚ*) → *vivyath* + *e*, through reduplication (*dvitva*; *vyath* + *vyath* + *e*), *samprasāraṇa* (*v*(*y*→*i*) *ath* + *vyath* + *e*), *pūrvarūpa* (*v*(*i*+*a*→*i*) *th* + *vyath* + *e* = *vith* + *vyath* + *e*; 6.1.108 *samprasāraṇāc ca* and 7.4.60 *halādiśeṣa* (*vi*(*th*→ϕ) + *vyath* + *e*). Note that the *y* of the *abhyāsa*, i.e., *vyath*, of *vyath* + *vyath* + *e*, would have gone through deletion because of *halādiśeṣa* (7.4.60). This rule, instead, offers *samprasāraṇa* which was not made available by an earlier rule (*Kāś*: *halādiśeṣeṇa yakārasya nivṛttau prāptāyāṃ samprasāraṇaṃ kriyate, yakārasya 'na samprasāraṇe*

samprasāraṇam (6.1.37) *iti pratiṣidhyate*). This rule blocks negation of 6.1.37 *na samprasāraṇe samprasāraṇam.*

But this can happen only when *LIṬ* follows. For, consider *vāvyathyate*, a derivate of (*vyath* + *yaṄ*) + *LAṬ*, where *halādiśeṣa* (7.4.60) reduces the *abhyāsa* to *va* (via deletion of *y*) and the *a* of the *abhyāsa* goes through a replacement in long (*dīrgha*). Thus, *vā* + *vyath* + *ya* + *te* = *vāvyathyate.*

7.4.69 दीर्घ इणः किति

dīrgha iṇaḥ kiti
/*dīrghaḥ* 1/1 *iṇaḥ* 6/1 *kiti* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *liṭi* #68)
iṇo' ṅgasya yo' bhyāsas tasya dīrgho bhavati kiti liṭi parataḥ
A long vowel comes in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *iṆ* 'to go' when a *LIṬ* affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows.

EXAMPLES:

īyatuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of *iṆ*'
īyuḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule allows a long replacement for the short of an *abhyāsa* when verbal root *iṆ* 'to go' constitutes an *aṅga* and a *LIṬ* affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows. Thus, consider *iṆ* + (*LIṬ*→*tas*→*atus*) and *i* + (*LIṬ*→*jhi*→*us*), where rule 6.4.81 *iṇo yaṇ* applies to replace the *i* with *y*. We get reduplication in (*i*→*y*) + *atus* and *i* + (*i*→*y*) + *us* = *iy* + *us* = *iyus*, via extension of form (*rūpātideśa*) of *i* which *y* replaced. That is, through *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating the substitute as what it replaced'. The problem is: 6.4.31 *iṇo yaṇ* is subsequent (*para*) in order and hence applies prior to long replacement in *ī*. Once the *i* is replaced with *y* it becomes *anacka* 'without any vowel'. This, in turn, blocks reduplication (*dvitva*). This is the reason why recourse to *sthānivadbhāva* is taken. The *abhyāsa* is then replaced with its long counterpart of this rule. Thus, (*i*→*y*) + *atus* → (*i* + *y*) + *atus* → (*i*→*ī*) + *y* + *atus* = *īyatu*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *īyatuḥ* and (*i*→*y*) + *us* → (*i* + *y*) + *us* → (*i*→*ī*) + *y* + *us* → *yu*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ* = *īyuḥ.*

2. Why do we have the condition of *kit* 'a *LIṬ* affix marked with *K* as an *it*'? Consider *iyāya* and *iyayitha* which derive from *i* + (*LIṬ*→*tiP*→*ṆaL*) = *i* + *a* and *i* + *tha.* Affix *LIṬ* is here replaced with the third person singular active ending *ṆaL*, via *tiP*, and second person singular active ending *thaL*, via *siP*, respectively. The *i* of *i* + *a* and *i* + *tha* goes through a replacement in *vṛddhi* and *guṇa*, respectively. Thus, *ai* + *a* and *e* + *tha* which, through reduplication, via *sthānivadbhāva*, produce *i* + *ai* + *a* and *i* + *e* + *tha.* Rule 6.4.78 *abhyāsasyāsavarṇe* then introduces *iyAṄ* to the *abhyāsa.* We thus get (*i*→*iyAṄ*) + *ai* + *a* = *iy* + *ai* + *a* and (*i*→*iyAṄ*) + *e* + *tha* = *iy* + *e* + *tha.* The *abhyāsa* of these examples is not replaced with its long counterpart because the replacement of *LIṬ* which follows is not marked with *K* as an *it.*

7.4.70 **अत आदेः**

ata ādeḥ
/ataḥ 6/1 *ādeḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *liṭi* #68 *dīrghaḥ* #69)
abhyāsasyāder akārasya dīrgho bhavati liṭi parataḥ
A long vowel comes in place of *aT* of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* when affix *LIṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

āṭa 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *aṭ* 'to move, wander''
āṭatuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of. . .'
āṭuḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate of . . .'

1. This rule allows a long replacement for the initial short *a* of an *abhyāsa* when *LIṬ* follows. This rule, thus, is an exception to 'single *guṇa*-replacement similar to the following' (*pararūpa*; 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*). Thus, we get *aṭ* + (*LIṬ*→*tiP*) → *aṭ* + (*tiP*→*ṆaL*) → *a* + *aṭ* + (*Ṇ*)*a*(*L*) → (*a*→*ā*) + *aṭ* + *a* = (*ā*+*a* →*ā*) *ṭ* + *a* = *āṭa*; *aṭ* + *atus* → *a* + *aṭ* + *atus* → (*a*→*ā*) + *aṭ* + *atus* → (*ā*+*a*→*ā*) *ṭatuḥ* = *āṭatuḥ* and similalry, *aṭ* + *uḥ* → *āṭuḥ*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *a* at the beginning? Consider *papāca* and *papāṭha* which derive from *pac* + (*LIṬ*→ *tiP*→*ṆaL*) → *pac* + *a* and *paṭh* + *a*, respectively. The *a* of the *abhyāsa* of *papac* + *a* and *papaṭh* + *a*, for reasons of not being initial (*ādi*), cannot receive a replacement in long.

7.4.71 **तस्मान्नुड् द्विहलः**

tasmān nuḍ dvihalaḥ
/tasmāt 5/1 *nuṭ* 1/1 *dvihalaḥ* 6/1 = *dvau halau yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *liṭi* #68)
tasmād ato' bhyāsād dīrghībhūtād uttarasya dvihalo' ṅgasya nuḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUṬ* is introduced to the form of an *aṅga* which consists of two consonants and occurs after a short turned-long vowel of the *abhyāsa*, when a *LIṬ* affix follows.

EXAMPLES:

ānaṅga 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *agI* 'to move''
ānaṅgatuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of . . .'
ānaṅguḥ 'third person plural *LIṬ*-derivate of . . .'
ānañja 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *añj* 'move, anoint''
ānañjatuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of . . .'
ānañjuḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate of . . .'

1. This rule introduces augment *nUṬ* to an *aṅga* which contains two consonants and occurs after the *abhyāsa* which just went through a long (*dīrgha*)

replacement. Thus, consider *ānaṅga, ānaṅgatuḥ* and *ānaṅguḥ*, which are derivates of *LIṬ* introduced after verbal root *agI* 'to move'. We get *aṅg* after *I* is deleted (1.3.2 *upadeśe' j anunāsika it*; 1.3.8 *tasya lopaḥ*) and augment *nUM* (7.1.58 *idito num dhātoḥ*) is introduced. We get *a + aṅg + a*, through reduplication and *halādiśeṣa* (7.4.60). An application of 7.4.70 *ata ādeḥ*, followed by *nUM* of this rule, produces *(a→ā) + aṅg + a → ā + nUṬ + aṅg + a = ānaṅga.* Similar rules apply in deriving dual and plural forms. Deriving *ānañja*, the third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate from *añj + (LIṬ→tiP→ṆaL)*, offers nothing new.

2. Note that a specification by *hal* 'consonant' also includes a references to *r* as part of *ṛ*. Augment *nUM* is thus also introduced in *ānṛdhatuḥ* and *ānṛdhuḥ* with reference to an *aṅga* containing two consonants. Consider *ṛdh + ṛdh + atus →* where *ṛ* of the *abhyāsa* goes through a replacement in *a* followed by *r* (*rapara*). An application of *halādiśeṣa* (7.4.60), followed by long replacement of the *abhyāsa* along with introduction of augment *nUṬ*, yields *a(r→ϕ) + ṛdh + atus → (a→ā) + ṛdh + atus → ā + nUṬ + ṛdh + atu(s→r→ḥ) = ānṛdhatuḥ.*

7.4.72 अश्नोतेश्च

aśnoteś ca
/aśnoteḥ 6/1 *ca ϕ/*
(aṅgasya #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *liṭi* #68 *tasmān nuṭ* #71)
aśnoteś ca dīrghībhūtād abhyāsād uttarasya nuḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *nUṬ* is also introduced to the form of an *aṅga* which occurs after a short-turned-long vowel of the *abhyāsa* of verbal root *aśU* 'to pervade', provided when a *LIṬ* affix follows.

EXAMPLES:

vyānaśe 'third person singular middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *aśŪ*'
vyānaśāte 'third person singular middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *aśŪ*'
vyānaśire 'third person plural middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *aśU*'

1. This rule introduces augment *nUṬ* to what occurs after the long vowel of the *abhyāsa* of verbal root *aśŪ* 'to reach, attain, pervade'. A specification with augment *nu* of *aśnoteḥ* is made to indicate that the root belongs to the class of verbal roots called *svādi*. For, *aś* of *aśnoti* is used with the class-marker (*vikaraṇa*) *nu*. Note that *aś* cannot refer to verbal root *aś* of *aśnāti*, the one which is used with *Śnā* as its class-marker, and is classed as *kryādi* with the signification of *bhojana* 'to eat, consume'. Consider *vyānaśe, vyānaśāte* and *vyānaśire* where the root is used with the preverb *vi*. The third personal singualr and plural replacements of *LIṬ*, i.e., *ta* and *jha*, are repalced with *eŚ* and *ireC* (3.4.81 *liṭas tajhayor . . .*), respectively. Thus, *aś + (LIṬ→ta→eś) → a + aś + e → (a→ā) + aś + e → ā + nUṬ + aś + e → ānaśe, v(i→y) +ānaśe = vyānaśe.* Similarly, *vyānaśāte* and *vyānaśire.*

The forms of *aś* 'to eat' will be *āśa, āśatuḥ* and *āśuḥ*, all active third person singualr, dual and plural of *LIṬ* replaced with *ṄaL, atus* and *us* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*), via *tiP, tas* and *jhi*, respectively.

7.4.73 भवतेरः

bhavater aḥ
/bhavateḥ 6/1 *aḥ* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *liṭi* #68)
bhavater abhyāsasyākārādeśo bhavati liṭi parataḥ
An *a* comes in place of the final sound segment of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *bhū* 'to be, become', provided when affix *LIṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

babhūva 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *bhū* 'to be, become''
babhūvatuḥ 'third person dual active *LIṬ*-derivate of . . .'
babhūvuḥ 'third person plural active *LIṬ*-derivate of . . .'
anubabhūve kambalo devadattena 'the blanket was liked by Devadatta'

1. This rule offers *a* as a replacement for the *abhyasa* of verbal root *bhū* when *LIṬ* follows. Refer to derivational details of *babhūva* under the appendix (II:429-30) of 1.2.6 *indhibhavatibhyāṃ ca*. Deriving *babhūvatuḥ* and *babhūvuḥ* should then not pose any problem. Since this specification of verbal root *bhū*, in *bhavateḥ*, is made with the indication of its class-marker *ŚaP*, and verbal ending *tiP* (*śtipā*), we get this replacement also in *anubabhūve*, the third singular middle passive (*ātmanepada*; 1.3.13 *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ*) form of *bhū*, used with the preverb *anu*. Of course, the third singualr middle ending *ta* which replaces affix *LIṬ* is further replaced with *eŚ*.

2. Note that this replacement is limited only to derivates of *LIṬ* introduced after verbal root *bhū*. That is, we do not get it, for example, when affixes *saN* and *yaṄ* are introduced after verbal root *bhū*. Thus, we get *bubhūṣati* (with *saN*) and *bobhūyate* (with *yaṄ*).

7.4.74 ससूवेति निगमे

sasūveti nigame
/sasūva (verbal *pada*); *iti* ϕ *nigame* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *liṭi* #68 *aḥ* #73)
'*sasūva*' *iti nipātyate nigame*
A form such as *sasūva* is derived in the Vedic, via *nipātana*.

EXAMPLES:

sasūva sthaviraṃ vipaścitām
'. . . inspired by old wisdom'

1. This is a Vedic usage. The *parasmaipada* 'active' replacement for *LIṬ* after the middle verbal root *ṣūṄ* 'to give birth' is accomplished by *nipātana*. This same is also responsible for augment *vUK*, and the *a*-replacement for *u* (*atva*) of the *abhyāsa*. Thus, *sū* + (*LIṬ*→*ṆaL*) → *sū* + *vUK* + *a* → *sū* + *v* + *sū* + *v* + *a* = *sū* + *sūv* + *a* → *s*(*ū*→*a*) + *sūv* + *a* = *sasūva*. Incidentally, the *ṣ* of verbal root *sūṄ* is replaced with *s* (6.1.62 *dhātvādeḥ ṣaḥ saḥ*).

7.4.75 णिजां त्रयाणां गुणः श्लौ

ṇijāṃ trayāṇāṃ guṇaḥ ślau
/ṇijām 6/3 *trayāṇām* 6/3 *guṇaḥ* 1/1 *ślau* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58)
nijādīnāṃ trayāṇām abhyāsasya guṇo bhavati ślau sati
A *guṇa* vowel comes in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by three roots enumerated beginning with *ṇijIR* 'to cleanse, nourish', provided when a deletion by *ŚLU* follows.

EXAMPLES:

nenekti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ṇijIR* with *ŚLU*-deletion'
vevekti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vijIR* with *ŚLU*-deletion'
veveṣṭi 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *viṣ* with *ŚLU*-deletion'

1. Note that a sense of *ādi* 'beginning with, et cetera' is gotten from the specification of *nijām* 'of those enumerated beginning with *nij*' in the genitive plural. Refer to derivational details of *nenekti* under the appendix of 2.4.75 *juhotyādibhyaḥ śluḥ* (III:707). Other examples follow similar rule applications.

2. Note that these three roots, specified beginning with *ṇijIR* (along with *vijIR* and *viṣL*) come at the end of a section in the *juhotyādi* listing of roots. Since *nijām* is given in the plural (not singular or dual), a specification with *nijām* alone should be enough. This should give the sense of *nijIR* and the rest. Why then state *trayāṇam* 'of three'? It is intended for use in subsequent rules (*uttarārtham*).

Why do we have to use *ślau* 'when *ŚLU* follows'? Observe *nineja*, the third person singular active *LIṬ* form of *ṇijIR*, where, since there is no *ŚLU*-deletion, there is no replacement in *e* for *i* of *ni*.

7.4.76 भृञामित्

bhṛñām it
/bhṛñām 6/3 *it* 1/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *trayāṇām ślau* #75)

bhṛñādīnām trayāṇām abhyāsasyekārādeśo bhavati ślau sati
An *iT* comes in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by three roots enumerated beginning with *bhṛÑ* 'to nourish, preserve', provided when a deletion by *ŚLU* follows.

EXAMPLES:

bibharti 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *bhṛÑ* with *ŚLU*-deletion'
mimīte 'third person singular middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *māṄ* 'to measure' with *ŚLU*-deletion'
jihīte 'third person singular middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *OhāṄ* with *ŚLU*-deletion'

1. This rule allows a short *i* to replace the final sound segment (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) of the *abhyāsa* of three verbal roots beginning with *bhṛÑ* 'to support, nurture'. This, of course, happens when a deletion via *ŚLU* follows. The specification with *bhṛñām* in the plural gives us the meaning of *ādi* 'etc.'. The three roots covered by this specification are: *bhṛÑ*, *māṄ* 'to measure' and *OhāṄ* 'to move, go, abandon'.

2. Refer to derivational details of *bibharti* under the appendix of 2.4.76 *juhotyādibhyaḥ śluḥ* (III:707). The third singular middle present *mimīte* is derived from *māṄ* + (*LAṬ*→*ta*). The *ŚaP* of *mā* + *ŚaP* + *ta* then goes through deletion, via *ŚLU*. Reduplication (6.1.10 *ślau*) and operations relative to *abhyāsa* produce *ma* + *mā* + *ta*. The *i* as a replacement for final vowel of *ma*, the *abhyāsa*, produces: *m*(*ā*→*i*) + *mā* + *ta*. The *ā* of *mā* is then replaced with *ī* (*ītva*; 6.4.113 *ī haly aghoḥ*)): *mi* + *m*(*ā*→*ī*) + *ta* = *mimī* + *t*(*a*→*e*) = *mimīte*. Our third derivate, i.e., *jihīte*, follows similar applications. Note that forms of *OhāṄ*, i.e., *jihīte*, etc., will go through *cutva* (*h*→*jh*; 7.4.62 *kuhoś cuḥ*) and *cartva* (*jh*→*j*; 8.4.54 *abhyāse car ca*).

3. The condition of *trayāṇām* 'of the three' is still valid. That is why, it does not apply to *OhāK* where we get *jahāti* 'abandons'. Additionally, this replacement applies only when *ŚLU* follows. Thus, we do not get it in *babhāra*, the third singular active *LIṬ* form of *bhṛÑ* 'to fetch, carry'.

7.4.77 अर्तिपिपर्त्योश्च

artipipartyoś ca
/arti-pipartyoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *ślau* #75 *it* #76)
'*arti, piparti*' *ity etayor abhyāsasyekārādeśo bhavati ślau*
An *iT* also comes in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *ṛ* and *pṛ*, provided a deletion by *ŚLU* follows.

EXAMPLES:

iyarti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ṛ* 'to go' with *ŚLU*-deletion and reduplication'
piparti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *pṝ*'

1. This rule allows *i* as a replacement to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *arti* (*ṛ* 'to go') and *piparti* (*pṝ* 'to nurture, fill'), when *ŚLU* finds its scope. Refer to derivational details of *iyarti* under notes of 6.4.78 *abhyāsasyāsavarṇe*. Other derivates follow similar patterns.

7.4.78 **बहुलं छन्दसि**

bahulaṃ chandasi
/bahulam 1/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *ślau* #75 *it* #76)
chandasi viṣaye' bhyāsasya ślau bahulam ikārādeśo bhavati
An *iT* comes variously in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* when a deletion by *ŚLU* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pūrṇāṃ vivaṣṭi
janimā vivakti
vatsaṃ na mānā siṣakti
jigharti somam

1. This rule offers a replacement in *i* for an usage of the Vedic, variously (*bahulam*). Refer to derivational details of *vivaṣṭi* and *vivakti* under the appendix of 2.4.76 *bahulaṃ chandasi* (III:707-8). We can similarly get *siṣakti* from *ṣic* 'to sprinkle' and *jighartti* from *ghrā* 'to smell'. Note that these examples will have the option of replacement in *i* (*itva*). An absence of *itva* will yield forms such as (*jan* + (*LAṄ*→*miP*)) = *jajanam* and (*dhan* +(*LAṄ*→*miP*)) = *dadhanam*. Notice how we do not get *aṬ* (cf. 6.4.75 *bahulaṃ chandasy amāṅyoge' pi*) and a replacement in *i* (*itva*), relative to the *abhyāsa*. Reduplication (*dvitva*) will, of course, be accomplished by 6.1.10 *ślau*. The first singular active ending *miP*, for example in *jajanam*, will be replaced with *am* (3.4.101 *tasthasthamipāṃ . . .*).

7.4.79 **सन्यतः**

sany ataḥ
/sani 7/1 *ataḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *it* #76)
sani parato' bhyāsasyekārādeśo bhavati
An *i* comes in place of the *a*-final *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* when affix *saN* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pipakṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pac* 'to cook' ending in *saN*' '
yiyakṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *yaj* 'to sacrifice' ending in *saN*'
tiṣṭhāsati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sthā* 'to stay, stand' ending in *saN*'
pipāsati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pā* 'to drink' ending in *saN*'

1. This rule allows an *abhyāsa* which ends in *a* to receive a replacement in *i*. Of course, this replacement applies to the final *a* of an *abhyāsa* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) and when the *aṅga* is followed by affix *saN*. Follow derivational details of many *saN*-derivates already discussed. Note, however, that verbal roots *pac* and *yaj* do not allow *iṬ* (*aniṭ*). A derivate such as *pipakṣati* will have its *c* replaced with *k* (8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*). The *j* of *yaj*, in *yiyakṣati*, will be replaced with *ṣ* (8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjasṛja . . .*). The *k*, of course, comes from the application of 8.2.41 *ṣaḍhoḥ kaḥ*. The roots in derivates such as *tiṣṭhāsati* and *pipāsati* derive from *sthā + san → ta + sthā + saN* and *pā + saN → pa + pā + saN*, respectively.

7.4.80 ओः पुयण्ज्यपरे

oḥ puyaṇjy apare
/oḥ 6/1 *puyaṇji* 7/1 = *puś ca yaṇ ca j ca* = *puyaṇj* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmin*; *apare* 7/1 = *aḥ paro yasmāt puyaṇjaḥ* (*bv.*), *tasmāt*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *it* #76 *sani* #79)
uvarṇāntābhyāsasya pavarge yaṇi jakāre cāvarṇapare parata ikārādeśo bhavati sani pratyaye parataḥ
An *i* comes in place of the final *u* of an *abhyāsa* which occurs either before a consonant of the *p*-series (*pavarga*), or before a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *yaṆ*, or else, before *j*, with each one of these followed by *a*, provided affix *saN* follows the *aṅga*.

EXAMPLES:

pipaviṣate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *pūṄ*, used with affix *saN*'
pipāvayiṣati 'third person singular active causal *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pūṄ* used with *ṆiC* and ending in affix *saN*'
vibhāvayiṣati 'third person singular active causal *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *bhū* used with *ṆiC* and ending in affix *saN*'
yiyaviṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *yu* 'to mix' ending in *saN*'

yiyāvayiṣati 'third person signular active causal *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *yu* used with the causative *ṆiC* and ending in affix *saN*'
rirāvayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ru* 'to cry' used with the causal *ṆiC* and ending in affix *saN*'
lilāvayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *lū* 'to cut' used with causal *ṆiC* and ending in affix *saN*'
jijāvayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ju* used with causal *ṆiC* and ending in affix *saN*'

1. Note that *sani* 'when *saN* follows' and *it* 'short *i*' are still carried over. This rule offers *i* as a replacement for the final *u* of an *abhyāsa*. The conditions of this replacement are complex: (*i*) the *u* at the end of the *abhyāsa* must be followed, either by a sound of the *p*-series (*pavarga*), or by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *yaṆ*, or else, by *j*; (*ii*) all these sounds which may constitute right condition for the *abhyāsa*-final *u* must also be followed by *a*. Finally, (*iii*) the *aṅga* must be followed by affix *saN*. Consider the derivational details of *pipaviṣate* and *pipāvayiṣati*. Given *pūṄ* + *saN*, augment *iṬ* will be introduced (7.2.74 *smipūṇrañjavaśāṃ sani*). An application of *guṇa* on *ū* with subsequent replacement in *av* will produce: *p*(*ū*→*o*→*av*) + *i* + *saN* = *pav* + *i* + *saN*. Reduplication (*dvitva*) of *pū*, via *sthānivadbhāva* (1.1.59 *dvirvacane' aci*), will produce: *pū* + *pav* + *i* + *saN*. The *ū* of the *abhyāsa* will then go through shortening. It will further go through a replacement in *i*. Thus, *p*(*u*→*i*) + *pav* + *i* + *saN* = *pi* + *pav* + *i* + *saN*. Deriving *pipaviṣate*, with the introduction of *LAṬ* replaced with the middle ending *ta*, should pose no problem. We similarly derive the active third singular causal derivate of *pūṄ* with *saN*. Thus, (*pū* + *ṆiC*) = *pāvi*; (*pāvi* + *saN*); (*pāvisa* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*) = *pipāvayiṣati*, again through reduplication and replacement in *i* (*itva*), etc. We also get *bibhāvayiṣati*, from (*bhū* + *ṆiC*) + *saN* → *bhāvisa* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*), with similar application of rules. These three offer examples where a consonant of the *p*-series occurs after the *abhyāsa*, itself followed by *a*.

Derivates such as *yiyaviṣati* and *yiyāvayiṣati* illustrate contexts where an *abhyāsa* is followed by *y*, followed by *a*. Recall that the root in these two derivates is *yu* 'to mix' and derivational patterns are similar to preceding examples. We similarly get *rirāvayiṣati* and *lilāvayiṣati*, with *vṛddhi* and a subsequent replacement in *āv*. An example where *j*, followed by *a*, follows an *abhyāsa*, is furnished by verbal root *ju*, a root found only in the *sūtrapāṭha*. Thus, we get *jijāvayiṣati*.

2. Derivates, where *saN* is introduced after a base ending in *ṆiC*, yield forms such as *bh*(*ū*→*au*→*āv*) + *ṆiC* = *bhāv* + *i* + *sa*(*N*) and *p*(*ū*→*au*→*āv*) + *Ṇi* + *sa*(*N*) = *pāv* + *i* + *saN*, through *vṛddhi* and subsequent replacement in *āv*. Reduplication at this stage cannot produce *bhū* + *bhāv* + *i* + *sa* and *pū* + *pāv* + *i* + *sa*, because what will go through reduplication will not be *bhū*, via *sthānivadbhāva*. It will, instead, be *bhāv*. Why can we not take *bhāv* through *sthānivadbhāva*? Because *ṆiC* which conditions *vṛddhi* does not form the right

condition (*nimitta*) for reduplication (*dvitva*). This then means that we cannot get a consonant of the *p*-series, etc., followed by *a*. That is correct. Then this rule will become vacuous (*vyartha*). Yes. It is to save this rule from becoming vacuous that a replacement in *āv*, for example of *bhāv*, can be accepted to go through *sthānivadbhāva*. We will thus get *bhū*, through reduplication via *sthānivadbhāva*. An application of replacement in *i* (*itva*) can then be made by treating the *abhyāsa* as *bhū* subsequent to reduplication.

3. Why do we state this *i*-replacement only for that which ends in *u*? So that replacement *i* (*itva*) could not be accomplished in *pāpacyate* and *pāpaciṣate*, where the first does not have *saN* but the second does. However, its *abhyāsa* does not end in *u*.

Why do we state this right context of a consonant of the *p*-series, or of *y*, or else of *j*, which must follow the *abhyāsa*. So that *i*-replacement (*itva*) does not apply in case of *avatutāvayiṣati*, a derivate of (*ava-tu* + *ṆiC*) + *saN*)) + *LAṬ*. There is no *itva*, also in *juhāvayiṣati*, a derivate of (*hu* + *ṆiC* + *saN*)) + *LAṬ*.

Why 'only when *a* follows'? Consider *bubhūṣati* where the *abhyāsa* ends in *u* and is followed by a consonant of the *p*-series. Notice, however, that *bh* is not followed by *a*. It is followed by *ū*, instead. The replacement in *i* (*itva*) is again blocked.

7.4.81 स्रवतिशृणोतिद्रवतिप्रवतिप्लवतिच्यवतीनां वा

sravatiśṛṇotidravatipravatiplavaticyavatīnāṃ vā
/ sravati-śṛṇoti-dravati-pravati-plavati-cyavatīnām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *vā* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *it* #76 *sani* #79 *oḥ puṇyaj apare* #80)
'*sravati, śṛṇoti, dravati, pravati, plavati, cyavati*' *ity eteṣām abhyāsasya or avarṇapare yaṇi vā ikārādeśo bhavati sani parataḥ*
An *i* comes, optionally, in place of the final *u* of an *abhyāsa* which occurs before a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *yaṆ* followed by *a*, provided the *aṅga* is constituted by verbal roots *sru* 'to move, go', *śru* 'to hear', *dru* 'to drip, move', *pruṄ* 'to move, go', *pluṄ* and *cyuṄ*' and affix *saN* follows.

EXAMPLES:

sisrāvayiṣati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sru* used with *ṆiC* and affix *saN*'
susrāvayiṣati 'ibidem (optional)'
śiśrāvayiṣati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *śru* used with *ṆiC* and affix *saN*'
śuśrāvayiṣati 'ibidem (optional)'
didrāvayiṣati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *dru* used with *ṆiC* and affix *saN*'

dudrāvayiṣati 'ibidem (optional)'
piprāvayiṣati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pruṄ* used with *ṆiC* and affix *saN*'
puprāvayiṣati 'ibidem (optional)'
piplāvayiṣati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pluṄ* used with *ṆiC* and affix *saN*'
puplāvayiṣati 'ibidem (optional), third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root used with *ṆiC* and affix *saN*'
cicyāvayiṣati 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *cyuṄ* used with *ṆiC* and affix *saN*'
cucyāvayiṣati 'ibidem'

1. Note that a replacement in *i* (*itva*) of this rule is optional. Consider *sisrāvayiṣati* and *susrāvayiṣati* where the two-third singular active causal *saN*-derivates of verbal root *sru* differ only in optional replacement of *u* by *i*. This same is also true of pairs of other derivates: (*śru* + *ṆiC*) = (*śrāvi* + *saN*) + *LAṬ* = *sisrāvayiṣati* and *susrāvayiṣati*, etc. They all go through reduplication, *vṛddhi*-replacement and optional replacement in *i* (*itva*) for final *u*.

2. A question is raised as to how a replacement in *i* (*itva*) can be accomplished when *u* is not followed immediately by *y*, followed by *a*. How could *u* be replaced with *i* when *s*, *ś* and *d*, etc., intervene between *y* followed by *a*? Commentators explain that *itva* is allowed here at the strength of Pāṇini's own statement of provision. Since this rule is an optional rule, and especially since *itva* of the previous rule applies only when no other sound intervenes between *u* and *y*, this option is special. It is explained as an instance of *aprāpta-vibhāṣā* 'an option made available which it previously was not'.

2. Recall, however, that this option is available only when a sound denoted by *yaṆ*, followed by *a*, follows *u*. Elsewhere, we will get *suśrūṣati* and *suśrūṣate*. That is, no *itva* since *a* does not follow *yaṆ*. This rule finds its scope only where a causal verbal root is used with *saN*.

7.4.82 गुणो यङ्लुकोः

guṇo yaṅlukoḥ
/guṇaḥ 1/1 *yaṅ-lukoḥ* 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58)
yaṅi yaṅluki ca igantasyābhyāsasya guṇo bhavati
A *guṇa* vowel comes in place of an *iK*-final *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* when affix *yaṄ*, and its deletion by *LUK*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

cecīyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *ciÑ* 'to heap, gather' with affix *yaṄ*'
lolūyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *lūÑ* 'to cut' with affix *yaṄ*'

johavīti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *hu* 'to sacrifice' with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*'
cokruśoti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *kruś* 'to call, challenge' with affix *yaṄ*'

1. Note that *lukoḥ* of *yaṅ-lukoḥ* must refer to *yaṅluk* 'deletion of *yaṄ* by means of *LUK*'. This rule will then apply in dual contexts of introduction as well as subsequent deletion of *yaṄ*. Since this rule offers a *guṇa* replacement with reference to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga*, rule 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī* must also be read in this context. Refer to the appendix (III:706-7) of 2.4.74 *yaṅo' ci ca* for derivational details of examples with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*. Consider *johavīti* from *hu* + *yaṄ* where *yaṄ* gets deleted (2.4.74 *yaṅo' ci ca*). Reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*, which also include replacement in *guṇa*, produce: *j*(*u*→*o*) + *hu* + (*yaṄ*→ϕ) → *jo* + *hu* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*) = *jo* + *hu* + *ti*. We can then get *īṬ* of 7.3.49 *yaṅo vā* to give us: *jo* + *hu* + *īṬ* + *ti*. We can get *johavīti*, through *guṇa* and subsequent replacement in *av*. Thus, *jo* + *h*(*u*→*o*→*av*) + *ī* + *ti* = *johavīti*. Since *īṬ* is optional, we will also get a form without it. Consider *johoti* derived with no *īṬ*, but with an application of *guṇa*.

Refer to the appendix (III:712-13) of 3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco kriyāsamabhihāre* . . . for derivational details of examples ending in *yaṄ*. Reduplication in these examples is accomplished by 6.1.9 *sani yaṅoḥ*. The final vowel of the *aṅga* is replaced with its long counterpart by 7.4.25 *akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ*. That is, after the *guṇa* application of 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*. The *Ṅ* of *yaṄ*, of course, ensures the introduction of middle (*ātmanepada*) endings (1.3.12 *anudāttaṅita ātmanepadam*).

7.4.83 दीर्घोऽकितः

dīrgho' kitaḥ
/*dīrghaḥ* 1/1 *akitaḥ* 6/1 = *kakāra it yasya* (*bv.*) = *kit*; *na kit* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya*/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *yaṅlukoḥ* #82)
akito' bhyāsasya dīrgho bhavati yaṅi yaṅluki ca
A long vowel comes in place of an *abhyāsa* not marked with *K* as an *it*, when affix *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

pāpacyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pac* ending in affix *yaṄ*'
pāpacīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pac* used with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*'
yāyajyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *yaj* ending in affix *yaṄ*'
yāyajīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *yaj* ending in affix *yaṄ*'

1. This rule allows a long replacement for the final short of an *abhyāsa*, not marked with *K* as an *i* (*akit*), provided *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows. Thus we get *pac* + *yaṄ* → *pa* + *pac* + *ya* → *pāpacya* + (*LAṬ*→*ta*) = *pāpacyate*, a form with no deletion of *yaṄ*. A deletion of *yaṄ* will produce *pa* + *pac* + *īṬ* + (*LAṬ*→*ti*) = *pāpacīti*. Here again, refer to derivational details under 2.4.74 *yaṅo' ci ca* (III:706-7) and 3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco* . . . (III:712-13).

2. Why do we need the condition of *akit* 'that which does not have *k* as an *it*'? Consider *yaṃyamyate / yaṃyamīti* and *raṃramyate / raṃramīti* which are derivates of *yam* and *ram* with *yaṄ* and its deletion by means of *LUK*, respectively. Note that augment *nUK* is introduced by 7.4.85 *nugato' nunāsikāntasya*, subsequent to reduplication and operations relative to *abhyāsa*. Given *ya* + *n* + *yam* + *ya* and *ra* + *n* + *ram* + *ya*, lengthening of the *abhyāsa* cannot be accomplished on the basis of condition of *akit*. Obviously, *nUK* is marked with *K* as an *it*. But why state the condition of *akit* 'no *k* as an *it*' to block lengthening? That is, when lengthening can be blocked by introducing *nUK* first, thereby making the *abhyāsa* ending in a non-vowel (*anajanta*). If this is accepted then *akitaḥ* indicates the application of (*Paribh*:67): *abhyāsavikāreṣv apavādā notsargān vidhīn bādhante* 'exceptions do not block their corresponding general rules in contexts of modifications of units termed *abhyāsa*'. Thus, lengthening applies first.

There are several consequences of accepting this interpretive provision:

(1) This rule does not block shortening in deriving *ḍoḍhaukyate*. Thus, given *ḍhauk* + *yaṄ*, we get *ḍhauk* + *ḍhauk* + *ya* → *ḍhau* + *ḍhauk* + *ya* → *ḍo* + *ḍhauk* + *ya*, through reduplication, *halādiśeṣa* and *jaśtva*: *ḍh*→*ḍ*. Shortening produces *ḍ*(*o*→*u*) + *ḍhauk* + *ya* which, after the application of 7.4.82 *guṇo yaṅlukoḥ*, produces *ḍ*(*u*→*o*) + *ḍhauk* + *ya*. We finally derive *ḍuḍhaukyate* by introducing *LAṬ* and performing related operations.

(2) Similar consequence is witnessed in deriving *acīkarat* from (*kṛ* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ* where *CLI* is replaced with *caṄ*. The *ṛ* of the *abhyāsa* is replaced with *a* (followed by *r*; *rapara*) after reduplication. Two rules, 7.4.79 *sany ataḥ* and 7.4.94 *dīrgho laghoḥ*, then become applicable. The *i*-replacement (*itva*) of the first rule is applied prior to application of lengthening. Refer to full derivational details of *acīkarat* under the appendix of 1.4.10 *hrasvaṃ laghu*.

(3) Refer to derivational details of *mīmāṃsate* (III:712) under the appendix of 3.1.6 *mānbadhadānānbhyo*. . . . Note here that, given *ma* + *mān* + *sa*, replacement in *i* applies prior to application of lengthening (*dīrgha*).

(4) We similarly get *ajīgaṇat* from (*gaṇ* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*. Note here that *ī*-replacement of 7.4.97 *ī ca gaṇaḥ* does not block 7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*. That is, it applies subsequently to that.

7.4.84 नीग्वञ्चुस्रंसुध्वंसुभ्रंसुकसपतपदस्कन्दाम्

nīg vañcusraṃsudhvaṃsubhraṃsukasapatapadaskandām
/nīg 1/1 *vañcu-sraṃsu-dhvaṃsu-bhraṃsu-kasa-pata-pada-skandām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *yaṅlukoḥ* #82)
'*vañcu, sraṃsu, dhvaṃsu, bhraṃsu, kasa, pata, pada, skanda' ity eteṣām abhyāsasya nīg āgamo bhavati yaṅi yaṅluki ca*
An augment, namely *nīK*, is introduced to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *vañcU* 'to move crookedly', *sraṃsU* 'to fall', *dhvaṃsU* 'to scatter', *bhraṃsU* 'to fall', *kasA* 'to move, go', *patA* 'to fall, move', *padA* 'to go' and *skandA* 'to leap, move' when affix *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

vanīvacyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *vañc* used with affix *yaṄ*'
vanīvañcīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *vañc* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
sanīsrasyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *srans* used with affix *yaṄ*'
sanīsraṃsīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *srans* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
danīdhvasyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *dhvans* used with affix *yaṄ*'
danīdhvaṃsīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *dhvans* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
banībhrasyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *bhrans* used with affix *yaṄ*'
banībhraṃsīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *bhrans* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
canīkasyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *kas* used with affix *yaṄ*'
canīkasīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *kas* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
panīpatyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pat* used with affix *yaṄ*'
panīpatīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pat* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
panīpadyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pad* used with affix *yaṄ*'
panīpadīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *pad* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'

canīskadyate 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *skand* used with affix *yaṄ*'
canīskandīti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *skand* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'

1. This rule introduces augment *nīK* to the *abhyāsa* of verbal roots *vañcU, sṛṃsU, dhvṃsU, bhraṃsU, kasA, patḶ, padA* and *skandIR* when affix *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows. Note that deletion of nasals (*anunāsika*) in all derivates is accomplished by 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hal upadhāyāḥ knīti*. That is, when *yaṄ* follows. In contexts where *yaṄ* is deleted by *LUK*, we do not get such nasal deletions. For, the condition of *knīti* 'marked with *k* and *Ṅ* as an *it*' cannot be met. Rule 1.1.62 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam* does not allow deleted *yaṄ* to still qualify the string to be treated as followed by an affix marked with *Ṅ* as an *it*.

7.4.85 नुगतोऽनुनासिकान्तस्य

nug ato' nunāsikāntasya
/nuk 1/1 *ataḥ* 5/1 *anunāsikāntasya* 6/1 = *anunāsiko'nte yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*/ (*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *yaṅlukoḥ* #82)
anunāsikāntasyāṅgasya yo' bhyāsas tasyākārāntasya nug āgamo bhavati
An augment, namely *nUK*, is introduced to the *a*-final *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* terminating in an *anunāsika*, provided when affix *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

tantamyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *tan* 'to faint' ending in affix *yaṄ*'
tantanīti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *tan* 'expand' used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
jaṅgamyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *gam* 'to go' ending in affix *yaṄ*'
jaṅgamīti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *gam* 'to go' used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
yaṃyamyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *yam* 'to restrain' ending in affix *yaṄ*'
yaṃyamīti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *yam* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
raṃramyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *ram* 'to sport' ending in affix *yaṄ*'
raṃramīti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *ram* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'

1. This rule introduces augment *nUK* to the *a*-final *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* when *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows. Verbal roots *tan* and *gam* would qualify as an *aṅga* ending in a nasal. We get *ta* + *tan* and *ga* + *gam* after reduplication and operations relative to their *abhyāsa*. The *abhyāsa* forms then receive augment *nUK*. Recall that *yaṃyamyate* and *yaṃyamīti*, etc., have their nasals replaced with an *anusvāra*. Commentators state that *nUK* points toward its replacement as any *sthānī* (item to be replaced), generally does (*Kāś*: *sthāninā hy ādeśo lakṣyate*). Augment *nUK* is thus introduced as an *anusvāra*. Not accepting this would create problems in replacing *n* of *nUK* with an *anusvāra* in *yaṃyamyate* and *yaṃyamīti*. For, rule 8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali* replaces a non-*pada*-final *m* and *n* with *anusvāra*, only when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* (non-nasal consonants) follows. The *anusvāra* can then be replaced with *n* via provision of a single replacement similar to what follows in a sequence (*parasavarṇa*; 8.4.58 *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ*).

2. The *Mahābhāṣya* adds that this *anusvāra* is also treated as if coming at the end of a *pada* (*padāntavad*; *padāntavac ceti ca vaktavyam*). This enables rule 8.4.59 *vā padāntasya* to apply for optional single replacement similar to the following sound (*parasavarṇa*). That is, the obligatory *parasavarṇa* of 8.4.58 *anusvārasya* . . . is made optional. This *parasavarṇa* is not found in *raṃramyate* and *raṃramīti* because the context does not meet the condition of homogeneity on account of *r*.

3. Why must the *abhyāsa* end in *a*? Consider *tetimyate* where, given *ti* + *tim* + *yaṄ*, *nUK* is not introduced on account of the *abhyāsa* not ending in *a*. Why do we have the specification of *a* made with a following *t* (*taparakaraṇa*)? So that *nUK* could not be introduced to an *abhyāsa* which previously ended in a long (*ā*), but subsequently had its *ā* replaced with a corresponding short (*hrasva*; 7.4.59 *hrasvaḥ*; *Kāś*: *taparakaraṇaṃ tu bhūtapūrvasyāpi dīrghasya nivṛtyartham*). Consider *bābhāmyate* which derives from *bhām* + *yaṄ* → *bhā* + *bhām* + *ya* where *ā* of *bhā* is replaced with *a*. The *abhyāsa* is thus not allowed augment *nUK*. Its *a*, again, is replaced with *ā* to yield *bābhāmyate*, via application of 7.4.83 *dīrgho' kitaḥ*.

Why do we have the condition of an *aṅga* ending in a nasal? Consider *pāpacyate* where, since *pac* does not end in a nasal, we do not get *nUK*.

7.4.86 जपजभदहदशभञ्जपशां च

japajabhadahadaśabhañjapaśāṃ ca
/japa-jabha-daha-daśa-bhañja-paśām 6/1 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *yaṅlukoḥ* #82 *nuk* #84)
'*japa, jabha, daha, daśa, bhañja, paśa*' *ity eteṣām abhyāsasya nug āgamo bhavati yaṅyaṅlukoḥ parataḥ*
An augment, namely *nUK*, is introduced to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *japA* 'to mutter', *jabhA* 'to yawn', *dahA* 'to burn',

daśA 'to bite', *bhañjA* 'to break' and *paśA* 'to fasten, bind', when affix *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

jañjapyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *jap* 'to mutter, chant' ending in affix *yaṄ*'
jañjapīti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *jap* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
jañjabhyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *jabh* 'to bite, yawn' ending in affix *yaṄ*'
jañjabhīti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *jabh* 'to bite, yawn' used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
dandahyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *dah* 'to burn' ending in affix *yaṄ*'
dandahīti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *dah* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
dandaśyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *daś* 'to bite' ending in affix *yaṄ*'
dandaśīti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *daś* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
bambhajyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *bhañj* 'to break' ending in affix *yaṄ*'
bambhañjīti 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *bhañj* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
pampaśyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *paś* ending in affix *yaṄ*'
pampaśītī 'ibidem; with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*'

1. This rule introduces augment *nUK* to the *abhyāsa* of verbal roots *japA* 'mutter, chant', *jabhA* 'to bite, yawn', *dahA* 'to burn', *daśA* 'to bite', *bhañjA* 'to break' and *paśA* 'a root only used in the *sūtras*' when *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows. This introduction of *nUK* was not available from the earlier rule. It has been made available here. Notice how a specification of *daśA* is made here without its nasal *m*. This specification without *m* of *damś* simply indicates that the nasal, i.e., *m*, gets deleted when *yaṄ* follows. This nasal deletion also applies when *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ* applies (*Kāś*: *danśir ayaṃ nakāralopārtham eva nirdiṣṭaḥ. tena yaṅluky api nakāralopo bhavati*). Recall that deletion of the root nasal is accomplished (6.4.24 *aniditāṃ . . .*) when *yaṄ* follows. Refer to derivational details of *jañjapyate*, etc., under the appendix of 3.1.24 *lupasadacarajapa. . . .* Recall here that 3.1.24 introduces *yaṄ* only when *bhāvagarhā* 'contempt for action' is denoted. The first four roots of our specification can receive *yaṄ* from 3.1.24 *lupasadacarajapa. . . .* That is, when censure of their denoted action is expressed. Verbal roots *bhañjA* and *paśA* can receive *yaṄ* under the meaning conditions of *paunaḥpunya* 'doing

something over and over again' or *atiśaya* 'intense action' (3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco . . .*).

2. Commentators inform that *paśA* is a root available only in the *Sūtrapāṭha* (*Kāś. paśa iti sautro dhātuḥ*).

7.4.87 चरफलोश्च

caraphaloś ca
/cara-phaloḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *yaṅlukoḥ* #82 *nuk* #84)
'*cara, phala*' *ity etayor abhyāsasya nug āgamo bhavati yaṅyaṅlukoḥ parataḥ*
Augment *nUK* is introduced also to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *carA* and *phalA* when affix *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

cañcūryate 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *carA* 'to consume' used with *yaṄ*'
cañcūrīti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *carA* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
pamphulyate 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *phalA* 'to bear fruit, burst' used with affix *yaṄ*'
pamphulīti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *phalA* used with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*'

1. This rule introduces *nUK* to the *abhyāsa* of verbal roots *car* 'to move, wander' and *phal* 'to bear fruit' when affix *yaṄ* or its deletion by means of *LUK* follows. Refer to derivational details of *cañcūryate* under the appendix (III:713-14) of 3.1.24 *lupasadacarajapa. . . .* Follow similar rule applications for deriving *pamphulyate*. We can derive *cañcurti* with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ* and introduction of augment *iṬ* (7.3.94 *yaṅo vā*). Note that there is no long replacement (*dīrgha*) for the short of *cu* (8.2.77 *hali ca*), since no consonant follows.

7.4.88 उत्परस्यातः

ut parasyātaḥ
/ut 1/1 *parasya* 6/1 *ataḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *yaṅlukoḥ* #82 *caraphaloḥ* #87)
caraphalor abhyāsāt parasyāta ukārādeśo bhavati yaṅlukoḥ parataḥ
An *a* which occurs after the *abhyāsa* of verbal roots *carA* and *phalA* is replaced with *u* (*uT*) when affix *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

cañcūryate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *carA* used with affix *yaṄ*'

cañcūrīti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *carA* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'
pamphulyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *phalA* used with affix *yaṄ*'
pamphulīti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verabl root *phalA* used with *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ*'

1. This rule introduces *u* in place of an *a* which occurs after the *abhyāsa* of verbal roots *carA* and *phalA*. Of course, when *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows. Thus, we get *ca* + *car* + *ya* → *ca* + *c*(*a*→*u*)*r* + *ya*, where short *u* (*utva*) replaces the *a* which occurs after *ca* termed *abhyāsa*.

2. Why do we require *a* to follow the *abhyāsa*? So that this replacement does not apply to the *abhyāsa* itself. Why state *ataḥ* 'in place of the *a*'? So that *u* does not replace the final sound segment (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) of the *abhyasta* (6.1.5 *ubhe abhyastam*).

3. Note that *t* is made to follow the specification of short *u* (*taparakaraṇa*) so that a *guṇa*-replacement of the penultimate (*laghūpadha*; 7.3.86 *puganta* . . .) can be blocked. Consider *cañcūrti* where the penultimate (*upadhā*) *u* is replaced with its long counterpart, under the provision of 8.2.77 *hali ca*. This long replacement, however, is considered *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of the application of *guṇa* of 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*. The replacement in long still applies. The short indicated by *u* (*ut*) thus cannot be canceled because of suspension (*asiddhatva*) of *dīrgha* 'long'. Similar applicational problem is witnessed in deriving *paṃphulīti*. Why is *taparakaraṇa* of *ut* not able to block long replacement 8.2.77 *hali ca* as it is able to block *guṇa* of *u*?

7.4.89 ति च

ti ca
/*ti* 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *yaṅlukoḥ* #82 *caraphaloḥ* #87 *ut ataḥ* #88)
takārādau pratyaye parataś caraphalor akārasya ukārādeśo bhavati
An *uT* comes in place, also, of the *a* of an *aṅga* constituted by *carA* and *phalA* when an affix beginning with *t* follows.

EXAMPLES:

caraṇaṃ cūrttiḥ 'quarter of a hymn'
brahmaṇaś cūrttiḥ 'quarter of a hymn'
praphultiḥ 'blossoming'
praphultāḥ sumanasaḥ 'flowers are blossomed'

1. The *ti* of this rule makes clear that *yaṅlukoḥ* and *abhyāsasya* should not be carried over here. For, contexts with *yaṄ* and *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ* can be covered by the earlier rule. The long in place of the short of *cur* in *cūrttiḥ* is

gotten from 8.2.77 *hali ca*. The reduplication of *t* is gotten from 8.4.46 *aco rahābhyāṃ dve*. Note that *praphultāḥ* is the nominative plural feminine of *praphul* + *Kta*. Of course, *cūrtti* is a derivate of affix *KtiN* introduced with the signification of feminine (3.3.94 *striyāṃ ktin*).

7.4.90 रीगृदुपधस्य च

rīg ṛdupadhasya ca
/rīk 1/1 *ṛd-upadhasya* 6/1 = *ṛd upadhā yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *yaṅlukoḥ* #82)
ṛdupadhāṅgasya yo' bhyāsas tasya rīg āgamo bhavati yaṅyyaṅlukoḥ parataḥ
Augment *rīK* is introduced to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* which contains *ī* in its penultimate position (*upadhā*), provided when affix *yaṄ*, or its deletion by *LUK*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

varīvṛtyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *vṛt* 'to turn' used with *rīK*'
varīvṛtīti 'ibidem; with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*'
varīvṛdhyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *vṛdh* 'to grow' used with *rīK*'
varīvṛdhīti 'ibidem; with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*'
narīnṛtyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *nṛt* 'to dance' used with *rīK*'
narīnṛtīti 'ibidem; with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*'

1. This rule introduces augment *rīK* to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* which has a short *ṛ* (*ṛt*) in its penultimate position. Of course, when *yaṄ*, or *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*, follows. Thus, *vṛ* + *vṛdh* + *ya* → *va* + *vṛdh* + *ya* → (*va* + *rīK*) + *vṛdh* + *ya*. The *dh* of *vṛdh* is doubled up (8.4.47 *anaci ca*) and the first *dh* is replaced with *d* (8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). Recall that *varīvṛtīti* and *varīvṛdhīti* are derivates with *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ*.

2. A proposal is made to specify *ṛt* as *ṛtvataḥ* to get the sense of *rīk ṛtvataḥ* 'augment *rīK* is introduced to that (a root) which has *ṛ* is its penultimate position'. This will enable us to get *rīK* in *varīvṛścyate / varīvṛścīti* and *parīpṛcchyate / parīpṛcchīti*, etc. Note that the roots in these derivates are *vraśc* 'to cut' and *pracch* 'to ask'. They do not have *ṛ* in their next to the last position. They, however, yield *va* + *vṛśc* and *pa* + *pṛcch*, through reduplication and *samprasāraṇa*. This rule then introduces *rīK*. That is, *rīK* can be introduced also where the roots may not have *ṛ* to start with.

7.4.91 रुग्रिकौ च लुकि

rugrikau ca luki

/ruk-rikau 1/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tau*; *ca* ϕ *luki* 7/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *rīk ṛdupadhasya* #90)
yaṅluki ṛdupadhasyāṅgasya yo' bhyāsas tasya rugrikāv āgamau bhavataś cakārād rīk ca
Augments *rUK*, *riK*, and *rīK* as well, are introduced to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* which has *ṛ* in its penultimate position (*upadhā*), when *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

narnarti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *nṛt* with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *rUK*'
narinarti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *nṛt* with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *riK*'
narīnarti '. . . with *rīK*'
varvarti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vṛt* with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *rUK*'
varivarti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vṛt* with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *riK*'
varīvarti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vṛt* with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *rīK*'

1. This rule introduces augments *rUK*, *riK* and *rīK* to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* where *LUK*-deletion of *yaṄ* is accomplished. Thus, we get *narnarti*, *narinarti* and *narīnarti*, respectively. Similarly, we get *varvarti*, *varivarti* and *varīvarti*. The *u* of *rU* is for ease of articulation (*uccāraṇārtha*). A specification by *luki* 'when *LUK*-deletion . . .' makes clear that these augments are not introduced when *yaṄ* does not go through *LUK*-deletion.

2. A *vārttika* proposal is made so that *marmṛjyate* and *marmṛjyamānāsaḥ* could be derived via *nipātana*. An introduction of *rUK*, in these examples, could not be possible because *yaṄ* follows. This *vārttika* proposal makes it possible, via *nipātana*. Incidentally, *marmṛjyamānāsaḥ* is a nominative plural form ending in *Jas*. Augment *asUK* is introduced, in the Vedic, when the nominative plural ending *Jas* follows.

7.4.92 ऋतश्च

ṛtaś ca
/ṛtaḥ 6/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *rīk* #90 *rugrikau luki* #91)
ṛkārāntasyāṅgasya yo' bhyāsas tasya rugrikāv āgamau bhavataś cakārād rīk ca
Augments *rUK* and *riK*, and *rīK* as well, are introduced to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* which ends in *ṛ*, when *LUK*-deletion of affix *yaṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

carkarti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *ḌUkṛÑ* 'to do' with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *rUK*'
carikarti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *ḌUkṛÑ* with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *riK*'
carīkarti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *ḌUkṛÑ* with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *rīK*'
jarḥarti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *hṛÑ* 'to fetch, carry' with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *rUK*'
jariharti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *hṛÑ* with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *rUK*'
jarīharti 'third person singular *LAṬ*-derivate of *hṛÑ* with deletion of *yaṄ* and augment *rīK*'

1. This rule allows introduction of augments *rUK*, *riK* and *rīK* to the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* where deletion of *yaṄ* has taken place. Thus, we get derivates of *ḌUkṛÑ* and *hṛÑ*, for example, *carkarti* and *jarharti*, etc. Note that we get *k*→*c* (*cutva*) in *kṛ* + *yaṄ* and *h*→*jh*→*j* (*jaśtva*) in *hṛ* + *yaṄ*, after *yaṄ*-deletion, doubling (*dvitva*) and operations relative to *abhyāsa*. Our strings *carīkṛ* + *ti* and *jarīhṛ* + *ti* also go through replacement in *guṇa*, followed by *r* (*tapara*).

2. Why do we have the condition of *taparakaraṇa* '*t* used at the end of a sound specification' (in *ṛt*; 1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*)? This question arises since an *abhyāsa* generally ends in a short vowel. Why then specify short *ṛ* with *taparakaraṇa*? This *taparakaraṇa* blocks augments (*āgama-nivṛtti*) in roots such as *kṝ* 'to scatter'. We thus get *kṝ* + *kṝ* + *ti* → *kar* + *kṝ* + *ti* = *ka* + *kṝ* + *ti*, through reduplication, *a*-replacement followed by *r* (*atva-raparatva*) and *halādiśeṣa* 'retention of the initial consonant'. A long replacement by 7.4.83 *dīrgho' kitaḥ*, plus replacement in *guṇa*, followed by *r* of *kṝ*, then applies to produce *c*(*a*→*ā*) + *k*(*ṝ*→*ar*) + *ti* = *cākarti*. Other forms of *kṛ*, namely *carikarti* and *carīkarti*, follow similar patterns. Derivates of *hṛ*, used with *LAṬ*→*tiP*, are similarly derived from *jar* + *hṛ* + *LAṬ* with augments *rUK*, *riK* and *rīK*.

3. Note that *aṅgasya* and *abhyāsasya* are both carried over to this rule (*ṛtaś ca*). The word *ṛtaḥ* could thus be considered a qualifier to both *aṅgasya* and *abhyāsasya*. But since *taparakaraṇa* is used here for canceling long *ṛ*, and also since a short *ṛ* will thus be automatically available, *taparakaraṇa* does not serve any purpose. Consequently, *ṛtaḥ* is considered a qualifier only to *aṅgasya*. That is, *ṛkārāntasyāṅgasya yo' bhyāsaḥ* . . . 'the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* which ends in a (short) *ṛ*'.

4. A *Mahābhāṣya* verse finds this usage of augments *rUK*, etc., challenging:

kirati carkarītāntaṃ pacatīty atra yo nayet/
prāptijñaḥ tam ahaṃ manye prārabdhas tena saṃgrahaḥ//
'he who is capable of leading *kirati* 'third singular present indicative active of *kṝ*' to *carkarīta*, i.e., *cākartti* intensive with deletion of *yaṄ*, via

LUK, similarly to *pacati*, etc., I consider him the knower of applicational scope (*prāpti*) of augments *rUK*, *rIK* and *rĪK*'

The word *kirati* is used in the specification as an *upalakṣaṇa* 'that which not only makes itself understood, but also others (*svabodhakatve sati svetarabodhakaḥ*)'. Verbal root *kṝ* not only represents a root ending in *ṝ* but also represents roots such as *gṝ giraṇe* 'to call out, invoke', etc.

7.4.93 सन्वल्लघुनि चङ्परेऽनग्लोपे

sanval laghuni caṅpare' naglope
/ sanvat ϕ laghuni 7/1 *caṅpare* 7/1 = *caṅparo yasmāt* (*bv.*), *tasmin*; *anaglope* 7/1 = *ako lopaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *nāsti aglopo yasmin* (*bv.*), *tasmin/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58)
laghuni dhātvakṣare parato yo' bhyāsas tasya caṅpare au paratah sanīva kāryaṃ bhavati anaglope
Operations similar to forms ending in affix *saN* apply to an *abhyāsa* which, in an *aṅga*, occurs before a root-vowel termed *laghu* 'light, short' (1.4.10 *hrasvaṃ laghu*), when affix *ṆiC*, followed by *CaṄ*, follows and the *aṅga* incurs no *LOPA*-deletion of a sound denoted by *aK*.

EXAMPLES:

acīkarat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *kṛ* + *ṆiC*'
apīpacat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *pac* + *ṆiC*'
apīpavat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *pū* + *ṆiC*'
alīlavat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *lū* + *ṆiC*'
ajījavat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *jū* + *ṆiC*'
asisravat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *sru* + *ṆiC*'
asusravat 'ibidem'
aśiśravat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *śru* + *ṆiC*'
aśuśravat 'ibidem'
adidravat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *dru* + *ṆiC*'
adudravat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *dru* + *ṆiC*'
apipravat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *pru* + *ṆiC*'
apupravat 'ibidem'
apiplavat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *plu* + *ṆiC*'
apuplavat 'ibidem'
acicyavat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*→*tiP*-derivate of *cyu* + *ṆiC*'
acucyavat 'ibidem'

1. This is an extension (*atideśa*) rule. It extends operations to an *abhyāsa*, occurring before a light (*laghu*) root-syllable, similar to when affix *saN* follows (*sanvat*) *ṆiC*, followed by *CaṄ*. We thus must have (*i*) an *aṅga* with *ṆiC* followed by *CaṄ*, provided the *aṅga* must not have gone through deletion of a sound denoted by *aK* and (*ii*) the *abhyāsa* of a root must be followed by a

vowel termed *laghu* (1.4.9 *hrasvaṃ laghu*). Now consider rules 7.4.79 *sany atah*, 7.4.80 *oḥ puyaṇjy apare* and 7.4.81 *sravatiśṛṇotidravati*. . . . Our first rule offers a replacement in *i* (*itva*) to the final sound of an *abhyāsa* which ends in *a*. This, of course, when *saṄ* follows. A string such as (*kṛ* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ* which, subsequent upon a replacement in *tiP* for *LUṄ*, and subsequent introduction of (*CLI*→*CaṄ*) and augment *aṬ*, yields *kāri* + *CaṄ* + *ti* → *k*(*ṛ*→*ār*) *i* + (*LUṄ*→*tiP*) → *kār* + *i* + (*CLI*→*CAṄ*) + *ti* → *aṬ* + *kār* (*i*→ϕ) + *a* + *t*(*i*→ϕ) → *a* + (*kā*→*a*) *r* + *a* + *t* = *a* + *kar* + *a* + *t*. An application of reduplication, *halādiśeṣa* 'retention of initial consonant' (*kar*→*ka*), deletion of *ṆiC* and *cutva* ((*k*→*c*) *a*) will produce *a* + *ca* + *kar* + *a* + *t*. Our present rule will then replace the final *a* of *ca* with *i* which, in turn, will be replaced with its long counterpart to produce: *a* + *c*(*a*→*i*→*ī*) + *kar* + *a* + *t* = *acīkarat*. Refer to derivational details of *acīkarat* and *ajīharat* under the appendix of rule 1.4.9 *hrasvaṃ laghu*.

Other examples can be similarly derived. Consider *apīpavat*, *alīlavat* and *ajījavat* which also involve replacement in *i* (*itva*) of an *abhyāsa* which ends in *u* (7.4.80 *oḥ puyaṇjy apare*). Our present rule allows this *itva* to the final *u* of the *abhyāsa* which occurs before a consonant of the *p*-series (*pavarga*), *yaṆ*, or *j* followed by *a*. That is, also when *CaṄ* follows. Remember that 7.4.80 *oḥ puyaṇjy apare* allows *itva* when *saṄ* follows. Rule 7.4.81 *sravatiśṛṇotidravati* . . . allows *itva* to *u* under similar conditions. Our present rule extends *itva*, via *sanvadbhāva* 'operations similar to when *saṄ* follows', also when *CaṄ* follows. Thus, we get *asisravat* (from (*sru* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*), *aśiśravat* (from (*śru* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*), *adidravat* (from (*dru* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*), *apipravat* (from (*pru* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*), *apiplavat* (from (*plu* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*) and *acicyavat* (from (*cyu* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*), respectively. Since this *sanvadbhāva* 'treatment as if when *saṄ* follows' is optional, we will also get forms where the option of *itva* is not accepted. Thus, we get *asusravat*, *aśuśravat*, *adudravat*, *apupravat*, *apuplavat*, and *acucyavat*, respectively.

2. Why state the condition of *laghuni* 'when a (syllable with a vowel termed) *laghu* follows'? Consider *atatakṣat* and *ararakṣat* where the vowel before the conjunct is termed *guru* (1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*) and hence, *sanvadbhāva* is blocked. This leads to an absence of *i*-replacement (*itva*) of the *abhyāsa*. This same is also true of *ajajāgarat*, a derivate of (*jāgṛ* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*)). Refer to derivational details under 1.4.10 *hrasvaṃ laghu* (II:507-9) and 6.1.11 *caṅi*.

3. Why do we have the condition of *caṅpare* 'when *CaṄ* follows'? So that this *sanvadbhāva* can be blocked in *ahaṃ papaca* 'I cooked'. This is a counter-example with no optional treatment as *ṆiC* of 7.1.91 *ṇal uttamo vā*. Besides, we do not get *CaṄ* in a derivate of *LIṬ*.

Why do we have to have the condition of a following *Ṇi* when *CaṄ* follows? So that *sanvadbhāva* does not apply when *CaṄ* alone follows. Consider *acīkamata*, a third singular middle derivate of *kamU* 'to glow' in *LUṄ* where *sanvadbhāva* is blocked because *ṆiC* is not followed by *CaṄ*.

4. Why do we have the condition of *anaglope* 'when no deletion of a sound

denoted by *aK*'? Consider *acakathat* where we find *Ṇi* followed by *CaṄ*. Note that the root ends in *a*. This *a* is deleted after *ṆiC* is introduced. The root thus becomes *aglopin* 'that which has lost its *aK* to deletion'. A similar deletion of *a* is found in (*dṛṣ* + *ṆiC*) + (*LUṄ* → *tiP*)) = *adadṛṣat*, where *sanvadbhāva* is also blocked. The *ṆiC* is here introduced by *tat karoti tad ācaṣṭe* (*gaṇasūtra*) and the *ṭi*-deletion is accomplished, via *vt*: *ṇāv iṣṭhavat prātipadikasya* (6.4.155 *ṭeḥ*).

Why, in *avīvadat* = *vāditavantaṃ prayojitavān* 'encouraged him while encourged to debate', where there are two *ṆiC* affixes the first of which is deleted, deletion of *aK* is not accepted as taken effect. The *ṇau* of our present rule denotes *ṆiC* as a class (*jāti*). Consequently, deletion (*aglopa*) has to be a deletion other than one of *ṆiC*. This deletion thus qualifies as non-*aK* deletion. We, therefore, get *sanvadbhāva* and replacement in *i* (*itva*) to apply.

7.4.94 दीर्घो लघोः

dīrgho laghoḥ
/dīrghaḥ 1/1 *laghoḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *laghuni caṅpare anaglope* #93)
dīrgho bhavati laghor abhyāsasya laghuni ṇau caṅpare' naglope
A long vowel comes in place of the *laghu* vowel of an *abhyāsa*, when followed by a *laghu* vowel of the root, provided affix *ṆiC*, used before *CaṄ*, follows the *aṅga*, and no *LOPA*-deletion of an *aK* of the *aṅga* has taken effect.

EXAMPLES:

acīkarat
ajīharat
alīlavat
apīpacat

1. Consider *acīkarat* which derives from (*kṛ* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*, via *LUṄ*→*tiP*, *CLI*→*CaṄ*, reduplication, operations relative to the *abhyāsa* and *sanvadbhāva* 'treatment as if affix *saN* follows'. Our present rule applies on *a* + *ci* + *kar* + *a* + *t* where the short *i* of *ci*, an *abhyāsa*, is replaced with its long counterpart to produce *acīkarat*. One can similarly derive *ajīharat*, *alīlavat* and *apīpavat* from (*hṛ* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*, (*lū* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*), and (*pū* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*, respectively. Refer also to examples of the preceding rule.

2. Why is this condition of long in place of a *laghu* 'light, short'? Consider *abibhrajat*, a derivarte of *bhrāj* 'to glow, shine', which derives from (*bhrāj* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*. The *i* of *bi* before the conjunct *bhr* no longer remains a *laghu* (1.4.10 *hrasvaṃ laghu*). It is termed *guru* 'heavy' (1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*), instead. The long replacement of this rule is thus blocked.

Why do we have the condition of 'a following *laghu* of the root'? Consider

atatakṣat and *ararakṣat*, the two active *LUṄ*-derivates of *takṣ* 'to fashion' and *rakṣ* 'to protect' where we do not find a following *laghu*. That is, *a* before *kṣ*, a conjunct, cannot be accepted as a *laghu*.

The condition of *caṅpare* 'when *CaṄ* follows' and *anaglope* 'when no deletion of *aK*' are also important. Refer to my notes of earlier rules for counter-examples such as *ahaṃ papaca*, *acakamata* and *acakathat*.

7.4.95 अत् स्मृदृत्वरप्रथम्रदस्तॄस्पशाम्

at smṛdṛtvaraprathamradastṝspaśām
/at 1/1 *smṛ-dṛ-tvara-pratha-mrada-stṝ-spaśām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *caṅpare* #93)
'*smṛ, dṛ, tvara, pratha, mrada, stṝ-spaśa*' *ity eteṣām abhyāsasya* '*at*' *ity ayam ādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *aT* comes in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal roots *smṛ* 'to think, remember', *dṛ* 'to fear', *tvarA* 'to hasten', *prathA* 'to spread', *mradA* 'to be gracious', *stṝ* 'to strew, cover' and *spaśA* 'to tie, touch' when affix *ṆiC*, followd by *CaṄ*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

asmarat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *smṛ*'
adadarat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *dṛ*'
atatvarat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *tvar*'
apaprathat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *prathA*'
amamradat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *mrad*'
atastarat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *stṝ*'
apaspaśat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of *spaś*

1. This rule allows *aT* as a replacement for the *abhyāsa* of verbal roots *smṛ* 'to remember', etc. This *aT* is offered against *i*-replacement (*itva*) of 7.4.79 *sany ataḥ*, in view of rule 7.4.93 *sanvallaghuni*. . . . The *taparakaraṇa* 'making a *t* to follow' specification of *aT* also blocks long replacement of 7.4.94 *dīrgho laghoḥ*.

7.4.96 विभाषा वेष्टिचेष्ट्योः

vibhāṣā veṣṭiceṣṭyoḥ
/vibhāṣā 1/1 *veṣṭi-ceṣṭyoḥ* 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *caṅpare* #93 *at* #95)
'*veṣṭi, ceṣṭi*' *ity etayor abhyāsasya vibhāṣā* '*at*' *ity ayam ādeśo caṅpare ṇau parataḥ*
An *aT* comes, only optionally, in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted *veṣṭ* 'to wrap' and *ceṣṭ* 'to strive, stir' when a *ṆiC*, followed by *CaṄ*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

avaveṣṭat 'third person singular active optional *LUṄ*-derivate of *veṣṭ* used with affix *ṆiC*'
aviveṣṭat 'third person singular active optional *LUṄ*-derivate of *veṣṭ* used with affix *ṆiC*'
acaceṣṭat 'third person singular active optional *LUṄ*-derivate of *ceṣṭ* used with affix *ṆiC*'
aciceṣṭat 'third person singular active optional *LUṄ*-derivate of *ceṣṭ* used with affix *ṆiC*'

1. Note that these roots, i.e., (*veṣṭ* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*) and (*ceṣṭ* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*, do not get a *laghu* vowel to follow after their *abhyāsa*. Consequently, replacement in *i* (*itva*), via *sanvadbhāva* 'treatment as if *saN* follows', is not available to them. The *e* of their *abhyāsa* is replaced with *i* by 7.4.59 *hrasvaḥ*. That is, when the option of *aT*, which is offered here, is not accepted.

7.4.97 **ई च गणः**

ī ca gaṇaḥ
/*ī* 1/1 (deleted) *ca* ϕ *gaṇaḥ* 6/1/
(*aṅgasya* #6.4.1 *abhyāsasya* #58 *caṅpare* #93 *at* #95)
gaṇer abhyāsasya īkārādeśo bhavati caṅpare ṇau parataḥ cakārād ac ca
An *ī*, and *aT* as well at the strength of *ca* 'and', comes in place of the *abhyāsa* of an *aṅga* constituted by verbal root *gaṇ* 'to count' when affix *ṆiC*, followed by *CaṄ*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

ajīgaṇat 'third person singular active *LUṄ*-derivate of causal *gaṇi*'
ajagaṇat 'ibidem (with *aT*)'

1. This rule offers *ī* as an optional replacement to the *abhyāsa* of *gaṇi* 'causal root' under conditions similar to the earlier rule. This *ī* is made optional against *aT*, at the strength of the use of *ca* 'and'. This replacement will be introduced in place of the last sound segment of the *abhyāsa* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*). This root cannot avail *sanvadbhāva* 'treatment as a form ending in affix *saN*' and *itva* 'replacement in *i*' because it ends in *a*. This *a* is deleted by 6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ* and thus qualifies the *aṅga* to be *aglopin* 'that which contains a deletion by *LOPA*'. We will get two forms: one with *aT* and the other with *ī*, i.e., *ajagaṇat* and *ajīgaṇat*, respectively. We will similarly get two forms in the middle (*ātmanepada*): *ajīgaṇata* and *ajagaṇata*.

Adhyāya Eight

Pāda One

8.1.1 सर्वस्य द्वे

sarvasya dve
/ sarvasya 6/1 *dve* 1/1/
adhikāro' yam. ita uttaraṃ yad vakṣyāmaḥ 'padasya' ity ataḥ prāk 'sarvasya dve' bhavataḥ' ity evaṃ veditavyam
Two occur in place of one whole form . . .

Examples:

pacati pacati 'cooks and cooks'
grāmo grāmo ramaṇīyaḥ 'each and every village is beautiful'

1. This is a governing heading (*adhikāra*) and, hence, it is carried over all rules enumerated prior to 8.1.16 *padasya*. This section of rules will allow a single form to be iterated. For example, consider 8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ* which allows a single form to be obligatorily replaced with two, when *nityatā* 'permanence' and *vīpsā* 'repetition, over and over again, pervasion' is signified. A question is raised as to what exactly is replaced with two. *Kāśikā* answers it *ye śabdataś cārthataś cobhayathāntaratame* 'those two which, in view of form and meaning both, are most similar'. Thus, a single word *pacati* when replaced with two becomes *pacati pacati*. Similarly, *grāmo grāmo ramaṇīyaḥ* 'each and every village is beautiful'.

2. Note that this rule does not specify any predicate (*vidheya*). It also does not specify any operand (*kāryin*). Since this rule is formulated such that it expects subsequent specifications of its predicate and operand, and also since it is marked with the *svarita* accent, it is an *adhikāra*. The meaning of this rule should be determined based on what one understands by the use of the words *sarvasya* 'in place of all, of the whole' and *dve* 'two'. That is, meaning of a form alone should be considered. Note that to accept the form alone could be appropriate, especially in consonance with 1.1.68 *svaṃ rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā* 'only the form of a word . . .'. However, this view will create difficulty in connection with the application of rules 6.1.99 *nāmreditasyāntasya tu vā* and 6.1.100 *nityam āmredite ḍāci*. For, these rules accept the existence of *at*, gotten through iteration, and offer operational provisions. If the form of these two rules alone was considered, it will be impossible to get *at*. Consequently, 'meaning' (*artha*) must be accepted as the basis for interpreting operational provisions of 8.1.1 *sarvasya dve*.

Note that *sarva* 'all, entire' is used with meanings of (*i*) entirety of sub-

stance (*dravyakārtsnya*), (*ii*) entirety of kind (*prakārakārtsnya*) and (*iii*) entirety of parts (*avayavakārtsnya*). Consider the following sentences which illustrate these three meanings:

(*a*) *sarvasvaṃ dadāti* 'gives all he owns'
(*b*) *sarvānnīno bhikṣuḥ* 'this beggar eats all kinds of food'
(*c*) *sarvaḥ paṭo dagdhaḥ* 'this dress is all burned'

The third meaning of *avayavakārtsnya* 'entirety of parts (of a whole)' is accepted in connection with *sarva* of 8.1.1 *sarvasya dve*. Recall that as, by bringing special meaning words such as *pari*, etc., close to the context of *sarvasya dve*, we do not get any part, for example of *paṭaḥ* in *sarvaḥ paṭaḥ dagdhaḥ* excluded (from burning), the *dve* of *sarvasya dve*, in interpreting *sarva* as denoting *avayavakārtsnya*, cannot exclude any part of what is to be replaced.

2. The operational provision of this rule, especially in view of the number word *dve* 'two' and the genitive of *sarvasya* '(in place) of entire', is interpreted in two ways:

(*i*) two words come in place of one (*sthāne dvirvacanam*) and
(*ii*) a single word is used twice by way of repetition (*dviḥprayogo dvirvacanam*).

The first view will interpret *sarvasya*, especially since this proposal is made in the context of instruction about words (*śabdānuśāsana*), as referring to the form of words (*śabda*). Since *dvi* is a number word, and especially since numbers (*saṃkhyā*) up to ten refer to what is to be numbered (*saṃkhyeya*), it will refer to the form of word (*saṃkhyeyaṃ śabdarūpaṃ*) or its repetition (*āvṛtti*). This *dve* can be interpreted as neuter or feminine. If it is interpreted as neuter it will refer to the number of the word-form (*saṃkhyeya*). If interpreted as feminine, it will refer to repetition (*āvṛtti*), twofold articulation of the word. The genitive of *sarvasya*, in view of replacing one word-form with two, will be interpreted as *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive denoting in place of'. Recall that *āvṛtti* 'repetition' is an action (*kriyā*) of which word will serve as a means (*sādhana*). A substituendum-substitute relationship (*sthānyādeśabhāva*) cannot obtain between an action (*kriyā*) and its means (*sādhana*). For if it does, the action, when replaced by the substitute, will be displaced. That is, the action of articulating the word will disappear. Thus, the genitive of *sarvasya* cannot be interpreted as denoting 'in place of', in accord with the repetition view (*āvṛttipakṣa*). It must be interpreted as the genitive marked with usage in conjunction with a *kṛt* affix (*kṛdyogalakṣaṇā ṣaṣṭhī*). The entire word (*śabda*), in this view, will become the subject of action of repetition (*Nyāsa*: *sarvo hi śabda āvartyamāna evāvṛttikriyāyāḥ kartā bhavati*). *Kāśikā*, in its paraphrase (*vṛtti*), states *sarvasya sthāne dve bhavataḥ* 'two come in place of a single whole'. This is done by accepting the first view, i.e., in place of, interpretation of the genitive.

8.1.2 तस्य परमाम्रेडितम्

tasya param āmreḍitam
/ tasya 6/1 *param* 1/1 *āmreḍitam* 1/1/
(*sarvasya dve* #1)
tasya dviruktasya yat paraṃ śabdarūpaṃ tad āmreḍitasaṃjñaṃ bhavati
The final of this iterated sequence is termed *āmreḍita.*

EXAMPLES:

caura caura3 ghātayiṣyāmi tvā bandhayiṣyāmi tvā 'thief, thief, I will kill you, I will have you tied up (arrested)'
vṛṣala vṛṣala3 ghātayiṣyāmi tvā bandhayiṣyāmi tvā 'vṛṣala, o vṛṣala, I will have you killed, I will have you tied up (arrested)'
dasyo dasyo3 ghātayiṣyāmi tvā bandhayiṣyāmi tvā 'bandit, o bandit, I will have you killed, I will have you tied up (arrested)'

1. The second element in iteration (*tasya*) is termed *āmreḍita.* Thus, given *caura* 'thief' which, after iteration (cf. 8.1.8 *vākyāder āmantritasya . . .*) produces *caura caura,* the second *caura* is termed an *āmreḍita.* Rule 8.1.91 *āmreḍitaṃ bhartsane* then applies to mark its *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*) vowel with a *pluta.* Thus, we get *caura caura3*! Recall that the iteration of *caura* has applied subsequent to deletion of *sU* after *caura caura,* under the *sambuddhi* 'vocative singular' condition of 6.1.67 *eṅi hrasvāt. . . .* The final *u* of *dasyu + sU* is replaced with its *guṇa* counterpart (7.3.108 *hrasvasya guṇaḥ*). Deletion of *sU* and subsequent iteration produce *dasyo dasyo3,* where the final vowel of the *āmreḍita* is replaced with *pluta.* We similarly get *vṛṣala vṛṣala3*!

The scope of the term *āmreḍita* is illustrated by rules such as 8.2.95 *āmreḍitaṃ bhartsane,* etc.

8.1.3 अनुदात्तं च

anudāttaṃ ca
/ anudāttam 1/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*āmreḍitam* #2)
anudāttaṃ ca tad bhavati yad āmreḍitasaṃjñam
That which is termed *āmreḍita* is also marked with *anudātta.*

EXAMPLES:

bhuṅkte bhuṅkte 'eats and eats'
paśūn páśūn 'animals and animals'

1. This rule allows *anudātta* to all vowels of an item termed *āmreḍita.* Thus, consider *bhuṅkte* 'eats', of *bhuṅkte bhuṅkte,* where iteration is accomplished by 8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ.* Recall that the third singular middle ending, here *te,* is selected in view of 1.3.66 *bhujo' navane.* Verbal root *bhujA* 'to consume' is

marked with *udātta* as its *it*. Iteration would have transferred the original accent to the resultant form. The affix, i.e., *te*, itself brings *udātta* in view of 3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*. Augment *ŚnaM* is qualified for *anudātta*, especially in view of the *vt*: *satiśiṣṭo' pi vikarṇasvaro lasārvadhātukasvaraṃ na bādhate* (ad 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam ekavarjam*). But since *ŚnaM* is also taught concurrently with *aT* (short *a*) to start with (*adupadeśa*), *te* becomes *anudātta* in view of 6.1.183 *tāsy anudāttenṅid*. . . . Now *ŚnaM* must be marked with *udātta* in consonance with affixal accent (3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*). But when *a* of *ŚnaM* gets deleted, we get *anudātta* from 6.1.155 *anudāttasya ca*. . . . This accentual pattern will also be available to forms resulting from iteration. Our present rule assigns *anudātta* to the entire form termed *āmreḍita*. Subsequently, *u* of *bhuṅkte* is marked with *svarita* (8.4.65 *udāttānudāttasya svaritaḥ*). The other *anudātta* accents go through monotone (*ekaśruti*). The *paśu* 'animal' of *paśun*, etc., similarly goes through this accentual assignment.

8.1.4 **नित्यवीप्सयोः**

nityavīpsayoḥ
/ nityavīpsayoḥ 7/2 = *nityañ ca vīpsā ca = nityavīpse* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/* (*sarvasya dve* #1)
nitye cārthe vīpsāyāṃ ca yad vartate tasya dve bhataḥ
Two come in place of a single whole form when the signification is *nitya* 'over and over again, regularly, continually' and *vīpsā* 'pervasion of a thing by property and action'.

EXAMPLES:

pacati pacati 'cooks and cooks'
jalpati jalpati 'talks and talks'
bhuktvā bhuktvā vrajati 'goes after eating and eating'
bhojaṃ bhojaṃ vrajati 'goes to each and every feast'
lunīhi lunīhi ity evāyaṃ lunāti 'cut it, cut it, thus he cuts'

1. Note that *nitya* is used in the general sense of *sarvakālabhāvin* 'that which happens at all times'. It is seen used in the sense of 'eternal, permanent', in examples such as *nitya ātmā* 'self (soul) is eternal', *nityam ākāśam* 'sky is eternal' and *nityā dyauḥ* 'heaven is eternal'. It is also seen used in the sense of *ābhīkṣṇya* 'repetition, over and over again', as in *nityaṃ prahasitaḥ* 'always laughing' and *nityaṃ jalpitaḥ* 'always talking'. If it is used with the signification of 'permanence, eternal', iteration (*dvirvacana*) will also apply to *ātmā* 'self' and *ākāśa* 'ether, space', etc. Since *ābhīkṣṇya* is the property of an action (*kriyādharma*), and also since *nityatā* 'permanence' of this rule must exclude any reference to 'eternality' of *ākāśa* and *ātmā*, etc., *nityatā* of this rule is interpreted as denoting *ābhīkṣṇya* 'over and over again'. The word *nitya*, in this context of *ābhīkṣṇya*, can now be seen as 'an action which

the agent primarily engages in to bringing about its completion (*Kāś: yāṃ kriyāṃ karttā prādhānyena anuparaman karoti*)'. Thus, we get *pacatipacati; bhuktvā bhuktvā vrajati, bhojaṃ bhojaṃ vrajati* and *lunīhi lunīhīty evāyaṃ lunāti,* etc. These examples illustrate that a *nityatā* of the *ābhīkṣṇya* type can be found in a *tiṄ* 'a form ending in an affix denoted by the abbreviatory term *tiṄ*' and *avyayakṛt* 'an indeclinable (*avyaya*) derived with an affix termed *kṛt* (1.1.39 *kṛn mejantaḥ*; 1.1.40 *ktvātosun . . .*)'.

Why is a form such as *pāpacyate* 'third singular present middle derivate of verbal root *pac* ending in *yaṄ*' not subjected to go through iteration when its denotatum is *paunaḥpunya* 'over and over again'? Commentators explain that 'iteration' (*dvirvacana*) is used so that *paunaḥpunya* can be denoted. Affix *yaṄ* of *pāpacyate* = *punaḥ punaḥ pacati* 'cooks over and over again' has already accomplished what iteration is supposed to accomplish. This is the reason why *pāpacyate* does not go through iteration. A form ending in affix *yaṄ* is capable of denoting *paunaḥpunya* without any expectancy of iteration (*dvirvacana*). I leave out any further details of this question.

The word *vīpsā* 'pervasion' focuses on property of 'forms which end in affixes denoted by the abbreviatory term *sUP*'. What is *vīpsā*? The desire of a speaker to pervade (*vyāptum icchā*) the loci of different objects in their entirety by means of 'action' (*kriyā*) and 'quality' (*guṇa*), concurrently (*yugpat; Kāś: nānāvācinām adhikaraṇānāṃ kriyāguṇābhyāṃ yugpat prayoktur vyāptum icchā vīpsā*). Thus we get *grāmo grāmo ramaṇīyaḥ* 'each and every village is beautiful' and *puruṣaḥ puruṣo nidhanam upaiti* 'each and every person reaches death'. Our first example illustrates the desire of speakers to pervade the entirely of different villages, based upon their direction and location, by means of quality of their 'beauty' (*ramaṇīyatā*), concurrently. Our next example illustrates the desire of speakers to pervade each and every person with the action of *nidhana* 'dying'.

A form which ends in a *tiṄ* and is used with *ābhīkṣṇya* and *prakarṣa* 'excellence', must receive an affix denoting *prakarṣa* after iteration has applied (*kṛtadvirvacanāt*). Thus, consider *pacati pacatitarām* where iteration of *pacati* precedes denotation of *prakarṣa*. Commentators note that conflict of equal strength (*vipratiṣedha*) is the reason why iteration must take precedence. Iteration finds its independent scope where *ābhīkṣṇya*, i.e., *pacati pacati*, and not *prakarṣa* 'excellence', is denoted. An affix denoting 'excellence' finds its independent scope where association with excellence, i.e., *pacatitarām*, and not *ābhīkṣya*, is denoted. A context where both find their scope, i.e., *pacati pacatitarām*, requires iteration to precede based on *vipratiṣedha* 'conflict of equal strength'. Once iteration has applied, excellence can be denoted by reconstructing the context of its use (*punaḥ prasaṅgavijñānāt*).

A form which ends in a *sUP* and is to be used in association with *vīpsā* and *prakarṣa* must go through iteration after receiving the affix denoting excellence. Thus, we get *āḍhyataram āḍhyatarm ānaya* 'bring each and everyone

who is rich'. An association with *vīpsā* is intended here for forms which already denote excellence.

8.1.5 परेर्वर्जने

parer varjane
/pareḥ 6/1 *varjane* 7/1/
(*sarvasya dve* #1)
parīty etasya varjane' rthe dve bhavataḥ
Two come in place of one whole form of *pari* when the signification is *varjana* 'exclusion'.

EXAMPLES:

paripari trigarttebhyo vṛṣṭo devaḥ 'it rained around, but not in the country of the Trigarttas'
pari trigarttebhyaḥ 'ibidem'
paripari sauvīrebhyo . . . 'it rained around, but not in the country of the Sauvīras'
pari sauvīrebhyaḥ 'ibidem'

1. This rule allows iteration of *pari* when it is used with the signification of *varjana* 'exclusion'. Thus, *pari pari trigarttebhyo vṛṣṭo devaḥ* 'god rained all over, but not in the country of the Trigarttas'. Recall that *pari* is termed a *karmapravacanīya* (1.4.87 *apaparī varjane*). The ablative (*pañcamī*) of *trigarttebhyaḥ* is introduced in consonance with 2.3.10 *pañcamy apāṅ. . . .*

This *pari* can also be allowed to optionally combine in a compound (2.1.11-12 *vibhāṣā apapari . . .*). We know it from the inclusion of *varjana* in this rule. For, an explicit statement of *varjana* was not necessary since its meaning could then have been gotten from the compound. This, in turn, also suggests that our present rule will apply where the option of compound formation is not accepted. That is, iteration does not apply when meaning of *varjana* is included within the denotatum of the compound. Note also that iteration was here made available under the condition of *vīpsā*. This signification of *varjana*, as part of the provision of this rule, then becomes restrictive (*niyama*) in nature.

2. Why do we state the condition of *varjane*? Observe *pariṣiñcati* 'waters all over' where *pari* is a preverb (*upasarga*), and not a *karmapravacanīya*.

3. A *vārttika* (*vt: parer varjane' samāse veti vaktavyam*) proposes iteration of *pari*, only optionally, when it is used with the signification of *varjana* and is not combined in a compound (*asamāse*). Thus, *paripari trigarttebhyo . . . .*; *pari trigarttebhyaḥ*.

8.1.6 प्रसमुपोदः पादपूरणे

prasamupodaḥ pādapūraṇe

/pra-sam-upodaḥ 6/1 = *praś ca sam ca upaś ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya*; *pāda-pūraṇam* 1/1 (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*sarvasya dve* #1)
'*pra, sam, upa, ut*' *ity eteṣāṃ pādapūraṇe dve bhavato dvirvacanena cet pādaḥ pūryate*
Two come in place of one whole form of *pra, sam, upa* and *ud*, when iteration serves as means of completing the quarter of a hymn.

EXAMPLES:

praprāyamagnirbhāratasyá śṛṇve 'when this ritual fire (agni) . . .'
saṃsamidyúvase vṛṣan 'you are the lord, giver of desires'
upópa me parā́ mṛśa 'come near me and touch'
kiṃ nódudu harṣase dātavā́ ú 'why do you not please to give us prosperity'

1. Since such usage is not available in the classical language, this rule applies only to the Vedic hymns.

Why do we have the condition of *pādapūraṇam* 'completion of a quarter of a Vedic hymn'? Consider *pra devaṃ devyā dhiyā* where completion of a quarter is not the purpose.

8.1.7 उपर्यध्यधसः सामीप्ये

uparyadhyadhasaḥ sāmīpye
/upary-adhy-adhasaḥ 1/3 = *upari ca adhi ca adhaś ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tāni*; *sāmīpye* 7/1/
(*sarvasya dve* #1)
'*upari, adhi, adhas*' *ity eteṣāṃ dve bhavataḥ sāmīpye vivakṣite*
Two come in place of one whole form of *upari, adhi* and *adhas*, when *sāmīpya* 'proximity' is the signification.

EXAMPLES:

uparyupari duḥkham 'misery is just about over'
uparyupari grāmam '. . . just above the village'
adhyadhi grāmam '. . . just below the village'

1. Note that *upari* 'above', *adhi* 'under' and *adhas* 'below' are all indeclinables (*avyaya*) with the signification of *sāmīpya* = *pratyāsatti* 'proximity'. Proximity is viewed with reference to time (*kāla*) and place (*deśa*). Sentence one denotes proximity with time (*kāla*), in the sense that 'misery has just about ended'. Our second sentence denotes proximity with place (*deśa*). Proximity to the village here refers to places 'above' and 'below' the location of the village (*grāmasya sāmīpyena upariṣṭād* (*adhastād vā*) *deśa ity arthaḥ*). The *dvitīyā* 'accusative' in *grāmam* 'village' is introduced in view of enumeration (*pariganana*) in the *vārttika* proposal (ad 1.4.48 *upānvadhyāṅ . . .*):

ubhasarvatasoḥ kāryā dhiguparyādiṣu triṣu/
dvitīyāmreḍitānteṣu tato' nyatrāpi dṛśyate//

2. Why do we have to state the condition of *sāmīpya* 'proximity'? Consider *upari candramāḥ* 'moon above . . .' where no proximity is denoted. Why do we not get iteration in *upari śiraso ghaṭaṃ dhārayati* 'has a jar placed on head'? What is denoted here is 'top (of the head)' and 'bottom (of the jar'; *auttarādharyam*). There is no denotation of proximity between the 'head' and the 'jar'. This proximity, however, is possible to infer. What about iteration in the following verse:

uparyupari paśyantaḥ sarva eva daridrati/
adho' dho darśane kasya mahimā nopajāyate//
'who does not feel belittled while looking up and above;
who does not feel elated while looking below.'

Iteration is here accomplished with the denotation of *vīpsā* 'pervasion'.

8.1.8 वाक्यादेरामन्त्रितस्यासूयासम्मतिकोपकुत्सनभर्त्सनेषु

vākyāder āmantritasyāsūyāsammatikopakutsanabhartsaneṣu
/vākyādeḥ 6/1 *āmantritasya* 6/1 *asūyā-sammati-kopa- kutsana-bhartsaneṣu* 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu/*
(*sarvasya dve* #1)
ekārthaḥ padasamūhaḥ vākyam. vākyāder āmantritasya dve bhavataḥ asūyā-sammati-kopa-kutsana-bhartsaneṣu yadi tad vākyaṃ bhavati
Two come in place of an *āmantrita* which occurs at the beginning of a sentence, provided the sentence is used with the signification of *asūyā* 'fault-finding', *sammati* 'praise, concurrence', *kopa* 'anger', *kutsana* 'censure' and *bhartsana* 'threat to harm, scolding'.

EXAMPLES:

mā̱ṇa̱va̱ká3 māṇavaka! a̱bhi̱rū̱pa̱ká3 abhirūpaka!! riktaṃ te ābhirūpyam
'O kid beautiful, gone is your beauty'
mā̱ṇa̱va̱ká3 māṇavaka! a̱bhi̱rū̱paká3 abhirūpaka!! śobhanaḥ khalv asi 'O kid, you are beautiful'
mā̱ṇa̱va̱ká3 māṇavaka a̱vi̱nīta̱ká3 avinītaka idānīṃ jñāsyasi jālma 'O kid, you are indeed an impudent wretch'
śa̱kti̱ké3 śaktike ya̱ṣṭi̱ké3 yaṣṭike riktā te śaktiḥ 'O Śaktikā, O Yaṣṭikā, gone indeed is your power'
caurá caurá3 vṛṣála3 vṛṣála! ghātayiṣyāmi tvā, bandhayiṣyāmi tvā 'O lowly Vṛṣala, I will have you killed, I will have you tied up (arrested)'

1. This rule allows iteration of a form termed *āmantrita* 'address', when this same is used at the beginning of a sentence and the sentence denotes *asūyā*, etc. *Kāśikā* explains a *vākya* 'sentence' as *ekārthaḥ padasamūhaḥ* 'a group

of words which denotes a single meaning'. A sentence at times is explained as a group of words where only one form ends in a *tiṄ* (*kvacit tu ekatiṅsamūho vākyam*). Sometimes a sentence is given no definition at all.

Kāśikā explains *asūyā* as *paraguṇānām asahanam* 'not tolerating qualities of others'. The words *pūjā* and *kopa* are glossed as *sammatiḥ* 'respect, concurrence' and *krodha* 'anger', respectively. The word *nindanam* is explained as *kutsanam* 'censure'. A similar explanation for *bhartsanam* is given as *apakāraśabdair bhayotpādanam* 'generating fear by threats of consequences'.

Note that *vākya* of the compound *vākyādeḥ* 'beginning of a sentence' is treated as secondary (*gauṇa*). Still, *asūyā*, etc., are related with *vākya* 'sentence'. Thus we get the interpretation: *asūyādiṣu yad vākyaṃ tad āder iti* 'the initial of a sentence which is used with the signification of *asūyā* 'fault-finding', etc. Only a sentence can denote *asūyā*, etc., since these happen to be characteristic qualities of speakers (*prayoktṛ-dharma*). Since they cannot be accepted as characteristic qualities of the denotatùm (*abhidheya*), an *āmantrita* cannot denote *asūyā*, etc. (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *prayoktṛdharmā hy asūyādayo nābhidheyadharmā, te ca vākyenaiva dyotyante nāmantritena*). It is for this reason that *asūyā*, etc., are used as qualifiers to a sentence. The wording of this rule has *āmantrita* as a qualified (*viśeṣya*), and hence principal (*pradhāna*). This renders *vākya* as non-principal (*apradhāna*). One may think that *asūyā*, etc., should, logically, be used as qualifiers to *āmantrita*. This, however, is not the correct view. For, an *āmantrita* can then avail iteration only when it is used with *asūyā*, etc., in integration. We will get iteration in a sentence such as *asūye asūye*! We cannot get iteration, for example, when a sentence denotes *asūyā*, etc. Thus, consider *māṇavaka*3! *māṇavaka*!!, etc.

2. Why do we state the condition of *vākyādeḥ* 'at the beginning of a sentence'? So that iteration does not apply to a form which may occur at the end, or middle, of a sentence. Thus, consider *śobhanaḥ khalv asi māṇavaka!* 'you are beautiful, indeed, kid' where *māṇavaka*, at the end of a sentence, cannot qualify for iteration.

3. Why do we state the condition of *āmantrita*? Consider *udāro devadattaḥ* 'Devadatta is generous' where iteration does not apply in the absence of an *āmantrita*. Finally, why do we state the condition of *asūyādiṣu* 'finding fault, etc.'? Consider *gām abhyāja śuklām* 'fetch the white cow to the village' where the sentence does not denote any meaning of *asūyā*, etc.

4. Note that *māṇavaka*, etc., go through iteration since they are termed *āmantrita* (2.3.48 *sā'' mantritam*), and are used as part of a sentence whereby *asūyā*, etc., are denoted. A *pluta* vowel marked with *svarita* is assigned (8.2.103 *svaritāmreḍite . . .*) to the first of words iterated under the condition of *asūyā*, etc. The *pluta* of *āmreḍita*, the second of words iterated under the condition of *bhartsana* 'reproach', is assigned *udātta* (8.2.95 *āmreḍitaṃ bhartsane*).

5. Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kāś*) cites the following verse:

guravo hi hitaiṣitvād akupyanto' pi bhartsanam/
kurvate bhartsyamānās tu kupitān pratiyanti tān//
vināpy asūyayā kutsāṃ kurvantīti pṛthak tayoḥ/
nirdeśaḥ sūtrakāreṇa vihitaḥ sūkṣmadarśinā//
'teachers, because of welfare of pupils, reproach them; while reproaching they still favor them; they are able to censure them even without finding faults; this has been made clear by the sharp-sighted formulator of the *sūtras*'

This verse is cited in the context of questioning the use of *kutsana* 'censure' and *bhartsana* 'reproach', especially in association with *kopa* and *asūyā*. For, *kutsā* cannot be accomplished without *asūyā*, and *bhartsana* cannot be accomplished without *kopa*. These two must present themselves as reasons for *kutsā* and *bhartsana*. Haradatta cites the following verse to refute it. For, one may find faults with affection, and likewise, may find benefit in striking:

sāmṛtaiḥ pāṇibhir ghnanti guravo na viśokṣitaiḥ/
lālanāśrayiṇo doṣās tāḍanāśrayiṇo guṇāḥ//
'teachers hit with nectar hands, and not with hands of torture; faults reside in spoiling while qualities reside in discipline'

8.1.9 एकं बहुव्रीहिवत्

ekaṃ bahuvrīhivat
/ekam 1/1 *bahuvrīhivat* ϕ = *bahuvrīher iva/*
(*sarvasya dve* #1)
ekam ity etac chabdarūpaṃ dviruktaṃ bahuvrīhivad bhavati
A sequence of two, in place of one whole form of *ekam* 'one', is treated as if it is a *bahuvrīhi* compound.

EXAMPLES:

ekaikam akṣaraṃ paṭhati 'reads each and evry syllable'
ekaikayā' hutyā juhoti 'sacrifices with oblations accompanying each and every offering'

1. Note that this is an extensional (*ātideśika*) proposal. The word *ekam*, when gone through iteration under the denotation of *vīpsā* (8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ*), is treated as if it was a *bahuvrīhi*. Treatment as a *bahuvrīhi* causes the assignment of the term *samāsa* 'compound', followed by deletion of nominal endings. We thus get *ek*(*a*+*e*→*ai*) *ka* = *ekaika* + (*sU*→*am*) = *ekaikam*; (7.1.24 *ato' m*), subsequent upon treatment of *ekamekam* as a *bahuvrīhi* and deletion of its nominal endings. We similarly get the feminine form *ekaikayā* from *ekā* + *Ṭā* + *ekā* + *Ṭā* = *ekayā* + *ekayā* → *ekaikayā*. The *ekā* of *ekaikayā* also goes through masculine transformaiton (*puṃvadbhāva*; 6.3.32 *striyāḥ puṃvad* . . .).

2. The purpose of *bahuvrīhivadbhāva* 'treatment as if a *bahuvrīhi*' is gener-

features of that which is signified (*abhidheya*), we will get iteration of the word-form *ābādha* and not of words such as *pīḍita* and *bādhita*, etc., which may be synonymous with it. That is, we may not get iteration of words such as *gata*, etc. If, however, *ābādha* is interpreted as referring to characteristic features (state) of speakers (*prayoktṛ*), iteration can apply to everything. For, *gata*, etc., do not denote *ābādha*. The word *ābādha* is here interpreted as referring to the *dharma* 'characteristic quality' of the speaker (*prayoktṛ-dharma*), and not to *abhidheya-dharma* 'features of denotation'.

The *ca* in this rule is used for split-interpretation (*vākyabheda*). Thus, one split sentence allows iteration and the other facilitates treatment as a *bahuvrīhi* (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś: tena dvayam atra vidhīyate: ekena vākyena dvirvacanam, apareṇa ca bahuvrīhivadbhāvaḥ*).

Incidentally, all examples involve deletion of *sUP*. Masculine transformation (*puṃvadbhāva*) is additionally involved in *gatagatā*, *naṣṭanaṣṭā* and *patitapatitā*.

8.1.11 कर्मधारयवदुत्तरेषु

karmadhārayavad uttareṣu
/karmadhārayavat ϕ uttareṣu 7/1/
(*sarvasya dve* #1 *bahuvrīhivat* #9)
ita uttareṣu dvirvacaneṣu karmadhārayavat kāryaṃ bhavati
Operations similar to a compound termed *karmadhāraya* obtain, hereafter, on that which has gone through iteration of a single whole.

EXAMPLES:

paṭupaṭuḥ 'intelligent, clever'
mṛdumṛduḥ 'soft, tender'
paṇḍitapaṇḍitaḥ 'skilled'
paṭupaṭvī 'intelligent, clever (feminine)'
mṛdumṛdvī 'soft, tender (feminine)'
kālakakālikā 'dark black (feminine)'

1. This rule extends operations similar to those which obtain on a *karmadhāraya* compound to a single form gone through iteration. The purpose of this extensional provision of *karamadhārayadbhāva* 'treatment as if a *karmadhāraya*' is to facilitate *sublopa* 'deletion of *sUP*' (2.1.74 *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ*), *puṃvadbhāva* 'masculine transformation' (6.3.42 *puṃvat karmadhāraya . . .*) and assignment of the final (*antya*) *udātta* accent. The first provision, i.e., deletion of *sUP*, is a general (*sādhāraṇa*) compound provision. The second, or *puṃvadbhāva*, is sometimes usual, and at others unusual (*asādhāraṇa*). That is, it is usual where there is no negation of *puṃvadbhāva* 'masculine transformation'. Consider, for example, *paṭupaṭvī*, etc., which yield *paṭupaṭuḥ*, etc., through masculine transformation applied to *paṭvī*. A

provision of *puṃvadbhāva* made against, for example, its negation by 6.3.37 *na kopadhāyāḥ*, is unusual. Thus, consider *kālakakālikā*, where *ṬāP* of the initial constituent, i.e., *kālikā*, goes through *puṃvadbhāva*, eventhough it has *k* in its penultimate position (*upadhā*). Recall that *kālika* is derived by introducing affix *ka* (5.3.70 *prāg ivāt kaḥ*) after *kālā* 'black' where, given *kālā* + *ka*, 7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ* replaces the final *ā* of *kālā* with its short counterpart. Rule 7.3.44 *pratyasthāt* . . . then orders a replacement in *i* (*itva*) to produce *kāl*(*ā*→*a*) + *ka* → *kāl*(*a*→*i*) + *ka*. We finally get *kālikākālikā* with *ṬāP* and iteration. Note that iteration (*dvitva*), in all these examples, is accomplished by 8.1.12 *prakāre guṇavacanasya*.

This rule also assigns a final *udātta* accent, for example to *paṭupaṭuḥ*, which was made available by 6.1.223 *samāsasya*, but was blocked by 8.1.3 *anudāttaṃ ca*. Our present rule reinstates this accentual provision.

2. Note that this rule is an *adhikāra* 'governing heading'. It would be carried over to subsequent rules, anyway. The word *uttareṣu* 'in subsequent rules' is then used for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*).

8.1.12 प्रकारे गुणवचनस्य

prakāre guṇavacanasya
/*prakāre* 7/1 *guṇavacanasya* 6/1 = *guṇasya vacanam* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin*/
(*sarvasya dve* #1 *karmadhārayavat* #11)
prakāre vartamānasya guṇavacanasya dve bhavataḥ

Two come in place of a single whole form signifying property (*guṇavacana*), with the resultant sequence additionally treated as if it was a compound termed *karmadhāraya*, when *prakāra* 'similarity, kind' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

paṭupaṭuḥ 'clever-like'
mṛdumṛduḥ 'soft-like'
paṇḍitapaṇḍitaḥ 'scholar-like'

1. The word *prakāra* is explained as both *bheda* 'difference' and *sādṛśya* 'similarity'. Thus, consider *bahubhir prakārair bhuṅkte* which means: *bahubhir bhedair bhuṅkte* 'he eats in many different ways'. Now consider *brāhmaṇaprakāro' yaṃ māṇavakaḥ* which denotes: *brāhmaṇasadṛśo' yaṃ māṇavakaḥ* 'this kid is similar to a brāhmaṇa kid'. This rule accepts the 'similarity' meaning of *prakāra*. Thus, *paṭupaṭu* denotes 'a kind of clever' person. That is, it denotes a person comparatively less clever to one who is really clever. This is how other examples also have to be interpreted.

A final *udātta* will block the *anudātta* (8.1.3 *anudāttaṃ ca*) at the strength of *karmadhārayavat* provision 'as if a *karmadhāraya*' of the earlier rule. That is, 8.1.3 *anudāttaṃ ca* offers an *anudātta* accent to an *āmreḍita* (8.1.2 *tasya*

paramāmreḍitam). Rule 6.1.217 *samāsasya* assigns a final *udātta*, instead, at the strength of extensional *karmadhāraya* (8.1.11 *karmadhārayavad . . .*).

2. Note that affix *jātīyaR* (5.3.69 *prakāravacane jātīyar*) also denotes *prakāra*. This provision of iteration is not intended to block *jātīyaR*. This is why *Kāśikā* (Vāmana) offers *paṭujātīyaḥ* as an example. Affix *jātīyaR* is used with the denotation of both *bheda* and *sādṛśya* meanings of *prakāra*. The present context of iteration requires denotation of *sādṛśya* 'similarity'. Commentators explain that an example such as *brāhmaṇajātīyaḥ* which denotes *prakāra* of the 'difference' kind (*bhedarūpe' rthe*), eventhough with no denotation of quality (*aguṇavacane' pi*), constitutes an independent scope (*sāvakāśa*) of *jātīyaR*. In the context of meanings such as 'similarity' (*sādṛśya*) it can then be blocked by the subsequent (*para*) provision of this iteration. This, however, cannot be accepted as blocking of *jātīyaR*. We will still get *paṭujātyaḥ*, etc.

3. Why do we state the condition of *guṇavacanasya* 'of that which is used with the signification of quality'? Consider *agnir māṇavakaḥ* 'this kid is fire' and *gaurvāhīkaḥ* 'this bull is (from) Vāhīka', where the two non-quality words, i.e., *agni* 'fire' and *go* 'bull', are being used, mostly because of their qualities of sharpness (*taikṣṇyam*) and *jāḍya* 'stupidity', to denote specific qualities, by way of comparison. The meaning of a word which one understands directly after hearing it is considered principal (*mukhya*). A meaning which is comprehended with effort (*yatna*) is considered secondary (*gauṇa*). 'Fire' and 'bull' are principal meanings of *agni* and *go*. The 'boy' of our example is comprehended by means of *agni*, with effort. This same also applies to *vāhīka* 'a place in the north-west'. A connection between the 'boy' and 'fire' and 'Vāhīka' and 'bull' is mediated by qualities of 'sharpness' and 'stupidity'. These words, *agni* and *go*, thus become quality words. Note, however, that this does not make them quality words forever (*sarvakāla-guṇavacana*). Iteration of this rule cannot apply where quality happens to be denoted by words which are not all-time quality words. They are basically non-quality words (*Kāś: tathāpi sarvadā guṇavacano na bhavatīti na dvir ucyate*).

There are several *vārttika* proposals under this rule:

(*i*) Iteration should be allowed where *ānupūrvī* 'successive (sequential) order' is denoted (*ānupūrvye dve bhavataḥ*). This proposal is being made to cover iteration in *vīpsā* 'pervasion'. Thus, *mūle mūle sthūlāḥ* 'thick at each and every root'; *agre agre sūkṣmāḥ* 'thin at each and every top'; *jyeṣṭhaṃ jyeṣṭhaṃ praveśaya* 'let each and every elder enter'.

(*ii*) Iteration applies when exact denotatum is to be determined from within more than one. Thus, *asmāt kārṣāpaṇād iha bhavadbhyāṃ māṣaṃ māṣaṃ dehi* 'give two Māṣas each out of this Kārṣāpaṇa (which has many Māṣas) to these two gentlemen'. This iteration is not allowed with the signification of *vīpsā*. For, only two Māṣas, and not all belonging to a single Kārṣāpaṇa, are given away.

(*iii*) Iteration is to be allowed also when *cāpala* 'unsteadiness, confusion' is denoted (*cāpale dve bhavata iti vaktavyam*). Thus, *ahirahir budhyasva budhyasva* 'beware, beware, there is a snake there!' It is not necessary that iteration will involve just two words. It may include more than two to ensure denotation. Thus, *ahir ahir ahir budhyasva budhyasva budhyasva*!

(*iv*) Iteration is also allowed when *kriyāsamabhihāra* 'frequent action' is denoted (*kriyāsamabhihāre dve bhavata iti vaktavyam*). Thus, *sa bhavān lunīhi lunīhi ity evāyaṃ lunāti* 'he says, 'please cut, please cut,' thus he cuts'.

(*v*) Iteration is to be allowed when *ābhīkṣṇya* 'over and over again' is denoted (*ābhīkṣṇye dve bhavata iti vaktavyam*). Thus, *bhuktvā bhuktvā vrajati* and *bhojaṃ bhojaṃ vrajati*, etc. This is already covered by 8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ*.

(*vi*) Iteration is to be allowed also when *ḌāC* follows. Thus, *paṭapaṭā karoti = paṭapaṭāyate*. The *ḌāC* of these examples must refer to what is provided for by 5.4.57 *avyaktānukaraṇād*. . . . Thus, we cannot ask for iteration, for example in *dvitīyā karoti* 'ploughs the field a second time' and *tṛtīyā karoti* 'ploughs the field a third time', where *ḌāC* is introduced by 5.4.58 *kṛño dvitīyatṛtīya*. . . . Some, in view of this restriction of *ḌāC*, read this *vārttika* as *ḍāci bahulam* (*Kāś*: *avyaktānukaraṇaḍājantasya dvirvacanam iṣyate. iha na bhavati-dvitīyā karoti, tṛtīyā karoti. tadarthaṃ kecid 'ḍāci bahulam' iti paṭhanti*).

(*vii*) Iteration is also allowed in case of *pūrva* 'prior, earlier' and *prathama* 'first', especially when *arthātiśaya* 'excellence of meaning' is denoted. Thus, *pūrvaṃ pūrvaṃ puṣpyanti* 'this tree comes out with flowers earlier than that' and *prathamaṃ prathamaṃ pacyante* 'this crop ripens comparatively earlier than that'.

(*viii*) Iteration is also allowed forms which end in affixes *Ḍatara* and *Ḍatama*, though, with the signification of comparative superiority in excellence of females. Thus, *ubhāv imāv āḍhyau; katarā katamā anayor āḍhyatā* 'they are both rich; who is the richer of these two'; *sarva ime āḍhyāḥ; katamākatamā eṣām āḍhyatā* 'they are all rich; who is the richest among them all'.

(*ix*) A pronominal is iterated when denoting reciprocity of action (*karmavyatihāre sarvanāmno dve bhavata iti vaktavyam*); the iterated strings are variously treated as if a compound (*samāsavac ca bahulam*). Thus, *anyo' nyam ime brāhmaṇā bhojayanti* 'these brāhmaṇas are feeding one another' and *anyamanyam ime*. . . 'ibidem'. When iteration is not treated as a compound, we find nominative singular in the first constituent (*Kāś*: *yadā na samāsavat prathamaikavacanam tadā pūrvapadasya*).

(*x*) The neuter and feminine iterated forms with the signification of

reciprocity of action also receive *ām* at the end (*strīnapuṃsakayor uttarapadasya cāmbhāvo vaktavyaḥ*). Thus, *anyo' nyām ime brāhmaṇyau bhojayataḥ* 'these two brāhmaṇa women are feeding one another'; *itaretaram ime brāhmaṇakule bhojayataḥ* 'these two clans of the brāhmaṇas are feeding one another'.

8.1.13 अकृच्छ्रे प्रियसुखयोरन्यतरस्याम्

akṛcchre priyasukhayor anyatarasyām
/ a-kṛcchre 7/1 = *na kṛcchram* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *priyasukhayoḥ* 6/2 = *priyaś ca sukhañ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*sarvasya dve* #1 *karmadhārayavat* #11)
'priya, sukha' ity etayor anyatarasyāṃ dve bhavataḥ akṛcchre dyotye
Forms of *priya* 'dear' and *sukha* 'happiness, comfort' are iterated, optionally, with an additional provision that their iterated sequence be treated as a compound termed *karmadhāraya*, when the derivate denotes *akṛcchra* 'easy to accomplish, easily, lack of hardship'.

EXAMPLES:

priyapriyeṇa dadāti 'easily gives things away'
priyeṇa dadāti 'ibidem'
sukhasukhena dadāti 'happily gives things away'
sukhena dadāti 'ibidem'

1. This rule allows optional iteration of *priya* 'dear' and *sukha* 'comfort, happiness', when the signification is *akṛcchra* 'non-hardship, no trouble'. Additionally, the iterated string is treated as if it was a compound termed *karmadhāraya*. Consider *priya* + *Ṭā* → *priyeṇa* and *sukha* + *Ṭā* → *sukhena*, where, after iteration and treatment of resultant string as a *karmadhāraya*, we get *priyapriya*, via *LUK*-deletion of nominal endings (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *tṛtīyaikavacanāntasya dvirvacane karmadhārayadbhāvā subluki punas tad eva vacanam*). Assignment of the term *prātipadika* 'nominal stem' to *priyapriya* (1.2.46 *kṛttaddhitasamāsāś ca*), and subsequent introduction of instrumental singular *Ṭā*, yields *pripriya* + *Ṭā* → *priyapriyeṇa*. Similar rules will apply in deriving *sukhasukhena*. Haradatta explains *priyapriyeṇa dadāti* as 'gives even the dearest things away without any difficulty' (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *atyantadayitam api vastv anāyāsena dadātīty arthaḥ*).

8.1.14 यथास्वे यथायथम्

yathāsve yathāyatham
/ yathāsve 7/1 = *yo yaḥ svo* = *yathāsvam* (*avyayībhāva*), *tasmin*; *yathāyatham* 1/1/
(*sarvasya dve* #1 *karmadhārayavat* #11)
yo ya ātmā yad yadātmīyaṃ tat tad yathāsvaṃ tasmin yathāyatham iti nipātyate

A form such as *yathāyatham* is derived, via *nipātana*, and is also treated as if it was a compound termed *karmadhāraya*, when the signification is *yathāsvam* 'a correspondingly true property'.

EXAMPLES:

jñātāḥ sarve padārthā yathāyatham 'all things were known (by me) in accord with their true properties'

1. This rule allows iteration and assigns neuter to *yathā* 'as', via *nipātana*. The final *ā* of a neuter nominal stem is then replaced with its short counterpart (1.2.47 *hrasvo napuṃsake prātipadikasya*).

The *avyayībhāva* 'indeclinable' compound of *yathāsvam* is formed with the signification of *vīpsā* 'pervasion' (2.1.7 *yathā' sādṛśye*). The word *sva* is here used in the sense of 'self' (*ātman*), or 'that which is like one's self' (*ātmīya*). That is why we get the example: *yo ya ātmā yad yad ātmīyaṃ tad tad yathāsvaṃ tasmin yathāyatham iti* 'whatever is this self and whatever may be the likeness with this self, that all is '*yathāsvam*'; a signification of that is made by *yathāyatham*'.

8.1.15 द्वन्द्वं रहस्यमर्यादावचनव्युत्क्रमणयज्ञपात्रप्रयोगाभिव्यक्तिषु

dvandvaṃ rahasyamaryādāvacanavyutkramaṇayajñapātraprayogābhivyaktiṣu
/dvandvam 1/1 *rahasya-maryādāvacana* (*maryādāyāḥ vacanam*; *ṣaṣ. tat.*)-*vyutkramaṇa-yajñapātraprayoga* (*yajñapātrāṇāṃ prayogaḥ*; *ṣaṣ. tat.*)-*abhivyaktiṣu* 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu*/
(*sarvasya dve* #1 *karmadhārayavat* #11)
'*dvandvam*' *iti dviśabdasya dvirvacanaṃ pūrvapadasyāmbhāvaḥ atvaṃ cottarapadasya nipātyate* '*rahasya, maryādāvacana, vyutkramaṇa, yajñapātraprayoga, abhivyakti*' *ity eteṣu artheṣu*
A form such as *dvandvam* is derived, via *nipātana*, and is also treated as if it was a compound termed *karmadhāraya*, when the signification is *rahasya* 'secret', *maryādāvacana* 'an extent, limit', *vyutkramaṇa* 'separation, moving away', *yajñapātraprayoga* 'positioning of ritual vessels' and *abhivyakti* 'manifestation'.

EXAMPLES:

dvandvaṃ mantrayate 'discusses in seclusion'
ācaturo hīme paśavo dvandvaṃ mithunāyante 'these animals mate with their offsprings only through four generations'
dvandvaṃ vyutkrāntāḥ 'they moved out having formed two groups each'
dvandvaṃ nyañci prayunakti dhīraḥ 'this priest is placing ritual pots face down in pairs'
dvandvaṃ nāradaparvatau 'the association of Nārada and Parvata'

dvandvaṃ saṅkarṣaṇavāsudevau 'the association of Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva'

1. Note that the word *dvandva* is generally used in the sense of *rahasya* 'secret'. Meanings such as *maryādā-vacana* 'delimitation of an extent or limit', *vyutkramaṇa* 'separation, moving away', *yajñapātra-prayoga* 'positioning of ritual vessels' and *abhivyakti* 'manifestation' also fall within the scope of contextual meaning of *dvandva*. Consider *dvandvaṃ mantrayate* where *dvandvam* means 'in a group of two; having become two each'. *Kāśikā* illustrates *maryādāvacana* 'delimitation of extent' with *ācaturaṃ hīme paśavo mithunāyante* 'animals mate with their offsprings up to (and including) their fourth generation'; *mātā putreṇa mithunaṃ gacchati, pautreṇa, tatputreṇāpīti* . . . 'a mother mates with her son, grandson, even with the grandson's (son's son's) son, but not with any offspring thereafter'. Note that iteration applies to *dvi* 'two' when used in conjunction followed by *au*. Given the string *dvi* + *au* + *dvi* + *au*, the *i* of first *dvi* then goes through a replacement in *am*. The second *i* is also replaced with *a* (*atva*). Thus, *dvi* + *au* → *dvi* + *au* + *dvi* + *au*; *dv*(*i*→*am*) + *au* + *dvi* + *au* → *dvam* + *au* + *dv*(*i*→*a*) + *au* → *dvam* + *au* + *dva* + *au* → *dvam* + (*au* →ϕ) + *dva* + (*au*→ϕ) = *dva*(*m*→*n*) + *dva* = *dvandva*. This all is accomplished, via *nipātana*. Recall that treatment of *dvam* + *au* + *dva* + *au* as a *karmadhāraya* facilitates deletion of nominal endings. Treatment as neuter further facilitates application of 6.1.106 *ami pūrvaḥ*. Thus, *dvandva* + (*sU*→*am*) = *dvandv*(*a*+*a*→*a*) *m* = *dvandvam*.

2. We also find *dvandvam*, elsewhere. It is for this reason that a split-interpretation of this rule is attempted. Recall that *dvandva* is also used in the sense of *ca* 'and' (2.2.29 *cārthe dvandvaḥ*).

8.1.16 पदस्य

padasya
/padasya 6/1/
'padasya' ity ayam adhikāraḥ; yad ita ūrdhvam anukramiṣyāmaḥ padasyety evaṃ veditavyam
In place of a *pada* . . .

EXAMPLES:

pacan 'o, you, who is cooking'
yajan 'o, you, who is performing ritual sacrifice'

1. This is an *adhikāra* 'governing heading'. The word *padasya* must be carried up to rule 8.3.55 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* (*adhikāro' yam, 'apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ' iti yāvad yad vakṣyati tat padasya bhavati*. . . .). Whatever is stated hereafter should apply to that which is a *pada* (1.4.14 *suptiṅantaṃ padam*, etc.).

The genitive of *padasya* is then interpreted, either as *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive

denoting in place of', or *avayava-ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive denoting some part of a whole', as desired by context of rules on hand. Consider, for example, rule 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ* whereby 'the final sound of that which ends in a conjunct goes through deletion by means of *LOPA*'. The phrase 'that which . . .' must be supplied with *pada* as the antecedent of 'that'. That is, 'the final sound of a *pada* which ends in a conjunct goes through deletion by means of *LOPA*'. The genitive in 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ* is interpreted as *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* 'a genitive denoting in place of'. The genitive, for example of 8.2.4 *udāttasvaritayor yaṇaḥ svarito vā' nudāttasya,* is treated as a genitive denoting 'part of a whole' (*avayava-ṣaṣṭhī*).

The example derivates, i.e., *pacan* and *yajan,* are *padas* where, given *pacant* and *yajant,* we get the deletion of *t* occurring as final of a conjunct. Refer to the appendix (III:751) under 3.2.124 *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv* . . . for derivational details of *pacan.*

8.1.17 पदात्

padāt
/padāt 5/1/
(*padasya* #16)
'*padāt*' *ity ayam adhikāraḥ prāk* '*kutsane ca supy agotrādau*' *ity etasmād yad ita ūrdhvam anukramiṣyāmaḥ* '*padāt*' *ity evam tad veditavyam*
In place of a *pada* which is used after a *pada* . . .

EXAMPLES:

pacati devadatta 'O Devadatta, he is cooking'

1. This is also an *adhikāra* 'governing heading'. It is carried over prior to 8.1.69 *kutsane ca supy agotrādau.* This rule introduces an operation relative to a *pada* (*padasya*) which occurs after a *pada* (*padāt*). Thus, consider the paraphrase of rule 8.1.19 *āmantritasya ca*: *āmantritasya padasya padāt parasya anudāttādeśo bhavati* 'an *anudātta* comes as a replacement in place of a *pada* termed *āmantrita* which, in turn, occurs after a *pada*'. Thus, consider *pacati devadatta* 'Devadatta, he is cooking', where *devadatta* receives blanket *anudātta* since it is termed *āmantrita* (2.3.48 *sā' mantritam*) and occurs after *pacati,* a verbal *pada.* Now consider *devadatta pacasi* 'Devadatta, you are cooking' where blanket *anudātta* could not be made available since *devadatta* does not occur after a *pada.*

8.1.18 अनुदात्तं सर्वमपादादौ

anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau
/anudāttam 1/1 *sarvam* 1/1 *apādādau* 7/1 = *pādasya ādiḥ* = *pādādiḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *na pādādiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17)

'anudātta' iti, 'sarvam' iti ca, 'apādādau' iti ca etat trayam adhikṛtaṃ veditavyam āpādaparisamāpteḥ
A *pada* which occurs after another *pada*, except when occurring at the beginning of the quarter of a verse, is marked with *anudātta* in its entirety.

EXAMPLES:

pacasi devadatta 'you are cooking Devadatta!'
pacasi devadatta 'ibidem'

1. This entire *sūtra* carries over through the end of this quarter. That is, whatever is stated hereafter must be read with *anudāttam, sarvam* and *apādādau*. Thus, Pāṇini will state *āmantritasya ca* (8.1.19) which, in turn, must be read with *anudāttam, sarvam* and *apādādau*. That is, that which is specified by subsequent rules will all be marked with *anudātta* if the same does not occur at the beginning of a quarter-verse (*pādādau*). The word *pāda* here refers to the quarter of a verse of praise (*śloka*) or hymn (*ṛk*).

Why do we state the condition of *apādādau*? Consider *mṛtyo anavadhṛṣṇyam* where *mṛtyo* is *āmantrita* but could not be all marked *anudātta* since it does occur at the beginning of the quarter of a verse. Pāṇini will similarly state 8.1.21 *bahuvacanasya vasnasau* which orders *vas* and *nas* as replacements for the genitive, dative and accusative plural forms of *yuṣmad* 'second personal pronominal' and *asmad* 'first personal pronominal', respectively. These replacements are also marked with *anudātta*. Thus, *grāmo vaḥ* . . . and *janapado naḥ*. . ., etc. Why do we have the condition of *apadadau*? Consider the following verse:

rudro viśveśvaro devo yuṣmākaṃ kuladevatā/
sa eva nātho bhagavān asmākaṃ śatrumardanaḥ//
'lord of the universe, the divine Rudra is the divinity of your clan; he alone is our protector lord, the one who will crush our enemies'

We do not get a replacement in connection with *yuṣmākam* and *asmākam* here since *yuṣmākam* occurs at the beginning of the quarter, i.e., *yuṣmākaṃ kuladevatāḥ* 'the divinity of your clan'. This same applies to *asmākam* which occurs at the beginning of the quarter *asmākaṃ śatrumardanaḥ* 'crusher of our enemies'. Incidentally, the word *pāda* here refers to the quarter of a hymn or a verse of praise (*śloka*).

2. Why do we need the specification of *sarvam* 'all'? For, only one *udātta*, or *svarita*, is possible in a *pada* (6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam ekavarjam*; *PM* ad *Kāś*:. . . *ekasmin pade eka evodāttaḥ svarito vā sambhavati*). If that same *udātta*, or *svarita*, is ordered to be marked with *anudātta*, the entire *pāda* will be marked with *anudātta*. This is why we need an explanation on the use of the word *sarvam* in this rule. A *pada* which may come under the purview of this

specification by *sarva* could be of two types: (*i*) where a particular accent has already applied (*anūdyamāna*) and (*ii*) where a rule of accent is anticipated to apply (*vidhīyamāna*). There is a conflict here: we can talk about changing the quality of a thing only when we already have that quality available. How could we talk about changing the quality which does not even exist? It is similar to changing the color of a piece of cloth which is already woven, and not of one which is yet to be woven (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *siddhasya hi vastuno dharmāntaraṃ śakyate kartum, yathā niṣpannarūpasya vāsaso rāgaḥ, nāniṣpannasya*). Thus, this *anudātta* provision will apply only to instances of *āmantrita* (8.1.19 *āmantritasya ca*), etc. That is, if *sarvam* is not stated in this rule. For example, *yuṣmad* and *asmad* for which accentual provisions are made will be covered by this rule. But, in the absence of *sarvam*, their replacements, i.e., *vām* and *nau* (8.1.20 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ . . .*), cannot receive *anudātta*. How is it possible to assign *anudātta* to replacements of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*? That is, even when this specification with *sarvam* is made. It will be made possible because replacements and their accentual provisions are made by separate rules (*vākya-bheda*). There is yet another purpose stated for this use of *sarvam*. I do not discuss it here because of its complexity.

8.1.19 आमन्त्रितस्य च

āmantritasya ca
/āmantritasya 6/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1 *padāt* #2 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #3)
āmantritasya padasya padāt parasyāpādādau vartamānasya sarvasyānudātto bhavati
A *pada* termed *āmantrita* which occurs after another *pada*, except when occurring at the beginning of the quarter of a verse, is also marked with *anudātta* in its entirety.

EXAMPLES:

pacasi devadatta 'you are cooking Devadatta!'
pacasi devadatta 'ibidem'

1. Note that the term *āmantrita* is assigned by 2.3.48 *sā' mantritam*. Rule 6.1.195 *āmantritasya ca* offers initial *udātta* to that which is termed an *āmantrita*. This rule assigns *nighāta* '*anudātta* in toto' (*sarvānudātta*) to an *āmantrita* which occurs after a *pada*, provided the same does not occur at the beginning of the quarter of a verse.

2. A *vārttika* proposes that *nighāta* rules (our present rule and 8.1.28 *tiṅ atiṅaḥ*, etc.), and rules dealing with accentual provisions of replacements of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* as well, apply only when the *pada* which conditions *nighāta*, and the *pada* which follows, are part of the same sentence. Consider *iha daṇḍo harānena* 'here is the stick, carry by means of it', *odanaṃ paca tava*

bhaviṣyati 'cook rice, it will be yours (to eat)' and *odanaṃ paca mama bhaviṣyati* 'cook rice, it will be mine', where *hara*, a *pada* ending in a *tiṄ*, follows *daṇḍa*, a *pada* not ending in a *tiṄ*, does not get *nighāta* since *daṇḍa* is not used in the same sentence. If the condition of occurrence in a single sentence is not required we will also get replacement of *yuṣmad* with *tava* and *asmad* with *me* (8.1.22 *temayāv ekavacanasya*) in sentences such as the preceding two with *tava* and *mama*.

Now consider *iha devadatta mātā te kathayati* 'here, your mother says Devadatta', *nadyās tiṣṭhati kūle* 'he is sitting on the bank of the river' and *śālīnāṃ te odanaṃ dāsyāmi* 'I shall give you rice-meal of the śāli grains'. The word *devadatta*, which is termed *āmantrita* in the first sentence, occurs after *iha* 'here' of the same sentence. It thus receives *nighāta*. This same applies to *tiṣṭhati* of the second sentence where the non-*tiṄ* word, *nadyāḥ*, precedes. A *nighāta* is to be understood in the context of a single sentence so that *yuṣmad*, i.e., *tava*, which occurs after *śālīnām* of the third sentence, is replaced with *te*. For this we must have the condition of *samānavākye* 'in the same sentence'. A sentence with *me* replacing *asmad* can be similarly understood as *śālīnāṃ me odanaṃ dehi* 'give me the rice-meal of śāli grains'.

8.1.20 युष्मदस्मदोः षष्ठीचतुर्थीद्वितीयास्थयोर्वान्नावौ

yuṣmadasmadoḥ ṣaṣṭhīcaturthīdvitīyāsthayor vānnāvau
/yuṣmad-asmadoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ṣaṣṭhī-caturthī-dvitīyāsthayoḥ* 6/2 = *ṣaṣṭhī ca caturthī ca dvitīyā ca* = *ṣaṣṭhī-caturthī-dvitīyāḥ*, *tāsu yau tiṣṭhataḥ* = *ṣaṣṭhī-caturthī-dvitīyāsthau*, *tayoḥ*; *vānnāvau* 1/1 = *vāṃ ca nau ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tau*/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttam sarvam apādādau* #18)
'*yuṣmad, asmad*' *ity etayoḥ ṣaṣṭhīcaturthīdvitīyāsthayor yathāsaṃkhyaṃ* '*vām, nau*' *ity etāv ādeśau bhavatas tau cānudāttau*
A *pada* which contains *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, ends in the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*), dative (*caturthī*), or accusative (*dvitīyā*), and occurs after some other *pada* though not as initial of the quarter of a verse, is replaced, respectively, with the *anudātta* form of *vām* and *nau*.

EXAMPLES:

grāmo vāṃ svam 'this village is the property of you two'
janapado nau svam 'this principality is the property of us two'
grāmo vāṃ dīyate 'this village is being given to you two'
janapado nau dīyate 'this principality is given to us'
grāmo vāṃ paśyati 'this village looks to us'
janapado nau paśyati 'this principality looks to us'

1. This rule allows a total replacement in *vām* and *nau* for *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, respectively, when they end in *dvitīyā* 'accusative', *caturthī* 'dative', or

ṣaṣṭhī 'genitive', after a *pada*, though not at the beginning of a verse quarter. Additionally, these replacements are both marked with *anudātta*. Since other replacements are subsequently offered for singular and plural, these replacements apply only to duals (*dvivacana*).

Why was this rule not specified with *ṣaṣṭhīcaturthīdvitīyāsu* 'when used in the genitive, dative or accusative'? That is, why did Pāṇini use this specification with *stha*, as in. . . *dvitīyāsthayoḥ*? The word *stha* 'standing, staying' is used here to indicate that endings must not be deleted or assumed. The endings thus must be heard (*śrūyamāṇa*). That is, these replacements are offered for deriving *yuvām/ āvām*; *yuvābhyām/ āvābhyām* and *yuvayoḥ/ āvayoḥ*, the accusative, dative and genitive dual forms of *yuṣmad/ asmad*. For example, we will get *uvābhyām*, etc., of *grāme yuvābhyāṃ kṛtam* 'done by you two in the village', etc., when this replacement is not applied. We similarly do not get any replacement in *yuṣmatputraḥ* 'your son', etc., where the nominal endings go through deletion.

8.1.21 बहुवचनस्य वस्नसौ

bavhuvacanasya vasnasau
/ bahuvacanasya 6/1 *vas-nasau* 1/2 (*itar. dv.*) /
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttam sarvam apādādau* #18 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ ṣaṣṭhīcaturthīdvitīyāsthayoḥ* #20)
bahuvacanāntayoḥ yuṣmadasmadoḥ ṣaṣṭhīcaturthīdvitīyāsthayoḥ yathāsaṃkhyam vas nas ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ
A *pada* which contains *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, ends in the genitive, dative or accusative plural, and occurs after some other *pada* though not at the beginning of a verse quarter, is replaced in full, respectively, with the *anudātta* form of *vas* and *nas*.

EXAMPLES:

grāmo vaḥ svam 'this village is your (pl.) property'
grāmo naḥ svam 'this village is our property'
grāmo vo dīyate 'this village is offered to you (plural)'
janapado no dīyate 'this principality is offered to us'
grāmo vaḥ paśyati 'this village looks at you (plural)'
janapado vaḥ paśyati 'this principality looks at you'

1. This rule is an exception to the preceding. It offers *vas* and *nas* as replacements for *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, respectively, when genitive and dative plural endings are in use. It is only applicable to the replacement of a *pada* ending in *ṣaṣṭhī* and *caturthī*. For, Pāṇini will be soon introducing separate replacements for a *pada* ending in the *dvitīyā* 'accusative' (*Kāś. dvitīyāntasyādeśāntara-vidhānasāmarthyāt ṣaṣṭhīcaturthyor evāyaṃ yogaḥ*). Recall that *vas* and *nas* replace the accusative plural *yuṣmān* and *asmān*, respectively. They

are marked *anudātta* and follow replacement conditions similar to those of the preceding rules. Refer to derivational details of *vaḥ* under the appendix of 1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo* . . . (II:397).

8.1.22 तेमयावेकवचनस्य

temayāv ekavacanasya
/ te-mayau 1/1 (*itar. dv.*), *tau*; *ekavacanasya* 6/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttam sarvam apādādau* #18 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ ṣaṣṭhīcaturthīdvitīyāsthayoḥ* #20)
yuṣmadasmador ekavacanāntayoḥ ṣaṣṭhīcaturthīsthayor yathāsaṃkhyaṃ 'te, me' ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ
A *pada* which contains *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, ends in the genitive, or dative, singular, and occurs after some other *pada*, though not as initial of a quarter verse, is replaced in full, respectively, with the *anudātta* form of *te* and *me*.

EXAMPLES:

grāmas te svam 'this village is your property'
grāmo me svam 'this village is my property'
grāmas te dīyate 'this village is being offered to you'
grāmo me dīyate 'this village is being offered to me'

1. A *pada*, constituted by *yuṣmad* and *asmad* which ends in the *ṣaṣṭhī*, or *caturthī*, singular (*ekavacana*), and occurs after another *pada*, though not at the beginning of the quarter of a verse, is replaced in toto with *te* and *me*, respectively. Additionally, these replacements are both marked with *anudātta*. A proposal for replacing the *pada* which ends in *dvitīyā* 'accusative' will be made subsequently. Thus, *dvitīyā* cannot be paraphrased with the wording of this rule. These replacements in *te* and *me* will be coming in place of *tava* and *mama* of the genitive, respectively. They will similarly come in place of *tubhyam* and *mahyam* of the dative (*caturthī*).

8.1.23 त्वामौ द्वितीयायाः

tvāmau dvitīyāyāḥ
/ tvāmau 1/1 = *tvāś ca māś ca* (*itar. dv.*); *dvitīyāyāḥ* 6/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttam sarvam apādādau* #18 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #20 *ekavacanasya* #22)
dvitīyāyā yad ekavacanaṃ tadantayor yuṣmadasmador yathāsaṃkhyaṃ 'tvā, mā' ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ
A *pada* which occurs after another *pada*, though not at the beginning of a quarter verse, and constitutes *yuṣmad* and *asmad* ending in the accusative singular, is replaced in full, respectively, with an *anudātta* form of *tvā* and *mā*.

EXAMPLES:

grāmas tvā̲ paśyati 'the village looks up to you'
grāmo mā̲ paśyati 'the village looks up to me'

1. This rule offers a replacement in *tvā* and *mā*, both concurrently marked with *anudātta*, respectively, for *yuṣmad* and *asmad* when used in the accusative singular. All other conditions remain similar to the preceding rules. Thus, what could have been *tvām* and *mām* is offered as *tvā* amd *mā*, respectively.

8.1.24 न चवाहाहैवयुक्ते

na cavāhāhaivayukte
/ naϕ cavāhāhaivayukte 7/1 = *caś ca vāś ca haś ca ahaś ca evaś ca = cavāhāhaivāḥ, tair yukte* (*tṛtīyā tat.* with internal *itar. dv.*) /
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ ṣaṣṭhī-caturthīdvitīyāsthayoḥ* #20)
'*ca, vā, ha, aha, eva*' *ebhir yuktair yuṣmadasmador vānnāv ādayo na bhavanti*
A *pada* which contains *yuṣmad* and *asmad* and ends in *ṣaṣṭhī, caturthī*, or *dvitīyā*, is not fully replaced, respectively, with an *anudātta* form of *vām* and *nau*, etc., when the same occurs after a *pada* in construction with *ca* 'and', *vā* 'or', *ha* 'indeed', *aha* 'certainly' and *eva* 'only'.

EXAMPLES:

grāmas tava ca svam 'this village is also your property'
grāmo mama ca svam 'this village is also my property'
. . .*yuvayoś ca svam* 'this village is also the property of you both'
. . . *āvayoś ca svam* 'this village is also the property of us both'
grāmas tava vā svam 'or the village is your property'
. . . *mama vā svam* 'or the village is my property'
. . . *yuvayor vā svam* 'or the village is the property of you two'
. . . *āvayor vā svam* 'or the village is the property of us both'
grāmas tava ha svam 'the village is indeed your property'
grāmo mama ha svam 'the village is indeed my property'
. . . *yuvayor ha svam* 'the village is the property of you both'
. . . *āvayor ha svam* 'the village is the property of us both'
grāmas tavāha svam 'the village is your. . . .'
grāmo mamāha svam 'the village is my . . . .'
. . . *āvayor aha svam* 'the village is. . . . us both'
grāmas tavaiva svam '. . . your property alone'
grāmo mamaiva svam '. . . my property alone'
. . . *yuvayor eva svam* 'of you two alone . . .'
. . . *āvayor eva svam* 'of us two alone . . .'
grāmaś ca te svam nagaraṃ ca me svam 'the village is your property and the city of mine'

1. This rule offers negation of all preceding replacements in the genitive, dative and accusative, whether singular, dual or plural, when *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used in construction with *ca, vā, ha, aha* and *eva*. Thus, we will get regular forms such as *tava, mama, yuvayoḥ, āvayoḥ, tvām* and *mām*, etc.

Note that *ca, vā, ha, aha* and *eva* are used with the signification of *samuccaya* 'collection, aggregation', *vikalpa* 'option', *adbhuta* 'extraordinary, wow!', *kheda* 'exclamation of sadness' and *avadhāraṇa* 'determination', respectively.

Why is *yukte* '. . . in association' used in this rule? Why was *tṛtīyā* 'instrumental' alone not used? Commentators explain that this negation does not apply when *ca*, etc., do not denote their meanings by directly following *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. Thus, consider *grāmaś ca te svam nagaraś ca me svam* where, since *ca* does not follow *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, we get *te* and *me*. It is to indicate this that *yukte* is used here. Consider the negation of the next rule which, in the absence of *yukte*, applies, whether or not the sense of *paśya* (*paśyārtha* 'sense of seeing') is expressed after *yuṣmad* and *asmad*.

8.1.25 पश्यार्थैश्चानालोचने

paśyārthaiś cānālocane
/paśyārthaiḥ 3/3 = *paśyo' rtho yeṣāṃ* (*bv.*), *taiḥ*; *ca* ϕ *anālocane* 7/1 = *na ālocanam* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *yuṣmadasmadoḥ* #20 *ekavacanasya* #22 *na* #24)
paśyārthair anālocane vartamānair yukte yuṣmadasmador vānnāv ādayo na bhavanti

A replacement in *vām* and *nau*, etc., does not come in place of a *pada* which contains *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, and ends in *ṣaṣṭhī, caturthī* and *dvitīyā*, also when used in construction with verbal roots having the signification of *paśya* 'perception', though with the exclusion of a perception gained by means of sight (*ālocana*).

EXAMPLES:

grāmas tava svaṃ samīkṣyāgataḥ 'understanding that this village is your property, I came here'
grāmo mama svaṃ samīkṣyāgataḥ 'understanding that this village is my property, I came here'
grāmas tubhyaṃ dīyamānaṃ samīkṣyāgataḥ 'understanding that this village is being given to you, I came here'
grāmo mahyam dīyamānaṃ samīkṣyāgataḥ 'with the understanding that the village is being given to me, he came'
grāmas tvāṃ samīkṣyāgataḥ 'knowing (about) you the entire village came'
grāmo māṃ samīkṣyāgataḥ 'knowing (about) me the entire village came'

1. This rule also blocks replacements in *vām* and *nau*, etc., for *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, when they are used in construction with a verbal root whose action

denotes 'seeing, perceiving' (*paśyārthaiḥ*), though not by sight (*anālocane*). The example derivates use *samīkṣya* 'having properly perceived, understood' to illustrate 'seeing without sight'.

Why do we state the condition of *anālocane* 'when not perceived by sight'? Consider *grāmas tvā paśyati* 'the entire village looks at you' and *grāmo mā paśyati* 'the entire village looks at me', where we do not get the negation of replacements. For, what is denoted here is 'seeing with sight'.

Recall that since there is no use of *yukte*, negation applies irrespective of whether the sense of *paśya* is denoted directly after *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. The example derivates illustrate both types.

8.1.26 सपूर्वायाः प्रथमाया विभाषा

sapūrvāyāḥ prathamāyā vibhāṣā
/sapūrvāyāḥ 6/1 = *saha* = *vidyamānaṃ pūrvam yasyāḥ* (*bv.*), *tasyāḥ*; *prathamāyāḥ* 6/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1/
vidyamānapūrvāt prathamāntāt padād uttarayor yuṣmadasmador vibhāṣā vānnāv ādayo na bhavanti
Replacements in *vām* and *nau*, and the others like them, optionally do not come in place of a *pada* which consists of *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, ends in *ṣaṣṭhī*, *caturthī* or *dvitīyā*, and occurs in construction after a *pada* ending in *prathamā* 'nominative', preceded by another *pada*.

EXAMPLES:

grāme kambalas te svam 'a blanket is your property in the village'
grāme kambalas tava svam 'ibidem'
grāme kambalo me svam 'a blanket is my property in the village'
grāme kambalo mama svam 'ibidem'
grāme kambalas te dīyate 'a blanket is given to you in the village'
grāme kambalas tubhyaṃ dīyate 'ibidem'
grāme kambalo me dīyate 'a blanket is given to me in the village'
grāme kambalo mahyaṃ dīyate 'ibidem'
grāme chātrās tvā paśyanti 'students see you in the village'
grāme chātrās tvā paśyanti 'ibidem'
grāme chātrā mā paśyanti 'students see me in the village'
grāme chātrā māṃ paśyanti 'ibidem'

1. The word *saha* 'with', in *saha pūrvāyāḥ* = *sapūrvāyāḥ* 'that which has something preceding', means *vidyamāna* 'present, occurring'. Thus, *sapūrvāyāḥ prathamāyāḥ* gives the sense of 'after a *pada* which ends in *prathamā* 'nominative' preceded by another *pada*'. This rule offers *vām* and *nau*, etc., as optional replacements for *yuṣmad* and *asmad* when these occur after a *pada* ending in the nominative, preceded by another *pada*. Consider *grāme kambalas tava svam* where *tava*, used preceded by *kambalaḥ* in the nominative,

can be optionally replaced with *te*, so long as *kambalaḥ* occurs preceded by yet another *pada*, here *grāme*. That is, we can get: *grāme kambalas te svam*. Note that all these examples of *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are given here in the singular. Replacements in dual and plural can also be gotten if earlier specifications allow.

Why do we have the condition of *sapūrvāyāḥ*? Consider *kambalas te svam* and *kambalo me svam* where, in the absence of any other preceding *pada*, we get the replacements in consonance with rule 8.1.22 *temayāv ekavacanasya*. That is, this rule does not apply, and we get the genitive singular *yuṣmad* and *asmad* replaced with *te* and *me*, obligatorily. This same obligatory replacement is also witnessed in *kambalo grāme te svam* and *kambalo grāme me svam* where *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are used after a *pada* not ending in *prathamā*, though used preceded by another *pada*.

2. A *vārttika* proposal is made to restrict optional replacements only when *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are not used in *anvādeśa* 'an appended (reinforcing) statement' (*vt: yuṣmadasmador vibhāṣā ananvādeśa iti vaktavyam*). The nature of this restriction makes this optional type 'fixed' (*vyavasthita-vibhāṣā*). Thus, we will get an obligatory (*nitya*) replacement, as against an optional (*vibhāṣā*) in *atho grāme kambalas te svam, atho grāme kambalo me svam*. Yet others desire that replacements such as *vā* and *nau*, etc., should be all made optional when *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are not used in *anvādeśa* (*vt: sarva eva vānnāv ādayo' nanvādeśe vibhāṣā vaktavyāḥ*). This *vārttika* proposal would apply, irrespective of whether a nominative is preceded by another *pada*. But what then will be the use of our present rule? This rule will find its scope only when *anvādeśa* is involved.

8.1.27 तिङो गोत्रादीनि कुत्सनाभीक्ष्ण्ययोः

tiṅo gotrādīni kutsanābhīkṣṇyayoḥ
/ tiṅaḥ 5/1 *gotrādīni* 1/3 *kutsanābhīkṣṇyayoḥ* 7/2/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18)
tiṅantāt padāt parāṇi gotrādīni kutsane ābhīkṣṇye cārthe vartamānāni anudāttāni bhavanti
A *pada* which occurs after a *pada* denoted by *tiN*, and is formed with a nominal enumerated in the list headed by *gotra* used with the implication of *kutsana* 'pejoration' and *ābhīkṣṇya* 'repeated action', is marked *anudātta* in its entirety.

EXAMPLES:

pacati gotraṃ 'he extolls the greatness of his lineage'
jalpati gotraṃ 'ibidem'
pacatipacati gotraṃ 'he repeats the name of his *gotra*, over and over again'

jalpatijalpati gotram 'ibidem'
pacati bruvam 'speaks extolling . . .'
jalpati bruvam 'ibidem'
pacatipacati bruvam 'speaks repeatedly extolling . . .'
jalpatijalpati bruvam 'ibidem'

1. This rule alllows *anudātta*, in toto, to a *pada* which occurs after a *pada* ending in a *tiṄ* and is constituted by a nominal of the *gotrādi* group, provided its dentotation entails *kutsana* 'pejoration' and *ābhīkṣṇya* 'repeated action'.

Verbal root *pac* is used in example-derivates with the signification of *khyāpana* 'extolling, proclaiming'. The word *bruva* is derived with affix *aC* (3.1.134 *nándigrahi . . .*), introduced after *brū* 'to speak', with no replacement in *vac* for *brū* (2.4.53 *bruvo vaciḥ*). The iteration of *pacati pacati*, etc., is accomplished by 8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ*, under the condition of *ābhīkṣṇya* 'repeated action'.

2. Note that this *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' is made optional in case of *nāma* 'name'. In the absence of *nighāta*, we will get initial *udātta*. Thus, *pacati nāma* and *paṭhati nāmá*.

8.1.28 तिङ्ङतिङः

tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ
/tiṅ 1/1 *atiṅaḥ* 5/1 = *na tiṅ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmāt/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18)
tiṅantaṃ padam atiṅantāt padāt param anudāttaṃ bhavati.
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and occurs after a non-*tiṄ* is marked with *anudātta* in its entirety.

EXAMPLES:

devadattaḥ pacati
yajñadattaḥ pacati

1. Note that *apādādau* 'when not occurring at the beginning of a verse quarter' is also carried over. This rule, thus, allows a *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ* to be marked *anudātta*, in toto, when the same occurs after a *pada* not ending in a *tiṄ*. Consider *pacati*, of *devadattaḥ pacati* and *yajñadattaḥ pacati* which is marked *anudātta*, in toto (*sarvānudātta*), since it ends in a *tiṄ* and occurs after a *pada* not ending in a *tiṄ*. Refer to rule 3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau* for accentual details of *pacati*, especially for accentual details prior to the application of this rule.

Why do we state the condition of *tiṅaḥ*? Consider *nīlam utpálam* 'blue lotus' and *śuklam vástram* 'white dress' where we do not get a *tiṄ* occurring after a non-*tiṄ*.

Why do we state the condition of *atiṅaḥ*? Consider *bhavati pacáti* 'the action of cooking at the current time by a single agent is taking place'. Note that *tiP* and *ŚaP* of *pacati* are marked with *anudātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). The *a* of *pac* is marked with *udātta* in consonance with root-accent (*dhātu-svara*). This causes the *a* of *ŚaP* to be marked with *svarita*, in view of 8.4.65 *udāttānudāttasya svaritaḥ*.

Since *bhavati* is a *pada* ending in a *tiṄ*, we do not get total *anudātta* in *pacati*. What is the use of *atiṅaḥ*, especially when a simple sentence contains only one *pada* ending in a *tiṄ*? This rule does not necessarily require the condition of a single sentence (*samānavākya*) for its application. The two words could be of two sentences. The *Mahābhāṣya*, however, can accept *bhavati* as the principal *pada*. It will then recognize *pacati* as a secondary *pada*, mostly because it here serves as a means (*sādhanatvena*).

8.1.29 न लुट्

na luṭ
/ na ϕ luṭ 1/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28)
luṅantaṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LUṬ*, and occurs after a non-*tiṄ pada*, is not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety.

EXAMPLES:

śvaḥ kartā 'he will do tomorrow'
śvaḥ kartārau 'those two will do tomorrow'
māsena kartāráḥ 'they will do in a month'

1. This rule starts making negative provisions against what may have been made available by earlier rules. For example, a *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LUṬ* 'periphrastic future' is not marked *anudātta* (*Kāś*: *luḍantaṃ . . . nānudāttam . . .*). Thus, *śvaḥ karttā* '. . . will do tomorrow', etc. Refer to derivational details of *karttā*, etc., under rule 6.1.183 *tāsyānudātteṅiḍa. . . .* Note that affix *tāsI* of *kartās*, etc., is marked with *udātta* (3.1.3 *ādy udāttaś ca*). Affixes *Ḍā*, *rau* and *ras* (2.4.85 *luṭaḥ prathamasya . . .*) which occur after *tāsI* are marked with *anudātta* (6.1.183 *tāsyānudātten . . .*). Recall that *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*) of *tāsI*, i.e., *ās*, is deleted. The *ā* of *tās* is thus marked with *udātta*.

8.1.30 निपातैर्यद्यदिहन्तकुविन्नेच्चेच्चण्कच्चिद्यत्रयुक्तम्

nipātair yadyadihantakuvinnecceccaṇkaccidyatrayuktam
/ nipātaiḥ 3/1 *yad-yadi-hanta-kuvin-ned-cec-caṇ-kaccid-yatra-yuktam = yac ca yadi ca hanta ca ned ca cec ca caṇ ca kaccic ca yatra ca = yadyady . . . yatrāḥ* (*itar. dv.*), *tair yuktam* (*tṛt. tat.* with int. *dv.*) /

(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam*
apādādau #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'*yat, yadi, hanta, kuvid, ned, cet, caṇ, kaccit, yatra*' *ity etair nipātair yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and occurs in construction with particles *yatra* 'the place where', *yadi* 'if', *hanta* 'oh, well', *kuvid* 'perhaps', *ned* 'not indeed', *cet* 'if', *caṆ* 'if', *kaccit* 'I hope that' and *yatra* 'the place where', is not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety.

EXAMPLES:

yat karoti, yat pacáti
yadi karoti, yadi pacáti
hanta karoti, hanta pacáti
kuvit karoti, kuvit pacáti
nej jihmāyanto narakaṃ patâma
sa ced bhuṅkte, sa ced adhīte
ayaṃ ca mariṣyati
kaccid bhuṅkte, kaccid adhīte
yatra bhuṅkte yatrādhīte
putrāso yatrá pitaro bhavánti

1. This accentual negation of a *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and is used in construction with a *nipāta* 'particle' goes against the positive provision of our preceding rule. Consider (*kṛ*→*kar*) + *u* + *tiP*→ *karoti*, where *tiP* is marked with *anudātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). The *a* of *kar* is also marked with *anudātta* by 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam*. . . . This leaves *u*, a *vikaraṇa* 'conjugational sign', to be marked with *udātta* (*vt: sati śiṣṭasvara* . . .; ad 6.1.155 *anudāttam* . . .). Consequently, *ti* is turned into a *svarita* (8.4.65 *udāttānudāttasya svaritaḥ*). Refer to the appendix for derivational details of other examples.

8.1.31 नह प्रत्यारम्भे

naha pratyārambhe
/ naha ϕ pratyārambhe 7/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'*naha*' *ity etena yukte pratyārambhe tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and occurs in construction with *naha*, is not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety when *pratyārambha* 'countering repeated denial' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

naha bhokṣyáse 'so (let's see) how you would not eat!'
nahādhyeṣyasé 'so (let's see) how you would not study!'

1. *Kāśikā* explains *pratyārambha* as 'a statement of desire rebuking (*upālambha*) someone for not doing something advised (*avadhīrayitāram upālabdhuṃ yā icchā*)'. Notice that *naha* 'not indeed', a combined specification with *na* 'not' and *ha* 'indeed', denotes negation in construction with repeated denial of an action denoted by the verbal root. Incidentally, *bhokṣyase* and *adhyeṣyase* are second dual middle forms of *bhuj* 'to consume' and *iṄ* 'to study' in *LṚṬ* 'future', where *thās* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhisip . . .*) gets replaced with *se* (3.4.80 *thāsaḥ se*). For reason that *sya* of *bhokṣyase* and *adhyeṣyase* is cited with *aT* in *upadeśa*, *se* is marked with *anudātta* (6.1.183 *tāsyānudāttet . . .*). Affix *sya*, itself, is marked with *udātta* on account of affixal accent (*pratyaya-svara*; 3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*). This subsequently causes *se* to be marked with *svarita* (8.4.65 *udāttānudāttasya svaritaḥ*).

Why do we have the condition of *pratyārambha*? Consider *naha vai tasmiṃś ca loke dakṣiṇāmiṯcha̲ntiṯ* 'not indeed in that place people expect to get a sacrificial fee'.

8.1.32 सत्यं प्रश्ने

satyaṃ praśne
/satyam 1/1 *praśne* 7/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'*satyam*' *ity anena yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati praśne*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and occurs in construction with *satyam* 'truly', is not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety when a question is signified.

EXAMPLES:

satyaṃ bhokṣyasé 'so you will surely eat?'
satyam a̲dhye̲ṣyasé 'so you will surely study?'

1. This rule denies *anudātta* to a verbal *pada* ending in a *tiṄ* when *satyam* is used in construction and a question is being asked. Why do we state the condition of *praśne* 'when a question is asked'? Consider *satyam vakṣyāmi nānṛtam* 'I speak truth and no untruth'.

8.1.33 अङ्गाप्रातिलोम्ये

aṅgāprātilomye
/aṅga ϕ *aprātilomye* 7/1 = *na prātilomye* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'*aṅga*' *ity anena yuktaṃ tiṅantam aprātilomye gamyamāne nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ* and occurs in construction with *aṅga* 'true' is not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety, when absence of non-amiability (*aprātilomya*) is signified.

EXAMPLES:

aṅga kuru 'indeed, you do'
aṅga pacá 'indeed, you cook'
aṅga paṭhá 'indeed, you recite'

1. The word *prātilomya* is explained as *anabhimata-kāritvam* 'doing something not desired'. Why do we state the condition of *aprātilomye*? Consider *aṅga kūja vṛṣala! idānīṃ jñāsyasi jālma!!* 'hey you lowly untouchable, go on cry, soon you will find out, rascal'.

8.1.34 हि च

hi ca
/ hi ϕ ca ϕ/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *aprātilomye* #33)
'*hi*' *ity anena yuktaṃ tiṅantam aprātilomye nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and occurs in construction with *hi* 'surely, indeed', is also not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety, when absence of non-amiability (*aprātilomya*) is signified.

EXAMPLES:

sa hi kuru 'indeed, now you go ahead and do'
sa hi pacá 'indeed, now you go ahead and cook'
sa hi paṭhá 'indeed, now you go ahead and recite'

1. The condition of *aprātilomye* still applies. Consider *sa hi kūja vṛṣala! idānīṃ jñāsyasi jālma!!* 'talk all you want O Vṛṣala, soon you will find out . . .'.

8.1.35 छन्दस्यनेकमपि साकांक्षम्

chandasy anekam api sākāṅkṣam
/ chandasi 7/1 *anekam* 1/1 = *na ekam* (*nañ. tat.*); *api ϕ sākāṅkṣam* 1/1 = *saha ākāṅkṣayā vartate* (*bv.*)*/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *hi* #34)
chandasi viṣaye hi-yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ sākāṅkṣam anekam api nānudāttaṃ bhavati
One or more *padas* which end in a *tiṄ* with some shared dependency relationship are also not marked with *anudātta*, in the Vedic, when they occur in construction with *hi* 'surely, indeed'.

EXAMPLES:

anṛtam hi matto vadáti, pāpmā enaṃ vipunāti 'a person who gets intoxicated speaks untruth, the sin, incurred through intoxication, makes him pure'

agnir hy agre udajáyat, tam indro' nūdájayat 'Agni indeed won first then Indra defeated him'
ajā hyagner ajániṣṭa garbhāt sā vā ápaśyaj janitārám agre 'Ajā indeed was born from Agni, then (she) experienced the one who brought her about'

1. This rule assigns *anudātta* to more than one verbal *pada*, provided there is shared mutual dependency and *hi* is used in construction. This *anudātta* may, sometime, also apply to a single *pada*. Consider *anṛtaṃ hi matto vadati pāpmā enaṃ vipunāti*. The two *padas* which here end in a *tiṄ* are both related to each other by means of *hi*. Their mutual dependency relationship can be described as that of a *hetu* 'cause' and *hetumat* 'effect'. Because the person is intoxicated, his intoxication is associated with impurity incurred as a result of speaking untruth. This same state of intoxication causes a thorough purification via repentance for accrued sins (*Nyāsa*: *yasmād anṛtaṃ matto vadati tasmāt pāpmā enaṃ vipunāti*). These *padas* both do not get marked with *anudātta*. Incidentally, *vadati*, like *pacati*, is marked with *udātta* at the beginning. The *nā* of *vipunāti* is marked *udātta* by affixal accent (*pratyaya-svara*). The *anudātta* of *vi*, a preverb, is gotten in consonance with 8.1.71 *tiṅi codāttavati*. . . . Our last example will also have its *ajaniṣṭa* denied blanket *anudātta*, eventhough, *ajaniṣṭa* and *apaśyat* both share a mutual dependency relationship on account of *hi*. Incidentally, *apaśyat* entails a replacement of *dṛś* with *paśya* (7.3.78 *pāghrādhmā* . . .). Deriving *ajaniṣṭa* from *jan* + *LUṄ*, with *sIC* and *iṬ*, etc., should present no difficulty.

Now consider *agnir hi agre udajayat tam indro' nūdajayat* where both the *padas* are in construction with *hi* but only one, i.e., *udajayat*, receives the negation of *anudātta*. This is as a result of the use of *api* in the wording of this rule. The second, i.e., *anūdajayat*, gets blanket *anudātta* (*nighāta*) of 8.1.28 *tiṅi atiṅaḥ*. Incidentally, *ud-ajayat* is a third singular active derivate of *LUṄ* and is marked with *udātta* at the beginning. For, *aṬ* is marked *udātta* by 6.4.71 *luṅlaṅlṛṅ*. . . . The remaining vowels then become all *anudātta*.

8.1.36 यावद्यथाभ्याम्

yāvadyathābhyām
/yāvadyathābhyām 3/2 = *yāvac ca yathā ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'*yāvat, yathā*' *ity etābhyāṃ yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and is used in construction with *yāvat* 'as long as' and *yathā* 'as', is not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety.

EXAMPLES:

yāvad bhuṅkte 'as long as he eats . . .'

yathā bhuṅkte 'the manner in which he eats . . .'
devadattaḥ pacáti yāvat 'as long as Devadatta cooks . . .'
devadattaḥ pacáti yathā 'the manner in which Devadatta cooks . . .'

1. This rule is not needed since 8.1.66 *yadvṛttān nityam* can deny blanket *anudātta*, obligatorily. It is stated that 8.1.66 specifies its obligatory *nighāta* with *pañcamī* 'ablative'. This, in view of 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*, will offer *nighāta* only when a *pada* ending in a *tiṄ* is followed by *yāvat* and *yathā*. That is, *devadattaḥ pacati yathā* and *devadattaḥ pacati yāvat* cannot avail this negation in view of 8.1.66 *yadvṛttān nityam*. This rule is formulated to facilitate negation, also when *yathā* and *yāvat* follow a *pada* ending in a *tiṄ* (*Kāś*: *pareṇāpi yoge bhavati pratiṣedhaḥ*). Hence, this rule makes a specification with *tṛtīyā*.

8.1.37 पूजायां नानन्तरम्

pūjāyāṃ nānantaram
/pūjāyām 7/1 *na* ϕ *anantaram* 1/1 = *na antaraṃ vidyate' sya tad* (*bv.*)/ (*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *yāvadyathābhyām* #36)
'*yāvat, yathā*' *ity etābhyāṃ yuktam anantaraṃ tiṅantaṃ pūjāyāṃ viṣaye nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and is used in construction contiguously after *yāvat* and *yathā*, is also not marked with non-*anudātta* in its entirety, provided *pūjā* 'praise' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

yāvat pacati śobhanam 'he cooks great as long as he does'
yathā pacati śobhanam 'he cooks great the way he does'
yāvat karoti cāru 'he does great as long as he does'
yathā karoti cāru 'he does great the way he does'

1. Note that *na* 'not' carries from rule 8.1.29 *na luṭ*. This, when read with *anudātta*, will give us the meaning of *na anudāttam* = *ananudāttam* 'non-*anudātta*'. The negative *na* of this rule will then negate *na ananudāttam* = *anudāttam* 'no non-*anudātta* = *anudātta*'. This is how we get the provision of *anudātta* in this rule. Thus, a form which ends in a *tiṄ* and immediately follows *yathā* and *yāvat* is not marked with *anudātta* when the context is *pūjā* 'praise'.

2. Note that the locative of *pūjāyām* is interpreted as *viṣaya-saptamī* 'locative of domain'. Thus, we will not get this negation where the context is not 'praise'. Consider *yāvad bhuṅkte* 'as long as he eats . . .' and *yathā bhuṅkte* 'the manner in which he eats . . .' where this rule does not apply since 'praise' is not the context. Consider *yāvad devadattaḥ pacati śobhanam* and *yathā devadattaḥ pacati śobhanam* where *yāvat* and *yathā* are not used immediately before *pacati*. This serves as a counter-example to the condition of *anantaram*.

Our earlier rule negates the *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' of these counter-examples, instead (*Kāś: pūrveṇātra nighātaḥ pratiṣidhyate*).

8.1.38 उपसर्गव्यपेतं च

upasargavyapetaṃ ca
/upasargavyapetam 1/1 = *upasargeṇa vyapetam* (*tṛt. tat.*); *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *yāvadyathābhyām* #36 *pūjāyāṃ nānantaram* #37)
yāvadyathābhyāṃ yuktaṃ upasargavyapetaṃ ca pūjāyāṃ viṣaye nānudāttaṃ bhavati
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and is used in construction preceded by *yāvat* and *yathā*, though intervened with a preverb, is also not marked with non-*anudātta* in its entirety, provided *pūjā* 'praise' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

yāvat prapacati śobhanam 'he cooks beautifully as long as he does'
yathā prapacati śobhanam 'it is beautiful the way he cooks'
yāvat prakaroti cāru 'it is beautiful as long as he does'
yathā prakaroti cāru 'it is beautiful as he does'

1. This rule allows negation of non-*anudātta* also when *yāvat* and *yathā* precede a *pada* ending in a *tiṄ*, with the intervention of a preverb (*upasargavyapetam*). Of course, the context of *pūjā* is still valid. Recall that the earlier rule requires a verbal *pada* to immediately follow *yāvat* and *yathā*. This rule can tolerate the intervention of a preverb. Incidentally, the words *śobhana* 'beautiful' and *cāru* 'ibidem' here denote *pūjā* 'praise'.

2. Note that *ca* is here used for attracting *pūjāyām* and *anantaram*, both. The word *upasarga* 'preverb' is used to cancel possible intervention of something other than a preverb.

8.1.39 तुपश्यपश्यताहैः पूजायाम्

tupaśyapaśyatāhaiḥ pūjāyām
/tu-paśya-paśyata-ahaiḥ 3/1 (*itar. dv.*), *taiḥ*; *pūjāyām* 7/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'tu, paśya, paśyata, aha' ity etair yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati pūjāyāṃ viṣaye
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and is used in construction with *tu* 'but, indeed', *paśya* 'see', *paśyata* 'ibidem' and *aha* 'surely', is not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety when *pūjā* 'praise' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

māṇavakas tu bhuṅkte śobhanam 'this kid, indeed, eats beautifully'

paśya māṇavako bhuṅkte 'look how beautifully the kid eats'
paśyata māṇavako bhuṅkte 'ibidem'
aha māṇavako bhuṅkte śobhanam 'wow, the kid eats beautifully'

1. This rule negates *anudātta* of a *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and occurs in construction with *tu, paśya, paśyata* and *aha.* This negation applies to the positive provision of *anudātta* made by 8.1.28 *tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ.* Look for derivational details of *bhuṅkte* under 8.1.30 *nipātair yadi. . . .*

2. Why do we have to state *pūjāyām* here when the same could be carried from 8.1.37 *pūjāyāṃ nānantaram.* Recall that *pūjāyām* of that rule is associated with the negation of blanket *anudātta* (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś: tadd hi pūjāgrahaṇaṃ nighātapratiṣedhasya pratiṣedhena sambaddham*). If that is carried here, the negation of *nighāta* must also be carried. It is to block the negation of *anudātta* that *pūjāyām* is used here again. That is, we will get the negation of *anudātta* here.

8.1.40 अहो च

aho ca
/aho ϕ ca ϕ/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *pūjāyām* #39)
'*aho*' *ity anena yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati pūjāyāṃ viṣaye*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ,* and is used in construction with *aho* 'wow, ah', is not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety, provided when *pūjā* 'praise' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

aho devadattaḥ pacáti śobhanam 'wow, Devadatta cooks beautifully'
aho viṣṇumitraḥ kṛoti cāru 'wow! Viṣṇumitra is making (it) beautifully'

1. The *ca* 'and' is used here to attract *pūjāyām.* Refer to derivational details under 8.1.30 *nipātair. . . .*

How come *aho ca* is formulated as a separate rule? Why was *aho* not included within the wording of the preceding rule? A separate rule with *aho* is formulated so that *aho* alone can be carried to subsequent rule(s) (*Kāś: pṛthag yogakaraṇam uttarārtham*).

8.1.41 शेषे विभाषा

śeṣe vibhāṣā
/śeṣe 7/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *aho* #40)
'*aho*' *ity anena yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ śeṣe nānudāttaṃ bhavati*

A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and is used in construction with *aho* 'ah, wow!', is, optionally, not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety when something other than praise (*pūjā*) is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

kaṭam aho kariṣyasi 'so, you will make a mat'
mama geham eṣyasi 'so, you will come to my house'

1. The negative provision of *anudātta* which was made by the preceding rule is here made optional in case of contexts outside *pūjā* 'praise'. If this optional negation is not accepted, we will have *anudātta* (8.1.28 *tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ*). Consider *kariṣyasi* where, in view of optional negation of *anudātta*, *sya* is marked with *udātta* by affixal accent (*pratyayasvara*; 3.1.3 *ādy udāttaś ca*). The *si*, of course, was marked with *anudātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). It was then subsequently marked with *svarita* (8.4.66 *udāttānudāttasya svaritaḥ*).

8.1.42 पुरा च परीप्सायाम्

purā ca parīpsāyām
/purā ϕ ca ϕ parīpsāyām 7/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *vibhāṣā* #41)
'*purā*' *ity anena yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ parīpsāyām arthe vibhāṣā nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and is used in construction with *purā* 'prior to, previously', is also, optionally, not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety when *parīpsā* 'haste' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

adhīṣva māṇavaka purā vidyotate vidyut 'study child, (before) lightning starts'
. . . *purā stanayati stanayitnuḥ* '. . . (before) thunder starts'

1. Note that the *dharmaśāstras* 'code of laws' strictly forbid studying during thunder and lightning. This is because they are considered obstacles (*antarāya*) in learning (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *vidyotanādāv adhyayanaṃ pratiṣiddham, atas tadupanyāsena tvaritam adhīṣveti gamyate ity arthaḥ*). Consequently, there is an urgency to complete studying before thunder and lightning starts. The word *purā*, a *nipāta*, here denotes proximity to some future action (*Kāś*: *purāśabdo' tra bhaviṣyad āsattiṃ dyotayati*).

The present (*LAṬ*) of *vidyotate*, etc., is used in the sense of future (3.3.4 *yāvatpurānipātayor laṭ*). The *te* of *vidyotate* is marked with *anudātta* in view of 6.1.183 *tāsyanudāttenṅid*. . . . Thus, *dyotate* is initially marked *udātta* in view of root-accent (*dhātusvara*). The *vi* is *anudātta* by 8.1.71 *tiṅi codāttavati*. Verbal root *stani* is a derivate of *ṆiC* introduced after *stan*. It is marked with *udātta*

at the end (*antodātta*) in view of 6.1.159 *dhātoḥ*. The *i* of *stani* goes through *guṇa* and a replacement in *ay*. The *a* of *na* of *stani* + *LAṬ* → *stan*(*i*→*e*→*ay*) + *ŚaP* + *tiP*= *stanayati* remains *udātta*.

If optional *udātta* is accepted, *vi* of *vidyotate* will be marked with *udātta*, based on affixal accent.

2. Why do we state the condition of *parīpsā* 'haste'? Consider *naḍena sma purādhīyate* 'previously, they used to study by means of (the glow of) reeds' where *purā* denotes a long past time. This same applies to *ūrṇayā sma purādhīyate* 'used to study by means of (the glow of) a ball of wool'.

8.1.43 नन्वित्यनुज्ञैषणायाम्

nanv ity anujñaiṣaṇāyām
/nanu ϕ *iti* ϕ *anujñaiṣaṇāyām* 7/1 = *anujñāyā eṣaṇā* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*)/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *vibhāṣā* #41)
'*purā*' *ity anena yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati anujñaiṣaṇāyāṃ viṣaye*
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ*, and is used in construction with *nanu* 'certainly, indeed', is optionally not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety, when *anujñaiṣaṇā* 'seeking permission conducive to doing (something)' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

nanu karomí bhoḥ 'may I do it, sir?'
nanu gacchāmí bhoḥ 'may I go, sir?'

1. The word *anujñaiṣaṇā* is explained by Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kāś*) as: *kiṃcit kartuṃ svayam evodyatasyaivaṃ kriyatām ity evaṃ rūpo' bhyupagamaḥ* = *anujñā* 'approaching someone by saying, 'this is how you do it', to someone willing to do something'. Affix *LAṬ* of *karomi* is introduced by 3.2.123 *vartamāne laṭ*. The *LAṬ* of *nanu karomi bhoḥ* 'here, I do it sir' could be introduced by 3.2.120 *nanau pṛṣṭaprativacane*. This can serve as a counter-example since the sentence denotes *pṛṣṭa-prativacana* 'response to a question', *akārṣī kaṭaṃ devadatta* 'did you make the mat Devadatta?'

8.1.44 किं क्रियाप्रश्नेऽनुपसर्गमप्रतिषिद्धम्

kiṃ kriyāpraśne' nupasargam apratiṣiddham
/kim 1/1 *kriyāpraśne* 7/1 = *kriyāyāḥ praśnaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *anupasargam* 1/1 = *na vidyate upasargo' sya* (*bv.*), *tat*; *apratiṣiddham* 1/1 = *pratiṣedhaḥ pratiṣiddham*; *na pratiṣiddham asyety* (*bv.*)/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'*kim*' *etat kriyāpraśne yadā vartate tadānena yuktaṃ tiṅantam anupasargam apratiṣiddhaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati*

A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and occurs in construction with *kim* 'what, which' with the signification of *kriyāpraśna* 'questioning an action', is not marked with *anudātta* when action denoted by the root is not negated and there is no preverb used.

EXAMPLES:

kiṃ devadattaḥ pacáti āhosvid bhuṅkte 'Devadatta is cooking or eating?'
kiṃ devadattaḥ śeté āhosvid adhīte 'Devadatta is sleeping or studying?'

1. Refer to derivational details of *śete* under 6.1.183 *tāsyanudāttenṅit*. . . . An objection is raised against denying *anudātta* to *bhuṅkte* and *adhīte* of our example derivates. It is argued that they are not used in construction with *kim*. Hence, this rule should only apply to *pacati* and *śete*. But such an objection does not make sense because it is not the proximity of usage with *kim* which is crucial. It is the expression of doubt, instead. An interrogative *kim* also relates, via doubt (*saṃśaya*), to *bhuṅkte* and *adhīte*.

2. Why do we have to state the condition of *kriyā* in *kriyāpraśne*? This rule will not apply when a means (*sādhana*) is questioned. Thus, *kiṃ devadatta odanaṃ pacati āhosvic chākam* 'is Devadatta cooking rice or vegetable?'

Why do we state the condition of *praśne* 'when a question?' Consider *kim adhīte devadattaḥ* 'Devadatta studies, what?' The word *kim* is here used to rebuke (*kṣepe*) Devadatta.

Why do we state the condition of *anupasargāt* 'when not occurring after a preverb'. Consider *kiṃ devadattaḥ prapacati āhosvit prakaroti* where the roots are both used with the preverb *pra*.

Why do we state the condition of *apratiṣiddham* 'when not negated'? Consider *kiṃ devadatto na paṭhati āhosvin na karoti* 'Devadatta does not read, or does not do'.

8.1.45 लोपे विभाषा

lope vibhāṣā
/lope 7/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *kiṃ kriyāpraśne' nupasargam apratiṣiddham* #44)
kimo lope kriyāpraśne tiṅantam anupasargam apratiṣiddhaṃ vibhāṣā nānudāttaṃ bhavati
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and occurs in construction with *kim* 'what, which' with the signification of *kriyāpraśna* 'questioning an action', even when deleted, is optionally marked with *anudātta* when action denoted by the root is not negated and there is no preverb used.

EXAMPLES:

devadattaḥ pacáti āhosvit paṭháti 'Devadatta is cooking or studying?'
devadattaḥ pacati āhosvit paṭhati 'ibidem'

1. This rule allows *anudātta*, only optionally, when a *pada* ending in a *tiṄ* is used in construction with *kim*, and *kim* has gone through deletion. All other conditions remain the same. A deletion of *kim* simply implies a context where *kim* is not used but its meaning is understood (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *aprayujyamānasyāpi tasyārtho gamyate*). Incidentally, *pacati* and *paṭhati* do not differ in accent.

8.1.46 एहिमन्ये प्रहासे लृट्

ehimanye prahāse lṛṭ

/ehimanye 1/1 (deleted) = *ehiś ca manye ca* (*itar. dv.*); *prahāse* 7/1 *lṛṭ* 1/1/

(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)

'*ehimanye*' *ity anena uktaṃ lṛdantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati prahāse*

A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LṚṬ*, and is used in construction with *ehi* and *manye*, is not marked with *anudātta* when *prahāsa* 'derision, chiding, joke' is signified.

EXAMPLES:

ehi manye odanaṃ bhokṣyase, na hi bhokṣyase, bhuktaḥ so' thibhiḥ 'come, (you) think that you will eat rice, that you will indeed not, that has already been eaten by the guests'

ehi manye rathena yāsyasi, na hi yāsyasi, yātas tena te pitā 'come, (you) think that you will go by the chariot, that you will indeed not, your father has already gone with it'

1. Note that these examples involve transposition (*vyatyaya*) of subjects (*puruṣa*) in the context of derision or joke (*prahāsa*; cf. 1.4.106 *prahāse ca manyopapade*). Thus, the second personal ending in *bhokṣyase* is used under the condition of a conjoined first personal subject (*asmad*). The first personal ending in *manye* is similarly accomplished under the condition of a conjoined second personal subject (*yuṣmad*; *Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: '*prahāse ca manyopapade*' *iti puruṣa-vyatyayaḥ*; '*bhujer asmady upapade madhyamaḥ, manyater yuṣmady upapade uttamaḥ*'). This transposition of subjects is not found in contetxts outside derision. Consider *ehi manyase odanaṃ bhokṣye* 'come, you think you will eat rice', a counter-example to the condition of *prahāse*.

Refer to accentual details of *bhokṣyase* under rule 8.1.31 *naha pratyārambhe*. The *siP* of *yāsyasi* will be marked with *anudātta*, based on its *P* as an *it* (*pit*; 3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). Its *sya* will be marked with *udātta* on account of affixal accent (*pratyayasvara*; 3.1.3 *ādy udāttaś ca*). This will make *si* marked with a *svarita*.

2. Note that 8.1.51 *gatyarthaloṭā* . . . allows a derivate of *LṚṬ* to retain its accent when used in construction with the imperative (*LOṬ*) of a verb of motion (*gatyartha*). Verbal root *iṆ*, here used in imperative *ehi* with the

preverb *āṄ*, denotes such action. Why do we need this rule when 8.1.51 *gatyarthaloṭā . . .* could account for what this rule offers. Commentators state that this accentual provision for a derivate of *LṚṬ* is restrictive (*niyama*) in nature. That is, it applies only when *prahāsa* 'derision' is denoted.

8.1.47 जात्वपूर्वम्

jātv apūrvam
/jātu ϕ *apūrvam* 1/1 = *avidyamānaṃ pūrvam yasmāt* (*bv.*)*/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'jātu' ity etad avidyamānapūrvaṃ tena yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati
A *pada* which ends in an affix denoted by *tiṄ* and is used in construction with *jātu* 'definitely', not preceded by any other *pada*, is not marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

jātu kariṣyāmi 'surely, I will do it'

1. Why do we state the condition of *apūrvam* 'that which is used with no preceding *pada*'? Consider *kaṭaṃ jātu kariṣyati* 'he will definitely make a mat', where *anudātta* cannot be denied. For, *jātu* is preceded by *kaṭam*.

8.1.48 किंवृत्तं च चिदुत्तरम्

kiṃvṛttaṃ ca ciduttaram
/kiṃvṛttam 1/1 = *kimo vṛttam* (*ṣaṣ. tat. via nipātana*); *ca* ϕ *ciduttaram* 1/1 = *cid uttaraṃ yasmāt* (*bv.*)*/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *apūrvam* #47)
. . . tat kiṃvṛttaṃ ciduttaram avidyamānapūrvaṃ yat tena yuktam nānudāttaṃ bhavati
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and is used in construction with *kiṃvṛtta* 'who, what, which', preceded by nothing but followed by *cid*, is also not marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

kaścid bhojayáti 'someone feeds'
kaścid adhīte 'someone studies'
kencit karóti 'makes with something'
kasmaicid dadáti 'gives to someone'
kataraścit karóti 'who among these two is doing'
katamaścid bhuṅkte 'who among these many is eating'

1. The word *kiṃvṛtta* has been explained as *kimaḥ vṛttam* 'where there is *kim*'. It thus refers to forms of *kim* with all nominal endings and affixes *Ḍatara/*

Ḍatama, as well. Affix *Kta* of *kiṃvṛtta* denotes locus (*adhikaraṇa*). Refer to derivational details of *bhuṅkte*, etc., under 8.1.30 *nipātair*. . . . Note that *bhojayati* has *bhuji* 'to have someone consume', a causal derivate of *ṆiC*, as its root. Its *i* is thus marked with *udātta* in view of root-accent (*dhātu-svara*; 6.1.159 *dhātoḥ*). The *a* of *ja*, subsequent to *guṇa* and *ay* of *i*→*e*, becomes *udātta*. The initial *udātta* of *dadāti* is accomplished in consonance with 6.1.187 *anudātte ca*.

8.1.49 आहो उताहो चानन्तरम्

āho utāho cānantaram
/āho ϕ utāho ϕ ca ϕ anantaram 1/1 = *na vidyate' ntaraṃ yasya* (*bv.*)/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *apūrvam* #47)
'*āho, utāho*' *ity etābhyāṃ pūrvābhyāṃ yuktam anantaraṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*, and is used in construction immediately after *āho* 'is this so?' and *utāho* 'is that so?', is not marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

āho bhuṅkte 'is he eating?'
utāho bhuṅkte 'ibidem'
āho paṭhāti 'is he studying?'
utāho paṭhāti 'ibidem'

1. But not when the sentence is *āho devadatto bhuṅkte*, where *bhuṅkte* is not used immediately after *āho*. See the next rule. The condition of *apūrvam* 'not used after any other *pada*' is still valid. Thus, consider *devadatta āho bhuṅkte* where *āho* is used preceded by *devadattaḥ*.

8.1.50 शेषे विभाषा

śeṣe vibhāṣā
/śeṣe 7/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'*āho, utāho*' *ity etābhyāṃ pūrvābhyāṃ yuktam tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ śeṣe vibhāṣā bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*, and is used in construction after *āho* and *utāho* in remaining (non-contiguous) contexts, is optionally not marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

āho devadattaḥ pacáti 'is Devadatta cooking?'
utāho devadattaḥ pacati 'ibidem'

āho devadattaḥ paṭháti 'is Devadatta studying?'
utāho devadattaḥ paṭhati 'ibidem'

1. This is a residual (*śeṣa*) provision of the preceding rule. The word *śeṣe* 'remainder' refers to contexts other than those which have already been specified by earlier rules. It refers to a context where a verbal *pada* ends in a *tiṄ* and occurs in construction after *āho* and *utāho* non-contiguously. This verbal *pada*, in accord with provisions of this rule, is optionally not marked with *anudātta*.

8.1.51 गत्यर्थलोटा लृण् न चेत् कारकं सर्वान्यत्

gatyarthaloṭā lṛṇ na cet kārakaṃ sarvānyat
/gatyarthaloṭā 3/1 = *gatir artho yeṣāṃ te = gatyarthāḥ* (*bv.*); *gatyarthānāṃ loṭ = gatyarthaloṭ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tena*; *lṛṭ* 1/1 *na* ϕ *cet* ϕ *kārakam* 1/1 *sarvānyat* 1/1 = *sarvañ ca·tad anyac ca* (*karmadhāraya tatpuruṣa*)/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
gaminā samānārthā gatyarthāḥ, gatyarthānāṃ loṭ gatyarthaloṭ; gatyarthaloṭā yuktaṃ lṛḍantaṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati, na cet kārakaṃ sarvam anyadbhavati
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LṚṬ* and is used in construction with a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LOṬ* introduced after a verbal root having the signification of *gati* 'movement', is not marked with *anudātta*, provided participant relations, as expressed, are not at all different.

EXAMPLES:

āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ drakṣyasy énam 'come to the village Devadatta, you will see it (the village)'
āgaccha devadatta grāmam odanaṃ bhokṣyasé 'come to the village Devadatta, you will eat rice'
uhyantāṃ devadattena śālayaḥ, tenaiva bhokṣyanté 'let grains of śāli rice be brought by Devadatta, their rice-meal will be eaten by him'
uhyantāṃ devadattena śālayaḥ yajñadattena bhokṣyanté
'let grains of śāli rice be brought by Devadatta, their meal will be eaten by Yajñadatta'

1. This rule negates the *anudātta* of a verbal form which ends in a replacement of *LṚṬ*, when this same is used in construction with a form ending in *LOṬ* and the 'agent and object' of actions denoted by roots of both verbal forms are not different at all. That is, when the agent or object denoted by derivates of *LṚṬ* and *LOṬ* are both expressed as the same. The word *kāraka* refers here to *kartṛ* and *karman* only. For, these are the only two *kārakas* which can be denoted by a form ending in a *tiṄ* (3.4.69 *laḥ karmaṇi . . .*). Other *kārakas*, i.e., *karaṇa* 'instrument', etc., cannot be included here (*Kāś*: *kartṛkarmaṇī evātra tiṅantavācye kārakagrahaṇena gṛhyete na karaṇādi kārakān-*

taram) within the reference of *kārakam*. It is for this reason that agents of *āgaccha* 'come', *drakṣyasi* 'will see' and *bhokṣyase* 'will eat' are similar in sentences one and two both. Our next two example sentences denote the same object (*karman*), *śālayaḥ* 'rice', in *uhyantām* and *bhokṣyante*. This is what the phrase *na cet*, read with the *karmadhāraya* compound *sarvānyat = sarvaṃ ca tad anyac ca* 'that which is all and is also different' means. Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*) explains that a *kāraka* denoted by the form ending in *LOṬ*, and one denoted by the sense of the form ending in *LṚṬ*, alone, is considered here for similarity. The similarity of any other *kāraka* denoted by any other word is not considered (*anena loḍantavācyaṃ lṛḍantavācyārthaṃ yat kārakaṃ tasyaivānanyatvam āśritam, na śabdāntaravācyasyaeti . . .*).

Why do we have the condition of *gatyartha* 'that which has the signification of motion (*gati*)'? Consider *paca devadattaudanaṃ bhokṣyase enam* 'cook rice Devadatta, you will eat this rice-meal', where *pac* does not denote an action signifying motion (*gati*). Why do we have the condition of *loṭā* 'used in construction with *LOṬ*'? Consider *āgaccher devadatta grāmam drakṣyasi enam*, where the action in *āgaccheḥ* signifies *gati* but is used in *LIṄ*, and no *LṚṬ*. Why do we have the condition of *LṚṬ*? Consider *āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ paśyasi enam*, where *āgaccha* denotes an action involving motion, but is not used in construction with a *LṚṬ*. For, *paśyasi* is a form of *LAṬ*.

Why do we have the condition of *na cet kārakam sarvānyat*? Consider *āgaccha devadatta grāmam pitā te odanaṃ bhokṣyate* 'come to the village Devadatta, your father will eat rice', where agents of *āgaccha* and *bhokṣyate* are not the same. Also consider *uhyantāṃ devadattena śālayaḥ saktavaḥ tena pāsyante* 'let grains of śāli rice be brought by Devadatta, saktu will be drunk by him', where the objects expressed by *uhyantām* and *pāsyante* are not the same.

Why the condition of *sarva* 'all'? Consider *āgaccha grāmam devadatta tvaṃ cāhaṃ ca drakṣyāvaḥ enam*, where negation of *anudātta* will also apply. For, the *kāraka* denoted by the *pada* ending in a replacement of *LOṬ* is here expressed by *LṚṬ*, along with a different *kāraka*. Note that non-difference does not relate here to all participant relations involved. Instead, it only relates to all participant relations which happen to be expressed by *padas* which end in *tiṄ* and are used in sentences on hand. For, in its absence, we will also get the application of this rule in: *vaha brāhmaṇa śālīṃs tvaṃ pitaitāṃs tava bhokṣyate* 'carry the śāli rice-grains O brāhmaṇa, their rice-meal will be eaten by your father'. The negation of *anudātta* is here blocked.

2. Note that, given *dṛś* + (*LAṬ→si*), rule 6.1.58 *sṛjidṛśor . . .* introduces augment *aM*. The *sya*, in all these examples, will be marked with *udātta* by affixal accent (*pratyaya-svara*; 3.1.3 *ādy udāttaś ca*). Refer to similar examples for derivational details of *drakṣyasi* and *bhokṣyase*.

8.1.52 लोट् च

loṭ ca

/ loṭ 1/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *gatyarthaloṭā na cet kārakaṃ sarvānyat* #51)
loḍantaṃ tiṅantaṃ gatyarthaloṭā yuktaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati, na cet kārakaṃ sarvam anyad bhavati
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LOṬ*, and is used in construction with a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LOṬ* introduced after a verbal root having the signification of *gati* 'movement', is also not marked with *anudātta*, provided participant relations, as expressed, are not at all different.

EXAMPLES:

āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ paśyá 'come Devadatta, see the village'
āvraja viṣṇumitra grāmaṃ śā̱dhi 'come Viṣṇumitra, protect the village'
āgamyatāṃ devadattena grāmo dṛśyatāṃ yajñadattena 'let Devadatta come and the village be seen by Yajñadatta'

1. This rule extends the negation of *anudātta* also to a *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LOṬ*, used in construction with a derivate of *LOṬ*. Of course, when participants expressed with both derivates of *LOṬ* are not different. Note that *āgaccha*, etc., are derivates of *LOṬ*. The *LA*-affix in *āgamyatāṃ* and *dṛśyatām* is introduced with the denotatum of *karman* 'object'. A second personal derivate of *LOṬ* has its *dṛś* replaced with *paśy*. The second personal *hi* of (*dṛś*→*paśy*) + *ŚaP* + *hi* is deleted by 6.4.105 *ato heḥ*. The *paśy* of *paśy* + (*Ś*) *a*(*P*) = *paśy* + *a* is marked with *udātta* by root accent. Since the *a* of *ŚaP* is *anudātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*), this *pada* gets marked with *udātta* at the beginning. Refer to derivational details of *śādhi* under 6.4.22 *asiddhavad atrābhāt*. This verbal *pada*, since its *hi* is marked with something other than *P* as an *it*, is marked with *udātta* at the end by affixal accent.

2. Note that the condition of a verbal root having the signification of *gati* (*gatyarthānām*) is still valid. Thus, this rule will not apply in case of *paca devadattaudanaṃ bhuṅkṣva enam* 'cook rice Devadatta, eat it'. Verbal root *pac* does not have the signification of *gati* 'movement'. The twin conditions of *loṭā* and *sarvānyat* are also important. This is how this rule does not apply on *āgaccher devadatta grāmaṃ paśyainam* and *āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ paśytv enaṃ yajñadattaḥ*, respectively. Note that *āgaccheḥ*, a potential, is not a form of *LOṬ* and the agent and object of *paśyatu* are also different. Note, however, that, because of the *anuvṛtti* of *sarva* 'all', this rule will still apply on *āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ tvaṃ cāhaṃ ca paśyāvaḥ* 'come to the village Devadatta, you and I will both see it'. Verbal form *dṛśyatām* derives from *dṛś* + *tām* → *dṛś* + *yaK* + *tām*, where *ā* of *tām* is marked with *udātta* by affixal accent (3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*). This *udātta* can be blocked by the *udātta* of the *vikaraṇa*, i.e., *yaK*. This, however, does not happen in view of the *Mahābhāṣya* (ad 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padaṃ . . .*): *satiśiṣṭo' pi vikaraṇasvaro lasārvadhātukasvaraṃ na*

bādhate 'the accent of a class-marker (*vikaraṇa*), even though taught subsequently, does not block the accent of a *sārvadhātuka*-replacement of *LA*'. This facilitates an *anudātta* for *tām* (6.1.183 *tāsyānudātten . . .*). Thus, *dṛśyatām* remains marked with *udātta* in the middle.

3. Why is this rule formulated separately from the preceding? So that the *anuvṛtti* of *LṚṬ*, and not of *LOṬ*, could be stopped from carrying over to the following rule (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *uttaratra loṭ eva kāryaṃ yathā syāt lṛṭo mā bhūd ity evam arthaṃ pṛthagyogakaraṇam*).

8.1.53 विभाषितं सोपसर्गमनुत्तमम्

vibhāṣitaṃ sopasargam anuttamam
/vibhāṣitam 1/1 *sopasargam* 1/1 = *upasargeṇa saha vartate* (*bv.*); *anuttamam* 1/1 = *na uttamam* (*nañ. tat.*)/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *gatyarthaloṭā na cet kārakaṃ sarvānyat* #51 *loṭ* #52)
loḍantaṃ sopasargam uttamavarjitaṃ gatyarthaloṭā yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ vibhāṣitaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati, na cet kārakaṃ sarvam anyad bhavati
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LOṬ* with the exception of *uttama* 'first personal', and which is used in construction with a *tiṄ*-replacement of *LOṬ* introduced after a verbal root having a signification similar to *gati* 'movement', is optionally not marked with *anudātta* provided, of course, when participant relations as expressed are not at all different.

EXAMPLES:

āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ praviśa 'come Devadatta, enter the village'
āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ praviśá 'ibidem'
āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ praśādhi 'come Devadatta, rule the village'
āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ praśádhi 'ibidem'

1. This rule optionally blocks the *anudātta* of a verbal root which is used with the signification of *gati* and ends in a non-first personal *tiṄ*-replacement of *LOṬ* (*anuttamam*). This rule makes the obligatory provision of the preceding rule as optional (*vibhāṣita*). The word *vibhāṣita* is synonymous with *vibhāṣā* and this option can be characterized as *prāpta-vibhāṣā* 'an option which was already made available'. The final *udātta* of *praśādhi* is similar to that of *śādhi*. The *pra* of *praśādhi* will receive *anudātta* of 8.1.71 *tiṅi codāttavati*. Note that *praviśa* derives from *pra-viś* + *Śa* + *hi* where *hi* gets deleted and *pra* receives *anudātta*. The *a* of *Śa* is marked with *udātta* by affixal accent. This offers *praviśa* the option of being marked with *udātta* at the end. If the option of *anudātta* is accepted then *praviśa* will receive total *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*', instead. The preverb *pra* will then be marked *udātta* by *Phiṭsūtra* ((80) *nipātā ādyudāttāḥ*).

2. Why do we have the condition of *sopasargam* 'used with a preverb'. Consider *āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ paśya* where, in the absence of this optional provision, the preceding rule applies obligatorily.

Why do we state the condition of *anuttamam* 'when not first personal'? Consider *āgaccha devadatta grāmaṃ praviśāni*, where *praviśāni* is a form of the first person. The preceding rule will again apply, obligatorily.

8.1.54 हन्त च

hanta ca
/ hanta ϕ ca ϕ/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *loṭ* #52 *vibhāṣitaṃ sopasargam anuttamam* #53)
'*hanta*' *ity anena yuktaṃ loḍantaṃ sopasargaṃ tiṅantaṃ vibhāṣitaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in a non-first personal (*anuttama*) *tiṄ*-replacement of *LOṬ*, and is used in construction with *hanta* 'o, well', is also optionally not marked with *anudātta.*

EXAMPLES:

hanta praviśa 'o, well, enter!'
hanta praviśa 'ibidem'
hanta praśādhi 'o, well, discipline!'
hanta praśādhi 'ibidem'

1. A verbal *pada* which ends in a non-first personal *tiṄ*-replacement of *LOṬ*, under conditions similar to the preceding rule, is also optionally not marked with *anudātta*, when this same is used in conjunction with *hanta* 'o, well!'. The word *ca* 'and' is used here to attract the preceding rule in its enitrety. This optional provision is made against the obligatory provision of 8.1.30 *nipātair yadyi. . . .*

8.1.55 आम एकान्तरमामन्त्रितमनन्तिके

āma ekāntaram āmantritam anantike
/ āmaḥ 5/1 *ekāntaram* 1/1 = *ekaṃ padam antaraṃ yasya tat* (*bv.*); *āmantritam* 1/1 *anantike* 7/1 = *na antikam* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *na* #29)
āma uttaram ekapadāntaram āmantritaṃ anantike nānudāttaṃ bhavati
A *pada* termed *āmantrita* which occurs after *ām* and is intervened by not more than a single *pada*, is not marked with *anudātta* in its entirety when an address is made to a person other than one close by (*antika*).

EXAMPLES:

*ām pacasi devádatta*3 'so you are cooking Devadatta!'
*ām bho devadatta*3 'yes, Devadatta!'

1. This rule negates *sarvānudātta* 'blanket *anudātta*' of a *pada* termed *āmantrita*, provided the same occurs after *ām* intervened by not more than a single *pada*. Note that this accentual provision is also conditioned by *anantike* 'when *antika* 'near' is not denoted'. The *Mahābhāṣya* offers two interpretations of *anantike*: far (*dūra*), and neither near nor far. I accept the second interpretation since the usage is *sambuddhi* 'address' and the rule does not explicitly use *adūre* 'far'. If Pāṇini's intent was to interpret *anantika* as *dūra* he would have used *adūre*. Refer also to *paribhāṣā* (75): *nañviyuktam anyasadṛśādhikaraṇe. . . .*

Consider *ām pacasi devádatta*3! and *ām bho devádatta*3, where this rule negates *anudātta* in *devadatta*, an *āmantrita*, since *ām* and *devadatta* are intervened by a single *pada*, i.e., *pacasi* and *bho*. Once *anudātta* is negated, rule 6.1.195 *āmantritasya ca* applies to mark *āmantrita* with initial *udātta*. Recall in this connection that *bhoḥ* is also *āmantrita* and hence, is treated as if non-existent (*avidyamānavat*; 8.1.72 *āmantritaṃ . . .*). How could the initial *udātta* of *devadatta* be accomplished here? Rule 8.1.73 *nāmantrite samānādhikaraṇe* will block the 'non-existence' provision (*avidyamānavat*) of 8.1.72 *āmantritaṃ pūrvam avidyamānavat*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *ām*? Consider *śākaṃ pacasi devadatta*3 'are you cooking leafy vegetables, devadatta!' Why do we have the condition of *ekāntaram* 'intervention of one'? Consider *ām prapacasi devadatta*3 where *pra* and *pacasi* both intervene. Why do we have the condition of *āmantritam*? Consider *ām pacati devadattaḥ* 'devadatta surely cooks', where *devadattaḥ* is not an *āmantrita*.

Why do we have the condition of *anantika* 'not far, not near'? Consider *ām devadattaḥ* 'yes, Devadatta . . .'. This rule, when its *anantika* is not interpreted as meaning 'not far not near', will leave no scope of application of *ekaśruti* 'monotone' (1.2.33 *ekaśruti dūrāt . . .*) and *pluta* 'prolated vowel' marked with *udātta* (8.2.84 *dūrāddhūte ca*).

Incidentally, *s* of *bhos* is replaced with *rU* (8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ*). The *r* is then replaced with *y* (8.3.17 *bhobhagoagho . . .*) to be subsequently deleted by 8.3.22 *hali sarveṣām*. This is how we get *bho*.

8.1.56 यद्धितुपरं छन्दसि

yaddhituparam chandasi

/yadd-hi-tu-param 1/1 = *yac ca hiś ca tuś ca* (*itar. dv.*); *chandasi* 7/1/ (*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)

yatparaṃ hiparaṃ tuparaṃ ca tiṅantaṃ chandasi nānudāttaṃ bhavati

A *pada* which ends in a *tiN*, and occurs in construction before *yad* 'that which', *hi* 'indeed' and *tu* 'indeed, but', is not marked with *anudātta* in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

gavâṃ gotram udasṛjo' yam áṅgiraḥ 'Aṅgirā, you have released cows from their shed'
indavo vām uśanti hi 'soma-drops, indeed, like you'
ākhyāsyāmí tu te 'I shall tell you, indeed'

1. Note that this negation of *anudātta* is already made available in the context of a following *yad* (8.1.30 *nipātair. . .*), *hi* (8.1.34 *hi ca*) and *tu* (8.1.39 *tupaśyapaśyatā . . .*). Why do we need this rule? A provision made against one already made available is made for restrictive purposes (*niyamārtham*). That is, a form which ends in a *tiṄ*, in the Vedic, and whose *anudātta* is negated under the condition of what follows in construction, should be negated only when *yad, hi* and *tu*, and not any other word follows (*Kāś: ebhir eva parair yoge pratiṣedho bhavati nānyair iti*). We will thus get *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' in *jāye svo rohāvaihí* where *rohāva*, a derivate of *ruh* in *LOṬ*, is used in construction with *ehi*, a derivate of *ā-i* 'to come' in *LOṬ* signifying *gati*.

Consider *udasṛjo yad . . .* where *yad* follows and *udasṛjaḥ* is a derivate of *LAṄ*, replaced with *siP*. Thus, (*ud+aṬ+sṛj*) + *Śa* + (*LAṄ→siP*)) → *udasṛjaḥ*. Note that (*s→rU*) is replaced with *u* (6.1.113 *haśi ca*) where 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* subsequently orders a single *guṇa* as a replacement for *a+u* at the end. The *aṬ*, of course, is marked with *udātta*. The *uśanti* of *vāmuśanti* is a derivate of *LAṬ* where *v* of verbal root *vaś* goes through *samprasāraṇa* (6.1.16 *grahi-jyāvayi . . .*). Thus, *vaś* + (*LAṬ→jhi*) → (*v→u*) *aś* + *ŚaP* + (*jhi→anti*)) → (*ua→ uś*) + *a* + *anti* = *uśanti*. The *a* of *ŚaP* is deleted by 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛti-bhyaḥ. . . .* Since *a* of *anti* is marked with *udātta* in view of affixal accent (3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*), *uśanti* is accepted as marked with *udātta* in the middle. Our last example *ākhyāsyāmi* is a first person singular derivate of *LṚṬ*, introduced after *ā-khyā* 'to relate'. Its *sya* is, as usual, marked with *udātta*. Since this *pada* will be marked with *udātta*, instead, the preverb will be marked with *anudātta* by 8.1.71 *tiṅi codāttavati*.

8.1.57 चनचिदिवगोत्रादितद्धिताम्रेडितेष्वगतेः

canacidivagotrāditaddhitāmreḍiteṣv agateḥ
/cana-cid-iva-gotrādi-taddhita-āmreḍiteṣu 7/3 = *canaś ca cit ca iva ca gotrādayaś* (*gotra ādir yeṣāṃ te, bv.*) *ca taddhitāś ca āmreḍitañ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu; agateḥ* 5/1 = *na gatiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmāt/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'*cana, cid, iva, gotrādi, taddhita, āmreḍita*' *ity eteṣu parataḥ agater uttaraṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati*
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and is used in construction before (*i*) *cana, cid, iva*, (*ii*) a nominal listed in the group headed by *gotra* (5.3.66-67), (*iii*) a derivate ending in an affix termed *taddhita* (4.1.76), and (*iv*) an

āmreḍita, is not marked with *anudātta*, provided the *pada* ending in a *tiṄ* does not occur in construction after *gati*.

EXAMPLES:

devadattaḥ pacáti cana 'Devadatta is not even cooking'
devadattaḥ pacáti cit 'ibidem'
devadattaḥ pacáti iva 'Devadatta shows as if he is cooking'
devadattaḥ pacáti gotram 'Devadatta is trouble to his family'
devadattaḥ pacáti bruvam 'Devadatta only talks, does not cook'
devadattaḥ pacáti pravacanam 'Devadatta only lectures, does not cook'
devadattaḥ pacátikalpam 'Devadatta only shows as if he is cooking'
devadattaḥ pacátirūpam 'ibidem'
devadattaḥ pacáti pacati 'Devadatta cooks repeatedly'

1. This rule begins negation of *anudātta* of those forms which end in a *tiṄ* and happen to be followed by *cana, cid, iva*; a nominal of the *gotrādi* group, a derivate of *taddhita*, or a form termed *āmreḍita* (8.1.2 *tasya paramāmreḍitam*), provided they do not occur in construction after a form termed *gati* (1.4.59 *upasargāḥ kriyāyoge*, 1.4.60 *gatiś ca*). *Kāśikā* warns that the term *gati* in this, and in rule 8.1.68 *sagatir api tiṅ* as well, should be understood only as referring to an *upasarga* termed *gati* (*Kāś*: *atrāgatigrahaṇe 'sagatir api tiṅ' ity atra ca upasargagrahaṇaṃ draṣṭavyam*; *Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *tenopasargasaṃjñasyaiva gater grahaṇaṃ vijñāyate*). It is for this reason that we do not get negation of *anudātta* in *śuklīkaroti can*, etc.

Note that, here too, the *gotrādi* nominals are accepted as involving the signification of *kutsana* 'pejoration' and *ābhīkṣṇya* 'repeated action' (*Kāś*: *ihāpi gotrādayaḥ kutsanābhīkṣṇyayor eva gṛhyante*; cf. 8.1.27 *tiṅo gotrādīni kutsanābhīkṣṇyayoḥ*).

2. Consider *pacatikalpam* and *pacatirūpam* where the *taddhita* affixes *kalpaP* (5.3.67 *īṣad asammāptau*) and *rūpaP* (5.3.66 *praśaṃsāyāṃ rūpap*) have been introduced. Since these affixes are both marked with *P* as an *it* (*pit*), they are marked with *anudātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). These forms thus avail the monotone (*ekaśruti*) provision of 1.2.39 *svaritāt*. . . . The iteration of *pacati pacati* is, of course, accomplished by 8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ*. The second *pacati* is here termed *āmreḍita*. The first *pacati* then qualifies for negation of its *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' under the condition of the following second which is termed *āmreḍita*.

8.1.58 चादिषु च

cādiṣu ca
/ *cādiṣu* 7/3 = *ca ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣu*; *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *agateḥ* #57)

cādiṣu parataḥ tiṅantam agateḥ paraṃ nānudāttaṃ bhavati
A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*, does not occur after a *pada* constituted by a *gati*, and is used in construction before that which is listed in the group headed by *ca* (*cādi*), is also not marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

devadattaḥ pacáti ca khādati ca 'Devadatta cooks and eats'
devadattaḥ pacáti vā khādati vā 'Devadatta is either cooking or eating'
devadattaḥ pacáti ha khādati ha 'Devadatta indeed cooks and eats'
devadattaḥ pacáty aha khādaty aha 'Devadatta certainly cooks and eats'
devadattaḥ pacáty eva khādaty eva 'Devadatta only cooks and eats'

1. This rule negates *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' of a form ending in a *tiṄ* when the same occurs preceded by a form other than a *gati*, and is followed by *ca*, etc. Note that *ca*, etc. (*cādi*), generally refers to a group of indeclinables which, when not denoting a thing (*asattve*), are termed particles (*nipāta*; 1.4.57 *cādayo' sattve*). The word *cādi* here refers only to particles *ca*, *vā*, *ha*, *aha* and *eva* which have been specified under rule 8.1.24 *na cavāhāhaivayukte*. This limited reference to *cādi* is determined on the basis of proximity (*pratyāsatti*) between this rule and rule 8.1.24 *na cavāhāhaivayukte*.

8.1.59 चवायोगे प्रथमा

cavāyoge prathamā
/*ca-vā-yoge* 7/1 = *caś ca vāś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tau*; *tābhyāṃ yogaḥ* (*tṛt. tat.*), *tasmin*; *prathamā* 1/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29)
'*ca, vā*' *ity etābhyāṃ yoge prathamā tiṅvibhaktir nānudāttā bhavati*
The first *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*, and is used in association with *ca* 'and' and *vā* 'or', is not marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

gardabhāṃś ca kālayáti vīṇāṃ ca vādayati '. . . goads the donkeys, plays the lute'
gardabhān vā kālayáti vīṇāṃ vā vādayati '. . . either goads the donkeys or plays the lute'

1. Note that the *anuvṛtti* of *agateḥ* 'after that which denotes something other than movement (*gati*)' which was valid in the last rule is here abandoned (*Kāś: agateḥ' iti pūrvasūtre cānukṛṣṭam ity atra nānuvartate*). The word *yoge* 'in association' is used here merely to indicate association (*sāhacarya*). It does not have any relevance to whether *ca*, etc., are used before or after the form ending in a *tiṄ*. Consequently, *nighāta* can also be negated when *ca*, etc., precede a form ending in a *tiṄ*.

The word *prathamā* is not used here in the sense of the nominative. It is, instead, used for referring to the first verbal form by way of its ending (*vibhakti*). This is why *Kāśikā* paraphrases the rule as: *ca vā ity etābhyāṃ yoge prathamā tiṅvibhaktir nānudāttā bhavati* 'the first (word-)ending (*vibhakti*)) denoted by *tiṄ*, in association with *ca*, etc., is not marked with *anudātta*'. This blocks the negation of *anudātta* in case of the second, etc., verbal forms ending in a *tiṄ* (*Kāś*: . . . *dvitīyādes tiṅantasya mā bhūd iti*).

Since association (*yoga*) with *ca* and *vā* is possible only when more than one entities are involved, negation of *anudātta* may apply to more than one. The word *prathamā* restricts the negation to the first. Thus, *kā̲layáti* in both examples will be subject to negation of *anudātta*. The second verb will be subject to *nighāta* of 8.1.28 *tiṅi atiṅaḥ*. The accentuation of *kā̲layáti* follows the pattern of *bhojayati* and *stanayati* (cf. 8.1.42 *purā ca parīpsāyām*, etc.).

8.1.60 हेति क्षियायाम्

heti kṣiyāyām
/ha ϕ iti ϕ kṣiyāyām 7/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *prathamā* #59)
'*ha*' *ity anena yuktā prathamā tiṅvibhaktir nānudāttā bhavati kṣiyāyāṃ gamyamānāyām*
The first *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*, and is used in association with *ha*, is not marked with *anudātta* when *kṣiyā* 'undesired conduct' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

svayaṃ ha rathena yāti3 upādhyāyaṃ padātiṃ ga̲maya̲ti̲ 'himself goes by a chariot, but has his teacher go on foot'
svayaṃ haudanaṃ bhuṅkte3 upādhyāyaṃ saktūn pā̲ya̲ya̲ti̲ 'himself eats a meal of rice, but has his teacher drink a meal of saktu'

1. *Kāśikā* explains *kṣiyā* as *dharmavyatikramaḥ ācāra-bhedaḥ* 'breach of conduct; opposite conduct'. As usual, the first verbal *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* will be denied its *anudātta*. The *svarita-pluta* of 8.2.104 *kṣiyāśīḥpraiṣeṣu* . . . will apply, instead. Recall, however, that *yā* of *yāti* remains *udātta* since the *svarita* of *ti* will remain suspended (*asiddha*) in view of the root accent.

2. The word *iti* is used here to indicate the word-form of *ha*, as a condition for negation of *anudātta*. In its absence, the negation of *anudātta* could apply to *ha*, or to the form ending in a *tiṄ* (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *itikaraṇe tu sati svarūpamātrapradhāno haśabdo nighātasya kāraṇaṃ bhavati/ asatyām api haśabdasya tiṅantasya vā kṣiyāyāṃ vṛttau nighātapratiṣedhaḥ siddho bhavati*).

8.1.61 अहेति विनियोगे च

aheti viniyoge ca

/ aha ϕ iti ϕ viniyoge 7/1 *ca ϕ/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *prathamā* #59 *kṣiyāyām* #60)
'aha' ity anena yuktā prathamā tiṅvibhaktir nānudāttā bhavati viniyoge gamyamāne
The first *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*, and is used in construction with *aha*, is not marked with *anudātta* when *viniyoga* 'commissioning for varying things' or *kṣiyā* 'undesired conduct' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

tvam aha grāmam gacchá tvam ahāraṇyaṃ gaccha 'you surely go to the village and indeed go to the forest'
svayam aha rathena yātí3 upādhyāyaṃ padātiṃ gamayati 'he indeed goes himself by the chariot and sends his teacher on foot'
svayam ahaudanaṃ bhuṅkté3 upādhyāyaṃ saktūn pāyayati 'he himself eats rice and has his teacher drink saktu'

1. Note that *viniyoga* is explained as *nānāprayojano niyogaḥ* 'commission for diverse purposes'. The use of *ca* 'and' attracts the condition of *kṣiyāyām* 'undesired conduct'. Thus, there are two conditions, *viniyoga* and *kṣiyā*, under which *anudātta* can be negated. Negation of *anudātta* and *pluta* is similar to examples of the preceding rule (*Kāś: pūrvavan nighātapratiṣedhaḥ plutaś ca*).

8.1.62 चाहलोपएवेत्यवधारणम्

cāhalopa evety avadhāraṇam
/ cāhalope 7/1 = *caś ca ahaś ca* = *cāhau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayor lopaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *eva ϕ iti ϕ avadhāraṇam* 1/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *prathamā* #59)
calope ahalope prathamā tiṅvibhaktir nānudāttā bhavati evety etac ced avadhāraṇārthaṃ prayujyate
The first *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* is not marked with *anudātta* when *ca* and *aha*, used in construction with it, go through a deletion by *LOPA*, provided *eva* is used with the signification of *avadhāraṇa* 'restriction, exact determination'.

EXAMPLES:

devadatta eva grāmaṃ gacchátu 'let Devadatta alone go to the village'
sa devadatta evāraṇyaṃ gacchatu 'and let that same Devadatta go to the forest'
devadatta eva grāmam gacchátu 'let Devadatta alone go to the village'
yajñadatta evāraṇyaṃ gacchatu '(and) let Yajñadatta alone go to the forest'

1. This negation of *anudātta* in the first verbal form is dependent upon deletion of *ca* and *ha*. Additionally, it requires the use of *eva* in the sense of *avadhāraṇa* 'restriction, exact determination'. What is the meaning of *cāhalope*? It means where *ca* and *aha* are not explicitly used but their sense is understood. Recall that *ca* means *samuccaya* 'collection, aggregation, and' and *eva* means *kevala* 'only'. Generally, in examples above, deletion of *ca* should be understood when same agents are involved. Thus, consider the first two sentences of our examples which can be rendered with *ca* as: *devadatta eva grāmaṃ cāraṇyaṃ ca gacchatu* 'let Devadatta alone go to the village, and to the forest'. Deletion of *aha* can be similarly understood when different agents are involved (*Kāś*: *samānakartṛke calopaḥ, nānākartṛke ahalopaḥ*).

The first *gacchatu* is marked with *udātta*, in view of root-accent (*dhātu-svara*; 6.1.159 *dhātoḥ*). It follows the accentual pattern of *pacáti*. The second *gacchatu* will, of course, be marked with *anudātta*, as required (8.1.28 *tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ*).

8.1.63 चादिलोपे विभाषा

cādilope vibhāṣā
/ cādilope 7/1 = *ca ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*); *teṣāṃ lopaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *vibhāṣā* 1/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *prathamā* #59)
cādayaḥ 'na cavāhāhaivayukte' iti sūtranirdiṣṭā gṛhyante, teṣāṃ lope prathamā tiṅvibhaktir nānudāttā bhavati vibhāṣā
The first *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* is not marked with *anudātta* when *ca*, etc., go through deletion by means of *LOPA*.

EXAMPLES:

śuklā vrīhayo bhavánti 'rice are generally white'
śuklā vrīhayo bhavanti 'ibidem'
śvetā gā ājyāya duhánti 'they milk white cows for butter (ghee)'
śvetā gā ājyāya duhanti 'ibidem'
vrīhibhir yajéta 'one should sacrifice with ritual oblation of (wild) rice'
vrīhibhir yajeta 'ibidem'
yavair yajéta 'one should sacrifice with ritual oblation of barley'
yavair yajeta 'ibidem'

1. This rule makes the negation of *anudātta* optional in contexts where *ca, vā, ha, aha* and *eva* (*cādi*) are deleted. Consequently, the first verbal form which ends in a *tiṄ* will be optionally denied its *anudātta*. Here again *cādi* refers to particles specified under rule 8.1.24 *na cavāhāhaivayukte*. The sense of *lope* 'when deletion . . .' also remains the same. That is, when *cādi* elements are not used but their sense is understood. Consider *śuklā vrīhayo*

bhavánti 'rice are generally white' where we will optionally also get *bhavanti*. There is no negation of *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' in the second *bhavanti*. We similarly get *vrīhibhir yajéta* where *vā* is deleted. Once *ta* is marked with *anudātta* on the basis of being a *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*) replacement of *LA*, *yajeta* will be marked with *udātta* at the beginning by root accent (6.1.159 *dhātoḥ*). Another option will be *yajeta*. One can similarly understand other examples (*Kāś: evaṃ śeṣeṣv api yathādarśanam udāhāryam*).

8.1.64 वैवावेति च च्छन्दसि

vaivāveti ca cchandasi
/vaivāva 1/2 (deleted) = *vaiś ca vāvaś ca* (*itar. dv.*); *iti* ϕ *ca* ϕ *chandasi* 7/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *prathamā* #59 *vibhāṣā* #63)
'*vai, vāva*' *ity etābhyāṃ yuktā prathamā tiṅvibhaktir vibhāṣā nānudāttā bhavati chandasi viṣaye*
The first *pada* (of a sentence) which ends in a *tiṄ* and is used in association with *vai* 'truly' and *vāva* 'indeed', is, optionally, not marked with *anudātta* in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

ahárvai devānāmāsīd rātriyrasúrāṇām āsīt 'the day indeed was of the gods and the night of the demons'
bṛhaspatírvai devānāṃ purohita āsít (*āsīt*) *śaṇḍāmarkāvasúrāṇām* 'Bṛhaspati indeed was the priest of gods, Śaṇḍa and Marka were the priests of demons'
ayaṃ vāv hasta āsít netara āsīt 'this, and not any other, was indeed the (famous) hand'

1. This rule offers optional negation of *anudātta*, in the Vedic, where *vai* and *vāva* are used in association with the first verbal form ending in a *tiṄ*. Refer to derivational details of *āsīt* under rule 7.3.96 *astisico' pṛkte*. Recall that *āṬ*, as an affix, is marked with *udātta* at the beginning (3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*).

8.1.65 एकान्याभ्यां समर्थाभ्याम्

ekānyābhyāṃ samarthābhyām
/ekānyābhyām 3/2 = *ekaś ca anyaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām*; *samarthābhyām* 3/2 = *samas tulyo' rtho yayoḥ* (*bv.*), *tābhyām/*
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *prathamā* #59 *vibhāṣā* #63 *chandasi* #64)

'eka, anya' ity etābhyāṃ samarthābhyāṃ yuktā prathamā tiṅvibhaktir vibhāṣā nānudāttā bhavati chandasi viṣaye
The first *pada* (of a sentence) which ends in a *tiṄ* and is used in association with *eka* and *anya*, having the same signification, is, optionally, not marked with *anudātta* in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

prajām ekā jinváti ūrjam ekā rakṣati 'one quickens progeny, the other preserves strength'
prajām ekā jinvati ūrjam ekā rakṣáti 'ibidem'
tayór anyaḥ pippálaṃ svādv attí anáśnann anyo abhicākaśītī 'one of these two eats the tasty Pippala fruit, the other, not eating, looks on intently'

1. The word *samarthābhyām* means 'with two having the same meaning'. Consequently, *eka* and *anya* are here used with the single meaning of 'one'. Incidentally, *eka* is diversely used in the sense of 'other', 'principal', 'first', 'only', 'common', 'equal', 'little' and 'one':

eko' nyārthe pradhāne ca prathame kevale tathā/
sādhāraṇe samāne' lpe saṃkhyāyāṃ ca prayujyate//

Recall also that *jinvati*, a third singular active present indicative of *jivI*, is derived with *nUM* (7.1.58 *idito num dhātoḥ*; 1.1.47 *mid aco' ntyāt paraḥ*) as: *jivI* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *jiv* + *ŚaP* + *tiP* → (*ji+nUM+v*) + *ŚaP* + *tiP*)) = *jinvati*. This verbal form is marked with *udātta* (6.1.159 *dhātoḥ*) at the beginning, similarly to *pacati*. This same is also true of *atti* 'eats'.

8.1.66 यद्वृत्तान्नित्यम्

yadvṛttān nityam
/*yadvṛttāt* 5/1 = *yado vṛttam* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmāt*; *nityam* ϕ/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *tiṅ* #28 *na* #29 *prathamā* #59)
yadvṛttād uttaraṃ tiṅantaṃ nānudāttaṃ nityam
The first *pada* (of a sentence) which ends in a *tiṄ*, and occurs after *yadvṛtta* 'forms of *yad* (that which) with various nominal endings', is obligatorily not marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

yo bhuṅkte 'he who eats . . .'
yaṃ bhojayáti 'the one he feeds . . .'
yena bhuṅkte 'that by means of which (or with who) he eats'
yasmai dadāti 'one to whom he gives . . .'

1. Note that *yadvṛtta* can be explained similarly to *kiṃvṛtta* (8.1.48 *kiṃvṛttaṃ*

ca . . .). Thus, *yadvṛtta* here refers to the totality of paradigmatic forms of *yad* 'that which'. Verbal form *juhumaḥ* derives from *hu* + (*LAṬ→mas→maḥ*), with doubling and its related operations. The form itself is *udātta* at the end by affixal accent (3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*).

8.1.67 पूजनात् पूजितमनुदात्तं काष्ठादिभ्यः

pūjanāt pūjitam anudāttam kāṣṭhādibhyaḥ
/pūjanāt 5/1 *pūjitam* 1/1 *anudāttam* 1/1 *kāṣṭhādibhyaḥ* 5/3/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18)
pūjanāt paraṃ pūjitam anudāttaṃ bhavati
A *pada* which denotes a thing praised (*pūjitam*), and occurs after a *pada* which denotes praise (*pūjana*), is marked with *anudātta.*

EXAMPLES:

kāṣṭhādhyāpakaḥ 'an excellent teacher'
kāṣṭhābhirūpakaḥ 'a teacher beyond comparison'
dāruṇādhyāpakaḥ 'a teacher who teaches difficult texts'
dāruṇābhirūpakaḥ 'a teacher beyond comparison'
amātāputrādhyāpakaḥ 'the teacher of one who does not have a mother'

1. Haradatta states that nominals listed in the group headed by *kāṣṭha* 'wood' (*kāṣṭhādi*) may denote a meaning synonymous with *adbhuta* 'amazing'. Consequently, their denotatum can be accepted as the denotatum of *pūjana* 'praise' (*PM* ad *Kāś: kāṣṭhādayaś caite' dbhutparyāyāḥ pūjanavacanā bhavanti*). Note that Pāṇini specifies a word ending in a *tiN* (*tiṅanta*) in the next rule. This rule is then interpreted as specifying a *pada* ending in a *sUP* (*subanta*). The words *kāṣṭhādhyāpakaḥ*, etc., are all qualifiers to an action (*kriyā-viśeṣaṇa*). They also end in *dvitīyā* 'accusative'. Thus, *kāṣṭham adbhutaṃ adhyāpayati = kāṣṭhādhyāpakaḥ* 'he who teaches wonderfully', etc. But since there are no rules whereby a *kriyāviśeṣaṇa* 'qualifier to an action' can be combined in a compound, commentators take recourse to 2.1.72 *mayūravyaṃsakādayaś ca.* The author of the *vārttika* proposes that deletion of *m* should be accomplished in these words. Thus, *kāṣṭham adhyāpayati = kāṣṭha*(*m→ϕ*) *adhyāpakaḥ = kāṣṭh*(*a+a →ā*) *dhyāpakaḥ = kāṣṭhādhyāpakaḥ.* Since this deleted *m* is part of a nominal inflection (*vibhakti*), we will also have to accept this deletion in the context of absence of compound formation. Thus, resort to 2.1.72 *mayūra-vyaṃsakādayaś ca* will not be necessary. Note that resort to 2.1.72 *mayūra . . .* is taken because of a lack of syntactic coordination (*vaiyadhikaraṇya*) between compound constituents such as *kāṣṭham* and *adhyāpakaḥ.* That is, *kāṣṭham*, etc., are adverbial modifiers (*kriyāviśeṣaṇa*) ending in the accusative (*dvitīyā*). Recall in this connection that *adhyāpaka*, etc., end in affix *ṆvuL.* Consequently, they are marked with *udātta* conditioned by *L* as affixal *it* (6.1.190 *liti*). Our present rule will assign *anudātta.*

2. *Kāśikā* and *SK* both read an additional word *kāṣṭhādibhyaḥ* as part of the wording of this rule. I omit it since it is part of a *vārttika* proposal.

8.1.68 सगतिरपि तिङ्

sagatir api tiṅ
/sagatiḥ 1/1 = *gatinā saha* (*bv.*); *api* ϕ *tiṅ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #16 *padāt* #17 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *pūjanāt pūjitam* #67)
sagatir agatir api pūjanāt paraṃ pūjitam tiṅantam anudāttaṃ bhavati
A *pada* which ends in a *tiN*, denotes a thing praised (*pūjitam*) and occurs after a *pada* which denotes praise (*pūjana*), is, whether used with a *gati* or not, marked with *anudātta.*

EXAMPLES:

yat kāṣṭhaṃ pacati 'that he cooks beautifully . . .'
yat kāṣṭhaṃ prapacati 'ibidem'
yad dāruṇaṃ pacati 'that he cooks assiduously . . .'
yad dāruṇaṃ prapacati 'ibidem'

1. This rule allows *anudātta* for a form which ends in a *tiṄ* and is used after a word denoting *pūjā* 'praise', when the form ending in a *tiṄ* is used in association with, and also without, a *gati* word. Recall that 8.1.28 *tiṅi atiṅaḥ* offers *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' which is subsequently negated by 8.1.30 *nipātair yadyadi.* . . . Our present rule makes its provision against negation of *nighāta.* The *vārttika* proposal of deletion of *m* (cf. earlier rule) applies only when a non-*tiṄ* follows. Consequently, *yatkāṣṭham*, etc., of *yatkāṣṭhaṃ pacati*, etc., do not lose their *m.* Since the specification of this rule is made with *sagatiḥ, nighāta* also applies to the *gati* word, irrespective of whether the *gati* word is combined with a form ending in *tiṄ.* Thus, we get *yaddāruṇaṃ prapacati*, etc. The word *gati*, since the context is that of a following form ending in a *tiṄ*, refers to a preverb (*upasarga*; 1.4.60 *gatiś ca*).

2. Why do we have the specification made with *tiṄ*? So that this rule does not apply in the context of a following non-*tiṄ.* Conversely, so that a *tiṄ* does not become part of the right context of the preceding rule. Also recall that the *vārttika* proposal of *m*-deletion applies only there. That is, it cannot apply here.

8.1.69 कुत्सने च सुप्यगोत्रादौ

kutsane ca supy agotrādau
/kutsane 7/1 *ca* ϕ *supi* 7/1 *agotrādau* 7/1 = *gotra ādir yasya* (*bv.*); *na gotrādiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*padasya* #16 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *sagatir api tiṅ* #68)

kutsane ca subante gotrādivarjite parataḥ sagatir api tiṅ agatir apy anudātto bhavati

A *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and occurs in construction with, or even without, a *gati*, is marked with *anudātta*, provided a *pada* which ends in a *sUP* and denotes *kutsana* 'censure', though is not constituted by a nominal of the *gotrādi* group, follows.

EXAMPLES:

pa̲ca̲ti̲ pūti '. . . cooks in a questionable way'
pra̲pa̲ca̲ti̲ pūti 'ibidem'
pa̲ca̲ti̲ mithyā '. . . cooks uselessly'
pra̲pa̲ca̲ti̲ mithyā 'ibidem'

1. Note that the *anuvṛtti* of *padāt* (8.1.17 *padāt*) is no longer valid. The *anuvṛtti* of *sagatir api tiṅ* is still valid. Consequently, the *nighāta* of 8.1.28 *tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ* could not be available in case of a *tiṄ* used without a *gati*. A form which ends in a *tiṄ* and is used with a *gati* could only avail *nighāta* for itself. Our present rule makes *nighāta* available to both. Recall that the *sU* of *pūrti* + *sU* is deleted by 7.1.23 *svamor napuṃsakāt*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *kutsane* 'when censure . . .'? So that this accentual provision does not apply to *pacati śobhanam* 'cooks beautifully'. Why do we have the condition of *supi* 'when a *pada* ending in a *sUP* follows'? So that this rule does not apply when a non-*sUP*, for example *pacati kliśnāti* 'saddens when cooks', follows. Why do we have the condition of *agotrādau* 'when a non-*gotrādi* nominal . . .'? Consider *pacati gotram* '. . . cooks while extolling the virtues of his lineage (*gotra*)' where this rule cannot apply.

3. A *vārttika* proposal requires this rule to apply only when *kriyā-kutsana* 'censure of action' is denoted. Thus, this rule cannot apply on *prapacati pūtir devadattaḥ* where *pūtiḥ* denotes censure of *devadattaḥ*, the agent (*karttuḥ kutsanam*). The *Mahābhāṣya* sums it all up in the following verse:

supi kutsane kriyāyā malopa iṣṭo' tiṅīti coktārtham /
pūtiś cānubandho vibhāṣitaṃ cāpi bahvartham //

8.1.70 गतिर्गतौ

gatir gatau
/gatiḥ 1/1 *gatau* 7/1/
(*padasya* #16 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18)
gatir gatau parato' nudātto bhavati
A *gati* which occurs before a *gati* is marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

a̲bhyuddharati '. . . lifts up'

samudānáyati '. . . properly brings up'
abhisamparyāhárati '. . . properly brings towards . . .'

1. Consider *abhy-ud-harati* where *abhi*, an *upasarga* 'preverb', receives *anudātta* by *phiṭsūtra* (1): *phiṣo' ntodāttaḥ*. This, of course, happens in view of the negation of *udātta* (*Phiṭsūtra* (81): *upasargaś cābhivarjam*). Since it is followed, here, by the *gati* word *ut*, it becomes *anudātta*. The *a* of *abhi* alone remains *anudātta*, subsequent to the *y*-replacement of its *i*. The *u* of *ut* becomes *udātta* in view of the *Phiṭsūtra* (81): *upasargaś cābhivarjam*. The *sa* of *sam-ud-ānayati* receives its *udātta* by *upasargaś cābhivarjam*. However, since *āṄ*, a *gati*, follows both *sam* and *ut*, they both become *anudātta*. Of course, *āṄ* remains *udātta*. The *abhi* of *abhi-sam-pary-āharati*, as usual, was qualified for *anudātta*. Since *āṄ* follows *abhi*, *sam* and *pari*, they all become *anudātta*.

2. Why do we say when followed by a *gati*? Consider *ā mandrair indra haribhir yāhi mayūraromabhiḥ* where *ā* is a *gati* in association with *yāhi*. Since *ā* is not followed by a *gati* it retains its accent. If *gatau* was not stated here *ā* would have lost its accent. Thus, *gatau* restricts the scope of application of this rule.

8.1.71 तिङि चोदात्तवति

tiṅi codāttavati
/*tiṅi* 7/1 *ca* ϕ *udāttavati* 7/1/ = *udātto' sminn astīti* (a derivate of *matUP*), *tasmin*/
(*padasya* #16 *anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau* #18 *gatiḥ* #70)
tiṅante udāttavati parato gatir anudātto bhavati
A *gati*, when occurring before a *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and carries an *udātta*, is also marked with *anudātta*.

EXAMPLES:

yat prapacáti 'whatever he cooks . . .'
yat prakaroti 'whatever he makes . . .'

1. This rule allows a *gati* to be marked with *udātta* when a *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ*, and possesses an *udātta*, follows. Recall that *pacati* and *karoti* possess an *udātta* on account of negation of their *nighāta* by 8.1.30 *nipātair yadyadi* . . . and 8.1.66 *yadvṛttān nityam*, respectively. Our *gati* word *pra*, under the following condition of *pacati* and *karoti*, is marked with *anudātta*. That is, it cannot be marked with *udātta* by the *Phiṭsūtra* (81): *upasargāś cābhivarjam*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *tiṅi*? So that a *gati* is not marked with *udātta* before any following *pada*. It must be marked with *udātta* only when a verbal *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* follows. Thus, consider *ā* of *ā mandrair indra haribhir yāhi mayūraromabhiḥ* 'O Indra, come by beautiful horses of peacock color', where *ā*(*Ṅ*) is a *gati* used in association with *yāhi*. The full verbal form is *āyāhi* 'come'. But since it is followed by *mandraiḥ*, and not a form ending in a *tiṄ*, it cannot be marked with *anudātta*. Similarly, *tiṅi* is used to make

sure that this rule applies with reference to a verbal *pada*, and not, for example, a root. Thus, consider *yat pra-karoti* where verbal root *kṛ* is marked with *anudātta*, but *karoti* is marked with *udātta*. It is also necessary that the accent of a form ending in a *tiṄ* be also clearly specified. This is why we must have *udāttavati* 'when a *tiṄ*, marked with *udātta*, follows'.

This explanation of the use of *tiṅi* creates problems, especially in view of the convention: *yat kriyāyuktāḥ prādayas teṣāṃ taṃ prati gatyupasargasaṃjñe bhavataḥ* '*pra*, etc., when used in construction with a *kriyā* 'action', are termed *gati* in relation to the action'. This makes *pra*, etc., to be treated as *gati* also in construction with a form not ending in a *tiṄ*. This, in view of the use of *tiṅi*, creates problems with *pra pacatitarām* and *pra pacatitamām* where *pra*, even without the use of a form ending in a *tiṄ*, is marked with *anudātta*. Commentators state three positions on this:

(*i*) An indeclinable (*avyaya*), here *pra*, is combined with a form ending in *ām*, i.e., *pacatitarām* and *pacatitamām*, to yield a compound (2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ*). The *gati* form then is marked with *udātta* (*Phiṭsūtra*: *nipātā ādyudāttaḥ*) by way of retaining its original accent (6.2.2 *tatpuruṣe tulyārtha . . .*). Thus, the *gati* does not get *anudātta* even when *tiṅi* is not used in this rule. The rest of the compound, in accord with 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam ekavarjam*, is marked with *anudātta*.

(*ii*) Some form an indeclinable compound with forms ending in affixes *taraP* and *tamaP*. In this view, *pra* retains its original accent even before the compound is formed. We get *ām*, an *udātta*, introduced subsequently. The *anudātta* of *gati* is thus established by 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam ekavarjam*. This rule then has no purpose in establishing the *nighāta* of a *gati*.

(*iii*) Recall that this compound-formation involves a *gati* and a form ending in an affix termed *kṛt*. The *Paribhāṣā* (76): *gatikārakopapadānāṃ kṛdbhiḥ saha samāsavacanaṃ prāk subūtpatteḥ* states that a compound such as this should be formed prior to the introduction of nominal endings denoted by *sUP*. Yet another interpretation of this *paribhāṣā* may demand that such compounds be formed only with a form ending in a *kṛt* affix, and not with any other form. According to the first interpretation, *pra*, since it cannot be a *subanta* 'an item ending in a *sUP*', cannot be combined. Since both *pra* and *pacatitarām* will have different accents, our present *sūtra* with *tiṅi* becomes necessary for facilitating the *nighāta* of *pra* in construction with the form ending in *ām*. Recall that *pra* gets *udātta* by the *Phiṭsūtra*: *upasargāś cābhivarjam* and *ām* gets its *udātta* by affixal accent (3.1.3 *ādy udāttaś ca*). The second interpretation of the *paribhāṣā* is not relevant to our discussion.

8.1.72 आमन्त्रितं पूर्वमविद्यमानवत्

āmantritaṃ pūrvam avidyamānavat
/ āmantritam 1/1 *pūrvam* 1/1 *avidyamānavat* ϕ = *na vidyamānam* (*nañ. tat.*); *avidyamānena tulyam = avidyamānavat/*
(*padasya* #16)
āmantritaṃ pūrvam avidyamānavad bhavati, tasmin sati yat kāryaṃ tan na bhavati asati yat tad bhavati
A *pada* termed *āmantrita*, when followed by another *pada*, is treated as if non-existent.

EXAMPLES:

devádatta yajñádatta 'O, Devadatta!, O, Yajñadatta!'
devádatta pacási 'Devadatta, you are cooking'
devadatta tava grāmaḥ svam 'Devadatta, this village is your property'
devadatta mama grāmaḥ svam 'Devadatta, this village is my property'
yāvad devadatta pacasi 'till the time you are cooking Devadatta!'
devádatta jātu pacási 'are you cooking at all Devadatta!'
āho devadatta pacási 'are you cooking Devadatta!'
utāho devadatta pacási 'ibidem'
ām bhoḥ pacasi devádatta 'yes Devadatta, you are cooking'

1. This rule makes an extensional provision of allowing an *āmantrita* to be treated as if non-existent provided this *āmantrita* is followed by another *pada*. That is, an operation which obtains on a following *pada*, under the condition of a preceding *pada* termed *āmantrita*, is not applied by treating the *āmantrita* as if non-existent (*avidyamānavat*). Similarly, operations which obtain on a *pada* when an *āmantrita* does not precede become applicable (*Kāś. āmantritaṃ pūrvam avidyamānavad bhavati tasmin sati yat kāryaṃ tan na bhavati, asati yat tad bhavati*).

What are the purposes of allowing this treatment as if non-existent? Consider *devádatta yajñádatta* where both are termed *āmantrita* (2.3.48 *sā'' mantritam*). The following *pada*, i.e., *yajñadatta*, is here subject to receiving *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' of 8.1.19 *āmantritasya ca*. Our present rule requires that the preceding *pada*, i.e., *devadatta*, be treated as if non-existent (*avidyamānavat*). The *nighāta* of *yajñadatta* which was earlier made available is now blocked. That is, the provision of initial *udātta* which was made available by 6.1.195 *āmantritasya ca* stays.

Similarly, the *nighāta* of 8.1.28 *tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ* is also blocked in *devádatta pacási* where *devadatta*, a preceding *āmantrita*, is treated as if non-existent. A replacement in *te* and *me*, for *yuṣmad* and *asmad*, will also be blocked in *devadatta tava grāmaḥ svam* and *devadatta mama grāmaḥ svam*. Note that 8.1.22 *temayāv ekavacanasya* requires this replacement in *anudātta*. Yet another *anudātta* (8.1.37 *pūjāyāṃ nānantaram*), which may be available to *pacasi* of *yāvad devadatta pacasi*, is blocked because of *devadatta* treated as if non-existent.

The *nighāta* of *pacási*, in *devadatta jātu pacasi*, is negated (8.1.47 *jātv apūrvam*), because *devadatta* is treated as if non-existent before *jātu*. Similar applications can be seen in *āho devadatta pacási* and *utāho devadatta pacási*, where *pacási* becomes non-*anudātta* (8.1.49 *ho utāho cānantaram*), subsequent to treatment of *devadatta* as non-existent. Finally, consider *ām bhoḥ pácasi dévadatta* where *dévadatta* becomes non-*anudātta* (8.1.55 *ām ekāntaram . . .*). For, *bhoḥ* is here treated as non-existent and *devadatta* then becomes an *āmantrita* intervened by a single *pada*. The condition of intervention by a single *pada* cannot be satisfied here since *bhoḥ* is not treated as non-existent.

2. Why do we have the condition of *āmantritam*? Consider *devadattaḥ pacati* where, in the absence of treatment of an *āmantrita* as non-existent (*avidyamānavat*), the *nighāta* of *pacati* must apply.

Why do we have the condition of *pūrvam* 'preceding'? So that the *āmantrita* is not treated as *avidyamānavat* with reference to operation on itself. For, *pūrva* 'preceding' is defined as a term relative to *para* 'subsequent'. An *āmantrita*, when used as a preceding *pada*, can be treated as if non-existent only for operations relative to what follows, irrespective of whether such an operation happens to be conditioned by itself, or by something else (*Kāś. pūrvatvaṃ ca parāpekṣaṃ bhavatīti parasyaiva eva kārye svanimitte anyanimitte vā tad avidyamānavad bhavati na tu svakārye*). Consider *devádatta pácasi* where *devadatta* becomes as if non-existent relative to *pacasi*. Its initial *udātta*, as per rule 6.1.195 *āmantritasya ca*, cannot be blocked. Now consider *imaṃ mé gaṅge yamune sarasvati* where *gaṅge* is an *āmantrita* used as a preceding *pada* in relation to *yamune*. It can be treated as if non-existent in relation to *yamune*. It cannot be considered as if non-existent in relation to *me*. For, *me* will be treated as immediately preceding *yamune* since *gaṅge* will be considered as if non-existent. The word *yamune* will thus be marked with *anudātta* because of *me*. Remember here that *gaṅge*, because of its status as non-existent, cannot condition the *anudātta* of *yamune*. That is, it cannot kill the conditioning status of *me* insofar as the *anudātta* of *yamune* is concerned.

8.1.73 नामन्त्रिते समानाधिकरणे सामान्यवचनम्

nāmantrite samānādhikaraṇe sāmānyavacanam

/ na ϕ āmantrite 7/1 *samānādhikaraṇe* 7/1 = *samānam adhikaraṇam yasya* (*bv.*), *tat*; */ sāmānyavacanam* 1/1 = *sāmānyasya vacanam* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*);/ (*padasya* #16 *āmantritaṃ pūrvam avidyamānavat* #72)

āmantritānte samānādhikaraṇe parataḥ pūrvam āmantritāntaṃ sāmānyavacanaṃ nāvidyamānavad bhavati

A *pada* termed *āmantrita*, used with the signification of a general (*sāmānya*), is not treated as if non-existent when another *āmantrita*, used in syntactic coordination with the preceding, follows.

EXAMPLES:

agné gṛhapate 'O Agni, master of the house'
māṇavaka jaṭilādhyāpaka 'O kid, the teacher with matted hair'

1. This rule declares a preceding *āmantrita*, signifying a general (*sāmānya*), as if not non-existent when an *āmantrita*, used in syntactic coordination with the preceding, follows. Consider *agne gṛhapate* where *agne* is treated as if existing (*vidyamānavat*) and, consequently, *gṛhapate* gets the *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' of 6.1.195 *āmantritasya ca*. That is, the following word is marked with *anudātta* on account of its preceding treated as *vidyamānavat* (*Kāś: pūrvasya vidyamānatvāt param anudāttam eva bhavati*). Similar reasoning also applies to the second example. If the option of treating as if existent is not accepted then 8.1.19 *āmantritasya ca* makes both words marked with *udātta* at the beginning.

2. Why do we have the condition of *āmantrite*? Consider *devadatta pacasi* 'Devadatta, you are cooking'. Note that the *LA*-affix of *pacasi* denotes an agent which is the denotatum of *devadatta*. There is a syntactic coordination between *devadatta* and *pacasi*. However, there is no *āmantrita* to follow.

Why do we have the condition of syntactic coordination? Consider *devadatta paṇḍita yajñadatta* where the word *paṇḍita* is a qualifier to *yajñadatta*. It cannot be accepted as sharing syntactic coordination with the preceding. Why do we have the condition of *sāmānyavacana* 'denoting a general'? So that this rule does not apply in cases of synonyms. Thus, *aghnyé, devi, sarásvati, īḍé, kāvyé, vihavyé*, which are all vocatives, but synonyms of Sarasvatī. They all follow the accentual provision of 6.1.195 *āmantritasya ca*.

8.1.74 विभाषितं विशेषवचने बहुवचनम्

vibhāṣitaṃ viśeṣavacane bahuvacanam
vibhāṣitam 1/1 *viśeṣavacane* 1/1 = *viśeṣasya vacanam* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*)/
(*padasya* #16 *āmantritaṃ pūrvam avidyamānavat* #72 *āmantrite samānādhikaraṇe* #73)
viśeṣavacane samānādhikaraṇe āmantritānte parataḥ pūrvam āmantritaṃ bahuvacanāntaṃ vibhāṣitam avidyamānavad bhavati
A *pada* termed *āmantrita*, used with the denotatum of *sāmānya* 'general', is treated as if non-existent, only optionally, when an *āmantrita* used in syntactic coordination with the denotatum of a particular (*viśeṣa*), follows.

EXAMPLES:

devâḥ śaráṇyāḥ 'O gods! the givers of shelter'
devâḥ śaraṇyāḥ 'ibidem'
brāhmáṇā vaiyākaraṇāḥ 'O brāhamaṇas, the grammarians'
brāhmáṇā vaiyākaraṇāḥ 'ibidem'

1. Note that the wording of this *sūtra* is generally accepted as: *vibhāṣitaṃ viśeṣavacane.* Patañjali requires that *bahuvacane* should also be used as part of the wording of this rule. This to inform that only plural usage is available. That is, a singular *āmantrita* word with the signification of general is obligatorily treated as if 'not existent' (*avidyamānavat*) when used in syntactic coordination with another such word signifying its 'particular' counterpart. Thus, *māṇávaka jaṭilaka* 'O kid, with matted hair'.

It is also stated that *sāmānyavacanam* is also needed because of syntactic coordination context with *viśeṣavacanam. Kāśikā* states that *viśeṣavacane,* since *sāmānyavacanam* is carried from the earlier rule, could be easily understood. Pāṇini uses it explicitly in this rule for clarity (*viśeṣavacanagrahaṇaṃ vispaṣṭārtham*). Note, however, that *Kāśikā* does it by also accepting *bahuvacanam* in the wording of this rule. Some others do not read *sāmānyavacanam* in the wording of the earlier rule. They read *sāmānyavacanam* in the wording of this rule, instead. Consider the examples where *deva* and *brāhmaṇa* denote general qualities of 'divineness' and 'brāhmaṇaness'. Their denotatum is thus *sāmānya.* The denotatum of *śaraṇya* and *vaiyākaraṇa* constitutes the particular used in syntactic coordination with its general counterpart. Thus, we optionally get *deva* and *brāhmaṇa* as if they did exist (*vidyamānavat*). Rule 8.1.19 *āmantritasya ca* can now apply to offer *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*' to *śaraṇya* and *deva.* If the option of *vidyamānavat* is not accepted, both these words, in view of 6.1.195 *āmantritasya ca,* will be marked with *udātta* at the beginning.

Pāda Two

8.2.1 पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्

pūrvatrāsiddham
/pūrvatra ϕ asiddham 1/1 = *na siddham* (*nañ. tat.*)/
adhikāro' yam ā adhyāyaparisamāpteḥ. yad ita ūrdhvam anukramiṣyāmaḥ 'ṗūrvatrāsiddham' ity evaṃ veditavyam. tatra yeyaṃ sapādasaptādhyāyyanukrāntā etasyām ayaṃ pādono' dhyāyo' siddho bhavati
That which follows from here onwards is treated as if suspended (*asiddham*) in view of what precedes.

Examples:

asmā uddhara 'fetch for this person'
dvā atra 'the two here'
dvā ānaya 'bring the two'
asā ādityaḥ 'that is sun'
amuṣmai 'dative singular of *adas* 'he''
amuṣmāt 'ablative singular . . .'
amuṣmin 'locative singular . . .'

śuṣkikā 'dried up'
śuṣkajaṅghā 'she whose thighs are thin'
kṣāmimān 'decaying'
aujaḍhat 'carried'
guḍaliṇmān 'jaggery-licking'

1. This is an *adhikāra*, and hence, it carries through all rules enumerated up to the end of this book-chapter (*adhyāya*). Whatever is stated hereafter must remain suspended in view of what precedes this rule. Thus, in view of the preceding seven and one quarter-chapters of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, its last three quarter-chapters of rules are considered suspended (*asiddha*). A following rule, here in this section of the *tripādī* 'last three quarter-chapters of rules', is also to be considered suspended (*asiddha*) in view of what precedes (*Kāś*: *ita uttaraṃ cottara uttaro yogaḥ pūrvapūrvatrāsiddho bhavati = asiddhavad bhavati*). What is the meaning of *asiddho bhavati* 'is considered suspended'. It does not do what is already done and established (*Kāś*: *siddhakāryaṃ na karotīty arthaḥ*).

Now the question: 'what is the thing which becomes suspended (*asiddha*)'? Is this a rule (*śāstra*), or an operation (*kārya*) performed by that rule? This brings two notions of *asiddhatva* 'suspension': (*i*) *śāstrāsiddhatva* 'suspension of rule(s)' and *kāryāsiddhatva* 'suspension of operation(s)'. The first view will accept a rule (*śāstra*; *lakṣaṇa*) as *asiddha* 'suspended'. The second view will consider an operation (*kārya*) performed by a given rule (*śāstra*) *asiddha*. This *asiddhatva* should be interpreted as *śāstrāsiddhatva*, because 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham* is a rule (*śāstra*) where *atra* 'here' denotes an extent (*avadhi*) in relation to *pūrva* 'prior', an obligatory *avadhimat* 'that which is bounded by an extent'. It is generally accepted that *avadhyavadhimatoḥ sajātīyatvam avadhi* 'extent' and *avadhimat* 'that which constitutes the extent' share similarity of class (*jāti*). That is, *yaj jātir avadhis taj jātir avadhimān* 'the class of an *avadhimān* is identical with the class of its corresponding *avadhi*'. Consider *caitrāt pūrvaḥ phālgunaḥ* '*phālguna* is prior to *caitra*'. Since the word *caitra* here denotes a particular month (first month of the Vikrama calendar), *phālguna* (last month of the Vikrama calendar) must also denote a month. It cannot, for example, denote Arjuna, one of the Pāṇḍava brothers. The word *pūrva* must thus denote *śāstra* 'rules'. The *asiddhatva* of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham* then must relate to the notion of suspension of rules (*śāstrāsiddhatva*). What about the notion of suspension of *kārya* 'operation'? The idea of the suspension (*asiddhatva*) of *kārya* can be gotten only secondarily, by way of suspension of the *śāstra* which is primary (*mukhya*). Why is *śāstrāsiddhatva* 'suspension of rule' considered primary (*mukhya*)? Because *śāstrāsiddhatva* is stated within rules by means of explicit statements (*sanniveśa-viśeṣa-yogitvāt*). When a rule (*śāstra*) becomes *asiddha*, the cognition which is generated by, and about, that particular *śāstra* also becomes *asiddha*. An operation which is carried out on the basis of cognition of a particular *śāstra* also becomes *asiddha* when

cognition of that *śāstra* becomes *asiddha*. This is the order in which this notion of *asiddhatva* can be effectively understood. Thus, *na hi mukhyasya grahaṇe sambhavati gauṇasya grahaṇaṃ yuktam* 'it is not appropriate for a specification made by means of a principal (*śāstrāsiddhatva*) to possibly refer to a non-principal (*kāryāsiddhatva*)'. The *asiddhatva* of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham* is thus accepted as suspension of rules (*śāstrāsiddhatva*). Neo-grammarians such as Nāgeśa and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita accept this view. Earlier grammarians, which also includes authors of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, accept the *kāryāsiddhatva* view.

Note that it is rather impossible for the tradition to accept suspension of rules. How could a *śāstra*, which has been stated and hence has attained the status of something established (*siddha*), be considered unestablished (*asiddha*). A pot (*ghaṭa*) will never become a piece of cloth (*paṭa*), no matter how many times someone calls it a piece of cloth. How can sun (*sūrya*) become non-sun (*asūrya*)? Pāṇini should not have formulated this rule, especially since what is done (*siddha*) is something which cannot be undone (*asiddha*). But how should one go against Pāṇini's own words (*vacana*). It is at the strength of Pāṇini's own formulation (*vacana-sāmarthya*) that commentators are willing to accept the *śāstra*, not exactly as *asiddha* but, as if *asiddha* 'suspended-like' (*asiddhavat*). That is, they extend (*atidiśanti*) the status of suspension (*asiddhatva*) to what is established (*siddha*). This is how an operation which is carried out by a rule, and which is *siddha*, will become *asiddha*(*vat*) 'as if not established'.

Everyone knows about *vatighaṭitatvaṃ atideśatvam* 'an extensional provision is made with inclusion of affix *vatUP*'. Where is *vatUP* in the wording of rule 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*? It is stated that one can get the sense of *vatUP*, even without explicitly stating *vatUP* (*vinā' pi vatiṃ vatvartho gamyate*) in the wording of the rule. Consider *abrāhmaṇaṃ brāhmaṇam ity āha* 'he called a non-brāhmaṇa a brāhmaṇa'. One gets the sense of *asiddhavat* from *asiddham* the same way one gets the sense of *brāhmaṇavat* 'brāhmaṇa-like' from *brāhmaṇa*.

Yet another problem: what is the nature of this rule? Is this a heading rule (*adhikāra*), or an extension (*atideśa*). Commentators accept this rule primarily as an *adhikāra* 'heading'. Secondarily, though, they accept its extensional provision included within its status as an *adhikāra*. It is similar to 6.4.22 *asiddhavad atrābhāt* which is an *adhikāra* with extensional provision of suspension (*asiddhatva*). This is how the independence of an *adhikāra* and *atideśa* is reconciled to coexistence.

But this rule, similar to 4.2.92 *śeṣe*, is not only a *lakṣaṇa* 'rule' but is also a *vidhi* 'operation'. It is an *adhikāra* since it has to be carried to rules contained within the last three quarters (*tripādī*) of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. It is also a *vidhi* since it provides for some new operation. How do you get these two meanings of *adhikāra* and *vidhi* from this single rule. One may resort to *tantra*, a technique which Patañjali (ad 1.3.3 *halantyam*) describes as: *sakṛd uccaritatve sati bahvarthabodhakatvam tantratvam* '*tantra* is an interpretive technique whereby

a word articulated just once denotes more than one meaning'. The other two interpretive techniques of *ekaśeṣa* 'retention of one' and *āvṛtti* 'repetition' are not employed here. A single citation of *asiddham* could account for both the governing heading as well as the operational extension of suspension.

Now consider *brāhmaṇābhyāṃ kṛtaṃ dehi* where a single citation of *brāhmaṇābhyām* can be read with the rest of the sentence in different ways to yield four different paraphrases:

(*i*) *brāhmaṇābhyāṃ kṛtam* 'made by two brāhmaṇas'
(*ii*) *braḥmaṇābhyām dehi* 'give to the two brāhmaṇas'
(*iii*) *brāhmaṇābhyāṃ kṛtam dehi* 'give that which was made by the two brāhmaṇas'
(*iv*) *brāhmaṇābhyāṃ kṛtaṃ dehi* 'give that which was made to the two brāhmaṇas'

Here is an additional example:

(*v*) *payo payaḥ jarayati*
'milk (when boiled) causes (its) water (content) to burn'
(*vi*) 'water (in milk) causes milk to burn'
A single *payaḥ* is giving two meanings here.

Consider the paraphrases of this rule, when read with the obligatory *param* 'that which follows':

(*a*) *pūrvatra kartavye sati param asiddham bhavati* 'in view of application of that which is 'prior' (*pūrvam*; the *sapāda-saptādhyāyī*), that which is 'subsequent' is treated 'as if suspended (*asiddham*; the *tripādī*)'.'
(*b*) *pūrvatra kartavye sati param asiddham bhavati* 'in view of application of that which is 'prior' in rules of the *tripādī* 'last three quarters of rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*', that which is 'subsequent' is treated 'as if suspended' (*asiddham*).'

The first interpretation will make this rule *vidhi* 'operational'. The second interpretation, since it is to be read as part of subsequent rules, will make it an *adhikāra* 'governing rule'. Still, this rule is primarily an *adhikāra*. Incidentally, how can one read *param* in this rule when it is not explicitly stated in the rule? We can read *param* 'that which follows' because *pūrvam* 'that which precedes', as in *pūrvatrāsiddham*, is a relative term and has an obligatory expectancy relationship (*nitya-sambandha*) with *param*.

This statement of *asiddhatva* is made for purposes of negating (*pratiṣedhārtham*) an operation with 'replacement' (*ādeśa*) as its condition (*nimitta*; *Kāś*: *tad etad asiddhatva-vacanaṃ ādeśalakṣaṇa-pratiṣedhārtham*). It is also made for purposes of accomplishing application of a rule with *sthānī* 'substituendum, i.e., that which is displaced by a substitute', as its condition (*Kāś*: *utsargalakṣaṇabhāvārtham ca*). Consider *asmai uddhara*, the dative sin-

gular form of *idam* 'this' followed in close proximity by *uddhara*, where 6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ* replaces the *ai* of *asmai* with *āy*. The *y* of *āy* then goes through deletion of 8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya*. We thus get *asm(ai→āy) uddhara →* *asmā(y→ϕ) uddhara = asmā uddhara*. Note here that 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* may find its scope of application on *asmā uddhara*. This will yield a wrong form **asm(ā→u→o)ddhara →* **asmoddhara*. Rule 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* cannot apply here since 8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya* will be treated as *asiddha*. That is, deletion of *y* will be accepted as not having taken effect. Similar examples with a replacement in *āv*, for *au* of *dvau* and *ādityau*, can be found in *dvau atra →* *dvā atra* and *asau ādityaḥ →* *asā ādityaḥ*. Of course, with deletion of *v* of *au→āv*, again by 8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya*. Note here that 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* may become applicable to *dvā atra* and *asā ādityaḥ* which, in turn, may produce unacceptable results **dv(ā+a→ ā) tra →* **dvātra* and *as(ā+ā →* *ā) dityaḥ →* **asādityaḥ*. Here again, the suspension of 8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya* will remove the condition of application of 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*. Consequently, we will get *dvā atra* and *asā ādityaḥ*. That is, when a following rule is treated as *asiddha* in close context of a preceding rule, an operation carried out by it is treated as if *asiddha*, even more so (*PM*: *yadā hi pūrvaśāstrasannidhau paramaśāstram asiddham, tadā tatpratipāditaṃ kāryaṃ sutarām asiddhaṃ bhavati*). The preceding are examples where an operation conditioned by a replacement is negated (*ādeśa-lakṣaṇa-pratiṣedha*).

2. Let us now consider *amuṣmai, amuṣmāt* and *amuṣmin*, the dative, ablative and locative singular forms of *adas* 'that', which illustrate accomplishment of an operation conditioned by items to be replaced (*utsarga-lakṣaṇa-bhāva*). Recall that, given *adas* + (*Ṅ*)*e*, the *s* of *adas* is replaced with *a* (7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*). The resultant sequence of two *a* vowels of *ada* (*s→a*) + (*Ṅ*)*e* = *ada* + (*Ṅ*)*e*, is then replaced with a single *a* (6.4.94 *ato guṇe*). The *e* of *Ṅe* is also replaced with *smai*, under the condition of a pronominal *aṅga* ending in *a* (7.1.14 *sarvanāmnaḥ smai*). Rule 8.2.20 *adaso' ser . . .* then applies on *ada* + *smai* to replace its *d* with *m* and *a* with *u*. We thus get: *a(d→m) + (a→u) + smai = amusmai*. An application of 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* then replaces the *s* of *amusmai* with *ṣ*. We thus get *amuṣmai*. We similarly get *amuṣmāt* and *amuṣmin*, where the ablative and locative singular endings *Ṅasi* and *Ṅi* are replaced with *smāt* and *smin*, respectively (7.1.15 *ṅasiṅyoḥ smātsminau*). Recall that the final *a* of *ada*, which gets replaced with *u* of 8.2.20 *adaso' ser . . .*, forms the left condition (*nimitta*) of replacement in *smai, smāt* and *smin*. These replacements cannot be accomplished unless 8.2.20 *adaso' ser . . .*, and thereby its effect, is not considered suspended. The *a* at the end of *ada* is clearly an item which, when replaced with *u*, removes the substituendum replaced by *u*. Restoring this subsituendum, via *asiddhatva*, facilitates application of replacements such as *smai, smāt* and *smin* (*Kāś*: *utvasyāsiddhatvāt smāyādayo bhavanti*).

Now consider the following verse:

śuṣkikā śuṣkajaṅghā ca kṣāmimān aujaḍhat tathā/
mator vatve jhalāṃ jaśtve guḍaliṇmān nidarśanam//

These examples illustrate additional suspensions:

(*i*) *śuṣkikā*: which derives from *śuṣ* + (*Kta*), where 8.2.51 *śuṣaḥ kaḥ* replaces the affixal *ta* with *ka*. We thus get *śuṣka* 'dried'. A feminine derivate with *ṬāP* will be *śuṣka* + *ṬāP* → *śuṣkā*. One will get *śuṣkā* + *ka* → *śuṣkāka* by introducing affix *ka* (5.3.73 *ajñāte*) with the denotatum of *ajñāta* 'not known'. What about the feminine counterpart of *śuṣkāka*? There are two possible forms *śuṣkāk*(*a*→ϕ) + (*Ṭ*) *ā*(*P*) → *śuṣk*(*ā*→*a*) *k* + *ā* → *śuṣkakā*; and *śuṣk*(*a*→*i*) *kā* → *śuṣkikā*. Note that the *ā* of *śuṣkāk* + *ā* is replaced with its short counterpart (7.4.13 *ke' ṇaḥ*). This *a* is then obligatorily replaced with *i* to produce *śuṣkikā* (7.3.44 *pratyayasthāt kāt pūrvasya . . .*). Rule 7.3.46 *udīcām ātaḥ . . .*, however, does not recognize this replacement, especially in the opinion of northern grammarians (*udīcām*). This will get a wrong form **śuṣkakā*. Recall that this replacement will be accomplished before *k* (*yakapūrvāyāḥ*). It is to block this optional *a*, against the obligatory *i*, that *ka* as a replacement for *ta* (8.2.51 *śuṣaḥ kaḥ*) is considered suspended in view of the application of 7.3.46 *udīcām ātaḥ. . . .*

(*ii*) *śuṣkajaṅghā*: This is a *bahuvrīhi* compound paraphrased as *śuṣke jaṅghe asyāḥ* 'she whose thighs are thin'. Here again, the negation of masculine transformation (*puṃvadbhāva*) by 6.3.37 *na kopadhāyāḥ* cannot be accomplished. For, *ka*-replacement of *ta* will be considered *asiddha* and hence, the *kopadha* 'penultimate *k*' condition of negation of *puṃvadbhāva* 'masculine transformation' will be removed.

(*iii*) *kṣāmimān*: The derivational history of this form begins with *kṣai* + (*K*) *ta*, where *ai* is replaced with *ā* (6.1.45 *ādeca upadeśe . . .*) and *t* of *Kta* is replaced with *m* (8.2.53 *kṣāyo maḥ*). We can now derive *kṣāmi*, parallel to *kṣāmasyāpatyam* 'offspring of Kṣāma', with affix *iÑ* (4.1.95 *ata iñ*). One may also derive *kṣāmin*, paraphrased as *kṣāmo vā asyāsti* 'he of whose is Kṣāma', with affix *inI* (5.2.115 *ata iniṭhanau*). The base-form of *kṣāmimān*, i.e., *kṣāmimat*, can now be derived by introducing affix *matUP* (5.2.94 *tad asyāsty asmin . . .*), either after *kṣāmi*, or after *kṣāmin*, ending in the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*). Why can we not replace *m* of *matUP* with *v* of 8.2.9 *mād upadhāyāś ca . . .*? The *m*-replacement of 8.2.53 *kṣāyo maḥ* is considered suspended (*asiddha*) in view of application of 8.2.9 *mād upadhāyāś ca*. The condition of *v*-replacement of *m* of *matUP* is thus removed.

(*iv*) *aujaḍhat*: This form derives from (*ūḍha* + *ṆiC*) + *LUṄ*, where *ūḍha* is derived from *vah* + (*K*) *ta*. Note that *vah* 'to carry' goes through

samprasāraṇa and its *h* is replaced with *ḍh* (*ḍhatva*; 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*), thereby yielding *uḍh + ta*. The *t* of (*K*)*ta* then goes through a replacement in *ḍh* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*), via *dh* (*dhatva*; 8.2.40 *jhaṣastathordho . . .*). Thus we get *uḍh + (t→ dh→ḍh) a = uḍh + ḍha*. The first *ḍh* of *uḍh + ḍha* then goes through deletion (8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ*). The *u* of *u + ḍha* is then replaced with its long counterpart (6.3.109 *ḍhralope pūrvasya . . .*). One can now introduce the causal suffix *ṆiC* with the signification of *tam ākhyat* 'described him' (*Mbh* ad 3.1.26 *hetumati ca*). Affix *LUṄ* can be then introduced after *ūḍha + (Ṇ)i(C)* to yield *ūḍha + i + (LUṄ→tiP) = ūḍha + i + ti*, where *ṭi*-deletion (6.4.115 *ṭeḥ*; *vt*: *ṇāv iṣṭhavat . . .*) will delete *a* of *ūḍha*, thereby yielding *ūḍh + i + ti*. The *i* of *ti* will be deleted by 3.4.100 *itaś ca*. An introduction of *CLI* (3.1.43 *cli luṅi*), its replacement in *CaṄ* (3.1.48 *ṇiśrudrusrubhyaḥ . . .*) and deletion of *ṆiC* (6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*) will then follow. This yields *ūḍh + (ṆiC→ϕ) + CaṄ + t→ ūḍh + (C)a(Ṅ) + t = ūḍh + a + t*.

Rule 6.1.11 *caṅi* must now apply on *ūḍh* of *ūḍh + a + ta*. It is in the application of reduplication (*dvirvacane kartavye*) that *h→ḍh* (*ḍhatva*; 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*), *t→dh* (*dhatva*; 8.2.40 *jhaṣastathordho . . .*), *dh→ḍh* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*) and deletion of *ḍh* (*ḍhalopa*; 8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ*) all become *asiddha* 'suspended' by 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*. The earlier *ṭi*-deletion is also treated here as what it replaced (*Mbh*: *ṇau kṛtaṃ sthānivad . . .*; 1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo' nalvidhau*). What is introduced here, via reduplication and in consonance with 6.1.2 *ajāder dvitīyasya*, is thus *hta*. We get *ū + hta + ḍh + (C)a(Ṅ) + t = ū + hta + ḍh + a + t* which, after application of 7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*, yields *ū + ha + ḍh + a + t*. Note here that augment *āṬ* must also be introduced before roots which begin with a vowel (6.4.72 *āḍ ajādīnām*; 1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*). We thus get: *ā(Ṭ) + ū + ha + ḍh + a + t*. The *h* of this string is then replaced with *jh* (*cutva*; 7.4.62 *kuhoś cuḥ*). This *jh* then goes through a replacement in *j* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.54 *abhyāse car ca*). Now we have: *ā + ū + (h→jh→j) a + ḍh + a + t* which, after application of 6.1.90 *āṭaś ca*, yields *(ā+ ū→au) + ja + ḍh + a + t→ aujaḍhat*. Why do we not get a replacement in *i* (*itva*) for *a* of *aujaḍhat*, via *sanvadbhāva* 'treatment as if when *saN* followed'. Because of the negation of *anaglope* 'not when there is deletion of *aK*' (7.4.93 *sanval laghuni . . .*). We thus do not get **aujiḍhat*. Note, however, that *aujiḍhat* could still be a form derived from *ūḍhi*, a derivate ending in affix *KtiN*.

(*v*) *guḍaliṇmān*: This form is derived by introducing affix *KvIP* after verbal root *lih* 'to lick, taste', under the cooccurrence condition of *guḍa* 'jaggery' in the accusative. Thus, *guḍaṃ leḍhi = guḍalih*. Affix *matUP* is then introduced after *guḍalih* to yield *guḍalih + matUP*.

The *h* of *guḍalih* then goes through a replacement in *ḍh* (*ḍhatva*; 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*) and *ḍ* (*jaśtva*; 8.2.29 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*). Why do we not get the *m* of *matUP* replaced with *v* (8.2.10 *jhayaḥ*)? Replacement applications of *ḍh* and *ḍ* are considered *asiddha* (8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*) in view of application of 8.2.9 *jhayaḥ*. Rule 8.4.44 *yaro' nunāsike*. . . then applies on *guḍali*(*h*→*ḍh*→*ḍ*) *mat* to produce *guḍali*(*ḍ*→*ṇ*) *mat*, whereby we get the nominative singular form *guḍaliṇmān*.

3. If the last three quarter-rules (*tripādī*) of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* are considered *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of application of the preceding *sapāda-saptādhyāyī*, then what is the purpose of specifications made here with *pañcamī* 'ablative', *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive' and *spatamī* 'locative'. For, rules dealing with these specifications will all become *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of application of 1.1.49 *ṣaṣṭhī sthāneyogā*, 1.1.66 *tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe*. . . and 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*. It is stated that, based on the *kāryakāla* 'formulation of a rule when it is intended to apply' view, these rules will not be considered *asiddha* in view of application of specific naming (*saṃjñā*) and interpreting (*paribhāṣā*) rules. The notion of *pūrva* 'prior' and *para* 'subsequent', especially with reference to *asiddhatva* 'suspension', cannot apply to them. It is stated that naming and interpretive rules are meant for facilitating applications of other rules. There is no *pūrva* 'prior' or *para* 'subsequent' applicational constraint on them because they indicate their functions only when brought close to applicational context of other rules. It is important to note that naming and interpretive rules (*saṃjñā-paribhāṣā*) abandon their sequential order dictated by their placement in grammar and, instead, follow their applicational order. They apply in the order of anticipated applications. Nyāsa illustrates this point with multiple examples of rule application and concludes that naming and interpretive rules cannot be considered suspended. This is what the tradition accepts in the *kāryakāla* view. The following verses sum it all:

saṃjñāḥ parārthā atyantaṃ paribhāṣāś ca tadvidhāḥ/
na svātantryeṇa tās tasmāt kāryāvagatihetavaḥ//
anekasya pradhānasya śeṣabhūtā bhavantv iti/
etāḥ kevalam ācāryaḥ pṛthagdeśā upādiśat//
vidhivākyais tu saṃhatya yatra tatra sthitair api/
bodhayantyaḥ svakāryāṇi naikapūrvāḥ parā imāḥ//

'naming (*saṃjñā*), and similarly interpreting (*paribhāṣā*), are extremely dependent on other rules. They, therefore, cannot be accepted as sources of understanding operations independently. They may thus be interpreted as residuals in relation to many principal operational rules. They have simply been read in different places by the *ācārya* (Pāṇini). There is no relative order such as prior and subsequent in relation to them. They, having approached operational rules placed all over, thus make their function known'

4. Recall that, in a conflict of equal strength (*vipratiṣedha*) between a prior (*pūrva*) and a subsequent (*para*) rule, that which is subsequent in order wins (1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam*). What happens to this interpretive rule in relation to 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*? If one accepts the *kāryakāla* view, this interpretive rule will also present itself at the time of application of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*. This interpretive rule of *vipratiṣedha*, since a subsequent rule which competes (*sparddhate*) against a prior rule is considered *asiddha* in view of its application, does not find scope (*Kāś*: *'vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam' ity eṣā tu paribhāṣā yena pūrveṇa lakṣaṇena saha sparddhate, paraṃ lakṣaṇaṃ tat prati tasyāsiddhatvān na pravartate*). Consider the two derivates of *ṆyaT*, i.e., (*vi-sphur* + *ṆyaT*) + *sU* → *visphoryam* and (*ava-gur* + *ṆyaT*) + *sU* → *avagoryam*, where application of *guṇa* (7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*) cannot be blocked by application of *dīrgha* 'long replacement' (8.2.77 *hali ca*) on the basis of subsequent order of enumeration (*paratva*). For, 8.2.77 *hali ca* will be treated as *asiddha* in view of application of 8.2.26 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*. The question of conflict between rules of 'equal strength' (*tulyabalatā*) thus does not arise.

If it is said that a subsequent operation is considered suspended when a prior operation is to be performed, a subsequent exception will become suspended in view of application of a prior (*pūrva*) general (*utsarga*) rule. Consequently, the *gh* of 8.2.32 *dāder dhātor ghaḥ* will become suspended in the derivation of *dogdhā* and *dogdhum*. The *ḍh* of *ho ḍhaḥ* (8.2.31), in turn, will become applicable. It is therefore said that in applying a general rule, even though placed subsequently, an exception (*apavāda*) is not considered suspended. This is accepted at the strength of Pāṇini's own statement. Why can they not be applied in turn at the strength of the Pāṇinian statement? This will save the Pāṇinian statement from becoming vacuous. This is not acceptable. Although an exception could be applied in turn, optional application of *gh* by 8.2.33 *vādruhamuha* . . . will become vacuous (cf. *Nyāsa* ad *Kāś.*).

This shows how an exception always blocks application of its corresponding general rule. The very formulation of an exception will become useless if it is blocked by a general rule placed subsequently (*Kāś*: *apavādasya tu parasyāpi utsarge kartavye vacanaprāmāṇyād asiddhatvaṃ na bhavati*).

8.2.2 नलोपः सुप्स्वरसंज्ञातुग्विधिषु कृति

nalopaḥ supsvarasaṃjñātugvidhiṣu kṛti
/ *nalopaḥ* = *nakārasya lopaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *sup-svara- saṃjñā-tug-vidhiṣu* 7/3 = *sup ca svaraś ca saṃjñā ca tuk ca* (*itar. dv.*); *eteṣāṃ vidhayaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tāsu*; *kṛti* 7/1/
(*asiddhaḥ* #1)
nalopaḥ pūrvatrāsiddho bhavati subvidhau svaravidhau saṃjñāvidhau tugvidhau ca kṛti

A deletion of *n* by means of *LOPA* is treated here as if suspended, when an operation relative to *sUP*, accent (*svara*), naming (*saṃjñā*) and introduction of augment *tUK* before a *kṛt* affix, is to be performed.

EXAMPLES:

rājabhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *rājan* 'king' '
takṣabhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *takṣan* 'carpenter' '
rājabhyām 'instrumental-dative-ablative dual of *rājan*'
takṣabhyām 'instrumental-dative-ablative dual of *takṣan*'
rājasu 'locative plural of *rājan*'
takṣasu 'locative plural of *takṣan*'
rājavatī 'a female with royal splendor'
pañcārmam 'five eye-diseases'
daśārmam 'ten eye-diseases'
pañcadaṇḍī 'a place with five shaft-carrying ascetics'
pañca brāhmaṇyaḥ 'five brāhmaṇa women'
daśa brāhmaṇyaḥ 'ten brāhmaṇa women'
vṛtrahabhyām 'instrumental-dative-ablative dual of *vṛtrahan* 'killer of Vṛtra' '
vṛtrahabhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *vṛtrahan*'

1. The word *vidhi* 'operation, process' is here interpreted as relatable to all four constituents of the *dvandva* compound *sup-svara-saṃjñā-tug-vidhiṣu*. For, the word *vidhi* is used at the end of a *dvandva* compound and whatever is used at the end of a *dvandva* compound is related to each one of its constituents (cf. *dvandvānte śrūyamāṇaṃ pratyekam abhisambadhyate*). That is, by reading the locative *vidhau* with individual constituents, we get the interpretations: *sub-vidhau* 'in an operation relative to elements denoted by the abbreviatory term *sUP*', *svara-vidhau* 'in an operation relative to accentuation', *saṃjñā-vidhau* 'in an operation relative to naming (*saṃjñā*) and *tug-vidhau*. The word *kṛti* is relatable only to *tug-vidhi* 'an operation relative to the introduction of augment *tUK*'. It is impossible (*asambhava*) to relate it to *sub-vidhi*, *svara-vidhi* and *saṃjñā-vidhi*. Thus, *kṛti*, when paraphrased with *tug-vidhau*, will yield the interpretation: 'in an operation relative to augment *tUK*, provided an affix termed *kṛt* follows'.

Note that *sup*, *svara*, *saṃjñā* and *tuk* form a *dvandva* compound which, in turn, is combined with *vidhi* to form a genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*) *tatpuruṣa* compound. This genitive is then interpreted as *śeṣa-ṣaṣṭhī* 'residual (not specified thus far by rules enumerating the use of genitive), denoting *sambandha-sāmānya* 'relationship in general' (2.3.50 *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*).

The word *vidhi*, which is here associated with *sup*, etc., can be interpreted either as *bhāva-sādhana* 'completed action (root-sense) as means' or as *karma-sādhana* 'operational object as means'. This dual interpretation is offered in view of whether operational objects relative to *sub-vidhi*, etc., already exist. A

bhāva-sādhana interpretation of *vidhi* will offer these operations relative to something which does not exist. A *karma-sādhana* interpretation of *vidhi* will offer these operations relative to something which already exists.

Our rule uses *vidhi* only once. How do we get this dual interpretation of *vidhi* from its single use. It is true that *vidhi* is used only once. However, it is read separately with *sup, svara, saṃjñā* and *tuk*. This separate usage enables us to get these two interpretations of *vidhi*. The problem of interpretation will arise only when we construe *vidhi* with *supsvarasaṃjñātuk*, all as a whole at once (*Nyāsa*: *yady eṣa vidhiśabdaḥ supsvarādibhiḥ samudāyena sambadhyate tadā syād ayaṃ doṣaḥ*). If we construe *vidhi* individually with *sup*, etc., it will yield different sentences. The *vidhi* of each one of those sentences can also be interpreted differently. That is, in view of both *bhāva-sādhana* and *karma-sādhana* interpretations of *vidhi* (*Nyāsa*: *teṣu ca bhinneṣu vākyeṣu vidhiśabdo' pi bhinna eva. kaścid bhāvasādhanaḥ, kaścit karmasādhanaḥ*). A *bhāvasādhana* interpretation, for examples, with *svara* will give the interpretation: 'when an operation relative to accent is to be performed'. A *karmasādhana* interpretation, for example with *sUP*, will yield the interpretation: 'when an operation with *sUP* as its focus (object) is to be performed'. This interpretation will include operations focusing on *sUP* (*sup-paraka*), as well as their replacements (*sup-sthānika*). Note that *karmasādhana* interpretation of *vidhi* is only relatable to *sUP*.

Consider *rājabhiḥ* and *takṣabhiḥ* which derive from *rājan* + *bhis* and *takṣan* + *bhis*. The final *n* of *rājan* and *takṣan*, in *rājan* + *bhis* and *takṣan* + *bhis*, goes through deletion of 8.2.7 *na lopaḥ prātipadikāntasya*. Mention must also be made here of three rules which may become applicable to these strings. Rule 7.1.9 *ato bhis ais* requires that *bhis* 'instrumental plural nominal ending', which occurs after an *aṅga* ending in *a* be replaced with *ais*. Rule 7.3.102 *supi ca* requires that the final *a* of an *aṅga*, here *rāja* and *takṣa*, be replaced with its long counterpart. Rule 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et* introduces *e* as a replacement to an *aṅga* which ends in *a*, provided a nominal ending (*sUP*) beginning with a consonant denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* follows. These replacements are blocked by treating the deleted *n* of *rājan* and *takṣan* as *asiddha* 'suspended'. For, a replacement in *ais* and *a* cannot be accomplished unless the *aṅga* ended in *a*. The *aṅga*, due mainly to suspension of *n*-deletion, ends in *n*.

Returning to the *bhāva-sādhana* interpretation of *vidhi*, we find that the suspension (*asiddhatva*) of *n* cannot be accomplished in view of introducing replacements in *ais* and *a*. For, in a *bhāva-sādhana* 'root-sense as a means' interpretation, *asiddhatva* 'suspension' is possible only when an operation brings about something which did not exist (*bhāvasādhane hi yatrāsato vidhānaṃ tatrāsiddhatvena bhavitavyam, na tu sataḥ*). In a *karma-sādhana* 'object as a means' interpretation of *vidhi* 'operation', *asiddhatva* is possible only when an operation is carried out with reference to something which

already exists. We can find *asiddhatva* in the context of *subvidhi* since *sUP* is there. Thus, we will find *asiddhatva* when an operation applies 'in place of' or 'when *sUP* follows'. It is the *karma-sādhana* interpretation of *sub-vidhi* that, with support of *asiddhatva* of *n*, blocks replacements in *ais* and *ā* in *rāja + bhis* and *takṣa + bhis*. Commentators explain that the *bhāva-sādhana* interpretation is followed in all operations, except for *sub-vidhi*. For, *sup*, *svara* and *saṃjñā* have to be all introudced first. For, it is only with reference to their introduction that *asiddhatva* obtains.

2. Note that all these four operations are contained within the *sapāda-saptādhyāyī* 'first seven and one quarter-chapters'. Deletion of *n* is, of course, contained within the *tripādī* 'last three quarters'. As such, deletion of *n* is already suspended (*asiddha*) in view of these four operations. Why raise, again, the question of *asiddhatva* 'suspension' of *n*-deletion? It is stated that a provision made against one which already exists is made for restrictive purposes (*siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*). What is that restrictive purpose here? Deletion of *n* should be considered *asiddha* only with reference to these operations, and not with reference to any other. Consider *rājīyati*, *rājāyate* and *rājāśvaḥ* where replacements in *ī*, i.e., (*rāja*(*n*→ϕ) + *ya* + *śaP* + *tiP* → *rāj*(*a*→*ī*) + *ya* + *a* + *ti* → *rājīyati*), and long *ā*, i.e., *rāja*(*n*→ϕ) + *ya* + (*ta*→*te*)) → *rāj*(*a*→*ā*) + *ya* + *ŚaP* + *te*)) = *rājāyate* is accomplished. Of course, under the non-suspension of *n*-deletion. This same is also witnessed in accomplishing the single replacement in *ā* of *rāja*(*n*→ϕ) + *aśva* → *rāj*(*a*+*a*→*ā*) *śvaḥ* = *rājāśvaḥ*.

Now consider some illustrations. For example, in *rāja* (*n*→ϕ) + *bhis* and *takṣa*(*n*→ϕ) + *bhis*, we do not get *ais* as a replacement, due mainly to the suspension of *n*-deletion. We similarly do not get a replacement in *ā* (7.3.102 *supi ca*) or *e* (7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et*).

Kāśikā offers *rājan* + (*m*→*v*) *at*(*UP*) = *rājavat* + *ṄīP* = *rājavatī*, a derivate of *matUP* used with the feminine affix *ṄīP* (4.1.6 *ugitaś ca*), to illustrate *asiddhatva* of *n*-deletion in *svara-vidhi*. Since deletion of *n* is treated as *asiddha* in *svara-vidhi*, *rājavatī* cannot be marked with *udātta* at the end (6.1.217 *anto' vatyāḥ*). For, due to the suspension of *n*-deletion, we cannot get *rājavatī* as ending in *avatī*. This being the case, *rājavatī* will be marked with *udātta* at the beginning, based on *N* as an *it* of affix *KanIN* in *rājan* (*Uṇādi* (162): *kaninyuvṛṣita . . .*). The final *ī* of *rājavatī* cannot be marked with *udātta* at the end at the strength of *avatī* (6.1.217 *anto' vatyāḥ*). The initial *udātta* (6.2.90 *arme cāvarṇaṃ dvyac tryac*) of *pañcan* and *daśan*, which becomes applicable after *n*-deletion at the strength of bases ending in *a*, is blocked in *pañcārmam* and *daśārmam*, due mainly to suspension of *n*-deletion. That is, due to appearance of *n* at the end, of *pañca*(*n*→ϕ) and *daśa*(*n*→ϕ), we could no longer find the bases ending *a*. These compounds are formed by 2.1.50 *diksaṃkhye saṃjñāyām* and are marked with *udātta* at the end (*antodātta*; 6.1.220 *samāsasya*), instead.

Next consider *pañcadaṇḍī* 'a group of five shaft-wearing ascetics', a *dvigu* of the *samāhāra* type, where the compound is formed by 2.1.51 *taddhitār-*

thottarapada. . . . Note that this compound is *napuṃsaka* 'neuter' (2.4.17 *sa napuṃsakam*). This compound, subsequent to *n*-deletion of *daṇḍin*, also qualifies as ending in a vowel denoted by *iK*. Consequently, 6.2.29 *iganta . . . dvigau* requires retention of the original accent of *pañca*. This, however, is blocked, due again to suspension of *n*-deletion. For, the condition of final *iK* caused by *n*-deletion can longer be met as a result of the suspension of *n*-deletion (*Nyāsa*: *nalope kṛta igantatā jāteti 'igantakālakapālabhagālaśarāveāṣu dvigau' iti pūrvapadasya prakṛtisvaraḥ prāpnoti, na lopasyāsiddhatvān na bhavati, samāsāntodāttatvam eva bhavati*). The original accent of the initial constituent (*pūrvapadaprakṛtisvara*) will not be retained. The compound will be marked with *udātta* at the end.

Let us take *pañca brāhmaṇyaḥ* and *daśa brāhmaṇyaḥ* as illustrations of *n*-deletion and negation of *ṬāP* (4.1.10 *na ṣaṭsvasrādibhyaḥ*). Note that *pañcan* and *daśan* are assigned the term *ṣaṭ* (1.1.24 *ṣṇāntā ṣaṭ*), based on these number words ending in *n*. This *n*, when deleted, has consequences for introducing feminine affixes. For example, rule 4.1.10 *na ṣaṭsvasrādibhyaḥ* negates affix *ṬāP* after bases recognized as *ṣaṭ*. How could a base, for example *pañcan*, which has lost its *n* to deletion be recognized as *ṣaṭ*? If it cannot be recognized as *ṣaṭ*, *ṬāP* (4.1.10 *na ṣaṭsvasrādibhyaḥ*) cannot be introduced. It is to retain the status of *ṣaṭ* that *n*-deletion is considered suspended (*asiddha*) in the context of *saṃjñā-vidhi*. Introduction of *ṬāP* by 4.1.10 *na ṣaṭsvasrādibhyaḥ* thus remains negated.

3. Some question whether a definitional rule should be formulated with reference to a single operation on hand, or it should be formulated once, and be used for multiple operations, as the need may arise. The first aspect of the question relates to *yathoddeśa-pakṣa* of grammar (*Nyāsa*: *yāvanti saṃjñākāryāṇi tatraikaiva saṃjñā pravartate* 'only one definitional term applies to all corresponding definitional functions'). The second view assumes that a definitional rule should be formed once and should be brought each time an operational rule needs it for *ekavākyatā* 'single sentenceness' (*Nyāsa*: *yayā saṃjñayaikakāryaṃ kriyate tayaivānyat, ato yāvanti saṃjñākāryāṇi tāvatya eva saṃjñā pravarttate* 'a definitional term by means of which one operational function is performed, by that same term additional function is also performed; thus, terms come into functional use as there may be definitional functions to be performed'. The first view does not have any applicational purpose here. The term by means of which *LUK*-deletion (7.1.22 *ṣaḍbhyo luk*) of *Jas* and *Śas* was accomplished, the same definitional term should also be employed here to indicate negation of *ṬāP*. Thus, the word *saṃjñā* need not be used here if the first view is accepted. We do need it if the second view is accepted.

Now consider *vṛtrahabhyām* and *vṛtrahabhiḥ* as illustrations of *tug-vidhi kṛti* 'operation relative to augment *tUK* when an affix termed *kṛt* follows'. These are instrumental dual and plural forms of *vṛtrahan* where the base is derived

with *KvIP*, introduced after *han* under the cooccurrence condition of object (3.2.87 *brahmabhrūṇa . . .*). Recall that the base *vṛtrahan* loses its *n* to deletion (8.2.7 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya*). We thus get *vṛtraha*(*n*→ϕ) + *bhyām* = *vṛtrahabhyām* and *vṛtrahabhiḥ*. Rule 6.1.71 *hrasvasya piti kṛti tuk* requires that augment *tUK* be introduced after a root which ends in a short vowel and occurs followed by a *kṛt* affix marked with *P* as an *it*. We thus get a situation where *tUK* could be introduced after *ha* of *vṛtra* + *am* + *ha*(*n*→ϕ) + *KvIP* = *vṛtra* + *am* + *ha* + *KviP*. This introduction of *tUK* is, however, blocked. For, treating *n*-deletion as *asiddha* will no longer leave the root terminating in the short vowel *a*.

4. Why is *tUK* specified in this rule? So that, via suspension (*asiddhatva*) of *n*-deletion, introduction of *tUK* could be blocked. Note that *n*-deletion is accomplished under the condition of extreme proximity (*sannipāta*) with *sUP*. This condition (*nimitta*) of extreme proximity will be impaired with introduction of *tUK*. The problem is: a condition which is characteristically described by extreme proximity is to be accepted as a non-condition if it causes destruction of that proximity' (*Paribhāṣā* (70): *sannipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tadvighātasya*). Some claim that an operation which is carried out based upon close proximity relations cannot be accepted as the cause of an operation which destroys that relation. The operation which is performed on *vṛtrahan* + *bhyām*, based on *sannipāta*, is assignment of the term *pada* (1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*). This causes *n*-deletion, an operation caused by assignment of the term *pada* (*padanimittakalopa*). An introduction of *tUK* will yield the form *vṛtraha* + *tUK* + *bhyām* = *vṛtraha*(*t*→*d*) + *bhyām* = *vṛtrahadbhām*. The *n*-deletion which was carried out based upon *sannipāta* cannot be considered as a cause in the introduction of *tUK*, an operation which destroys *sannipāta*. That is, how could extreme proximity be considered a condition of *tUK* when it causes its own destruction. If *n*-deletion cannot serve as a condition for introduction of *tUK*, specifying *tUK* in this rule is vacuous. Besides, *tUK* is introduced with reference to the final short *a*, and not the entire nominal stem which may end in it.

There is also another position on this. It is claimed that deletion of *n* is accomplished based on a nominal ending which is external (*bāhya*). Introduction of *tUK* is accomplished based upon *a*, followed by *KvIP*, which is internal (*antaraṅga*; *Paribhāṣā* (51) *asiddhaṃ bahiraṅgam antaraṅge*). If that is so, why specify *tUK* in this rule. *Kāśikā* notes that *tUK* is used here to indicate non-obligatory nature (*anityatva*) of these two interpretive conventions (*Kāś*: *atra kecit-' 'sannipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tadvighātasya' iti tukaṃ prati nalopasyānimittatvād bahiraṅgalakṣaṇena vā' siddhatvāt tugvidhigrahaṇam anarthakam iti pratipannāḥ, tat kriayte paribhāṣādvayasyaānityatvaṃ jñāpayitum*).

5. Why do we have the condition of *kṛti* 'when a *kṛt* affix follows'? Consider *vṛtrahacchatram* 'shelter of one who killed Vṛtra' and *vṛtrahacchāyā* 'shadow of one who killed Vṛtra' as counter-examples where *tUK* is introduced under

the condition of a following *ch* (6.1.73 *che ca*). That is, this *ch* is not an affix termed *kṛt*.

8.2.3 न मुने

na mu ne
/na ϕ mu 1/1 (deleted) *ne* 7/1/
(*asiddhaḥ* #1)
mubhāvo nābhāve kartavye nāsiddho bhavati
A replacement in *mu* is not treated as if suspended when a replacement in *nā* is introduced.

EXAMPLES:

amunā 'instrumental singular of *adas* 'that' '

1. Note that *na* 'not' is an indeclinable (*avyaya*). A specification with *mu* is made here without using any nominal ending (*Kāś*: *avibhaktiko' yaṃ nirdeśaḥ*). This word-form *mu* refers to the *mu* of *amunā* 'instrumental singular of *adas* 'that', gotten through applications of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ*, 8.2.80 *adaso' ser dād u do maḥ* and 7.3.120 *āṅo nā' striyām*. One must remember here that *amu* is termed *ghi* by 1.4.7 *śeṣo ghy asakhi*. The instrumental singular ending *Ṭā* is replaced with *nā* only when the same follows an *aṅga* termed *ghi*. Consequently, if *mu* is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended', *nā* will not be able to replace *Ṭā* 'the instrumental singular nominal ending'. It thus does not make any sense to declare the suspension (*asiddhatva*) of *mu* when *nā* follows. But this rule does not state suspension of *mu*. It states its negation, instead. But how could something be negated when there is no corresponding positive provision made. A negation always applies against some positive provision (*prāptipūrvako niṣedhaḥ*). It is for this reason that our present rule is restrictive: *mu* remains unsuspended in introducing *nā*. Thus, (*adas→amu*) + (*Ṭā→nā*)) = *amunā*.

Note that the process whereby we get *mu* (*mu-bhāva*) is in focus here. We also have, as a focus, the process of deriving *nā* as a replacement of *Ṭā* in *amunā*. Finally, the *ne* of *na mune* is explained as derived from *na* + *Ṅi* = *ne*, the locative singular form of *na*. This rule negates *asiddhatva* 'suspension' of *mu* when *na* follows. That is, when *nā* is introduced, or *nā* follows, *mu* remains non-suspended (*siddha*).

The *saptamī* 'locative' of *ne* gets a two-way interpretation: 'when *nā* is to be introduced, and 'when *nā* follows'. It is claimed that this *śāstra* does not define a locative with the denotation of *para* 'that which follows'. Actually, the locative which is explained as serving the right condition for an operation to apply on what precedes (*bhāva-saptamī*), itself, turns into *para-saptamī* 'that which follows'. Commentators also advise that the locative of *na* could be interpreted as denoting both *viṣaya-saptamī* 'locative denoting scope' and *parasaptamī* 'locative denoting the right condition of occurrence'. For, *nā*

cannot be accepted as a condition toward destroying the *hrasvatva* 'short duration'. A condition characterized with extreme proximity becomes a non-condition when the same destroys extreme proximity.

These two interpretations of *na* can be gotten by means of *tantra*, an interpretive technique whereby desired results are obtained by reading two different meanings of a single word. The first reading of this rule will interpret *na* with the meaning of applicational scope: *ne kartavye* 'when *na* is to be introduced'. The second reading will interpret *na* with the meaning of right condition: *ne parataḥ* 'when *na* follows'. The first view establishes *siddhatva* 'non-suspension' of *mu*. The second establishes replacement in *nā* (*nābhāva*), based on the non-suspension of *mu*. These both interpretations are captured by the *Kāśikāvṛtti*: *ne parato yat prāpnoti tasmin kartavye mubhāvo nāsiddha eva*: 'that which obtains when *na* follows; *mu*, indeed, remains un-suspended in accomplishing that'.

How could both intents be realized, via a single rule? It is like *vṛddha-kumārī* 'an old unmarried woman who, when requesting a boon, said: *putrā me bahu-kṣīra-ghṛtam-annaṃ suvarṇapātryāṃ bhuñjīran* 'may my sons be blessed to consume food with plentiful milk and ghee in a gold plate'. How could she have her sons consume this plentiful milk, ghee and rice when she did not have any sons? How could she have those sons when she was old and unmarried. How could she produce sons without a husband? Remember that it was a boon. If she got plentiful milk, ghee and rice, she had to have sons to consume milk, ghee and rice. For, granting of the boon will become vacuous. This is how she will also get married, have a husband and produce sons. She got everything by way of getting a single boon granted. This same way one can get two intents realized by a single rule.

2. The *mu* which we get, for example of *amunā*, is considered non-suspended (*nāsiddha*) when *na*, for example of *nā*, follows. This non-suspension, in the context of application of 7.3.102 *supi ca*, enables *amu* to be still seen as *amu*, and not as *ada*. As a result, we do not get *dīrgha* 'lengthening' in *amu*, of *amunā* (cf. 7.3.102 *supi ca*; 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*). This lengthening of 7.3.102 can still be blocked even when *nā* as a replacement of *Ṭā* is accomplished. How? A condition which is characteristically described by extreme proximity (of *nā*) is to be accepted as a non-condition if it causes destruction of that proximity' (*sannipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tadvighātasya*). An operation where *nā* is introduced, or where *nā* follows, is a non-condition if it conditions destruction of the short (*hrasva*). This will result into blocking of long-replacement. This is supported by the specification of *amunā* with a short *u* in *mu*. This non-suspension of *mu* has dual consequenses. Recall that we get *ada* + *ā* from *adas* + *Ṭā* with the application of 7.2.102 *tyadādīnām aḥ* (*s*→*a*), and 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* (*ad*(*a*+*a*→*a*)). We derive *amunā* with the application of 8.2.80 *adaso' ser dād u do maḥ*: *a*(*d*→*m*) (*a*→*u*)) = *amu* + *ā*. Finally, *ā* is replaced with *nā* under the condition of occurrence

after a stem termed *ghi* (7.3.120 *āṅo nā' striyām*). This introduction of *nā* will be blocked if *mu* is considered suspended. Given *ada* + *ā*, we will then have the application of 7.1.12 *ṭāṅasiṅasāminātsyāḥ*. This rule will introduce *in* and we will end up with a wrong form **adenā*. This is the reason why *mu* is considered non-suspended in the application of *mu*. For, a suspended *mu* will block the *nā* conditioned by *ghi*. If we have the *mu* suspended in view of 7.3.102 *supi ca*, we will end up with another wrong form **adānā*. If it is treated as non-suspended then we will end up with still another wrong form: **amūnā*. This is the reason that the rule is interpreted by *tantra* in two ways:

(*i*) *ne kartavye mutvasya asiddhatvaṃ niṣedhati* 'it negates the suspension of *mu* when *na* is to be introduced';

(*ii*) *ne parataḥ yatprāptaṃ tatra asiddhatvaṃ niṣedhati* 'it negates the suspension of *mu* relative to what obtains, i.e., long replacement of 7. 3.102'. The two purposes of non-suspension are: introduction of *nā* as conditioned by assignment of the term *ghi*; and long replacement (*dīrgha*) of 7.3.102 *supi ca*.

3. Now consider some *vārttika* proposals under this rule:

(*i*) An internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) single replacement accent (*ekādeśa-svaraḥ*) should be treated as *siddha* (*vt: ekādeśasvaro' ntaraṅgaḥ siddho vaktavyaḥ*).
What is the purpose of making this *vārttika* proposal? So that the following accents can be regulated:

(*a*) accent of a single replacement in *ay*, *āy* and *āv*;
(*b*) accent of single replacements (*ekādeśa-svara*);
(*c*) accent of forms derived with affix *ŚatṚ*;
(*d*) accent of a *pada* where all syllables, except for one, are marked with *anudātta* (*ekānanudātta*; 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ . . .*);
(*e*) accent of a *pada* where all syllables are marked with *udātta* (8.1.28 *tiṅatiṅaḥ*).

(*a*) accent of a single replacement in *ay*, *āy* and *āv*: Haradatta (*PM*) offers four views on accent of a single replacement:

(*i*) a single replacement in place of an *udātta* and *anudātta* is marked with *udātta* in view of close similarity (*ānantarya*), as per 8.2.5 *ekādeśa udāttenodāttaḥ*. This accentual provision will be accepted as *siddha* 'non-suspended', against the *svarita* (8.4.65 *udāttānudāttasya svaritaḥ*) which is most similar (*antar atama*).

(*ii*) the second view simply accepts *udātta* as a replacement accent for the *svarita* mentioned in (*i*).

(*iii*) the third view accepts that, as an interpretive rule (*paribhāṣā*), 8.2.5 *ekādeśa udāttenodāttaḥ* applies only where a single replacement is

ordered. Thus, a replacement accomplished by 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* will, on account of being a replacement for *udātta* and *anudātta*, be marked with *udātta*. This way, an *udātta* can be accomplished concurrently with the replacement.

(*iv*) the fourth view will offer *udātta* as an exception to *svarita*.

The *udātta* accent of *ay*, etc., is *siddha*, insofar as the interpretive (*paribhāṣā*) view is concerned. We will face the question of *asiddhatva* of *udātta* in other views. The *udātta*, particularly against close similarity of a *svarita* replacement, will have to be treated as *siddha*. This is how *svarita* can be blocked.

Consider *vṛkṣa* which, because of nominal stem accent (*prātipadika-svara*), is marked *udātta* at the end (*Phiṭsūtra* 1). Given *vṛkṣa* + (*Ṅ*)*i* + *idam* = *vṛkṣ*(*a*+*i*→*e*) + *idam* = *vṛkṣe* + *idam*, where we get *e* as a single replacement of *a*+*i* (6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*). Because a replacement must be most similar to what it replaces, we will get *svarita* (8.4.65 *udāttānudāttasya svaritaḥ*) for *e*. This *svarita* will be blocked in favor of *udātta* when *udātta* is treated as *siddha* 'non-suspended'. If the *svarita* is not treated as *siddha*, *svarita* could also be accepted as the most similar replacement. With *svarita* treated as *siddha*, *udātta* can be treated as the most similar replacement. Now consider the replacement of *e*, of *vṛkṣe* + *idam*, with *ay*. This single replacement is internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*). For, application of 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* is dependent upon a single word. A replacement in *ay* is dependent upon both the *padas*. A replacement in *ay* is, hence, externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*). The *ay* must also be marked with *udātta*. That is, the *udātta* which it replaces is treated as *siddha*. What is true of (*vṛkṣ*(*a*+*i*→*e*) + *idam*)) = (*vṛkṣ*(*e*→*ay*) + *idam*)) = (*vṛkṣa*(*y*→ϕ) + *idam*)) = *vṛkṣa idam* is also true of (*plakṣ*(*a*+*i*→*e*) + *idam*)) → (*plakṣ*(*e*→*ay*) + *idam*)) = (*plakṣa*(*y*→ϕ) *idam*)) = *plakṣa idam*.

Now consider *kumārī* + *Ṅe* → *kumāryai*, the dative singular of *kumārī*. The word *kumāra* is marked with *udātta* at the end. Affix *ṄīP* is then introduced after it to derive *kumārī* (4.1.20 *vayasi prathame*). The final *a* of *kumāra* is deleted (6.4.148 *yasyeti ca*). The *ī* of *kumārī* is marked with *udātta* by 6.1.158 *anudāttasya ca*. . . . Now consider the dative singular *kumārī* + (*Ṅ*)*e*, where augment *āṬ* is introduced by 7.3.112 *āṇ nadyāḥ*. We then get the *ī* replaced with *y*: *kumār*(*ī*→*y*) + *āṬ* + *e*. The *e* is marked with *udātta* in view of 6.1.171 *udāttayaṇo halpūrvāt*. This *udātta*, however, applies to *āṬ* in view of 1.1.54 *ādeḥ parasya*. A single *vṛddhi* replacement in *ai* is then ordered for the vocalic sequence *ā*+*e* (6.1.90 *āṭaś ca*). Thus, we get *kumāry* + (*ā*+*e*→*ai*) = *kumāryai*. Given *kumāryai* + *idam*, we get *ai* of *kumāryai* replaced with *āy* before *i* of *idam*. We thus get *kumāry*(*ai*→*āy*) + *idam*. This single *vṛddhi* replacement (of 6.1.90 *āṭaś ca*) qualifies for *svarita*, based on its closest similarity with what was replaced. Rule 8.2.5 *ekādeśa udāttenodāttaḥ* marks it with *udātta*. But this can be done only when it is treated as *siddha* 'non-suspended'. This *udātta*, however, can be realized before *ai* replaces *ā*+*e*. The replacement in *ay* will then get the *udātta* accent. Or else, given *kumāryā* + *e*, we get the *vṛddhi* of

6.1.90 *āṭaś ca*. Augment *āṬ* also gets its accent from 6.1.171 *udāttayaṇo halpūrvāt*. These two both are non-obligatory (*anitya*). The accent is non-obligatory because it applies to a different form (*śabdāntara-prāpteḥ*). It applies to *ai* (*vṛddhi*) before *āṬ* is introduced. The *vṛddhi* is also realized prior to the *udātta* and *anudātta* accents. An operation which, after assigning the accent to *āṬ*, brings in an accent different from the *udātta* and *anudātta* is treated as *anitya* 'non-obligatory'. In a situation where both accentual provisions are *anitya*, accent could be assigned based on *paratva* 'subsequent operational order'. But since this operation is related to sounds, a replacement in *vṛddhi* applies on the basis of being internally conditioned (*antaraṅgatvāt*). The accentuation, because of the requirement of nominal endings, becomes externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*).

(*b*) accent of single replacements (*ekādeśa-svara*): Consider *gāṅga* + *Ṅi*, where *gāṅga* is derived with affix *aṆ* (4.3.120 *tasyedam*), introduced after *gaṅgā* + *Ṅas* with the signification of *gaṅgāyā idam* 'this is of Gaṅgā'. It is also *udātta* at the end by affixal accent (*pratyaya-svara*). Affix *Ṅi*, on account of being a *sUP*', is marked *anudātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). A single replacement in *e*, resulting from replacing the sequence *a+i* of *gāṅg*(*a+i*→*e*) = *gāṅge*, will be marked with *udātta* (8.2.5 *ekādeśa udāttenodāttaḥ*). Given *gāṅge' anūpaḥ*, where *anūpa* is a *prādi* compound (2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ*) paraphrased as *āpo' nugatam* '(ocean) water gone into land', the compound could retain the indeclinable accent of its initial constituent (6.2.2 *tatpuruṣe tulyārtha* . . .). However, it is marked with *udātta* at the end of its following constituent, in view of 6.2.189 *anor apradhānakanīyasī*. The rest of the compound goes through *nighāta* 'blanket *anudātta*'. A single replacement of the vocalic sequence *e+a* (6.1.108 *eṅaḥ padāntād ati*), as in *gāṅg*(*e+a*) *nūpaḥ*, is also marked with *udātta* by 8.2.5 *ekādeśa udāttenodāttaḥ*. The *svarita* accent of 8.2.6 *svarito vā' nudātte* . . . is also optionally made available to it.

(*c*) Consider *tud* + *Śa* + (*LAṬ*→*ŚatṚ*) → *tud* + *a* + *at* = *tudat*, where a corresponding feminine form is given as *tudatī*. Note that *Śa* is marked with *udātta* by affixal accent (3.1.3 *ādy udāttaḥ*). The single replacement of *a+a* in *tud*(*a+a*→*a*) *t* = *tudat* is marked with *udātta* (8.2.5 *ekādeśa* . . .). This, of course, is to be treated as *siddha* 'non-suspended'. Now comes 6.1.170 *śaturanumo nadyajādī* which, when read with the *anuvṛtti* of *antodāttād uttarapadāt*, marks the final *ī* of *tudatī* with *udātta*. This final *udātta* could not be accomplished if the single replacement accent is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended'. For, this is the domain of *antodāttāt* 'after that which is marked with *udātta* at the end'.

The negation of *anumaḥ* (in 6.1.170 *śaturanumo* . . .) becomes an indicator (*jñāpaka*) that the accent of a single replacement is

considered *siddha* 'non-suspended' in matters of assigning accent to a form ending in *ŚatṚ*. If not, this negation will become vacuous (*vyartha*). For, a word which ends in *ŚatṚ* and is augmented with *nUM* cannot be found as marked with *udātta* at the end, especially when there is no single replacement accent (*Kāś: na hi sanumkaṃ śatrantaṃ kiṃcid ekadeśasvaram antareṇāntodāttam asti*). That is, *udātta* at the end without a single replacement accent is impossible to find.

(*d*) accent of a *pada* where, all syllables except for one, are marked with *anudātta* (*ekānanudātta*; 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ . . .*).

Consider *tudanti* and *likhanti* where, given *tud* + *Śa* + *anti* and *likh* + *Śa* + *anti*, we get a single replacement accent on (*Śa+a→a*) *nti* = *anti*. Rule 8.2.5 *ekādeśa udāttenodāttaḥ* assigns an *udātta*. This accent is considered *siddha* for purposes of 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam. . . .* Thus, we get *tudanti* and *likhanti*.

(*e*) accent of a *pada* where all syllables are marked with *udātta* (8.1.28 *tiṅṅatiṅaḥ*).

Consider *brāhmaṇās tudanti* and *brāhmaṇā likhanti* where the replacement accent of *a* is treated as *siddha*. Consequently, all syllables are marked with *anudātta*, as per 8.1.28 *tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ*. Now consider *pacatīti*, where *iti*, because of being a particle (*nipāta*), is marked with *udātta* at the beginning (*nipātā ādyudāttā bhavanti*). A single long replacement in place of two *i*-vowels of *pacati* and *iti* is accepted as *bahiraṅga* 'externally conditioned'. For, it is conditioned by two words (*dvipadāśrayatvāt*).

Since *vārttika* one recognizes only an internally conditioned single replacement accent as *siddha*, an externally conditioned replacement accent will thus be considered *asiddha* 'suspended'. The exclusion of 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam ekavarjam* will thus not apply. We will similarly not get the *anudātta* of *gati*, i.e., *pra*, from 8.1.71 *tiṅi codāttavati*. The blanket *anudātta* of 8.1.28 *tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ* alone applies.

(*ii*) This *vārttika* proposes that, in matters of replacing *rU* with *u*, 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ* should not be considered suspended (*vt: saṃyogāntasya lopo ror utve siddho vaktavyaḥ*). Consider *harivo medinaṃ tvā*, where *harivaḥ* is the vocative singular form of *hariva* + *sU*. The word *hariva*, in turn, is a derivate of *matUP*. Given (*hari+ mat*(*U*)*P*) + *sU*, we get (*hari* + (*ma+nUM+t*)) + *sU* = *hari*(*m→v*) *ant* + *sU* = *harivant* + *sU*, by introducing augment *nUM* and replacing the *m* of *matUP* with *v* (8.2.15 *chandasīraḥ*). This gives us: *harivant* + *sU*. Rule 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .* then deletes *sU* by way of assigning the term *apṛkta* to *s*. We thus get *harivant* + (*sU→ϕ*) = *harivant*. The final *t* of *harivant* then goes through deletion of 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya*

lopaḥ. The final *n* of *harivan* is then replaced with *rU* (8.3.1 *matuvaso ru sambuddhau chandasi*). Rule 6.1.113 *haśi ca* then applies on *harivar* + *medinam* to replace *r(U)* with *u*. We thus get *hariva(n→r(U)* + *medinam* → *hariva* + (*r→u*) + *medinam* = *hariv(a+u→o)* + *medinam* = *harivo medinam*, by replacing the *a+u* sequence with *o* (*guṇa*; 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*). Note that *r* is replaced with *u* under the condition of *m*, a consonant denoted by the abbreviatory term *haŚ*. If, however, the conjunct-final *t*-deletion is treated as suspended (*asiddha*), *r* will be accepted as followed by *t*, a consonant not denoted by *haŚ*. This would block the replacement of *r* with *u*. It is to facilitate this replacement that this *vārttika* proposes *t*-deletion to be treated as *siddha* 'non-suspended'.

(*iii*) A deletion of *sIC* is to be treated as non-suspended (*siddha*) when a single replacement is to be accomplished (*vt: sijlopa ekādeśe siddho vaktavyaḥ*). Thus, consider *alāvīt* and *apāvīt* where, given *a* + *lau* + *i* + (*sIC→ϕ*) + *ī* + *t*, 8.2.18 *iṭ īṭi* applies to delete *sIC*. The sequence of two *i* vowels, i.e., *i+ī*, is then replaced with *ī* (6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*). Rule 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* cannot apply to replace *i+ī* with *ī* if deletion of *sIC* is treated as suspended (*asiddha*). If deletion of *sIC* is treated as *siddha*, we will have no *sIC* to intervene. A single long-replacement in *ī* will be easily accomplished. Refer to *alāvīt* (II:333-34) for further derivational details. We can similarly derive *apāvīt*.

(*iv*) This *vārttika* proposes that, in matters of operations relative to a replacement in *ṣ*, accentuation (*svara*), affixal operation (*pratyaya-vidhi*) and augment *iṬ* (*iḍ-vidhi*), the substitute of an affix termed *niṣṭhā* (*niṣṭhādeśa*; 1.1.26 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) is treated as *siddha* 'non-suspended' (*vt: niṣṭhādeśaḥ ṣatva-svara-pratyayavidhīḍvidhiṣu siddho vaktavyaḥ*). Consider *vṛkṇaḥ* and *vṛkṇavān*, where *vṛkṇa* (*Kta*) and *vṛkṇavat* (*KtavatU*) are derivates of *niṣṭhā* (1.1.26 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) suffixes *Kta* and *KtavatU*, respectively. Given *OvraścU* + *Kta* where, because of *O* as an *it* in the root, *t* of *Kta* is replaced with *n* (8.2.45 *oditaś ca*). We thus get *vṛśc* + (*t→n*) = *vṛśc* + *na*. Recall here that *r*, of *vraśc* + *ta*, is replaced with its *samprasāraṇa* counterpart *ṛ* (6.1.16 *grahijyāvayi* . . .). The resultant vocalic sequence *ṛ+a* is then replaced with *ṛ* (6.1.107 *samprasāraṇāc ca*). The *n*-replacement of *t* is treated as *siddha*, in matters of replacing the root-final *c* with *ṣ* (8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjsṛj* . . .). If this *n*-replacement is not treated as *siddha* 'not suspended', the string will still be *vṛśc* + *ta*. Since *t* is included within the denotatum of *jhaL*, a replacement in *ṣ* for the final *c* of the root can thus not be blocked. Incidentally, the *c* is replaced with *k* (*kutva*; 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*). The *n* itself is replaced with *ṇ* (8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅ* . . .). We thus get *vṛkṇa* and *vṛkṇavat*. The *s* of the

conjunct, in the absence of a replacement in *ṣ*, is deleted (8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ca*).

Consider *kṣība* 'a drunk' which is given as an example for operations relative to accent, affixation and *iṬ*. How could this one example illustrate three operational considerations? This word is derived via *nipātana*. A *nipātana* is manipulated to account for derivates in many ways. Consider (*kṣīb* + *i*(*Ṭ*→ϕ) + (*K*→ϕ) *ta*))) → (*kṣīb* + (*i*+*t*→ϕ) *a*)) = *kṣība*, a name (*saṃjñā*), where deletion of *i* and *t* is accomplished via *nipātana*. Since this deletion, under the condition of *saṃjñā* 'name', is treated as *asiddha*, *kṣība* cannot be assigned *udātta* at the beginning. Now consider *kṣībe tarati* = *kṣībikaḥ*, a derivate of *ṢthaN* (4.4.7 *naudvyacaṣ ṭhan*), where charactceristic accent of a disyllabic name cannot be availed (6.1.202 *niṣṭhā ca dvyajanāt*). We get augment *iṬ* (7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*) because of suspension of *t*-deletion.

(*v*) Another *vārttika* (*plutavikārastugvidhau che siddho vaktavyaḥ*) proposes that modification relative to a *pluta* 'extra-long' vowel be treated as *siddha* 'not suspended', when augment *tUK* is introduced before affix *cha*. Why before *cha*? So that, elsewhere, modification relative to a *pluta* vowel be treated as *asiddha*. Consider *agnā3i cchatram* and *patā3u cchatram*, where, after deletion of the nominal ending termed *sambuddhi*, *agne* and *paṭo* go through modification of an extra-long *ā* (8.2.107 *eco' pragṛhyasya . . .*). An extra-long *ā* replaces the first half of *i* and *u* of the vocative. Its next half is replaced with *i* and *u*. Because the *pluta* modification is treated here as *siddha*, we get obligatory *tUK* (6.1.73 *che ca*). An optional *tUK* (6.1.76 *padāntād vā*) may have been available if modification relative to *pluta* was not treated as *siddha*.

(*vi*) Yet another *vārttika* proposes that, in matters of introducing *dhUṬ* (8.3.29 *ṅaḥ si dhuṭ*), a replacement in *ś*, and also *cU* (*c*, *ch*, *j*, *jh*, *ñ*), is treated as *siddha* 'non suspended'. Consider verbal root *ścyutir* which begins with *s*. This *s* is replaced with *ś* because *c* follows. If this *ś* is treated as *asiddha*, we will get *dhUṬ* (8.3.29 *ṅaḥ si dhuṭ*) in *aṭścyotati* and *aṭ* + *sU* and *raṭ* + *sU*, where *aḍ* and *raḍ* are derivates of *KvIP*, gone through total deletion (*sarvāpahāri-lopa*). Incidentally, *sU* goes through deletion (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*) and the final *ṭ* of *aṭ* and *raṭ* is replaced with *ḍ* (8.2.30 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*).

Why is *ścyutir* 'to drip' specified with *s*? It does not serve any purpose. Consider *madhuś cyotatīti* = *madhuścyut*, once again a derivate with *KvIP*. Now add the causal affix *ṆiC* to derive *madhuści*. Forms such as *madhuścyutam ācaṣṭe* = *madhuścyayati / madhuścyayate* can now be derived by introducing affix *KvIP* after *madhuści*, where affix *ṆiC* is deleted (6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*). Affix *KvIP*, as usual, also goes

through deletion. The *ś* at the beginning of the conjunct *ścy*, in *madhuścy*, must be deleted (8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ca*). The *y* must also go through deletion because it is conjunct-final in a *pada* (8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*). The resultant *madhuc* now gets its final *c* replaced with *k* (8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*). We thus get *madhuk*. It would have been difficult to delete *ś* had the root been specified as beginning with *ś*. That is, only *c* and *y* could be deleted. The resultant *madhuś* would have gotten its *ś* replaced with *ṣ* (8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjasṛj . . .*). Finally, this *ṣ* would have been replaced with *ṭ* (8.2.30 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*) to yield **madhuṭ*, a form not desired (*aniṣṭa*).

(*vii*) This *vārttika* proposes that a replacement denoted by *jaŚ* and *caR*, when occurring in an iterated form, be treated as *siddha*, provided operations relative to a replacement in *e* (*vt: abhyāsajaśtvacartve etvatukoḥ siddhe vaktavye*; 6.4.120 *ata ekahalmadhye . . .*) and augment *tUK* are to be performed. Consider *babhaṇatuḥ* and *babhaṇuḥ*, the active third person dual and plural perfect (*LIṬ*) forms of *bhaṇ*, where we also get iteration (*dvirvacana*). The *bh* of *bhabhaṇ* is here repalced with *b* (*jaŚ*). This replacement must be treated as *siddha*. For, the root will, otherwise, be treated as not beginning with a replacement (*anādeśādi*). This will cause the application of a replacement in *e* (*etva*; 6.4.120 *ata ekahalmadhye . . .*). The resultant forms of perfect, i.e., **bheṇatuḥ* and **bheṇuḥ*, will again be undesired.

Now consider the desiderative (*saN*) third person singular active present form *vicicchitṣati*. The initial *ch* of the iterated verbal form *chichid + sa* → (*ch*→*c*) *ichid + sa* is here replaced with *c* (*cartva*; 8.4.54 *abhyāse car ca*). If this replacement is not treated as *siddha*, we will not get augment *tUK* of 6.1.73 *che ca*.

(*viii*) This *vārttika* proposes that a single replacement similar to what follows (*parasavarṇa*) is to be accepted as *siddha* when iteration (*dvirvacana*) is to be performed. Consider *sam + yantā* and *sam + vatsara*; and *yallokam* and *tallokam*. The *m* is here changed into an *anusvāra* (8.2.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*). This *anusvāra* is further replaced with a nasalized *ỹ* and *l̃* (8.4.58 *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ*). If this replacement is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended', we will not get doubling of *ỹ* and *l̃* by applying 8.4.47 *anaci ca*, read with 8.4.45 *yaro' nunāsike. . . .* That is, *sañyyanta*; *sañvvatsaraḥ*; *yal̃llokam* and *tal̃llokam* cannot be derived.

(*ix*) Yet another *vārttika* proposes that replacements in *l* (*latva*; 8.2.21 *acivibhāṣā*), *ḍh* (*ḍhatva*; 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*), *gh* (*ghatva*; 8.2.33 *vā druhamuhaṣṇuhaṣṇihām*), *n* (*natva*; 8.2.56 *nudavidondatrā . . .*), *rU* (*rutva*; 8.2.75 *daś a*), *ṣ* (*ṣatva*; 8.3.85 *mātuḥpiturbhyām . . .*), *ṇ* (*ṇatva*; 8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅ . . .*), nasal (*anunāsika*; 8.4.45 *yaro' nunāsike . . .*) and

ch (*chatva*; 8.4.63 *śaścho' ṭi*) are treated as *siddha* for purposes of doubling. Of course, if rules which accomplish these replacements are read with the *anuvṛtti* of *padasya* (8.1.16 *padasya*, etc.). Consider the examples: *latva*: *garo garaḥ/galo galaḥ*; *ghatva*: *drogdhā drogdhā/drodhā droḍhā*; *natva*: *nunno nunnaḥ/nuṭto nuttaḥ*; *rutva*: *abhino' bhinaḥ/abhino' bhinat*; *ṣatva*: *mātuṣṣvasā mātuḥsvasā*; *pituṣṣvasā pituḥsvasā*; *ṇatva*: *māṣavāpāṇi māṣavāpāni*; *anunāsika*: *vāṅnayanaṃ vāgnayanam*; *vākchayanaṃ vākchayanam*; *vāḳśayanaṃ vāḳśayanam*.

8.2.4 उदात्तस्वरितयोर्यणः स्वरितोऽनुदात्तस्य

udāttasvaritayor yaṇaḥ svarito' nudāttasya
/udātta-svaritayoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *yaṇaḥ* 5/1 *svaritaḥ* 1/1 *anudāttasya* 6/1/
udāttayaṇaḥ svaritayaṇaś ca parasyānudāttasya svarita ādeśo bhavati
A *svarita* comes in place of an *anudātta* which, in turn, occurs after a *yaN* replacing an *udātta* and *svarita*.

EXAMPLES:

kumāryaú
kumāryáḥ
sakṛllvyáśā
khalapvyáśā

1. This rule offers *svarita* as a replacement for an *anudātta* which, in turn, occurs after a sound denoted by *yaN*, itself a replacement of an *udātta* or *svarita* vowel. Consider *kumār*(*ī*→*y*) + *au* and *kumār*(*ī*→*y*) + (*J*)*as* → *kumāryaḥ*, where the nominal endings *au* and (*J*)*as* are marked with *udātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). Note that the masculine base *kumāra* is marked with *udātta* at the end (*Phiṭsūtra* 1: *phiṣo' ntodāttaḥ*). Affix *ṄīP*, which is introduced after *kumāra* to derive *kumārī*, is marked with *anudātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). Since deletion of the *udātta a* of *kumāra* is caused by the following *anudātta* of *ṄīP*, rule 6.1.158 *anudāttasya ca yatrodāttalopaḥ* allows *ī* of the feminine *kumārī* to be marked with *udātta*. This resultant *udātta* is referred to by commentators as *udātta-nivṛtti-svara* 'an accent which is obtained by way of *udātta*-deletion'. When this *udātta ī* of *kumārī* is replaced with *y* (*yaN*), the *anudātta* nominal endings *au* and (*J*)*as* are replaced with *svarita*.

Now consider *sakṛllū* + *āśā* → *sakṛll*(*ū*→*v*) + *āśā* = *sakṛllvāśā* and *khalap*(*ū*→*v*) + *āśā* → *khalapvāśā*, where affix *KvIP* is introduced after *lū* 'to cut' and *pū* 'to cleanse'. These roots are marked with *udātta* at the end, in consonance with root-accent (*dhātusvara*; 6.1.159 *dhātoḥ*). The compound is formed by 2.2.19 *upapadam atiṅ*. These compounds, based on retention requirement of original accent in the following constituent of a *pada* ending in affix *kṛt* (6.2.139 *gatikārakopapadāt kṛt*), are marked with *udātta* at the end.

When their *udātta* vowel *ū* is replaced with *v* before the *anudātta* vowel of *Ṅi* 'locative singular', our present rule marks *i* with *svarita*. We thus get *sa̲kṛllví* and *kha̲la̲pví*, both marked with *svarita* at the end. This *svarita* vowel *i* goes through a replacement in *yaṆ* before *ā* of *āśā*. Note that *āśā* is marked with *udātta* at the end (*Phiṭsūtra* (18): *āśāyā ādigākhyā*). Consequently, *ā* of *āśā* is marked with *anudātta* by 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam ekavarjam*. Thus, we get: *sa̲kṛllvyāśā* and *kha̲la̲pvyāśā*, where the *anudātta* vowel, i.e., *ā*, of *āśā*, when occurring after a *yaṆ*-replacement marked with *svarita*, is replaced with *svarita*. In summary, this rule assigns *svarita* to an *anudātta* when the *anudātta* follows a *yaṆ*-replacement marked with *udātta* (*Nyāsa*: *ihānena sūtreṇānudāttasyodāttayaṇaḥ parasya svarito vidhīyate*). This rule also assigns *svarita* to an *anudātta* when the *anudātta* follows a *yaṆ*-replacement marked with *svarita* (*Nyāsa*: *svaritayaṇaś ca parasya* (*saptamy ekavacanasya pūrveṇa prakāreṇa*) *svarito vidhīyate*). The expressions *udāttayaṇaḥ* and *svaritayaṇaḥ* refer to a *yaṆ*-replacement marked with *udātta* and *svarita*, as obtained by rule applications.

Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* for further discussion on this accentuation.

2. Why do we state *udāttasvaritayoḥ* 'in place of *udātta* and *svarita*'? Consider *baidī āśā* = *baidyāśā*, and *śārṅgaravī* + *āśā* = *śārṅgaravyāśā*, where an *anudātta* vowel, i.e., *ī*, is replaced with *yaṆ* (*anudāttayaṇaḥ*). The initial constituents of these compound words are marked with *udātta*, based on *N* as an *it* of the feminine affix *ṄīN* (4.1.73 *śārṅgaravād . . . ṅīn*). That is, *N* as an *it* assigns *udātta* at the beginning. The rest of the word gets marked with *anudātta*. The word *baidyāśā* has *y* as a replacement of *anudātta*, and not of an *udātta* or *svarita*.

Why state *anudāttasya* 'in place of an *anudātta*'? Consider *kumār*(*ī*→*y*) + *atra* = *kumāryatra* and *kiśor*(*ī*→*y*) + *atra* = *kiśoryatra* where *atra* is marked with *udātta* at the beginning in consonance with *L* as an *it* in *traL* (5.3.10 *saptamyās tral*; 6.1.190 *liti*). The *udātta* of *atra*, obviously, cannot be replaced with the *svarita* offered by this rule.

8.2.5 एकादेश उदात्तेनोदात्तः

ekādeśa udāttenodāttaḥ
/*ekādeśaḥ* 1/1 = *ekaś cāsāv ādeśaś ca* (*karmdhāraya tat.*); *udāttena* 3/1 *udāttaḥ* 1/1/
(*anudāttasya* #4)
udāttena sahānudāttasya ya ekādeśaḥ sa udātto bhavati
A single replacement in place of an *udātta* and *anudātta* is marked with *udātta*.

EXAMPLES:

a̲gnī 'nominative dual of *agni* 'fire'
vā̲yū 'nominative dual of *vayu* 'wind' '

vṛkṣaiḥ 'instrumental plural of *vṛkṣa* 'tree' '
plakṣaiḥ 'instrumental plural of *plakṣa* 'a kind of tree' '

1. Note that *anudāttasya* is carried. A *svarita* is considered the most similar single replacement in place of an *udātta* and *anudātta*. This rule offers an *udātta*, instead (*Nyāsa*: *svarite prāpte idam ārabhyate*). Stems such as *agni*, *vāyu*, *vṛkṣa* and *plakṣa* are marked with *udātta* at the end (*Phiṭsūtra* (1): *phiṣo' nta udāttaḥ*). Their nominal endings are marked with *anudātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). A single replacement in *ī* (6.1.101 *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇaḥ*), for example in place of *i* of *agni* and *au* of the nominative dual, is marked with *udātta*. Thus, *agn*(*i* + *au*→*ī*) = *agnī*, *vāyū*; and *vṛkṣa* + (*bhis*→*ais*) → *vṛkṣ*(*a*+*ai*→*ai*) *s* → *vṛkṣai*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *vṛkṣaiḥ*, *plakṣaiḥ*. Incidentally, the *ai*-replacement in *vṛkṣaiḥ* and *plakṣaiḥ* is accomplished by 6.1.88 *vṛddhir eci*.

Why do we have the specification made with *udāttena* 'with an *udātta*'? Consider *pac* + *ŚaP* + *anti* → *pacanti* and *yaj* + *ŚaP* + *anti* → *yajanti*, where the *a* of *ŚaP* and the *sārvadhātuka*-replacement of *LA*, i.e., (*jhi*→*anti*), is also marked with *anudātta* (6.1.183 *tāsy anudāttaeṅnida* . . .). A single replacement, i.e., *a* (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*), similar to what follows (*pararūpam*), must, hereby, be marked with *anudātta*. The *svarita* of 8.4.66 *udāttādanudāttasya svaritaḥ* which may be available to *ŚaP* is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended', relative to the single replacement of 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*.

8.2.6 स्वरितो वाऽनुदात्ते पदादौ

svarito vā' nudātte padādau
/*svaritaḥ* 1/1 *vā* ϕ *anudātte* 7/1 *padādau* 7/1 = *padasya ādiḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin*/
(*anudāttasya* #4 *ekādeśa udāttasya* #5)
anudātte padādau udāttena saha ya ekādeśaḥ sa svarito vā bhavaty udātto vā
A single replacement in place of a vocalic sequence formed with an *udātta*, followed by an *anudātta* at the beginning of a *pada*, is, optionally, marked with *svarita*.

EXAMPLES:

su utthitaḥ = *sūtthítaḥ* 'properly raised; produced'
sâtthitaḥ 'ibidem'
vīkṣáte '. . . observes, beholds'
vîkṣate 'ibidem'
vasukó' si 'you are rich'
vasuko' sí 'ibidem'

1. This rule, optionally, allows a single replacement in place of a sequence of an *udātta* and a *pada*-initial *anudātta*, to be optionally marked with a *svarita*. Consider *su utthitaḥ* = *sūtthítaḥ* and *sûtthtaḥ*, where the first has a replacement

in *svarita* for a sequence of *udātta* and a *pada*-initial *anudātta*. The second example retains the *udātta* of the preceding rule. Note that *su* is a member of the *prādi* group termed *karmapravacanīya* (1.4.83 *karmapravacanīyāḥ*). It combines with the past participial *ūtthitaḥ* to form an *avyayībhāva* (2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ*) compound where its first, an indeclinable (*avyaya*) constituent, retains its original accent (6.2.2 *tatpuruṣe tulyārtha . . .*). That is, the first constituent will be marked with initial *udātta* (*Phiṭsūtra* (80): *nipātā ādyudāttaḥ*). The rest of the compound is marked with *anudātta* (6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam ekavarjam*). Now consider *vīkṣate / vasuko' si* where both *vīkṣate* and *asi* are marked with *anudātta* (8.1.28 *tiṅi atiṅaḥ*). We find a *pada*-initial *udātta* in both instances. Recall that *vi* of *vīkṣate* is marked with *udātta* at the end (*Phiṭsūtra* (81): *upasargāś cābhivarjam*). A final *udātta* is also assigned to *a* of *vasuka*, based on nominal stem accent (*prātipadika-svara*; *Uṇādi*: *phiṣo' ntodāttaḥ*). The *i* of *vi* and the *ī* of *īkṣate*, when replaced with *ī*, are thus, optionally, marked with *svarita*.

2. Why do we have to use *svarita*? It is used for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*). If *svarita* is not used in this rule, the *udātta* of the preceding rule will become optional under the condition of the following *anudātta* of this rule. If *udātta* becomes optional, we will get *svarita* in instances where optional *udātta* is not accepted. This will happen because of close proximity (*ānantarya*) of *svarita* with *udātta* and *anudātta*. That is, we can get *svarita* without the use of the word *svarita*.

Why do we have the condition of *anudātte*? Consider *devadatto' tra* where *atra* 'here' is marked with *udātta* at the beginning. The option of this rule is, hence, not allowed.

Why do we state *padādi* 'at the beginning of a *pada*'? Consider *vṛkṣau* and *vṛkṣāḥ* where the nominal endings are marked with *anudātta*. They, however, do not occur at the beginning of a *pada*.

3. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita interprets *vā* of this rule, especially in the context of a single long replacement of two short *i* vowels, as *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā* 'fixed option'. He follows the *Prātiśākhyas* and offers examples with illustrations of three kinds of *sandhi*: (*i*) *abhinihata* 'merged', for example, *pararūpa* 'a single replacement similar to what follows in a vocalic sequence' and *pūrvarūpa* 'a single replacement similar to what precedes in a vocalic sequence'; (*ii*) *praśliṣṭa* 'a *sandhi* with composite replacement in *guṇa*, *vṛddhi* and *savarṇa-dīrgha* 'homogeneous long'; and (*iii*) *kṣaipra* 'a *sandhi*, i.e., *yaN*, involving speedy articulation' (*SK*: *vyavasthitavibhāṣātvād ikārayoḥ svaritaḥ . . . ikārayoś ca praśleṣe kṣaiprābhinihateṣu ceti*).

8.2.7 नलोपः प्रातिपदिकान्तस्य

nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya
/nalopaḥ 1/1 *nakārasya lopaḥ* = *nalopaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *prātipadika* 6/1 (deleted); *antasya* 6/1/

(*padasya* #1.16)
prātipadikasya padasya yo' ntyo nakāras tasya lopo bhavati
Deletion by *LOPA* comes in place of the final *n* of a nominal stem which is termed a *pada* (1.4.14 *suptiṅantaṃ padam*).

EXAMPLES:

rājā 'nominative singular of *rājan* 'king' '
rājabhyām 'instrumental/dative/ablative dual . . .'
rājabhiḥ 'instrumental plural . . .'
rājatā 'nominative singular of *rājatā* 'kingship' '
rājataraḥ 'a comparatively better king'
rājatamaḥ 'the best king'

1. Note that *padasya* (8.1.16 *padasya*) is carried over. This rule offers deletion of the final *n* of a nominal stem which is termed a *pada*. The two genitives of *prātipadikāntasya* and *padasya* are interpreted as sharing coreferentiality (*sāmānādhikaraṇya*) relationship. The final *n* of *rājan*, a nominal stem which is termed a *pada* (1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*), before *bhyām*, etc., is deleted via *LOPA*.

The word *anta* 'end, final' is treated as a qualifier to *prātipadikasya* (with deleted genitive). Since *asarvanāmasthāne* 'not when a *sarvanāmasthāna* ending follows' negates assignment of the term *pada* to a nominal stem which may end in *n*, the *n* must also be accepted as part of the nominal stem. The *n* is here qualified with both *prātipadika* 'nominal stem' and *anta* 'end'. If a *vyadhikaraṇa* 'non-coreferential' relationship between *pada* and *prātipadikānta* is accepted, *padasya* will become a qualifier to *prātipadikāntasya*. This will make *n* as part of both the *pada* as well as the nominal stem (*Nyāsa*: *padasya yo' vayàvaḥ so' pi prātipadikasyety arthaḥ*). This being the case, even when *anta* is used, deletion, via *tadantavidhi* 'treating *x* as referring also to that which ends in *x*', will apply to the final *n* (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) of *rājan* in *rājānau* and *rājānaḥ*. If *anta* is not used, deletion will apply to *n* wherever it occurs. For, the *sūtra* will then read: *nalopaḥ prātipadikasya* (*padasya*). We may thus get a deletion of *n*, even in *narābhyām*. Even when *anta* is combined with *prātipadika*, the *sūtra* will read: *prātipadikāntasya padāvayavasya nakārasya* 'of *n* which occurs at the end of a nominal stem as part of a *pada*'. This cannot give us the sense of *n* occurring at the end of a *pada*. This will save the *n* of the third plural *LAṄ*-derivate of *han* 'to kill, move', i.e., *ahan*, from deletion since we do not have a nominal stem, mostly because of negation of *dhātu* 'verbal root' in 1.2.45 *arthavad adhātuḥ*. . . . This no sense of *n* occurring at the end of a *pada* will also save the initial *n* of *narābhyām* from deletion. But deletion may still apply to the *n* of *rājānau*, etc. *Kāśikā*, therefore, states that *prātipadika* is not combined with *anta*. It is, instead, used in this rule without any case-ending. That is, the genitive ending at the end of *prātipadika*, i.e., *prātipadikasya*, has gone through *LUK*-deletion (7.1.39 *supāṃ suluk . . .*).

In summary, *prātipadika* and *pada*, both, must be used in this rule, not combined but used in syntactic coordination. The genitive of *prātipadika* is given as deleted in the process. The word *prātipadika* must be used to save the *n* of verbal forms *ahan*, etc., from deletion. The word *pada* must be used to save, for example, the *n* of *rājan* + *au* = *rājānau* from deletion.

Haradatta (*PM*) quotes the following *kārikā*-verse:

> *viśeṣyam antasyety asya nety etad avibhaktikam/*
> *tathaiva prātipadikety etat padaviśeṣaṇam//*
> 'the word *prātipadika* 'nominal stem' is considered the qualified (*viśeṣya*) element of *anta* 'end, final' (*antasya*); its specification does not lack a nominal ending; in this same manner, this word *prātipadika* is considered a qualifier to the word *pada*'

2. Negation of *n*-deletion of *ahan* must be stated (*vt: ahno nalopapratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ*). Consider *ahan* + *sU*, where *sU* goes through *LUK*-deletion (7.1.23 *svamor napuṃsakāt*). Since *sU* goes through deletion by *LUK*, *ahan* cannot be qualified as followed by *sUP* (1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya*). The *n* of *ahan* is then replaced with *rU* (8.2.68 *ahan*). A replacement in *rU* for *n* of *ahan* is also found in *ahan* + *bhyām*. The *rU*-replacement of *n* of *ahan* is further replaced with *u* (6.4.114 *haśi ca*). We get *ah*(*a*+*u*→*o*) + *bhyām* = *ahobhyām*, with a single replacement in *guṇa* for the vocalic sequence of *a*+*u*. This same also applies to *ahobhiḥ*.

A question is raised against the validity of this *vārttika* proposal. Why do we need this *vārttika*? The *n* of *ahan* is replaced with *u*, via *rU*. Why negate *n*-deletion even when the question of its deletion does not arise. A more complex discussion which includes *asiddhatva* of rules, and *āvṛtti* as a technique of rule interpretation, follows in the *Mahābhāṣya*. If one copies *ahan* from 8.2.86, it will itself facilitate absence of *n*-deletion (*nalopābhāva*), via *nipātana*. The other interpretation will accomplish *rU* (*rutva*) which, otherwise, would have become suspended. Operationally, lack of *n*-deletion precedes *rutva*. I omit other details for fear of expatiation.

8.2.8 न ङिसम्बुद्ध्योः

> *na ṅisambuddhyoḥ*
> */na ϕ ṅi-sambuddhyoḥ* 7/2 = *ṅiś ca sambuddhiś ca* = *ṅisambuddhī* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
> (*padasya* #1.16 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya* #7)
> *ṅau parataḥ sambuddhau ca nakāralopo na bhavati*
> A deletion by *LOPA* does not come in place of the final *n* of a nominal stem which constitutes a *pada*, provided when *Ṅi*, or a nominal ending termed *sambuddhi*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

ārdre carman 'hide soaked with (water)'
lohite carman 'hide soaked with blood'
he rājan 'O king!'
he takṣan 'O carpenter!'

1. This rule negates deletion of the final *n* of a nominal stem when *Ṅi* 'locative singular', or a nominal ending termed *sambuddhi* (2.3.49 *ekavacanaṃ sambuddhiḥ*), i.e., *sU*, follows. Consider *ārdre carman* and *lohite carman* where the locative ending *Ṅi* goes through *LUK*-deletion (7.1.39 *supāṃ suluk . . .*) after *carman*. The *sambuddhi* after *rājan* and *takṣan* of *he rājan* and *he takṣan* also goes through deletion (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo dīrghāt . . .*). The final *n*-deletion of the preceding rule here becomes applicable to *carman*, *rājan* and *takṣan*. But because of *pratyayalakṣaṇa* 'operation characteristic of deleted affix' based upon *sambuddhi*, this rule negates *n*-deletion. It is thus a general practice to negate *n*-deletion before *Ṅi* and *sambuddhi*.

2. Now consider *rājan* + *Ṅas* + *puruṣa* + *sU* → *rājan* + (*Ṅas*→ϕ) + *puruṣa* + (*sU*→ϕ) = *rāja*(*n*→ϕ) + *puruṣa* = *rājapuruṣa* + *sU* = *rājapuruṣaḥ*, where a *prātipadika* is treated as a *prātipadika*, even when the suffix used after it goes through deletion. This goes against 1.1.63 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam*. That is, *Ṅas* will still be there after *rājan*. The assignment of the term *prātipadika* to *rājan* + *Ṅas* by 1.2.46 *kṛttaddhitasamāsāś ca*, of the compound base *rajan*+(*Ṅas*→ϕ)*puruṣa*+(*sU*→ϕ) = *rājapuruṣa*, will go against the negation of *apratyayaḥ* of 1.2.45 *arthavad. . . .* Consequently, *rājan* will not be called a nominal stem. Deletion of *n* will thus be blocked. But since this rule allows such deletions by way of negating it in the context of *Ṅi* and *sambuddhi*, we infer that assignment of the term *prātipadika* is not negated at the strength of *apratyayaḥ* 'non-affix'. That is, the negation of *apratyayaḥ* has no validity here. If it does, we will also get the negation of the assignment of the term *prātipadika* in *he takṣan* and *he rājan*. This will block *n*-deletion and as a result, make the negation of 8.2.8 *na ṅisambuddhau* vacuous. This same will also happen in case of *he carman*. This rule also indicates that assignment of the term *bha* (1.4.18 *yaci bham*) is also negated, especially in relation to affixal deletion (*pratyayalopa*; 1.1.62 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam*) of *Ṅas* which cannot be revived by means of *pratyayalakṣaṇa*. This saves the *a* of *rājan*+(*Ṅas*→ϕ)+*puruṣa*+*sU* = *rājapuruṣa* from deletion. Note, however, that given *rājan* + *Ṅas*, in deriving *rājñaḥ*, the *a* of *an* of *rājan* is deleted (6.4.131 *allopo' naḥ*). Operations relative to an *aṅga* will not be performed. The term *aṅga* will not be assigned before the affix. But we will get the assignment of the term *pada* by accepting the form as ending in a *sUP*. We thus will derive *rājñaḥ*, a fully inflected word (*pada*). The assignment of the term *bha* will be blocked by the assignment of the terms *prātipadika* and *pada*. Based on this very negation, the *apratyayaḥ* 'non-affixal' meaning of 1.2.45 *arthavad . . .*

will enable the assignment of the term *prātipadika* to that which ends in an affix and begins with a nominal stem (*pratyayānta tadādi*). This is how *allopo' naḥ* will not be able to delete the *a* of *rājan.*

Others object to this negation of *bha-saṃjñā.* They argue that *yaci* (1.4.18 *yaci bham*) defines *bha-saṃjñā.* The notion of *pratyayalakṣaṇa* 'characteristic operations relative to affixal deletion' does not revive *LUK*-deletion of *Ṅas* so that *bha-saṃjñā* could be assigned. The negation of 1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya* applies to all operations relative to an *aṅga,* whether they are related to the domain of *aṅga* or not (*PM: tatra hi lumatā lupte pratyaye yadaṅgaṃ tasya yatkāryam āṅgam anāṅgam vā tat sarvaṃ pratiṣidhyate*). Consequently, this rule cannot indicate non-assignment of the term *bha* relative to an operation on an *aṅga.*

Nyāsa explains that no purpose can be served by non-assignment of the term *bha* in *yathoddeśapakṣa* 'understanding the function of rules in view of their placement in grammar'. The question of assigning the term *bha* does not arise in the *kāryakālapakṣa* 'understanding rules in view of their function at the time of their application'. For, operations under assignmenrt of the term *bha* are performed relative to an *aṅga,* and 1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya* will be ready to negate them. What then is the need for indicating non-assignment of the term *bha*?

2. A *vārttika* proposal is made for negating the negation of this rule, especially when a final compound constituent combines to follow a preceding constituent ending in the locative (*vt: ṅāv uttarapade pratiṣedhasya pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ*). Consider *carmaṇi tilā asya = carmatilaḥ* 'he on whose skin there are moles'. The *n* of *carman* of (*carman+Ṅi*) +(*tila+jas*) = *carma*(*n*→ϕ) *tila* is saved from deletion because of this negation. That is, it occurs before *Ṅi* used in combination with a following constituent (*uttarapade*). That is, negation of negation, i.e., *n*-deletion, is accomplished, for example in *carmaṇitilaḥ,* when *Ṅi* followed by a *pada* follows. This *bahuvrīhi* compound is formed on the basis of suggestivity (*gamakatvāt*), and not on the basis of *carmaṇi* and *tilāḥ* used in appositional relationship. Now consider *he rājavṛndāraka!* where the compound-base *rājavṛndāraka* is used before a *sambuddhi.* The *sambuddhi* is here used after *rājavṛndāraka,* the compound. It is not possible to have this compound with *rājan* where the first constituent is also used in combination before a *sambuddhi* (*sambuddhyantaṃ pūrvapadaṃ naiva samasyate* 'a preceding constituent ending in *sambuddhi* is never combined in a compound'). The deletion of *n* thus applies. If one forms a compound, paraphrased as *he rājan vṛndāraka!,* by 2.1.62 *vṛndārakanāgakuñjaraiḥ pūjyamānam, n*-deletion will be negated. That is why *Kāśikā* says that, in *he rājavṛndāraka,* the entire compound, i.e., *rājavṛndāraka,* is used before *sambuddhi.* For, *he rājavṛndāraka* can never give the meaning of *he rājan vṛndāraka!*

Yet another *vārttika* proposal is made for optional deletion of *n* at the end of a neuter nominal stem. Thus: *he carman!/he carma!* Haradatta (*PM*) con-

siders this *aprāpta-vibhāṣā* 'an option which was not made available is made available'. Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa*) considers it a case of *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā* 'fixed option'.

8.2.9 मादुपधायाश्च मतोर्वोऽयवादिभ्यः

mād upadhāyāś ca mator vo' yavādibhyaḥ
/māt 5/1 = *maś ca aś ca* = *mam* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt*; *upadhāyāḥ* 6/1 *ca* ϕ *matoḥ* 6/1 *vaḥ* 1/1 *ayavādibhyaḥ* 5/3 = *yava ādir yeṣāṃ te* = *yavādayaḥ* (*bv.*); *na yavādayo* (*naÑ. tat.*), *tebhyaḥ/*
makārāntād makāropadhād avarṇāntād avarṇopadhāc cottarasya matoḥ 'va' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati yavādibhyas tu parato na bhavati
The initial *m* of *matUP* is replaced with *v*, when *matUP* occurs after a nominal stem which either ends in *m* or has *m* in its *upadhā* 'penultimate', or ends in *a* or has *a* in its *upadhā*, but does not occur after a nominal of the group headed by *yava* 'barley'.

EXAMPLES:

kiṃvān 'rich in nothing; he who says, 'what' all the time'
śaṃvān 'tranquil'
śamīvān 'rich in śamī trees'
dāḍimīvān 'rich in dāḍima fruits'
vṛkṣavān 'rich in trees'
plakṣavān 'rich in plakṣa trees'
khaṭvāvān 'rich in cots'
mālāvān 'rich in garlands'
payasvān 'rich in milk'
yaśasvān 'famous'
bhāsvān 'glowing'

1. This rule replaces the initial *m* of *matUP* with *v*, if *matUP* occurs after a nominal stem which (*i*) either ends in *m* or has *m* in its *upadhā*, or ends in *a* or has *a* in its *upadhā*, but does not occur after a nominal listed in the group headed by *yava*. The two meaning conditions are thus: (*makārāntāt/ akārāntāt*) *prātipadikāt*; and (*makāropadhāt/ akāropadhāt*) *prātipadikāt*.

This rule has a very complex formulation, or so it seems, when one tries to reach the desired interpretation. Note first that *māt* is a *samāhāra-dvandva* used in the ablative, paraphrased as *māt*: *maś ca aś ca, tasmāt* '*ma* = *m* and *a*, after that (*māt*)'. Haradatta says that *ca* of this rule is responsible for rule-splitting (*yoga-vibhāga*). We thus get the first sentence: *māt parasya mator vo bhavati* '(the initial of) a *matUP* which occurs after a form ending in *m* or *a* is replaced with *v*'. The second split-sentence which we get with *upadhāyāḥ* is: *upadhāyāś ca* (*māt parasya*) *mator vo bhavati* '(the initial of) a *matUP* which occurs after that which has *m* or *a* in its penultimate position is replaced

with *v*'. Note that *matUP* is here used by way of being a *kāryin* 'operational locus'. This specification of *kāryin* then brings a nominal stem in construction. Recall that 5.2.94 *tad asyāsty asminn iti matup* introduces affix *matUP* after a syntactically related nominal stem ending in the *prathamā* 'nominative'. This nominal stem is then qualified with *māt*. That is, *makāro' nto yasya* 'that whose final is a *m*' and *avarṇo' nto yasya* 'that whose final sound is *a*'. Similarly, we qualify *upadhā* 'penultimate' with *māt* to get the sense of: *makāra upadhā yasya* 'that whose penultimate is *m*' and *akāra upadhā yasya* 'that whose penultimate is *a*'.

2. Note that *māt* is to be interpreted independently to give the sense of 'after that which ends in *m* and *a*'. It also has to be interpreted as a qualifier to *upadhāyāḥ*, thereby to yield the meaning: 'after that which has *m* and *a* in its *upadhā*' This way, the *m* of *matUP* alone will be replaced with *v*. Refer to my notes under 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya* and 1.1.54 *ādeḥ parasya* for additional details.

3. Now consider,

(*i*) examples after a stem ending in *m* (*makārāntāt*): *kiṃvān* and *śaṃvān*.
kim + (*m*→*v*) *at*(*UP*) = *ki*(*m*→*ṃ*) *vat* = *kiṃvat* + *sU* → *kiṃvān*, where *matUP* is introduced by 5.2.94 *tad asyāsty iti*. . . . Rule 7.1.70 *ugid acāṃ* . . . introudces augment *nUM* to produce *kiṃva* + *n*(*UM*) + *t* + *sU* → *kiṃvant* + *sU*. Two deletions, i.e., of *sU* (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo* . . .), and of *t* at the end of the conjunct (8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*), then apply to yield: *kiṃvant* + (*sU*→ϕ) → *kiṃvan*(*t*→ϕ) = *kiṃvan*. An application of 6.4.14 *atvasantasya cādhātoḥ* finally produces *kiṃv*(*a*→*ā*) *n* = *kiṃvān*. We similarly get (*śam* + *vatUP*) + *sU* = *śaṃvān*.

(*ii*) examples after a stem with *m* in its *upadhā* (*makāropadhāt*): *śamīvān* and *dāḍimīvān*.

(*iii*) examples after that which ends in *a* (*avarṇāntāt*): *vṛkṣavān* and *plakṣavān*; *khaṭvāvān* and *mālāvān*.

(*iv*) examples after that which has *a* in its *upadhā* (*avarṇopadhāt*): *payasvān*, *yaśasvān* and *bhāsvān*.

Note that *payas* and *yaśas* are assigned the term *bha* before *vān* (1.4.19 *tasau matvarthe*). This blocks a replacement in *rU* for the final *s* of *yaśas* and *payas* (8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ*). Refer to notes and appendix under 5.2.94 *tad asyāstity asminn iti matup* for additional derivational details.

4. Why do we state *mād upadhāyāś ca* 'after that which ends in *m* or *a*, or has *m* or *a* in its *upadhā*'? Consider *agnimān* and *vāyumān*, where *agni* and *vāyu* do not end in *m* or have *a*. They also do not contain *m* or *a* in their *upadhā*.

Why do we have an exclusion stated by *ayavādibhyaḥ* 'after those which are not listed in the group headed by *yava* 'barley'?' Consider *yavamān* 'rich

in barley' and *ūrmimān* 'abounding in waves', where *yava* ends in *a* and *ūrmi* 'wave' has *m* in its *upadhā*. But these nominals, both, are part of the *yavādi* group. The nominals of the *yavādi* group are excluded so that a replacement in *v* for the initial of *matUP* can be blocked. Recall that such a replacement may, otherwise, become available. Note also that the *yavādi* is an 'open-ended' (*ākṛti*) group. That is, any nominal which meets the condition of *mād upadhāyāḥ*, but where a replacement in *v* for the *m* of *matUP* is not seen, can be included within the *yavādi* listing (*Kāś. akṛtavatvo matub yavādiṣu draṣṭavyaḥ. yasya sati nimitte matupo vatvaṃ na dṛśyate sa yavādiṣu draṣṭavyaḥ*). That is, any nominal with no replacement in *v* for *m* can be considered part of the *yavādi* listing.

Why do we not get a replacement in *v* in *nṛmata idam = nārmatam*? Given (*nṛ + Nas + matUP*) + *aṆ*)), where affix *aṆ* is introduced with the signification of *tasyedam* (4.3.120) 'that is his', we get a replacement in *vṛddhi*. This gives us: *nārmata*, where we get an *a* sound in the *upadhā*. But this *upadhā* qualification is facilitated by *vṛddhi* which, in turn, is externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) by *aṆ*. This replacement in *v* is, of course, internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*). The *vṛddhi* is considered suspended (*asiddha*) in view of replacement in *v*. This is why there is no *v*-replacement for the *m* of *matUP* in *nārmatam = narā asya santīti nṛmān; nṛmata idam* 'this belongs to one who has many men at his command'.

8.2.10 **झयः**

jhayaḥ
/jhayaḥ 5/1/
(*padasya* #8.16 *mator vaḥ* #9)
jhayantād uttarasya matoḥ 'va' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
The *m* of *matUP* is replaced with *v* when *matUP* occurs after that which ends in a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaY* (*Śs*.8-12).

EXAMPLES:

agnicitvān grāmaḥ 'a village where they heap ritual fire'
udaśvitvān ghoṣaḥ 'a settlement of cow-herds rich in buttermilk'
vidyutvān balāhakaḥ 'cloud with lightning'
indro marutvān 'Indra, the lord of winds'
dṛṣadvān deśaḥ 'a place with pebbles in abundance'

1. Note that *matUP* of this rule must occur after a form which ends in a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaY* (non-nasal stops). Refer to derivational details of *vidyutvān* 'possessing lightning' and *udaśvitvān* 'possessing butter-milk' under 1.4.19 *tasau matvarthe* (II:519-20). Recall that *agnicit* is assigned the term *bha* (1.4.19 *tasau matvarthe*). This blocks the assignment of the term *pada*. Consequently, 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte* cannot replace the *t* of *agnicitvān* with *d* (*jaśtva*; 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*).

8.2.11 संज्ञायाम्

saṃjñāyām
/saṃjñāyām 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *mator vaḥ* #9)
saṃjñāyāṃ viṣaye matoḥ 'va' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati
The initial sound, i.e., *m*, of *matUP*, is replaced with *v* when the derivate denotes a name (*saṃjñā*).

EXAMPLES:

ahīvatī 'name of a river'
kapīvatī 'ibidem'
ṛṣīvatī 'ibidem'
munīvatī 'ibidem'

1. Note that *matUP* of these derivates is introduced by 4.2.84 *nadyāṃ matup*. A long replacement for the short of *ahi* 'snake', *kapi* 'monkey' and *muni* 'sage' is ordered by 6.3.118 *śarādīnāṃ ca*. Finally, bases ending in *matUP* receive the feminine affix *ṄīP* (4.1.6 *ugitaś ca*).

8.2.12 आसन्दीवदष्ठीवच्चक्रीवत्कक्षीवद्रुमण्वच्चर्मण्वती

āsandīvadaṣṭhīvaccakrīvatkakṣīvadrumaṇvaccarmaṇvatī
/āsandīvad-aṣṭhīvac-cakrīvat-kakṣīvad-rumaṇvac-carmaṇvatī (all specifications, except for the last, made with deleted nominative)/
(*saṃjñāyām* #11)
'āsandīvat, aṣṭhīvat, cakrīvat, kakṣīvat, rumaṇvat, carmaṇvatī' ity etāni saṃjñāyāṃ nipātyante
Forms such as *āsandīvat, aṣṭhīvat, cakrīvat, kakṣīvat, rumaṇvat* and *carmaṇvatī* are derived, via *nipātana*, when a name is signified.

EXAMPLES:

āsandīvat 'name of a place (village)'
aṣṭhīvat 'ibidem'
cakrīvat 'ibidem'
kakṣīvat 'ibidem'
rumaṇvat 'ibidem'
carmaṇvatī 'name of a river'

1. This rule is not formulated to offer a replacement in *v* for the *m* of *matUP*. Such a replacement is already made available by the preceding rule. Our present rule offers replacements to bases which occur before *matUP*, provided derivates denote a name. Thus, *āsana* is replaced with *āsandī* before *vat*, when *āsandīvat* is to denote a name. Similar replacement are ordered for other bases. Thus, *asthi→ aṣṭhī; cakra→cakrī; kakṣyā →kakṣyī; lavaṇa→ ruman.*

Now the examples: (*āsana→āsandī*) *vat* = *āsandīvat*; (*asthi→aṣṭhī*) *vat* = *aṣṭhīvat*; (*cakra→cakrī*) *vat* = *cakrīvat*; (*kakṣyā →kakṣī*) *vat* = *kakṣīvat*; (*lavaṇa→rumaṇ*) *vat* = *rumaṇvat*; (*carman →carman*) *vat* = *carmaṇvat*. The feminine affix *ṄīP* can now be introduced after *carmaṇvat* to derive *carmaṇvatī*, name of a river. Notice how all derivates, except for one *carmaṇvatī*, are specified with deleted nominative singular. Derivational details of these forms are not offered because they have been shown derived, via *nipātana*.

These examples can refer to names of places: *āsandīvān grāmaḥ* 'a village named Āsandīvat', etc.

> *āsandīvati dhānyādaṃ rukmiṇaṃ haritasrajam/*
> *aśvaṃ babandha sāraṅgaṃ devebhyo janamejayaḥ//*
> 'Janamejaya, tied the corn-eating, variegated horse with white spot on its forehead, and green garlands around its neck, for gods at Āsandīvat'

Elsewhere, when the denotation is not a name, we will get: *āsanavān*, *asthimān*, *cakravān*, *kakṣyāvān*, *lavaṇavān* and *carmavatī*, respectively.

8.2.13 उदन्वानुदधौ च

> *udanvān udadhau ca*
> /*udanvān* 1/1 *udadhau* 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
> (*saṃjñāyām* #11)
> '*udanvān*' *ity udakaśabdasya matāv udanbhāvo nipātyate udadhāv arthe saṃjñāyāṃ ca viṣaye*
> A form such as *udanvat* is derived, via *nipātana*, by replacing *udaka* 'water' with *udan*, when affix *matUP* follows and the derivate denotes an ocean, or a name.

EXAMPLES:

> *udanvān nāma ṛṣiḥ, yasyaudanvataḥ putraḥ* 'Udanvān is a sage whose son is named Audanvat'
> *udanvān = yasmin udakaṃ dhīyate* 'that in which water is held, i.e., an ocean'

1. This rule limits replacement of *udaka* with *udan* under the condition of two meanings: an ocean (*udadhi*; that in which water is held) and a name (*saṃjñā*). We thus get *udanvat* + *sU*→ *udanvān* which is the name of a sage. This same can also be used for 'ocean'. But consider *udakavān ghaṭaḥ* 'the jar (is) with water' where this replacement is not allowed. For, the idea of *dhāraṇa* 'containing, holding' is not expressed with the jar. What then is the expressed idea here? It is the idea of a general relationship with possible existence of water (*Kāś. udakasattā sambandhasāmānyam*) in the jar. The possibility of something else, i.e., grains, in the jar cannot be ruled out.

8.2.14 **राजन्वान्सौराज्ये**

rājanvān saurājye
/ rājanvān 1/1 *saurājye* 7/1 = *śobhano rājā yasmin deśe sa = surājā* (*bv.*); *tasya karma = saurājyam* (a derivate of *ṢyaÑ*), *tasmin/*
'rājanvān' iti nipātyate saurājye gamyamāne
A form such as *rājanvān* is derived, via *nipātana*, when the signification is *saurājya* 'good governance; good rule of a king'.

EXAMPLES:

rājanvān deśaḥ 'a place with a good king'
rājanvatī pṛthvī 'earth with a good king'

1. This rule derives *rājanvat + sU* → *rājanvān* when the derivate denotes *śobhano rājā yasmin* 'a place where the king is good'. Note that *n*-deletion (8.2.7 *nalopaḥ . . .*) is blocked here, via *nipātana*. Or else, augment *nUṬ* is introduced, via *nipātana*, after *n*-deletion has applied. Incidentally, affix *matUP* is introduced here in the sense of praise (*praśaṃsā*). Elsewhere, we will get *rājavat + sU* → *rājavān* 'royal'.

8.2.15 **छन्दसीरः**

chandasīraḥ
/ chandasi 7/1 *iraḥ* 5/1 = *iś ca raś ca* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt/*
(*mator vaḥ* #9)
chandasi viṣaye ivarṇāntād rephāntāc coccāritasya mator vatvaṃ bhavati
A replacement in *v* comes in place of initial sound of affix *matUP*, in the Vedic, provided *matUP* occurs after a nominal stem which ends in *i* or *r*.

EXAMPLES:

trivatī yājyānuvākyā bhavati
harivo medinaṃ tvā
adhipativatī juhoti
carur agnivān iva
ā revān etu mā viśat
sarasvatīvān
bhāratīvān
dadhīvāṃś caruḥ

1. This rule replaces the *m* of *matUP* with *v* when *matUP* occurs after a *pada* which ends in *i* or *r*. Consider *hari* + (*ma+nUṬ+t*(*UP*)) → *hari*(*m*→*v*) *an*(*t*→ϕ) = *harivan*, where *n* gets replaced with *rU* (8.3.1 *matuvaso ru . . .*). This *rU*, when used before *medinam*, is replaced with *u* (6.1.113 *haśi ca*). The vocalic sequence of *a+u* is then replaced with *o*. Thus, *hariva*(*n*→*rU*→*u*) =

hariv(*au*→*o*) = *harivo*. Also refer to notes under 8.2.2 *na mune*. Recall here that deletion of a conjunct-final consonant, i.e., *t* of *harivant*, is treated as *siddha* in view of application of 6.1.113 *haśi ca*. If it was treated as *asiddha* then 6.1.113 *haśi ca* could not apply. For, a following *t* could not have been denoted by *haŚ*. A replacement in *u* would thus have been blocked.

Now consider *revān* where, given *rayi* + (*ma*+*nUṬ*+*t*(*UP*)) = *rayi* + *mant*, we get *samprasāraṇa* (*vt. rayer mato bahulam*; ad 6.1.37 *na samprasāraṇe* . . .). Thus, *ra*(*y*→*i*) *imant* → *ra*(*i*+*i*→*i*) *mant* → *ra* + *i* + (*m*→*v*) *ant*→ *r*(*a*+*i*→*e*) *vant* = *revan*(*t*→ϕ) → *rev*(*a*→*ā*) *n* = *revān*. Refer to derivational details of *pūḥ* (III:758), under 3.2.177 *bhrājabhāsa*. . . . A similarly derived *dhūr*, with *matUP*, will yield *dhūrvān*. We similarly get *gīrvān* and *āśīrvān*, both derivates of *KvIP* with a following *matUP*. These serve as examples of *rephāntāt* 'after that which ends in *r*'. An *ir* (7.1.100 *ṛt id dhātoḥ*) as replacement for *ṛ*, where *i* of *ir* is further replaced with *ī* (8.2.76 *rvor upadhāyāḥ*), will yield *gīr*. Thus, *gīr* + *matUP* → *gīrvat* =*gīrvān*. We similarly get *āś*(*ā*→*i*) *s* + *KvIP* = *āś*(*i*→*ī*) *s* + *matUP*→ *āśī*(*s*→*r*) + *matUP* = *āśīrvat* = *āśīrvān*.

2. It is stated that, in the Vedic, all operations can be considered optional (*chandasi sarve vidhayo vikalpyante*). Thus we do not get a *v*-replacement in *saptarṣimantam*, *ṛṣimān*, *ṛtīmān* and *sūryaṃ te dyāvāpṛthivīmantam*.

8.2.16 अनो नुट्

ano nuṭ
/*anaḥ* 5/1 *nuṭ* 1/1/
(*matoḥ* #9 *chandasi* #15)
anantād uttarasya mator nuḍ āgamo bhavati chandasi viṣaye
A *matUP* which, in the Vedic, occurs after a nominal stem ending in *an* is augmented with *nUṬ*.

EXAMPLES:

akṣaṇvantaḥ kárṇavantaḥ sakháyaḥ
asthanvantaṃ yad nastahā bibhártti
akṣaṇvatā lāṅgalena
śīrṣaṇvatī
mūrdhanvatī

1. Consider *akṣi* + *Ṭā*, where *anAṄ* is introduced (7.1.76 *chandasy api dṛśyate*) to yield (*akṣ*(*i*→ *an*(*AṄ*) + *Ṭā*)) + *matUP*))) = *akṣan* + (*Ṭā*→ϕ) + *matUP* → *akṣa*(*n*→ϕ) + *mat*(*UP*→ϕ) = *akṣa* + (*nUṬ* + *mat*) = *akṣan*(*m*→*v*) *at* → *akṣanvat* + *Ṭā* → *akṣa*(*n*→*ṇ*) *vat* + (*Ṭ*→ϕ) *ā* → *akṣaṇvatā* 'by one who possesses eyes'. Recall that *anAṄ* replaces the final *i* of *akṣi*, and *n* of resultant *akṣan* goes through deletion by 8.2.7 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya*. Note that *nUṬ* becomes *asiddha* 'suspended' in replacing the *m* of *matUP* with *v*. If *nUṬ* is not treated as *asiddha*, *v* will replace the *n* of *nmatUP*. This will happen because *nUṬ* will

then be treated as part of *matUP. Kāśikā*, therefore, remarks: *nuṭo' siddhatvāt tasya ca vatvaṃ na bhavati, tataḥ parasya ca bhavati nUṬ*, as part of *matUP*, is not replaced with *v* on account of becoming *asiddha* 'suspended; the *m* which follows is then replaced with *v*'. Refer to derivational details of *asthanvantam* under 7.1.76 *chandasy api*. . . . Recall here that *śīrṣan* of *śīrṣaṇvatī* is derived, via *nipātana*, under rule 6.1.59 *śīrṣaṃś chandasi*. Affix *ṄīP* (4.1.4 *ugitaś ca*) is then introduced to derive *śīrṣaṇvatī*.

8.2.17 नाद्घस्य

nād ghasya
/nāt 5/1 *ghasya* 6/1/
(*chandasi* #15 *nuṭ* #16)
nakārāntād uttarasya ghasaṃjñakasya nuḍ āgamo bhavati chandasi viṣaye
That which is termed a *gha*, and occurs after that which ends in *n*, is augmented with *nUṬ* in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

supathintaraḥ 'with a better road among two'
dasyuhantamam 'most killer of bandits among two'

1. Recall that affixes *taraP* and *tamaP* are termed *gha* (1.1.22 *taraptamapau ghaḥ*). Consider *supathin* + *taraP* = *supathi*(*n*→ϕ) + *tara* = *supathi* + *tara*, where 8.2.7 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya* deletes *n*. Augment *nUṬ* is then introduced to produce *supathi* + *nUṬ* + *tara* = *supathintara* + *sU* = *supathintaraḥ*. We similarly derive *dasyuhantama* + *sU* → *dasyuhantamaḥ*, where *dasyuhan* is derived with *KvIP*, parallel to *dasyuṃ hatavān* 'killed demons, bandits'.

Note that the rule which deletes *n* is also contained within the *tripādī*. The question is: *n*-deletion before *nUṬ*; or *nUṬ* before *n*-deletion. For, the condition of, 'after that which occurs after *n* cannot be made after *n*-deletion'. It is for this reason that *n*-deletion applies first but is treated as *asiddha* for introduction of *nUṬ*.

2. The following are two *vārttika* proposals:

(*i*) Augment *tUṬ* is to be introduced to *taraP* and *tamaP* when they occur after *bhūridāvan* 'a generous giver' (*vanIP*; 3.2.74 *āto maninkvani*. . .). Thus, we get *bhūri dadāti* = *bhūridāvattaraḥ* 'comparatively better among two plentiful givers'.

(*ii*) The final of *rathin* 'charioteer' is replaced with a long *ī* before affixes termed *gha*. Thus, *rathi*(*n*→ϕ) + *tara* = *rath*(*i*→*ī*) + *tara* = *rathītara* + *sU* = *rathītaraḥ* 'comparatively better charioteer'. It is also suggested that *n* itself can be replaced with *ī* at the strength of 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*, thereby blocking *n*-deletion. The form *rathī* can still be derived via *savarṇadīrgha*. One can also introduce affix *ī* after *ratha* in the sense of *matUP*, thereby deriving *rathī* (*Kāś*: *rathaśabdād eva vā matvarthīyo' yam īkāraḥ*).

8.2.18 कृपो रो लः

kṛpo ro laḥ
/kṛpaḥ 6/1 *raḥ* 6/1 *laḥ* 1/1/
kṛper dhāto rephasya lakārādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *l* comes in place of *r* of verbal root *kṛpA* 'to be capable'.

EXAMPLES:

kalptā 'nominative singular; one who will fashion'
kalptārau 'nominative dual . . .'
kalptāraḥ 'nominative plural . . .'
klptaḥ 'capable . . .'
klptavān 'he became capable . . .'

1. This rule introduces *l* as a replacement for *r* of verbal root *kṛpA*. It is accepted that *ṛ* also contains *r*. This *r*, in relation to *ṛ*, is called *rephaśruti* 'the *r* which is heard in *ṛ*'. A replacement in *l*, for purposes of this rule, comes in place of *r* in general. That is, the *r* which one gets in *ar* as a *guṇa* replacement of *ṛ* and the *r* which is contained within *ṛ* (*Kāś: tena yaḥ kevalo rephaḥ yaś ca ṛkāraḥ tayor dvayor api grahaṇam*). Thus, we get *kalptā, kalptārau, kalptāraḥ*, etc., where *ṛ* of *kṛpA* goes through a replacement in *guṇa*, i.e., *ar*, before the *niṣṭhā* suffix *Kta* (1.1.26 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*). Instances, such as *klptaḥ* and *klptavān* where we do not get a replacement in *guṇa*, involve a replacement in *l* for the *r* (*rephaśruti*) of *ṛ*. The *ṛ* of *kṛpA* thus gets replaced with *l*, via modification of the *r* part of *ṛ* (*Kāśikā: ṛkārasyāpi ekadeśavikāradvāreṇa ḷkāraḥ*). That is *klpA* yields the form *klpA*. Refer to derivational details of these examples under 1.3.93 *luṭi ca klpaḥ* (II:498-99).

2. Note that *kṛpaḥ* of this rule does not include any reference to *krapA* 'to move' of *kṛpā* 'compassion'. Verbal root *krapA* is listed in the *bhidādi* group (3.3.104 *ṣidbhidādibhyo' aṅ*), by way of its derived nominal *kṛpā*. Recall that *kṛpā* is derived from (*krapA* + *aṄ*), where *ra* of *krapA* is replaced with *ṛ*, via *samprasāraṇa* (cf. *Gaṇasūtra: krapeḥ samprasāraṇaṃ ca*, ad 3.3.104). This replacement in *ṛ*, which derives *kṛpā*, should not create any confusion about reference to *kṛpA* of this rule. Why? Because the *ṛ* of *krapA* results out of rule-application (*lākṣaṇikatvāt; Kāś:. . . . kṛtasamprasāraṇasya lākṣaṇikatvāt iha kṛpa iti grahaṇaṃ nāsti*).

A proposal, in the *Mahābhāṣya*, accepts *kṛpaṇa* 'miserly', *kṛpīṭa* 'firewood' and *karpūra* 'camphor', etc., as derivates of *krapA*. If one insists on accepting these forms as derivates of *kṛpA*, one must also accept that *kṛpA* is saved from a replacement in *l* on account of 3.3.1 *uṇādayo bahulam*.

A *vārttika* (*vt: bālamūlalaghvasurālamaṅgulīnām vā ro lam āpadyate*) makes the *l*-replacement of *r* optional in words such as *bālaḥ* 'child', *mūlam* 'root', *laghuḥ* 'small, short', *asuraḥ* 'demon', *alam* 'enough, able' and *aṅguliḥ* 'finger'. We thus also get *mūram, bāraḥ, raghuḥ, asulaḥ, aram* and *aṅguriḥ*. This op-

tional provision can be read also as: whatever *r* or *l* is there, it gets replaced with *r* or *l*. Thus, *bālaḥ* → *bāraḥ*; *bāraḥ* →*bālaḥ*, etc.

Yet another *vārttika* (*vt: kapilādīnāṃ saṃjñāchandasor vā ro lam āpadyate*) proposal makes *l*-replacement optional in the Vedic, i.e., *lomāni* 'hair, pores', *pāṃsulam* 'dust, pollen', etc., or in names such as *kapilakaḥ*, *tilpilīkam*, etc.

Some, however, claim that *r* and *l* are the same. That is, these two share a general scope (*sāmānya-viṣayatvam*) of usage.

8.2.19 उपसर्गस्यायतौ

upasargasyāyatau
/upasargasya 6/1 *ayatau* 1/2 = 7/1/
(*ro laḥ* #17)
ayatau parata upasargasya yo rephas tasya lakāra ādeśo bhavati
The *r* of an *upasarga* 'preverb', when used with verbal root *ayA* 'to go', is replaced with *l*.

EXAMPLES:

plāyate 'goes away'
palāyate 'ibidem'
palyayate 'ibidem'

1. Note that *upasargasya ayatau*, when read with *raḥ* of the *anuvṛtti*, is interpreted in two ways: (*i*) *ayataḥ* is a qualifier to *r*: *ayati parasya rephasya*; *sa ced upasargasya* 'in place of *r* followed by *ayA*, provided *r* is part of an *upasarga*; and (*ii*) *ayataḥ* is a qualifier to *upasargasya*: *ayatiparasya upasargasya yo rephas tasya* . . . 'the *r* of an *upasarga* which (the *upasarga*) *ayA* follows'. We will get the following paraphrase with the first view: *ayatau parato yo repha upasarga-sambandhī tasya*: '*l* comes in place of that *r* which is part of an *upasarga* followed by *ayA*'. The second view will yield the following paraphrase: *ayatau parato ya upasargas tasya yo rephas tasya* . . . '*l* comes in place of the *r* of that *upasarga* which *ayA* follows'. Verbal root *ayA* is marked with *anudātta* as an *it*. Consequently, it is used with verbal endings termed *ātmanepadam* 'middle' (1.3.12 *anudāttaṅita ātmanepadam*). Then an objection: why do we get *parasmaipadam* 'active' in *udayati* of *udayati vitatordhvaraśmirajjau* 'at the time when sun, who weaves over us a canopy of ray-threads, arises'? What purpose could be served by this question? Haradatta retorts, 'what purpose could be served by this cleansing of a wild-elephant' (*PM: kim anena vanyagajaśaucena*). We are hear talking about two views of interpreting this rule, and not whether *udayati* should have an *ātmanepada*.

If *ayati* is treated as a qualifier to *r*, *r* becomes the primary focus of operation (*PM: kāryitvena pradhānatvāt*). This means that *ayA* must follow *r* immediately. Given *pra* + *ay*(*A*) + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*) → *pra* + *ay* + (*Ś*)*a*(*P*) + *ti*(*P*) = *pra* + *ay* + *a* + *t*(*i*→) = *pra* + *ay* + *a* + *te*, we get *p*(*r*→*l*)*a* + *āyate* → *plāyate*. How could we get

a replacement in *l* when, in doing that, we get *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating a replacement as what it replaced' (1.1.57 *acaḥ parasmin pūrvavidhau*). This *sthānivadbhāva* will cause *r* to be intervened by *a* before *ayA*. But this intervention, since it is caused by a single whole specified as *upasarga*, should not block the replacement in *l*. Why? That (one sound segment) by means of which non-interruption is specified, an operation (such as a replacement in *l*) would still be performed when an interruption by that occurs' (*Kāś*: *yena nāvyavadhānaṃ tena vyavahite' pi vacanaprāmāṇyāt*). A replacement in *l* will thus be accomplished when there is an interruption by one sound segment. This is done at the strength of the statement itself (*vacana-prāmāṇyāt*). Now consider *pari-ayA* + (*ŚaP*) + (*LAṬ→te*)) = *par*(*i→y*) + *ayate* → *pa*(*r→l*)*yayate* →*palyayate*, where we get a replacement in *l*, also when interruption of one sound segment is not realized, via *sthānivadbhāva*. It is realized, instead, via a sound segment, i.e., *y*, which is actually heard in usage (*śrūyamāṇenaiva varṇena laukikaṃ vyavadhānam*). The first interpretation thus accomplishes everything desired.

Now consider *prati-ayA* + *ŚaP* + (*LAṬ→te*) → *prat*(*i→y*) + *ay* + *a* + *te* = *pratyayate* where, according to some, *r* of *prati* can be replaced with *l* to yield *p*(*r→l*) *atyayate* = *platyayate*. This can be accomplished by accepting the second interpretation of *upasargasyāyayatau*. Recall that *ayati*, in the second view, is treated as a qualifier to the preverb (*upasarga*). Those who accept the first view will only accept *pratyayate*. Still others believe that *ayA* with *prati* is not found in usage (*Kāś*: *prathamapakṣadarśanābhiniviṣṭās tu pratyayata ity eva bhavatīti manyante. apare tu pratiśabdasyopasṛṣṭasyāyateḥ prayogam eva necchanti*).

Recall that *rU* as a replacement (8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ*) for *s*, of *nis* and *dus* in *ni*(*s→rU*) + *ayaṇam* = *nirayaṇam* and *du*(*s→rU*) + *ayayṇam* = *durayaṇam*, will become *asiddha* 'suspended'. Consequently, *l* as a replacement for *r* could never be accomplished.

8.2.20 ग्रो यङि

gro yaṅi
/*graḥ* 6/1 *yaṅi* 7/1/
(*ro laḥ* #17)
'*gṝ ity etasya dhāto rephasya lakāra ādeśo bhavati yaṅi parataḥ*
A replacement in *l* comes in place of *r* of verbal root *gṝ* 'to swallow' when affix *yaṄ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

nijegilyate 'third singular middle derivate of *yaṄ* in *LAṬ*; 'swallows over and over again; swallows in a bad manner' '
nijegilyete 'third dual . . .'
nijegilyante 'third plural . . .'

1. This rule allows *l* as a replacement of *r* which, in turn, develops from *gṝ*, especially when affix *yaṄ* (3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco . . .*) 'intensive' follows. Consider *nijegilyate, nijegilyete* and *nijegiyante.* Recall that 3.1.24 *lupasadacara . . .* introduces *yaṄ* under the denotation of *bhāvagarhā* 'censure of root-sense'. Refer to the appendix of 3.1.24 *lupasadacara . . .* (II:713-14) for derivational details.

Some state that *gṝ* must refer to both *girati* (the *tudādi* root *gṝ*) and *gṛṇāti* (the *kryādi* root *gṝ*) in general. Others do not accept any reference to *kryādi* roots. They argue that no usage of this *kryādi* root with *yaṄ* is found.

2. Why do we state the condition of *yaṅi* 'when *yaṄ* follows'? Consider *nigīryate* '. . . is swallowed' where no replacement in *l* is allowed. For, *ya* is not affix *yaṄ.* It is the *sārvadhātuka* affix *yaK* (3.1.67 *sārvadhātuke yak*), instead.

8.2.21 अचि विभाषा

aci vibhāṣā
/aci 7/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1/
(*ro laḥ* #18 *graḥ* #20)
ajādau pratyayae parato gro rephasya vibhāṣā lakārādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *l* comes, optionally, in place of *ṝ* of verbal root *gṝ*, when a vowel-initial affix follows.

EXAMPLES:

nigirati '. . . swallows'
nigilati 'ibidem'
nigaraṇam 'swallowing'
nigalanam 'ibidem'
nigārakaḥ 'he who swallows'
nigālakaḥ 'ibidem'

1. Note that *aci*, the locative singular form of *ac* 'vowel' (*aci*), is interpreted as: 'when an affix beginning with a vowel follows'. Commentators explain that *aci* is used to indicate an affix which may follow verbal root *gṝ.* We get this indication from express use of verbal root *gṝ* in the ablative (*pañcamī*). That is, (*PM*): *dhātoḥ svarūpagrahaṇe tatpratyaye kāryavijñānāt pratyayaḥ sannidhāpitaḥ* 'an express mention of the form of a *dhātu* 'verbal root' indicates an operation relative to an affix introduced after it'. The word *aci* thus specifies an affix which, with the help of *tadādividhi* 'interpreting a specification made with *x* as that which begins with *x*', refers to an affix beginning with a vowel (*PM*: *tasyācā viśeṣaṇāt tadādividhir vijñāyate*).

Note that the optional provision of this rule is considered *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā* 'fixed option'. That is, we get *galaḥ* 'neck', obligatorily (*nitya*), when the derivate denotes a limb of living beings (*prāṇyaṅga*). This obligatory replacement in *l* is not found when the derivate denotes *garaḥ* 'poison' (*viṣa*).

2. Consider *ni-gṝ + a + ti = nigarati, niga(r→l) ati = nigalati*; and *nigaraṇam,*

nigalanam, where the second set of examples are derivates of *LyuṬ* (3.3.115 *lyuṭ ca*). Note that, given *ni-gṝ* + *a* + *ti*, *ṝ* of the root does not go through a replacement in *guṇa*. Rule 7.1.100 *ṛta id dhātoḥ* replaces it with *i* (*ir*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*), instead. We also get *nigārakaḥ* and *nigālakaḥ*, derivates of affix *ṆvuL* (3.1.133 *ṇvultṛcau*), where the root goes through a replacement in *vṛddhi* (7.2.115 *aco' ñṇiti*).

Now consider (*ni-g*(*ṝ*→*ār*) + (*ṆiC*→ϕ)) + *yaK* + (*LAṬ*→*te*))) = *nigāryate* and *nigālyate*, where *r* should not be replaced with *l*. For, the affix which follows does not begin with a vowel. This replacement is still made possible because deletion of *ṆiC* is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended'. But this *asiddhatva* is negated by the interpretive convention, or *vārttika* proposal: *pūrvatrāsiddhe na sthānivat* 'a replacement is not considered as what it replaced with reference to the scope of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*'. This negation itself is not without exceptions (*Kāś*: *etad api sāpavādam eva*). It does not hold good when operations relative to 'initial conjunct deletion' (*saṃyogādilopa*), 'replacement in *ḷ*' (*latva*), and 'replacement in *ṇ*' (*atva*; *Kāś*: '*tasya doṣaḥ saṃyogādilopa-latva-ṇatveṣu*') are to be performed. One can also apply optional *l*-replacement first, since it will be internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) by *ṆiC*. The affix can then be subsequently deleted (*Kāś*: *anatraṅgād vā kṛte vikalpe ṇilopo bhaviṣyati*). Why do we not get *l*-replacement in the nominative dual and plural forms *girau* and *giraḥ*? A specification of *l*-replacement made with express mention of the form of a root expects the affix to be introduced after the root (*Kāś*: *dhātoḥ svarūpagrahaṇe tatpratyaye kāryavijñānam*). What we have here are affixes introduced after a nominal stem.

8.2.22 परेश्च घाङ्कयोः

pareś ca ghāṅkayoḥ
/*pareḥ* 6/1 *ca* ϕ *gha-aṅkayoh* 7/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*/
(*ro laḥ* #18 *vibhāṣā* #21)
'*pari*' *ity etasya yo rephas tasya ghaśabde ṅkaśabde ca parato vibhāṣa lakāra ādeśo bhavati*
The *r* of *pari* is, optionally, replaced with *l* when *gha* (of *han* 'to kill') and *aṅka* 'curve' follow.

EXAMPLES:

parighah 'iron bar'
palighaḥ 'ibidem'
paryaṅkaḥ 'bed, couch'
palyaṅkaḥ 'ibidem'

1. Note that *aṅka* refers to word-form *aṅka*. Consequently, *gha*, based on its associated (*sāhacarya*) specification with the form of the word *aṅka* (*svarūpa-grahaṇa*), should also be interpreted as referring to its word-form

gha. This *gha* is then interpreted as a replacement of verbal root *han* (3.3.84 *parau ghaḥ*). It does not refer to items assigned the term *gha* (1.1.22 *taraptamapau ghaḥ*).

Consider *parighaḥ*, where affix *aP* (3.3.84 *parau ghaḥ*) is introduced after verbal root *han* under the cooccurrence condition of *pari* as an *upapada* 'conjoined *pada*'. Verbal root *han* is also concurrently replaced with *gha*, in toto (1.1.55 *anekālśit sarvasya*). The *a* of *gha* then goes through *ṭi*-deletion (6.4.143 *ṭeḥ*). We thus get *parigha* + *sU* = *parighaḥ*.

Note that *aṅka* is derived with affix *aC* (3.1.134 *nandigrahipacādy* . . .) introduced after verbal root *akI*. This root, since it is marked with *I* as an *it*, receives augment *nUM*. Thus, *akI* + *aC* → *a*+*nUM*+*k*(*I*→ϕ) + *aC* → *aṅka*. A compound with *pari* (2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ*) is then formed to yield *par*(*i*→*y*) + *aṅka* = *paryaṅka*. An optional replacement of *r* with *l* will give us: *palyaṅka*.

2. A *vārttika* (*vt*: *yoge ceti ca vaktavyam*) proposal is made to allow this replacement also where *pari* is combined with *yoga*. Thus, *pariyogaḥ* and *paliyogaḥ*.

8.2.23 संयोगान्तस्य लोपः

saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ
/*saṃyogāntasya* 6/1 = *saṃyogo' nte yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *lopaḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16)
saṃyogāntasya padasya lopo bhavati
A deletion by *LOPA* comes in place of the final sound segment of a *pada* which ends in a conjunct (*saṃyoga*).

EXAMPLES:

gomān 'rich in cows; that where the cows are'
yavamān 'rich in barley; that where the barley is'
kṛtavān '. . . made'
hṛtavān '. . . carried'

1. Note that *padasya* is carried. A specification with *saṃyogasya*, with no *anta* as part of this rule, could still give us the meaning of *saṃyogāntasya padasya*. This will be possible by qualifying *padasya* with *saṃyogasya*, via *tadantavidhi* 'interpreting *x* (*pada*), as also that which ends in *x* (*saṃyoga*)'. Why is the word *anta* used at the end of *saṃyoga*? For clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*).

2. Consider *gomant* + *sU* → *gomān* and *yavamant* + *sU* → *yavamān*, where *gomant* derives from *go* + *mat*(*UP*) → *go* + *ma* + *n*(*UM*) + *t* = *gomant*. The final of the conjunct, i.e., *t*, goes through deletion to yield: *goman* + *s*. The penultimate *vṛddhi* of *a* in *gomat* is accomplished by rule 6.4.14 *atvasantasya cādhātoḥ*. The *s* of *sU* is, of course, subject to deletion of 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo*. . . . Note here that *n* does not go through deletion. Refer to derivational details of many *matUP* examples already discussed. Augment *nUM* is, of course, intro-

duced by 7.1.70 *ugid acāṃ. . . .* The *a* of *goman*(*t*→ϕ) → *gom*(*a*→*ā*) *n* will be replaced with its long counterpart (6.4.14 *atvasantasya cādhātoḥ*). Refer to the appendix (II:337-39) for derivational details of examples with affix *KtavatU.*

Now consider *śreyas* + *sU* → *śreyān,* where *śreyas* derives with affix *īyasUN,* from *praśasya* + *īyasUN* → (*praśasya*→*śra*) + *īyas*(*UN*→ϕ) = *śr*(*a*+*i*→*e*)*yas* = *śreyas,* with a replacement in *śra* for *praśasya* (5.3.60 *praśasyasya śraḥ*) and application of 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ.* Augmnent *nUM* is then introduced to the *aṅga,* i.e., *śreyas* + *sU,* before an affix termed *sarvanāmasthāna* (7.1.70 *ugid acām. . . .*). Rule 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .* then deletes *sU* to yield *śreyans* + (*sU*→ϕ) = *śreyans.* Rule 6.4.10 *sāntamahataḥ saṃyogasya* then applies to replace the penultimate short *a* with its long counterpart before the conjunct. We thus get: *śrey*(*a*→*ā*) *ns* = *śreyāns.* One may here think of applying rule 8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ* to replace the final *s* with *rU.* But this application of *rU,* even though subsequent, is blocked because of *asiddhatva* 'suspension' (*Kāś. iha 'śreyān, bhūyān' iti rutvaṃ param apy asiddhatvāt saṃyogāntasya lopaṃ na bādhate*). Our present rule then applies to delete the final *s* of *śreyāns.* We thus get *śreyān*(*s*→ϕ) = *śreyān.*

Now consider yet another instance of a replacement in *rU.* Given *payas* + *sU,* we get *paya*(*s*→*rU*) = *payar* after *sU*-deletion (6.1.68). Rule 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte* will here require the final *s* of *payas* to be replaced with a sound denoted by *jaŚ.* This replacement in *jaŚ* is blocked by *rU.* It can be argued here as to why a subsequent *rU* cannot block *jaŚ* in a manner similar to its not blocking *saṃyogānta-lopa* 'deletion of a conjunct final consonant on the basis of *asiddhatva*'. That is, one must apply a replacement in *jaŚ* in *payas* and *yaśas,* against *rU.* It is explained that this provision of replacement in *rU* (*rutva*) is made irrespective of whether conjunct deletion obtains (as it does in *śreyān,* etc.) or does not (as it does not obtain in *payas*). It is noted that *rutva* is initiated in view of *jaśtva* obtaining everywhere (*sarvatra*). That is, if this *rU* (*rutva*), even though subsequent in order, does not block conjunct deletion on grounds of suspension (*asiddhatva*), it, on similar basis, should also not block a replacement in *jaŚ* (*jaŚ*). Thus, we must get *jaŚ,* as against *rU,* as a replacement in *payaḥ* 'milk' and *yaśaḥ* 'fame'. But this will run us into problems. It is explained that the rule which replaces *s* with *rU* is formulated irrespective of whether, or not, deletion of the final consonant of a conjunct obtains. Thus, it obtains in *śreyān* but does not in *payaḥ* and *yaśaḥ.* It is appropriate then that *rU* does not block conjunct deletion. The rule which offers a replacement in *jaŚ* is formulated based upon its application everywhere (*sarvatra*), including the scope of *rU.* Consequently, *rU,* in order for carving out its domain of application, should block a replacement in *jaŚ* (*Kāś. jaśtve tu nāprāpte tad ārabhyata iti tasya bādhakaṃ bhavati* 'that which (*rU*) is proposed under the obligatory replacement condition of that (a sound denoted by *jaŚ*), that (*rU*) blocks that (*jaśtva*').

Why is the final of a conjunct, i.e., *y*, not deleted in *dadhy atra* 'yoghurt (is) here' and *maddhv atra* 'honey (is) here'? This deletion of the final of a conjunct is blocked because of *asiddhatva* 'suspension' provision of externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) replacement in *yaṆ*. Deletion of the final of a conjunct, because of a single *pada* as its locus, is treated as internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*).

8.2.24 रात्सस्य

rāt sasya
/rāt 5/1 *sasya* 6/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ* #23)
saṃyogāntapadasya yo rephas tasmād uttarasyāntasya sakārasya lopo bhavati
A final *s* which, in a *pada* ending in a conjunct, occurs after *r* goes though deletion by *LOPA*.

EXAMPLES:

mātuḥ 'genitive singular of *mātṛ* (mother)'
pituḥ 'genitive singular of *pitṛ* (father)'
gobhir akṣāḥ '. . . wandered with cows'
pratyañcam atsāḥ '. . . moved behind'

1. This rule deletes a final *s* which, in a *pada* ending in a conjunct, occurs after *r*. Note here that *saṃyogāntaṃ padam* is a qualifier to *r* (*repha*). That is why *r* is treated as part of the *pada* which ends in a conjunct. The *r* itself is construed as a qualifier to *s*. That is why *s*, construed as occurring after *r*, in view of 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*, goes through deletion as final of the conjunct-final *pada*. Recall that this deletion could be accomplished by the preceding rule. This new formulation, against one already made available, is here made for restrictive purposes (*Kāś*: *siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*). This deletion applies only to that *s* which occurs after *r*, and not to any other (*Kāś*: *rāt sasyaiva lopo bhavati, nānyasyeti*). *Nyāsa* reminds that this restrictive provision should not be understood inversely as *rād eva sasya* '*s*-deletion should occur only after *r*'. For, rule 5.4.151 *uraḥprabhṛtibhyaḥ* . . . enumerates *pumān*, after accomplishing *s*-deletion in *pumāns*, in the list headed by *uras* 'chest'. If *s*-deletion could only be accomplished after *r* we could not get *s*-deletion in *pumāns* (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *rād eva sasya ity eṣa tu viparītaniyamo' tra nāśaṅkanīyaḥ; uraḥprabhṛtiṣu pumān iti kṛtasaṃyogāntasya lopasya puṃśabdasya pāṭhāt*).

Note that this deletion cannot apply to the *KvIP*-derivate *urk* (of *ūrj*), where *k*, and not *s*, occurs after *r*. It can similarly not apply to *t* which occurs in the *LUṄ*-derivate of verbal root *mṛj* 'to wipe', namely *amārṭ*.

Refer to *hotuḥ* (6.1.110 *ṛt ut*) for deriving *mātuḥ* and *pituḥ* from *mātṛ* + *Ṅas* and *pitṛ* + *Ṅas*. Recall that a sequence of *ṛ* and *a* of *mātṛ* + *Ṅas* and *pitṛ* + *Ṅas* is replaced with *uT*, followed by *r* (*rapara*; 6.1.110 *ṛt ut*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*).

The *s* of *māt(ṛ+a) →ur) s = māturs* is then deleted by this rule. The next two examples, i.e., *akṣāḥ* and *atsāḥ* of *gobhir akṣāḥ* and *pratyañcam atsāḥ*, are derivates of *LAṄ*. Given *kṣar* + (*LAṄ→tiP*) → *aṬ* + *kṣar* + *sIC* + *tiP*, *a* of *kṣar* goes through a replacement in *vṛddhi* (7.2.2 *ato lrāntasya*). Additonally, *tiP* goes through deletion of 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo. . . .* Given *a*(*Ṭ*) + *kṣ*(*a→ā*)*r* + *s*(*IP→ϕ*) + (*tiP→ϕ*) = *akṣārs*, this rule deletes *s*, and *r* is subsequently replaced with *ḥ* (8.3.15 *kharavasānayor. . .*). We thus get *akṣā*(*r→ḥ*) = *akṣāḥ*. Deriving *atsāḥ* from *tsar* + *LUṄ* should not be difficult. Note that *īṬ* is blocked in these examples in accord with 7.3.97 *bahulaṃ chandasi*. These forms can be derived only when there is a long replacement (*Kāś*: *dīrghe sati rūpam etat*). Incidentally, *Kāśikā*'s statement with *dīrghe sati* does not make much sense. It should be *vṛddhau satyām* 'when *vṛddhi* is accomplished'.

8.2.25 धि च

dhi ca
/dhi 7/1 *ca ϕ/*
(*lopaḥ* #23 *sasya* #24)
dhakārādau pratyaye parataḥ sakārasya lopo bhavati
A *s* is deleted by *LOPA* when an affix beginning with *dh* follows *s*.

EXAMPLES:

alavidhvam 'second person plural middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *lū* 'to cut'; 'you all cut' '
alaviḍhvam 'ibidem'
apavidhvam 'second person singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *pūÑ* 'to cleanse'; 'you all purified' '
apaviḍhvam 'ibidem'

1. This rule allows *s*-deletion when an affix beginning with *dh* follows. Consider *a*(*Ṭ*) + *lū* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *s*(*IC*) + *dhvam* = *alavidhvam* and *a*(*Ṭ*) + *pū* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *s*(*IC*) + *dhvam* = *apavidhvam*, both second person plural derivates of *LUṄ* in the middle (*ātmanepada*), where the root-final vowel *ū* is replaced with *av*, via its *guṇa* counterpart *o*. The *s* of *s*(*IC*) can now be deleted before *dh* of *dhvam*. This gives us *al*(*ū→o→av*) + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *dhvam* = *alavidhvam*. We similarly get *apavidhvam*. We will get (*aṬ* + (*lū→o→av*)) + (*CLI→sIC→ϕ*))) + (*dh→ḍh*)))) *vam* = *alaviḍhvam* and *apavi*(*dh→ḍh*) *vam* = *apaviḍhvam* if *dh* is optionally replaced with *ḍh* (8.3.79 *vibhāṣeṭaḥ*). If this deletion of *s* was not accomplished, we may not hear *dh*, even when the option of replacing it with *ḍh* is not accepted. For, *s* will then be replaced with *ṣ* (8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*). This *ṣ* will then go through a replacement in *ḍ* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). This, in turn, will replace *dh* with *ḍh* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). The *s* is deleted here so that *dh* is heard, even when the option of retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) replacement is accepted.

Kāśikā offers an *iṣṭi* 'desideratum' whereby deletion of *s* of *sIC*, and not any other, becomes desired (*Kāś: itaḥ prabhṛti sicaḥ sakārasya lopa iṣyate*). Consider *cakāddhi* of *cakāddhi palitaṃ śiraḥ* 'the bald head glowed'. Thus, *s* cannot be deleted in *cakās(Ṛ) + si(P) = cakās + (ŚaP→ϕ) + si → cakās + (si→hi) → cakās + (hi→dhi) → cakā(s→d) + dhi = cakāddhi* 'second person singular *LOṬ*-derivate of *cakāsṛ* 'to glow'. Recall that *ŚaP* after *cakās(Ṛ)* is deleted because of its listing as *adādi* (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ*). The *si* is replaced with *dhi* (6.4.101 *hujhalyo her dhiḥ*), via *hi* (3.4.87 *ser hy apic ca*). The *s* of *cakās* also goes through a replacement in *d* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). This deletion of *s* will also not be available in *payaḥ* of *payo dhāvati*, etc. Note that deletion of *s* in *sagdhiḥ* and *babdhām* is *chāndas* 'Vedic' (2.4.39 *bahulaṃ chandasi*). Refer to derivational details of *sagdhiḥ* and *babdhām* under the appendix of 1.1.58 *na padāntadvirvacana* . . . (II:410-12).

The author of the *Mahābhāṣya* notes that *cakāddhi* is a regular form. That is, *s*-deletion should be offered as a general provision. This requires some special efforts whereby it can be made available also to *payo dhāvati*, etc. It is explained that a replacement in *rU*, since its locus is a single *pada*, is internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*). Deletion of *s*, due to its dependency on two *padas*, is externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*). Consequently, because of the *asiddhatva* of *s*-deletion, replacement in *u* alone will apply. This *rU*, in the absence of *sthānivadbhāva*, and also because of *alvidhi* 'operation relative to a sound segment' (1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo' nalvidhau*), cannot be deleted. Consider the following *ślokavārttika* which summarizes this all:

> *dhi sakāre sico lopaś cakāddhīti prayojanam/*
> *āśādhvaṃ tu kathaṃ jaśtvaṃ sakārasya bhaviṣyati//*
> *sarvam evaṃ prasiddhaṃ syāc chrutiś cāpi na vidyate/*
> *luṅaś cāpi na mūrdhanye grahaṇaṃ seṭi duṣyati//*
> *ghasibhasor na sidhyeta tasmāt sijgrahaṇaṃ na tat/*
> *chāndaso varṇalopo vā yatheṣkarttāram adhvare//*
> 'this rule is intended for deletion of *s* of *sIC* before *dhi* so that *s* of *cakāddhi* could be saved; how would you then derive *āśādhvam*? By (not deleting, but) replacing *s* with *d* (*jaśtva*); if this is so then let this replacement in *jaŚ* be made generally applicable; this, however, will shorten 8.3.78 *iṇaḥ sīdhvam* . . . with no mention of *LUṄ*; *jaŚ* cannot be made general since it will create difficulty in roots with *iṬ* (*seṬ*) in *LUṄ*; derivates with *ghasI* and *bhas* (*sagdhiḥ/babdhām*) cannot be derived if *s*-deletion is limited to *sIC*; *s*-deletion in *sagdhiḥ* and *babdhām* is *chāndas*; for, a sound segment can be dropped, as *n* of *niṣkartāram* in *iṣkartāram*'

2. According to the author of the *vārttikas*, rule 8.2.25 *dhi ca* accomplishes deletion of *s* of *sIC* (cf.: *dhisakāre sico lopaḥ* 'deletion of *s*, via *LOPA*, when *dhi* follows'). This deletion applies only to the *s* of *sIC*, and not to any other *s*. The purpose of this statement is to facilitate derivation of *cakāddhi*. Thus,

cakās 'to glow', when introduced with *LOṬ→siP*, produces the string: *cakās + (siP→hi) → cakās + ŚaP + hi→ cakās + (ŚaP→LUK) + hi* (6.4.101 *hujhalyor her dhiḥ*). We thus get *cakās + (hi→dhi) = cakā(s→ϕ) + dhi = *cakādhi*, if there is *s*-deletion of a non-*sIC*. We will get *cakā(s→d) + dhi = cakāddhi*, the correct form, if there is no *s*-deletion of a non-*sIC*. The *s* is then replaced with *d* by 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*.

If it is accepted that *s* of *sIC* alone is deleted, we run into problems in deriving *āśādhvam*. Thus, *āṄ + śās + (LOṬ→ dhvam) = āśās + dv(am→e) = āśās + dhve* (3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ . . .*). This string goes through a change, again, with application 3.4.91 *savābhyāṃ vāmau*, thereby producing: *āśās + dhv(e→am) = āśās + dhvam*. If we accept *s*-deletion of a non-*sIC*, we will get *āśadhvam*. A non-deletion of non-*sIC* will produce the form *āśāsdhvam*, where *s* can then be replaced with *d*. The result will be *āśāddhvam*. There is yet another possibility. What if, for example in *cakās + dhi*, the *d*-replacement of *s* goes through doubling of *d* by 8.4.47 *anaci ca*. This will produce *cakāddddhi*, with two *d* sounds. This problem of two *d* sounds can be described as *śrutibheda* 'difference in the hearing one of two sounds'. Thus, *cakāddhi/ cakāddhi*; *āśāddhvam*. It is claimed that no special difference results in articulation of one or two sounds before a consonants.

There is an added benefit in replacing *s* with *d*. The use of *luṅ* in the wording of rule 8.3.78 *iṅaḥ ṣīdhvaṃ luṅ liṭā dhoṅgāt* is no longer needed. Consider the derivation of *acyoḍhvam* from *a-cyu-s-dhvam* where *s* is replaced with its retroflex counterpart *ṣ* (8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*). The retroflex *ṣ* will then be replaced with *ḍ* (8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). The *dh* of *dhvam* will then be replaced with *ḍh* of 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*. The *u* of *cyu* will then go through a replacement in *guṇa* and yield *acyoḍhvam*. We will similarly get *aploḍhvam*. If there is a deletion of *s*, we will have to make a specification with *LUṄ* in order for replacing *dh* with *ḍh*. Those who favor this view state that if *LUṄ* is not used in the wording of rule 8.3.78 *iṅaḥ ṣīdhvam . . .*, 8.3.79 *vibhāṣeṭaḥ* will block optional replacement with *ḍh* of *dh* of *LUṄ*, occurring after *iṄ* followed by *iṬ*. For, *LUṄ* is carried over to 8.3.79 *vibhāṣeṭaḥ* from 8.3.78 *iṅaḥ ṣīdhvam. . . .* How could one carry over *LUṄ* when *LUṄ* is not present in the earlier rule. This lack of *anuvṛtti* of *LUṄ* could yield only one form: *alavidhvam*. We will not be able to derive *alaviḍhvam*. The form is derived from *(aṬ + (lū + (LUṄ→dhvam)) → (aṬ + (lū + s + dhvam)) → a + lū + iṬ + s + dhvam = alū + i + s + dhvam*. The *s* will be replaced with *ḍ* via *ṣ* subsequent upon *ū→o→av* change of *lū*. We thus get *alaviḍḍhvam* after *dh* of *dhvam* is replaced with *ḍh*. Why can we not derive *alavidhvam* by not replacing *dh* with *ḍh* of 8.3.79 *vibhāṣeṭaḥ*? This is not a good argument. For, a replacement in *ḍh* can be gotten by *ṣtutva* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*) even when 8.3.79 *vibhāṣeṭaḥ* has not applied. It is therefore necessary to state that 8.2.25 *dhi ca* accomplishes deletion of *s* of *sIC*. Similarly, we should include *sIC* in the wording of rule 8.3.78 *iṅaḥ ṣīdhvam. . . .*

Now yet another problem. If the *s* of *sIC* is deleted by 8.2.25 *dhi ca* we will not be able to derive *sagdhi* and *babdhām*. The *kārikā*, therefore, states: *ghasibhasor na siddhyeta tasmāt sijgrahaṇaṃ na tat* 'it will not be possible to accomplish *s*-deletion of *ghasI* and *bhas*'. It should be stated that *s*-deletion by 8.2.25 *dhi ca* is not limited only to *s*-deletion of *sIC*. Consider *ghsati* derived from *ad* + *KtiN* where 2.4.39 *bahulaṃ chandasi* replaces *ad* with *ghas*. The *a* of *ghas* + *ti* goes through penultimate deletion (*upadhālopa*) of 6.4.100 *ghasibhasor hali ca*. The *s* of *ghsti* will then be deleted based on Vedic anamoly (*bahulaṃ chandasi*). The *t* of *ti* will then be replaced with *dh* of 8.2.40 *jhaṣas tathordho' dhaḥ*. The *gh* will also be replaced with *g* of 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*. This will get us *gdhi*. A *karmadhāraya* compound with replacement of *samāna* with *sa* can then be formed to produce *sagdhi*.

Now refer to *babdhām* (appendix, II:411-12) which is derived from *bhas* + (*LOṬ*→*tas*→*tām*). The *t* of *tām* is here replaced with *dh*. It is through replacement of *bh* with *b* and reduplication that we finally get *babdhām*. It is stated that whether *s* of *sIC* is specified in 8.2.25 *dhi ca*, or not, *s*-deletion in *sagdhi* and *babdhām* will have to be accomplished on the basis of usage seen in the Vedic (*chandas*; *dṛṣṭānuvidhi-prayoga*), similarly to *iṣkartāram adhvare*. *Nyāsa* notes that *vā* of *chandaso varṇalopo vā* indicates yet another derivational source. That is, *gdhi* is not derived from *ghas*. It, instead, is derived from *ṣadh* used with the signification of *hiṃsā* 'to harm'. Similarly, *babdhām* is derived from *bandh* used in the sense of *bandhana* 'to tie'. The *kārikā* verse thus does not favor any *s*-deletion of *ghas* and *bhas*. Consequently, no specification with *sIC* should be made. That is, *sagdhi* and *babdhām* should be derived from different roots. In conclusion, *s*-deletion of 8.2.25 *dhi ca* aims on deletion of *s* of *sIC*. This is what the verses establish. This is what the view of the author of the *vārttikas* is.

8.2.26 झलो झलि

jhalo jhali
/jhalaḥ 5/1 *jhali* 7/1/
(*lopaḥ* #23 *sasya* #24)
jhala uttarasya sakārasya jhali parato lopo bhavati
The *s* which occurs after a sound denoted by *jhaL* (*Śs.* 8-14) is deleted by *LOPA* when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* follows *s*.

EXAMPLES:

acchitta 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *chid* 'to cut''
accitthāḥ 'second singular middle . . .'
abhitta 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *bhid* 'to pierce''
abhitthāḥ 'second singular middle . . .'

avāttām 'third singualr active *LUṄ*-derivate of *vas* 'to dwell' '
avātta 'second person plural active *LUṄ*-derivate . . .'

1. This rule allows *s*-deletion when *s* is preceded and followed by a sound denoted by *jhaL*. Thus, we get *a(Ṭ) + bhid + (sIC→ϕ) + (LUṄ→ta) = a + bhid + ta = abhitta* and *a(Ṭ) + chid + (sIC→ϕ) + ta → a(Ṭ) + t(UK) + chid + ta = a + (t→c) + chid + ta → acchitta*, where *d→t* in *abhitta* is accomplished by 8.4.54 *khari ca*. Augment *tUK* is introduced in *acchitta* by 6.1.73 *che ca*. A replacement in *c* for *t* (*ścutva*; 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*) then follows. We similarly get derivates such as *abhitthāḥ* and *acchitthāḥ* where *LUṄ* is replaced with *thās* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhi . . .*).

The *tas* (active third dual) is replaced with *tām* (3.4.101 *tasthastha . . .*) in *a(Ṭ) + vas + (sIC→ϕ) + (LUṄ→tas→tām) = avas + tām*. A *vṛddhi*-replacement (7.2.3 *vadavraja . . .*) for the *a* of *vas* gives us: *av(a→ā)s + tām = avās + tām*. The final *s* of *avās* is then replaced with *t* (7.4.49 *saḥ syād ārdhadhātuke*). This replacement is not possible because *tām*, as 7.4.49 must demand, does not begin with *s*. The *sIC*-deletion is treated as *asiddha* in view of application of 7.4.49 *saḥ syād. . . .* We can similarly derive *avas + (LUṄ→thas→ta) → av(a→ā)s + ta → avā(s→t) + ta = avātta*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *jhalaḥ* 'after a sound denoted by *jhaL*? Consider *aṬ + manA + sIC + (LUṄ→thas→ta) = aman + s + ta → ama(n→ṃ)sta = amaṃsta*, where deletion of *s* cannot be accomplished because *s* occurs after *n* which is not a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*. We similarly do not get *s*-deletion in *amaṃsthāḥ*, a derivate with verbal ending *thās*.

Why do we have the condition of *jhali* 'when a sound denoted by *jhaL* follows'? Consider *aṬ + bhid + sIC + (LUṄ→ātām) → abhi(d→t) + sātām = abhitsātām* and *abhitsata* where *s*-deletion is blocked again since what follows is not a sound denoted by *jhaL*.

The *s*-deletion of this *sūtra* again refers only to deletion of *sIC*. Consequently, we do not get deletion of *s* in *somasut stotā* and *dṛṣat sthānam* where the final *t* of *somasut* and *dṛṣat* precede the initial *jhaL* of *stotā* and *sthānam*. Besides, they are not part of a single word. Haradatta (ad *Kās*) rightly remarks that this application requires *s* and two required *jhaL* sounds, all three, within a single *pada* (*PM*: *trayāṇām apy ekasambandhatve vidhir iyam*). This deletion can also not be accomplished in a compound such as *somasutsthitiḥ* where *t* is not a part of the *pada* which begins with *s* and *th* (*PM*: *samāse' pi na bhavati. kiṃ kāraṇam? sakārathakārābhyāṃ yat padam ārabdhaṃ tat prati takārasyā vayavābhāvāt*).

8.2.27 ह्रस्वादङ्गात्

hrasvād aṅgāt
/*hrasvāt* 5/1 *aṅgāt* 5/1/

(*lopaḥ* #23 *sasya* #24 *jhali* #26)
hrasvād aṅgād uttarasya lopo bhavati jhali parataḥ
The *s* which occurs after an *aṅga* terminating in a short vowel (*hrasvāt*) is deleted by *LOPA* when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* follows *s*.

EXAMPLES:

akṛta 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *kṛ* 'to do' '
akṛthāḥ 'second singular middle . . .'
ahṛta 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *hṛ* 'to carry' '
ahṛthāḥ 'second singular middle . . .'

1. This rule allows *s*-deletion after an *aṅga* which ends in a short vowel and when this *s* is followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*. Refer to the appendix (II:437) under 1.2.12 *uś ca* for derivational details of *akṛta* and *ahṛta*. Deriving examples with *thās* should not be any difficult.

2. Why do we state *hrasvāt* 'after an *aṅga* which ends in a short vowel'? Consider *acyoṣṭa* and *aploṣṭa* where the *aṅga* ends in *o*, a non-short vowel. Note that a *guṇa*-replacement for *u* of *cyu* 'to drip, fall' and *plu* 'to float' is accomplished first under the condition of *asiddhatva* 'suspension' of *sIC*-deletion. Deletion can no longer apply here since this resultant final vowel of the *aṅga*, i.e., *o*, removes the condition of deletion (*PM*: *salopasyāsiddhatvāt pūrvaṃ guṇaḥ, tato vihitanimittatvāl lopābhāvaḥ*).

Why do we have the condition of *aṅgāt* 'after an *aṅga*'? Consider *aṬ* + (*lū*→*au*→*āv*) + *iṬ* + *sIC* + *tām* = *alāviṣṭām* and *alāviṣuḥ* (cf. III:776) where *s* does not occur after the *aṅga*. It, instead, occurs after the *aṅga* intervened by *iṬ*.

The condition of *jhali* 'when a sound denoted by *jhaL* follows' is still there. Consider *akṛṣātām* and *akṛṣata*, third person dual and plural forms of *kṛṣ* 'to draw, drag', where *guṇa* of *ṛ* is blocked because of *K* as an *it* (1.2.12 *uś ca*).

This deletion also refers to deletion of *sIC*. We thus do not get it in *dviṣṭarām* and *dviṣṭamām*, where comparative-superlative suffixes *taraP* and *tamaP* are introduced with the signification of excellence after *dvis* ending in *sUC* (5.4.18 *dvitricaturbhyaḥ suc*). The *s* is then replaced with *ṣ* (8.3.101 *hrasvāt tādau taddhite*). Note that *ām* after *taraP* and *tamaP* is introduced by 5.4.11 *kimettiṅ*. . . .

8.2.28 इट ईटि

iṭa īṭi
/*iṭaḥ* 5/1 *īṭi* 7/1/
(*lopaḥ* #23 *sasya* #24)
iṭa uttarasya sakārasya lopo bhavati īṭi parataḥ
A *s* which occurs after *iṬ* is deleted by *LOPA* when *īṬ* follows.

EXAMPLES:

adevīt 'he sported'
asevīt 'he served'
akoṣīt 'he dragged'
amoṣīt 'he stole'

1. This rule deletes *s* after an *iṬ* when *īṬ* follows. Consider *aṬ + div + (LUṄ → tiP)* = *adevīt* 'he sported', where 7.2.4 *neṭi* blocks the *vṛddhi* of *i* of *div*. We get a short-penultimate replacement in *guṇa*, instead. Augment *iṬ* is introduced by 7.3.96 *astisico' pṛkte*. . . . We similarly get *asevīt* '. . . served', *akoṣīt* '. . . dragged' and *amoṣīt* '. . . stole', the derivates of *sev* 'to serve', *kuṣ* 'to draw, extract' and *muṣ* 'to steal', respectively. Refer to *alāvīt* (II:333-34) for additional derivational details.

Let us consider the third singular active *LUṄ*-derivate, i.e., *ātīt*, of verbal root *at* 'to move continually'. Given *āṬ + at + s + t* → *ā + āt + iṬ + s + t* → (*ā + a*→*ā*) *t + i + s + t* = *āt + is + t*, where 6.4.72 *āḍ ajādīnām* introduces augment *āṬ*. Augment *iṬ* is introduced by 7.3.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*. A single *vṛddhi* replacement for *ā+a* is accomplished by 6.1.90 *āṭaś ca*. Rule 7.3.96 *astisico' pṛkte* now introduces *īṬ* to yield *āt + i + s + īṬ + t* → *āt + is + īt* = *āt + is + īt*. Our present rule then applies deletion by *LOPA* to *s* thereby yielding: *āt + i*(*s*→ϕ) *+ īt* = *āt + i + īt*. Rule 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* then replaces the vocalic sequence of *i+ī* with a single long *ī*. We thus get *āt + īt* = *ātīt*. Recall that 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* is placed outside the *tripādī*. Rule 8.2.28 *iṭa īṭi* is obviously contained within the *tripādī*. Given 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*, the *s*-deletion of 8.2.28 *iṭa īṭi* is considered suspended in view of the application of 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*. This becomes a problem in deriving *ātīt* with a single homogeneous long vowel replacement (*savarṇa-ekādeśa*). The *Mahābhāṣya* proposes a *vārttika* on rule 8.2.28 *iṭa īṭi*: (*vt. sijlopa ekādeśe siddho vācyaḥ* 'a deletion of *s*(*IC*) should be considered *siddha* in view of a single replacement'). We can now apply 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* to derive *ātīt*.

2. Why do we have the specification made with *iṭaḥ* 'after *iṬ*'? Consider *akārṣīt* and *ahārṣīt* (II:332-33), the two derivates of *kṛ* and *hṛ* offered here as counter-examples, where *s* does not occur after *iṬ*.

Why do we state the condition of *īṭi* 'when *īṬ* follows'? Consider *alāviṣṭām* and *alāviṣuḥ*, the two derivates of *lūÑ* 'to cut' offered here as counter-examples, where *īṬ* does not follow.

8.2.29 स्कोः संयोगाद्योरन्ते च

skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ca
/skoḥ 6/2 = *saś ca kaś ca* = *skau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *saṃyogādyoḥ* 6/2 = *saṃyogasya ādī* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tayoḥ*; *ante* 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.18 *lopaḥ* #23 *jhalì* #26)

padasyānte yaḥ saṃyogaḥ jhali parato vā samyogaḥ tad ādyoḥ sakārakakārayor lopo bhavati
The initial *s* and *k* of a conjunct which occurs at the end of a *pada*, or is followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*, is deleted by *LOPA*.

EXAMPLES:

lagnaḥ 'derivate of (*OlasjI* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
lagnavān 'derivate of (*OlasjI* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
sādhulak 'pleasantly shy'
magnaḥ 'cleansed from (*masjI* + *Kta*) + *sU*'

1. This rule deletes the initial *s* and *k* of a conjunct which occurs at the end of a *pada*, or which is followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*. Consider *lasj* + *Kta* → (*lagna*) + *sU* → *lagnaḥ* and *lasj* + *KtavatU* → *lagnavat* + *sU* → *lagnavān*, where *s* of the conjunct goes through deletion by *LOPA*. Augment *iṬ* cannot be introduced since *OlasjI* is a root marked with *I* as an *it* (*idita*; 7.2.14 *śvīdito niṣṭhāyām*). The *t* of the *niṣṭhā* (1.1.26 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) suffix is replaced with *n* (8.2.45 *oditaś ca*). The *j* of the root goes through a replacement in *k* (*kutva*; 8.2.29 *coḥ kuḥ*). A replacement in *n* for *t* of the *niṣṭhā* suffix is, for purposes of replacement in *kU* 'consonant of the *k*-series', considered *asiddha* 'suspended' (8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*). Note that (*sādhu* + *sU*) + (*lasj* + (*KvIP*→ϕ))) = *sādhulasj* + (*sU*→ϕ) = *sādu*(*s*→ϕ)*j* → *sādhula*(*j*→*k*) = *sādhulak* has the conjunct *sj* at the end of the *pada*. Other rule applications remain the same.

Now consider *masj* + *Kta*, where *Ṭ* is blocked because *masj* consists of a single vowel (7.2.10 *ekāc upadeśe* . . .). Augment *nUM* (7.1.60 *masjinaśorjhali*) is then introduced before *j* at the strength of a *vārttika*: *masjer antyāt pūrvo nuṃ vācyaḥ* '*nUM* is to be introduced prior to the final of *masj*'. Thus, *ma*(*s*+*nUM*)*j* + (*K*)*ta* → *mas* (*n*→ϕ)*j* + *ta* = *ma*(*s*→ϕ)*j* + (*t*→*n*)*a* → *ma*(*j*→*g*) + *na* = *magna* + *sU* → *magnaḥ*. The *n* of *nUM* is subsequently deleted by 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala*. . . . We similarly get examples of *k*-deletion in derivates of *niṣṭhā*: *takṣ* + (*Kta*) → *ta*(*k*→ϕ)*ṣ* + *ta* → *taṣ*(*t*→*ṭ*)*a* + *sU* = *taṣṭaḥ* and (*takṣ* + *KtavatU*) + *sU* → *taṣṭavān*, with *ṭ* as a replacement for *t* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). Recall here that rule 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā* blocks introduction of augment *iṬ*. Now consider (*kāṣṭha* + *am*) + (*takṣ* + *KvIP*)) → *kāṣṭhata*(*k*→ϕ)*ṣ* → *kāṣṭhata*(*ṣ*→*ḍ*→*ṭ*) = *kāṣṭhataṭ*, paraphrased as *kāṣṭhaṃ takṣṇoti* 'he who planes wood'. Note that *ṣ* of *takṣ* is replaced with *ḍ* (*jaśtva*; 8.2.39b *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*). This *ḍ* then goes through a replacement in *ṭ* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *vā' vasāne*).

2. A *vārttika* proposal (*vt*: *jhali sañīti vaktavyam*) is made to specify *jhali* as *jhali sañi*, '*jhaL* included within the abbreviatory term *saṄ*, formed with *sa* of *saN* (3.1.5 *guptijkidbhyaḥ san*) and *Ṅ* of *mahiṄ* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhi* . . .; *Kāś*: *sanaḥ prabhṛti mahiṅo ṇakāreṇa pratyāhāraḥ*). This abbreviatory term will then represent all affixes introduced after verbal roots. The *vārttika* is proposed to

facilitate blocking of several rule applications in deriving *giraḥ* (optional *l* by 8.2.2 *gro yaṅi*), *abhodhiḥ* (non-deletion of *s* of *abhas* by 8.2.25 *dhi ca*)), *dviṣṭarām* (8.2.27 *hrasvād aṅgāt*), *dṛṣasthaḥ* (8.2.26 *jhalo jhali*), *kāṣṭhaśaksthiraḥ* (8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ca*), *kruñcā* (8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*), *dhuryaḥ* (no lengthening; 8.2.77 *hali ca*). Refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* for additional details on:

giro' bhodhir dviṣṭarāṃ ca dṛṣasthaḥ kāṣṭhaśakisthiraḥ/
kruñcā dhuryeti mā smaiṣu satvādīni bhavantv iti//

3. Why do we state *skoḥ* 'in place of *s* and *k*'? Consider *narnarti* and *varvarti*, derivates of deleted *yaN* introduced after *nṛtI* 'to dance' and *vṛt* 'to choose, like' where we do not find the conjunct at the end of a *pada* followed by a sound denoted by *jhaL*.

Why do we state *saṃyogādyoḥ* 'at the beginning of a conjunct'? Consider *payaḥśak*, where the conjunct is not at the end of a *pada*. Besides, a *pada* which ends in a *KvIP*, and is combined with a cooccurring *pada*, is impossible to find.

8.2.30 चोः कुः

coḥ kuḥ
/coḥ 6/1 *kuḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *jhali* #26 *ante ca* #29)
cavargasya kavargādeśo bhavati jhali parataḥ padānte ca
A sound denoted by *cU* is replaced with a corresponding sound denoted by *kU* when *cU*, either occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*.

EXAMPLES:

paktā 'he will cook'
paktum 'for cooking'
paktavyam '. . . ought to be cooked'
odanpak 'he who cooks rice'
vaktā 'speaker'
vaktum 'for speaking'
vaktavyam '. . . ought to be said'
vāk 'speech'

1. Note that *jhali* and *padānte* are both individually construed with *coḥ* 'in place of that which is denoted by a consonant of the *c*-series'. This rule then allows a consonant of the *c*- series to be replaced with a corresponding consonant of the *k*-series (*kU*) when a consonant of the *c*-series occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*. Consider (*pa*(*c*→*k*) + *tṛ*(*C*)) + *sU* → *paktā*, (*pa*(*c*→*k*) + *tavtyaT*) + *sU* = *paktavyam*, and (*odana* + *pa*(*c*→*k*)) + (*KvIP*→ϕ)) = *odanapak*. We similarly

get (*vac* + *tṛC*) + *sU* = *vaktā*, *vaktavyam* and *vāc* + *sU* → *vāk*. Recall that *sU* is deleted by 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo*. . . . The *c* is then replaced with *g* (*kutva*) of 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*. Our present rule then replaces *g* with *k*. Incidentally, *vāk* derives from *vac* + *KvIP* → *v*(*a*→*ā*) *c* + (*KvIP*→ϕ) = *vāc* + *sU* = *vāk* at the strength of a *vārttika* (ad 3.2.178 *anyebhyo' pi dṛśyate*, *vt*: *kvib vacipracchyāyatastu* . . .). This *vārttika* also offers a long replacement for the short *a* of *vac*.

Why is *ñ* of *kruñcā* 'a female swan' not replaced with *ṅ* before *c*? For those who accept the root as *kruñc* 'to be curley, crooked', the answer is twofold: (*i*) this rule applies only when an affix denoted by *saṄ* follows (see note 2 under the preceding rule); (*ii*) Pāṇini himself uses it, via *nipātana*, in rule 3.2.59 *ṛtvigdadhṛk*. . . . One can also accept the root as *kuc*, with no *r* and no *n*. I omit any further discussion for fear of expatiation (*prapañca*).

8.2.31 हो ढः

ho ḍhaḥ
/haḥ 6/1 *ḍhaḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *jhali* #26 *ante ca* #29)
hakārasya ḍhakārādeśo bhavati jhali paratah padānte ca
A *h* is replaced with *ḍh* when it occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*.

EXAMPLES:

soḍhā 'he will endure'
soḍhum 'for enduring'
soḍhavyam '. . . ought to be endured'
jalāṣāṭ 'name of Indra'
voḍhā 'he will carry'
voḍhum 'for carrying'
voḍhavyam '. . . ought to be carried'
turāṣāṭ 'name of Indra; he who endures water'
praṣṭhavāṭ 'a bull who can carry a *prastha* in weight'
dityavāṭ 'a calf of two years'

1. This rule requires a *h* to be replaced with *ḍh* when *h* occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*. Refer to notes under 6.3.112 *sahivahor*. . . for derivational details of (*sah* + *tṛC*) + *sU* = *soḍhā* and (*vah* + *tṛC*) + *sU* = *voḍhā*, where this rule replaces *h* with *ḍh*. We can similarly derive *soḍhum*, *soḍhavyam*; and *voḍhum*, *voḍhavyam* with affixes *tumUN* and *tavyaT*. Note here that augment *iṬ* can be optionally introduced after verbal root *sah* when an *ārdhadhātuka* affix beginning with *t* follows (7.2.48 *tīṣasaha* . . .). That is, we can also find forms such as *soḍhitā*, *soḍhitum* and *soḍhitavyam*, respectively. Derivates where *h* is replaced with *ḍh*

at the end of a *pada* are: *turāṣāṭ, praṣṭhavāṭ* and *dityavāṭ*. Refer to derivational details of *turāṣāṭ* 'Indra' under the appendix of 3.2.63 *chandasi sahaḥ* (II:739). The *ṆvI* of *praṣṭhavāṭ* is introduced after *vah* 'to carry' by 3.2.64 *vahaś ca*. The penultimate *vṛddhi* is accomplished by 7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*.

2. Why was this rule not formulated jointly with the preceding as: *cuhoḥ kuḍhau*? Rule 1.3.10 *yathāsaṃkhyam* . . . would have then required assignment of equivalency of replacements in accord with equal number of enumerated items (*saṃkhyātānudeśa*). That is, a replacement in *kU* would have applied before an affix beginning with a *jhaL* sound (*jhalādau kutvam*). A replacement in *ḍh* would have similarly applied at the end of a *pada* (*padānte ḍhatvam*).

Why did Pāṇini not formulate the rule by reading *a* at the end of *h* in the genitive: *hasya ḍhaḥ*? This simply indicates variety in his choice.

Thus, (*sa*(*h*→*ḍh*) + *tṛ*(*C*)) → (*saḍh* + (*t*→*dh*)*ṛ*) → (*saḍh* + (*dh*→*ḍh*)*ṛ*) → *sa*(*ḍh*→ϕ) + *ḍhṛ* → *s*(*a*→*o*) + *ḍhṛ* = *soḍhṛ* + *sU* = *soḍhā*, where this rule replaces *h* with *ḍh*. The *t* of affix *tṛC* is also replaced with *dh* (8.2.40 *jhaṣastathordho' dhaḥ*). This *dh* is then replaced with *ḍh* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). Rule 8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ* then applies to delete *ḍh* of *saḍh*. Finally, the *a* of *saḍh* is replaced with *o* to produce *soḍhā*. This same applies to (*vah* + *tṛC*) + *sU* = *voḍhā*. Refer also to note #2 under rule 6.3.112 *sahivahor*. . . . Also refer to derivational details of *jalāsāṭ* 'he who endures water' and *praṣṭhavāṭ* 'a calf under training for ploughing'.

8.2.32 दादेर्धातोर्घः

dāder dhātor ghaḥ
/*dādeḥ* 6/1 = *dakāra ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *dhātoḥ* 6/1 *ghaḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *jhali* #26 *ante ca* #29 *haḥ* #31)
dakārāder dhātor hakārasya ghakārādeśo bhavati jhali parataḥ padānte ca
The *h* of a verbal root which begins with *d* is replaced with *gh* when *h* occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*.

EXAMPLES:

dagdhā 'he will burn (something)'
dagdhum 'for burning'
dagdhavyam '. . . ought to be burned'
kāṣṭhadhak 'he who ignites the firewood'
dogdhā 'he will milk'
dogdhum 'for milking'
dogdhavyam '. . . ought to be milked'
godhuk 'he who milks cows'

1. This rule replaces the *h* of a root with *gh* when the root begins with *d*, and *h* occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*. Consider *dagdhā*, *dagdhum* and *dagdhavyam*, where *h* of *dah* is replaced with *gh*. Thus, *da(h→gh) + (t→dh)ṛ(C)) → da(gh→g) + dhṛ = dagdhṛ*, where *gh* is replaced with *g* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). We can similarly derive *dogdhā*, *dogdhum* and *dogdhavyam* with affixes *tṛC*, *tumUN* and *tavyaT*, where *u* of *duh* will be replaced with *o* (*guṇa*; 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārddha . . .*). Now consider (*kāṣṭha + am + dah + KvIP*) = *kāṣṭhada* (*h→gh*), where *d* of *dah* is replaced with *dh* (*bhaṣbhāva*; 8.2.37 *ekāco baśo . . .*). The *gh* of *kāṣṭha + dha(gh→g→k)* = *kāṣṭhadhak* is first replaced with *g* (*jaśtva*) and then with *k* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *dādeḥ* 'of a verbal root which begins with *d*'? Consider *lih + tṛC = leḍhā, leḍhum, leḍhavyam* and *guḍa + am + lih + KvIP → guḍali(h→ḍh→ṭ) = guḍaliṭ*, where *h* of non-*duh* verbal root *lih* 'to lick' is not replaced with *gh*. It is replaced with *ḍh*, instead (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*).

3. It is stated that the genitive in *dhātoḥ* does not denote a coreferentiality relationship (*sāmānādhikaraṇya*) with the genitive of *dādeḥ*. It, instead, is a qualifier to *dādeḥ*. What difference does this make? We get a qualifier and qualified relationship also where coreferentiality is denoted. Actually, *dhātoḥ* will become a qualified (*viśeṣya*) of its qualifier *dādeḥ* if we accept correferentiality. We interpret *dhātoḥ* as a qualifier ending in the genitive denoting *avayava* 'part of a whole'. This will facilitate us to interpret *dhātor dādeḥ* as *dhātor avayavo yo dādiḥ śabdas tadavayavasya hakārasya* 'in place of a *h* which is part of the *d*-initial part of a root'. What does one accomplish by this interpretation of genitive as denoting *avayava* 'part of a whole'? We get a replacement in *gh* in (*duh + (LUṄ→tiP)*) → *duh + (ŚaP→ϕ) + tiP→ aṬ + duh + (tiP→ϕ)* → *a + (d(u→o)h → a + do(h→gh→g→k)* → *a(d→dh)ok → adhok* (cf. *kāṣṭhadhak*). But this kind of *avayava* 'part of a whole' interpretation of genitive will create difficulty in replacing *h* with *gh* in *dogdhā* and *dogdhum*. For, *h* is not any part of *d*-initial part of the root. It, instead, is a part of the whole which is *d*-initial. It is claimed that *d*-initial part of the root of which *h* is a part will be accepted as the whole on the basis of *vyapadeśivadbhāva* 'treating secondary as principal'. That is, *d*-initial part of the whole verbal root will be treated as the whole. Such a special treatment even when there is no difference in the two entities is also witnessed in the outside world. Thus, we get expressions such as: *śilāputrakasya śarīram* 'rock-son's body, where 'rock's son' itself is the 'body' and *rāhoḥ śiraḥ* 'head of Rāhu', where 'head' itself is Rāhu'. In summary, the genitive is introduced with the understanding that there is no difference (*bheda*) between the whole and its part.

Or else, one can also accept *dādiḥ* as 'that (a *dhātu* 'verbal root') which is initially cited as *d*-initial in the *Dhātupāṭha*'. It will thus not yield a *gh* in *dāmaliham icchati = dāmalihyati* 'wishes to lick the rope', where *dāmalihya* is a derived verbal root which begins with *d* but is not a root with *d* at the begin-

ning in its original citation (*upadeśa*). The root in initial citation begins with *l* (*lih*). We can also not get *gh* in *dāmaliṭ* 'a calf (who licks the rope)' which ends in a *KvIP*. Consequently, we do not get **dāmalik*.

8.2.33 वा द्रुहमुहष्णुहष्णिहाम्

vā druhamuhaṣṇuhaṣṇihām
/vā ϕ druha-muha-ṣṇuha-ṣṇihām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*padasya* #1.16 *jhali* #26 *ante ca* #29 *haḥ* #31 *dhātoḥ ghaḥ* #32)
'*druha, muha, ṣṇuha, ṣniha*' *ity eteṣāṃ dhātūnāṃ hakārasya vā ghakārādeśo bhavati jhali parataḥ padānte ca*
The *h* of verbal roots *druhA* 'to wish harm to', *muhA* 'to be confounded, infatuated', *ṣṇuhA* 'to vomit' and *ṣṇihA* 'to love' is, optionally, replaced with *gh* when *h* occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*.

EXAMPLES:

drogdhā 'he will harm'
droḍhā 'ibidem'
mitradhruk 'he who wishes to harm a friend'
mitradhruṭ 'ibidem'
unmogdhā 'confounded (feminine)'
unmoḍhā 'ibidem'
unmuk 'confounded'
unmuṭ 'ibidem'
utsnogdhā 'one who will vomit'
utsnoḍhā 'ibidem'
utsnuk 'vomiting'
utsnuṭ 'ibidem'
snegdhā 'he will love'
sneḍhā 'ibidem'
snik 'loving'
sniṭ 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers an optional replacement, in *gh*, for *h* of verbal roots *druh* 'wish harm to', *muhA* 'to be sad, distraught, confounded', *ṣṇuhA* 'to vomit' and *ṣṇihA* 'to love', when *h* occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*. Thus, we get *drogdhā, droḍhā*; (*mitra* + *am* + *druh* + *KvIP*) → (*mitra* + (*d*→*dh*) *ruh* (*KvIP*→ϕ)) → (*mitra* + *dhru*(*h*→*gh*→*g*→*k*)) = *mitradhruk*, where *KvIP* is introduced by 3.2.61 *satsūdviṣadruha*. . . . We similarly get *mitradhruṭ*. Note that *druh* begins with a *d* in its initial citation. Consequently, a replacement of its *h* with *gh* is obligatorily made available (*prāpta*) by the preceding rule. Other roots, since they do not begin with *d*, did not have this replacement available to them

(*aprāpta*). This rule makes an optional provision (*Kāś. druher dāditvād ghatvaṃ nityaṃ prāptam, itareṣām aprāptam eva ghatvaṃ vikalpyate*). If the option of replacing *h* with *gh* is accepted, we will get *dr*(*u*→*o*) *h* + (*t*→*dh*) *ṛC*) → (*dro*(*h*→*gh*→*g*) + *dhṛ*) + *sU* = *drogdhā*. If *h* is replaced with *ḍh* (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*), instead, we will get (*dro*(*h*→*ḍh*) + (*t*→*dh*→*ḍh*) *ṛ*)) → *dro*(*ḍh*→ϕ) + *ḍhṛ* = (*droḍhṛ*) + *sU* = *droḍhā*. We will get similar forms of other roots. Thus, *unmoghā*, *unmoḍhā*; and *unmuk* and *unmuṭ*, etc. Examples with *pada*-final replacements are all derivates of *KvIP* (3.2.76 *kvip ca*). A replacement in *ṣ* for *s* of *ṣṇuhA* and *ṣṇihA* is accomplished by 6.1.64 *dhātvādeḥ ṣaḥ saḥ*. The *ṇ* which was gotten on account of its proximity with *ṣ* will be changed back to *n*.

2. Note that verbal roots *druh*, etc., are enumerated in the class of roots headed by *div* 'to play, sport'. They are listed in this same order also in a subset headed by *radh* 'submit, surrender' (*radhādi*). It is because of their membership in the *radhādi* class that augment *iṬ* can be introduced after them only optionally (7.2.45 *radhādibhyaś ca*). If all roots enumerated here beginning with *druh* are listed in this same order within the *divādi* class, then they can all be mentioned here as *druhādi*. This way, the rule could also be formulated as *vā druhādīnām* 'optionally of roots enumerated beginning with *druh*'. But Pāṇini chose a longer formulation of this rule, perhaps to indicate its application also to contexts where affix *yaṄ* goes though deletion (*yaṅluki*). Thus, we get *dodhruk* and *dodhruṭ*. A listing by groups, such as *druhādi*, etc., may have blocked application of this rule to individual verbal roots (*PM* ad *Kāś. tara* '*vā druhādīnām*' *iti vaktavye pratipadapāṭho yaṅluky api yathā syāt, dodhruk, dodhruṭ; anyathā* '*nirdiṣṭaṃ yadgaṇena ca*' *iti na syāt*). Also refer to my notes under rule 7.1.6 *śīṅo ruṭ*.

8.2.34 **नहो धः**

naho dhaḥ
(*padasya* #1.16 *jhali* #26 *ante ca* #29 *haḥ* #31 *dhātoḥ* #32)
naho hakārasya dhakārādeśo bhavati jhali pare padānte ca
A replacement in *dh* comes in place of *h* of verbal root *ṇahA* 'to tie' when this *h* occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatoery term *jhaL*.

EXAMPLES:

naddham 'tied'
naddhum 'for tying'
naddhavyam '. . . ought to be tied'
upānat 'sandals, shoes'
parīṇat 'tied around(?)'

1. Note that *nah* refers to verbal root *ṇahA* 'to tie' where *ṇ* is replaced with *n* (6.1.65 *ṇo nah*). This rule replaces the *h* of *nah* with *dh* when *h* occurs

at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL*. Consider *nah* + (*K*)*ta* → *nah* + (*t*→*dh*)*a* → *na* (*h*→*dh*→*d*) + *dha* = *naddha* + *sU* = *naddham*, where *t* of *Kta* is replaced with *dh* (8.2.40 *jhaṣastathor*. . .). The *dh*-replacement of *h* is further replaced with *d* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.52 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). We similarly get (*nah* + *tumUN*) + *sU* → *naddham* and (*nah* + *tavyAT*) → *naddhavyam*. Refer to derivational details of (*upa* + *nah*) + *KvIP*)) → *upānat*, under 6.3.116 *nahivṛtivṛṣi*. . ., whereby we get the short *a* of *upa* replaced with its long counterpart. Similar rules apply in deriving the *KvIP*-derivate (*pari* + *nah*) + *Kta* → *parīṇat*, where short *i* of *pari* is replaced with its long counterpart by 6.3.116 *nahivṛtivṛṣi*. . . . Rule 8.4.14 *upasargād asamāse' pi*. . . replaces *n* with *ṇ* (*ṇatva*). Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*) notes that a replacement in *dh*, as against the more econominal *d*, is preferred so that in deriving *naddha* we can get *dh* as a replacement. If *d* was offered as a replacement, we could not get *dh*. For, *d* is not included within the denotatum of the abbreviatory term *jhaṢ* (8.2.40 *jhaṣastathor*. . .; *Nyāsa*: *naddhety atra 'jhaṣastathordho' dhaḥ' iti dhatvaṃ yathā syād ity evam artham*). This replacement in *dha* is also intended for application of *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto naḥ*.

8.2.35 **आहस्थः**

āhas thaḥ
/*āhaḥ* 6/1 *sthaḥ* 1/1/
(*jhali* #26 *haḥ* #31 *dhātoḥ* #32)
āho hakārasya thakārādeśo bhavati
The *h* of *āh* (*brū*; 3.4.84 *bruvaḥ pañcānām*. . .) is replaced with *th* when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* follows.

EXAMPLES:

idam āttha 'you are saying this'
kim āttha 'what are you saying'

1. This rule replaces the *h* of (*brū*→*āh*) + *thaL* = *āh* + *tha* with *th* when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* follows. Refer to derivational details of *āttha*, under 3.4.84 *bruvaḥ pañcānām ādita*. . . (III:781-82), whereby *āh* comes as a replacement of *brū*. The *th* of this rule is further replaced with *t* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*).

2. Why did he not formulate a single rule: *āhanahor dhaḥ*, thereby facilitating the replacement of *h*, of *āh*, with *dh*. An application of 8.4.55 *khari ca* could then have yielded *āttha*. Why did Pāṇini not formulate the rule simply as *āhas taḥ*? That is, if he wanted a replacement in *t*. Why is he offering a different replacement? It is stated that a different replacement is offered so that an application of 8.2.40 *jhaṣastathor*. . . could be blocked (*Kāś*: *ādeśāntarakaraṇam 'jhaṣasthaordho' dhaḥ' ity asya nivṛtyartham*). That is, the *th* of

thaL (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*) would then have been replaced with *dh* of 8.2.40 *jhaṣastathor. . . .* An application of 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte* could then have yielded: *ātthaḥ.* If *t* was given as a replacement, 8.4.47 *anaci ca* would have doubled it up. For, *t* will be considered non-suspended in view of 8.4.47 *anaci ca.* If a replacement in *th* will go through a replacement in *t* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*), *t* will be considered suspended in view of 8.4.47 *anaci ca.* Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kāśikā*) states that *evam api takāra eva kartavyaḥ* 'even then, *t* alone should be specified as a replacement'. This is not appropriate.

Recall that this replacement is valid only when *jhaL* follows. This is why we get counter-examples: *āha / āhatuḥ / āhuḥ.*

3. A proposal (*vt: hṛgrahor bhaś chandasi hasyeti vaktavyam*) is made to replace the *h* of *hṛ* 'to carry' and *grah* 'to seize' with *bh*, in the Vedic. Consider *sambharati, grabhītā, udgrābham* and *nigrābham* as examples.

8.2.36 व्रश्चभ्रस्जसृजमृजयजराजभ्राजच्छशां षः

vraścabhrasjasṛjamṛjayajarājabhrājacchaśāṃ ṣaḥ
/ vraśca-bhrasja-sṛja-mṛja-yaja-rāja-bhrāja-cha-śām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *ṣaḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *jhali* #26 *ante ca* #29 *dhātoḥ* #32)
'*vraśca, bhrasja, sṛja, mṛja, yaja, rāja, bhrāja' ity eteṣām chakārāntānām, śakārāntāṃ ca ṣakāra ādeśo bhavati jhali parataḥ padānte ca*
A replacement in *ṣ* comes in place of the final sound segment of verbal roots *vraścA* 'to cut', *bhrasjA* 'to roast', *sṛjA* 'to project, create', *mṛjA* 'to wipe, cleanse', *yajA* 'to sacrifice', *rājA* 'to shine, rule', *bhrājA* 'to shine', and also of roots which end in *ś* and *ch*, when what is replaced with *ṣ* occurs at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL.*

EXAMPLES:

vraṣṭā 'he will cut'
vraṣṭum 'for cutting'
vraṣṭavyam '. . . ought to be cut'
mūlavṛṭ 'he who cuts roots'
bhraṣṭā 'he will roast'
bhraṣṭum 'for roasting'
bhraṣṭavyam '. . . ought to be roasted'
dhānābhṛṭ 'he who roasts grains'
sraṣṭā '. . . will create'
sraṣṭum 'for creating'
sraṣṭavyam '. . . ought to create'
rajjusṛṭ 'he who braids a rope'
mārṣṭā 'he will cleanse'

mārṣṭum 'for cleansing'
mārṣṭavyam '. . . ought to be cleansed'
kaṃsaparimṛṭ 'he who fully cleanses the drinking vessel'
yaṣṭā 'sacrificer'
yaṣṭum 'for sacrificing'
yaṣṭavyam 'sacrifice ought to be performed'
upayaṭ 'a sacrifice'
samrāṭ 'emperor'
svarāṭ 'self-ruler'
virāṭ 'huge'
praṣṭā 'he will ask'
praṣṭum 'for asking'
praṣṭavyam 'ought to be asked'
śabdaprāṭ '. . . asks about words'
leṣṭā 'he will move'
leṣṭum 'for moving'
leṣṭavyam 'ought to move'
liṭ 'mover'
veṣṭā 'he will enter'
veṣṭum 'for entering'
veṣṭavyam 'ought to be entered'
viṭ 'entering'

1. This rule offers *ṣ* as a replacement for the final (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) sound segment of verbal roots *OvraścŪ* 'to cut, pierce', *bhrasjA* 'to cook', *sṛjA* 'to discharge, emit', *mṛjŪṢ* 'to cleanse, wipe', *yajA* 'to perform a sacrifice', *rājṚ* 'to glow' and *ṬUbhrājṚ* 'to glow', and also of roots which end in *ś* and *ch*, when their final sound occurs at the end of a *pada*, or is followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jhaL*. Verbal roots *rājṚ* and *ṬUbhrājṚ* are specified here for *padānta* 'end of a *pada*'. This is why no example before a *jhaL* sound is offered for them. The initial *jhaL* of what follows them is separated by augment *iṬ* (*Kāś*: *rājabhrājoḥ padāntārthaṃ grahaṇam, jhalādir ābhyām iṭā paryavapadyate*). The first four roots are *seṭ* 'used with augment *iṬ*', only optionally (7.2.44 *svaratisūtisyati* . . .). The remaining roots cannot be used with *iṬ* (7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe* . . .).

Now consider some examples:

(*i*) *vraśc* + *tṛ*(*C*) = *vraṣṭā*, *vraśc* + *tum*(*UN*) = *vraṣṭum* and *vraśc* + *tavya*(*T*) = *vraṣṭavyam* where, after *c* is replaced with *ṣ*, the preceding *ś* is changed back to *s*. This *s* is then deleted by 8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ca*. The *t* of *tṛC*, *tumUN* and *tavyaT* then goes through a replacement in *ṭ* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). We similarly derive *bhraṣṭā*, *bhraṣṭum* and *bhraṣṭavyam*, etc. Note that *mārṣṭā*, *mārṣṭum* and *mārṣṭavyam* have *ṛ* of the root replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart

ār (7.2.114 *mṛjer vṛddhiḥ*). Refer to derivattional details of *sraṣṭā, sraṣṭum* and *sraṣṭavyam* under 6.1.58 *sṛjadṛśor jhaly am akiti.*

(*ii*) Examples such as (*mūla* + *am*) + *vraśc* + *KvIP* = *mūlavṛṭ* and *dhānābhṛṭ* involve *samprasāraṇa* of *vraśc* and *bhrasj* (6.1.16 *grahijyāvayivyadhi* . . .). They also involve *s*-deletion.

(*iii*) This rule offers *ṣ* as a replacement for *j* of *sam* + *rājṚ* + (*KvIP*→ϕ) = *sam-rā*(*j*→*ṣ*→*ḍ*→*ṭ*) = *samrāṭ*, for which see notes under 6.4.19 *cchvoḥ śūḍ*. . . . The *m* of *sam* escapes a replacement in *anusvāra* (8.3.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*) at the strength of 8.3.25 *mo rāji samaḥ kvau.* One can similarly derive *virāṭ* and *svarāṭ*. Refer to derivational details of *upayaṭ* in the appendix (III:741).

(*iv*) Examples such as (*liś* + *tṛC*) + *sU*→ *leṣṭā, liś* + *tumUN*→ *leṣṭum* and (*liś* + *tavyaT*) + *sU*→ *leṣṭavyam* derive with *guṇa*, *ś*→*ṣ* and *ṭ*→*ṭ* like many other forms already discussed. Follow similar rules to derive *liś* + *KvIP* → *li*(*ś*→*ṣ*→*ḍ*→*ṭ*) = *liṭ*, through *ṣatva* (8.3.36 *vraścabhrasj* . . .), *jaśtva* (8.3.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*) and *cartva* (8.4.56 *vāvasāne*). One can similarly derive *veṣṭā, veṣṭum, veṣṭavyam,* and *viṭ.*

2. A question is raised against using *cha* in this rule. Why use *ch* when it can be replaced with *ś* of 6.4.19 *cchvoḥ śuḍ anunāsike,* and *pṛṣṭaḥ,* etc., can be derived by replacing *ś* at the end with *ṣ* of this rule. That is, *cch* of 6.4.19 *\cchoḥ śūḍ* . . . will serve the purpose of this *ch.* It is stated that, in that rule, *cch* is specified because *anunāsikasya kvijjaloḥ knīti* is carried there. This is how *praṣṭā* and *praṣṭum* could be derived, in addition to *pṛṣṭaḥ* and *pṛṣṭavān.* For, a replacement in *ś* would, otherwise, not be possible in derivates of *tṛC, tumUN* and *tavyaT*, i.e., *praṣṭā / praṣṭum / praṣṭavyam,* with no affix marked with *K* and *Ṅ* as an *it.* This is the view of the author of the *sūtras* (*Nyāsa: etac ca sūtrakāramatenoktam*). Some, however, refute the use of *ch* in that rule. They, instead, carry over the *anuvṛtti* of *knīti* there. This facilitates the application of 6.4.19 *cchoḥ śuḍ anunāsike* in *praṣṭā / praṣṭum / praṣṭavyam.* We thus do not need to specify *ch* in this rule.

8.2.37 एकाचो बशो भष् झषन्तस्य स्ध्वोः

ekāco baśo bhaṣ jhaṣantasya sdhvoḥ

/ekācaḥ 6/1 = *eko' c yasmin* (*bv.*), *tasya; baśaḥ* 6/1 *bhaṣ* 1/1 *jhaṣantasya* 6/1 = *jhaṣ ante yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya; sdhvoḥ* 7/2 = *saś ca dhvaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*

(*padasya* #1.16 *jhali* #26 *ante ca* #29 *dhātoḥ* #32)

dhātor avayavo ya ekāc jhaṣantaḥ tadavayavasya baśaḥ sthāne bhaṣ ādeśo bhavati jhali sakāre dhvaśabde ca parataḥ padānte ca

A sound which, denoted by the abbreviatory term *baŚ,* forms part of a monosyllabic part of a verbal root ending in a sound denoted by the

abbreviatory term *jhaṢ*, is replaced with a sound denoted by *bhaŚ*, when this sound denoted by *baŚ* occurs before *s*, *dhva*, or occurs at the end of a *pada*.

EXAMPLES:

bhotsyante 'third singular middle *LṚṬ*-derivate of *budh* 'to comprehend' '
abhudhvam 'second plural middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *budh*'
arthabhut 'derivate of *artha* + *am* + *budh* + *KviP*'
nighokṣyate 'third person singular middle *LṚṬ*-derivate of verbal root *guh* 'to cover, hide' used with the preverb *ni*'
nyaghūḍhvam 'second person plural middle *LUṄ*-derivate of verbal root *guh* used with the preverb *ni*'
parṇaghuṭ 'derivate of *parṇa* + *am* + *guh* + *KviP*'
dhokṣyate 'third singular middle *LṚṬ*-derivate of *duh* 'to milk' '
adhughdhvam 'second plural middle *LUṄ*-derivate of verbal root *duh* used with the preverb *ni*'
godhuk 'derivate of *go* + *am* + *duh* + *KviP*'
ajarghāḥ 'second person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *jar-gṛdh* (*gṛdh* + *yaṄ*)'
gardhap 'derivate of (deleted) causal *ṆiC*, ending in *KviP*'

1. This rule replaces a sound denoted by *baŚ* with a sound denoted by *bhaṢ*, when *baŚ* forms part of a *jhaṢ*-final monosyllabic part of a verbal root and occurs either at the end of a *pada*, or occurs before *s* or *dhva*. Note that four sound segments, namely *b*, *ḍ*, *d* and *g* are denoted by *baŚ*. These are to be replaced with an equal number of sound segments denoted by *bhaṢ*, namely *bh*, *gh*, *ḍh* and *dh*. If one follows *saṃkhyātānudeśa* 'assignment of equivalency in the order of enumeration' (1.3.10 *yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām*), *ḍh* cannot be selected as a substitute for *ḍ*. For, it is impossible to find *ḍ* at the beginning of a monosyllabic part of a root. A selection of substitutes is then made on the basis of close proximity (*ānantarya*).

Haradatta (*PM*) quotes the following verses:

catvāro bhaṣa ādeśāḥ sthāninas tu baśas trayaḥ/
ḍakārasya tu na kvāpi sambhavo' sti kathañcana//1//
'replacements of *bhaṢ* are four; but the *baŚ* items which they replace are only three. Since it is not possible to find *ḍ* as a substituendum (*sthānin*), *ḍh* cannot be selected as a substitute'

śāstrapratītivelāyāṃ saṃkhyāsāmyasya sambhavāt/
pravarttate yathāsaṃkhyam anuṣṭhāne tv asambhavaḥ//
'equivalency in accord with equal number of enumerated items is possible at the time when rules are comprehended; but it becomes impossible when rules are to be applied'

2. Note that *dhātoḥ*, in the genitive (*saṣṭhī*), is carried over from 8.2.32 *dāder dhātor ghaḥ* for qualifying *ekācaḥ*. The word *jhaṣantasya* is also a qualifier in syntactic coordination with *ekācaḥ*. However, there is no syntactic coordination between *dhātoḥ* and *ekācaḥ jhaṣantasya*. For this will give us the sense of: 'a root which is monosyllabic and ends in a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaṢ*'. This interpretation will not allow a replacement in *bhaṢ* where the root is not monosyllabic. This, however, should not mean that *bhaṢ* is intended as a replacement without the qualification of *ekācaḥ* 'monosyllabic'. For, if the specification was not made with *ekācaḥ*, replacement in *bhaṢ* will apply to *ḍh* of *dāmaliḍh* after *h* of *lih* is replaced with *ḍh*.

We will encounter difficulties in replacing *baṢ* with *bhaṢ*, if *dhātoḥ* and *ekācaḥ jhaṣantasya* are interpreted as qualifier-qualifieds in syntactic coordination. Consider *gardabha* + *ṆiC* → *gardabhaya* from which we derive *gardabh* by introducing *KvIP*, dubbed *apratyaya* 'non-affix' because of its total deletion, with the denotatum of *kartṛ* 'agent'. The *bh* of *dabh* of *gardabh* is monosyllabic, but it is not a root. Consequently, it cannot be replaced with *p*. Commentators, therefore, interpret *ekācaḥ jhaṣantasya* as part (*avayava*) of *dhātoḥ*. This way, the *baŚ* of a root's monosyllabic part ending in *jhaṢ*, is replaced with *bhaṢ*. The *bh* of *dabh* which ends in *jhaṢ*, and is a monosyllabic part of the root, is replaced with *p*, a sound denoted by *baŚ*.

3. Now consider some examples:

3.1 *bhotsyate*

(*a*) *budh* + (*LṚṬ*→*te*) → (3.1.33 *syatāsī* . . .)
(*b*) *budh* + *sya* + *te* → (7.3.86 *puganta* . . .)
(*c*) *b*(*u*→*o*)*dh* + *sya* + *te* → (8.2.37 *ekāco* . . .)
(*d*) (*b*→*bh*)*odh* + *sya* + *te* → (8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*)
(*e*) *bho*(*dh*→*d*) + *sya* + *te* → (8.4.55 *khari ca*)
(*f*) *bho*(*d*→*t*) + *sya* + *te* = *bhotsyate*

3.2 *abudhvam*

(*a*) *budh* + (*LUṄ*→*dhvam*) → (3.1.43-44 *cli luṅi-cleḥ sic*)
(*b*) *budh* + (*CLI* → *s*(*IC*) + *dhvam* → (6.4.71 *luṅlaṅlṛṅ* . . .)
(*c*) *aṬ* + *budh* + (*s*→ϕ) + *dhvam* → (8.2.25 *dhi ca*)
(*d*) *a* + (*b*→*bh*)*udh* + *dhvam* → (8.2.37 *ekāco* . . .)
(*e*) *a* + *bu*(*dh*→*d*) + *dhvam* → (8.4.52 *jhalāṃ* . . .) = *abuddhvam*

3.3 *arthabhut*, where *KvIP* (3.2.76 *kvip ca*) is introduced after *budh* in conjunction with *artha* + *am*. Thus, *artha* + (*am*→ϕ) + (*b*→*bh*)*udh* → *arthabhu*(*dh*→*d*→*t*) = *arthabhut*

3.4 *nighokṣyate*

(*a*) *ni-guh* + *sya* + *te* → (8.2.37 *ekāco* . . .)
(*b*) *ni-*(*g*→*gh*)*uh* + *sya* + *te* → (7.3.86 *puganta* . . .)
(*c*) *ni-gh*(*u*=*o*)*h* + *sya* + *te* → (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*)

(*d*) *ni=gho(h→ḍh) + sya + te →* (8.2.41 *ṣaḍhoḥ kaḥ si*)
(*e*) *ni-gho(ḍh→k) + sya + te →* (8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*)
(*f*) *ni-ghok + (s→ṣ)ya + te = nighokṣyate*

3.5 *nygūḍhvam*
(*a*) *ni-guh + (LUṄ→dhvam) →*
(*b*) *ni + guh + CLI + dhvam →*(3.1.45 *śala . . .*)
(*c*) *ni + guh + (CLI→ksa) + dhvam →*
(*d*) *ni + a(Ṭ) + guh + ksa + dhvam →* (7.3.73 *lug vā . . .*)
(*e*) *n(i→y) + a(Ṭ) + guh + (ksa→ϕ) + dhvam →* (8.2.37 *ekāco . . .*)
(*f*) *ny + a(Ṭ) + (g→gh)uh + dhvam →* (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*)
(*g*) *ny + a(Ṭ) + ghu(h→ḍh) + dhvam →* (8.4.40 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*)
(*h*) *ny + a(Ṭ) + ghuḍh + (dh→ḍh)vam →* (8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ*)
(*i*) *ny + a(Ṭ) + ghuḍh + (ḍh→ϕ)vam →* (6.3.109 *ḍhralope . . .*)
(*j*) *ny + a(Ṭ) + gh(u→ū)ḍh + vam = nyaghūḍhvam*

3.6 *parṇaghuṭ*, a derivate of *guh* with *KvIP*, introduced in conjunction with *parṇa + am*. The *g* of *parṇa + guh + (KvIP→ϕ)* is similarly replaced with *bhaS* to produce: *parṇa + (g→gh)uh = parṇaghuh*. The *h*, through a replacement in *ḍh*, then goes through a replacement in *ṭ* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*) via *ḍ* (*jaśtva*; 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*). Thus, we get: *parṇaghu(h→ḍh→d→ṭ) = parṇaghuṭ*.

3.7 *dhokṣyate*
Derives from *duh + (LṚṬ→te) → duh + sya + te→ doh + sya + te*, where *h* of *duh* is replaced with *gh* (8.2.32 *dāder dhātor ghaḥ*). The *d* itself gets replaced with *dh* of this rule. Thus, *(d→dh)o(→gh) + sya + te*. We get *dho(gh→k) + sya + te → dhok(s→ṣ)yate = dhokṣyate*, with application of rules already made familiar.

3.8 *ajarghāḥ*
acīkamad yo na jānāti yo na jānāti barbarīti/
ajarghā na vijānāti tasmai kanyā na dīyatām//
'he who does not properly understand *acīkamat*, *barbarīti* and *ajarghāḥ*, to him one should not give one's daughter away in marriage.'
gṛdher yalope laṅi serilope
bhaṣbhāvacarce ca bhavaty ajarghāḥ
(*a*) *gṛdh(U) →*(1.3.1 *bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ*); (3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco halādeḥ . . .*)
(*b*) *gṛdh + ya(Ṅ) →*(2.4.74 *yaṅo' ci ca*; 6.1.9 *sany aṅoḥ*)
(*c*) *gṛdh + (ya(Ṅ)→ϕ)) → gṛdh + gṛdh → gṛ + gṛdh* (7.4.66 *ur at*; 7.4.66 *kuhoś cuḥ*)
(*d*) *gar + gṛdh → (g→j)ar + gṛdh →*(7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*; 7.4.91 *rug rikau ca luki*)

(*e*) *ja(r→ϕ) + gṛdh → ja + rUK + gṛdh → jar + gṛdh →* (3.1.32 *sanādyantā . . .*; 3.2.111 *anadyatane laṅ*)
(*f*) *jar + gṛdh + LAṄ → a(Ṭ) + jar + gṛdh + (Ś)a(P) + si(P)→* (7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*)
(*g*) *a + jar + g(ṛ→ar)dh + a + si → a + jar + gardh + a + s(i→ϕ) → a + jar + gardh + s* (*Dhātupāṭha: carkarītañ ca*); 3.4.100 *itaś ca*; 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*); 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ . . .*
(*h*) *a + jar + gardh + (a→ϕ) + s → a + jar + gardh + (s→ϕ) = a + jar + gardh →*(8.2.37 *ekāco baśo . . .*; 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*)
(*i*) *a + jar + (g→gh)ar + dh → a + jar + ghar(dh→d) →* (8.2.75 *daś ca*)
(*j*) *a + jar + ghar(d→rU) → a + jar + ghar + r(U) →* (8.3.14 *ro ri*)
(*k*) *a + jar + gha(r→ϕ) + r →* 6.3.111 *ḍhralope . . .*
(*l*) *a + jar + gh(a→ā) + r = ajarghār →* 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ*
(*m*) *ajarghā(r→ḥ) = ajarghāḥ*

3.9 *gardhap*, refer to note 2

4. Why do we have the condition of *ekācaḥ* '. . . monosyllabic'? Consider *dāmaliham icchati = dāmalihyati*; *dāmalihya + KvIP = dāmaliṭ* 'he who likes to lick the rope; a calf', where, if *ekācaḥ* was not specified, *baŚ* alone could be qualified with *dhātoḥ*. Since it is impossible to get a *baŚ* which ends in *jhaṢ*, *jhaṣantasya* could only qualify *dhātoḥ*. This will give us the following meaning: *jhaṣantasya dhātor yo' vayavo baś tasya bhaṣ iti* 'a *baŚ* which ends in *jhaṢ* and is part of a verbal root; a *bhaṢ* comes in place of that'. This will cause application of this rule on *dāmaliḍh* (see *supra*, note 2).

Why do we have the specification made with *baśaḥ* 'in place of *baŚ*'? Consider *krotsyati*, a derivate of *krudh* 'to be angry', where *k* cannot be replaced with *gh* because it is not a *baṢ*.

Why do we state the condition of *jhaṣantasya* 'of that which ends in a *jhaṢ*'? Consider *dāsyati*, where *dā* does not end in *jhaṢ*.

Why do we state the condition of *sdhvoḥ* 'when *s* or *dhva* follows'? Consider *boddhā*, *boddhum* and *boddhavyam*, where no *s* or *dhva* follows.

Why was this specificaton made with *dhva*, and not just with *dh*? Consider *dādaddhi*, a form of (*dadh + (yaṄ→LUK)*) + (*LOṬ→si→hi→dhi*))), where the root goes through reduplication and *si* (3.4.87 *ser hy apic ca*) is replaced with *dhi*, via *hi* (6.4.101 *hujhalyor her dhiḥ*).

8.2.38 दधस्तथोश्च

dadhas tathoś ca

/dadhaḥ 6/1 *tathoḥ* 7/2 = *taś ca thaś ca = tathau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ca* ϕ/ (*padasya* #1.16 *jhali* #26 *ante ca* #29 *dhātoḥ* #32 *baśo bhaṣ jhaṣantasya sdhvoḥ* #37)

dadhaḥ ity etasya jhalantasya baśaḥ sthāne bhaṣ ādeśo bhavati jhali sakāre dhvaśabde ca parataḥ padānte ca

A replacement denoted by *bhaṢ* comes in place of one denoted by *baŚ*, of *dadh* (*dhā*) 'to bear, support' ending in *jhaL*, when the substituendum occurs, either at the end of a *pada*, or occurs followed by *t*, *th*, *s* or *dhva*.

EXAMPLES:

dhattaḥ 'third person dual active *LAṬ*-derivate of *dhā*'
dhatthaḥ 'second person dual active . . .'
dhatse 'second person dual middle . . .'
dhatsva 'second person singular middle *LOṬ*-derivate . . .'
dhadhvam 'second person plural middle *LOṬ* . . .'

1. This rule offers a replacement in *bhaṢ*, for the *baŚ* sound of verbal root *dadh* when ending in *jhaṢ*, provided a *s* or *dhva* preceded by *jhaL* follows. Note that *dadh* ends in *dh* (*jhaṢ*) and is a form of verbal root *ḌUdhāÑ* resulting from its reduplication (6.1.1 *ekāco dve* . . .), i.e., *dhā* + *dhā*, shortening (7.4.59 *hrasvaḥ*; *dh*(*ā*→*a*) and (*dh*→*d*)*a* = *da* (*jaśtva*). This gives us *dadh*(*ā*→ϕ) = *dadh*, where 6.4.112 *śnābhyastayor ātaḥ* deletes the *ā* of *dhā*. Note that this deleted *ā* cannot be treated as *ā*, via *sthānivadbhāva*, at the strength of this rule formulation. A replacement in *jaŚ* in the *abhyāsa* 'reduplicated syllable' is also treated as suspended (*asiddha*; *Kāś*: *vacanasāmarthyāt lopasaya sthānivadbhāvo na bhavati. abhyāsajaśtvasya cāsiddhatvam*).

We derive *dhattaḥ* from (*dadh* + (*LAṬ*→*tas*) = *dadh* + (*ŚaP*→ϕ) + *tas* → *dadh* + *tas*. Our present rule will replace the initial *d* of *dad* with *dh*. The final *dh* will be replaced with *t* (8.4.54 *khari ca*), thereby producing (*d*→*dh*)*dh* + *tas* → *dha*(*dh*→*t*) + *tas* = *dhattas*. An application of *rutva-visarga* will derive *dhatta*(*s* →*rU*→*ḥ*) = *dhattaḥ*. We will similarly get *dhatthaḥ* from *dhā* + *LAṬ* if *thas* is selected to replace *LAṬ*. We will similarly get the second person singular middle (*ātmanepada*) form *dhatse* when the second singular *thās* is further replaced with *se* (3.4.80 *thāsaḥ se*). We can also derive *dhatsva* from *dad* + (*LOṬ*→*thās*→*se*), where *e* of *se* will be replaced with *va*. Thus, (*dadh* + *s*(*e*→*va*) → (*d*→*dh*)*adh* + *sva* → *dha*(*dh*→*t*) + *sva* → *dhatsva*. Deriving *dhadhvam* should not pose any problem.

2. Why do we have the condition of *tathoḥ* 'when *t* and *th* follow'? Haradatta states that *tathoḥ* should not be stated in the rule. He argues that *jhali* and *jhaṣantasya* are both carried. A *jhaL* which may follow is not any different from *t* and *th* of *tathoḥ*. Besides, if *tathoḥ* was not used in this rule, *s* and *dhva* would be desired to be carried, via *ca*, anyway. Thus, *d* of *dadh* can be replaced with *dh* of the preceding rule. This change of *dh* could have been accomplished by this rule without *tathoḥ* (*PM*: '*jhali*' *iti vartate*, '*jhaṣantasya*' *iti ca*; *na ca takārathakārābhyām anyo dadho jhal asti, sdhvos tāvad iṣṭam eva. tasmāt tathor iti na vaktavyam*).

The condition of *jhaṣantasya* 'in place of that which ends in a sound denoted by *jhaṢ*' will still be valid. Consider *dadhāti* where this rule does not apply since it does not get the form *dadh* subsequent to deletion of *ā*.

8.2.39 झलां जशोऽन्ते

jhalāṃ jaśo' nte
/jhalām 6/1 *jaśaḥ* 1/3 *ante* 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16)
jhalāṃ jaśa ādeśā bhavanti padasyānte vartamānānām
A sound which is denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* (*Śs.* 7-14), and occurs at the end of a *pada*, is replaced with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *jaŚ* (*Śs.* 10).

EXAMPLES:

vāg atra
śvaliḍ atra
agnicid atra
triṣṭub atra

1. This rule replaces a *pada*-final sound denoted by *jhaL* with a corresponding sound denoted by *jaŚ*. Consider *śvali*(*h*→ *ḍh*→*ḍ*) → *śvaliḍ atra*, where *jaśtva* (*ḍh*→*ḍ*) applies after *h* is replaced with *ḍh*. Other derivates have similar applications.

The word *anta* here denotes *avasāna* 'end'. It does not denote *avayava* '(terminal) part of a whole' (*PM*: *antaśabdo' vasānavacanaḥ; na tv avayavavacanaḥ*). It is also used here to cancel the *anuvṛtti* of *jhali* (*Kāś*: *antagrahaṇaṃ jhalīty etasya nivṛtyartham*). Why use *anta* when the same could have been carried from 8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogāder*. . . ? This *anuvṛtti* is associated with *jhali*. If one is carried the other must also be carried. Consider (*vas* + *tṛC*) + *sU*)) → *vastā* and (*vas* + *tavyaT*) + *sU*)) → *vastavyam*, where a *jaŚ*-replacement cannot be accomplished because *anta* does not mean *avayava* 'part of a whole'.

8.2.40 झषस्तथोर्धोऽधः

jhaṣas tathor ḍho' dhaḥ
/jhaṣaḥ 6/1 *ta-thoḥ* 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ; dhaḥ* 6/1
a-dhaḥ 5/1 (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmāt*/
jhaṣa uttarayos takārathakārayoḥ sthāne dhakāra ādeśo bhavati dadhātiṃ varjayitvā
A *dh* comes in place of *t* or *th* which, in turn, occurs after a sound denoted by *jhaṢ* (*Śs.* 8-9) with the exception of verbal root *ḌUdhāÑ* 'to place'.

EXAMPLES:

labdhā 'derivate of (*labh* 'to obtain' + *tṛC*) + *sU*'
labdhum 'derivate of *labh* + *tumUN*'
labdhavyam 'derivate of *labh* + *tavyaT*'
alabdha 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *labh*'

alabdhāḥ 'second singular middle *LUṄ*. . .'
dogdhā '*tṛC*-derivate of *duh* 'to milk' '
dogdhum '*tumUN*-derivate of. . .'
dogdhavyam '*tavyaT*-derivate of. . .'
adugdha 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *duh*'
adugdhāḥ 'second singular middle *LUṄ*. . .'
leḍhā '*tṛC*-derivate of *lih* 'to lick' '
leḍhum '*tumUN*-derivate of *lih*'
leḍhavyam '*tavyaT*-derivate of *lih*'
alīḍha 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *lih*'
alīḍhāḥ 'second singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of. . .'
boddhā '*tṛC*-derivate of *budh* 'to comprehend' '
boddhum '*tumUN*-derivate of *budh*'
boddhavyam '*tavyaT*-derivate of *budh*'
abuddha 'third singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *budh*'
abuddhāḥ 'second singular middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *budh*'

1. This rule replaces a *t* or *th* with *dh* when the same occurs after a *jhaṢ* sound. Commentators state that the negation stated by *adhaḥ* applies to verbal root *ḌUdhāÑ*. This should not be construed as a negation applying to *dh*, per se. If this negation was intended to apply to *dh* per se, a *t* and *th* which occurs after *dh* could not be replaced with *dh*. Consequently, specifications made with *buddhi* (1.4.52 *gatibuddhi*. . .) and *vṛddhi* (1.1.73 *vṛddhir yasyācām*. . .) could not be justified.

Consider (*labh* + *tṛC*) + *sU*)) → *labh* + (*t*→*dh*)*ṛC*) *sU*)) → *labdhā*, (*labh* + (*t*→*dh*)*um*)) = (*la*(*bh*→*b*) + *dhum*)) = *labdhum* and (*labh* + *tavyaT*) + *sU* → *labdhavyam*. Refer to derivational details of *abuddha* (II:437). Similar rules apply in deriving *alabdha*. A similar derivate with *thās* will be *alabdhāḥ*. Derivates such as *adugdha*, *adugdhāḥ*; *alīḍha* and *alīḍhāḥ* are derived under 7.3.73 *lug vā duhadihaliha*. . . . These forms could be easily comprehended because scores of *tṛC*, *tumUN*, *tavyaT*, and also middle derivates of *LUṄ*, have already been discussed.

2. Why do we state *adhaḥ* 'not after *dhā*'? Consider *dhattaḥ* and *dhatthaḥ* where this replacement does not apply because the root is constituted by *dhā*.

8.2.41 षढो: क: सि

ṣaḍhoḥ kaḥ si
/*ṣaḍhoḥ* 6/2 = *ṣaś ca ḍhaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *kaḥ* 1/1 *si* 7/1/
ṣakāraḍhakārayoḥ kakārādeśo bhavati sakāre parataḥ
A replacement in *k* comes in place of *ṣ* and *ḍh* when *s* follows.

EXAMPLES:

pekṣyati 'derivate of (*piṣ* + (*LṚṬ*→*tiP*))'

apekṣyat 'derivate of (*piṣ* + (*LṚṄ→tiP*))'
pipakṣati 'derivate of (*piṣ* + *saN*) + (*LAṬ→tiP*))'
lekṣyati 'derivate of (*lih* + (*LṚṬ→tiP*))'
alekṣyat 'derivate of (*lih* + (*LṚṄ→tiP*)'
lilikṣati 'derivate of (*lih* + *saN*) + (*LAṬ→tiP*))'

1. This rule replaces a *ṣ* and *ḍh* with *k* when *s* follows. Thus, *piṣ* + (*LṚṬ→tiP*) → *p*(*i→e*)*ṣ* + *sya* + *ti* → *pe*(*ṣ→k*) + *sya* + *ti* → *pek* + (*s→ṣ*)*ya* + *ti* = *pekṣyati*. We similarly get *aṬ* + *piṣ* + *sya* + (*LṚṬ→tiP*) → *apekṣyat*. A derivate of *saN* with *LAṬ*, where 1.2.10 *halantāc ca* blocks *guṇa*, will be derived as *pipikṣati* 'wishes to powder'. Similar examples of *li*(*h→ḍh*), where *ḍh* gets replaced with *k*, are: *lekṣyati*, *alekṣyat* and *lilikṣati*.

Why do we have the condition of *si* 'when *s* follows'? Consider *piṣ* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *pi* + *ŚnaM* + *ṣ* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) = *pinaṣ* + (*t→ṭ*)*i* = *pinaṣṭi*, where *ṣ* does not occur before *s*. A similar example is *leḍhi* where *ḍh* cannot be replaced with *k*. Incidentally, *ŚaP* goes through *LUK*-deletion because *lih* is a root of the *adādi* group (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ . . .*). The *h* of *lih* is, of course, replaced with *ḍh* of 8.4.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*.

8.2.42 रदाभ्यां निष्ठातो नः पूर्वस्य च दः

radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto naḥ pūrvasya ca daḥ
/ra-dābhyām 5/2 = *raś ca daś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām*; *niṣṭhātaḥ* 6/1 = *niṣṭhāyās takāraḥ* = *niṣṭhāt* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasya*; *naḥ* 1/1 *pūrvasya* 6/1 *ca* ϕ *daḥ* 6/1/
rephadakārābhyām uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakāra ādeśo bhavati pūrvasya ca dakārasya
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after *r* and *d* is replaced with *n*, with an additional provision that *d* be also replaced with *n*.

EXAMPLES:

āstīrṇam 'derivate of (*āṄ-stṝÑ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
vistīrṇam 'derivate of (*vi-stṝÑ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
viśīrṇam 'derivate of (*vi-śṝ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
nigīrṇam 'derivate of (*ni-gṝ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
avagūrṇam 'derivate of (*ava-gur* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
bhinnaḥ 'derivate of (*bhid* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
bhinnavān 'derivate of (*bhid* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
chinnaḥ 'derivate of (*chid* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
chinnavān 'derivate of (*chid* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'

1. This rule replaces the *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix with *n* when *t* occurs after *r* and *d*. Additionally, the *d* which precedes *t* is also replaced with *n*. Note that *niṣṭhā* suffixes begin with *t* and are introduced after a root. If *t* of these suffixes is to occur after *r* and *d*, the root must end in *r* and *d*. Thus, *ā-stṝÑ* +

Kta → *āst*(*ṝ*→*ir*) + *ta* → *āst*(*i*→*īr*) + *ta* → *āstīr* + (*t*→*n*) *a* → *āstīr* + (*n*→*ṇ*) *a* = *āstīrṇa* 'strewn around', where *ṝ* is replaced with *ir*. Refer to derivational details under 7.1.100 *ṛt id dhātoḥ*. Our next two derivates, *viśīrṇam* 'decayed, shattered' and *nigīrṇam* 'swallowed', follow similar rule applications. What is different in (*ava-g*(*u*→*ū*) *r* + *ta*) + *sU*→ (*ava-gūr* + (*t*→*n*) *a*)) + *sU*→ *avagūrṇam* is the availability of *iṬ* (7.2.35 *ārddhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*). This *iṬ* is, however, negated by 7.2.14 *śvīdito niṣṭhāyām*. Refer to derivational details of *bhinnaḥ* in the appendix of rule 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca* (II:337). Deriving *chinnaḥ* from (*chid* + *Kta*) + *sU*→ *chi*(*d*+*t*→*nn*) *a*)) + *sU*→ *chinnaḥ* is easy.

2. Why do we have the condition of *radābhyām* 'after *r* and *d*'? Consider *kṛ* + *Kta* → *kṛta* + *sU*→ *kṛtaḥ* and *kṛt* + *KtavatU*→ *kṛtavat* + *sU*→ *kṛtavān*, where this rule does not apply since *t* does not occur after *r*. It is argued that this rule must apply since *ṛ* is generally accepted as including *r*. However, since *r* of *ṛ* is not followed immediately by *t* of *Kta*, this rule does not apply. What intervenes between *r* of *ṛ* and *t* of *Kta* is the vocalic part of *ṛ*. This rule refers to *r* as a consonant (*Kāś*. . . . *vyañjana-mātram, rephasāmānyānirdeśe' pi sati rephāt parā yā''jbhaktis tadvyavadhānān na bhavati*). Besides, the *r* which results out of the application of *vṛddhi* is accepted here as externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*).

Why do we have the condition of *niṣṭhā* '. . . of *niṣṭhā*'? Consider *kartā* and *hartā* where what follows is the non-*niṣṭhā* suffix *tṛC*.

Why do we have the condition of *taḥ* 'in place of *t* of *niṣṭhā*'? Consider (*car* + *iṬ* + *ta*) + *sU*→ *caritam* and (*mud* + *iṬ* + *ta*) + *sU*→ *muditam*, where *t* follows *r*, intervened by *i*. This rule thus does not apply.

Why do we state *pūrvasya* 'in place of that which precedes'? So that a replacement in *n* cannot apply to *d* which follows (*Kāś*: *parasya na bhavati*). Consider (*bhid* + *tavat*) + *bhyām* = *bhinnavadbhyām* and (*bhid* + *tavat*) + *bhis* = *bhinnavadbhiḥ*, where *d* which precedes *t*, and not that which may follow by way of being a replacement of *t* (*jaśtva*), can be replaced with *n*.

Why is this replacement not applied in *kṛtasyāpatyam* = *kārttiḥ* 'son of Kṛta', where *r* precedes *t*. This *r* is part of the *vṛddhi*-replacement of *ṛ* of *kṛta*. Since this replacement is externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) by the *taddhita* affix *iÑ* (4.1.95 *ata iñ*), it will become *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of the application of *n*-replacement (*Kāś*: *iha kṛtasyāpatyaṃ kārttir iti vṛddher bahiraṅgalakṣaṇāyā asiddhatvāt natve kartavye rephasyāsiddhatvām* 'since the externally conditioned *vṛddhi* of *kṛtasyāpatyam kārttiḥ* is considered suspended, *r* is considered suspended in accomplishing a replacement in *n*').

8.2.43 संयोगादेरातो धातोर्यण्वतः

saṃyogāder āto dhātor yaṇvataḥ
/ *saṃyogādeḥ* 5/1 = *saṃyoga ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasmāt*; *ātaḥ* 5/1 *dhātoḥ* 5/1
yaṇvataḥ 5/1 = *yaṇ asyāstīti* = *yaṇvān* (*bv.*), *tasmāt*/
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)

saṃyogādir yo dhātur ākārānto yaṇvān tasmād uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakāra ādeśo bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix introduced after a verbal root which begins with a conjunct, ends in *ā*, and contains a sound denoted by *yaṆ*, is replaced with *n*.

EXAMPLES:

pradrāṇaḥ 'derivate of ((*pra-drā* + *Kta*) + *sU*)'
pradrāṇavān 'derivate of ((*pra-drā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*)'
mlānaḥ 'derivate of ((*mlai* + *Kta*) + *sU*)'
mlānavān 'derivate of ((*mlai* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*)'

1. This rule replaces the *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix with *n* when this suffix occurs after a root which (*i*) begins with a conjunct, (*ii*) ends in *ā* and (*iii*) contains a sound denoted by *yaṆ*. Thus, (*pra-drā* + *Kta*) + *sU* → *pradrā* + (*t*→*n*)) + *sU* → *pradrāṇaḥ*, where *drā* before *Kta* qualifies as a root ending in *ā*, beginning with a conjunct and containing a *yaṆ* sound. The *n* is here replaced with *ṇ* (*ṇatva*; 8.4.29 *kṛty acaḥ*). Note that verbal roots *glai* and *mlai* yield *glā* and *mlā*, after their *ai* is replaced with *ā* (6.1.44 *ādeca upadeśe* . . .). Thus, we also get this replacement in *mlānaḥ* and *mlānavān*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *saṃyogādeḥ* 'after that which begins with a conjunct'? Consider (*yā* + *Kta*) + *sU* = *yātaḥ* and (*yā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU* = *yātavān*, where *yā* does not begin with a conjunct and this rule does not apply.

Why do we have the condition of *ātaḥ* 'after (a root) ending in *ā*'? Consider (*cyuṄ* + *Kta*) + *sU* = *cyutaḥ* '. . . has dripped'/ (*cyuṄ* + *KtavatU*) + *sU* = *cyutavān* 'dripped'; and (*plu* + *Kta*) + *sU* = *plutaḥ* '. . . has moved'/(*plu* + *KtavatU*) + *sU* = *plutavān* 'moved', where the roots end in *u*.

Why do we have the condition of *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal root'? Consider *nir-yā* + *Kta* = *niryāta* 'gone outside', where the root ends in *ā* but does not begin with a conjunct. The unit formed by the conjunct with *ā*, i.e., *ryā*, is not a root. The conjunct results out of combination of the preverb and root. Our present rule can thus not apply here.

Why do we have the condition of *yaṇvataḥ* 'after that which contains a *yaṆ* sound'? Consider (*snā* + *Kta*) + *sU* = *snātaḥ* 'bathed' and (*snā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU* = *snātavān*, where the root ends in *ā* and begins with a conjunct. However, this root does not contain any *yaṆ* sound. Here again, our present rule cannot find any application.

8.2.44 ल्वादिभ्यः

lvādibhyaḥ
/*lvādibhyaḥ* 5/3 = *lū ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *tebhyaḥ*/
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)

lvādibhya uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakāra ādeśo bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal roots enumerated in the group headed by *lūÑ* 'to cut' is replaced with *n*.

EXAMPLES:

lūnaḥ 'a derivate of (*lūÑ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
lūnavān 'a derivate of (*lūÑ* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
dhūnaḥ 'a derivate of (*dhūÑ* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
dhūnavān 'a derivate of *dhūÑ* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
jīnaḥ 'a derivate of (*jyā* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
jīnavān 'a derivate of (*jyā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'

1. Note that *lvādibhyaḥ* refers to an enumeration of roots within the *kryādi* class, beginning with *lūÑ* 'to cut' and ending with *vṛÑ* 'to choose'. Thus, *lū*(*Ñ*) + (*K*)*ta* → *lū* + (*t*→*n*)*a* = *lūna* + *sU* = *lūnaḥ*; (*lū* + *KtavatU*) + *sU* → *lūnavān*. We similarly derive *jyā* + (*K*)*ta* → *j*(*y*→*i*)*ā* + *ta* → *j*(*i*+*ā*→*i*) + *ta* → *j*(*i*→*ī*) + *ta* → *jī* + (*t*→*n*)*a* = *jīna* + *sU* → *jīnaḥ* and (*jyā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU* → *jīnavān*, etc. Recall that an application of *samprasāraṇa* (6.1.16 *grahijyā-vayivyadhi* . . .), i.e., replacement in *i* for *y* of *jyā* (1.1.45 *ig yaṇaḥ samprasā-raṇam*), and a single replacement application in *i* (6.1.107 *samprasāraṇāc ca*) for the resultant vocalic sequence of *i*+*ā* must be made now. A long replace-ment in *ī*, for this short *i*, is then accomplished by 6.4.2 *halaḥ*. The *t* of the *niṣṭhā* suffix is, of course, replaced with *n*.

2. The following *vārttika* proposals are also made:

(*i*) The *t* of affix *KtiN*, similar to that of affixes termed *niṣṭhā*, is to be replaced with *n* when occurring after a root ending in *ṛ* (short or long), or after roots specified here as *lvādi* (*vt*: *ṛkāralvādibhyaḥ ktin niṣṭhāvad bhavatīti vaktavyam*). Consider *kṝ* + *KtiN* → *kīrṇi* + *sU* → *kīrṇiḥ*, *śīrṇiḥ*; *lūniḥ* and *pūniḥ*.

(*ii*) The short final *u* of *du* 'to be afflicted' and *gu* 'to void solid matter from the body' should be replaced with its long counterpart, in addition to *n*-replacement of *t* of *niṣṭhā* (*vt*: *dugvor dīrghaś ceti vaktavyam*). Thus, *ādūnaḥ* and *vigūnaḥ*.

(*iii*) The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* should be replaced with *n* after *pūÑ* 'to destroy' (*vt*: *pūño vināśa iti vaktavyam*). Thus, *pūnā yavāḥ* 'barleys are de-stroyed'. Why do we state the condition of *vināśe* 'when the signifi-cation is 'destruction'? Consider *pūtaṃ dhānyam* 'grains are cleansed'.

(*iv*) The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix is replaced with *n* when it is introduced after *si* 'to bind' and the denotatum is *grāsa* 'morsel', an object turned agent (*karmakartṛ*; *sinoter grāsakarmakartṛkasyeti vaktavyam*). Thus, *sino grāsaḥ svayameva* 'morsels rolled up by themselves'.

Why do we state the condition of *karmakartṛkasya* 'of an object turned

agent'? Consider *sitā pāśena sūkarī* 'the (female) pig was caught by snares'. Or else, *sito grāso devadattena* 'Devadatta made the morsel'.

8.2.45 ओदितश्च

oditaś ca
/oditaḥ 5/1 = *ot it yasya* (*bv.*) = *odit, tasmāt; ca* ϕ/
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)
okāreto dhātor uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakāra ādeśo bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after a verbal root marked with *O* as an *it* is replaced with *n*.

EXAMPLES:

lagnaḥ 'derivate of (*OlasjĪ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
lagnavān 'derivate of (*OlasjĪ* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
udvignaḥ 'derivate of (*OvijĪ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
udvignavān 'derivate of (*OlasjĪ* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
āpīnaḥ 'derivate of (*OpyāyĪ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
āpīnavān 'derivate of (*OpyāyĪ* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'

1. This rule replaces the *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix with *n* when the same occurs after a root marked with *O* as an *it*. Refer to derivational details of *lagnaḥ* and *lagnavān* under 7.2.14 *śvīdito niṣṭhāyām* and 8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor. . . .* The *pyāy* of *OpyāyĪ* is, optionally, replaced with *pī* (6.1.28 *pyāyaḥ pī*). Thus, (*āpyāy→āpī*) + (*K*)*ta* → *āpī* + (*t→n*)*a* = *ā-pina* + *sU* → *āpīnaḥ*. We similarly get *āpīnavān*, a derivate with *KtavatU*.

2. The following verbal roots are also considered marked with *O* as an *it*. Thus, *ṣūṄ* = *sūnaḥ/sūnavān*; *dūṄ* = *dūnaḥ/dūnavān*; *dīṄ* = *dīnaḥ/dīnavān*; *ḍīṄ* = *ḍīnaḥ/ḍīnavān*; *dhīṄ* = *dhīnaḥ/dhīnavān*; *mīṄ* = *mīnaḥ/mīnavān*; *rīṄ* = *rīṇaḥ/rīṇavān*; *līṄ* = *līnaḥ/līnavān*; *vrīṄ* = *vrīṇaḥ/vrīṇavān*.

8.2.46 क्षियो दीर्घात्

kṣiyo dīrghāt
/kṣiyaḥ 5/1 *dīrghāt* 5/1/
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)
kṣiyo dhātor dīrghād uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakāra ādeśo bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after the long vowel of verbal root *kṣi* 'to decay' is replaced with *n*.

EXAMPLES:

kṣīṇāḥ kleśāḥ 'miseries are over'
kṣīṇo jālmaḥ 'this wretched one is finished (anger)'
kṣīṇas tapasvī 'this ascetic is thin (pity)'

1. This specification of verbal root *kṣi* is made with its *i* replaced with *iyAṄ* in *kṣiyaḥ*. Since this specification can easily refer to *kṣi* ending in a long *ī*, the use of the word *dīrghāt* is not necessary. If the specification intended a short *i*, Pāṇini should have said *kṣeḥ*, blocking *iyAṄ* with *guṇa* of 7.3.111 *gher ṅiti* on the basis of *paratva* (1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe . . .*). Since it is only appropriate to imitate a form which may facilitate lengthening, a short thus must be the form of reference with *iyAṄ*. *Kāśikā* states that *iyAṄ* refers here to *kṣi* ending in a short *i*. How come such a short specification for *ji*, made with *jeḥ*, was not made with *jiyaḥ* in 1.3.19 *viparābhyāṃ jeḥ*? That rule refers to *ji* in general, and not to an imitation of its form in particular (*Kāś*: . . . *jirūpasāmānyānukaraṇaṃ draṣṭavyam*).

Note that, in the absence of any qualification (*viśeṣānupādānāt*), *kṣi* refers to both *kṣi* 'to decay' and *kṣi* 'to move, dwell'. Incidentally, *t* is replaced with *n* when *i* of *kṣi* is replaced with *dīrgha* 'long' (6.4.60 *niṣṭhāyām aṇyadarthe*). This, of course, happens when the *niṣṭhā* suffix does not denote the sense of *ṆyaT*, i.e., *bhāva* 'root-sense' and *karman* 'object'.

2. Why do we have the condition of *dīrghāt* 'after a long vowel'? Consider *akṣitam*, of *akṣitam asi māmekṣeṣṭhāḥ*, where *akṣita*, combined after the negative *naÑ*, is a derivate of *Kta* introduced after *kṣi* signifying *bhāva* 'root-sense'.

8.2.47 श्योऽस्पर्शे

śyo' sparśe
/śyaḥ 5/1 *asparśe* 7/1 = *na sparśaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)
śyāyater uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasyāsparśe nakāra ādeśo bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal root *śyaiṄ* 'to be coagulated' is replaced with *n*, provided *sparśa* 'touch' is not the signification.

EXAMPLES:

śīnaṃ ghṛtam 'coagulated ghee'
śīnaṃ medaḥ 'coagulated marrow'
śīnā vasā 'coagulated fat'

1. Note that the *ai* of *śyaiṄ* goes through a replacement in *ā* (6.1.45 *ādeca upadeśe . . .*). The *y* then goes through *samprasāraṇa* (6.1.24 *dravamūrttisparśayoḥ śyaḥ*). Thus, *śyai*(*Ṅ*) + (*K*)*ta* → *śy*(*ai*→*ā*) + *ta* → *ś*(*y*→*i*)*ā* + *ta* = *ś*(*i*+*ā*) + *ta*. Rule 6.1.107 *samprasāraṇāc ca* then has the sequence *i*+*ā* replaced with *i* (*pūravūpa*). The short *i* is then replaced with its long counterpart (6.4.60 *niṣṭhāyām aṇyadarthe*). Our present rule, of course, replaces the *t* with *n*. Thus, *ś*(*i*+*ā*→*i*) + (*t*→*n*)*a* = *śīna* + *sU* = *śīnaḥ*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *asparśe* 'when *sparśa* 'touch' is not the signification'? Consider *śītaṃ vartate* 'it is cold' and *śītaṃ vāyuḥ* 'wind has

cooled', where the signification is either *bhāva* 'root-sense' or *karman* 'object', respectively. Note that, in *śītaṃ vāyuḥ*, the idea of *sparśa* 'touch' is secondary (*guṇabhūtaḥ*). It still serves as the condition for blocking *n*-replacement of *t* (*natva-pratiṣedha*) and *samprasāraṇa*. How could a secondary or non-principal (*apradhāna*) serve as a condition for an operational principal (*pradhāna*; (*PŚ* 106): *pradhānāpradhānayoḥ pradhāne kāryasampratyayaḥ*)? The negation in *asparśe* is not interpreted here as *paryudāsa*, i.e., *sparśād anyad dravyam* 'something other than 'touch' '. It is interpreted as *prasajya*, instead. Consequently, negation of *n*-replacement can be accomplished even when there is slightest possibility of 'touch' (*Nyāsa*: . . . *prasajyapratiṣedhaḥ. tena yatra sparśagandho' sti tatra tadāśrayeṇa natvapratiṣedhena bhavitavyam. asti ca guṇabhūtaḥ sparśaḥ, tena tadāśrayo natvapratiṣedho bhavaty eva*). Besides, Pāṇini has disregarded the principle of 2.2.34 *alpāc taram* in placing *sparśa* at the end in 6.1.24 *dravamūrttisparśayoḥ*. . . . This, in turn, indicates that negation can be blocked even when *sparśa* is secondary.

3. Note that *sparśa* is also used with the signification of *roga* 'affliction'. However, negation of *n*-replacement (*natva*) applies only when the signification is 'quality (of touch)'. That is why, we get the non-negation of *natva* in *pratiśīnaḥ*, thereby meaning 'affliction'.

8.2.48 अञ्चोऽनपादाने

añco' napādāne
/añcaḥ 5/1 *anapādāne* 7/1 = *na apādānam* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)
añcater uttarapadasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakārādeśo bhavati na ced apādānaṃ tatra bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal root *añcU* 'to bend, curve' is replaced with *n*, provided an *apādāna* 'ablative' is not used in connection with it.

EXAMPLES:

samaknau śakuneḥ pādau 'a bow-legged bird'
tasmāt paśavo nyaknāḥ 'that is why animals are bent'

1. This rule allows *n* as a replacement for *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix when the same occurs after *añcU* and there is no connection with any *apādāna* 'ablative'. Note that there is no possibility of an *apādāna* in the context of *añcU*. Why? Because the possibility of a *kāraka* exists only in relation to an action denoted by the root (*Nyāsa*: *na hy añcatāv apādānatvaṃ sambhavati, kiṃ tarhi? tadarthe kriyāviṣayatvāt kārakāṇām*). Why do we then have the negation of *anapādāne* 'when the context is not of an *apādāna*'? Consider *udaktam udakaṃ kūpāt* 'water was lifted from the water-well', where *udakta* is a form of verbal root *añjU* 'to take out, draw'.

Note that *nyakna* is derived from *ni-añc*(*U*→ϕ) = *n*(*i*→*y*)*-añc* + (*K*→ϕ) *ta* → *nyañc* + *ta*, where *ñ* of *añc* is deleted by 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala. . . .* Our present rule then replaces the *t* of *ny-a*(*ñ*→ϕ) *c* + (*t*→*n*) *a* = *ny-ac* + *na* with *n*. Rule 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ* then replaces *c* with *k* to yield *ny-a*(*c*→*k*) + *na* → *ny-ak* + *na* = *nyakna*.

8.2.49 दिवोऽविजिगीषायाम्

divo' vijigīṣāyām
/*divaḥ* 5/1 *avijigīṣāyām* 7/1 = *na vijigīṣā*
(*nañ. tat.*), *tasyām*/ (*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)
diva uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakāra ādeśo bhavati avijigīṣāyām arthe
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal root *div* 'to sport, play' is replaced with *n*, provided *vijigīṣā* 'wish to win' is not denoted.

EXAMPLES:

ādyūnaḥ 'savoring a meal by rubbing the belly'
paridyūnaḥ 'sad, miserable; weak'

1. Consider (*ā-div* + (*K*) *ta*) + *sU* = *ādyūnaḥ* and *pari-div* + (*K*) *ta*) + *sU* = *paridyūnaḥ*, where augment *ūṬH* is introduced by 6.4.19 *ccvoḥ śuḍ anunāsike*. Thus, *ā-di*(*v*→*ū*(*ṬH*)) + *ta* → *ā- d*(*i*→*y*) *ū* + *ta* → *ā-dyū* + (*t*→*n*) *a* → *ā-dyūna* + *sU* → *ā-dyūnaḥ*. We similarly get *paridyūnaḥ*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *avijigīṣāyām* 'when desire to win is not denoted'? Consider *div* + (*K*) *ta* = *dyūta* in *dyūtaṃ vartate*. We do not get a replacement in *n* since what is denoted here is 'gambling with a desire to win'. *Kāśikā* states that it is the desire to win which makes a gambler to throw dice to fall the way they should.

8.2.50 निर्वाणोऽवाते

nirvāṇo avāte
/*nirvāṇaḥ* 1/1 *avāte* 7/1 = *na vātaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*/
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)
'nirvāṇaḥ' iti nispūrvād vāter uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakāro nipātyate, na ced vātādhikaraṇo vātyartho bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal root *vā*, used with the preverb *nis*, is replaced with *n* to derive *nirvāṇa*, provided the derivate does not denote *vāta* 'wind'.

EXAMPLES:

nirvāṇo' gniḥ 'the fire is extinguished'
nirvāṇaḥ pradīpaḥ 'the lamp is extinguished'
eṣa nirvāṇo bhikṣuḥ 'this ascetic is at peace
(with his worldly attachments, etc.); passed away'

1. Consider *nirvāṇaḥ pradīpaḥ* where the action means *upaśama* 'extinction'. *Kāśikā* explains *avāte* as *na ced vātādhikaraṇo vātyartho bhavati* 'when *vāta* 'wind' is not the locus (*adhikaraṇa*) of action denoted by verbal root *vā*'. That is, *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix used after *vā* cannot be replaced with *n* if *vāta* 'wind' serves as locus of action denoted by *upaśama* 'control, extinction, tranquility'. Consider (*nir-vā* + (*t*→*n*) *a*)) + *sU*→ *nirvāṇaḥ* of *nirvāṇaḥ pradīpaḥ*, where this replacement is allowed since *pradīpa* 'lamp', and not the wind (*vāta*), is locus of *upaśama*. The ascetic's tranquility in *nirvāṇo bhikṣuḥ* can be identified as 'full control of senses'.

Now consider *nirvāto vātaḥ* and *nirvāto vātena*, where *vāta* 'wind' serves as locus of action denoted by verbal root *vā*. There is no replacement in *n* (*natva*). But consider *nirvāṇaḥ pradīpo vātena* 'the lamp is extinguished by the wind', where 'lamp' serves as locus of action denoted by *vā* 'to move'. The 'wind' (*vāta*) serves as the *karaṇa* 'instrument'. Consequently, we have a replacement in *ṇ*.

8.2.51 **शुषः कः**

śuṣaḥ kaḥ
/*śuṣaḥ* 5/1 *kaḥ* 1/1/
(*niṣṭhātaḥ* #42)
śuṣer dhātor uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakāra ādeśo bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal root *śuṣA* 'to dry' is replaced with *k*.

EXAMPLES:

śuṣkaḥ 'derivate of (*śuṣ* + *Kta*) + *sU* 'dry' '
śuṣkavān 'derivate of *śuṣ* + *KtavatU* + *sU*'

1. This rule replaces the *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix with *k* when the same occurs after verbal root *śuṣA* 'to dry'. Consider *śuṣ* + (*K*) *ta* → (*śuṣ* + (*t*→*k*) *a*) + *sU*)) = *śuṣkaḥ* and (*śuṣka* + *KtavatU*) + *sU* → *śuṣkavān*. Recall that *t* should have been replaced with *ṭ* (*ṣṭutva*). This rule offers *k*, instead.

2. Why can this *śuṣka* not be accomplished by *nipātana* of 6.1.203 *śuṣkadhṛṣṭau*? A *k*-replacement, via *nipātana*, will make the *i*-replacement of (*a*→*i*) (7.3.46 *udīcām ātaḥ* . . .) of *śuṣkikā* optional before *y* or *k* of an affix. It will also cause negation of masculine transformation in *śuṣkajaṅghā* (*puṃvadbhāva*) by 6.3.37 *na kopadhāyāḥ*. These two things do not happen if this *k*-replacement is accepted. It will be treated as *asiddha* in consideration of *śuṣkikā* and *śuṣkajaṅghā* (*Nyāsa*: . . . *iha tu kakārasya vidhāne sati tasyāsiddhatvād etad ubhayaṃ na bhavati*).

8.2.52 **पचो वः**

paco vaḥ

/pacaḥ 5/1 *vaḥ* 1/1/
(*niṣṭhātaḥ* #42)
pacer dhātor uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya vakārādeśo bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal root *pac* 'to cook' is replaced with *v*.

EXAMPLES:

pakvaḥ 'derivate of (*pac* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
pakvavān 'derivate of (*pac* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*)'

1. Why can this replacement not be accomplished under the *nipātana* provision of rule 2.1.41 *siddhaśuṣkapakvabandhaiś ca*)? Our present rule is needed since *pakvavān* cannot be accounted for by the said *nipātana*. Why then include *pakvaḥ* as an example here? A rule formulated for something different, for example *pakvavān*, can also account for *pakva* (*Nyāsa*: *anyārthaṃ cārabhyamāṇaṃ pakva ity etad artharūpam api bhavatīti . . . nipātanadvāreṇa tadvyutpattau pratipattigauravaṃ syād ity abhiprāyaḥ*). That is, understanding *pakvaḥ*, via *nipātana*, and *pakvavān* by this rule will be prolix (*gaurava*).

8.2.53 क्षायो मः

kṣāyo maḥ
/kṣāyaḥ 5/1 *maḥ* 1/1/
(*niṣṭhātaḥ* #42)
kṣaidhātor uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya makārādeśo bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal root *kṣai* 'to dry up, decay, be scorched' is replaced with *m*.

EXAMPLES:

kṣāṃaḥ 'derivate of (*kṣai* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
kṣāmavān 'derivate of (*kṣai* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'

1. Recall that *ai* is replaced with *ā* (*ātva*) of 6.1.45 *ādeca upadeśe' śiti*.

8.2.54 प्रस्त्योऽन्यतरस्याम्

prastyo' nyatarasyām
/prastyaḥ 5/1 = *prapūrvaḥ styāḥ* = *prastyāḥ* (*tat.*), *tasmāt*; *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*niṣṭhātaḥ* #42 *maḥ* #53)
prapūrvāt styāyater uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya anyatarasyāṃ makārādeśo bhavati
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal root *styai* 'crowd together, noise', used with the preverb *pra*, is replaced with *m*, only optionally.

EXAMPLES:

prastīmaḥ 'derivate of (*pra-stai* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
prastītaḥ 'ibidem'
prastīmavān 'derivate of (*pra-stai* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
prastītavān 'ibidem'

1. This rule optionally replaces the *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix with *m* when the same occurs after *stai*, used with the preverb *pra*. Here again, the *ai* of *stai* is replaced with *ā* (*ātva*) of 6.1.45 *ādeca upadeśe*. . . . Refer to derivational details of examples under 6.1.23 *styaḥ prapūrvasya*.

Note that a replacement in *n* (8.2.43 *saṃyogāder dhātor*. . .) will apply if this optional replacement in *m* is not accepted. But this will then produce undesired forms **prastīnaḥ*, **prastīnavān*, etc. How can one block the application of 8.2.43 *saṃyogāder*. . . ? By treating it as *asiddha* in view of applying *samprasāraṇa* on *styā*. This will give us *styā* + *ta* → *st*(*y*→*i*) *ā* + *ta* → *st*(*i*+*ā*→*i*) + *ta* → *st*(*i*→*ī*) + *ta*. Rule 8.2.43 *saṃyogāder dhātor*. . . will now have its condition of application removed. A replacement in *n* for *t* of *ta* is thus not possible (*Kāś*: *yadā matvaṃ nāsti tadā 'saṃyogāder āto dhātor yaṇvataḥ' ity asya pūrvatrāsiddhatvāt samprasāraṇaṃ prathamaṃ kriyate. tatra kṛte nimittavyāghātān natvaṃ na bhavati*). For, the condition of replacement, i.e., ending in *ā* and containing a sound denoted by *yaṆ*, is not met.

8.2.55 अनुपसर्गात् फुल्लक्षीबकृशोल्लाघाः

anupasargāt phullakṣībakṛśollāghāḥ
/*anupasargāt* 5/1 = *na upasargaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmāt*; *phulla-kṣība-kṛśa-ullāghāḥ* 1/3 (*itar. dv.*)/
(*niṣṭhātaḥ* #42)
'*phulla, kṣība, kṛśa, ullāgha*' *ity ete nipātyante, na ced upasargād uttarā bhavanti*
Forms such as *phulla*, *kṣība*, *kṛśa* and *ullāgha* are derived, via *nipātana*, provided they do not occur used after a preverb.

EXAMPLES:

phullaḥ 'blossomed'
kṣībaḥ 'drunk'
kṛśaḥ 'emaciated'
ullāghaḥ 'clever'

1. These forms should be accepted as derived. Obviously, there are problems in deriving them with regular rule applications. Thus, *phal* + (*K*) *ta* → *ph*(*a*→*u*) *l* + (*K*) *ta* → *phul* + (*t*→*l*) *a* → *phulla*, where *u* replaces the *a* of *phal* (7.4.88 *ut parasyātaḥ*) and 7.2.16 *āditaś ca* blocks augment *iṬ*. What is accomplished here, via *nipātana*, is *l*-replacement of *t* of (*K*) *ta*. We similarly derive

phullavān. Now consider *kṣībR̥* + (*K*) *ta*, *kṛś* + (*K*) *ta*, *ut-lāgh* + (*K*) *ta*, where *kṣība* is to be derived by deleting *t* of (*K*) *ta* and blocking augment *iṬ* (7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*), again via *nipātana*. We thus get *kṣīb* + (*t*→ϕ) *a* = *kṣība*. If one does not want to delete *t* and block *iṬ*, via *nipātana*, one then has to delete *iṬ*, via *nipātana*. Thus, *kṣīb* + (*K*) *ta* → *kṣīb* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + (*K*) *ta* → *kṣīb* (*i*+*t*→ϕ) *a* → *kṣīb* + *a* = *kṣība*. Similar applications can be seen in deriving *kṛśaḥ* and *u*(*t*→*d*→*l*)*-lāgh* + (*K*) *ta* → *ullāgh* + (*t*→ϕ) *a* = *ullāgha* + *sU* → *ullāghaḥ*.

2. Notice that *ullāghaḥ* does not meet the condition of *anupasargāt* 'when not used after a preverb'. An exception to the use of *ut* before *lāgh* is made so that *ullāghaḥ* can be derived.

Why do we state this condition of *anupasargāt*? Consider *praphultāḥ sumanasaḥ*, *prakṛśitaḥ* and *prollāghitaḥ*, where *t* of (*K*) *ta* cannot be deleted because the roots are used with a prevrb. Notice that augment *iṬ* is also introduced in these examples.

2. A *vārttika* proposal is made to also include *utphullaḥ* and *samphullaḥ* in the listing of words derived, via *nipātana* (*vt. utphullasamphullayor iti vaktavyam*).

How can one derive *parikṛśaḥ* where *kṛś* is used with the preverb *pari*. This goes against the condition of *anupasargāt*. Actually, *pari* is not an *upasarga* in relation to *kṛś*. It is a preverb in relation to another verbal root, namely *gam* 'to go', whose action is understood (*gamanakriyā-nirūpita-upasargatva*). Thus, *parigato kṛśaḥ* = *parikṛśaḥ* (*Kāś. parikṛśa ity atra yaḥ pariśabdaḥ sa kriyāntarayogāt kṛśiṃ praty anupasarga eva*).

8.2.56 नुदविदोन्दत्राघ्राह्रीभ्योऽन्यतरस्याम्

nudavidondatrāghrāhrībhyo' nyatarasyām
/ *nuda-vidonda-trā-ghrā-hrībhyaḥ* 5/3 = *nudaś ca vidaś ca undaś ca trāś ca ghrāś ca hrīś ca* = *nuda . . . hriyaḥ* (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ*; *anyatarasyām* 7/1/ (*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)
'*nuda, vida, undī, trā, ghrā, hrī' ity etebhya uttarasya nīṣṭhātakārasya nakāra ādeśo bhavati anyatarasyām*
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal roots *nudA* 'to move, impel', *vidA* 'to consider', *undĪ* 'to be wet', *trā* 'to protect', *ghrā* 'to smell' and *hrī* 'to feel shy' is, optionally, replaced with *n*.

EXAMPLES:

nunnaḥ 'impelled'
nuttaḥ 'ibidem'
vinnaḥ 'considered'
vittaḥ 'ibidem'
samunnaḥ 'thoroughly wet'
samuttaḥ 'ibidem'
trāṇaḥ 'protected; protection'

trātaḥ 'ibidem'
ghrāṇaḥ 'smelled; smell'
ghrātaḥ 'ibidem'
hrīṇaḥ 'shy'
hrītaḥ 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers *n* as an optional replacement for *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix when the same occurs after verbal roots *nudA* 'to inspire, impel', *vidA* 'to consider, think', *undA* 'to wet, dampen', *trā* 'to protect', *ghrā* 'to smell' and *hrī* 'to feel shy'. This replacement in *n* is not made available (*aprāpta*) to *hrī* by any rule. The other roots have this made available to them obligatorily (*nityam*; 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto . . .*; 8.2.43 *saṃyogāder āto . . .*). This rule makes it optional. A specification with *vidA* is made here for verbal root *vida vicāraṇe* 'to consider, think'. Consider the following verse:

vettes tu vidito niṣṭhā vidyater vinna iṣyate/
vinter vinnaś ca vittaś ca bhogavittaś ca vindateḥ//
'*vid* 'to know', because of an obligatory *iṬ*, has *vidita* in *niṣṭhā*; a replacement in *n* is desired after *vid* 'to exist' to derive *vinna*; two forms, i.e., *vinna* and *vitta*, are desired for *vid* 'to consider' with optional *n*-replacement; *vitta* (of *bhogavitta*) is the desired form of *vid* 'to gain''

8.2.57 न ध्याख्यापॄमूर्च्छिमदाम्

na dhyākhyāpṝmūrcchimadām
/ na ϕ dhyā-khyā-pṝ-mūrcchi-madām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)
'*dhyā, khyā, pṝ, mūrcchi, mada*' *ity eteṣāṃ niṣṭhātakārasya nakārādeśo na bhavati*
The *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal roots *dhyā* (*dhyai*) 'to concentrate, meditate', *khyā* 'to relate, proclaim', *pṝ* 'to fill', *mūrcchI* 'to solidify, congeal' and *madA* 'to be exhilarated, be happy' is not replaced with *n*.

EXAMPLES:

dhyātaḥ 'derivate of (*dhyai* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
dhyātavān 'derivate of (*dhyai* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
khyātaḥ 'derivate of (*khyā* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
khyātavān 'derivate of (*khyā* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
pūrtaḥ 'derivate of (*pṝ* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
pūrttavān 'derivate of (*pṝ* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
mūrttaḥ 'derivate of (*mūrcch* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
mūrttavān 'derivate of (*mūrcch* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'
mattaḥ 'derivate of (*mad* + *Kta*) + *sU*'
mattavān 'derivate of (*mad* + *KtavatU*) + *sU*'

1. This rule negates a replacement in *n* for the *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after *dhyai* 'to concentrate', *khyā* 'to relate, tell', *pṝ* 'to fill, nourish', *mūrcchI* 'solidify, congeal, faint' and *madI* 'to be happy, exhilarated'. A specification with *khyā* also includes references to *khyā*, a replacement of *cakṣIṄ* (2.4.54 *cakṣiṅaḥ khyāñ*). How could *khyā* also refer to *khyā*-replacement of *cakṣIṄ* against *Paribhāṣā* (82): *niranubandhakagrahaṇe na sānubandhakasya* 'a specification made without an *it* does not also refer to a form used with an *it*'? No problem. This interpretive convention cannot apply here. Recall that a specification such as *radābhyām* (8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto . . .*) has appropriately been made with the ablative to indicate that *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix follows. A similar specification in the ablative should have also been made here. But we have the specification made here with the genitive. A specification made with genitive in the context of one made with the ablative thus denotes a relatum in general. The genitive of roots such as *khyā* must denote its relatum in general (*Nyāsa:. iha hi niṣṭhātakārasya paratvapratipādane pañcamī yuktā, yathā radābhyām iti. tatra pañcamīnirdeśe kartavye yaḥ ṣaṣṭhīnirdeśaḥ kriyate sa sambandhasāmānyaṃ pratipādayitum*). The *khyā* of this rule must also denote the *khyā*-replacement of *cakṣiṄ*.

2. This negation of *n*-replacement is made against positive provisions made by 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto . . .* and 8.2.43 *saṃyogāder āto . . .* (*Kāś*: '*radābhyām . . .*', '*saṃyogādeḥ . . .*' *iti ca prāptaḥ pratiṣidhyate*). Consider *dhy*(*ai*→*ā*) + (*K*)*ta* → *dhyāta* + *sU* = *dhyātaḥ, dhyātavān; khyātaḥ, khyātavān,* etc. Note that augment *iṬ* is negated in (*pṝ* + (*K*)*ta*) + *sU* → *pūrttaḥ* by 7.2.11 *śryukaḥ kiti*. A doubling of *t* is accomplished in consonance with 8.4.45 *aco rahābhyāṃ dve*. The *ṝ*, in turn, is replaced with *u* by 7.1.102 *ud oṣṭhyapūrvasya*. A long replacement (8.2.27 *hali ca*) for the short *u* then follows. Augment *iṬ* is similarly negated (7.2.16 *āditaś ca*) in *mūrtaḥ*. The *ch* of *murch* is deleted by 6.4.21 *rāl lopaḥ*. This, in turn, makes 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto . . .* applicable. Augment *iṬ* is negated in *mattaḥ* by 7.2.14 *śvīdito niṣṭhāyām*.

8.2.58 वित्तो भोगप्रत्यययोः

vitto bhogapratyayayoḥ
/vittaḥ 1/1 *bhoga-pratyayayoḥ* 7/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42 *na* #57)
'*vitta*' *iti vider lābhārthād uttarasya ktasya natvābhāvo nipātyate bhoge pratyaye cābhidheye*
The word *vitta* is derived, via *nipātana*, when *bhoga* 'possession, consumption' and *pratyaya* 'knowledge, belief' are denoted.

EXAMPLES:

vittam asya bahu 'his wealth is bountiful'
vitto' yaṃ manuṣyaḥ 'this man is knowlegeable'

1. This rule negates a replacement in *n* for the *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after *vid* 'to gain'. Of course, when the derivate is to denote *bhoga* 'possession, consumption' and *pratīti* 'knowledge, belief'. This *n*-replacement was made available by 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto. . . .*

8.2.59 भित्तं शकलम्

bhittaṃ śakalam
/bhittam 1/1 *śakalam* 1/1/
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42 *na* #57)
'*bhittam*' *ity nipātyate* '*śakalam*' *ced bhavati*
The word *bhitta* is derived, via *nipātana*, when the signification is *śakala* 'piece, chip, fragment'.

EXAMPLES:

bhittaṃ tiṣṭhati 'a piece is there'
bhittaṃ prapatati 'a piece is falling'

1. This rule negates a replacement in *n* for the *t* of a *niṣṭhā* suffix which occurs after verbal root *bhidIR* 'to split', provided the derivate denotes *śakala* 'piece, chip, fragment'. This *n* was, again, made available as a replacement for *t*, on account of occurring after *d* (8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto . . .*). How does *bhitta* 'split' mean *śakala*? It is synonymous with *śakala* 'piece' when used as a qualifier. Thus, *bhittam śakalam* 'chipped'.

8.2.60 ऋणमाधमर्ण्ये

ṛṇam ādhamarṇye
/ṛṇam 1/1 *ādhamarṇye* 7/1 = *adhamaḥ ṛṇe* = *adhamarṇaḥ* (*sapt. tat.*; *ṛṇa* postposed via *nipātana* by this rule); *adhamarṇasya bhāvaḥ* = *ādhamarṇaḥ*, *tasmin* (a derivate of *SyaÑ*)/
(*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42)
'*ṛṇam*' *iti* '*ṛ*' *ity etasmād dhātor uttarasya niṣṭhātakārasya nakāro nipātyate ādhamarṇya viṣaye*
The word *ṛṇa* is derived, via *nipātana*, when *ādhamarṇya* 'state of being in debt' is signified.

EXAMPLES:

ṛṇaṃ dadāti '. . . pays off a debt'
ṛṇaṃ dhārayati '. . . incurs a debt'

1. This rule supports *n*-replacement for *t* of (*K*) *ta* to derive *ṛ* + (*K*) *ta* → *ṛ* + (*t*→*n*) *a* → *ṛ*(*n*→) *a* = *ṛṇa*, via *nipātana*. The derivate must, however, signify *ādhamarṇya* 'state of being in debt; debtor'. A *ṇ*-replacement (*ṇatva*) of *t*→*n* = *n* is accomplished by a *vārttika* (*vt. ṛvarnāc ceti . . .*; 8.4.1 *raṣābhyāṃ ṇo naḥ . . .*).

Note that *adhamaḥ ṛṇe* = *adhamarṇaḥ* 'he whose status is inferior in debt' is a locative *tatpuruṣa* compound where its first member, i.e., *adhamaḥ* 'inferior', does not end in the locative. This *nipātana* indicates that such compounds can still be formed.

2. Why do we have the condition of *ādhamarṇye* 'when state of being in debt is signified'? Consider *ṛtam* of *ṛtam vakṣyāmi nānṛtam* 'I speak truth, never non-truth', where this replacement is not allowed. If the etymology of *ṛṇa* 'debt' will relate only to *adhamarṇa* then how would one derive *uttamarṇa*. We, in fact, should derive **uttamartta*. We can derive *uttamarṇa* by way of exchange of the debt at some other time. That is, in a manner similar to: *ṛṇaṃ dadāti* = *ṛṇaṃ dhārayati*.

8.2.61 नसत्तनिषत्तानुत्तप्रतूर्तसूर्तगूर्तानि छन्दसि

nasattaniṣattānuttapratūrtasūrtagūrtāni chandasi
/ *nasatta-niṣatta-anutta-pratūrtta-sūrta-gūrtāni* 1/3 (*itar. dv.*); *chandasi* 7/1/ (*niṣṭhāto naḥ* #42 *na* #57)
'*nasatta, niṣatta, anutta, pratūrtta, sūrta, gūrta*' *ity etānī chandasi visaye nipātyante*
Forms such as *nasatta* 'not seated', *niṣatta* 'seated', *anutta* 'invincible, not cast down', *pratūrtta* 'rapid, swift', *sūrta* 'trodden' and *gūrta* 'approved, strived' are derived, via *nipātana*, in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

nasattam añjasā
niṣattamásya carátaḥ
anúttamā té maghavan
pratūrtam vājinam
sūrtā gāvaḥ
gūrttā amṛtasya

1. This rule derives *na*(*Ñ*)-*ṣad*(*L*) + (*K*) *ta* → *nasatta*, *ni*-*ṣadL*+ (*K*) *ta* → *niṣatta*, *an*-*undI* + (*K*) *ta* → *anutta*, *pra*-(*ÑI*) *tvar* + (*K*) *ta* → *pratūrtta*, *sṛ* + (*K*) *ta* → *sūrtta* and *gurī* + (*K*) *ta* → *gūrtta*, via *nipātana*, in the Vedic. All examples qualify for a replacement in *n* for *t* of their *Kta* (cf. 8.2.42 *radābhyām* . . .). Recall that *ṣ* of *ṣadL* 'to sit' is replaced with *s* by 6.1.62 *dhātvādeḥ ṣaḥ saḥ*. The *s* of *nisatta* is replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣatva*) by 8.3.66 *sadir aprateḥ*. The *n* of verbal root *undI* 'to be wet' goes through deletion of 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala*. . . . Its *d*, as usual, will go through a replacement in *t* (*cartva*). The *va* of *tvar* 'to hurry' will be replaced with *ūṬH* (6.4.20 *jvaratvara* . . .). If one derives *pratūrtta* from *turv*(*Ī*) + (*K*) *ta*, *v* will be deleted (6.4.21 *rāl lopaḥ*) and *u* will be replaced with its long counterpart (8.2.77 *hali ca*). The *ṛ* of *sṛ* 'to move' in *sūrtta* is replaced with *u*, via *nipātana*. It is then replaced with its long counterpart.

Since this absence of *n*-replacement for *t* applies to the Vedic, we find examples such as *nasanna, niṣaṇṇa, anunna, pratūrṇa, sṛta* and *gūrṇa* in the classical language.

8.2.62 क्विन्प्रत्ययस्य कुः

kvinpratyayasya kuḥ
/ kvinpratyayasya 6/1 = *kvin pratyayo yasmād dhātoḥ* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *kuḥ* 1/1/ (*padasya* #16)
kvinpratyayasya padasyālo' ntyasya kavargādeśo bhavati
The final sound segment of a *pada* which ends in affix *KvIN* is replaced with a sound denoted by a consonant of *k*-series (*kU*).

EXAMPLES:

ghṛtaspṛk 'touching ghee'
halaspṛk 'touching plow'
mantraspṛk 'invoking a mantra'

1. This rule requires a replacement in *kU* 'consonant of *k*-series' for the final sound segment (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) of a *pada* which ends in affix *KvIN*. Refer to derivational details of *ghṛtaspṛk* under the appendix of 1.2.41 *apṛkta ekāl* . . . (II:446-47). Other examples can be similarly derived. Thus,

kvinpratyayasya sarvatra padānte kutvam iṣyate/
kvinaḥ kur iti vaktavye pratyayagrahaṇaṃ kṛtam/ /
'a replacement in *kU* for affix *KvIN* is desired, everywhere, at the end of a *pada*; the word *pratyaya* is used with *KvIN* in stating *kU* as a replacement for *KvIN*'

2. Why was the word *pratyaya* 'affix' used in *kvinpratyayasya* 'of affix *KvIN*'? Why qualify *KvIN* with *pratyayasya* when there is no possibility of *KvIN* ever being anything different (*Nyāsa*: *na hi kvin pratyayatvaṃ vyabhicarati*)? The word *kvinpratyayasya* is interpreted as a *bahuvrīhi* compound paraphrased as: *kvinpratyayaḥ yasmād dhātoḥ sa = kvinpratyayaḥ* 'a root after which affix *KvIN* is introduced'; *tasya dhātor alo' ntyasya kavargādeśo bhavati* 'a consonant of the *k*-series comes in place of the final sound segment of that root (after which *KvIN* is introduced)'. One should not doubt here that this *kU*-replacement will block deletion of *KvIN* (6.1.67 *ver apṛktasya*). That is, one should not understand that *v* of *KvIN* will be replaced with *gh*, its counterpart denoted by *kU*. It is to block this *kU*-replacement of affix *KvIN* that a *bahuvrīhi* with *pratyayasya* is used in this rule. A specification made without the use of *pratyayasya* would have replaced *v* with *gh*. If this specification was intended for simply replacing *v* with *gh*, its specification with a replacement in *kU* will then become useless. For, a specification such as *kU* is made in view of more than one substitute for more than one item to be replaced (*PM*: *evaṃ hi*

vargagrahaṇam anarthakaṃ syāt. anekasya sthānino' nekādeśapratipattaye hi vargagrahaṇam). To sum up, *pratyayasya*, is used for availing a *bahuvrīhi* interpretation.

This interpretational use of a *bahuvrīhi* compound also has other implications. As the *bahuvrīhi* compound *citraguḥ* of *citragur ānīyatām* 'let one whose cows are brindled be brought' implies bringing of someone other than 'brindled cows', this same way a root ending in an affix different from affix *KvIN* can also form the focus of this replacement (*Kāś. kvinpratyayo yasmād vihitas tasmād anyasminn api pratyaye kutvaṃ yathā syāt*). Consider *asrāk* and *adrāk* of *mā no* (*asrāk/ adrāk*), where verbal roots *sṛj* and *dṛś* are used with *LUṄ→tiP*. Thus, *a(Ṭ) + sṛj + (CLI→sIC) + ti → a + sṛ(aM)j + tiP → a + s(ṛ→r)aj + ti → asr(a→ā)j + ti → asrāj + (ti→ϕ) → asrā(j→k) = asrāk*. Affix *LUṄ* is introduced after *sṛj* in consonance with 3.3.175 *māṅi luṅ*. Introduction of augment *aM* (6.1.58 *sṛjidṛśor . . .*), deletion of *ti* (3.4.100 *itaś ca*; 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*) and *vṛddhi* of *a* of *asraj* (7.2.3 *vadavrajahalantasyācaḥ*) are additional applications. Note that, in the Vedic, we find *aṬ* even when *LUṄ* is not used in association with *māṄ*. We similalry also do not get augment *iṬ*. This can be explained in view of *bahulaṃ chandasi* 'variously in the Vedic'. The *g*-replacement of *j* of *asrāj* is finally replaced with *k* (*cartva*) of 8.4.56 *vāvasāne*. Recall that *k* of *asrāk* cannot be replaced with *ṣ*. For, *k* (*kutva*) cannot be treated as *asiddha* in view of replacement in *ṣ*. For, this replacement in *kU* will then become useless. This same can be said about *dṛgbhyām* and *dṛgbhiḥ* where *KvIP* occurs after *dṛś* and replacement in *kU* is accomplished. We need a counter-proposal (*Kāś. prativídhānaṃ kartavyam*) to facilitate blocking of undesired *ṣ*-replacement of 8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjasṛj . . .*, in *rajjusṛḍbhyām*.

8.2.63 नशेर्वा

naśer vā
/naśeḥ 5/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *kuḥ* #62)
naśeṇ padasya vā kavargādeśo bhavati
The final sound segment of a *pada* constituted by *naś* is optionally replaced with *kU*.

EXAMPLES:

sā vai jīvanag āhutiḥ
sā vai jīvanaḍ āhutiḥ

1. This rule optionally replaces the final (1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*) sound segment of *naś* 'to perish' with a consonant of the *k*-series (*kU*). Consider *ṇaś + KvIP = naś*, where *KvIP* is introduced (*vt.* (3.3.94): *sampadādibhyaḥ kvip*) with the signification of *bhāva*. The *ś* is optionally replaced with *k*, or with *ṣ* (8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjsṛj . . .*), after deletion of *KvIP*. This *ṣ* is then replaced with *ḍ* (*jaśtva*;

8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*). An application of 8.4.56 *vāvasāne* finally produces *na*(*ś*→ *ḍ*→*ṭ*) = *naṭ*. We will get *na*(*ś*→*k*) = *nak* if the optional *k* is accepted as a replacement for *ś*. Note that *jīvanak* is a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound paraphrased as *jīvanasya nāśaḥ* = *jīvanasya nak* = *jīvanana*(*ś*→*k*). We will get *jīvanaṭ* if the optional replacement in *ś* is not accepted. An optional *k* (*kutva*) is offered in view of the optional *ṣ* of 8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjsṛj*. . . .

8.2.64 मो नो धातोः

mo no dhātoḥ
/*maḥ* 6/1 *naḥ* 1/1 *dhātoḥ* 6/1/
(*padasya* #1.16)
makārāntasya dhātoḥ padasya nakārādeśo bhavati
The final sound segment of a verbal root which constitutes a *pada* terminating in *m* is replaced with *n*.

EXAMPLES:

praśān 'tranquility'
pratān 'creeper'
pradān 'restraint'

1. Note that *padasya* is also understood here. It is qualified with *m* which, in turn, is in syntactic coordination with *dhātoḥ*. Thus, we get the interpretation: *makārāntasya padasya dhātoḥ* 'of a verbal root constituting a *pada* ending in *m*'. This rule replaces *m* with *n*. We thus get *pra-śam* + *KvIP* = *pra-śa*(*m*→*n*) + (*KvIP*→ϕ) → *pra-ś*(*a*→*ā*)*n* = *praśān*. Similar rules apply in deriving (*pra-dam* + *KvIP*) → *pradān* and (*pra-tam* + *KvIP*) → *pratān*. Recall that a short vowel of these roots is replaced with its long counterpart by 6.4.15 *anunāsikasya kvijhaloḥ*. . . . Why can we not delete the final *n* by 8.2.7 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya*. This *n*-replacement will be considered *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of *n*-deletion (*Kāś*: *natvasyāsiddhatvān nalopo na bhavati*).

2. Why do we have the condition of *maḥ* 'in place of the final *m*. . .? Consider *bhid* and *chid* where we do not get a final *m*.

Why do we have the condition of *dhātoḥ* 'of a verbal root. . .? Consider *idam* and *kim* which end in *m* (*mānta*) but are not a verbal root.

The condition of *padasya* is still valid. Consider *pratāmau* and *pratāmaḥ*, as counter-examples, where *m* is part of a *pada* but does not occur at the end.

8.2.65 म्वोश्च

mvoś ca
/*mvoḥ* 7/2 = *maś ca vaś ca* = *mvau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ca* ϕ/
(*mo no dhātoḥ* #64)
makāravakārayoś ca parataḥ makārāntasya dhātor nakārādeśo bhavati

The *m* of a verbal root which ends in *m* is replaced with *n* when affixes beginning with *m* and *v* follow.

EXAMPLES:

aganma tamasaḥ pāram 'we went across the dark'
aganva 'we (dual) went . . .'
jaganvān 'first person dual *LIṬ*-derivate of *gam* in the Vedic'

1. This rule replaces the final *m* of a verbal root with *n* when affixes beginning with *m* or *v* follow. Consider (*aṬ* + (*gam* + *LAṄ*→*mas*)) → (*agam* + (*ŚaP*→ϕ) + *vas*)) → (*aga*(*m*→*n*) + *mas*) → (*aganma*(*s*→ϕ)) → *aganma* and also *aganva*. Note that *ŚaP* here gets deleted by 2.4.73 *bahulaṃ chandasi*. The *s* of *mas* and *vas* is deleted by 3.4.98 *sa uttamasya*. Refer to *jakṣivān* and *papivān* (II:745) for derivational details of *jaganvān*, a Vedic form where *LIṬ* is replaced with *KvasU* (3.2.107 *kvasuś ca*). Note that 'penultimate deletion' (6.4.98 *gamahanajana . . .*), optional *iṬ* (7.2.68 *vibhāṣā gamahana . . .*) and reduplication (in view of 1.1.59 *dvirvacane' ci*) are important operational steps. We get *jaganvān* from *jaganvas* when optional *iṬ* is not accepted (*Kāś*: '*vibhāṣā gamahanajanavidaviśām' iti kvasāv iḍāgamasyābhāvaḥ*).

2. This rule, unlike the one before, focuses on *m* which does not occur at the end of a *pada* (*Kāś*: *apadāntārtha ārambhaḥ*).

8.2.66 **ससजुषो रुः**

sasajuṣo ruḥ
/*sasajuṣaḥ* 5/1 = *saś ca sajuṣ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ruḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16)
sakārāntasya padasya '*sajuṣ*' *ity etasya ca rur bhavati*
The final *s* of a *pada* which ends in *s*, and also the final *ṣ* of *sajuṣ* 'companion, together with', is replaced with *rU*.

EXAMPLES:

agnir atra 'Agni here'
vāyur atra 'Vāyu here'
sajūr ṛṣibhiḥ 'together with sages'
sajūr devebhiḥ 'together with gods'

1. This rule replaces the final *s* of a *pada*, or the final *ṣ* of *sajuṣ*, with *rU*. Consider *agni* + (*sU*→*rU*) *atra* + *sU* = *agnir atra* and *vāyu* + (*sU*→*rU*) *atra* + *sU* = *vāyur atra*, where the *s* of *sU* after *agni* 'fire' and *vāyu* 'wind' is replaced with *rU*. We similarly get *sajūr ṛṣibhiḥ*, where *sajuṣ* is a compound termed *upapada*, with *KvIP* introduced after *juṣ* under the cooccurrence condition of *saha* 'with'. Thus, *saha juṣate* = (*saha* + *juṣ* + *KvIP* → (*saha*→*sa*) + *juṣ* = *sajuṣ*, where 6.3.73 *sahasya saḥ saṃjñāyām* replaces *saha* with *sa*. Given *sajuṣ* +

ṛṣibhiḥ → *saju*(*ṣ*→*rU*) + *ṛṣibhiḥ*, the *u* of *sajuṣ* is replaced with *ū* (8.2.76 *rvor upadhāyāḥ*). We similarly get *sajūr devebhiḥ*.

2. A specification with *sajuṣ* is made here to enable this replacement to apply on forms which do not end in *s* (*Nyāsa*: *sajuṣo grahaṇam asakārāntārtham*). This rule is an exception to the *jaś*-replacement of 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*.

8.2.67 अवयाः श्वेतवाः पुरोडाश्च

avayāḥ śvetavāḥ puroḍāś ca
/avayāḥ 1/3 *śvetavāḥ* 1/3 *puroḍāḥ* 1/3 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16)
'*avayāḥ, śvetavāḥ, puroḍāḥ*' *ity ete nipātyante*
Forms such as *avayāḥ, śvetavāḥ* and *puroḍāḥ* are derived, via *nipātana*.

EXAMPLES:

avayāḥ 'those who share ritual oblations'
śvetavāḥ 'borne by white horses'
puroḍāḥ 'a ritual oblation of rice balls'

1. This rule is a *nipātana*. One need not show what rule applications are involved in deriving these examples. These are forms of *sambuddhi* 'nominative singular denoting address' (2.3.49 *ekavacanaṃ sambuddhiḥ*). Thus, *avayaj, śveta-vah, puras* + *dāś* (3.2.71 *mantre śvetavahoktha . . .*; 3.2.72 *aveḥ yajaḥ*) receive affix *ṆvIN*. A derivate which anticipates its status as a *pada* receives *ḍas* as an exception to *ṆvIN* (cf. *vt* ad (3.2.71 *mantre śvetavahoktha . . .*). A nominative singular *sU* is then introduced with the denotaum of address (*sambodhana*; 2.3.47 *sambodhane ca*).

Refer to derivational details of examples (III:740) under 3.2.71 *mantre śvetavahoktha . . .*; 3.2.72 *aveḥ yajaḥ*. Note, however, that derivates under that rule are all non-*sambuddhi* nominative singulars. They had penultimate *vṛddhi* available to them from 6..4.14 *atvasantasya. . . .* Our present rule will offer that lengthening to these derivates of *sambuddhi*, via *nipātana*.

2. Why do we have to use *nipātana* when *rU* can be gotten from the earlier rule and lengthening is made available by 6.4.14 *atvasantasya . . .* ? Lengthening is made available by 6.4.14 only in the context of non-*sambuddhi*. This rule offers it in the context of *sambuddhi*. Thus, *he avayāḥ, he śvetavāḥ* and *he puroḍāḥ*.

3. The *ca* of this rule is used to account for what may have been left out (*cakāro' nuktasamuccayārthaḥ*).

8.2.68 अहन्

ahan
/ahan (deleted genitive)/

(*padasya* #1.16 *ruḥ* #66)
'*ahan*' *ity etasya padasya rur bhavati*
A replacement in *rU* comes in place of the final sound segment of a *pada* constituted by *ahan* 'day'.

EXAMPLES:

ahobhyām 'instrumental-dative dual of *ahan*'
ahobhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *ahan*'
dīrghāhā nidāghaḥ 'summer with long days'

1. This rule offers *rU* as a replacement for the final *n* of *ahan*, especially against *n*-deletion of 8.2.7 *na lopaḥ prātipadikāntasya*. This specification with *ahan* without *n*-deletion (or replacing its *n* with *rU*), is made to indicate that this *n* is not deleted (*Kāś. nalopam akṛtvā nirdeśo jñāpakaḥ—na lopābhāvo yathā syād iti*). Consider *aha*(*n*→*r*(*U*) + *bhyām* → *aha* (*r*→*u*) + *bhyām* → *ah*(*au*→*o*) + *bhyām* = *ahobhyām*, where 6.1.113 *haśi ca* replaces *r* with *u*. Rule 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* then replaces the vocalic sequence *a*+*u* with a single *guṇa* substitute *o*. We thus get *ahobhyām* and *ahobhiḥ*.

The compound *dīrghāhāḥ*, as a qualifier to *nidāghaḥ* of *dīrghāhā nidāghaḥ* 'summer during which time days are longer'. We get *dīrgha* + *Jas* + *ahan* + *Jas* → *dīrghāhan* + *sU* → *dīrghāhā*, where *n* is replaced with *rU* of this rule. The *a* before *rU*, under the condition of *asiddhatva* 'suspension', is then replaced with its long counterpart *ā* (6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne cāsambuddhau*). The nominal ending *sU* also goes through deletion (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*). Rule 8.3.17 *bhobhagoagho . . .* then replaces *rU* with *y*. We thus get *dīrghāh*(*a*→*ā*) *r* →*dīrghāhār* → *dīrghāhā*(*r*→*y*) → *dīrghāhā*(*y*→ϕ) = *dīrghāhā nidāghaḥ*. Note that *y* goes through deletion of 8.3.22 *hali sarveṣām*. The *rU*, for example of *dīrghāhar atra*, will be replaced with *u* of 6.1.112 *ato ror aplutād. . . .* Rule 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* will again offer a single substitute for *a*+*u* in *o*. An application of rule 6.1.108 *eṅaḥ padāntād ati* will finally produce *dīrghāho' atra*.

2. A *vārttika* proposal (*vt. ahno ruvidhau rūparātrirathantareṣūpasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam*) requires *n* of *ahan* to be replaced with *rU* before *rūpa*, *rātri* and *rathantara*. Thus, *ahorūpam*, *ahorātraḥ* and *aho rathantaraṃ sāma*. This *vārttika* proposal is an exception to 8.2.69 *ro' supi*. Some claim that this proposal should be acceptable in all situations where *ahan* is followed by a word beginning with *r*. Thus, *aho ramyam* 'how beautiful!' and *aho ratnāni* 'beautiful jewels!'.

8.2.69 रोऽसुपि

ro' supi
/*raḥ* 1/1 *asupi* 7/1 = *na sup* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*/
(*ahan* #68)
'*ahan*' *ity etasya rephādeśo bhavaty asupi parataḥ*

The final sound segment of *ahan* is replaced with *rA* when a *sUP* does not follow.

EXAMPLES:

ahar dadāti 'the day offers enjoyment'
ahar bhuṅkte 'enjoys (eats) the day'

1. This rule replaces the *n* of *ahan* with *rA* when what follows is not a *sUP*. It is an exception to the preceding rule. The *a* of *rA* is used to facilitate articulation (*uccāraṇārthaḥ*). Consider *aha(n→rA) + (sU→ϕ) + dadāti → ahar dadāti* and *aha(n→r) + (am->ϕ) + bhuṅkte = ahar bhuṅkte*, where the nominative and accusative singular nominal endings *sU* and *am*, used after *ahan* with the signification of *atyantasaṃyoga* 'close connection' (in case of *am*), get deleted (7.1.23 *svamor napuṃsakāt*). Why can we not accept the deleted nominal endings still there to follow'? That is, via 1.1.62 *partayayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam* 'operations specific to an affix obtain even when the affix is deleted'. It is stated that 'an operation characteristic of a deleted affix does not apply to the *rU* of *ahan* when what deletes the affix is a *LUK, ŚLU* or *LUP* (*Kāś: ahno ruvidhau lumatā lupte pratyayalakṣaṇaṃ na bhavati*). Recall here that *sU* and *am* after *ahan* are deleted via *LUK*.

A deletion of nominal ending after *ahan*, via *LOPA*, would qualify *ahan* for operations relative to affixal-deletion. Thus, consider *he dīrghāho' tra* and *he dīrghāho nidāghaḥ*, where 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .* deletes the nominal ending *sU* after *dīrghāho*. Refer to notes under the preceding rule for additional derivational details.

2. Why do we state the condition of *asupi* 'when a *sUP* does not follow'? Consider *ahobhyām* and *ahobhiḥ* where what follows *ahan* is a nominal ending. Our present rule will not apply here.

The negation in *asupi* 'when a *sUP* does not follow' is interpreted as an instance of *prasajya-pratiṣedha*. Consequently, this rule will apply when anything other than a *sUP* follows. If it is interpreted as a *paryudāsa*, this rule will apply only when, not a *sUP* but anything similar to a *sUP*, follows. A following affix other than *sUP* could thus mark the right condition. We will be able to get examples such as *aharvān* where an affix follows. But we will have problems in examples such as *aharahaḥ* where no affix follows.

8.2.70 अम्नरूधरवरित्युभयथा छन्दसि

amnarūdharavar ity ubhayathā chandasi
/amnarūdharavar (deleted gen.) = *amnaś ca ūdhaś ca avaś ca = amnarūdharavar* (*sam. dv.*), *tasya; iti* ϕ *ubhayathā* ϕ *chandasi* 7/1/ (*padasya* #1.16 *ruḥ* #66 *raḥ* #69)
'*amnas, ūdhas, avas*' *ity eteṣāṃ chandasi viṣaye ubhayathā bhavati*
The final sound segment of a *pada* in the Vedic, particularly one con-

stituted by *amnas* 'currently, unawares, a little', *ūdhas* 'udder' and *avas* 'downwards, below', is replaced either way (*ubhayathā*), with *rA* or *rU*.

EXAMPLES:

amnar eva 'just a little'
amna eva 'ibidem'
ūdhar eva 'udder alone'
ūdha eva 'ibidem'
avar eva 'only downwards'
ava eva 'ibidem'

1. This rule is formulated so that the obligatory *rU* of 8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ* could be, hereby, made optional with *rA* (*repha*). A specification with *rU* is made after having the *s* replaced with *rU*. Thus, *ubhayathā* 'either way', we can get *rA* (*repha*), or its absence (*abhāva*), recognized as *rU* (*repha*). Consider *amna* (*s→rU*) + *eva* → *amna*(*rU→y*) + *eva* → *amna*(*y→ϕ*) + *eva* = *amna eva*, where *rU* gets deleted (8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya*), via its replacement in *y* (8.3.17 *bhobhagoagho . . .*; *Kāś*: *yadā rutvaṃ tadā 'bhobhagoaghoaprvasya yo' śi' iti yakāraḥ*). An optional *rA* (*repha*) will produce *amna*(*rU→r*) + *eva* = *amnar eva*. We similarly get other derivates. Note that this replacement in *rU*, or *rA*, applies to the final sound segment.

2. A *vārttika* proposal (*vt*: *chandasi bhāṣāyāṃ ca vibhāṣā pracetaso rājany upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam*) is made to offer a *rU*, or *rA*, as a replacement for the final *s* of *pracetas* before *rājan*. This proposal equally applies to the classical as well as Vedic usage. Thus, *pracetā rājan* and *praceto rājan*. Note that the *rA*-replacement in *praceta*(*s→rU→rA*) *rājan* is deleted by 8.3.14 *ro ri*. Rule 6.3.111 *ḍhralope pūrvasya . . .* then replaces the final *a* of *praceta* with long (*dīrgha*). Thus, *praceta* (*r→ϕ*) + *rājan* → *pracet*(*a→ā*) *rājan* = *pracetā rājan*. If one accepts the option of *rU*, one will get it replaced with *u* (*utva*; 6.1.114 *haśi ca*). The final form *praceto rājan* can then be gotten via application of 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*. Thus, *praceta*(*s→rU→u*) + *rājan* → *pracet*(*a+u →o*) *rājan* = *praceto rājan*.

Yet another *vārttika* proposal is made for *rU* to be optionally replaced with *r* of *ahar*, etc., before *pati*, etc. (*vt*: *aharādīnāṃ patyādiṣūpasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam*). Thus, we get *aha* (*rA→rU*) + *patiḥ* → *aharpatiḥ* and *aha*(*rA→r→ḥ*) + *patiḥ* → *ahaḥpatiḥ*; *gīrpatiḥ* and *gīḥpatiḥ*; *dhūrpatiḥ* and *dhūḥpatiḥ*.

Note that *r* (*repha*) as a replacement of *r* (*repha*; of *rU*) is offered for blocking the *visarga*-replacement of 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ* (*Kāś*: *visarjanīyabādhanārtham atra pakṣe rephasyaiva repho vidhīyate*).

8.2.71 भुवश्च महाव्याहृतेः

bhuvaś ca mahāvyāhṛteḥ
/ bhuvaḥ (used without any *sUP*); *ca ϕ mahāvyāhṛteḥ* 6/1/ = *mahatī vyāhṛtiḥ* = *mahāvyāhṛtiḥ* (*karm. tat.*), *tasyāḥ/*

(*padasya* #1.16 *ruḥ* #66 *raḥ* #69 *ubhayathā chandasi* #70)
'*bhuvas*' *ity etan mahāvyāhṛteś chandasi viṣaye ubhayathā bhavati*
The final sound segment of *bhuvas* is replaced with *rU*, or *rA*, in the Vedic, when *bhuvas* denotes *mahāvyāhṛti* 'one of the seven great mantric utterances'.

EXAMPLES:

bhuvar 'one of the seven *mahāvyāhṛtis*; ether, space'
bhuva 'ibidem'

1. This relates to *bhuvas* used with the signification of a *mahāvyāhṛti* 'great mantric utterance'. The *s* of *bhuvas* can then be replaced with *rU* or *rA*. We thus get *bhuva*(*s*→*rU*→*rA*) *ity antarikṣam* → *bhuvar ity antarikṣam* 'the second or middle of the three spheres' and *bhuva*(*s*→*rU*→*rA*) *ity antarikṣam* → *bhuva*(*rU*→*y*→ϕ) *ity antarikṣam* = *bhuva ity antarikṣam.*

2. Why do we have the condition of *mahāvyāhṛteḥ* 'of a great mantric utterance'? Consider *bhuvo viśvasya bhuvaneṣu yajñiyaḥ*, where we get a *visarjanīya* at the end of *bhuva* because its *bhuvas* is not a *mahāvyāhṛti* 'mantric utterance'.

3. Note that seven *vyāhṛtis* 'mantric utterances' are recognized as *mahāvyāhṛtis.* Literally, a *mahāvyāhṛtti* can be explained as an utterance about *mahat* 'great; the supreme self'. Thus, *bhūr, bhuvas, svar, mahas, janas, tapas,* and *satyam.* The word *bhuvas* is an indeclinable and is used as a *mahāvyāhṛti* with the signification of *antarikṣa* 'a region between heaven and earth, the second or middle sphere'.

8.2.72 वसुस्रंसुध्वंस्वनडुहां दः

vasusraṃsudhvaṃsvanaḍuhāṃ daḥ
/*vasu-sraṃsu-dhvaṃsu-anaḍuhām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *daḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saḥ* #66 (*maṇḍūkapluti*))
vasvantasya padasya sakārāntasya '*sraṃsu, dhvaṃsu, anaḍuh*' *ity eteṣāṃ ca dakārādeśo bhavati*
The final *s* of a *pada* which ends in *vasU*, or which occurs as final of *sraṃsU, dhvaṃsU* and *anaḍuh*, is replaced with *d.*

EXAMPLES:

vidvadbhyām 'instrumental/ dative dual of *vidvas* 'scholar' '
vidvadbhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *vidvas*'
papivadbhyām 'instrumental/dative dual of *papivat*'
papivadbhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *papivat*'
ukhāsradbhyām 'instrumental/dative dual of *ukhāsrat*'
ukhāsradbhiḥ 'instrumental plural of *ukhāsrat*'
parṇadhvadbhyām 'instrumental/dative dual of *parṇadhvat*'
parṇadhvadbhiḥ 'instrumental plural . . .'

anaḍudbhyām 'instrumental/dative dual of *anaḍuh*'
anaḍudbhiḥ 'instrumental plural . . .'

1. Note that *saḥ* which is carried over from 8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ* can only be used as a qualifier to *vasU*, thereby meaning: 'the *s* which comes at the end of a *pada* terminating in *vasU*'. The *s* at the end of *vasU* is not only possible (*sambhava*), but can also not be found (*vyabhicārāc ca*) in *vasU* as a result of some rule application. It is based on this 'possibility' (*sambhava*) of occurrence and 'possible absence' (*vyabhicāra*) of *s* that it only qualifies *vasU*. It cannot qualify *sraṃsU* and *dhvaṃsU* since their *s* is not only 'possible' but can never abandon them (*na vyabhicarati*). It is for these reasons that *sraṃsU* and *dhvaṃsU* cannot be qualified with *s*. A qualifier must be capable of appearing and disappearing relative to its qualified. The *s* of *sraṃsU* and *dhvaṃsU* never leaves them. As far as *anaḍuh* is concerned, *s* is obviously impossible (*asambhava*) to find.

2. The word *vidvas* is derived from *vid* + (*LAṬ→ŚatṚ→vasU*) = *vidvas*, where *ŚatṚ* is replaced with *vasU* (7.1.36 *śatur vasu* . . .). The final *s* of *vidvas* + *bhyām*, under the condition of *vidvas* assigned the term *pada* (1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*), is replaced with *d*, by blocking *rU*. We thus get *vidva*(*s→d*) + *bhyām* = *vidvadbhyām*. Similar ruels apply in deriving *vidvadbhiḥ* from *vidva*(*s→d*) + *bhis→ vidvadbhiḥ*. Refer to derivational details of *papivān* under 3.2.107 *kvasuś ca* (III:743). One can easily derive *papivadbhyām* and *papivadbhiḥ* from *papivas* + *bhyām* and *papivas* + *bhiḥ*. Derivational details of *ukhāsrat* and *parṇadhvat* can be found under 3.2.76 *kvip ca* (III:741-42). Deriving *ukhāsradbhyām, ukhāsradbhiḥ; parṇadhvadbhyām* and *parṇadhvadbhiḥ* from *ukhāsras* + (*bhyām / bhis*) and *parṇadhvas* + (*bhyām / bhis*) offers nothing new. Rule 1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne* assigns the term *pada*. Note that the final sound segment of *anaḍuh* 'ox', i.e., *h*, is replaced with *d*. Thus, we get *anaḍudbhyām* and *anaḍudbhiḥ*.

3. Note that the condition of *saḥ* 'in place of *s*' must be met. This rule will not apply if the derivate of *vasU* does not end in *s*. Consider *vidvān* and *papivān* where the final sound segment is *n*.

This replacement in *d* applies before any other rule application. Thus, it will block a replacement in *rU* for the final *s* of *vidvas* in *vidvad* + *bhyām*. How come this replacement in *d* does not block deletion of a conjunct-final consonant in *vidvāns*? That deletion is not directly relatable to this replacement. This *d*-replacement is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended' in accomplishing conjunct-final deletion (*Kāś. rutve nāprāpte idam ārabhyata iti tad bādhyate. saṃyogāntalopas tu naivam iti tenaitad eva datvaṃ bādhyate* 'since this application is initiated in the wake of the obligatory replacement in *rU*, that (*rU*) is blocked; this is not the case with the deletion of the final of a conjunct; this replacement in *d* is blocked by that'. The *ḍh*-replacement for the final *h* of *anaḍuh* (of 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*) is also blocked by this rule.

Why is the *n* of *nUM* not replaced with *d* in *anaḍvān*? Recall that *nUM* is

specified with reference to particular enumerations. If *n* is replaced with *d*, *nUM* will be rendered without any scope of application (*anavakāśa*). Thus, a replacement in *d* is blocked at the strength of the express provision of *nUM*. As a replacement in *d* is ruled out at the strength of the express provision of *nUM*, this same way, the *rU*-replacement of *n* of *anaḍvān atra*, made available by 8.3.9 *dīrghād aṭi*, will also be ruled out. An operation which renders another vacuous is blocked. Besides, an operation which does not have any consequence for another is blocked. That which has some consequence, such as *rU* of *nUM*, is not blocked.

8.2.73 तिप्यनस्तेः

tipy anasteḥ
/tipi 7/1 *anasteḥ* 6/1 = *na astiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya/*
(*padasya* #1.16 *saḥ* #66 (*maṇḍūkapluti* 'frog's leap'); *daḥ* #72)
tipi parataḥ sakārāntasya padasya anaster dakāra ādeśo bhavati
The final *s* of a *pada* constituted by a verbal root ending in *s*, with the exception of *as* 'to be', is replaced with *d* when the third singular active verbal ending *tiP* follows.

EXAMPLES:

acakād bhavān 'you, sir, glowed'
anvaśād bhavān 'you, sir, instructed'

1. This rule replaces a *pada*-final *s* with *d*, though with the exception of *s* of verbal root *as* 'to be'. Consider *cakās*(*Ṛ*) + (*LAṄ*→*tiP*) → *cakās* + (*ŚaP*→ϕ) + *ti* → *cakās* + *t*(*i*→ϕ) = *a*(*Ṭ*) + *cakās* + *t*, where *ŚaP* gets deleted because of the *adādi* listing of *cakāsṚ* (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyo śapaḥ*). Our present rule then replaces *s* with *d*. The *i* of *tiP*, as usual, gets deleted by 3.4.100 *itaś ca*. The remaining *t* then goes through deletion via *LOPA* of 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo*. . . . We thus get *aṬ* + *cakā*(*s*→*d*) → *acakād*. We can similarly get *anvaśād* from *anu* + *aṬ* + *śā*(*s*→*d*) = *anvaśād*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *tipi* 'when *tiP* follows'? Consider *cakāḥ* where *s* of *cakās* + (*KvIP*→ϕ) = *cakās* is first replaced with *rU*, and then with *ḥ*.

Why do we have the condition of *anasteḥ* 'when not of *as*'? Consider *āpa evedaṃ salilaṃ sarvam āḥ*, where *āḥ* is a third singular imperfect (*LAṄ*) form of *as* 'to be'. The *s* of *ās* is here replaced with *ḥ*, via *rU*. Note that augment *īṬ* is not introduced here, largely in because of 7.3.97 *bahulaṃ chandasi*.

8.2.74 सिपिधातो रुर्वा

sipi dhāto rur vā
/sipi 7/1 *dhātoḥ* 6/1 *ruḥ* 1/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saḥ* #66 (*maṇḍūkapluti*); *daḥ* #72)

sipi parataḥ sakārāntasya padasya dhāto 'ruḥ' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati, dakāro vā
The final *s* of a *pada* which is constituted by a root ending in *s* is replaced with *rU*, and also optionally with *d*, when the second singular active verbal ending *siP* follows.

EXAMPLES:

acakās tvam 'you glowed'
acakāt tvam 'ibidem'
anvaśās tvam 'you instructed'
anvaśāt tvam 'ibidem'

1. This rule replaces the final *s* of a root termed *pada* with *rU*, optionally with *d*, when the second singular active ending *siP* follows. Thus, (*cakās*(*Ṛ*)) + (*LAṄ*→*si*(*P*→ϕ))) → *a*(*Ṭ*→ϕ) + *cakās* + (*ŚaP*→ϕ) + *si* → *a* + *cakās* + (*si*→ϕ) → *acakā*(*s*→*rU*→*ḥ*) = *acakā*(*ḥ*→*s*) + *tvam* → *acakās tvam* and *acakā*(*s*→*d*→*t*) + *tvam* → *acakāt tvam*, where *rU* is first replaced with *visarga* (8.3.15 *kharavasānayor . . .*). It is then replaced with *s* before *tvam* by 8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*. We will get a replacement in *d* when optional replacement of *rU* is not accepted. This *d* will be replaced with *t* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*) before *tvam*. We can similarly derive *anvaśās tvam* and *anvaśāt tvam*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *dhātoḥ* 'after a verbal root' when *r* and *d* are given as replacements for a final *s*? Besides, what else, other than a *dhātu*, can occur before *siP*? It is stated that *dhātoḥ* and *rU* are given for use in subsequent rules. This use in subsequent rules finds its function in rules 8.2.75 *daś ca* and 8.2.76 *rvor upadhāyā dīrgha ikaḥ*. Since we will get *rU* at the strength of the option of *d*, anyway, *rU* is also explained as used for subsequent rules.

8.2.75 दश्च

daś ca
/*daḥ* 1/1 *ca* ϕ)
(*padasya* #1.16 *daḥ* #72 *sipi dhāto rur vā* #74)
dakārāntasya dhātoḥ padasya sipi parato rur bhavati dakāro vā
The final *d* of a *pada* constituted by a verbal root ending in *d* is replaced with *rU*, and also optionally with *d*, when the second singular active ending *siP* follows.

EXAMPLES:

abhinat tvam 'you split (it)'
abhinas tvam 'ibidem'
acchinat tvam 'you pierced (it)'
acchinas tvam 'ibidem'

1. This rule makes an optional provision of *rU*, against *d*, for the final *d* of a verbal root termed *pada*. Refer to *abhinar* in the derivational history of *abhino' tra* (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*). The *r* of *abhinar* will be replaced with *s*, via *ḥ*, before *tvam* to produce *abhinas tvam*. We will get *abhina*(*r*→*d*→*t*) → *abhinat tvam* if the option of *rU* is not accepted. Similar application of rules is involved in deriving *acchinas tvam* and *acchinat tvam*.

2. The *ca* 'and' of this rule is used to attract *d*. Consequently, *d* is not carried over to subsequent rules (*cānukṛṣṭaṃ nottaratra*).

8.2.76 र्वोरुपधाया दीर्घ इकः

rvor upadhāyā dīrgha ikaḥ
/rvoḥ 6/2 = *raś ca vaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *upadhāyāḥ* 6/1 *dīrghaḥ* 1/1 *ikaḥ* 6/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *dhātoḥ* #74)
rephavakārāntasya dhātoḥ padasya upadhāyā iko dīrgho bhavati
A penultimate sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *iK* of a *pada* constituted by a verbal root ending in *r* and *v*, is replaced with its long counterpart.

EXAMPLES:

gīḥ 'nominative singular of *gir* 'speech' '
dhūḥ 'nominative singular of *dhur* 'forefront of a yoke' '
pūḥ 'nominative singular of *pur* 'a town' '
āśīḥ 'nominative singular of *āśī* 'benediction' '

1. Note that the words *padasya* and *dhātoḥ* are both used here in syntactic coordination. They both are then qualified with *r* and *v* (*rvoḥ*), thereby facilitating *tadantavidhi* 'treating a form as ending in that which specifies it'. Thus, *rephavakārāntasya dhātoḥ padasya . . .* 'of a verbal root termed *pada* ending in *r* and *v*'.

This rule replaces the short penultimate vowel of a root with its long counterpart, when the root ends in *r* and *v* and is also termed a *pada*. Consider *gīḥ* and *pūḥ* which derive from (*gṝ* + *KvIP*) + *sU*) and (*pṝ* + *KvIP*) + *sU*), where *ṝ* is replaced with a short *i*, followed by *r* (7.1.100 *ṛd id dhātoḥ*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*). The *r* of *gir* and *pur* is replaced with *visarga* and our present rule replaces the short penultimate *i* with its long counterpart. We thus get *gīḥ* and *pūḥ*. Similar rules apply in deriving *dhūḥ* from (*dhurv*(*Ī* + *KvIP*) + *sU*)) where 6.4.21 *rāl lopaḥ* applies to delete the *v* which occurs after *r*. Deriving *dhūḥ* offers nothing new.

2. Why do we not have any example with a verbal root ending in *v*? A root termed *pada* which ends in *v* and has an *iK* vowel as its penultimate, is hard to find (*Nyāsa*: *vakārāntasya dhātor asambhavāt*). Why is *v*, then, used with *r* in *rvoḥ*? For use in subsequent rules (*uttarārtham*).

Why do we have the condition of *upadhāyāḥ* 'in place of the penultimate'? Consider *abibhar* of *abibhar bhavān*, a third person singular active derivate of *bhṛÑ* 'to support, nourish, bear' in *LUṄ*. This rule applies to the *iK* of a verbal root, and not of an *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*).

Why do we have the condition of *ikaḥ* 'in place of a vowel denoted by *iK*'? Consider *abibhar bhavān*, again, where the penultimate *a* of *abibhar* cannot be replaced with its long counterpart.

Note that conditions of *dhātoḥ* and *padasya* are still valid. Thus, this rule cannot apply to *agniḥ* and *vāyuḥ* beacuse no root is involved. We similarly get *girau* and *giraḥ* in view of condition of *padasya*.

8.2.77 हलि च

hali ca
/hali 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *dhātoḥ* #74 *rvor upadhāyā dīrgha ikaḥ* #76)
hali ca parataḥ rephavakārāntasya dhātor upadhāyā iko dīrgho bhavati
A penultimate vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK*, and forming part of a verbal root ending in *r* and *v*, is replaced with its long counterpart when a consonant follows.

EXAMPLES:

āstīrṇam 'strewn around'
vistīrṇam 'spread about'
viśīrṇam 'broken to pieces, withered'
dīvyati '. . . sports'
sīvyati '. . . sews'

1. This rule replaces the short penultimate *i*, *u*, *ṛ* and *ḷ* of a verbal root when the root is followed by a consonant (*hali*). Refer to derivational details of examples under 7.1.100 *ṛd id dhātoḥ* and 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto. . . .* We, thus, get examples (*ā-stṝ* + *Kta*) + *sU* = *āstīrṇam*, (*vi-śṝ* + *Kta*) + *sU* = *viśīrṇam*, *div* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) = *dīvyati* and *siv* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) = *sīvyati*.

2. Note that the condition of *dhātoḥ* is still valid. Thus, we do not get a long replacement for *i* and *u* of *divam* 'heaven' and *catur* 'four' in *divam icchati→ dīvyati* and *caturaḥ icchati→ caturyati*. These are non-root (*adhātuḥ*) nominal stems (*prātipadika*).

The condition of *ikaḥ* 'in place of an *iK*' also carries. Consequently, *smaryate* and *bhavyate* do not get their *a* replaced with a corresponding long.

Recall that the earlier rule offered long replacements for roots ending in *r* and *v*. This rule is formulated for offering long replacements to roots which do not end in *r* and *v* (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: '*apadāntārtho' yam ārambhaḥ', pūrvaṃ rephavakārāntasya dhātor dīrghatvavidhānād arephavakārāntārtham idam*).

8.2.78 **उपधायां च**

upadhāyāṃ ca
/upadhāyām 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *dhātoḥ* #74 *rvor upadhāyā dīrgha ikaḥ* #76)
dhātor upadhābhūtau yau rephavakārau halparau tayor upadhāyā iko dīrgho bhavati
A long vowel comes in place of the penultimate *iK* vowel of *r* and *v* which constitutes the penultimate of a root followed by a consonant.

EXAMPLES:

hūrcchitā 'derivate of *hūrch* 'to be crooked' with *Kta* in the feminine'
mūrchitā 'derivate of *mūrch* 'to faint' with *Kta* in the feminine'
ūrvitā 'derivate of *urv* 'to harm' with *Kta* in the feminine'
dhūrvitā 'derivate of *dhūrv* 'to injure' with *Kta* in the feminine'

1. Note that *rvor upadhāyāḥ* is carried as a whole (*sarvam*). The *upadhāyām* 'penultimate' of this rule is used as a qualifier to *rvoḥ*, paraphrased as *rephavakārayoḥ*, in the genitive dual (*ṣaṣṭhī dvivacana*). For this qualifier-qualified relationship, one would expect *upadhāyām* to have been given as *upadhayoḥ*, again a genitive dual. But we get locative singular in place of genitive dual by transmutation (*vyatyaya*; *PM*: '*rvor upadhāyāḥ' ityādi sarvam anuvartate. idam upadhāgrahaṇaṃ rvor viśeṣaṇam*). But since we have the locative singular *upadhāyām*, instead, the genitive dual of *rvoḥ* can be replaced with the locative singular, in tune with *upadhāyām*. The *upadhā* of the earlier rule is interpreted as a qualifier to *ikaḥ*. This establishes the occurrence of *iK* before *r* and *v*. This is how the *Kāśikāvṛtti* offers its paraphrase: *dhātor upadhābhūtau yau rephavakārau halparau tayor upadhāyā iko dīrgho bhavati* 'the *r* and *v* which occur before a consonant and have become the penultimate of a verbal root; the penultimate *iK* of such *r* and *v* is replaced with a long'. *Kāśikā* interprets *halparau* 'followed by a consonant' as a *bahuvrīhi* paraphrased as: *hal paraḥ ābhyām* 'the two after which there is a consonant'. This consonant is then understood as part of the root. Contexts where a consonant occurs after *r* and *v* of an affix are covered by the earlier rule (*Nyāsa*: *yatra hi pratyayāvayavo rephavakārābhyāṃ halparas tatra pūrveṇaiva siddhaḥ*).

Consider *hurch* + *iṬ* + *ta* → *hūrcchita* of the feminine *hūrcchitā*, where our present rule replaces the short *u* of the root with its long counterpart *ū*. We similarly get (*mūrch* + *iṬ* + *Kta* → *mūrchita* and (*dhurv* + *iṬ* + *Kta*) → *dhūrvita* in their corresponding feminine forms. An objection is raised as to how *r* could be considered penultimate when 8.4.46 *aco rahābhyāṃ dve* doubles up the *ch*. The *r* is still considered penultimate since 8.4.46 *aco rahābhyāṃ dve* is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of this long replacement (*Nyāsa*: *dīrghatve kartavye dvirvacanasyāsiddhatvāc chakāro' traika eva hal iti bhavaty evopadhātvaṃ rephasya* 'since doubling is considered *asiddha* in the application

of replacement in long, a single *ch*, alone, is seen there as a consonant; this is how the penultimate status of *r* is established').

Note that *ca* in this rule is used to attract *hali* of the previous rule (*Nyāsa*: *cakāro halīty asyānukarṣaṇārthaḥ*). That is, *r* and *v* must be followed by a consonant (*hali*). We do not get this long replacement in *ciri* + *Śnu* + *ti* → *ciriṇoti* and *jiri* + *Śnu* + *ti* → *jiriṇoti* where verbal roots *ciri* and *jiri* have their penultimate *r* followed by a vowel.

Why do we not get this long replacement for the short *i* and *u* of the *abhyāsa* of *riryatuḥ / riryuḥ* and *vivyatuḥ / vivyuḥ*, the third dual and plural active perfect (*LIṬ*) forms of *rī* and *vī* 'to go' with replacements of *LIṬ* further replaced with *atus* and *us*. Note here that the final vowel of the root is replaced with *y* and *v* (*yaṇādeśa*). These replacements in *y* and *v* are considered *bahiraṅga* 'externally conditioned' since they are accomplished in the domain of *aṅga* and hence, are conditioned by a following affix. This replacement in long is internally conditioned since it is accomplished in relation to the base (*prakṛti*). Since this replacement in *y* and *v* is considered *asiddha*, there will be no *r* and *v* followed by a consonant. The question of a long replacement, hence, does not arise.

Why do we not get this long replacement in (*cutur* + *KyaC* → (*caturya* + *tṛC*) + *sU*) = *caturyitā*, where, after the deletion of the final *a* (6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*) of *caturya*, before *tṛC*, we get a penultimate *r* occurring before a consonant. Note here that deletion of *a* is externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*) because of being conditioned by the *ārdhadhātuka* affix *tṛC*. This long replacement is internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*). The externally conditioned deletion of *d* becomes *asiddha* in view of applying this long replacement. Now consider *pratidīvnā* where this consideration of 'internally conditioned versus externally conditioned' argument does not apply. For this *paribhāṣā* is non-obligatory (*anitya*), especially in the *yathoddeśa* view. The long replacement in *pratidīvnā* is questioned because, like *caturyitā*, we also do not get *r* as the penultimate sound of the root. This matter of non-application of lengthening is resolved in view of 1.1.58 *na padāntadvirvacana . . .*, where I also discuss derivational details of *pratidīvnā* and *pratidīvne* (II:409-10).

Kāśikā further informs that this long replacement is also not found in *jiriḥ*, *kiriḥ*, where the stems are both non-derived nominal (*'uṇādayo' vyutpannāni prātipadikāni' iti jivriḥ kiryoḥ giryor ity evam ādiṣu dīrgho na bhavati*).

8.2.79 न भकुर्छुराम्

na bhakurchurām

/ na ϕ bhakurchurām 6/3 *bhaś ca kur ca chur ca = bhakurchuraḥ* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*

(*dhātoḥ* #74 *rvor upadhāyā dīrgho ikaḥ* #76)

rephavakārāntasya bhasya 'kur, chur' ity etayoś ca dīrgho na bhavati

The short vowel of a *bha* (1.4.18 *yaci bham*) which ends in *r* and *v*, and the penultimate vowel of verbal roots *kur* 'to do, make' and *chur* 'to pierce' as well, is not replaced with its long counterpart.

EXAMPLES:

dhuraṃ vahati = *dhuryaḥ* 'he who carries the yoke; an ox'
dhuri sādhur yaḥ = *dhuryaḥ* 'he who is good in harness; an ox'
kuryāt 'may he do!'
churyāt 'may he pierce!'

1. This negation (*pratiṣedha*) of a long replacement is made against positive provision of 8.2.77 *hali ca*. Refer to derivational details of the benedictive *LIṄ*-derivate *kuryāt* (III:784), under 3.4.103 *yāsuṭ parasmaipade*. . . . Similar rules apply in deriving *churyāt*. Now consider *dhuryaḥ*, paraphrased as *dhuraṃ vahati*, where affix *yaT* is introduced after *dhura* + *am* (4.4.77 *dhuro yaddhakau*) with the signification of *vahati* 'carries'.

Why is verbal root *kṛÑ* specified here as *kur*, with its *vikaraṇa*, i.e., *u* (3.1.79 *tanādikṛñbhya uḥ*)? So that this negation does not apply to *cikīrṣati* 'wishes to do or make', etc. (*Nyāsa*: *karoter vikaraṇena nirdeśaś cikīrṣatīty atra pratiṣedho mā bhūd iti*). This negation will apply only where the word-form *kur* is found.

2. Why should we qualify *bha* (1.4.18 *yaci bham*) with the requirement of ending in *r* and *v*? Consider the counter-examples: *pratidīvnā* 'instrumental singular of *pratidivan* 'sun'' and *pratidīvne* 'dative singular of *pratidivan*', where the stem which ends in *v* is not a *bha*, and the stem which is a *bha* does not end in *v* (II:409-10). It ends in *n*, instead.

8.2.80 अदसोऽसेर्दादु दो मः

adso' ser dād u do maḥ
/*adasaḥ* 6/1 *aseḥ* 6/1 = *avidyamānaḥ siḥ sakāro yasya sa* = *asiḥ* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *dāt* 5/1 *u* (1/1 deleted); *daḥ* 6/1 *maḥ* 1/1/
adaso' sakārāntasya varṇasya dāt parasya uvarṇādeśo bhavati dakārasya ca makāraḥ
A sound segment which occurs after *d* of *adas*, when not ending in *s*, is replaced with *u* with an additional provision that *d* be replaced with *m*.

EXAMPLES:

amum 'accusative singular masculine of *adas* 'he, that'''
amū 'accusative dual masculine . . .'
amūn 'accusative plural masculine . . .'
amunā 'instrumental singular masculine . . .'
amūbhyām 'instrumental dual masculine . . .'

1. Note that *i* of *asi* in *aseḥ* 'of that which does not have *s*' is used for ease of articulation. Consider *amum* which derives from *adas* + *am*, where *s* of

adas is replaced with *a*. The sequence of two vowels, namely *a+a*, is then replaced with a single vowel similar to what follows in the sequence (6.1.97 *ato guṇe*). Our present rule is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of application of rule 6.1.97 *ato guṇe*. Thus we get: *ada*(*s*→*a*) + *am* → *ad*(*a*+*a*→*a*) *m* → *adam*. Our present rule can now apply on *adam* to produce *a*(*d*→*m* (*a*→*u*) *m*)) → *amum*. Refer to derivational details of *amū* under 1.1.12 *adaso māt* (II:348-49). Derivational details of *amaunā* can be found under 8.2.3 *na mune*. Recall that a replacement in *u*, for example in *amūbhyām*, can be determined on the basis of similarity in duration (*pramāṇa*; cf. 1.1.50 *sthāne' ntaratamaḥ*). Note that *s* of *Śas* 'accusative plural ending' in *amūn* is replaced with *n* (6.1.102 *tasmāc chaso naḥ puṃsi*).

2. Why do we have the condition of *aseḥ* 'of that which does not have *s* at the end'? Consider *adaḥ icchati* → *adasyati* 'wishes to get that for himself', which derives from *adas* + *am* + *KyaC* (3.1.8 *supa ātmanaḥ kyac*). This could not be a valid example since *padasya* 'of that which is termed a *pada*' is carried over, and *adas* before *KyaC* cannot be termed a *pada*. This then indicates that a replacement in *mu* applies even when *adas* is not a *pada* (*PM*: *nanu ca 'padasya' iti vartate, na cedaṃ padam*; *'naḥ kye' iti niyamāt. evaṃ tarhy etad eva jñāpayati*: *apadasyāpy adasa etan mutvaṃ bhavatīti* . . .).

A *vārttika* proposal (*vt*: *adaso' nosra iti vaktavyam*) is made to state *anosraḥ* 'of that which does not have *o*, *s* and *r* at the end'. This proposal is clearly a move to expand the scope of *aseḥ*. For, *aseḥ* only has the negation of *s*. The *vārttika* adds on an additional negation of *o* and *r* (*Nyāsa*: *okāra-sakāra-rephāṇāṃ dvandvaḥ, avidyamānā osro' syeti bahuvrīhiḥ*). Thus, we get counter-examples: *ado' tra* and *adaḥ kulam*. Given *adas* + *sU*, in *ado' tra*, we get deletion of *sU* by 7.1.23 *svamor napuṃsakāt* because of a neuter (*napuṃsaka*). The *s* of *adas* then goes through a replacement in *rU* (*rutva*). This *rU* is then replaced with *u* (*utvam*; 6.1.113 *ato ror aplutād* . . .). Rule 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* then applies on *ada*+*u* + *atra* to replace its vocalic sequence *a*+*u* with *o*, a *guṇa* corresponding with *u* which follows in the sequence (*paravarūpa*). Finally, we apply a single replacement similar to what precedes (*pūrvarūpa*; 6.1.108 *eṅaḥ padāntād ati*) on the vocalic sequence *o*+*a* of *ad*(*o*+*a*→*o*) *tra* = *ado tra* to obtain *ado' tra*. The *adaḥ* of *adaḥ kulam* is an example of negation of *r*, where *visarga* comes as a replacement for *rU* (*rutva*; *Nyāsa*: *etat tu rephapratiṣedhasya* (*pratyudāharaṇam*); *rutve kṛte visarjanīyaḥ*)). Some propose a change in the wording of the rule as: *aḥ ser yasya so' yam asiḥ* '*asi* means that in which there is *a* in place of *s*'. So that negation of *o* and *r* could both be established. That is, replacements in *u* (*utva*) and *m* (*matva*) are accomplished only where *s* is replaced with *a*. Put differently, *utva* and *matva* are blocked where *adas* yields a form ending in *o*, *s* and *r* (*vt*: *adaso' nosra iti vaktavyam*). *Kāśikā* initiates further discussion on this topic, which I omit for fear of expatiation (*prapañca*). The following verse sums it up:

adaso' dreḥ pṛthaṅ mutvaṃ kecid icchanti latvavat /
kecid antyasadeśasya netyeke' ser hi dṛśyate //
'the *mutva* of *d* and *r* of *adas* and *adriṄ* is applied separately; some desire it similarly to replacement in *l* (of *calīklṛpyate*); some desire the replacement for the replacement of the final *s*, i.e., *d* and *r*; some do not desire any replacement when *adri* comes as a replacement.'

Why do we have the condition of *dāt* 'in place of that which occurs after *d*'? So that this replacement does not apply to a final sound segment (*Kāś. alo' ntyasya mā bhūt*). Thus, we get counter-examples: *amuyā* and *amuyoḥ*.

8.2.81 एत ईद् बहुवचने

eta īd bahuvacane
/etaḥ 6/1 *īt* 1/1 *bahuvacane* 7/1/
(*adaso' ser dāt do maḥ* #80)
adaso dakārād uttarasya ekārasya īkārādeśo bhavati dakārasya ca makāro bahuvacane = bahūnām arthānām uktau
An *eT* (*e*) after *d* of *adas*, when *adas* does not end in *s*, is replaced with *ī*, with an additional provision that *d* of *adas* be also replaced with *m*, when the signification is many (*bahuvacane*).

EXAMPLES:

amī 'nominative plural masculine of *adas*'
amībhiḥ 'instrumental plural . . .'
amībhyaḥ 'dative/ablative plural . . .'
amīṣām 'genitive plural . . .'
amīṣu 'locative plural . . .'

1. This rule replaces an *e*, which occurs after *d* of *adas*, with *ī*. Additionally, *d* of *adas*, in plural, is also replaced with *m*. The word *bahuvacana* is not used here in its technical sense of plural. A technical interpretation will give us the meaning: 'when an affix with the signification of plural follows'. This will block the derivation of *amī* where no affix with the signification of plural follows.

It is to remove such difficulties that *bahuvacane* 'in the sense of many' is used in its etymological sense of *bahūnām arthānām uktiḥ* 'expression of many meanings' (*Kāśikā: 'bahuvacane' ity arthanirdeśo' yam. pāribhāṣikasya hi bahuvacanasyagrahaṇe amī ity atra na syāt*). Refer to derivational details of *amī* under 1.1.12 *adaso māt* (II:348-49). If one interprets the following *Jas* in the technical sense of plural number, *amī* could not be derived. For, given *ada* + (*Jas→Śi*) = *ada* + *i* → *ad* (*a+i→e*) = *ade*, there will not be any *Jas* to follow. The *ī* (*ītva*) in *ade* + *bhis* →*amībhiḥ* = *amībhiḥ*, etc., is accomplished after *e*-replacement (*etva*) of 7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et* has applied. Why can we not get **adaiḥ* from *ade* + *bhis* by applying 7.1.9 *ato bhis ais*? Because

7.1.11 *nedamadasorakoḥ* negates it. Furthermore, given *ada* + *am*, we need augment *sUṬ* (7.1.52 *āmi sarvanāmnaḥ . . .*) before other operations are performed. That is, when we want to derive the genitive plural form *amīṣām*.

Why is *ī* specified with *īT*? For ease of articulation (*mukhasukhārthaḥ*). Why is *e* specified with *eT*? Specifying *e* with the genitive *eḥ* could confuse us about *i* as an item to be replaced (*Nyāsa*: *'eḥ' ity ucyamāne ikārasyāpi sthānitvam āśaṅkyeta*).

8.2.82 वाक्यस्य टेः प्लुत उदात्तः

vākyasya ṭeḥ pluta udāttaḥ
/ vākyasya 6/1 *ṭeḥ* 6/1 *plutaḥ* 1/1 *udāttaḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16)
adhikāro' yam. 'vākyasya ṭer' iti, 'pluta' iti ca, 'udātta' iti ca, etat trayam apy adhikṛtaṃ veditavyam āpādaparisamāpteḥ
A vowel termed *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*) of an utterance is replaced with its *pluta* counterpart marked with *udātta*.

EXAMPLE:

abhivādaye devadatto' ham! 'I, Devadatta, salute (you, sir!)'
*bho āyuṣmān edhi devadatta*3 'O, Devadatta, (grow to) be long-living'

1. Since this rule is an *adhikāra* 'governing rule', its *anuvṛtti* must, hereafter, be carried over through all rules contained within this quarter. The *ṭi*-vowel of the last word (*pada*) of an utterance (*vākya*) is, hereby, replaced with a *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta*. Since *hrasva* 'short', *dīrgha* 'long' and *pluta* 'extra-long' are names assigned to vowels, this replacement will also come in place of a vowel which constitutes the *ṭi* of a *pada*. If the *ṭi* of such words is constituted by a consonant, this rule will apply to the vowel which precedes *ṭi*. This is what *Kāśikā* means by *ṭigrahaṇaṃ vyañjanāntasyāpi ṭer acaḥ pluto yathā syāt-agnici*3*d iti* 'a specification with *ṭi* is made so that the vowel before a consonantal *ṭi* can also be replaced with *pluta*, as in *agnici*3*d*'.

Note that the use of *vākyasya* does not cancel the *anuvṛtti* of *padasya*. If *vākyasya* was not used, all *padas* in a sentence would have their *ṭi*-vowel replaced with a *pluta* vowel. A specification with *vākyasya* restricts this replacement in *pluta* to the *ṭi* vowel of the last *pada* of a sentence (*Nyāsa*: *antyasyaiva hi padasya yaṣ ṭiḥ sa vākyasya ṭir bhavati*; *Kāś*: *vākyagrahaṇam anantyasya padasya plutanivṛtyartham*). Why could this rule not apply to the *ṭi*-vowel of a non-final *pada* in an utterance? Because that is not desired (*aniṣṭatvāt*). Consider 8.2.83 *pratyabhivāde' śūdre*, whereby the *ṭi* vowel of an utterrance, when used in response to the salutation of a non-*śūdra*, is replaced with a *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta*. A specification with *ṭi* is made so that the *ṭi*-vowel of a *pada* ending in a consonant could also avail this *pluta*. Thus, consider *agnici*3*d iti*.

Kāśikā explains: *pratyabhivādo nāma yad abhivādyamāno gurur āśiṣaṃ prayuṅkte tatrāśūdraviṣaye yad vākyaṃ vartate tasya ṭeḥ pluta udātto bhavati* 'the *ṭi* vowel of an utterance which is used in response to a salutation as benediction by a saluted person, outside the context of a non-*śūdra*, is replaced with a *pluta* marked with *udātta*'. Thus, *abhivādaye devadatto' ham* 'I, Devadatta, salute you (sir!)'; *bho āyuṣmān edhi devadatta*3 'O, Devadatta, be long-living'.

8.2.83 प्रत्यभिवादेऽशूद्रे

pratyabhivāde' śūdre
/pratyabhivāde 7/1 = *aśudre* 7/1 = *na śudraḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*padasya* #1.16 *vākyasya ṭeḥ plutaḥ udāttaḥ* #82)
pratyabhivādo nāma yad abhivādyamāno gurur āśiṣaṃ prayuṅkte, tatrāśūdraviṣaye yad vākyaṃ vartate tasya ṭeḥ pluta udātto bhavati
The *ṭi*-vowel of an utterance which is used in response to a salutation as benediction, in the context of a non-*śūdra*, is replaced with a *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta.*

EXAMPLES:

abhivādaye devadatto' ham ! 'I, Devadatta, salute (you, sir!)'
*bho āyuṣmān edhi devadatta*3 'O, Devadatta, be long-living'

1. Refer also to my notes under the preceding rule. It is stated that a word which denotes a name and is used at the end of a benediction, generally receives this *pluta* replacement for its *ṭi* vowel. The word *pratyabhivāda* is explained as a benedictive response, made to a person by his elders (teacher, etc.) in response to a salutation. This rule makes an injunction against using the *pluta* in response made to a *śūdra* 'person of a lower caste'. Thus, the *pluta*-replacement is limited to a benedictive response made for a *brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya* or *vaiśya.* It is noted that a *brāhmaṇa* should be addressed in response to his salutation with, *āyuṣmān bhava saumya* 'be long-living, O, good man!'.

Why do we state the condition of *aśūdre* 'in the context of a non-*śudra*'? Consider *abhivādaye tuṣajako' ham* 'I, Tuṣajaka, salute (you, sir!)'; *bho āyuṣmān edhi tuṣajaka* 'O, you Tuṣajaka, be long-living', where this replacement is not made available.

2. A *vārttika* (*vt: striyām api pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ*) prohibits this replacement also in the context of a woman'. Thus, *abhivādaye gārgy aham* 'I, Gārgī, salute (you, sir!)'; *bho āyuṣmatī bhava gārgi* 'O Gārgī, be long-living'. Why was the final long vowel of *āyuṣmatī* not replaced with its short counterpart? It is part of the predicate, the address is indeed limited to the subject.

Some also desire this prohibition in the context of *asūyā* 'fault-finding, impudence; that which may irritate the teacher, etc.', expressed in the salutation. Thus, *abhivādaye sthāly aham bhoḥ* 'I, Sthālī (carrying a cooking pot) salute you, sir!' The response: *asūyakas tvaṃ jālma, na tvaṃ pratyabhivā-*

danam arhasi, bhidyasva vṛṣala sthālin 'you are impudent, you wretched one, you do not deserve a benedictive response; may you burst (like a pot while cooking) O, lowly untouchable, Sthālin (carrier of a cooking pot)'. Note that the person who salutes here does not use his real name. He, instead, uses the name Sthālin (perhaps to annoy the teacher). Why this name? Because he must have been carrying a cooking pot at that time. It is stated that this *vārttika* proposal is unnecessary. For, a salutation will deserve response only till the time *asūyā* does not become known. Once *asūyā* is known, the question of a benedictive response does not arise. However, a response denoting anger cannot be ruled out.

This replacement in *pluta* is desired in the word which is repeated in a benedictive response. Thus, it cannot apply to *devadatta kuśaly asi* 'Devadatta, you are happy!'; *devadatta āyuṣmān edhi* 'Devadatta, long-living, grow'.

A *vārttika* (*vt. bhorājanyaviśāṃ veti vaktavyam*) makes this *pluta* optional in cases where *bhoḥ* follows a proper name, or when a *kṣatriya* and *vaiśya* is the recipient of benedictive responses. Thus, *bho abhivādaye devadatto' ham; āyuṣmāna edhi devadatta bhoḥ; āyuṣmānedhi devadatta bhoḥ*, etc. It is said that short and long vowels are used all the time (*sārvakālika*). A *pluta* is not used all the time (*asārvakālika*).

8.2.84 दूराद्धूते च

dūrādd hūte ca
/dūrāt 5/1 *hūte* 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *vākyasya ṭeḥ pluta udāttaḥ* #82)
dūrādd hūte yad vākyaṃ vartate tasya ṭeḥ pluto bhavati sa codāttaḥ
The *ṭi* vowel of the final *pada* of an utterance, when used for calling out (*hūte*) someone at a distance (*dūrāt*), is also replaced with a *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta.*

EXAMPLES:

*āgaccha bho māṇavaka devadatta*3! 'come here (my) boy, Devadatta'
*āgaccha bho māṇavaka yajñadatta*3! 'come hear (my) boy, Yajñadatta!'
*saktūn piba devadatta*3! 'Devadatta, drink *saktu*'
*palāyasva devadatta*3! 'run, Devadatta'

1. The word *hūta* is explained as 'calling out'. That is, addressing someone by means of words. Thus, *āgaccha bho māṇavaka devadatta*3; *āgaccha bho māṇavaka yajñadatta*3! Note that the condition of *dūrāt* 'from a distance' is important. How far is far? Since 'far' denotes a relative notion, and also since *hūtam* is here used in the sense of 'calling out by means of words', any comparatively non-regular extra speech-effort, such as voice modulation, will enable the context to meet the condition of *dūrāt* (*Kāś: yatra prākṛtāt prayatnād yatnaviśeṣa āśrīyamāṇe śabdaḥ śrūyate tad dūram*). The 'call' must be

heard at a distance. The use of *dūrāt* is thus made relative to words used for calling out. A word which can be heard from a distance must be produced with some additional efforts and, likewise, must also be heard with additional efforts.

Why do we get a *pluta*-replacement in *devadatta*3 of *saktūn piba devadatta*3! 'drink saktu, Devadatta!'; *palāyasva devadatta*3! 'run, Devadatta!' This does not give us any clue that Devadatta is called at a distance. The word *hūta* must then be looked as a pretext for address in general (*Kāś: hūtagrahaṇaṃ ca sambodhanamātropalakṣaṇārthaṃ draṣṭavyam*). Only a person, thus addressed, is engaged in the activity of drinking, etc. (*Nyāsa: sambodhito hi puruṣo pānādau vā niyujyate*).

Note that 1.2.33 *ekaśruti dūrāt sambuddhau* assigns *ekaśruti* 'monotone' to sentences covered by this rule. Should this *pluta* be included within the scope of *ekaśruti*? Should this be considered an option (*vikalpa*)? Should this be considered an exception (*bādhikā*) to *ekaśruti*? It cannot be considered an exception since they both share a general scope (*sāmānyaviṣayatvāt*). It is also not appropriate to consider them optional. They must apply concurrently (*sahaprāpteḥ*). This *pluta* becomes suspended (*asiddha*) in accomplishing *ekaśruti*. In a way, this rule will be an exception to *ekaśruti*. How? The *ṭi*-vowel of a sentence will be marked with *pluta*. The rest of the sentence will be marked with monotone (*ekaśruti*). There may even be an inclusion of *pluta* within *ekaśruti*.

This *pluta* is desired in a word at the end of an address sentence used for calling someone at a distance.

8.2.85 हैहेप्रयोगे हैहयोः

haiheprayoge haihayoḥ

/ hai-he-prayoge 7/1 = *haiś ca heś ca = haihayoḥ, tayoḥ prayoge* (*ṣaṣ. tat.* with int. *dv.*); *haihayoḥ* 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*

(*padasya* #1.16 *pluta udāttaḥ* #82 *dūrādd hūte* #84)

haiheprayoge dūrādd hūte yad vākyaṃ vartate tasya ṭeḥ pluto bhavati sa codāttaḥ

A *pluta* marked *udātta* comes in place of *hai* and *he* alone when a sentence with them is used for calling (*hūte*) someone from a distance (*dūrāt*).

EXAMPLES:

*hai*3 *devadatta*!
*devadatta hai*3!
*he*3 *devadatta*!
*devadatta he*3!

1. This rule assigns *pluta* to *hai* and *he* alone, when they are used in an

utterance to call someone at a distance. This specification with repetition of *hai* and *he* is made so that *hai* and *he* could be assigned *pluta* even when not occurring at the end of an utterance. Thus, *hai3 devadatta, devadatta hai3; he3 devadatta, devadatta he3.*

Note that the earlier rule assigns *pluta,* primarily to the final word of an utterance used as means for calling out. This rule is formulated for offering *pluta* to words which are used as means of drawing attention.

Why was this specification of *haihe* made with the word *prayoge* 'when used'? So that this rule does not apply where more than one *hai* and *he* are used.

8.2.86 गुरोरनृतोऽनन्त्यस्याप्येकैकस्य प्राचाम्

guror anṛto' nantyasyāpy ekaikasya prācām
/guroḥ 6/1 *anṛtaḥ* 6/1 = *na ṛt* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya; anantyasya* 6/1 = *na antyo' nantyaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya; api* ɸ *ekaikasya* 6/1 = *ekam ekam = ekaikam* (*vīpsā,* treated as a *bahuvrīhi* by 8.1.9 *ekaṃ bahuvrīhivat*), *tasya; prācām* 6/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *vākyasya ṭeḥ pluta udāttaḥ* #82)
ṛkāravarjitasya guror anantyasya apiśabdād antyasyāpi ṭer ekaikasya sambodhane vartamānasya pluto bhavati prācām ācāryāṇāṃ matena
A non-final, non-*ṛ, guru* (1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru,* 1.4 12 *dīrghaṃ ca*) vowel of an address (*sambodhana*), used in response to the salutation of a non-*śūdra,* or in response to a call from a distance, is, in the opinion of eastern scholars replaced with a *pluta* vowel.

EXAMPLES:

āyuṣmān edhi de3vadatta!
āyuṣmān edhi devada3tta!
āyuṣmān edhi devadatta3!
āyuṣmān edhi ya3jñadatta!
āyuṣmān edhi yajñada3tta!
āyuṣmān edhi yajñadatta3!

1. This rule replaces a non-*ṛ,* non-final *guru* vowel, or even the final *guru* vowel of the *ṭi* of an utterance, in turn, with a *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta.* Of course, when the sentence in focus is either used in response to the salutation of a non-*śudra,* or is used for calling out from a distance. Thus, we get three replacements,in turn, in the address (*sambodhana*) form *devadatta: de3vadatta!, deva3datta!* and *devadatta3!,* etc. The word *api* is used in this rule to also include the *guru* vowel of the *ṭi* of an utterance (*Nyāsa: anenāpiśabdaṣ ṭeḥ samuccayaṃ karoti*). This replacement in a *pluta* marked *udātta* is intended for the *guru* of an address, and not for any *guru* of the sentence. Furthermore, it is intended to be applied in turn (*ekaikasya*). One can thus not apply it concurrently, as **de3va3datta3!*

2. The word *prācām* is used for showing options (*vikalpārtham*). We can also then get *devadatta*!, with no *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta* at all. Thus, *āyuṣmān edhi devadatta*!. Patañjali (ad 8.2.92 *agnītpreṣaṇe parasya ca*) declares all *pluta*-replacement rules optional. This goes against this limited optional provision made by *prācām*. Making this option applicable to all rules will be contrary to rules of grammar. Violating the authority of grammatical rules needs courage (*sāhasa*). Those who cannot muster courage must read *prācām* of this rule in all rules relating to a replacement in *pluta* (*Mbh*: *sarva eva plutaḥ sāhasam anicchatā vibhāṣā kartavyaḥ*).

3. Why do we state the condition of *guroḥ* 'in place of a vowel termed *guru*'? So that a short vowel (1.4.9 *hrasvaṃ laghu*) may not be replaced with a *pluta* vowel, marked *udātta*.

Why do we say *anṛtaḥ* 'in place of a non-*ṛ*'? So that a *ṛ* vowel termed *guru* cannot be replaced with a *pluta* vowel, marked with *udātta*. Consider *kṛṣṇa3mitra*! and *kṛṣṇamitra3*!, but not **kṛ3ṣṇamitra*!

8.2.87 ओमभ्यादाने

om abhyādāne

/om ϕ abhyādāne 7/1/

(*padasya* #1.16 *pluta udāttaḥ* #82)

abhyadānam = prārambhaḥ, tatra ya omśabdaḥ tasya pluto bhavati

A *pluta* vowel, marked with *udātta*, comes in place of a *pada* which is constituted by *om* at the beginning (*abhyādāna*) of a Vedic hymn.

EXAMPLES:

o3m agnimīḍe purohitam

1. Why do we have the condition of *abhyādāne* 'at the beginning . . .'? Consider *om ity etad akṣaram udgītham upāsīta* which, because it is a statement from the *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, does not have a *pluta* replacing the *o* of *om*. The word *abhyādāne* is explained as *prārambhaḥ* 'the beginning'. At the beginning of what (*kasya prārambhe*)? Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*) answers it with *svādhyāyādeḥ* 'at the beginning of recitation of the Vedic hymns, etc'.

8.2.88 ये यज्ञकर्मणि

ye yajñakarmaṇi

/ye (deleted genitive); *yajñakarmaṇi = yajñasya karma* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin/*

(*padasya* #1.16 *pluta udāttaḥ* #82)

'ye' ity etasya yajñakarmaṇi pluto bhavati

A *pluta* vowel, marked with *udātta*, comes in place of *yé* when the same is used as part of a sacrificial activity (*yajñakarman*).

EXAMPLES:

ye3 yajāmahe . . . 'we who sacrifice . . .'

1. Consider *ye3 yajāmahe*, where *e* of *ye3* is a *pluta*, marked with *udātta*. The first plural middle present form of *yaj* clearly indicates the ritual activity context of the usage. We can thus not get this *pluta* in *ye yajāmahe iti pañcākṣaram* '*ye yajāmahe* consists of five vowels (syllables)'. This clearly is not any ritual usage. It is, instead, an usage of the *svādhyāya* 'recitation, study' type. It is stated (Prajñādevī: III:544) that *ye3 yajāmahe* is added at the beginning of a hymn which is used for offering oblations to fire by ritualists of the *śrauta* school.

2. *Kāśikā* cites a desideratum (*iṣṭi*), whereby this *pluta* is desired only in the context of *ye3 yajāmahe* (*Kāś*: *ye yajāmahe ity atraivāyaṃ pluta iṣyate*). This *pluta* is not desired, for example, in *ye devāso divy ekādeśasthaḥ*. *Nyāsa* notes that this rule, with the *anuvṛtti* of *prācām* from 8.3.86 *guror anṛto . . .*, can be interpreted as *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā* 'fixed option'.

8.2.89 **प्रणवष्टेः**

praṇavaṣ ṭeḥ
/praṇavaḥ 1/1 *ṭeḥ* 6/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *vākyasya pluta udāttaḥ* #82 *yajñakarmaṇi* #88)
yajñakarmaṇi ṭeḥ praṇava ādeśo bhavati
The *ṭi* of the final *pada* of an utterance is replaced with a *praṇava*, a *pluta* marked *udātta*, provided the same is used as part of a sacrificial activity.

EXAMPLES:

apāṃ retāṃsi jinvato3m
devān jigāti sumnayo3m

1. Note that *yajñakarmaṇi* is still carried over. Questions have been raised about the true signification of the word *praṇavaḥ*? What does it refer to (*Kāś*: *ka eṣa praṇavo nāma*)? This word is technically not used in the grammar. It is also not well known in the usage. The word *praṇava* is here recognized as referring to the *o* of *om*, the famous *mantra*. What is called *praṇava* is the *o* of the *om*, or a vowel equal to the duration of three moras (*mātrā*), which is brought as a replacement for the *ṭi* vowel, or the *ṭi* of a quarter verse or hymn (*Kāś*: *pādasya vā ardharchasya vā' ntyam akṣaram upasaṃgṛhya tadādyakṣaraśeṣasya sthāne trimātram okāraṃ oṅkāraṃ vā vidadhāti taṃ praṇavam ity ācakṣate*). Thus, *apāṃ retāṃsi jinvato3m* and *devān jigāti sumnayo3m*, where the final *i* and *u* of *jinvati* and *sumnayus* are replaced with *o3m*.

It is clear from these examples that *ṭi* is replaced with *om*, in toto (*Kāś*: *ṭigrahaṇaṃ sarvādeśārtham. okāraḥ sarvādeśao yathā syāt*). It also shows that *om* cannot be brought as a replacement where the final word of a hymn ends in a consonant (*Kāś*: *vyañjanānte mā bhūt*). Finally, this all must happen in the context of a ritual activity (*Kāś*: '*yajñakarmaṇi*' *ity eva*).

Prajñā (III:545) notes that *om* comes as a replacement only in some special hymns of the *śrauta* rituals. It is not brought as a replacement in all hymns used in ritual activities. She further adds that *om* is used as a replacement in special hymns, especially when *svāhā* and *vauṣaṭ* are not used.

8.2.90 याज्यान्तः

yājyāntaḥ
/yājyāntaḥ 1/1 = *yājyānām antaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*)/
(*padasya* #1.16 *vākyasya pluta udāttaḥ* #82 *yajñakarmaṇi* #88 *ṭeḥ* #89)
yājyā nām ye yājyākāṇḍe paṭhyante mantrāḥ, teṣām antyo yaṣṭiḥ sa plavate yajñakarmaṇi
A *pluta*, marked with *udātta*, comes in place of the *ṭi* of a *yājyā*-hymn when sacrificial action is signified.

EXAMPLES:

stomairvidhemāgnā3i
jihvāmagne cakṛṣe havyavāhā3m

1. Note that *yājyā* refers to a hymn (*ṛk*) whose second quarter contains the name of the divinity to whom the hymn is dedicated (Sūryakānta, p. 546: *mantrapratipādyāyā devatāyā nāmadheyaṃ yasyām ṛci uttarārdhe bhavati sā yājyā*). Thus, *jihvāmagne cakṛṣe havyavāhām3*, with *agni* as the divinity. *Kāśikā* recognizes *yajyā* as a group of hymns recited in the *yājyākāṇḍa* of the *saṃhitā* recitations. Their final *ṭi* is replaced with *pluta* in ritual recitation.

2. Why do we have the condition of *antaḥ* 'at the end'. Some *yājyā* hymns are collection of sentences. We do not need to replace the final *ṭi* of every sentence with a *pluta*. The word *antaḥ* is used so that only the *ṭi* of the last hymn is replaced with *pluta* (*Kāś*: *tatra yāvanti vākyāni teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ ṭeḥ plutaḥ prāpnoti; sarvāntyasyaiveṣyate, tadartham antagrahaṇam*).

8.2.91 ब्रूहिप्रेष्यश्रौषड्वौषडावहानामादेः

brūhipreṣyaśrauṣaḍvauṣaḍāvahānām ādeḥ
/brūhi-preṣya-śrauṣaḍ-vauṣaḍ-āvahānām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *ādeḥ* 6/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *pluta udāttaḥ* #82 *yajñakarmaṇi* #88)
'*brūhi, preṣya, śrauṣaṭ, vauṣaṭ, āvaha*' *ity eteṣām ādeḥ pluto bhavati yajñakarmaṇi*
A *pluta* vowel, marked with *udātta*, comes in place of the initial vowel of *brūhi, preṣya, śrauṣaṭ, vauṣaṭ* and *āvaha* when a sacrificial activity is signified.

EXAMPLES:

agnaye' nubrū3hi 'make a pledge to Agni'
agnaye gomayān pre3ṣya 'offer cowdung (cakes) to Agni'

astu śrau3ṣaṭ
somasyāgne vrīhi vau3ṣat
agnim ā3vaha 'invoke the presence of Agni'

1. This rule replaces the initial vowel of *brūhi, preṣya, vauṣaṭ* and *āvaha* with a *pluta*, marked with *udātta*, when the context is sacrificial activity (*yajñakarmaṇi*). Thus, *agnaye' nubrū3hi*, etc. Note that *āvaha devāny yajamānāya* 'invite gods for the scrificer' does not get this *pluta*-replacement, especially since *sarve vidhayaś chandasi vikalpyante* 'all operations are made optional in the Vedic'. *Kāśikā*, while citing *āvaha devāny yajamānāya* as optional, uses *ity evam ādau*. This expression is interpreted differently by Haradatta and Jinendrabuddhi. Haradatta interprets *ādau* 'et cetera' as indicating other possible examples: *āvaha jātavedaḥ, suyajā yaja*, etc. Jinendrabuddhi interprets this *ādau* as indicating 'initial position in a sentence'. Thus, *ādigrahaṇam vākyāder mā bhūd iti* '*ādi* is used so that it does not apply at the beginning of a sentence'.

8.2.92 अग्नीत्प्रेषणे परस्य च

/ agnītpreṣaṇe parasya ca/
agnītpreṣaṇe 7/1 = *agnīdhaḥ preṣaṇam* = *agnītpreṣaṇam* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin*;
parasya 6/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *pluta udāttaḥ* #82 *yajñakarmaṇi* #88 *ādeḥ* #91/
agnīdhaḥ preṣaṇe ādeḥ pluta udātto bhavati tasmāt parasya ca, yajñakarmaṇi
A *pluta* vowel, marked with *udātta*, comes in place of the initial vowel of a *pada*, and also in place of the vowel which follows this initial vowel of a *pada*, when a sacrificial activity signifies commissioning of a high priest.

EXAMPLES:

ā3śrā3vaya! 'announce; have them hear'
o3śrā3vaya!

1. Note that *agnītpreṣaṇa* is analyzed as *agnīdhaḥ preṣaṇam* 'comissioning, or entrusting a ritual high priest (*ṛtvij*), to preside over a sacrifice'. The word *agnīdh* refers to a priest who kindles the ritual fire. An utterance used for calling out the *agnīdh* to kindle the ritual fire gets the *pluta* as a replacement for its initial and next to initial vowels. The word *parasya* is interpreted relative to *ādeḥ* because of contextual proximity. Thus, *ā3śrā3vaya*! and *o3śrā3vaya*!

This *pluta* is made available only in these examples. It does not obtain, for example, in *agnīdagnīnvihara barhistṛṇīhi*. Some, to make this clear, like to bring *vibhāṣā* from the next rule and, thereby, turn this rule into a *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā* 'fixed option'. Others still maintain, '*sarva eva plutaḥ sāhasam anicchatā vibhāṣā vijñeyaḥ* 'all *pluta*, for those who do not have courage to call the rule defective, must be known as optional'.

What is happening in *uddhara3 uddhara!*, *abhihara3 abhihara?* This indeed is an illustration of diverse application (*bāhulaka*) of Vedic rule.

The condition of *yajñakarmaṇi* 'in sacrificial activity', though, is still valid. Thus, we do not get *pluta* in *ośrāvaya!*

8.2.93 विभाषा पृष्टप्रतिवचने हेः

vibhāṣā pṛṣṭaprativacane heḥ
/vibhāṣā 1/1 *pṛṣṭa-prativacane* 7/1 = *pṛṣṭasya prativacanam* (*ākhyānam*; *ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *heḥ* 6/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *pluta udāttaḥ* #82)
pṛṣṭapratipacane vibhāṣā heḥ pluto bhavati
A *pluta* vowel, marked with *udātta*, optionally comes in place of the final sound segment of *hi*, when used in the answer sentence to a question.

EXAMPLES:

akārṣīḥ kaṭam devadatta! 'did you make the mat, Devadatta!'
akārṣaṃ hi3 'I did'
akārṣaṃ hi 'ibidem'
alāvīḥ kedāraṃ devadatta! 'did you harvest the patch, Devadatta!'
alāviṣaṃ hi3 'I did'
alāviṣaṃ hi 'ibidem'

1. This rule offers a replacement in *pluta* to *hi* when *hi* occurs in response to a question (*pṛṣṭa-prativacana*).

2. Why do we have the condition of *pṛṣṭa-prativacane* 'when in response to a question'? Consider *kaṭaṃ kariṣyati hi* 'he will indeed make the mat', where one does not know whether this utterance is used in response to a question.

Why do we state the condition of *heḥ* 'in place of *hi*'? Consider *karomi nanu* 'I do!, never', where *nanu* cannot qualify for this replacement.

8.2.94 निगृह्यानुयोगे च

nigṛhyā' nuyoge ca
/nigṛhya ϕ *ānuyoge* 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *vākyasya pluta udāttaḥ* #82 *teḥ* #89 *vibhāṣā* #93)
svamatātpracyāvanam = nigraham, anuyogaḥ = tasya matasyāviṣkaraṇam; tatra nigṛhyānuyoge yad vākyam vartate tasya teḥ pluto bhavati vibhāṣā
The *ṭi*-vowel of the final *pada* of an utterance is, optionally, replaced with *udātta*, when an opinion, after having been successfully refuted, is brought to light (repeated) by way of reproach.

EXAMPLES:

anityaḥ śabda ity āttha3 'word is non-eternal', thus you claim

anityaḥ śabda ity āttha
adya śrāddham ity āttha3 'today is *śrāddha*', thus you proclaim
adya śrāddham ity āttha
adyāmāvāsyety āttha3 'today is the thirteenth day of the month (*amāvāsyā*)', thus you declare
adyāmāvāsyety āttha

1. Note that *nigraha*, of *nigṛhya*, is interpreted as *svamatāt pracyāvanam* 'making someone accept the opposite of his own stated opinion'. The word *anuyoga* refers to *tasya matasyāviṣkaraṇam* 'bringing that refuted opinion to light'. The *ṭi* vowel of an utterance which is used in this context of *nigṛhyānuyoga* 'reproach by repeating a refuted opinion' is optionally replaced with a *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta*. Consider *anityaḥ śabdaḥ* 'word is not eternal (*nitya*)', an opinion which someone successfully refuted with logical arguments. The person who refuted this opinion can now, borrowing the same expression *anityaḥ śabdaḥ*, proclaim: *anityaḥ śabdaḥ, ity āttha3* 'word is not eternal, thus you say'. Notice that this utterance is repeated for expressing reproach. We will thus get optional *pluta* for the *ṭi*-vowel of the sentence.

8.2.95 आम्रेडितं भर्त्सने

āmreḍitaṃ bhartsane
/āmreḍitam 1/1 *bhartsane* 7/1/
(*plutaḥ udāttaḥ* #82)
bhartsane dyotye ya āmreḍita plavate udāttaś ca bhavati
A *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta* comes in place of (the *ṭi* vowel of) an *āmreḍita* when *bhartsana* 'threat (with reproach)' is signified.

EXAMPLES:

cauracaura3, ghātayiṣyāmi tvā 'thief, thief, I will have you killed'
vṛṣalavṛṣala3 bandhayiṣyāmi tvā 'vṛṣala, vṛṣala, I will have you tied up'
dasyodasyo3 ghātayiṣyāmi tvā 'bandit, bandit, I will have you killed'

1. Note that the use of *āmreḍitam* in this context of *bhartsane* 'when a threat (with reproach) is denoted' implies doubling of a *pada*. This is accomplished in consonance with 8.1.8 *vākyāder āmantritasya . . .* with the signification of *bhartsana*. The *ṭi* vowel of an *āmreḍita* is thus replaced with a *pluta* vowel, marked with *udātta*. Recall that the *ṭeḥ* 'of the *ṭi*-vowel' here refers to the *ṭi* of an utterance. That is, the *ṭi* vowel of the last *pada* of an utterance will become the focus of this replacement. But since an *āmreḍita* is gotten via reduplication of initial *pada* of an utterance, this rule applies to the *āmreḍita* at the beginning of a sentence. Thus we get examples such as *cauracaura3! ghātayiṣyāmi tvā* 'thief, thief, I will kill you', *dasyodasyo3 bandhayiṣyāmi tvā* 'bandit, bandit, I will tie you up', etc., optionally, with *cauracaura! . . .*, *dasyodasyo! . . .*, etc.

2. A *vārttika* (*vt: bhartsane paryāyeṇeti vaktavyam*) proposes that this replacement should apply in turn (*paryāya*) to an *āmreḍita*. That is, one can also apply this replacement to the original whose iterated counterpart the *āmreḍita* is. Thus, *caura3caura!* . . . and *dasyo3dasyo!* . . ., etc.

8.2.96 अङ्ग्युक्तं तिङाकाङ्क्षम्

aṅgayuktaṃ tiṅākāṅkṣam
/aṅga-yuktam 1/1 = *aṅga ity anena yuktam* (*ṭr. tat.*); *ākāṅkṣam* 1/1 = *ākāṅkṣati iti/*
(*pluta udāttaḥ* #82 *bhartsane* #95)
'*aṅga*' *ity anena yuktaṃ tiṅantaṃ ākāṅkṣaṃ bhartsane plavate*
A *pluta* vowel, marked with *udātta*, comes in place of the final vowel of a verbal *pada* (*tiṅanta*) which shares an expectancy relationship with something else, and is used in association with the word *aṅga* where the utterance denotes *bhartsana* 'threat (with reproach)'.

EXAMPLES:

aṅga kūja3! aṅga vyāhara3! idānīṃ jñāsyasi jālma!
'chatter and wander, you wretch! pretty soon you will realize (the consequences of your actions)'

1. The word *ākāṅkṣam* is explained as 'that which expects (*ākāṅkṣati*)'. Obviously, the *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* with the denotatum of action expects something to follow as a consequence. Such expectancies generally point toward a meaning which is desired to be expressed but is literally not expressed (*vivakṣitārthasyāparisamāptatvāt*). The word *aṅga*, as an address word, denotes *amarṣa* 'anger'. It denotes friendly persuasion in cited counter-examples (*PM: aṅgaśabdo' marṣe, pratyudāharaṇe tv anunaye*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *tiṄ*? Consider *aṅga devadatta mithyā vadasi* 'yes, Devadatta! you are speaking non-truth', where *aṅga devadatta* is one sentence and *mithyā vadasi* the other. The first sentence expects the second, where expectancy is not shared by a verbal *pada*.

Why do we state the condition of *ākāṅkṣam* 'that which expects'? Consider *aṅga paca!* 'yes, you cook', where *paca* does not expect any other meaning to be expressed.

Finally, the condition of *bhartsane* is still valid. We thus do not get a *pluta* in *adhīṣva* of *aṅgādhīṣva odanaṃ te dāsyāmi* 'yes, you study, I will feed you rice'.

8.2.97 विचार्यमाणानाम्

vicāryamāṇānām
/vicāryamāṇānām 6/3/
(*vākyasya pluta udāttaḥ* #83 *ṭeḥ* #89)

pramāṇena vastuparīkṣaṇam = vicāraḥ, tasya viṣaye vicāryamāṇānāṃ vākyānāṃ ṭeḥ pluta udātto bhavati
A *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta* comes in place of the *ṭi* of utterances whose denotatum constitutes the focus of objective deliberation.

EXAMPLES:

hotavyaṃ dīkṣitasya gṛhā3i 'should one offer oblations at the house of the initiate'
tiṣṭhed yūpā3i 'should the sacrificer stay guard at the ritual post'
anuprahared yūpā3i 'should the sacrificer stay guard at the ritual post'

1. Note that *vicāryamāṇa* refers to a careful scrutiny 'of two categories (*koṭi*) of things (*vastu*) and standards (*pramāṇa*) by which things can be judged'. The knowledge which emerges from this scrutiny forms scope of current scrutiny. Thus:

koṭidvayasya vijñānaṃ vicāra iti kathyate/
vicāryamāṇas taj jñāna viṣayībhūta ucyate//
'special knowledge of two categories, both, is called *vicāra* 'thought'; a knowledge which forms focus of thought process is considered the subject of its scope'

Consider *hotavyaṃ dīkṣitasya gṛhā3i* 'should one offer oblation at the house of the initiate (*dīkṣita*)?' and *tiṣṭhed yūpā3i / anuprahared yūpā3i* 'should one gaurd, or strike at, the ritual post'? These are utterances under deliberation. These examples will have their *e* (of *gṛhe* and *yūpe*) replaced with a *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta*. It is required (8.2.107 *eco' pragṛhyasya ādūrād . . .*) that the preceding half of an *eC* which goes through a replacement in *pluta* be replaced with *a*. Its succeeding part is then to be replaced with *i* or *u*. The *e* of *gṛhe* and *yūpe* is thus represented as *gṛhā3i* and *yūpā3i*, respectively. Recall that *e* carries a duration of two moras (*mātrā*). The *ā* and *i* carry one mora each.

8.2.98 पूर्वं तु भाषायाम्

pūrvaṃ tu bhāṣāyām
/pūrvam 1/1 *tu* ϕ *bhāṣāyām* 7/1/
(*vākyasya pluta udāttaḥ* #83 *ṭeḥ* #89 *vicāryamāṇānām* #97)
bhāṣāyāṃ viṣaye vicāryamāṇānāṃ vākyānāṃ pūrvam eva plavate
A *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta*, in the classical usage (*bhāṣāyām*), comes in place of the *ṭi* of preceding among utterances whose denotatum constitutes focus of objective deliberation.

EXAMPLES:

ahir nu3 rajjur nu 'is this a snake, or rope'
loṣṭo nu3 kapoto nu 'is it a stone-piece, or a gray pigeon'

1. This rule allows a *pluta* replacement for the *ṭi* of an utterance which precedes others constituting the scope of objective deliberation. Note that *nu* is a particle denoting a query with doubts. It receives a replacement in *pluta* because it constitutes the end of an utterance.

2. The use of the word *bhāṣāyām* 'in the classical usage' limits the scope of the preceding rule to usage of the Vedic (*chandas*).

8.2.99 प्रतिश्रवणे च

pratiśravaṇe ca
/pratiśravaṇe 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *vākyasya pluta udāttaḥ* #82 *teḥ* #89)
pratiśravaṇam = ābhyupagamaḥ, pratijñānam; pratiśravaṇe ca yad vākyam vartate tasya teḥ pluto bhavati
A *pluta* vowel, marked with *udātta*, comes in place of the *ṭi* of an utterance which signifies *pratiśravaṇa* 'affirmation, pledge'.

EXAMPLES:

gāṃ me dehi bhoḥ! 'give me a cow, please'
*aham te dadāmi*3 'I shall give you (a cow)'
devadatta bhoḥ! *kim āttha*3 'what did you say, Devadatta!'

1. The word *pratiśravaṇa* is explained as 'affirmation of a pledge'. It means *abhyupagama* 'approaching with grant of a favor in the affirmative'. It can also mean simply the action of being attentive to what someone may have said (*śravaṇaṃ prati śravaṇam*). Our second sentence here denotes 'a pledge, or grant of a favor'. The third sentence simply shows how attentive the listener is to the content of earlier statement.

8.2.100 अनुदात्तं प्रश्नान्ताभिपूजितयोः

anudāttaṃ praśnāntābhipūjitayoḥ
/anudāttam 1/1 *praśnāntābhipūjitayoḥ* 6/2 = *praśnasya antaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *praśnāntaś ca abhipūjitaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*padasya* #1.16 *vākyasya pluta udāttaḥ* #82 *teḥ* #89)
anudāttaḥ pluto bhavati praśnānte, abhipūjite ca
A *pluta* vowel which replaces the *ṭi* of the final *pada* of an utterance is marked with *anudātta* when the same occurs either at the end of a question, or in a sentence used with the signification of *abhipūjita* 'praised'.

EXAMPLES:

*agama*3*ḥ pūrvā*3*n grāmā*3*n agnibhūtā*3*i paṭā*3*u* 'O Agnibhūta!, O Paṭu! did you go to eastern villages'

agamáḥ3 pūrvá3n grāmá3n agnibhūtâi 'you went to eastern villages Agnibhūta!'
agamáḥ3 pūrvá3n grāmá3n paṭá3u 'you went to eastern villages Paṭu!'
śobhanaḥ khalv asi māṇavaká3 'you are indeed very good kid!'

1. This rule offers *anudātta-pluta* as a replacement for a *pluta* which is marked with *udātta* and occurs as the *ṭi* vowel of the last *pada* of a question, or occurs in an utterance used with the signification of someone praised (*abhipūjita*). Note that 8.2.105 *anantasyāpi praśnākhyānayoḥ* offers a *pluta* vowel marked with *svarita*. It is offered as a replacement for the *ṭi* of a *pada*, even when the same is not used at the end of a question, and also when the utterance signifies a narration (*ākhyāna*). This rule offers a *pluta* marked with *anudātta*, against the *udātta* of 8.2.84 *dūrād hūte ca*. At the strength of Pāṇini's own statement (*vacana-prāmāṇya*), this rule will offer a *pluta* vowel marked with *anudātta* at the end of a question. Rule 8.2.105 *anantasyāpi* . . . will offer a *pluta* marked with *svarita*, elsewhere. Recall that 8.2.107 *eco' pragṛhyasya* . . . will still apply to replace one half of the *pluta* with *a* and the other half with *i* or *u*. Thus, we will still get *agnibhūtā3i* and *paṭā3u*.

8.2.101 चिदिति चोपमार्थे प्रयुज्यमाने

cid iti copamārthe prayujyamāne
/ cit ϕ iti ϕ ca ϕ upamārthe 7/1 = *upamāyā arthaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*padasya* #1.16 *vākyasya plutaḥ* #82 *ṭeḥ* #89 *anudāttam* #100)
'cit' ity etasmin nipāte upamārthe prayujyamāne vākyasya ṭer anudāttaḥ bhavati
A *pluta* vowel, marked with *anudātta*, comes in place of the *ṭi* of the final *pada* of an utterance when *cit* is used with the signification of comparison (*upamā*).

EXAMPLES:

agnicid bhāyá3t 'may he glow like fire'
rājacid bhāyá3t 'may he glow like a royalty'

1. This rule offers a *pluta* to be marked with *anudātta* when *cit*, a particle, is used with the signification of 'comparison'. The word *iti*, after *cit*, is used to denote that *prayujyamāna* 'one which is in use' is a qualifier to *cit*. One may interpret *cit*, itself, as *pluta* used in association with some other word denoting comparison.

2. Why do we have the condition of *upamārthe* 'in the sense of comparison'? Consider *kathañcid āhuḥ*, where the sense of *cit* is *kṛcchra* 'a little'.

Why do we have the condition of *prayujyamāne* 'when used in an utterance'? Consider *agnir māṇavako bhāyāt* 'may the kid glow like fire', where, with no use of *cit*, this rule cannot apply.

8.2.102 उपरिस्विदासीदिति च

uparisvid āsīd iti ca
/uparisvid ϕ *asīt* (verbal *pada*) *iti* ϕ *ca* ϕ/
(*vākyasya plutaḥ* #82 *ṭeḥ* #89 *anudāttaḥ* #100)
'*uparisvid āsīt*' *ity etasya ṭer anudāttaḥ pluto bhavati*
A *pluta* vowel, marked with *anudātta*, comes in place of the *ṭi* of *uparisvid āsīt*.

EXAMPLES:

adha̲ḥ svída̲sī3t 'was darkness underneath the creator'
u̲pari svída̲sī3t 'was darkness above the creator'

1. This rule deals with particular Vedic utterances, namely *adhaḥ svid āsīt* 'was it below (him)' and *upari svid āsīt* 'was it above (him)'. These utterances contain *svid*, an indeclinable, which indicates doubts about their denotata. What is debated here is whether or not the expanse of darkness at the beginning of this creation was overwhelming enough for the creator. This rule then offers a *pluta* vowel, marked with *anudātta*, as a replacement for the *ṭi* of *uparisvid āsīt*. We can get a *pluta*, marked with *udātta*, for *adhasvid āsīt* by 8.2.97 *vicāryamāṇānām*. Note that both utterances get their *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta* by 8.2.97 *vicāryamāṇānām*. This rule replaces the *udātta* of the *ṭi* of *āsīt*, of *uparisvid āsīt*, with *anudātta*.

8.2.103 स्वरितमाम्रेडितेऽसूयासम्मतिकोपकुत्सनेषु

svaritam āmreḍite' sūyāsammatikopakutsaneṣu
/svaritam 1/1 *āmreḍite* 7/1 *asūyā-sammati-kopa-kutsaneṣu* 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu*/
(*plutaḥ* #82 *ṭeḥ* #89)
svarito pluto bhavaty āmreḍite parataḥ asūyāyām, sammatau, kope, kutsane ca vartamāne
A *pluta* vowel, marked with *svarita*, comes in place of the *ṭi* of a preceding *pada* when a *pada* termed *āmreḍita* follows and *asūyā* 'fault-finding', *sammati* 'assent, praise', *kopa* 'anger' and *kutsana* 'blame, censure' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

māṇavaká3! māṇavaka! abhirūpaká3! abhirūpaka! riktaṃ ta ābhirūpyam 'O kid, the beautiful, gone is all your beauty'
māṇavaká3! māṇavaka! abhirūpaká3! abhirūpaka! śobhanaḥ khalv asi 'O kid, the beautiful, you still are handsome'
māṇavaká3! māṇavaka! avinītaká3! avinītaka! idānīṃ jñāsyasi jālma! 'O kid, you impudent, now you will know (the consequence of what you did)'

śāktīki3! śāktīka! yāṣṭīka3! yāṣṭīka! riktā te śaktiḥ 'O you stick-wielding! you!, gone is your power'

1. Recall that 2.3.48 *sā' mantritam* assigns the term *āmantrita* to a *pada* which ends in *prathamā* and denotes address (*sambodhana*). Rule 8.1.8 *vākyāder āmantritasya . . .* recommends iteration of a sentence-initial *āmantrita* when *asūyā* 'fault-finding; jealousy', *sammati* 'assent, praise', *kopa* 'anger', *kutsana* 'blame, censure' and *bhartsana* 'reproachful threat' is denoted. Our present rule directly refers to the context of rule 8.1.8 *vākyāder āmantritasya . . .* and assigns a *pluta* vowel, marked with *svarita*, as a replacement for the *ṭi* vowel of an *āmantrita*, when an *āmreḍita* follows and when *asūyā*, *sammati*, *kopa* and *kutsana* are denoted. Notice that *bhartsana*, the subject matter of 8.2.95 *āmreḍitaṃ bhartsane*, is excluded from these denotational conditions. Thus, the *ṭi* vowel of the first of an iterated sequence of *padas* is replaced with a *pluta*, marked with *svarita*. Of course, when the utterance denotes *asūyā*, etc.

2. A *vārttika* proposal (*vt. asūyādiṣu vāvacanaṃ kartavyam*) makes the provision of this rule optional.

8.2.104 क्षियाशीः प्रैषेषु तिङाकांक्षम्

kṣiyāśīḥ praiṣeṣu tiṅ ākāṅkṣam
/ kṣiyāśīḥpraiṣeṣu 7/3 = *kṣiyā ca āśīḥ ca praiṣaś ca*(*itar. dv.*), *teṣu*; *tiṅ* 1/1 (*ākāṅkṣam* 1/1)
(*plutaḥ* #82 *ṭeḥ* #89 *svaritam* #103)
'*kṣiyā, āśīḥ, praiṣaḥ*' *ity eteṣu gamyamāneṣu tiṅantam ākāṅkṣaṃ yat tasya svaritaḥ pluto bhavati*
A *pluta* vowel, marked with *svarita*, comes in place of the *ṭi* vowel of a *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* and shares dependency relation with something else, provided when *kṣiyā* 'unbecoming conduct', *āśīḥ* 'benediction' and *praiṣa* 'command' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

svayaṃ rathena yāti3 upādhyāyaṃ padātiṃ gamayati 'himself goes by chariot, but sends his teacher on foot'
svayaṃ odanaṃ ha bhuṅkte3 upādhyāyaṃ saktūn pāyayati 'himself eats rice, but has his teacher drink a meal of saktu'
sutāṃś ca lapsīṣṭā3 dhanaṃ ca tāta 'may you receive sons, and also wealth, son!'
chando' dhyesīṣṭá3 vyākaraṇaṃ ca bhadra 'study the Vedas, and also grammar, O good one!'
kaṭaṃ kurú3 grāmaṃ ca gaccha 'make the mat, and also go to the village'
yavān lunīhí3 saktūṃś ca piba 'harvest the barley, and also drink saktu'

1. This rule offers replacement in a *pluta* vowel marked with *svarita* to the *ṭi*-vowel of a *pada* ending in a *tiṄ*, under the condition that the utterance

denotes *kṣiyā* 'unbecoming conduct', *āśīḥ* 'benediction' and *praiṣa* 'command', and the *pada* ending in *tiṄ* expects something else to complete the utterance. The *pada* which ends in a *tiṄ* in all these utterances shares an expectancy relationship (*ākāṅkṣā*) with what follows.

2. Why the condition of *ākāṅkṣam* 'sharing an expectancy relationship'? Consider *dīrgham te āyur astu* 'may you live long'; *agnīn viṅara* 'enjoy the fire', where the *padas* which end in a *tiṄ* do not expect anything else for completion of their meaning. Why is no counter-example for *kṣiyā* is offered? The 'expectancy' in that case is obligatory (*nitya*).

8.2.105 अनन्त्यस्याऽपि प्रश्नाऽख्यानयोः

anantyasyā'pi praśnā'khyānayoḥ
/ anantyasya 6/1 = *na antyam* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya*; *api* ϕ *praśnākhyānayoḥ* 7/2 = *praśnaś ca ākhyānaṃ ca* = *praśnākhyāne* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*plutaḥ* #82 *teḥ* #89 *svaritam* #103)
anantyasyāpi antyasyāpi padasya teḥ pluto bhavati praśne ākhyāne ca
A *pluta* marked with *svarita* comes in place, also, of the *ṭi* of a non-final *pada*, and of a final as well, when *praśna* 'question' and *ākhyāna* 'answer' is denoted.

EXAMPLES:

agamá3ḥ pūrvá3n grāmá3n
agnibhūtā3i paṭá3u
agamá3m pūrvá3n grāmá3n grāmá3n bhóḥ

1. Note that *padasya* and *svaritam* are both carried over. The word *api* is used in this rule to make it also apply to what may not be a final *pada*. This rule then offers a *pluta* vowel as a replacement, marked with *svarita*, to the *ṭi*-vowel of a final, and also a non-final, *pada* when *praśna* 'question' and *ākhyāna* 'narration, answer' is denoted. All *padas*, in an utterance, will thus have their *ṭi*-vowel replaced with a *pluta*, marked with *svarita*. Of course, under the meaning condition of *praśna* and *ākhyāna*. The final *pada* will have its *ṭi*-vowel marked with *anudātta*, of course, at the strength of express Pāṇinian statement (*vacanasāmarthya*; 8.2.100 *anudāttaṃ praśnāntābhipūjitayoḥ*). An *anudātta* of this rule will then become optional (*Kāś. anudātto' pi pakṣe bhavati*).

8.2.106 प्लुतावैच इदुतौ

plutāv aica idutau
/plutau 1/2 *aicaḥ* 6/1 *id-utau* 1/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tau/*
(*plutaḥ* #82)
aichaḥ plutaprasaṅge tadavayavabhūtāv iditau plutau
When a vowel denoted by *aiC* (*ai/au*) is to be replaced with its *pluta* counterpart, the *i* and *u* segments of *ai* and *au* are replaced with *pluta*.

EXAMPLES:

ai3tikāyana
au3pagava

1. Recall that 8.2.84 *dūrād hūte ca*, etc., offer *pluta* as a replacement. If such a replacement in *pluta* involves *ai* and *au*, their *i* and *u* segments will be replaced with a *pluta* by this rule. Obviously, *ai* and *au* are accepted as combination (*samāhāra*) of *a+i* and *a+u*, respectively. Each sound in the combination generally carries one mora (*mātrā*) as its duration. The *pluta* replacement of the short *i* and *u* of the combined *ai* and *au* is assigned duration of two moras by this rule. The idea of a replacement in *pluta* is to enhance the duration of *ai* and *au* to three moras (*Kāś. tāvatī ca sā plutir bhavati, yayā tāv ecau trimātrau sampadyete*). Consider *ai3tikāyanaḥ* and *au3pagavaḥ* as examples where 8.2.86 *guror anṛto . . .* offers a *pluta*. Our present rule will enhance that with a *pluta* for *i* and *u* of *ai* and *au*.

This specification of *plutau* in the nominative dual, as against the expected genitive, is made with a focus on action. The word *pluta* thus denotes its non-technical meaning of *vṛddhi* 'growth, enhancement'. What was consisting of two moras grows to become three. That is, if one accepts the duration of a single mora, each, for *a*, *i* and *u* of the combined *ai* and *au*. If one accepts individual duration of *a*, *i* and *u*, in combination, as half of one mora, the *pluta* of *ai* and *au* will carry a duration of three and a half moras (*Kāś. yadā tv ardhamātrāvarṇasyādhyardhyamātrā ivarṇovarṇayoḥ tadā tāv ardhatṛtīyamātrau kriyete*).

Patañjali accepts that a *pluta* of *ai* and *au* carries the duration of four moras. That is, *ai* and *au* carry a total of two moras where *a*, *i* and *u* carry the duration of one mora each. A *pluta* enhancement of *ai* for its *i*, and of *au* for its *u*, will add three moras. Thus, a *pluta* corresponding to *ai* and *au* will have four moras. The maximum duration of a vowel is generally accepted as three moras. This view, if accepted, will raise that to four for a *pluta* of *ai* and *au*.

8.2.107 एचोऽप्रगृह्यस्यादूराद्धूते पूर्वस्यार्द्धस्यादुत्तरस्येदुतौ

eco' pragṛhyasyādūrādd hūte pūrvasyārddhasy ād uttarasyedutau
/ecaḥ 6/1 *apragṛhyasya* 6/1 = *na pragṛhyaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya*; *adurād* 5/1 = *na dūrāt* (*nañ. tat.*); *hūte* 7/1 *pūrvasya* 6/1 *arddhasya* 6/1 *āt* 1/1 *uttarasya* 6/1
id-utau 1/2/
eco' pragṛhyasyādūrādd hūte plutaviṣayasyārddhasyākāra ādeśo bhavati sa ca plutaḥ, uttarasyekārokārāv ādeśau bhavataḥ

In matters of *pluta* in connection with a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *eC*, the first half of *eC* is replaced with a *pluta* vowel, namely *ā*, and the second half is replaced with *i* or *u*, provided the

context does not relate to calling out at a distance and *eC* is not a vowel termed *pragṛhya.*

EXAMPLES:

agama3ḥ pūrvā3n grāmā3n
agnibhūtā3i paṭā3u
bhadraṃ karoṣi māṇavaka3 agnibhūtā3i paṭā3u
hotavyaṃ dīkṣitasya gṛhā3i
āyuṣmān edhi agnibhūtā3y paṭā3u
ukṣānnāya vaśānnāya somapṛṣṭhāya vedhase
stomair vidhemāgnayā3i

1. This rule focuses on replacing a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *eC,* with the exception of one termed *pragṛhya* (1.1.11 *īdūded dvivacanaṃ pragṛhyam*). Furthermore, the context of this replacement must exclude an utterance used for calling out at a distance. The first half of a vowel denoted by *eC,* and meeting the twin-conditions of *apragṛhya* 'non-*pragṛhya*' and *adūrādd hūte* 'not calling out at a distance' is replaced with a *pluta* vowel, namely *ā.* The second half of such *eC* vowels is replaced with *i* and *u,* respectively. Recall that earlier rules (8.2.83 *pratyabhivāde . . .*, etc.) offer replacement in a *pluta* vowel marked with *udātta, anudātta* and *svarita.* Our present rule offers a similar *ā* marked with *udātta, anudātta* and *svarita,* whatever the case may be. As far as *i* and *u* of the second half of *eC* are concerned, they are *udātta* anyway. For, the *udātta* of 8.2.82 *vākyasya ṭeḥ pluta udāttaḥ* is carried over, via *anuvṛtti.*

A *vārttika* proposal is made to enumerate the scope of application of this rule (*vt: viṣayapariganaṇanaṃ kartavyam*). Another *vārttika* proposal enumerates the scope as follows: *praśnāntābhipūjita-vicāryamāṇa-pratyabhivāda-yājyānteṣv iti vaktavyam.* Thus,

(*i*) *praśnānte* (8.2.100): *agama3ḥ pūrvā3n grāmā3n agnibhūtā3i / paṭā3u; abhipūjita: bhadraṃ karoṣi māṇavaka3 agnibhūtā3i / paṭā3u*
(*ii*) *vicāryamāṇe* (8.2.97): *hotavyaṃ dīkṣitasya gṛhā3i*
(*iii*) *pratyabhivāde* (8.2.83): *āyuṣmān edhi agnibhūtā3i / paṭā3u*
(*iv*) *yājyānte* (8.3.91): *ukṣānnāya vaśānnāya somapṛṣṭhāya vedhase stomair-vidhemāgnayā3i*

This kind of replacement in *ā,* a *pluta,* should, as per specifications, be understood as marked with *udātta, anudātta* and *svarita.* The *i* and *u,* indeed, will only be marked with *udātta.*

Why do we resort to enumeration (*pariganaṇanaṃ kim*)? Consider *viṣṇubhūte viṣṇubhūte3 ghātayiṣyāmi tvā / āgaccha māṇavaka viṣṇubhūte,* where the example sentences are covered by 8.2.95 *āmreḍitaṃ bhartsane* and 8.2.84 *dūrādd hūte ca,* respectively. If the scope of this rule was not enumerated, this rule did not have to include *adūrādd hūte* as part of its wording.

This rule should include the specification of *padānta* 'at the end of a *pada*'. Thus, it will not apply to: *bhadraṃ karoṣi gauḥ* 'you are doing great, bull!' Note that *go* will not be a *pada* before *sU*, because of negation of 1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*. It ends in *visarjanīya* and not in *au*.

Why do we state the condition of *apragṛhya* 'when not a *pragṛhya*'? Consider *śobhane khalu staḥ khaṭve3* 'you two cots are beautiful, indeed', where *khaṭve* at the end is a *pragṛhya*.

A *vārttika* proposal states that this modification of a *pluta* vowel is limited, in the Vedic, to *āmantrita* 'locative singular'. Thus, *agnā3i patnīva3ḥ sajūr-devena tvaṣṭrā somaṃ piba*.

8.2.108 तयोर्य्वावचि संहितायाम्

tayor yvāv aci saṃhitāyām
/ tayoḥ 6/2 *yvau* 1/2 = *yaś ca vaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tau*; *saṃhitāyām* 7/1/ (*plutaḥ* #82)
tayor idutor yakāravakārāv ādeśau bhavato' ci saṃhitāyāṃ viṣaye
A short *i* and *u*, which has been specified as a replacement for the second half of *eC* in the context of *pluta*, is replaced with *y* and *v*, respectively, when a vowel follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

agnā3yāśā
paṭā3vāśā
agnā3yindram
paṭā3vudakam

1. This is an *adhikāra* and, hence, is carried over to all rules enumerated hereafter to the end of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This rule is similar in function to 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*. Why can we not have 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci* account for replacement provision of this rule. This being the domain of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*, *i* and *u* of this rule remain suspended (*asiddha*) in view of application of 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci* (*Kāś. idutor asiddhatvāt 'iko yaṇ aci' iti na prāpnotīty ayam ārambhaḥ*). Even if *i* and *u* of this context of *pluta* were somehow accepted as *siddha* in view of 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*, this rule will be required for blocking a homogeneous long vowel replacement (*savarṇadīrgha*; 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*). It is also needed to block the retention of, and a short replacement for, a vowel denoted by *iK* (6.1.126 *iko' savarṇe . . .*).

But still, 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci* has a *vārttika* proposal (*vt. ikaḥ plutapūrvasya savarṇadīrghabādhanārthaṃ yaṇādeśo vaktavyaḥ* 'a statement about replacement in *yaṆ* should be made for blocking homogeneous long-vowel replacement when a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK* is used before a vowel marked with *pluta*, made against *savarṇa-dīrgha*, in the context of a *pluta* vowel'. This rule is not needed because 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*, along with its

accompanying *vārttika* proposal, can account for provisions of this rule. But the accentual provision of *svarita*, made in place of an *anudātta* occurring after a *yaṆ*-replacement in place of an *udātta* and *svarita* (8.2.4 *udāttasvaritayor*. . .), cannot be accomplished because of suspension (*asiddhatva*) of replacement in *yaṆ* (*Kāś*: *yaṇādeśasyāsiddhatvāt* '*udāttasva-ritayor yaṇaḥ svarito' nudāttasya' ity eṣa svaro na bhavati*). This rule formulation is needed for blocking the accent relative to *yaṆ* of 8.2.4 *udāttasvaritayor*. . . .

The following *kārikā*-verses summarize the issue with focus on replacement in *yaṆ* (6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*), *dīrgha* 'long vowel replacement', and blocking of accent of rule 8.2.4 *udāttasvaritayor*. . .:

kintu yaṇā bhavatīha na siddhaṃ
yvāv idutor yad ayaṃ vidadhāti/
tau ca mama svarasandhiṣu siddhau
śākaladīrghavidhī tu nivartyau//
ik tu yadā bhavati plutapūrvas
tasya yaṇaṃ vidadhāty apavādam/
tena tayoś ca na śākaladīrgho
yaṇsvarabādhanam eva tu hetuḥ//

2. Pāṇini offers replacements in *i*→*y* and *u*→*v* before a vowel in examples such as *agnā3 i āśā* and *paṭā3 u udakam*, etc. Since this replacement in *yaṆ* can already be accomplished by application of 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*, no purpose can be served by 8.2.108 *tayor vāv aci saṃhitāyām*. It can be argued that *i* of *agnā3 i āśā* is brought about by 8.2.107 *eco' pragṛhyasya*. . . . This rule, in turn, is contained in the *tripādī*, and hence, is suspended (*asiddha*) in view of application of 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*. That is, 6.1.77 does not find its scope of application here. Yet, there is a provision made for replacement in *y* and *v*. It is then stated that *i* and *u*, in application of vocalic *sandhi* (*svara-sandhi*) made available by 8.2.107 *eco' pragṛhyasya*. . ., is considered *siddha* 'non-suspended'. But it is non-applicational in *śākala* and *dīrgha* operations. For, *ikaḥ plutapūrvasya dīrgho vaktavyaḥ śākaladīrghavidhinivṛtyartham* offers exceptions to operational provision of *yaṆ*.

Now the question: if *i* and *u* are suspended only in the context of *śākala* and *dīrgha* operations, why can we not accomplish *yaṆ*. The answer is: *ik tu yadā bhavati plutapūrvam* 'when *iK* occurs after a *pluta* then provision of *yaṆ* becomes applicable'. This *yaṆ* will then not only become an exception to *prakṛtibhāva* 'non-*sandhi*' of 6.1.125 *plutapragṛhyā' ci nityam*, but will also become suspended in *dīrgha* made available in *agnā3 i indraḥ* by 6.1.101 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*. It will also become *asiddha* in the *prakṛtibhāva* provision of *agnā3 i āśā* made available by 6.1.127 *iko' savarṇe śākalyasya hrasvaś ca*. When *iK* cannot be seen due to suspension, application of lengthening and *prakṛtibhāva* cannot be availed. If *śākala* and *dīrgha* operations are not applied

just on the basis of suspension, what is the purpose of offering *yaṆ* as an exception. The answer is:

yaṇsvarabādhanam eva tu hetuḥ

A provision of *yaṆ* is made for blocking the accent of *yaṆ*. The author of the *vārttikas* provides *yaṆ* for an *iK* which occurs after a *pluta*. An accent which has its locus in replacement of *yaṆ* is characterized as accent of *yaṆ*. Rule 8.2.4 *udāttasvaritayor yaṇaḥ . . .* offers *svarita* to an *anudātta* which occurs after a *yaṆ* coming in place of an *udātta* and *svarita*.

Pāda Three

8.3.1 मतुवसो रु सम्बुद्धौ छन्दसि

matuvaso ru sambuddhau chandasi
/matu-vasoḥ 6/2 = *matuś ca vaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ru* 1/1 (deleted)
sambuddhau 7/1 *chandasi* 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108)
matvantasya vasvantasya ca padasya 'ruḥ' ity ayam ādeśo bhavati sambuddhau parataḥ chandasi viṣaye
The final sound segment of a *pada* (1.4.14 *suptiṅantaṃ padam*) which, in the Vedic, ends in *mat* (*matUP*) and *vas* (*KvasU*) is replaced with *rŨ* when a nominal ending termed *sambuddhi* (2.3.49 *ekavacanaṃ sambuddhiḥ*) follows in close proximity (*saṃhitā*).

Examples:

indrá marutva ī̲ha pâhi̲ soma̲m 'O Marutvan Indra, protect, here, the soma'
harivo medinaṃ tvā 'O Rudra, with beautiful horses . . .'
mīḍhvastokāya tanayāya mṛḍa 'O you who is capable of . . . our offspring'

1. This rule allows a *pada*-final *t* and *s*, of affixes *matUP* and *KvasU*, to be replaced with *rŨ* in the Vedic, when a nominative singular termed *sambuddhi* (2.3.49 *ekavacanaṃ sambuddhiḥ*) follows in close proximity. Note here that *saṃhitāyām* is also carried over. Obviously, this rule qualifies for application in the context of close proximity between sounds. Refer to derivational details of *harivo medinam* under 8.2.15 *chandasīraḥ*. The final *t* of *harivat*, before a nominative singular termed *sambuddhi*, is replaced with *rŨ* of this rule. Given *hariva*(*t*→*rŨ*) + *medinam*, we get *r* replaced with *u* (6.1.113 *haśi ca*). Finally, we get the vocalic sequence of *a*+*u* of *hariva*+*u* + *medinam* replaced with *o*. We thus get: *hariv*(*a*+*u*→*o*) + *medinam* = *harivo medinam* with the application of 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*. One can similarly derive *marutvat* from *marut* + *matUP*, with *nUM* (7.1.70 *ugid acām . . .*), replacement in *m*→*v* (8.2.10 *jhayaḥ*), deletion of *sU* (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*) and deletion of the conjunct-final conso-

nant (8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya . . .*) *t*. The *n* will again be replaced with *rŨ*. Given *marutvan*(*t*→ϕ) = *marutva*(*n* →*rŨ*) + *iha*, rule 8.3.17 *bhobhago . . .* will replace *r* with *y*. This *y* will be deleted (8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya*) to yield *marutva*(*y* →ϕ) *iha*. Refer to derivational details of *mīḍhvan* where, given *mīḍhvan* + (*sU*→ϕ) *tokāya*, this rule replaces the final *n* with *rŨ*. This *rŨ* then goes through a replacement in *visarga* (8.3.15 *kharavasānayor . . .*). It is this *visarga* which is then replaced with *s* before *tokāya* (8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*).

Why do we need a specification with *matuvasoḥ* 'of that which ends in *matUP* and *vasU*'? Consider *brahman stoṣyāmaḥ*, where *brahman* is used with a nominative singular ending termed *sambuddhi*, but it does not end in *matUP*, or *vasU*. This *n* of *brahman* cannot be replaced with *rŨ*.

Why do we have the condition of *sambuddhau* 'when a nominative singular ending termed *sambuddhi* follows'? Consider *ya eva vidvān agnim ādhatte* 'he who is knowledgeable, he alone heaps up the ritual fire', where *vidvān* is not used in the nominative singular termed *sambuddhi*. It is a nominative singular, but is not termed *sambuddhi*.

Why do we have the condition of *chandasi* 'in the Vedic'? Consider the classical usage, i.e., *he goman* and *he paṭvan*, which serve as counter-examples.

2. A proposal (*vt. vana upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam*) is also made to include affixes *vanIP* and *KvanIP* within the reference of this rule. That is, a *pada* ending in these affixes must also have its final sound replaced with *rŨ* before the nominal ending termed *sambuddhi*. Consider *prāta*(*ṛ*→*r*) + (*i*+*tUK*+*KvanIP*) = *prātaritvan* which produces *prātaritva*(*n*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *prātaritvaḥ*.

3. An optional proposal of *rŨ* is also made for the final of *bhavat*, *bhagavat* and *aghahvat*, both in the Vedic as well as in classical languages. The *ava* of these words is also, concurrently, replaced with *o* (*vt. vibhāṣā bhavadbhagavadaghavatām oc cāvasya*). Thus, *he bh*(*ava*→*o*) *t* + *sU*→ *bho*(*t*→*rŨ*→*ḥ*) + (*sU*→ϕ) = *he bhoḥ*, *he bhag*(*ava* →*o*) *t* + *sU*→ *bhago*(*t*→*rŨ*→*ḥ*) + (*sU*→ϕ) = *he bhagoḥ* and *he agh*(*ava*→*o*) *t* + *sU*→ *agho*(*t*→*rŨ*→*ḥ*) + (*sU*→ϕ) = *he aghoḥ*. If the optional replacement in *rŨ* is not accepted, we will get *he bhavan*, *he bhagavan* and *he aghavan*. Pāṇini himself uses these derivates in 8.3.17 *bhobhagoaghо . . .* One can also accept *bhos*, *bhagos* and *aghos* as indeclinable particles.

Note that this rule deals with *sambuddhi* which, in turn, is singular. However, we do find usage in the dual and plural: *bho devadattayajñadattau*! and *bho devadattayajñadattaviṣṇumitrāḥ*! We also find examples in the feminine: *bho brāhmaṇi*!

Examples also show that *saṃhitāyām* is not followed as a condition. That is, the usage under this rule does not always show two sounds in close proximity. This condition, however, is considered valid in subsequent rules, especially those where sounds in close proximity are desired. An example is: 8.3.7 *naś chavy apraśān*. Some still argue that *saṃhitā* 'close proximity between sounds' is always a valid condition within a single *pada*. Why need a qualifi-

cation such as *saṃhitāyām* when there is no deviation from rule of *saṃhitā* within a single word.

8.3.2 अत्रानुनासिकः पूर्वस्य तु वा

atrānunāsikaḥ pūrvasya tu vā
/atra ϕ anunāsikaḥ 1/1 *pūrvasya* 6/1 *tu ϕ vā ϕ/*
(*ru sambuddhau* #1)
adhikāro' yam. ita uttaraṃ yasya sthāne rur vidhīyate 'tataḥ pūrvasya tu varṇasya vā' nunāsiko bhavati'
A sound segment which precedes a replacement in *rU* is hereafter, in this context of *rŨ*, optionally replaced with an *anunāsika*, provided close proximity between sounds obtains.

EXAMPLES:

sāskarttā '*tṛC*-derivate of *sam-skṛ*'
sāsskarttā 'with two *s*, optionally'
sāskarttum '*tumUN*-derivate of . . .'
sāsskarttum 'with two *s*, optionally'
sāskarttavyam '*tavyaT*-derivate of . . .'
sāsskarttavyam 'with two *s*, optionally'

1. This rule allows an optional replacement in *anunāsika* 'nasalized' for a sound segment which precedes a consonant replaced with *rŨ*. This is an *adhikāra* 'governing heading' which carries (*anuvartate*) over to all rules up to 8.3.12 *kānāmreḍite*. The nominative ending of *ruḥ* which is carried over from rule 8.3.1 *matuvaso ru . . .*, for purposes of this rule, is interpreted as *pañcamī* 'ablative', via *vibhakti-viparināma* 'transposition of nominal endings'.

Thus, Pāṇini states 8.3.5 *samaḥ suṭi* whereby *rŨ* is introduced for *m* of *sam* in *sa(m→rŨ) + s(UṬ) + karttā → sa(r→ḥ →s) + s + karttā = sasskarttā*. Recall that *sUṬ* is introduced by 6.1.137 *samparyupebhyaḥ. . . .* The *a* before *s* which replaces *rŨ* is now replaced with its *anunāsika* counterpart. Thus, we get *sāsskarttā*. We can also get *sāskarttā* where one *s* of the conjunct will be deleted (8.4.64 *jharo jhari savarṇe*). Recall that a *vārttika* (*vt: saṃpuṃkānāṃ so vaktavyaḥ*; ad 8.3.5 *samaḥ suṭi*) also desires *m* of *sam* to be replaced with *s*. The *a* before *s* which replaces *m* will now be changed to an *anunāsika*. We will thus get: *sāsskarttā*. If an *anusvāra* is accepted as a vowel (*aC*), rule 8.4.46 *anaci ca* will introduce two *s* sounds in place of one after the *anunāsika*. This will give us *sāssskarttā* with three *s* sounds. We can thus get one, two or three *s* sounds, optionally, via doubling and deletion of *s*. If the optional *anunāsika* is not accepted, rule 8.3.4 *anunāsikāt . . .* will introduce *anusvāra*. This will give us: *saṃsskarttā*. Refer also to notes under 6.1.134 *suṭ kāt pūrvaḥ*.

2. Why do we have to use *atra* 'here'? The word *atra* 'here' is used to specify the context as: 'here in this context of concurrent application of *rŨ*

and *anunāsika*' (*Kāś*: *atragrahaṇaṃ ruṇā saha sanniyogapratipatyartham*). But this same could be accomplished in view of the fact that this is an *adhikāra* 'governing rule'. There is no other *adhikāra* where *rŨ* and *anunāsika* are offered concurrently. If this specification was not made, the extent to which this *adhikāra* carries may not become fully understood. Since this *anunāsika* is here introduced concurrently within the scope of *rŨ*, it may, in the absence of *atra*, wrongly apply beyond the scope of *rŨ*. That is, it may apply in context of rules such as 8.3.13 *ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ*, where *rŨ* does not find any scope. One may be confused about the application of *anunāsika* there.

The word *tu* 'indeed' is used to indicate something special about what precedes. That is, that which follows receives *rŨ*, obligatorily. That which precedes receives *anunāsika*, only optionally (*PM*: *tuśabdaḥ parasmāt kāryiṇaḥ pūrvasya viśeṣadyotanārtham*: *parasya nityaṃ rutvam, pūrvasya tu vānunāsikaḥ*).

Why do we have to use *vā* 'option'? Haradatta (*PM*) declares it useless, especially since such an option becomes indicated by the following rule. How? It is known from the fact that, in subsequent rules (8.3.4 *anunāsikāt* . . .), Pāṇini teaches *anusvāra* after that which precedes *rŨ*, and for which no *anunāsika* was applied. This clearly indicates that an option not to apply *anunāsika* is offered.

8.3.3 आतोऽटि नित्यम्

āto' ṭi nityam
/*ātaḥ* 6/1 *aṭi* 7/1 *nityam* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1 *anunāsikaḥ pūrvasya* #2)
aṭi parato roḥ pūrvasyākārasya sthāne nityam anunāsikādeśo bhavati
An *ā* which occurs before *rŨ* is obligatorily replaced with its *anunāsika* counterpart when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *aṬ* (*Śs.* 1-5) follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

mahā̃ asi 'you are great'
mahā̃ indro ya ojasā 'Indra who is great by valor'
devā̃ acchādīvyat '. . . gods sported'

1. This obligatory *anunāsika* is offered to an *ā* which occurs before *rŨ* when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *aṬ* (*Śs.* 1-6; vowels, and *h, y, v, r*) follows. Consider *mahān* + *asi*, where *ā* is replaced with its *anunāsika* counterpart *ã̄*. Note that the final *n* of *mahān* is replaced with *rŨ* (8.3.9 *dīrghād aṭi samānapāde*), to be further replaced with *y* (8.3.17 *bhobhagoagho* . . .). This *y* then goes through deletion (8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya*). This obligatory *anunāsika* is offered against an optional provision already made available.

Some, followers of the Taittirīya school, consider this *anunāsika* as an *anusvāra*. This can be seen as a Vedic anomaly (*vyatyaya*; 3.1.85 *vyatyayo bahulam*; *Kāś*: *kecid anusvāram adhīyate sa ca cchāndaso draṣṭavyaḥ*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *ātaḥ* 'in place of *ā*'? Consider *vanaspatī* (*n→rŨ*) + *anu* → *vanaspatīr anu*, where no *ā* occurs before *rŨ* to be replaced with an *anunāsika*.

Why do we state the condition of *aṭi* 'when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *aṬ* follows'? Consider *bhavāṃś carati* 'you wander' and *bhavāṃś chādayati* 'you cover (protect)', this rule cannot apply since *c* and *ch* are not included within the denotatum of *aṬ*.

3. Haradatta thinks that the use of the word *nityam* does not make any sense (*PM*: *nityagrahaṇam anarthakam*). For, *ārambyasāmarthyād eva nityo vidhiḥ siddhaḥ* 'that this operation is obligatorily established by the formulation of this rule, itself'. A provision made against one which already exits is made for restrictive purposes. What is the restrictive purpose: only in place of *ā*, and only when a sound denoted by *aṬ* follows *rŨ*. Not in place of any other sound, not when *rŨ* is followed by any sound other than *aṬ*. Jinendrabuddhi interprets the situation differently. He says that a restrictive provision is made when there is no predicate available. We have *nityo' nunāsikaḥ* 'an *anunāsika*, obligatorily' as the predicate. Consequently, what we have here is an operational provision, and not any restrictive. A specification with *nityam* is then made here for clarity (*Nyāsa*: *nityagrahaṇaṃ vispaṣṭārtham. pūrveṇaiva vikalpe siddhe saty ārambhasāmarthyād eva nityo' yaṃ vidhir vijñāsyate . . . asati hi vidheyo niyamo bhavati. iha tv asti vidheyam, kiṃ tat? nityo' nunāsikaḥ*).

8.3.4 अनुनासिकात् परोऽनुस्वारः

anunāsikāt paro' nusvāraḥ
/anunāsikāt 5/1 *paraḥ* 1/1 *anusvāraḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1 *pūrvasya* #2)
anunāsikād anyo yo varṇaḥ roḥ pūrvaḥ, yasyānunāsiko na kṛtaḥ, tataḥ paro' nusvāra āgamo bhavati
An *anusvāra* comes after that which is other than an *anunāsika*, and which occurs before *rŨ*, provided close proximity between sounds finds its scope.

EXAMPLES:

saṃskarttā
saṃskarttavyam
puṃskāmā 'desirous of a male'
bhavāṃś carati 'you are wandering about'

1. Commentators advise that the word *anya* 'other' must be brought here for properly interpreting this rule. If *anya* is not brought here, the *pañcamī* 'ablative' of *anunāsikāt* will be interpreted in relation to *paraḥ* 'following'. For, there is no other word with which this ablative can be construed. If what is specified in *pañcamī* should be construed with what follows (cf. 1.1.67

tasmād ity uttarasya), *para* 'following' becomes useless. So that it does not become useless, *pañcamī* should be interpreted in view of what is specified with *paraḥ* 'following'. This will lead us to two interpretations relative to *para*: (*i*) *digvṛtti* 'operation relative to signification of *diś* 'direction' and *anyārthavṛtti* 'operation relative to signification' of *anya* 'other' (2.3.29 *anyārād . . .*). The first interpretation will introduce *anusvāra* after the *anunāsika* before *rŨ*. It will not introduce *anusvāra* after *rŨ*. The second will interpret *anusvāra* as something other than *anunāsika*. In this case, the use of *para* will become useless. An *anusvāra* does not deviate from the status of something different (*anyatva*) in comparison with *anunāsika*. It is therefore suggested that the word *anya* should be paraphrased in the ablative in expectation of the specification of *pañcamī* 'ablative'. This is what will give us the sense of *anunāsikād anyo yo varṇaḥ roḥ pūrvaḥ* 'the sound segment which precedes *rŨ* and differs from the *anunāsika*'. The sound segment which will thus be different from the *anunāsika* may also be one which was not replaced with an *anunāsika*. That is why *Kāśikā* reads: *yasyānunāsiko na kṛtaḥ* 'that for which an *anunāsika* was not introduced'. Some state that *anya* should not be read in this rule because *para* means *anya*. Thus, *anunāsikāt paraḥ* will mean *anunāsikād anyaḥ* 'other than an *anunāsika*'. This also makes the *anusvāra* an augment and not a replacement (*ādeśa*). We will thus get *anusvāra* as an augment where there is no *anunāsika*. What receives this augment? That which precedes *rŨ*.

Consider *saṃskarttā*, *saṃskarttum* and *saṃskarttavyam* where *anusvāra* is introduced before *r*(*Ũ*)→*s* after a non-*anunāsika*. Refer to notes under 8.3.2 *atrānunāsikaḥ . . .* and 6.1.134 *suṭ kāt pūrvaḥ* for derivational details. Refer also to 8.3.5 *samaḥ suṭi*, 8.3.6 *pumaḥ khayy ampare* and 8.3.7 *naś chavy apraśān*.

8.3.5 समः सुटि

samaḥ suṭi
/*samaḥ* 6/1 *suṭi* 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1)
'*sama*' *ity etasya rur bhavati suṭi parataḥ saṃhitāyāṃ viṣaye*
A replacement in *rŨ* comes in place of the final sound segment of *sam* when *sUṭ* follows, and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

sāsskarttā
saṃsskarttā
sāsskarttum
saṃsskarttum
sāsskarttavyam
saṃsskarttavyam

1. Note that *rU* replaces the final *m* of *sam* in view of rule 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*. The *rŨ*-provision of this rule is offered against the *anusvāra*-provision made available by 8.3.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*. Refer to preceding rules for derivational details. Note, however, that *rŨ* is replaced with *visarga* (8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ*). This *visarga* is then replaced with *s* (8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*). Now consider 8.3.36 *vā śari* which offers *ḥ* (*visarga*) as an optional replacement for *visarga*, when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *śaR* (*Śs.* 13-14) follows. But since *vā* of 8.3.36 *vā śari* is interpreted as a 'fixed option' (*vyavasthita-vibhāṣā*), a *visarga*-replacement of *rŨ* is replaced with *s*, obligatorily (8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*). Recall that this *s*-replacement is optional to *visarga* in view of 8.3.36 *vā śari*.

2. Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*) also accepts this rule-formulation made against the provision of *anusvāra* made by 8.3.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*. Consider *saṃskarttā*, etc., where, after the introduction of affixes *tṛC*, etc., after verbal root *kṛ* used with the preverb *sam*, we get augment *sUṬ* of 6.1.135 *saṃ-paryupebhyo karotau bhūṣaṇe*. The *m* of *sam* is first replaced with *rŨ*, in view of 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*. The preceding vowel is then turned into an *anunāsika* 'nasalized'. The *rŨ* is then replaced with *ḥ* (*visarjanīya*). *Kāśikā* invokes *vyavasthita vibhāṣā* 'fixed option' and shows how this *visarjanīya*, when faced with its optional replacement in *s* under the provision of 8.3.36 *vā śari*, is replaced with *s*, obligatorily.

Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*) now returns to the question of how, in this rule, a specification is made with *s*. He explains this in view of the position whereby, after replacing *s* of the nominal ending with *visarga*, one does not replace the same with *s*. Otherwise, this specification should have been made with three *s*-sounds: one *s* of the nominal ending *sU*; another of the *visarga* replaced with *s*; and the third of augment *sUṬ*. When this rule is read with three *s*-sounds, the word *dvi* 'two' of *Kāśikā*'s *dvisakārakayoga* 'rule-formulation with two *s*-sounds' must be interpreted in the sense of 'more than one'. If the *visarjanīya* is replaced with *s*, we will not get the *anusvāra* in *saṃskarttā*, etc. As a result, the word *atra* is here used to indicate concurrent application with *rŨ*. The *rŨ* which is used in the earlier rule is thus intended for purposes of relating this *rŨ* with it, by implication. We will, otherwise, not get *anusvāra* in *saṃskarttā*, etc.

Haradatta (*PM* ad *Kāśikā*) goes into much finer details. He mentions how this *rŨ* is explained in the previous rule. If one applies the *s*-replacement here then, because of suspension (*asiddhatva*) of *s*, and absence of *rU*, 8.4.47 *anaci ca* will apply to double up the *s* sound. We will thus get three *s*-sounds. If optional deletion of *s* by 8.4.65 *jharo jhari savarṇe* is availed, we will get two *s*-sounds. If not, we will get three *s*-sounds. When one accepts *anusvāra* as a replacement of *m* (of *sam*), its consonantal status (cf. *ayogavāha*, especially with reference to the abbreviatory term *aṬ*) will cause optional deletion by 8.4.65 *jharo jhari savarṇe*. We will thus get two *s*-sounds, or even one. When,

parallel to consonantal status of *anusvāra*, one accepts its vocalic status, we can get three *s*-sounds, subsequent upon that, and in view of doubling of 8.4.47 *anaci ca*. We thus get five forms: two *s*-sounds if one accepts the option of *anunāsika*; two, one, or even three, if one accepts the option of *anusvāra*. These five, in view of optional doubling of *k* by *śaraḥ khayaḥ* (a *vārttika*), will yield ten forms.

Some scholars (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *samo vā lopam eke*) desire optional deletion of *m* of *sam*. Here, again, we find the twin views of *anusvāra* and *anunāsika*. Since they are both offered in this context of *rŨ*, we may perhaps end up with one *s* after doubling (8.4.47 *anaci ca*) and optional deletion (8.4.65 *jharo jhari savarṇe*). That is, in the *anunāsika* view. There, too, doubling of *k* will yield two forms. This will bring the totality of forms to twelve. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita extends this totality of forms to one hundred and eight, which I do not discuss for fear of expatiation. All this explains why *samaḥ suṭi* is given with one *s* sound. Possibilities of two or three *s*-sounds (*dvisakāraka-trisakāraka*) present possibilities of *s*-sounds in the context of *rŨ* with reference to *anunāsika* (8.3.2 *atrānunāsikaḥ pūrvasya tu vā*) and *anusvāra* (8.3.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*), in addition to applications of 8.4.87 *anaci ca* and 8.4.65 *jharo jhari savarṇe*. Frankly, this is all justifiable expatiation.

3. Why do we have the condition of *samaḥ* 'in place of (*m* of) *sam*'? Consider *upaskarttā* where this rule does not apply because *skṛ* is not used after *sam*.

Why do we have the specification made with *suṭi* 'when *sUṬ* follows'? So that *m* is not replaced with *rŨ* in the context where *sUṬ* is not introduced. Consider *saṃkṛtiḥ* where *sUṬ* does not follow *sam*.

Some demand (*vt*: *saṃpuṃkānāṃ so vaktavyaḥ*) that *s* should be stated to, always, replace *m* and *n* of *sam* (8.3.5), *pum* (8.3.6) and *kān* (8.3.12). Thus we should get *saṃsskarttā*, *puṃsskāmā* and *kāṃsskān*. This *vārttika*, though, suggests that *s* of *sam*, *pum* and *kān* should be accomplished when undesired forms result subsequently after replacement in *rŨ* (*Kāśikā*: *ruvidhau hy aniṣṭaprasaṅgaḥ*).

8.3.6 पुमः खय्यम्परे

pumaḥ khayy ampare
/pumaḥ 6/1 *khayi* 7/1 *ampare* 7/1 = *am paro yasmāt* (*bv.*), *tasmin/* (*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1)
'*pum*' *ity etasya rur bhavati ampare khayi parataḥ*
The final sound segment of a *pada* constituted by *pum* 'male' is replaced with *rŨ* when a sound denoted by *khaY* (*Śs*.11-13), followed by yet another sound denoted by *aM*, follows, and the context is close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

pũskāmā 'desirous of a male'

puṃskāmā
pũsputraḥ 'he whose son is a man; diligent person'
puṃsputraḥ
pũsphalam 'fruit of manhood'
puṃsphalam
pũścalī 'a whore'
puṃścalī

1. This rule replaces the *m* of *pum* with *rŨ*, in close proximity with a following sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *khaY* (*Śs.* 11-12) which, in turn, is followed by a sound denoted by *aM* (*Śs.* 1-7). Note that *aM*, especially because of its associated listing (*sāhacarya*), here with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *khaY*, is interpreted as an abbreviatory symbol (*pratyāhāra*). It does not refer to the accusative singular nominal ending *am*. Consider (*puṃs + am + kāmI + Ṇa*) → *puṃskāma + ṬāP* → *puṃskāmā*, paraphrased as *pumāṃsaṃ kāmayate* 'she who longs for a man'. Affix *Ṇa* is here introduced after *kāmI* by a *vārttika* to derive *puṃskāma* (*śīlikāmibhikṣācaribhyo ṇo vaktavyaḥ*; cf. 3.2.1 *karmaṇy aṇ*). A feminine counterpart of *puṃskāma*, i.e., *puṃskāmā*, is then derived with the introduction of affix *ṬāP* (4.1.4 *ajādyataṣ ṭāp*). This compound can also be paraphrased as a *bahuvrīhi*: *puṃsi kāmo' syāḥ* 'she whose desire is (in) a man'.

Note that this specification with *pum* is made after accomplishing deletion of conjunct-final *s* (8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*). It is not a new word. Given deletion of conjunct-final *s* by 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*, the *anusvāra* goes back to *m*, in view of *nimittāpāye naimittikasyāpāyaḥ* 'an effect is removed when its conditioning cause is removed'. Now consider *puskāmā* which we get from: *pu(m→r(Ũ)) + kāmā* → *pu(r(Ũ)→ḥ) + kāmā* → *pu(ḥ→s) + kāmā = puskāmā*, through application of this rule. The *rŨ* will then be replaced with *visarga* (8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ*). This *visarga* will then be replaced with *s* (8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*). The *u* of *puskāmā* will then be replaced with an *anunāsika* (8.3.2 *atrānunāsikaḥ pūrvasya tu vā*). We will thus get *pũskāmā*. If the option of *anunāsika* is not accepted, we will get an *anusvāra* (8.3.4 *anunāsikāt paro' nusvāraḥ*) before *s*, thereby yielding *puṃskāmā*. An optional doubling of *s* by 8.4.46 *anaci ca* will produce: *puṃskāmā* and *puṃsskāmā*. Forms with nasalization will similarly be: *pũskāmā* and *pũsskāmā*.

We will thus get four forms for all examples. The word *pũścalī* 'a whore', or its *anusvāra* counterpart *puṃścalī*, is interpreted as a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound ending in *ṄīP* (4.1.15 *ṭiḍḍhāṇañ . . .*). Commentators derive *cala* (of *pũṃścala + ṄīP*) by introducing affix *aC* after verbal root *cal* 'to move' on account of its listing as *calAṬ*, in the *pac-ādi* group (3.1.134 *nandigrahi . . .*). Incidentally, *s* of *puṃ(s→ś) calī* is replaced with *ś* (8.4.39 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*). Affix *ṄIP* is introduced based on *Ṭ* as an *iT* (*ṭitvāt*; 4.1.15 *ṭiḍḍhāṇañ . . .*).

Note that 8.3.37 *kupvoḥ . . .* retains a *visarjanīya*, optionally to a *jihvāmūlīya* 'a sound produced at the root of the tongue' and *upadhmānīya* 'an unrepre-

sented replacement of *visarga* followed by first or second consonant of the *p*-series', depending on whether a consonant of *k* or *p*-series (*kU* or *pU*) follows. This option is, however, interpreted as *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā* 'fixed option'. Consequently, *rŨ* will be first replaced with *visarga* (*ḥ*) and then with *s*, obligatorily. It cannot go through the *visarjanīya* option of 8.3.37 *kupvoḥ*. . . . If the formulation of this preceding rule is accepted as made with two *s* sounds, i.e., *samaḥ ssuṭi*, then one *s* will be carried over here, via *anuvṛtti*. This will then not allow the *visarga*-replacement of *rŨ* to go through options of 8.3.37 *kupvoḥ*. . . . Note that the *anuvṛtti* of *rŨ* is also carried here. But to associate this with *s* and *visarjanīya* of rule 8.3.5 *samaḥ ssuṭi* will not be appropriate. For, *rŨ* must be associated only with *matuvasoḥ* (8.3.1 *matuvaso ru sambuddhau chandasi*). It cannot be associated with something else (*Kāś*: *rutvaṃ tu anuvartamānam api nātrābhisambadhyate. sambandhānuvṛttis tasyeti*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *khayi* 'when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *khaY* follows'? Consider *puṃdāsaḥ* 'man servant' and *puṃgava* 'bull, best cow' where *d* and *g* are not included within the denotatum of *khaY*. This rule can thus not apply.

Why do we state the condition of *ampare* 'when *am* follows'? Consider *puṅkṣīraḥ* 'man's milk' and *puṅkṣuraḥ* 'man's razor' where *k* occurs followed by *ṣ*, a sound not included within the denotatum of *aM*.

Why should we simply not state *khayyami* '*khaY* followed by *aM*'? Why use an extra *pare* 'followed by'? One may understand quite the opposite: 'when *khAY* with a preceding, or following *aM*, follows'. This will lead to wrong applications in *pumākhyaḥ* 'male name' and *pumācāraḥ* 'man's conduct' (*Nyāsa*: *asati paragrahaṇe ami khayi para iti vijñāyeta, tataś ca 'pumākhyaḥ', 'pumācāraḥ' ity atrāpi syāt*). Haradatta states that, without *pare*, this rule will be interpreted as '. . . when *aM* followed by *khaY* follows'. That is, we will get paraphrases as: *pumaḥ khayi ami* or *pumaḥ ami khayi*. It will limit the application of this rule to *pumākhyaḥ* and *pumācāraḥ* (*PM*: . . . *khayi parato yo' m tatrety api vijñāyeta, tataś ca pumākhaḥ pumācāraḥ ity atraiva syāt*). The wording of Haradatta's statement is problematic.

8.3.7 नश्छव्यप्रशान्

naś chavy apraśān

/naḥ 6/1 *chavi* 7/1 *apraśān* 1/1 (*nañ. tat.*; nominative used with the signification of *ṣaṣṭhī/*

(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1 *ampare* #6)

nakārāntasya padasya praśānvarjitasya rur bhavati ampare chavi parataḥ

A *pada*-final *n*, except for *n* of *praśān* 'extreme tranquility', is replaced with *rŨ* when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *chaV* (*Śs.* 11), followed by another denoted by *aM*, follows, and the context is close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

bhavā̃ś chādayati 'you are covering'
bhavāṃś chādayati
bhavā̃ś cinoti 'you are heaping'
bhavāṃś cinoti
bhavā̃ṣ ṭīkate 'you are moving'
bhavāṃṣ ṭīkate
bhavā̃s tarati 'you are floating'
bhavāṃs tarati

1. This rule replaces a *pada*-final *n* with *rŨ* when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *chaV* (*Ss.* 11), followed by another sound denoted by *aM*, follows. Consider *bhavā̃ś chādayati / bhavāṃś chādayati; bhavā̃ś cinoti / bhavāṃś cinoti; bhavā̃ṣ ṭīkate / bhavāṃṣ ṭīkate*, and *bhavā̃s tarati / bhavāṃs tarati.* Note that *n* of *bhavān* 'nominative singular of pronominal you (*bhavat*)' is replaced with *rŨ* which, in turn, is replaced with *ḥ*. The *ḥ* is then replaced with *s*. This *s* will then be subject to a corresponding replacement in a retroflex (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*), or palatal (8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*). One can get a set of four forms each if *s* also goes through doubling in the two sets distinguished by *anunāsika* and *anusvāra.* Refer to notes under 8.3.2 *atrānunāsikaḥ . . .*, etc., for relevant details.

2. Note that *rŨ* is carried over, though its association with *matuvasoḥ* is canceled. The word *na* denotes the sound segment *n* which, in turn, becomes a qualifier to *padasya.* This relationship activates *tadantavidhi*, 'treating *n* as denoting what ends in *n*'. The word *apraśān* is a nominative, used with the signification of the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhyarthe prathamā*).

3. Why do we have the condition of *chavi* 'when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *chaV* follows'? Consider *bhavān karoti* 'you are doing' where *k* is not included within the denotatum of *chaV.*

Why do we state *apraśān* 'not in place of the final *n* of *praśān*'? Consider *praśā̃ñ chādayati* and *praśān cinoti.*

The condition of *ampare* is still valid. Consider *bhavān tsarukaḥ* 'you are skilled' where *t*, a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *chaV*, follows *n*. But this *t* is followed by *s* which falls outside the denotation of *aM.*

8.3.8 उभयथर्क्षु

ubhayatharkṣu
/ubhayathā ϕ ṛkṣu 7/3/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1 *ampare* #6 *naś chavi* #7)
nakārāntasya padasya chavi parataḥ ampare ubhayathā ṛkṣu bhavati rur vā nakāro vā
The final *n* of a *pada*, in a quarter of hymns (*ṛkṣu*), is replaced with *rŨ*, when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *chaV*, followed by an-

other denoted by *aM*, follows, and close proximity between sounds obtains.

EXAMPLES:

tasmīs tvā dadhāti
tasmiṃs tvā dadhāti
tasmins tvā dadhāti

1. The *rŨ*-replacement for *n* which was made obligatorily available by the preceding rule is here made optional. Thus, a *pada*-final *n* which is part of the quarter of a Vedic hymn is replaced with *rU*, only optionally. That is, either *rŨ* or *n*. Prajñādevī (III:559) quotes Jaimini and notes that *ṛk* does not simply refer to hymns of the *Ṛgveda*. It refers, instead, to an arrangement of hymns in quarters, especially in view of comprehending their meanings (*yatrārthavaśena pādavyavasthā sā ṛk*).

2. Why state *ṛkṣu* 'in the hymns'? Consider *tā̃s tvaṃ khāda sukhāditavān* where this option is not allowed.

8.3.9 दीर्घादटि समानपादे

dīrghād aṭi samānapāde
/*dīrghāt* 5/1 *aṭi* 7/1 *samānapāde* 7/1 = *samānaś cāsau pādaś ca* (*karm. tat.*), *tasmin*/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1 *naḥ* #7 *ṛkṣu* #8)
dīrghād uttarasya padāntasya nakārāntasya rur bhavati aṭi paratas tau cen nimittanimittinau samānapade bhavataḥ ṛkṣu
A replacement in *rŨ* comes in place of a *pada*-final *n*, used after a long vowel (*dīrgha*) in the quarter of a hymn, when *aṬ* follows and close proximity between sounds obtains, provided the *nimmitta* 'cause, condition' and *nimittin* 'affected element' are both contained within the same *pāda* 'quarter'.

EXAMPLES:

paridhī̃ rati
devā̃ acchādīvyat
mahā̃ indro ya ojasā

1. Note that *n* and *ṛkṣu* are both carried over. The word *samāna* is used as a synonym of *eka* 'one, same' (*PM*: *ekaparyāyaḥ samānaśabdaḥ . . .*). The compound *samānapāda*, itself, is explained as a *karmadhāraya* used in the locative: *samāne ekasmin pāde nimittanimittinor ādhārabhūte* when *nimitta* 'condition, cause' and *nimittin* 'affected element' both find their locus in a single hymn-quarter'. Thus, a *pada*-final *n* which occurs after a long vowel is replaced with *rŨ* when a sound denoted by *aṬ* (*Śs.* 1-5) follows. Commentators further explain that *aṬ*, which conditions this replacement (*nimitta*), must occur in

close proximity of *n*, the sound which goes through replacement (*nimmittin*), within the same hymn-quarter (*Kāś*: . . . *tau cen nimittanimittinau samānapāde bhavataḥ*). Consider *paridhīn rati* → *paridhī̃ rati*, etc., where the cause (*nimitta*) and effect (*nimittin*) of this replacement, both, must occur within the same quarter of the hymn.

2. Why do we state the condition of *dīrghāt* 'after a long vowel'? Consider *ahann ahim*, where *n* is followed by *aṬ* but does not occur after a long vowel.

Why do we state the condition of *aṭi* 'when *aṬ* follows'? Consider *ibhyān kṣattriyān*, where *n* occurs after a long vowel but is not followed by a sound denoted by *aṬ*.

Why do we state the condition of *samānapāde* 'in the same hymn-quarter'? Consider *yātudhānān upaspṛśaḥ*, where *n* and the following *u*, a sound denoted by *aṬ*, occur in different quarters of the hymn.

3. The word *ubhayathā* 'either way' also remains carried (*Kāś*: *ubhayathā ity eva*) over. This rule is again optional. We thus find *ādityān havāmahe̊*, where *n* is optionally not replaced with *rU*.

8.3.10 नॄन् पे

nṝn pe
/*nṝn* 6/1 (deleted) *pe* 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1 *naḥ* #7)
'*nṝn*' *ity etasya nakārasya rur bhavati paśabde parataḥ*
The final *n* of *nṝn* is replaced with *rŪ* when *pA* follows in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

nṝḥ pāhi
nṝṃḥ pāhi
nṝḥ prīṇīhi
nṝṃḥ prīṇīhi

1. Note that *nṝn* has been specified here with its genitive deleted by 7.1.39 *supāṃ suluk*. . . . Haradatta states that *nṝn* is specified with a nominative used with the signification of a genitive (*nṝn iti ṣaṣṭhyarthe prathamā*). Jinendrabuddhi states that this specification is made without any nominal ending (*Nyāsa*: *vibhaktir evātra nopapadyate*). The *a* of *pa* is simply used for ease of articulation (*uccāraṇārthaḥ*). What is intended here is the condition of *p* (*PM*: *pakāramātraṃ nimittam*).

Here again we find four examples for each derivate. That is, two distinguished by *anusvāra* and *anunāsika*; and two distinguished by *visarjanīya* (*ḥ*; 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ*) and *upadhmānīya* (×8.3.37 *kupvoḥ* . . .). Recall that the *rŪ*-replacement of this *n* is replaced with *visarjanīya*. Furthermore, it is either retained as a *visarjanīya*, or is optionally replaced with an *upadhmānīya*, before *p*.

2. Why state *pe* 'when *pA* follows'? Consider *nṝn bhojayati* 'feeds men', where this replacement is not allowed since *n* is followed by *bh*.

Some also carry *ubhayathā* 'either way' to this rule so that they can also account for *nṝn pāhi* 'protect men!' (*Kāś. ubhayathety api kecid anuvartayanti*).

8.3.11 स्वतवान् पायौ

svatavān pāyau
/svatavān 1/1 *pāyau* 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1 *naḥ* #7)
'*svatavān*' *ity etasya nakārasya rur bhavati pāyuśabde parataḥ*
The *n* of *svatavān* 'protector' is also replaced with *rŨ* when *pāyu* follows, and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

svatavā̃ pāyur agne 'powerful protector, O Agni!'

1. This rule replaces the *n* of *svatavān* with *rŨ*. Refer to derivational details under 7.1.83 *dṛksvavas. . . .* Examples of *svatavān* with *anusvāra* and *upadhmānīya* are hard to find.

8.3.12 कानाम्रेडिते

kānāmreḍite
/kān 6/1 (deleted) *āmreḍite* 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *ru* #1 *naḥ* #7)
'*kān*' *ity etasya nakārasya rur bhavati āmreḍite partataḥ*
The *n* of *kān* is replaced with *rU* when an *āmreḍita* 'repeated utterance' follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

kāṃskān āmantrayate
kā̃skān bhojayati

1. This rule replaces the *n* of *kān* with *rU* when an *āmreḍita* 'a repeated word' follows. Note that *kān* is an accusative plural form of *kim*. Given *kim* + (*Ś*) *as*, 7.2.103 *kimaḥ kaḥ* replaces *kim* with *ka*. The vocalic sequence of *ka* + *as* is then replaced with a single long similar to the preceding (6.1.102 *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇaḥ*). This gives us *k*(*a*+*a*→*ā*)*s* → *kās*. The *s* is then replaced with *n* of 6.1.102 *tasmāc chaso. . . .* The resultant *kā*(*s*→*n*) → *kān* then goes through iteration in the sense of *vīpsā* (8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ*). This gives us *kān* + *kān* where this rule replaces the *n* of the first *kān* with *rU*. A replacement in *visarjanīya* (8.3.15 *kharavasānayor. . .*), followed by *s* (8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*), gives us *kā*(*n*→*rU*→*ḥ*→*s*) + *kān* → *kāskān*. One gets *k*(*ā*→*ā̃*)*skān* → *kā̃skān* if the option of *anunāsika* (8.3.2 *atrānunāsikasya . . .*) is accepted. If not, we will get an *anusvāra* which yields *kāṃskān*.

2. Recall that the second *kā* is *āmreḍita*. What if it is not? The second *kān* could be interpreted as used for contempt (2.1.64 *kiṃ kṣepe*). We can thus get *kān kān paśyati* 'what despicable ones you see'. It is stated that *kāṃskān* is listed in the *kaskādi* group of nominals (8.3.48 *kaskādiṣu ca*). Consequently, the *s* which results from *rU→ḥ* is replaced with *s*. That is, it cannot be repelaced with the *jihvāmūlīya* of 8.3.37 *kupvoḥ*. . . . Why can we not carry *s* from 8.3.5 *samaḥ suṭi* and thus get *s*. Carrying *s* from 8.3.5 *samaḥ suṭi* will create problems. Since that *s* has its own contextual relation, and also since it is carried over to subsequent rules, we will get *s* in all preceding rules.

3. Why do we have the condition of *āmreḍite* 'when an *āmreḍita* follows'? Consider *kān kān* of *kān kān paśyati*, where the second *kān* denotes 'censure'. Consequently, this rule cannot apply.

8.3.13 ढो ढे लोपः

ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ
/ḍhaḥ 6/1 *ḍhe* 7/1 *lopaḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108)
ḍhakārasya ḍhakāre lopo bhavati
A deletion by *LOPA* comes in place of a *ḍh* when *ḍh* follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

līḍham 'licked'
upagūḍham 'embraced'

1. This rule allows deletion of *ḍh* when what follows is also a *ḍh*. The locative form *ḍhe* is used here to specify the *ḍh* sound (*varṇa*) as forming the right condition (*nimitta*) of deletion. That is, *ḍha* of *ḍhe* does not denote a sequence of *ḍh* and *a* sounds (*varṇa-samudāya*). The *a* of *ḍha* is used for ease of articulation (*uccāraṇārthaḥ*). The specified sound is simply a consonantal *ḍh* as is clear from the first word of the rule, i.e., genitive singular *ḍhaḥ*. Why did he not use *ḍh* again in the second word? That is, he should have specified *ḍh* in the locative singular *ḍhi*. Afterall, he specified *ḍh* without *a* in 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*. This is the beauty of Pāṇini's stylistic variation (*rucīnāṃ vaicitryāt* . . .).

Consider *lih* + (*K*)*ta* → *li*(*h→ḍh*) + *ta*, where *h* is changed to *ḍh* by 8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*. The *t* of *ta* is also replaced: first with *dh* (8.2.40 *jhaṣastathor* . . .) and then with *ḍh* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). We thus get *li*(*h→ḍh*) + (*t→dh→ḍh*)) → *liḍh* + *ḍha*. Our present rule then deletes *ḍh* before *ḍh* to yield *liḍh* + (*ḍh→ϕ*) *a* → *liḍh* + *a*. Rule 6.3.111 *ḍhralope pūrvasya* . . . then replaces the *i* of *liḍh* with its long counterpart. We thus get *l*(*i→ī*) *ḍh* + *a* → *līḍha*. We can similarly derive *guhŪ* + *Kta* → *gūḍha* and *mih* + *Kta* → *mīḍha*. Note here that these forms can be derived even if one accepts *ḍh* of this rule as a group of sounds, i.e., *ḍha*. But we will run into difficulty in deriving forms such as *lih* + *Ktvā* → *liḍh* +

ḍhvā → *li*(*ḍh*→ϕ) + *ḍhvā* → *l*(*i*→*ī*) + *ḍhvā* = *līḍhvā* and *mīḍhvā*. For, these derivates have their *ḍh* deleted under the condition of *ḍha*, and not *ḍh*. We will end up with wrong forms **līḍhavā* and **mīḍhavā*.

How could we meet the condition of a following *ḍh* for deletion of this preceding when the *ḍh*-replacement of *dh* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*) will be suspended (*asiddha*; 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*)? It will be impossible (*asambhava*) to apply this deletion if *ḍh*-replacement of *dh* is accepted as *asiddha*. Pāṇini's formulation of this rule will become useless for lack of applicational scope (*niravakāśatvāt*). It is therefore suggested that the *ḍh*-replacement of *dh* (*ṣṭutva*) will be treated as *siddha*, based upon the use of *ḍhe* as a condition (*Nyāsa*: *tasmād ḍhakārasya nimittatvenāśrayaṇād eva ṣṭutvasya siddhatvaṃ veditavyam; anyathā hy asya vacanasya vaiyarthyaṃ syāt; anavakāśatvāt*).

Now consider *śvaliḥ* + *ḍhaukate* → *śvali*(*h*→*ḍh*) + *ḍhaukate* → *śvali*(*ḍh*→*ḍ*) + *ḍhaukate* → *śvaliḍ ḍhaukate*, where *ḍh* (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*) of *śvali*(*h*→*ḍh*) = *śvaliḍh* is replaced with its counterpart *ḍ* (*jaśtva*; 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*). Why can our present rule not delete *ḍh*? Why does it have to be replaced with *ḍ*? Since this replacement in *ḍ* is internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*) within a single *pada*, and also since it cannot be considered *asiddha* 'suspended' on account of being placed prior to this *ḍh*-deletion, replacement in *ḍ* must apply before *ḍh*-deletion of this rule. The question of *ḍh*-deletion does not arise once *ḍh* is replaced with *ḍ*. Commentators recognize two sets of sounds which may be involved in a close proximity (*ānantarya*) situation of sounds:

(*i*) *śāstrakṛta*: where *ḍh* of *śvaliḍh* is a replacement of *h*. Consequently, it is treated as rule-derived (*śastrakṛta*).

(*ii*) *śrutikṛta*: where *ḍh* of *ḍhaukate*, for example of *śvali*(*h*→*ḍh*) *ḍhaukate* = *śvaliḍh ḍhaukate*, is not derived by any rule application (*śrutikṛta*).

Appearance of these two sets of sounds in close proximity (*ānantarya*) can define two types of close proximities: *śāstrakṛta-ānantarya* 'rule-derived' and *śrutikṛta-ānantarya* 'originally heard'. The close proximity which we find between the two *ḍh* sounds of *liḍh* + *ḍha* → *līḍha* is recognized as *śāstrakṛta*. Elsewhere, for example in *śvaliḍh ḍhaukate*, it will be *śrutikṛta*. There will be no proximity of either kind when *ḍ* replaces *ḍh* in *śvali*(*ḍh*→*ḍ*) + *ḍhaukate* = *śvaliḍ ḍhaukate*.

This *ḍh*-deletion requires close proximity caused by application of a rule. Consequently, a *ḍh* which results out of a rule application is treated as *siddha*.

8.3.14 रो रि

ro ri
/raḥ 6/1 *ri* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *lopaḥ* #13)
rephasya rephe parato lopo bhavati

Deletion by *LOPA* replaces *r* when *r* follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

nīraktam
dūraktam
agnī rathaḥ
indū rathaḥ
punā raktaṃ vāsaḥ
prātā rājakrayaḥ
ajarghāḥ
apāspāḥ

1. Recall that the *anuvṛtti* of 8.1.16 *padasya* is still valid. Since the genitive of *padasya* is used here as a qualifier (*viśeṣaṇa*) to *r*, deletion by *lopa* can also apply to *r* at the end of a *pada*. If this genitive is interpreted as a qualifier denoting *avayava* 'part of a whole', it can apply to any *r* in a *pada*. If it is interpreted as *sthāna-ṣaṣṭhī* 'in place of', deletion of *r* will be possible only at the end of a *pada*, especially in view of 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya*. Refer to notes under 8.1.16 *padasya* and 8.1.17 *padāt*. Remember, however, that we do not find *r* at the end of a *pada*. The question of its deletion at the end of a *pada*, thus, does not arise.

2. What does this *r* of *raḥ* refer to? Is this the *r* of *rU*, or *r* in general (*repha-sāmānya*). This question arises since *rU* with *U* as an *it* is offered by the context. Furthermore, (*PŚ* 82): *niranubandhakagrahaṇe na sānubandhakasya* demands that a specification made without the use of an *it* cannot refer to something specified with an *it*. This *paribhāṣā* will thus rule out any reference to *rU*. For, *raḥ* specifies *r* with no *it*. This rule may be able to apply in (*nir-rañj*) + *Kta*)) + *sU* → (*ni*(*r*→ϕ) + *rakta* → *n*(*i*→*ī*) + *rakta* = *nīrakta* + *sU* → *nīraktam* and (*dur-rakta*) + *sU* → *dūraktam*. It will, however, run into problem in deriving *agnir* + *rathaḥ* → *agnī rathaḥ* and *indur* + *rathaḥ* = *indū rathaḥ* where *r* of *agnir* and *indur* comes from *rU* (8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ*). No problem. This said *paribhāṣā* does not apply where specifications are made with sounds (*PM*: *naiṣa doṣaḥ, varṇagrahaṇeṣu naiṣā paribhāṣā pravarttate*).

Refer to derivational details of examples under rule 6.3.110 *ḍhralope pūrvasya*. . . . Refer to derivational details of *ajarghāḥ* under 8.2.37 *ekāco baśo bhaṣ*. . . .

Now consider *apāspāḥ*, a second person singular active derivate of *LAṄ*. Affix *LAṄ* is here introduced after *pāsparddh*, a derivate of *yaṄ* introduced with subsequent deletion after *sparddh* 'to compete'. Thus, *sparddh* + *yaṄ* → *pas* + *parddh* + (*yaṄ*→ϕ) → *p*(*a*→*ā*) + *sparddh* = *pāsparddh* + *yaṄ*, where *yaṄ* is introduced with the denotation of *kriyāsamabhihāra* 'intensive action' (3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco* . . .). Doubling and operations relative to *abhyāsa* then follow. We get (*s*→ϕ) *pa* + *spardh* + *yaṄ* → *pa* + *spardh* + *yaṄ* with application of 7.4.61

śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ. The *a* of *pa* is replaced with its long counterpart by 7.4.83 *dīrgho' kitaḥ.* The *yaṄ* itself is deleted by 2.4.74 *yaño' ci ca.* Affixes *LAṄ, siP* and *śaP* are then introduced after *pāspardh.* An introduction of augment *aṬ* and deletion of both *ŚaP* (*Gaṇasūtra: carkarītañ ca,* under 7.4.53 *yīvarṇayor . . .*) and *siP* (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*) then produces *apāspardh.* Rule 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte* applies to replace *dh* with *d* (*jaśtva*). The *d* is then replaced with *rU* (8.2.75 *daś ca*). Our present rule then causes deletion of *r* before *rU.* We thus get *apāspar*(*dh→d→rU*) = *apāspa* + *r*(*U*). The *a* of *apāsp*(*a→ā*) + *r* is replaced with its long counterpart (6.3.110 *ḍhralope pūrvasya . . .*). An application of 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ* then produces *apaspā*(*r→ḥ*) = *apāspāḥ.*

8.3.15 खरवसानयोर्विसर्जनीयः

kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ
/*kharavasānayoḥ* 6/2 = *khar ca avasānaṃ ca* = *kharavasāne* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ; visarjanīyaḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raḥ* #14)
rephāntasya padasya khari parato' vasāne ca visarjanīyādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *visarjanīya* (*ḥ*) comes in place of the final sound segment of a *pada* which ends in *r,* provided a sound denoted by *khaR,* or termination (of speech; *avasāna*), itself, follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣaś chādayati
plakṣaś chādayati
vṛkṣas tarati
plakṣas tarati
vṛkṣaḥ
plakṣaḥ

1. Note that *paḍasya* is still carried over. Its genitive, however, is interpreted as *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* 'in place of'. For, if it is interpreted as 'part of a whole' (*avayava*) qualifier to *r,* the *r* of *arkaḥ,* etc., will also be replaced with *ḥ.* An 'in place of' interpretation with *padam* qualified with *r* will, via *tadantavidhi,* yield the meaning: *rephāntasya padasya* 'of a *pada* ending in *r*'. Rule 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya* will then facilitate the word-final *r* to be replaced with *ḥ.* The locative of *khari* meaning 'when *khaR* follows' cannot be associated with *avasāna* 'pause, termination of speech'. For, *virāma* is explained as *viratiḥ* 'termination (of speech)'. Nothing can follow an *avasāna.* What is the meaning of *saptamī* of *avasāne*? Commentators explain that this single *saptamī* of *kharavasānayoḥ* is split into two interpretations: it denotes a right condition, 'when *x* follows', in *khari*; it denotes scope (*viṣaya*) in *avasāne* (*PM*: '*kharava-*

sānayoḥ' ity ekāpi saptamī viṣyabhedād bhidyate-khari parasaptamī, avasāne viṣayasaptamī). Some still believe in the *parasaptamī* interpretation (right condition) of both. They claim that *paurvāparya* 'sequential order', in *avasāna*, can be mentally created (*buddhiviracitam*).

2. This rule replaces *r* with *ḥ* at the end of a *pada*, or before a sound denoted by *khaR* (*Śs.* 11-13). Thus, *vṛkṣa*(*s*→*ḥ*) + *chādayati* → *vṛkṣa*(*ḥ*→*s*) + *chādayati* → *vṛkṣa*(*s*→*ś*) + *chādayati* → *vṛkṣaś chādayati*, where *ḥ* is further replaced with *s* (8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*). This resultant *s* then goes through a replacement in *ś* (8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā śuḥ*). Examples such as *vṛkṣa* + (*s*→*rU*→*ḥ*) = *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ* illustrate *ḥ* at the end of a *pada*.

3. Why do we not get *ḥ* for the *r* before *khaR* in (*nṛkuṭī* + *Ṅi* + *bhava* + *sU*) + *aṆ* = *nṛkuṭyāṃ bhavaḥ* = *nārkuṭaḥ* and (*nṛpati* + *Ṅas* + *apatya* + *sU*) + *Ṇya* → *nṛpater apatyam* = *nārpatyaḥ*? We do not get a replacement in *ḥ* since *vṛddhi* of *ṛ* which serves as locus for bringing about *r* is externally conditioned by the *taddhita* affix denoting the sense of *bhava*, etc. This *r*, since it is dependent upon rule-application of *vṛddhi*, also thus becomes *bahiraṅga*. A replacement in *visarjanīya* is internally conditioned since it is only dependent upon the condition of *khaR*. Thus, in view of (*PŚ* (51): *asiddhaṃ bahiraṅgam antaraṅge*), *r* becomes *asiddha* 'suspended'. We thus, in the absence of *r*, do not get a replacement in *visarjanīya*.

4. Why do we state the condition of *kharavasānayoḥ* 'when *r* is followed by *khaR*, or occurs at *avasāna*'? Consider *agnir nayati* and *vāyur nayati* where *n* of *nayati* is not included within the denotata of *khaR*.

8.3.16 रोः सुपि

roḥ supi
/*roḥ* 6/1 *supi* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raḥ* #14 *visarjanīyaḥ* #15)
'*ru*' *ity etasya rephasya supi parato visarjanīyādeśo bhavati*
The *r* of a replacement in *rU* is replaced with *visarjanīya* when the locative plural nominal ending *suP* follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

payaḥsu
sarpiḥṣu
yaśaḥsu

1. This rule replaces a *rU* with *visarga* when *suP* follows. Note that *suP* refers here to the locative plural nominal ending. It is not the abbreviatory term *sUP* which denotes all nominal endings (4.1.2 *svaujasmauṭ . . .*). We understand this in view of the *anuvṛtti* of *khari*. Why formulate this rule when the preceding can account for this *visarga*-replacement of *r*? A provision

which is made against one which already exists is made for restrictive purposes (*siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*). What is the restrictive purpose here? This replacement in *visarga* applies only to the *r* of *rU*, and not to any other *r*. Consider *gīr* + *su* → *gīrṣu* and *dhūrṣu*, where *r* is not the *r* of *rU*. A *visarga* as a replacement for this *r* is thus blocked. Recall that, in *paya*(*s*→*rU*→*ḥ*) + *su* = *payaḥsu*, *sarpiḥsu* and *yaśaḥsu*, the *s* is replaced with *rU* of 8.2.66 *sasajuṣo ruḥ*.

8.3.17 भोभगोअघोअपूर्वस्य योऽशि

bhobhagoaghoapūrvasya yo' śi
/*bhobhagoaghoapūrvasya* 6/1 = *bhoś ca bhagoś ca aghoś ca aś ca* = *bhobhagoaghoāḥ* (*itar. dv.*); *bhobhagoaghoāḥ pūrvā yasya* (*bv.* with int. *itar. dv.*), *tasya*; *yaḥ* 1/1 *aśi* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raḥ* #14 *roḥ* #16)
'*bhor, bhagor, aghor*' *ity evam pūrvasya avarṇapūrvasya ca ro rephasya yakārādeśo bhavati aśi parataḥ*
The *r* of *rU* which occurs after *bho, bhago, agho* and *a* is replaced with *y* when a sound denoted by *aŚ* follows, and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

bho atra
bhago atra
agho atra
bho dadāti
bhago dadāti
agho dadāti
ka āste
kay āste
brāhmaṇā dadati
puruṣā dadati

1. This rule replaces the *r* of *rU* with *y* when *rU* occurs after *bho, bhago, agho* and *a*, provided a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *aŚ* (*Śs.* 1-10) follows. Consider *bho*(*s*→*rU*) + *atra* → *bhor*(*U*) + *atra* → *bho*(*r*→*y*) + *atra* = *bho*(*y*→ϕ) + *atra* → *bho atra*, where this replacement in *y* is obligatorily (*nitya*) deleted by 8.3.20 *oto gārgyasya*. Note that *gārgyasya* in this deletion rule is used for respect (*pūjā*). A similar obligatory deletion of this *y* before a consonant is accomplished by 8.3.22 *hali sarveṣām*. Thus, we get *bhago*(*rU*→*y*→ϕ) + *dadāti* → *bhago dadāti*, etc. Now consider (*kim*→*ka*) + *sU* → *ka*(*s*→*rU*→*y*) + *āste* → *kay* + *āste*, where *y* occurs after *a* and *ā*, and a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *aŚ* follows. Note that *a* also includes *ā* in its reference. Here again 8.3.22 *hali sarveṣām* deletes *y*. Similar deletion occurs in *brāhmaṇa* + (*J*)*as* + *dadati* → *brāhmaṇa* + *a*(*s*→*rU*→*y*) + *dadati* → *brāhmaṇ*(*a*+*a*→*ā*)*y* +

dadati → *brāhmaṇā dadati.* Incidentally, *bhos, bhagos* and *aghos* can either be accepted as indeclinable particles, or they can be derived at the strength of a *vārttika* proposal (cf. under 8.3.1 *matuvaso ruḥ . . .*).

2. Why do we have this specification made with *bhobhagoagho*? Consider *agnir atra* and *vāyur atra,* where, in the absence of *bho, bhago* and *agho,* we do not get a replacement in *y.*

3. Why do we state the condition of *aśi* 'when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *aŚ* follows'? Consider *vṛkṣa* + *s*(*U*) → *vṛkṣas* and *plakṣa* + *s*(*U*) → *plakṣas,* where *s* is replaced with *rU.* This *rU* cannot be replaced with *y* since a sound denoted by *aŚ* does not follow. This *rU* occurs finally before pause. Consequently, 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ* replaces *r* with *visarga.*

Questions have been raised against using *aŚ* as a condition. This condition does not make any sense, especially when it is made against *khaR* (8.3.15 *kharavasānayor . . .*). There is no way *rU* cannot be replaced with *visarga.* The *y* of this rule cannot be considered *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of replacing *rU* with *ḥ,* via *sthānivadbhāva.* For, 8.3.2 *atrānunāsikaḥ pūrvasya tu vā* makes its specification without replacing *visarga* with *y.* This, in turn, becomes an indicator (*jñāpaka*): 'a replacement in *visarga* made under the condition of *khaR* is not replaced with *y*' (*Nyāsa: visarjanīyasya khari yakāro na bhavati*). This replacement of a *visarga* in *y* cannot even be accomplished at pause (*avasāna*). For, this being the domain of *saṃhitā.* Besides, there is no question of *sthānivadbhāva* in operations concerning sounds (*PM: tasmād alvidhitvād api nāsti sthānivadbhāvaḥ*). This specification with *aśi* is meaningless. It is stated that *aśi* is then specified for subsequent rules (*uttarārtham*). Consider 8.3.22 *hali sarveṣām* where *aśi* is needed to qualify *hali.* That is, *y* (or *v*) will be deleted only before a consonant included within the denotatum of *aŚ.* This saves *v* of *vṛkṣav karoti* from deletion. For, *k* is not included within consonants denoted by the abbreviatory term *aŚ.* Incidentally, *vṛkṣav* derives from *vṛkṣaṃ vṛścati* = *vṛkṣa* + *am* + *vIC* → *vṛkṣaviṭ* + *ṆiC,* etc. I omit further details of this derivation since it is very complex. Refer to *Nyāsa* and *Padamañjarī* for conflicting details.

If consonants denoted by *aŚ* are required to qualify *haL* of 8.3.22 *hali sarveṣām,* it would be better to formulate *hali sarveṣām* as *haśi sarveṣām.* Why not *haśi sarveṣām*? The *hali* of 8.3.22 is needed for subsequent rule(s). This proposed *haśi* will greatly reduce the scope of consonants. Besides, *aśi* is also used here to block application of 8.3.18 *vyor laghu . . .* and 8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya* on examples such as *vṛkṣav karoti.*

Why did Pāṇini not use *aśi* in rules where needed. That is, why use here when the need is elsewhere. If *aśi* was used in association with *hali,* carrying *hali* to subsequent rules would have also required carrying *aśi.* This being the case, 8.2.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ* could introduce *anusvāra* only where a consonant denoted by *aŚ* followed. I choose not to discuss this in detail. Patañjali does not consider this specification with *aśi* necessary.

4. Note that the condition of *roḥ* is still valid. Thus, we do not get the application of this rule on *r* of *prātar atra* and *punar atra*. For, their *r* does not have its source in *rU*.

8.3.18 व्योर्लघुप्रयत्नतरः शाकटायनस्य

vyor laghuprayatnataraḥ śākaṭāyanasya
/ vyoḥ 6/2 = *vaś ca yaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *laghu-prayatnataraḥ* 1/1 *laghu prayatno yasya* (*bv.*); *atiśayena laghuprayatnaḥ* = *laghuprayatnataraḥ*; *śākaṭāyanasya* 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raḥ* #14 *roḥ* #16 *bhobhagoagho-a pūrvasya yo' śi* #17)
vakārayakārayor bhobhagoaghoavarṇapūrvayoḥ padāntayor laghuprayatnatara ādeśo bhavati
A replacement articulated with a comparatively lighter articulatory effort (*laghuprayatnatara*) comes, in the opinion of Śākaṭāyana, in place of a *pada*-final *v* or *y* which occurs after *bho, bhago, agho*, or after *a* or *ā*, provided when a sound denoted by *aŚ* follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

bhagoy atra
bhago atra
aghoy atra
agho yatra
kay āste
ka āste
asmāy uddhara
asmā uddhara
asāv ādityaḥ
asā ādityaḥ
dvāv atra
dvā atra
dvāv ānaya
dvā ānaya

1. Commentators explain *laghuprayatnatara* as sounds produced with a comparatively lighter articulatory effort. That is, where 'place' (*sthāna*) and 'means' (*karaṇa*) of articulation are both in a relatively relaxed state (*Nyāsa: tayor uccāraṇe śaithilyaṃ laghuprayatnataratvam*). A slighter contact by the articulator with the place of articulation results in such sound qualities.

Note that *v* and *y* have three different articulations depending on where they occur in a word. A *v* or *y* at the beginning of a word (*padādi*) is articulated with slight articulatory effort. This effort is relatively slighter in the middle of a *pada* and slightest at the end. The *Yājñavalkya-śikṣā* refers them as *guru*

'heavy', *laghu* 'light' and *laghutara* 'lighter'. Recensions of the *Yajurveda* have different conventions of marking these efforts. For example, *v* and *y* at the beginning of a *pada* were written twice.

2. This rule offers a slightly articulated *v* and *y* as a replacement for the *pada*-final *v* and *y*, when these occur after *bho, bhago, agho* or *a*. Of course, when a sound denoted by *aŚ* follows them. Note that 1.1.50 *sthāne' ntaratamaḥ* will require *v* and *y* to be replaced only with their corresponding slighter articulations. Mention of *Śākaṭāyana* is made here to indicate option (*vibhāṣā*). Deletion of the following rules must apply if this option is not accepted.

Consider *bhoy atra / bho atra, bhagoy atra / bhago atra* and *aghoy atra/ agho atra* which illustrate slighter articulation, or deletion of *y*, gotten from the preceding rule. Examples such as *kay āste / ka āste* and *kākay āste / kāka āste* illustrate this same occurring after *a*. The *v* and *y* sounds of examples such as *asmai uddhara* → *asm*(*ai*→*āy*) *uddhara, as*(*au*→*āv*) *ādityaḥ, dv*(*au*→*āv*) *atra* and *dv*(*au*→*āv*) *ānaya* result from application of 6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ.*

8.3.19 लोपः शाकल्यस्य

lopaḥ śākalyasya
/ lopaḥ 1/1 *śākalyasya* 6/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apūrvasya aśi* #17 *vyoḥ* #18)
vakārayakārayoḥ padāntayor avarṇapūrvayor lopo bhavati śākalyasyācāryasya matenāśi parataḥ
A *pada*-final *v* or *y* which occurs after *a* or *ā* is, in the opinion of Śākalya, replaced with *LOPA* when a sound denoted by *aŚ* follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

ka āste
kay āste
kāka āste
kākay āste
asmā uddhara
asmāy uddhara
dvāv atra
dvā atra
asāv ādityaḥ
asā ādityaḥ

1. Mention of *śākalyasya* is made here to denote option (*vibhāṣā*). This rule thus optionally deletes a *pada*-final *v* and *y* which occurs after *a* or *ā*, provided a sound denoted by *aŚ* follows. Thus, we get *ka*(*y*→ϕ) *āste* and *kay āste*, etc.

Note that this rule will yield three examples in a set: *kay āste, kay āste* and

ka āste, where the first two *kay āste* will have one *y* with regular and the other with slight articulatory effort. The third form will show optional deletion. What is most likely deleted here is the regular one.

8.3.20 ओतो गार्ग्यस्य

oto gārgyasya
/ otaḥ 5/1 *gārgyasya* 6/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apūrvasya aśi* #17 *vyoḥ* #18 *lopaḥ* #19)
okārād uttarasya yakārasya lopo bhavati gārgyasyācāryasya matenāśi parataḥ
A *pada*-final *y* which occurs after *o* is, in the opinion of Gārgya, deleted by *LOPA*, provided a sound denoted by *aŚ* follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

bho atra
bhago atra
bho idam
bhago idam

1. Note that *gārgyasya* is used here to show respect to Gārgya. It does not denote any option. Why formulate this rule when desired deletion can be accomplished by the preceding rule. This rule is obligatory (*nitya*). A *pada*-final *y* which is optionally deleted by the preceding rule is here deleted obligatorily. Thus, we get *bho atra* and *bhoy atra*, etc. Some, however, do wish deletion of all *y* sounds (*Kāś: kecit tu sarvameva yakāram atra necchanti*).

2. Examples of *v* after *o* are impossible to find. Hence, only *y* is associated with the wording of this rule (*Nyāsa: okārād uttaro vakāro nāsti*). The *t* of *otaḥ* (*taparakaraṇa*) is used for clarity. A specification with *oḥ* may confuse us whether the specified sound is *u* or *o*. Such confusion can be easily ruled out by using *o* with *t* in *otaḥ*.

It might not be a bad idea to summarize operational results of this *sūtra*, as compared with the preceding two. *Śākaṭāyana* (8.3.18), optionally after *bho, bhago* and *agho*, or after *a/ā*, replaces a *pada*-final *y* and *v* with *laghuprayatnatara* 'that which has a comparatively slighter articulation'. Others, however, will not allow a replacement. *Śākalya* (8.3.19) would apply deletion of *y* or *v* after *a/ā* at the end of a *pada*. Others, of course, will not apply the deletion. The *y* and *v* will be heard, especially when replacement of 8.3.18 has not applied. Our present rule offers deletion of *y* which is already made available by the preceding rule. But since that provision is optional, our present rule is needed to make the *y*-deletion obligatory (*nitya*).

8.3.21 उञि च पदे

uñi ca pade

/uñi 7/1 *ca* ϕ *pade* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apūrvasya* #17 *vyoḥ* #18 *lopaḥ* #19)
avarṇapūrvayoḥ vyoḥ padāntayor lopo bhavati uñi ca pade parataḥ
A *pada*-final *v* or *y* which occurs after *a*, or *ā*, is deleted by *LOPA* when a *pada* constituted by *uÑ* follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

sa u ekaviṃśatiḥ
sa u ekāgniḥ

1. Note that this deletion could be accomplished by the preceding rule. This rule is then stated for restrictive purposes (*niyamārthaḥ*). What is this restrictive purpose? This deletion should apply only when a *pada* constituted by *uÑ* follows. We know that *v* after *o* is impossible to find. This rule then focuses on *y* when used after *a* and *ā*. Since a *pada* constituted by *u* marked with *Ñ* will always be one without *Ñ* when used, *uÑ* can also refer to a *pada* which earlier had *Ñ* as an *it*. Thus, consider *saḥ u ekāgniḥ* → *sa*(*s*→*rU*→*y*) *u ekāgniḥ* → *sa*(*y*→ϕ) *u ekāgniḥ*, where *u* has to be comprehended as *uÑ*. But this can be either interpreted as a particle, or as a form of verbal root *veÑ* subsequent upon application of *samprasāraṇa* (6.1.15 *vacisvaliyajādīnāṃ . . .*).

2. A condition of *pade* is imposed so that *uÑ* could not refer to the verb form *uÑ*. It is argued that *uÑ* cannot refer to the form of verbal root *veÑ*. For, the form of *veÑ* which results from *samprasāraṇa* is not *uÑ*. It is *u*, instead. Moreover, we already have the particle *uÑ* expressly given as original (*pratipadokta*). If this non-*samprasāraṇa* form of *uÑ* can be comprehended in this manner then we do not need the condition of *pade*. It is suggested that *pade* is used for subsequent rules (*uttarārtham*). Consider 8.3.32 *ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṇ nityam*, whereby a sound denoted by *ṅAMuṬ* (*ṅUṬ*, *ṇUṬ* and *nUṬ*) is introduced to a *pada*-final sound denoted by *ṅaM* (*Śs.* 7) and preceded by a short vowel. This, of course, happens at the word-boundary before a word beginning with a vowel. It is because of *pade* that *paramadaṇḍin* + (*Ṭ*) *ā* = *paramadaṇḍinā* does not get *n* introduced after *n* to yield **paramadaṇḍinnā*. That is, what follows is a vowel-initial affix, and not a *pada*.

3. Why do we state the condition of *pade*? Consider *tantra utam* and *tantray utam*, where the *e* of *tantre* is replaced with *ay* (6.1.78 *eco' yavāyāvaḥ*) before *u* ending in the *niṣṭhā* affix *Kta*. This *u* is the *uÑ* of *veÑ* received via *samprasāraṇa*. This rule does not apply here.

8.3.22 हलि सर्वेषाम्

hali sarveṣām
/hali 7/1 *sarveṣām* 6/3/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *bhobhagoaghoapūrvasya* #17 *vyoḥ* #18 *lopaḥ* #19)

hali parato bhobhagoaghoapūrvasya yakārasya padāntasya lopo bhavati sarveṣām ācāryāṇāṃ matena
A deletion by *LOPA* comes, in the opinion of all scholars, in place of a *pada*-final *y* which occurs after *bho, bhago, agho* and *a*, provided a sound denoted by *haL* follows; and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

bho hasati
bhago hasati
agho hasati
bho yāti
bhago yāti
agho yāti
bālakā hasanti

1. This rule, as per all scholars, deletes a *pada*-final *y* which (*i*) occurs after *bho, bhago* and *agho* or (*ii*) occurs after *a* and *ā*, provided a *pada* beginning with a consonant follows. Recall that *y* alone is found occurring after *bho, bhago* and *agho*. We can find an example of *v* after *a* or *ā* in *vṛkṣav karoti*. This *v* cannot be deleted because *aśi* qualifies *hali* and *aŚ* of *aśi* does not include *k* of *karoti*. This rule only relates to deletion of *y*. Patañjali (on *Śs.* 6: *na padāntā halo' ṇaḥ santi*) claims that a *pada* which ends in *h, y, v, r* and *l*, and occurs preceded by *a, i* and *u*, cannot be found in usage. This makes *vṛkṣav* of *vṛkṣav karoti* a suspect.

2. The use of *sarveṣām* also includes references to *śākaṭāyanasya* and *śākalyasya*. One may be confused about its reference only to *gārgyasya* because of proximity (*pratyāsatti*). The *laghuprayatnatara* 'articulated with slight articulatory effort' of Śākaṭāyana can also not be saved from deletion (*Kāś: sarveṣāṃ grahaṇaṃ śākaṭāyanasyāpi lopo yathā syāt laghuprayatnataro mā bhūd iti*).

8.3.23 मोऽनुस्वारः

mo' nusvāraḥ
/maḥ 6/1 *anusvāraḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *hali* #22)
makārasya padāntasyānusvāra ādeśo bhavati hali parataḥ
A *pada*-final *m*, when occurring in close proximity with a following consonant, is replaced with *ṃ* (*anusvāra*).

EXAMPLES:

kuṇḍaṃ hasati
vanaṃ hasati

kuṇḍaṃ yāti
vanaṃ yāti

1. This rule replaces a *pada*-final *m* with *ṃ* (*anusvāra*) when a consonant follows. Note that the genitive of *padasya* denotes 'in place of' (*sthāna-ṣaṣṭhī*). We get a *tadantavidhi* interpretation when *maḥ* qualifies *padasya*. A reading with 1.1.52 *alo' ntyasya* offers the interpretation: *makārāntasya padasya alo' ntyasya anusvāraḥ* 'an *anusvāra* in place of *m* of a *pada* ending in *m*'. Thus, *vana(m→ṃ) hasati = vanaṃ hasati*, etc.

2. Why do we state the condition of *hali* 'when a consonant follows'? Consider *tvam + atra → tvam atra* and *kim atra*, where *m* is not replaced with *anusvāra* since a vowel follows.

Why do we retain the condition of *padāntasya* 'of that which occurs at the end of a *pada*'? Consider *gamyate* and *ramyate*, where *m* does not occur at the end of a *pada*.

8.3.24 नश्चापदान्तस्य झलि

naś cāpadāntasya jhali
/naḥ 6/1 *ca* ɸ *apadāntasya* 6/1 = *padasya antaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *na padāntaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *jhali* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *mo' nusvāraḥ* #23)
nakārasya makārasya cāpadāntasyānusvārādeśo bhavati jhali parataḥ
A non-final *n*, and also *m*, of a *pada* is replaced with *anusvāra* when a consonant denoted by the abbreviatory term *jhaL* (*Śs.* 8-14) follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

payāṃsi
yaśāṃsi
sarpīṃṣi
dhanūṃṣi
ākraṃsyate
ācikraṃṣyate
adhijigāṃsate

1. Note that the *anuvṛtti* of *hali* 'when a consonant follows' is canceled by the use of *jhali* 'when a consonant denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jhaL* follows'. The *ca* 'and' is used here to attract *m*. This rule then allows a non-final *n*, and also *m*, to be replaced with an *anusvāra* when a sound denoted by *jhaL* follows in close proximity. Refer to derivational details of *payas + Jas → payāṃsi*, under the appendix (II:384-85) of 1.1.47 *mid aco' ntyāt paraḥ*. Similar derivational steps are followed in deriving *yaśas + Jas → yaśāṃsi*, *sarpis + Jas → sarpīṃsi* and *dhanuṣ + Jas → dhanūṃsi*. What gets replaced here with *anusvāra* is a non-final *n* of augment *nUM*. Refer to derivational details of

adhyetum icchati = adhijigāṃsate '. . . wishes to study' in the appendix (III:700) of 2.4.47 *sani ca.* The third singular *ātmanepada* ending (1.3.40 *āṅ udgamane*) *ta* replaces *LṚṬ* in *ā-kram + sya + te* → *ākra(m→ṃ) + sya + te = ākraṃsyate.* Rule 1.3.62 *pūrvavat sanaḥ* introduces the same *ātmanepada* ending as a replacement of *LAṬ* in *ācikraṃsate,* a derivate of (*ā-kram + saN*) + *LAṬ*)), where *kram* means to go. What is replaced here with *anusvāra* is the root-final *m.*

2. Why do we state the condition of *apadāntasya* 'of the non-final of a *pada*'? Consider *rājan bhuṅkṣva* where a *pada*-final *n* before *bh* cannot be replaced with *anusvāra.*

Why do we state the condition of *jhali* 'when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jhaL* follows'? Consider *yamyate* and *gamyate* where the non-final *m* cannot be replaced with *anusvāra* since *y* is not a sound denoted by *jhaL.*

8.3.25 मो राजि समः क्वौ

mo rāji samaḥ kvau
/maḥ 1/1 *rāji* 7/1 *samaḥ* 6/1 *kvau* 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *maḥ* #23)
samo makārasya makāra ādeśo bhavati rājatau kvip pratyayānte parataḥ
The *m* of *sam* when followed in close proximity with verbal root *rājṚ,* terminating in affix *KviP,* is replaced with *m.*

EXAMPLES:

samrāṭ
sāmrājyam

1. This rule offers an *anusvāra* as a replacement for *m* of *sam* when verbal root *rājṚ* 'to glow', terminating in *KvIP,* follows in close proximity. Consider (*sam + rāj(Ṛ) + KviP*) + *sU,* where *KvIP* is introduced after *rājṚ* by 3.2.61 *satsūdviṣadruh. . . .* The *j* of this root is first replaced with *ś* (8.2.36 *vraścabhrasjsṛj . . .*). A replacement in *ḍ* (*jaśtva;* 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*) then follows. A replacement in *ṭ* (*cartva;* 8.4.55 *vāvasāne*) finally derives *sam-rā(j→ś→ḍ→ṭ) = samrāṭ.* Recall that *sU* goes through deletion of 6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo. . . .* The word *sāmrājayam* is derived from (*sam-rājṚ + KvIP*) + *ṢyaÑ*)) + *sU* where *ṢyaÑ* is introduced by 5.1.123 *guṇavacana. . . .* A replacement in *vṛddhi* before *ṢyaÑ* followed by *am* as a replacement of *sU* produces *sāmrājyam.* Note here that *m* as a replacement for *m* is given here to cancel *anusvāra* of 8.2.24 *mo' nusvāraḥ* (*Kāś. makārasya makāravacanam anusvārani-vṛtyartham*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *rāji* 'when *rājṚ* follows'? Consider (*saṃ-yam + KvIP → sa(m→ṃ)yat*)) = *saṃyat,* where *m* of *sam* is replaced with *anusvāra* because verbal root *yam* occurs after *sam.* Incidentally, the *m* of *yam* is deleted by 6.4.37 *anudāttopdeśa. . . .* Augment *tUK* is then introduced to *a* (6.1.71 *hrasvasya piti . . .*).

Why do we state the condition of *samaḥ* 'in place of *m* of *sam*'? Consider *kiṃrāṭ* where *m* of *kim* is replaced with *anusvāra.*

Why do we state the condition of *kvau* 'followed by *KvIP*'? Consider *saṃrājitā, saṃrājitum* and *saṃrājitavyam* where affixes *Kta, KtavatU* and *tavyaT* follow.

8.3.26 हे मपरे वा

he mapare vā
/ he 7/1 *mapare* 7/1 = *maḥ paro yasmāt sa* (*bv.*), *tasmin; vā* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *maḥ* #23 *maḥ* #25)
hakāre makārapare parato makārasya vā makāra ādeśo bhavati
A *pada*-final *m*, when occurring before *h* followed by *m* in the context of close proximity, is optionally replaced with *m*.

EXAMPLES:

kiṃ hmalayati
kim hmalayati
kathaṃ hmalayati
katham hmalayati

1. This rule optionally replaces *m* with *m*, when it occurs before *h* followed by *m* in close proximity. Consider *kim hmalayati* where *m* of *kim* is optionally replaced with *m*, before *h* of *hmalayati* followed by *m*. If this option of replacing *m* with *m* is not accepted, *m* of *kim* will be replaced with *anusvāra* (8.3.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*). Incidentally, *hmalayati* is a form of the causal *hmal* + *ṆiC* → *hmali*, where the short penultimate *a* does not go through replacement in long because of 6.4.92 *mitāṃ hrasvaḥ.*

2. A *vārttika* proposal (*vt: yavalapare yavalā vā*) is made to optionally replace a *pada*-final *m* with *y, v* and *l*, respectively, when *h* with a following *y, v* and *l* follows in close proximity. Thus, we get: *kiỹ hyaḥ / kiṃ hyaḥ* 'what is tomorrow'; *kiṽ hvalayati / kiṃ hvalayati* 'what is shaking'; *kil hlādayati / kiṃ hlādayati* 'what makes him happy'?

This *vārttika* proposal is controversial. Commentators explain that *y/ v / l* are classed into two sets each based on their sound qualities of *anunāsika* 'nasalized' and *niranunāsika* 'non-nasalized'. Since we find *y/ v/ l* as replacements for *m* (a nasal), what replaces the nasal should be a nasalized *y/ v/ l*, in accord with 1.1.50 *sthāne' ntaratamaḥ.* The tradition accepts that a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *aṆ*, used as a part of operational predication (*vidheya*), does not denote sounds homogeneous with it (1.1.69 *aṇudit savarṇasya cāpratyayaḥ*). The *y/ v/ l* of this rule is a part of operational predication. It is therefore argued that nasalized *y/ v/ l* should not be allowed as replacements. It is also attested by the Pāṇinian practice of rule formulation. For example, he does not allow the nasalized *m* of *matUP* to be replaced with

the nasalized *v* of 8.2.9 *mād upadhāyāś ca*. Consider the following rules where I highlight the non-nasalized *v* with a capital letter: 1.2.45 *arthavadadhātur apratyayaḥ prātipadikam*; 8.2.43 *saṃyogāder āto dhātor yaṇvataḥ*; 4.4.125 *tadvānāsāmupadhāno mantra itīṣṭikāsu*. . . . But the tradition, from the *Mahābhāṣya* to the *Laghukaumudī*, accepts nasalized *y/v/l* as replacements. Some claim that predicative status of *y/v/l* is established, not by way of *aN* (*aṇtvena* '*aN*-ness'), but by way of being *y/v/l* (*yatvena* '*y*-ness'; *vatvena* '*v*-ness'; *latvena* '*l*-ness'). How did we get *vidvān likhati* → *vidvā l likhati*? This is an instance of *parasavarṇa* 'replacement similar to the homogeneous sound which follows' of rule 8.4.60 *tor li*. I skip other details of this discussion.

8.3.27 नपरे नः

napare naḥ
/napare 7/1 = *nah paro yasmāt* (*bv.*), *tasmin*; *naḥ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *maḥ* #23 *he vā* #26)
nakārapare he parataḥ makārasya vā nakārādeśo bhavati
A *pada*-final *m*, when occurring before *h* followed by *n* in the context of close proximity, is optionally replaced with *n*.

EXAMPLES:

kin hnute
kiṃ hnute
kathan hnute
kathaṃ hnute

1. This again is an optional replacement in *m* for a *pada*-final *m* when what follows in close proximity is *h* followed by *n*. Thus we get: *ki*(*m*→*n*) *hnute* → *kin hnute*/*ki*(*m*→*ṃ*) *hnute* → *kiṃ hnute* and *kathan hnute*/*kathaṃ hnute*.

2. Note that *para* 'that which follows' is used so that *m* can be optionally replaced with *n* when *h* followed by *n* follows. A formulation as *ne naḥ*, without *para*, would allow *m* to be replaced with *n* only when *n* followed. A specification with *ne* is made to cancel the *anuvṛtti* of *he*, mostly because of incompatibility.

8.3.28 ङ्णोः कुक्टुक् शरि

ṅṇoḥ kukṭuk śari
/ṅṇoḥ 6/2 = *ṅaś ca ṇaś ca* = *ṅṇau* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *kukṭuk* 1/1 *kuk ca ṭuk ca* (*sam. dv.*); *śari* 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *vā* #26)
ṅakāraṇakārayoḥ padāntayoḥ 'kuk, ṭuk' ity etāv āgamau vā bhavataḥ śari parataḥ
Augments *kUK* and *ṭUK* are introduced, optionally, to a *pada*-final *ṅ*

and *ṇ*, respectively, when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *śaR* follows and the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

prāṅk śete
prāṅ śete
prāṅk ṣaṣṭhaḥ
prāṅ ṣaṣṭhaḥ
prāṅk sāye
prāṅ sāye
vaṇṭ śete
vaṇ śete

1. This rule introduces augments *kUK* and *ṭUK*, optionally, to a *pada*-final *ṅ* and *ṇ*, in this order, when a consonant denoted by *ŚaR* (*Śs.* 13) follows. Consider *prāṅ*(*kUṬ*) *śete* = *prāṅk śete*, *prāṅ śete* and *vaṇ*(*ṭUṬ*) + *śete*, *vaṇ śete*, etc.

2. Why mark augments *kUK* and *ṭUK* with *K*, thereby to introduce them at the end of *ṅ* and *ṇ*, in view of 1.1.45 *ādyantau ṭakitau*? It would not make any difference in the context of close proximity if they were introduced at the beginning of what follows. Commentators state that this view will create problems. Consider *prāṅk śete* where *ś* of *śete* can be optionally replaced with *ch* (8.4.63 *śaś cho' ṭi*). This optional replacement in *ch* can apply when *ś* occurs after a sound denoted by *jhaY* (*Śs.* 8-12), and *ś* occurs followed by *aṬ* (*Śs.* 1-5). If *k* (of *kUṬ*), a sound denoted by *jhaY*, is introduced at the end of *prāṅ*, *ś* of *śete*, which occurs followed by *e*, can be replaced with *ch*. If, however, *k* were to be introduced to *ś* of *śete*, we cannot get this replacement. We cannot get *prāṅk chete*. A similar problem of application is witnessed in *prāṅk sāye*, where 8.3.59 *ādeśa pratyayayoḥ* cannot replace *s* of *sāye* with *ṣ*. If, however, augment *kUK* is introduced at the beginning of *sāye*, this replacement in *ṣ* cannot be blocked by 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ*. The result will be an undesired: **prāṅ kṣete*. A similar replacement in *ṣ* for *s* cannot be allowed in *vaṇṭ sāye*, because of negation of 8.4.42 *na padāntāṭ ṭor anām*. If *ṭUK* was introduced to *sāye*, we will get *s* of *ṭṣāye* replaced with *ṣ* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*).

8.3.29 डः सि धुट्

ḍaḥ si dhuṭ
/*ḍaḥ* 5/1 *si* 7/1 *dhuṭ* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *vā* #26)
ḍakārāntāt padād uttarasya sakārādeḥ padasya vā dhuḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *dhUṬ* is optionally introduced to a *pada* which begins with *s* and occurs after a *pada* ending in *ḍ*, provided the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

śvaliṭ tsāye 'dog-licker in the evening'
madhuliṭ tsāye 'honey-licker in the evening'
śvaliṭ sāye
madhuliṭ sāye

1. Augment *dhUṬ* is optionally introduced to a *pada* which begins with *s* and occurs after a *pada* ending in *ḍ*. Consider *śvaliṭ sāye*→ *śvaliṭ* (*dh*(*UṬ*)) *sāye* → *śvaliṭ* (*dh*→*t*) *sāye* → *śvaliṭ tsāye* and *śvaliṭ sāye*. We similarly get *madhuliṭ tsāye* and *madhuliṭ sāye*.

2. Note that *ḍaḥ* of this rule is to be interpreted as specified with *pañcamī* 'ablative'. The locative specification of *si*, when transformed into its genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*) *saḥ*, will make the ablative specification comparatively more powerful (*PŚ* (71): *ubhayanirdeśe pañcamīnirdeśo balīyaḥ*). If this is what was intended, why did Pāṇini make this specification with *si* in the locative? This he did for economy (*lāghavārthaḥ*). A formulation such as *ṅaḥ si dhuṭ* would have been longer by one mora (*Nyāsa*: *mātrādhikye gauravaṃ syāt*). Why can we not interpret the locative *si* as 'an operational specification made with a sound, here *s*, in the locative, applying to that which begins with that sound' (*PŚ* (34): *yasmin vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇe*). This could have been accomplished even without using *s* of *si* in this rule. Why did he not state the rule with *dhuk*. This would have then blocked the negation of 8.4.42 *na padāntaṭṭor anām*.

Augment *dhUṬ* will then have to be introduced to *s*. Why is *dhUṬ* introduced at the beginning of that which follows? Why not introduce *dhUK*, instead, at the end of what precedes. We will not thus need *tUK* in the formulation of rule 8.3.31 *śi tuk*. For, this *dhUK* can then be carried there. If *dhUK* was introduced at the end of the preceding *pada*, *dh* of *dhUK* will be replaced with *ṭ* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). If introduced at the beginning of what follows, *ṭ* of *śvaliṭ* will still be at the end of the *pada*. This can then be covered by the negation of 8.4.42 *na padāntāṭ ṭor anām*. The augment is thus introduced at the beginning of what follows (*Kāś*: *parādikaraṇam* '*na padāntāṭ ṭor anām*' *iti ṣṭutvapratiṣedhārtham*). Note that *h* of *śvalih* is first replaced with *ḍh* (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*) and then with *ḍ* (8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*). The *dh* of *dhUṬ*, of course, goes through a replacement in *t* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*).

8.3.30 **नश्च**

naś ca
/*naḥ* 5/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *vā* #26 *si dhuṭ* #29)
nakārāntād padād uttarasya sakārasya vā dhuḍ āgamo bhavati
Augment *dhUṬ* is optionally introduced to a *s* which occurs after a

pada ending in *n*, provided the context is that of close proximity between sounds.

EXAMPLES:

mahān tsāye
mahān sāye
bhavān tsāye
bhavān sāye

1. This rule optionally introduces augment *dhUṬ*, also to the initial *s* of a *pada* which follows a *pada* ending in *n*. Consider *bhavān tsāye / bhavān sāye*, and *mahān tsāye / mahān sāye*. Why do we not get the *n* of *bhavān* and *mahān* replaced with *rU* of 8.3.7 *naś chavy apraśān*? Since the *ṭ*-replacement of *dh* of augment *dhUṬ* becomes *asiddha* 'suspended', *n* cannot be replaced with *rU* (*Kāś*: *dhuṭaś cartvasya asiddhatvāt 'naś chavy apraśān' iti rutvaṃ na bhavati*). Haradatta objects against accepting *ṭ*-replacement of *dh* as suspended (*asiddha*). He is in favor of making *dhUṬ* itself suspended (*asiddha*). He further argues that *rU* cannot be accomplished, even when *dhUṬ*, or *ṭ*-replacement of *dh* of *dhUṬ*, is treated as non-suspended (*siddha*). For, 8.3.7 *naś chavy aprāśān* will require *n* to be followed by *chaV*, in turn, followed by *aM*. We cannot find *aM*, here in this context of *rU*, coming as a replacement of *n* (*PM*: *yady api dhuḍ apy asiddhaḥ, tathāpi na tad ucyate; siddhe' pi tasmin vinā cartvena rutvasyāprāpteḥ*). Haradatta has his heart in *tuṬ* (against *dhUṬ*) as the augment (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *tuṭo' siddhatvād api ror aprasaṅgaḥ. tasmāt tuḍ eva vaktavyaḥ*; cf. 8.3.29 *ḍaḥ si dhuṭ*).

8.3.31 शि तुक्

śi tuk
/śi 7/1 *tuk* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *vā* #26 *naḥ* #30)
nakārasya padāntasya śakāre parato vā tug āgamo bhavati
Augment *tUK* is, optionally, introduced to a *pada*-final *n* when *ś* follows in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

bhavāñ chete 'you are sleeping'
bhavāñ cchete
bhavāñ cśete
bhavāñ śete

1. This rule introduces augment *tUK* to a *pada*-final *n* when *ś* follows in close proximity. Consider *bhvān + śete* → *bhavān + t(UK) + śete* → *bhavān + t + (ś→ch) ete = bhavānt chete*. The initial *ś* in *śete* is here replaced with *ch* (*chatva*)

of 8.4.63 *śas cho' ṭi*. Note that 8.4.63 *śaś cho' ṭi* may also block introduction of *tUK* in favor of replacement in *ch* (*chatva*), on account of being *para* 'subsequent' in the *tripādī* 'the last three quarter rules of this grammar'. This will give us *bhavān* (*ś→ch*) *ete* → *bhavā*(*n→ñ*) *chete* = *bhavāñ chete* as a result of suspension (*asiddhatva*) of *tUK*. Now consider 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ* which will give us *bhavāñ śete*. But augment *tUK* can then be introduced by treating *ch*-replacement of 8.4.62 *śaś choṭi* as *asiddha* 'suspended'. This will give us *bhavānt* + *śete* → *bhavān*(*t→c*) + *śete* → *bhavā*(*n→ñ*) *c* + *śete* → *bhavāñ c*(*ś→ch*) *ete* → *bhavāñ cchete*. Not availing the option of *tUK* will give us *bhavā*(*n→ñ*) *śete* → *bhavāñ* + (*ś→ch*) *ete* → *bhavāñ chete*. Note that 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ* will replace *t* with *c*, and *n* with *ñ*, in all these examples. Rule 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*, a single *sūtra*, can be accepted as two in view of its two different goals of application. Thus, it replaces *t* with *c* before *ś*; it replaces *n* with *ñ* before *c*.

2. Note that *tUK* is introduced at the end of the preceding *pada* (*pūrvāntaḥ*). But we can still get this *t* (of *tUK*) by introducing augment *dhUṬ* at the beginning of the following *pada* (*parādiḥ*). This, however, will block *ch*-replacement of *ś* of *śete*. We run into another problem if *tUK* is introduced at the end of the preceding *pada*. That is, given *kurvan* + (*ś→ch*) *ete* → *kurva*(*n→ñ*) + *chete* = *kurvañ chete*, the *n* of *kurvan* becomes subject to a replacement in *ṇ* (8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅ . . .*). For, this *n* happens to be at the end of a *pada*. This should not pose any problem if the augment is introduced at the beginning of the following *pada*. For, this *ṇ*-replacement will be blocked by 8.4.37 *padāntasya*.

A proposal for split-interpretation of 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ* is made for negation of replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva-pratiṣedha*). The first split-rule will read as *stoḥ ścunā*, thereby *s* and *tU*, followed by *ś* and *cU*, will not allow *n* to be replaced by *ṇ*. The next split-rule will simply be *ścuḥ*. This will replace a preceding *s* and *tU* with *ś* and *cU* 'consonant of the *c*-series', respectively. The *ṇ*-replacement in *kurvañ chete* will thus be blocked. This negation of replacement in *ṇ* will be valid even when replacement in *ch* is treated as suspended (*asidaha*). How? At the strength of the split-interpretation of 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ* (*Nyāsa: yogavibhāgakaraṇasāmarthyāt ścutvasyāsiddhatve' pi ṇatvapratiṣedho bhavatyīty adoṣaḥ*). Some traditionalists do not accept this split-interpretative method of negating *ṇ*-replacement. They argue that, given *kurvan* + *c* + *chete*, rule 8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali* will apply to replace *ñ* with *anusvāra*. For, *n* will then not be occurring at the end of the *pada*, and *c*, i.e., a sound denoted by *jhaL*, will be forming the right condition. This *anusvāra* can then be replaced with *ñ* before the following homogeneous (*parasavarṇa*) sound *c*. The result is: *kurva*(*n→ṃ→ñ*) + *c* + *chete*. The question of a replacement in *ṇ* does not arise since the *ñ* which is brought about by *parasavarṇa* 'a replacement homogeneous with what follows' is treated as suspended (*asiddha*). This also shows why we do not need any split-interpretation of 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*.

Application of these rules is a little bit difficult. I therefore list all rules, and then show how one can derive all forms:

8.3.31 *śi tuk* (introduction of *tUK*)
8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ* (*t*→*c*, *n*→*ñ*)
8.4.63 *śaś cho' ṭi* (replacement in *ch*)
8.4.65 *jharo jhari savarṇe* (optional deletion of *c*)

Applying rule 8.3.31 *śi tuk* will offer *bhavān + tUK + śete.* An application of replacement in *ch* (*chatva*) will produce *bhavān* (*ś*→*ch*) *ete* → *bhavān + t + chete.* An application of 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ* will replace *t* with *c*, and *n* with *ñ*, thereby yielding *bhavā*(*n*→*ñ*) + (*t*→*c*) + *chete* = *bhavāñ cchete.* An optional deletion of *c* will produce *bhavāñ* (*c*→ϕ) *chete* = *bhavāñ chete.* No optional application of replacement in *ch* will produce *bhavāñ cśete.* No optional application of *tUK* will produce *bhavān + śete.* The idea is to work through general rules and then apply options.

8.3.32 ङमो ह्रस्वादचि ङमुण् नित्यम्

ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṇ nityam
/*ṅamaḥ* 5/1 *hrasvāt* 5/1 *aci* 7/1 *ṅamuṭ* 1/1 *nityam* 1/1
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108)
hrasvāt paro yo ṅam tadantāt padād uttarasyāco ṅamuḍ āgamo bhavati nityam
An augment denoted by *ṅamuṭ*, i.e., *ṅUṬ*, *ṇUṬ* and *nUṬ*, is, obligatorily, introduced to a vowel denoted by *aC* when the same occurs after a *pada* which ends in a sound denoted by *ṅaM* used after a short vowel.

EXAMPLES:

pratyaṅṅ āste 'sits facing east'
vaṇṇ āste 'sits with a thud'
vaṇṇ avocat 'speaks loudly'
kurvann āste 'sits doing'
kurvann avocat 'speaks while doing'
kṛṣann āste 'sits drawing'
kṛṣann avocat 'speaks while drawing'

1. Note that *ṅaM* (*Śs.* 7) is an abbreviatory term which denotes *ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n*. These individual sounds are also represented within *ṅaM* of *ṅamuṭ* which, when read with *ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n*, individually with its *UṬ*, produce three augments *ṅUṬ*, *ṇUṬ* and *nUṬ*. These three are introduced at the beginning of a *pada* in view of *yathāsaṃkhya* 'assignment of equivalency in the order of enumeration'. That is, *ṅUṬ*, *ṇUṬ* and *nUṬ* are introduced after a *pada* which ends in *ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n*, respectively. These *ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n* must occur at the end of a *pada* preceded by a short vowel. Augments *ṅUṬ*, *ṇUṬ* and *nUṬ* must be introduced at the beginning of the following *pada*, also beginning with a vowel.

The word *ṅamaḥ* is interpreted as ending in the ablative (*pañcamī*). It is used as a qualifier to *padasya* whose genitive is transformed into the ablative singular in view of the qualifier. Thus, we get *hrasvāt ṅamaḥ padāt* where *hrasvāt* is construed as a qualifier to *ṅamaḥ*. This, in view of *tadantavidhi*, presents the interpretation: *hrasvāt paro yo ṅam tadantāt padāt* 'after a *pada* which ends in a *ṅaM* occurring after a short vowel'. The locative singular of *aci* is also transformed into genitive to facilitate introduction of *ṅUṬ*, *ṇUṬ* and *nUṬ*. Recall that a *pañcamī* 'ablative' specification (of *ṅamaḥ*) will be considered more powerful than one made by the locative of *aci* (*pbh.* (71): *ubhayanirdeśe pañcamīnirdeśo balīyaḥ*). Hence, *aci* is transformed into *acaḥ*. A *saptamī* 'locative' specification is not only econominal (*lāghavārthaḥ*) but is also intended for use in subsequent rules.

2. Consider *pratyaṅ āste/ pratyaṅ ṅāste; vaṇ āste/ vaṇ ṇāste; vaṇ avocat/ vaṇ ṇavocat; kurvan āste/ kurvan nāste; kṛṣan avocat/ kṛṣan navocat.*

Why do we have the condition of *ṅamaḥ* 'after *ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n*'? Consider *tvam āsse* where a nasal, other than one denoted by *ṅaM*, occurs after the short *a* of *tvam*. An augment thus could not be introduced.

Why do we have the condition of *hrasvāt* 'after a short vowel'? Consider *prāṅ āste* where *ṅ* occurs after a long *ā*.

Why do we have the condition of *aci* 'when a vowel . . .'? Consider *pratyaṅ karoti* 'makes (something) facing east' where the following *pada* begins with *k*, a consonant.

3. Why do we not get augment *nUṬ* in *paramadaṇḍin* + *au* = *paramadaṇḍinau* 'nominative dual, two best ascetics' and *paramadaṇḍin* + (*Ṭ*)*ā* → *paramadaṇḍinā* 'instrumental singular . . .'. This question arises since *n* of *daṇḍin* occurs after a short *i*, and *daṇḍin* can be accepted as a *pada*, especially in view of 1.1.62 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam* based on compound-formation. The instrumental singular vocalic ending can be accepted as satisfying the condition of *aci*. First of all, the second compound constituent, i.e., *daṇḍin*, cannot be accepted as a *pada*, via *pratyayalakṣaṇa* 'operation characteristic of a deleted affix', unless an operation relative to the initial of a *pada* is involved (*vt: uttarapadatve cāpadādividhau pratiṣedhaḥ*). Secondly, the instrumental singular ending *Ṭā* then must constitute a *pada* which it does not. It is stated that *pade* of 8.3.21 *uñi ca pade* should be carried over to ensure the meaning: *ṅamantāt padād uttarasya ajādeḥ padasya* '. . . to a *pada* which begins with a vowel and occurs after a *pada* ending in *ṅaM*'. Augment *nUṬ* can thus not be introduced to *au* of *paramadaṇḍin* + *au* = *paramadaṇḍinau* and *ā* of *paramadaṇḍin* + *ā* = *paramadaṇḍinā*, because they begin with a vowel but are not termed *pada*.

8.3.33 मय उञो वो वा

maya uño vo vā
/ mayaḥ 5/1 *uñaḥ* 6/1 *vaḥ* 1/1 *vā* ϕ/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *aci* #32)
maya uttarasya uño vā vakārādeśo bhavati aci parataḥ
A replacement in *vA* comes, optionally, in place of *uÑ* when *uÑ* occurs after a sound denoted by *maY* and *aC* follows in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

śam u astu vediḥ 'the sacrificial receptacle is propitious'
śam v astu vediḥ
tad u asya paretaḥ 'he defeated him'
tad v asya paretaḥ
kim u āvapanam '. . . is the sowing well done?'
kimv āvapanam '. . . is the hair-cut well done'

1. This rule replaces *uÑ*, optionally, with *vA* when *uÑ* occurs preceded by a sound denoted by *maY* (*Śs.* 7-12) and followed by a vowel, in close proximity. Consider *śam + u + astu = śam + (u→v) + astu → śam v astu* of *śam v astu vediḥ*, where *u* is an indeclinable (*uÑ*). Recall that *u*, after *it-* deletion, is optionally assigned the term *pragṛhya* by 1.1.17 *uñaḥ*. Rule 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci* could not apply since 6.1.124 *pluta pragṛhyā aci nityam* blocks it. We now have an optional replacement in *vA*. Thus, *śam v astu vediḥ* and *śamu astu vediḥ*, etc. Can we get the *m* of *śam v astu* replaced with *anusvāra* of 8.3.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*? No. Because *v* will be considered *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of replacing *m* with *anusvāra*. It is stated that a replacement in *vA* is offered here in view of *prakṛtibhāva* 'a lack of *sandhi*; as it were' caused by assignment of the term *pragṛhya*. A replacement in *anusvāra* cannot be made because *vA* is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended' (*Kāśikā*: *pragṛhyatvād uñaḥ prakṛtibhāve prāpte vakāro vidhīyate. tasyāsiddhatvādd halīti 'mo' nusvāraḥ' na bhavati*). That is, *m* cannot be replaced with *anusvāra* since there will not be a consonant to follow (*hali*). Thus, the saying:

tripādīye vakāre tu nānusvāraḥ pravarttate
'there is no application of *anusvāra* when *v* follows in the *tripādī*'

Note that *uÑ* is optionally termed *pragṛhya* (1.1.17 *uñ iti*) when it occurs after *maY* and is followed by *iti*. This can then be replaced with *ū*. A question is raised against formulation of this rule. It is stated that 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci* can account for a replacement in *yaÑ*. Does this rule offer an option to the obligatory *yaÑ* of 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*? No. The *anuvṛtti* of *vā* will be carried over from 6.1.76 *padāntād vā*. That will make it *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā* 'fixed option'. Consequently, *u*(*Ñ*) is replaced with *v* (*yaÑ*), based on assignment of the term *pragṛhya*. This being the case, rule 6.1.124 *pluta pragṛhyāci nityam* demands *prakṛtibhāva* (no application of *sandhi*), obligatorily. It is at this stage that *v* is assigned, instead, by this rule. It is still argued that *uÑ* should be replaced with *v* of 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*. This way, one does not have to specify

vaḥ in this rule. One does not even have to state *vā*. The *vā* will be carried over, via *maṇḍūkapluti*, from 6.1.76 *padāntād vā*. But that, i.e., *v*, when stated will become *siddha* 'established'. Consequently, because of being a following consonant, it will condition the replacement of *m* with *anusvāra* (8.3.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*). This, however, is not desired. It is for this reason that *v* is given right here. An *m* does not get replaced with *anusvāra* because this *v* becomes suspended (*asiddha*).

It is argued that *uÑ* of this rule can still be replaced with *v* (6.1.74? *iko yaṇ aci*) when the option of *pragṛhya* is not accepted. It can also be replaced with *vA* of this rule. We can also get a replacement in *anusvāra* (8.3.23 *mo' nusvāraḥ*). Thus, we can get *kim v iti* and *kiṃ v iti*. An optional substitute in *ũ* will also get an optional replacement in *ṽ*. Thus, *kimṽ v iti* and *kim ũ iti*.

8.3.34 विसर्जनीयस्य सः

visarjanīyasya saḥ
/visarjanīyasya 6/1 *saḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *khari* #15)
visarjanīyasya sakāra ādeśo bhavati khari parataḥ
A *visarjanīya* is replaced with *s* when a sound denoted by *khaR* (*Śs.* 11-13) follows.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣaś chādayati
plakṣaś chādayati
vṛkṣaṣ ṭhakāraḥ
plakṣaṣ ṭhakāraḥ
vṛkṣas thakāraḥ
vṛkṣaś cinoti
plakṣaś cinoti
vṛkṣaṣ ṭīkate
plakṣaṣ ṭīkate
vṛkṣas tarati
plakṣas tarati

1. This rule replaces a *visarjanīya*, i.e., *ḥ*, with *s* when a sound denoted by *khaR* follows in close proximity. Recall that *khaR* includes 13 consonants within its denotatum: *kh, ph, ch, ṭh, th, c, ṭ, t, k, p, ś, ṣ,* and *s*. A replacement in *s* is, however, offered only before the first eight. Different replacements are offered before the last five. Thus, *vṛkṣa*(*ḥ*→*s*) *tiṣṭhati* → *vṛkṣas tiṣṭhati*, etc. This *s* is subsequently replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*) and *ś* (*ścutva*; 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*).

2. Note that the *visarga* which is here offered a replacement in *s* is gotten from 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ*. That is, *r* is replaced with *ḥ* when a

khaR follows, or else, *r* occurs at the end before pause (*avasāna*). This may create a problem in replacing *ḥ*, of *vṛkṣa* + (*s*→*rU*→*ḥ*) → *vṛkṣaḥ*, with *s* at the end before a pause. Mostly because *saṃhitāyām* 'in close proximity' is still carried over. A *visarjanīya* cannot be replaced with *s* if nothing follows. It is for this reason that *khari* is brought here, via *anuvṛtti*, from 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor*. . . . But this *anuvṛtti* gets canceled because of incompatibility presented by *aci* of the preceding rule. One would still bring *khari*, via *maṇḍūkapluti* 'frog's leap'. One can also make *kahri* (of 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor*. . .) understood because of its association with *visarjanīya*. It is also stated that our next rule (8.3.35 *śarpare visarjanīyaḥ*) uses the *bahuvrīhi* compound *śarpare* to mark the right condition. That is, with implications of something (*anyapadārtha*) other than a sound denoted by *ŚaR* which follows. What can be a sound other than *ŚaR* in this context? It is recognized as none other than a consonant denoted by *khaR*. Refer to *Padamañjarī* for full implications of *anuvṛtti* of *khari*. I omit further discussion because of fear of expatiation (*prapañca*).

8.3.35 शर्परे विसर्जनीयः

śarpare visarjanīyaḥ
/*śarpare* 7/1 = *śar paro yasmāt sa* (*bv.*), *tasmin*; *visarjanīyaḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34)
śarpare khari parato visarjanīyasya visarjanīyādeśo bhavati
A *visarjanīya* is replaced with *visarjanīya* when a sound denoted by *khaR*, itself followed by a sound denoted by *śaR*, follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

śaśaḥ kṣuram 'rabbit's hoof'
puruṣaḥ kṣuram 'man's razor'
adbhiḥ psātam 'eaten (having made the morsel) with water'
vāsaḥ kṣaumam 'silk-garment'
puruṣaḥ tsaruḥ 'sword-(brave) man'
ghanāghanaḥ kṣobhaṇaś carṣaṇīnām 'a killer who kills again and again . . .'

1. Note that *śarpare* is a *bahuvrīhi* compound paraphrased as: *śar paro yasmāt saḥ* 'that after which a sound denoted by *ŚaR* (*ś*, *ṣ*, *s*) occurs'. The antecedent of 'that' is here construed as *khari*, brought via *anuvṛtti*, from the preceding rule. The word *para* 'subsequent' is used in this rule so that *ŚaR*, alone, is not accepted as right condition of replacement. This could be true, especially in view of the use of *śari*, alone, in the following rule.

2. Why did Pāṇini not formulate this rule as *śarpare na* 'not when a sound denoted by *khaR* occurs follwed by *śaR*'? That is, negating a replacement in *s* would have retained the *visarga*. Such a formulation could block *s* from replacing *ḥ* (8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*). It could, however, not block modified

(colored) replacements of *ḥ* in a *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* (8.3.37 *kupvoḥ* . . .). This rule expressly uses *visarjanīya* to also rule out application of 8.3.37 *kupvoḥ*. . . . Using *na* 'not' would occasion the application of *paribhāṣā* (*PŚ*:62): *anantarasya vidhir vā bhavati pratiṣedho vā* 'an application, or negation, applies to the most immediate'. For, this negative provision must then apply only to *s* of the preceding rule. Replacements in *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* are blocked at the strength of this express mention of *visarjanīya* (*Kāś*: *'na' iti vaktavye visarjanīyasya visarjanīyādeśavidhānaṃ vikāranivṛtyartham*). The word *visarjanīya* is thus used to block any other replacement.

8.3.36 वा शरि

vā śari
/vā ϕ śari 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *visarjanīyaḥ* #35)
visarjanīyasya visarjanīyādeśo vā bhavati śari pare
A *visarjanīya* is replaced, only optionally, with a *visarjanīya*, when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *śaR* follows in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣaḥ śete 'the tree sleeps'
vṛkṣaś śete
plakṣaḥ śete
plakṣaś śete
vṛkṣaḥ ṣaṇḍe
vṛkṣaṣ ṣaṇḍe 'the tree is weak'
vṛkṣaḥ sāye 'the tree is strong'
vṛkṣas sāye

1. This rule replaces a *visarga* with *visarga*, only optionally, when *ś*, *ṣ* or *s* follows. Thus, *vṛkṣa*(*ḥ*→*ḥ*) + *śete* → *vṛkṣaḥ śete* and *vṛkṣa*(*ḥ*→*ś*) + *śete* → *vṛkṣaś śete*. Note that a following *ś*, *ṣ* and *s* will further condition replacement of a *visarjanīya* with *ś*, *ṣ* or *s*, respectively.

2. A *vārttika* proposal (*vt*: *kharpare śari vā lopo vaktavyaḥ*) is made to, optionally, delete a *visarjanīya* when a sound denoted by *śaR*, followed by another denoted by *khaR*, follows. Thus, *vṛkṣā*(*ḥ*→*ϕ*) + *sthātāraḥ* → *vṛkṣā sthātāraḥ* and *vṛkṣāḥ sthātāraḥ*. We can additionally get *vṛkṣā*(*ḥ*→*s*) + *sthātāraḥ* → *vṛkṣās sthātāraḥ*, when optional deletion is not accepted.

8.3.37 कुप्वोः ×क×पौ च

kupvoḥ×ka×pau ca
/kupvoḥ 6/2 = *kuś ca puś ca* = *kupū* (*itare. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *×k ×pau* 1/2 *ca ϕ*/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *visarjanīyaḥ* #35)

kavargapavargayoḥ parato visarjanīyasya yathāsāṃkhyaṃ ×k, ×p' ity etāv ādeśau bhavataḥ, cakārād visarjanīyaś ca
A replacement in *×k* and *×p*, respectively, and a *visarjanīya* as well, optionally comes in place of a *visarjanīya*, when a consonant of *k* (*kU*) and *p* (*pU*) group follows in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣa ×karoti
vṛkṣaḥ ×karoti
vṛkṣa ×khanati
vṛkṣaḥ ×khanati
vṛkṣa ×pacati
vṛkṣaḥ ×pacati
vṛkṣa ×phalati
vṛkṣaḥ ×phalati

1. A *visarjanīya* when followed by a consonant of the *k* and *p* series, in close proximity, is replaced, respectively, with *×k* and *×p*. It is also replaced with a *visarjanīya* at the strength of the use of the word *ca* 'and'. We thus get *vṛkṣa(ḥ→ḥ) + karoti → vṛkṣaḥ karoti, vṛkṣa(ḥ →×) + karoti = vṛkṣa ×karoti; vṛkṣaḥ khanati, vṛkṣa(ḥ→×) + khanati → vṛkṣa ×khanati* and *vṛkṣaḥ pacati, vṛkṣa(ḥ→×) + pacati → vṛkṣa ×pacati; vṛkṣaḥ phalati, vṛkṣa(ḥ→×) + phalati → vṛkṣaḥ phalati.*

Recall that 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ* offers *ḥ* (*visarjanīya*) as a replacement for *rU* when a sound denoted by *khaR* follows. This rule offers *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* as replacements when consonants of the *k* (*kU*) and *p* (*pU*) groups follow. Since *k/kh* and *p/ph* are included within the denotatum of *khaR*, a *visarjanīya* of 8.3.15 *kharavasānayor* . . . will be replaced with its *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* counterparts before *k/kh* and *p/ph*, repsectively.

Commentators use *jihvāmūlīya* 'articulated by root of the tongue' and *upadhmānīya* 'articulated at lips with aspirated explosion', here, as adjectives to *visarjanīya*. That is, such articulations are modifications added on to the articulation of a *visarjanīya*. Since it is not possible to pronounce such *visarjanīyas* without accompanying articulation of the consonants of *kU* and *pU* groups, they are represented here by the symbol ×, followed by consonants of the *kU* and *pU* groups (*Kāś: kapāv uccāraṇārthau. jihvāmūlīyopadhmānīyāv etāv ādeśau*). The tradition represents them with ×. The *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* sounds are considered like half of a *visarga* (*ardhavisarga*). They carry the duration of one-fourth of a mora.

2. This rule blocks the application of rule 8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*. That is, it will offer a *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* as a replacement against *s* of 8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*. Of course, when *k/kh* and *p/ph* follow. But it cannot block the application of rule 8.3.35 *śarpare visarjanīyaḥ*. Recall that *s* as a

replacement of *visarjanīya* has two sources: (*i*) that which is gotten when a sound denoted by *khaR*, followed by a sound denoted by *śaR*, follows (8.3.35 *śarpare visarjanīyaḥ*) and (*ii*) that which is gotten when a sound denoted by *khaR* follows at the end before pause (*avasāna*). What is to be replaced here with *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* must be a *visarjanīya* which covers the most general scope of being replaced with *s*. One cannot invoke *vipratiṣedha* (1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam*) since *vipratiṣedha* 'conflict among two rules of equal strength where the subsequent wins' does not find its scope in the *tripādī* 'last three quarters of rules'. Thus, *vāsaḥ kṣaumam* and *adbhiḥ psātam*, which are covered by 8.3.35 *śarpare visajanīyaḥ*, cannot come under the scope of this rule. Note that our present rule will be able to block 8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ* in view of (*PŚ:* 58): *yena nāprāpte yo vidhir ārabhyate sa tasya bādhako bhavati* 'that against whose obligatory application an operation is started, that blocks that operation'. It will not be able to block 8.3.35 *śarpare visarjanīyaḥ* because it has its scope of application established by *adbhiḥ psātam* and *vāsaḥ kṣaumam*. The scope of application of 8.3.37 *kupvoḥ* . . . will be established at the strength of blocking 8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*.

Some offer split-interpretation (*yogavibhāga*) of this rule to block it from blocking 8.3.35 *śarpare visarjanīyaḥ*. The two split rules are: (*i*) *kupvoḥ* and (*ii*) °*ka* °*pau*. The first split rule will carry the *anuvṛtti* of 8.3.35 *śarpare visarjanīyaḥ*, thereby to ensure *visarjanīya*, alone, as a replacement for *visarjanīya*. The second rule will account for *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* replacements of *visarjanīya*.

8.3.38 सोऽपदादौ

so' padādau

/saḥ 1/1 *apadādau* 7/1 = *padasya ādiḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *na padādir ādiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *taṣmin/*

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37)

sakārādeśo bhavati visarjanīyasya kupvor apadādyoḥ parataḥ pāśakalpa-kāmyeṣu

A *visarjanīya*, when followed by a consonant of the *kU* and *pU* group not used at the beginning of a *pada*, is replaced with *s* in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

payaspāśam 'bad milk'
yaśaspāśam 'infamy'
payaskalpam 'like milk'
yaśaskalpam 'as if fame'
payaskam 'milk'
yaśaskam 'fame'
payaskāmyati '. . . desires milk'
yaśaskāmyati '. . . desires fame'

1. This rule is an exception to the preceding. It replaces a *visarjanīya* with *s* when a non-initial *kU* and *pU* of a *pada* follows. Consider (*payaḥ* + *pāśa*(*P*)) + *su* → (*paya*(*ḥ*→*s*) + *pāś*) *a*)) + *sU* → *payaspāśam*, where affix *pāśaP* occurs after the *visarga* of *payaḥ* (5.3.47 *yāpye pāśap*) within the same *pada*. Affix *kalpaP* (5.3.67 *īṣad asamāptau . . .*) similarly occurs fater *payaḥ* and *yaśas* of (*paya*(*ḥ*→*s*) + *kalpa*(*P*)) + *sU* → *payaskalpam* and (*yaśa*(*ḥ*→*s*) + *kalpa*(*P*)) + *sU* → *yaśaskalpam*. We get similar examples with affixes *ka* (5.3.70 *prāg ivāt kaḥ*) and *kāmyaC* (3.1.9 *kāmyac ca*) in *payaskam*, *yaśaskam*; and (*payas* + *am* + *kāmyaC*) + *LAṬ*)) in *payaskāmyati* and (*yaśas* + *am* + *kāmyaC*) + *LAṬ* → *yaśaskāmyati*. This rule applies generally when we have affixes *pāśaP*, *kalpaP* and *kāmyaC*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *apadādau* 'when not at the beginning of a *pada*'? Consider *paya*(*ḥ*→×) + *kāmayate* → *paya* ×*kāmayate* and *paya* (*ḥ*→×) + *pibati* → *paya* ×*pibati*, where the *visarjanīya* is replaced with *upadhmānīya*, instead. For, the *p* which follows is occurring at the beginning of a *pada*.

3. A *vārttika* proposal (*vt*: *so' padādāv ity anavyayasyeti vaktavyam*) is made to clarify that '*s* is replaced with *visarjanīya* only when it occurs in a non-indeclinable *pada*'. It is suggested that *vā* of 8.3.36 *vā śari* should be brought here to make this rule a 'fixed option' (*vyavasthita-vibhāṣā*). This, in turn, will ensure a replacement only in a non-indeclinable *pada*. Thus, the *visarjanīya* of *prātaḥ* 'morning' and *punaḥ* 'again', in *prātaḥkalpam* and *punaḥkalpam*, will be saved from being replaced with *s*. Recall that *prātar* 'morning' and *punar* 'again' are indeclinables (*avyaya*).

Another proposal is made to restrict a *visarjanīya* which may be replaced with *s* before *kāmya* 'desired'. It is stated that such a *visarjanīya* must have its origin in *rU* (*vt*: *roḥ kāmye niyamārtham*). We can thus get a replacement in *payaskāmyati* and *yaśaskāmyati*, but not in *gīḥkāmyati* and *dhūḥkāmyati*. For, the *r* in *gīḥkāmyati* and *dhūḥkāmyati* does not have its source in *rU*.

A third proposal (*vt*: *upadhmānīyasya kavarge parataḥ sakārā ādeśo bhavati*) requires an *upadhmānīya* to be replaced with *s* before a consonant of the *k*-series. Derivates of *ubj* 'to be simple, straight', i.e., *abhyudgaḥ* and *samudgaḥ*, are offered as examples. It is generally accepted that *ubj* has a penultimate *upadhmānīya* which is not heard, and is written as *b*. For, *ubj* is specified by replacing it with *jaŚ* (*kṛtajaśtva-nirdeśaḥ*). Some consider the root as *udj*, again, used with the meaning of *ārjava* 'straightness, simplicity'. If we accept the root as *ubj*, used with the preverbs *abhi* and *sam*, we will end up with wrong derivates of *GHaÑ*: **abhybgaḥ* and **samubgaḥ*. Thus, 3.3.121 *halaś ca* would introduce affix *GHaÑ*, and a velar replacement (*kutva*) in *g* for *j* will be accomplished by 7.3.52 *cajoḥ ku ghiṇṇyatoḥ*. The *upadhmānīya* of *ubj* will then be replaced with *b* by 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*. It is stated that the *upadhmānīya* of *ubj* should then be replaced with *s* before *k*. The *s* should then be replaced with *d* (*jaśtva*). This will give us the correct forms: *abhyudgaḥ* and *samudgaḥ*. See *Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā* for additional details.

8.3.39 **इणः षः**

iṇaḥ ṣaḥ
/iṇaḥ 5/1 *ṣaḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37 *apadādau* #38)
iṇ uttarasya visarjanīyasya ṣakārādeśo bhavati kupvor apadādyoḥ parataḥ pāśakalpakāmyeṣu
A *visarjanīya* which occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ*, and is followed by a consonant of the *k* and *p* group not used at the beginning of a *pada*, is replaced with *ṣ* in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

sarpiṣpāśam 'bad ghee'
yajuṣpāśam 'incomplete recitation of *Yajurveda*'
sarpiṣkalpam 'ordinary ghee'
yajuṣkalpam 'ordinary recitation of *Yajurveda*'
sarpiṣkam 'bad ghee'
yajuṣkam 'bad recitation of *Yajurveda*'
sarpiṣkāmyati '. . . wishes for ghee'
yajuṣkāmyati '. . . wishes to recite *Yajurveda*'

1. This rule replaces a *visarjanīya* with *ṣ* when (*i*) the *visarjanīya* occurs after a vowel denoted by *iṆ* (*Śs.* 1) and (*ii*) is followed by a non-initial *kU* and *pU*, in close proximity. Thus, *yaju(ḥ→ṣ)pāśam → yajuṣpāśam, sarpi(ḥ→ṣ)pāśam → sarpiṣpāśam; sarpiṣkalpam, yajuṣkalpam; sarpiṣkam, yajuṣkam*; and *sarpiṣkāmyati, yajuṣkāmyati.*

Note that *apadādau* is still carried over. Thus, we do not get a *visarjanīya* replaced with *ṣ* in *agniḥ karoti* 'fire is burning (doing)', *vāyuḥ karoti* 'wind is doing (blowing); *agniḥ pacati* 'fire is cooking', *vāyuḥ pacati* 'wind is cooking'; and *sarpis te* 'ghee to you', *yajus te* 'your recitation of the *Yajus* hymn'.

Kāśikā remarks that *saḥ* and *iṇaḥ ṣaḥ* are both carried over to subsequent rules. Consequently, a *visarjanīya* which occurs after *i* and *u* (*iṆ*) is replaced with *ṣ*. A *visarjanīya* which occurs after any other vowel is replaced with *s* (*Kāś: ita uttaram 'saḥ' iti 'iṇaḥ ṣaḥ' iti ca vartate; tatra iṇaḥ paro yo visarjanīyas tasya ṣakāro bhavati, anyasya sakāro bhavati*).

8.3.40 **नमस्पुरसोर्गत्योः**

namaspurasor gatyoḥ
/namas-purasoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *gatyoḥ* 6/2
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37 *saḥ* #38)
'namas, puras' ity etayor gatisajñakayor visarjanīyasya sakārādeśo bhavati kupvor parataḥ
The *visarjanīya* of *namas* 'obeisance' and *puras* 'in front', when termed

gati, is replaced with *s*, provided a consonant of the *kU* and *pU* group follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

namaskartā 'he will pay obeisance'
namaskartum 'for paying obeisance'
namaskartavyam 'should pay obeisance'
puraskartā 'he who presents'
puraskartum 'for presenting before'
puraskartavyam 'should present'

1. Note that the *anuvṛtti* of *apadādau* 'when not at the beginning of a *pada*' is canceled. This rule then replaces the *visarjanīya* of *namas* 'to bow' and *puras* 'in front' with *s* when a consonant denoted by *kU* or *pU* follows. Thus, (*nama*(*ḥ*→*s*) + (*kartṛ*) + *sU*)) → *namaskartā*, *namaskartum* and *namaskartavyam*. Recall that *namas* and *puras* are termed *gati* by 1.4.73 *sākṣātprabhṛtīni ca* and 1.4.46 *puro' vyayam*, respectively.

2. Why do we have the condition of *gatyoḥ* 'of *namas* and *puras* termed *gati*'? Consider *puraḥ karoti* 'he says *puraḥ*', where *pūḥ* of *puraḥ* is not a *gati*.

8.3.41 इदुदुपधस्य चाप्रत्ययस्य

idudupadhasya cāpratyayasya
/*id-ud-upadhasya* 6/1 = *ic ca uc ca* = *idutau* (*itar. dv.*); *idutau upadhe yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*; *ca* ϕ *apratyayasya* 6/1 = *na pratyayaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya*/ (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37 *ṣaḥ* #39)
ikāropadhasya, ukāropadhasya cāpratyayasya visarjanīyasya ṣakārādeśo bhavati kupvoḥ parataḥ
The *visarjanīya* of that which is not an affix, and has an *i* and *u* in its penultimate position (*upadhā*), is replaced with *ṣ* when a consonant denoted by *kU* and *pU* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

niṣkṛtam 'expelled'
niṣpītam 'drunk up'
duṣkṛtam 'badly done'
duṣpītam 'badly drunk'
bahiṣkṛtam 'expelled'
bahiṣpītam 'outside drinking'
āviṣkṛtam 'invented, manifested'
āviṣpītam 'quietly drunk'
catuṣkṛtam 'made four-sided'
catuṣkapālam 'four bowls'
catuṣkaṇṭakam 'four pegs'

catuṣkalam 'fourfold, foursided'
prāduṣkṛtam 'made manifest, visible'
prāduṣpītam 'drunk in sight'

1. This rule replaces the *visarjanīya* of *nir, dur, bahir, āvis, catur* and *prādus*, i.e., *id-ud-upadhasya* 'that which has *i* and *u* in its penultimate position', with *ṣ* before a consonant of the *k* and *p* series. Thus, we get *ni*(*r*→*ḥ*→*ṣ*) + *kṛtam* → *niṣkṛtam, niṣpītam; duṣkṛtam, duṣpītam*, etc.

2. Why do we have the condition of *apratyayasya* 'of a non-affix'? Consider *agniḥ karoti* and *vāyuḥ karoti*, which serve as counter-examples because their *visarga* (*ḥ*) is a replacement of the nominative singular affix *sU* (*pratyaya-visarga*). Why do we not get a replacement in *ṣ* of *pituḥ karoti* and *mātuḥ karoti*, where the *visarjanīya* does not have its source in an affix. It is stated that a *visarjanīya* which occurs after a single replacement (*ekādeśa*), here *u* of (*māt*(*ṛ*+(*Ṅ*) *a*) → *mātur*(*s*->ϕ) → *mātuḥ* and *pituḥ* (6.1.111 *ṛta ut*; 8.2.24 *rāt sasya*), is not replaced with *ṣ*. Note that this *visarga* does not have its source in an affix. This absence of replacement in *ṣ*, in turn, is indicated by inclusion of *bhrātuṣputraḥ*, as an exception, in the *kaskādi* listing of nominals (8.3.48 *kaskādiṣu ca*). This listing of *bhrātuṣputraḥ* in the *kaskādi* group would serve no purpose if replacement in *ṣ* could be accomplished with the application of this rule.

3. A *vārttika* proposal (*vt: puṃmuhusoḥ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ*) is made to negate a replacement in *ṣ* of the *visarjanīya* of *pum* and *muhus*. Thus, *puṃskāmā* and *muhuskāmā*.

There are two more proposals which I exclude here. For, an externally conditioned replacement in a *vṛddhi*, or a *pluta* vowel, cannot block a replacement in *ṣ*. They will both be considered suspended (*asiddha*).

8.3.42 तिरसोऽन्यतरस्याम्

tiraso' nyatarasyām
/ tirasaḥ 6/1 *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37 *ṣaḥ* #39 *gatyoḥ* #40)
tiraso visarjanīyasyānyatarasyāṃ sakārādeśo bhavati kupvoḥ parataḥ
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada* constituted by *tiras* 'across' is, optionally, replaced with *s*, when a consonant denoted by *kU* or *pU* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

tiraskartā 'he who will despise'
tiraḥkartā
tiraskartum 'to despise'
tiraḥkartum

tiraskartavyam 'should be despised'
tiraḥkartavyam

1. This rule offers an optional replacement in *s* to the *visarjanīya* of *tiras* when a consonant denoted by *kU* or *pU* follows in close proximity. Recall that *tiras* is termed *gati* by 1.4.72 *vibhāṣā kṛñi* when the signification is *antardhi* 'disappearance, hiding' (1.4.71 *tiro' ntardhau*). This rule then accepts the *anuvṛtti* of *gati*, via *maṇḍūkapluti* 'frog's leap'. We will get *visarjanīya* as a replacement for *visarjanīya* when this option of *s*-replacement is not accepted. This rule is formulated to block application of 8.3.37 *kupvoḥ*. . . . Thus we get: *tiraskartā* and *tiraḥkartā*, etc.

2. Note that *gateḥ* 'of a *gati*' is understood here. That is why we do not get a replacement in *s* of *tiraḥ kṛtvā kāṇḍaṃ gataḥ* 'placing the log aside he left'. This *tiras* does not mean *antardhi* 'hiding', and hence, is not a *gati* (1.4.71 *tiro' ntardhau*).

8.3.43 द्विस्त्रिश्चतुरिति कृत्वोऽर्थे

dvistriścatur iti kṛtvo' rthe
/dvis-triś-catuḥ (*sam. dv.*; used with no *sUP*); *iti* ϕ *kṛtvo' rthe* 7/1 = *kṛtvasaḥ arthaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin/*
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37 *ṣaḥ* #39)
'*dvis, tris, catur*' *ity eteṣāṃ kṛtvo' rthe vartamānānāṃ visarjanīyasya ṣakāra ādeśo bhavati anyatarasyāṃ kupvoḥ parataḥ*
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada* constituted by *dvis* 'two', *tris* 'three' and *catur* 'four' with the signification of *kṛtvasUC* (5.4.17 *saṃkhyāyāḥ* . . .), is replaced with *ṣ* when *kU* and *pU* follow in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

dviṣ karoti
dviḥ karoti
triṣ karoti
triḥ karoti
catuṣ karoti
catuḥ karoti
dviṣ pacati
dviḥ pacati
triṣ pacati
triḥ pacati
catuṣ pacati
catuḥ pacati

1. Note that *ṣaḥ* is carried over. This rule optionally replaces the *visarjanīya* of *dvis, tris* and *catur* with *ṣ*, when they are used with the signification of the *taddhita* affix *kṛtvasUC* (5.4.17 *saṃkhyāyāḥ kriyābhyāvṛttigaṇane kṛtvasuc*), and

a consonant of the *k* (*kU*), or *p* (*pU*) group follows in close proximity. This option of *ṣ* is recognized as *ubhayatra* 'both, made available (*prāpta*) and not (*aprāpta*)'. This rule makes *ṣ* optional in case of *catur*, against one made available, obligatorily. That is, it is made available to *catur* under the non-affixal provision of 8.3.41 *idupadhasya cāpratyayaḥ*. It has not been made available by any earlier rule to *dvis* and *tris*. The word *iti* 'thus' is used here to relate *dvis*, etc., with the *visarjanīya*. Such relations are generally made clear also with the use of the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*).

Consider *dvi*(*ḥ*→*ṣ*) *karoti* → *dviṣ karoti* and *dviḥ karoti*, etc., as examples. Recall that affix *sUC* is introduced by 5.4.18 *dvitricaturbhyaḥ suc* after *dvi*, *tri* and *catur* with the signification of *kṛtvasUC*. The *s* of *dvi* + *sUC*, etc., is replaced with *rU* and *visarjanīya*. The *s* of *sUC*, after *catur*, is deleted by 8.2.24 *rāt sasya*. The *r* of *catur* is then replaced with *visarjanīya*. Incidentally, *kṛtvasUC* is used with the denotatum of *kriyābhyāvṛttigaṇana* 'counting repetition of an action'.

2. Why use *dvis* and *tris* when the rule already uses *kṛtvo' rtha*? For, even without the use of *dvis*, *tris*, and only with *kṛtvo' rthe*, this rule can be interpreted with the *anuvṛtti* of *idupadhasya* to yield the interpretation: 'let there be an optional replacement in *ṣ* of a non-affixal *visarga* with *i* and *u* in the penultimate position'. Note here that there are no words other than *dvis*, *tris* and *catur* with penultimate *i* and *u* ending in *sUC*. Their *sUC* is introduced with the signification of *kṛtvasUC* by 5.4.18 *dvitricaturbhyaḥ suc*. Elsewhere, we get *kṛtvasUC* from rule 5.4.17 *saṃkhyāyāḥ kriyābhyāvṛttigaṇane*. . . . This also indicates that a specification with *kṛtvo' rtha* does not serve any purpose here.

If *dvis*, *tris* and *catur* are not stated in the rule, and the rule is simply formulated as *kṛtvo' rthe*, the *visarjanīya* which is carried over via *anuvṛtti* will become the qualified (*viśeṣya*) of *kṛtvo' rtha*. The rule will then be interpreted as: let there be an optional replacement in *ṣ* of a *visarjanīya* which has penultimate *i*/*u*. This will then block the optional replacement in *ṣ* of *catuḥ*. For, the *visarga* of *dvis* and *tris* will be used in a form with the signification of *kṛtvasUC*, but *catuḥ* cannot be considered used with the signification of *kṛtvasUC*. Given *catur* + *s*, 8.2.24 *rāt sasya* will then delete *s*, and *r* will be obligatorily replaced with *visarjanīya*. This *visarjanīya* will not be relatable to *kṛtvo' rtha*. This is what is stated by *caturo na siddhyati*. . . .

3. *Nyāsa* asks: what is the purpose of specifying *kṛtvo' rtha* in the context of optional replacement in *ṣ*. The answer is: if this specification is not made, we will also have an optional replacement in *ṣ* in *catuṣkapāla*. Note that an obligatory replacement in *ṣ* is desired here. Our earlier rule 8.3.41 *idudupadhasya cāpratyayaḥ* has already made available this obligatory replacement. If the specification with *kṛtvo' rtha* is accepted, and optional replacement in *ṣ* is availed, we will still get the replacement obligatorily by 8.3.41 *idudupadhasya*. . . . That is, the replacement will be heard obligatorily, whether or not optional replacement is availed. Even if *kṛtvo' rtha* is not stated in this

rule, *catur*, because of its associated listing in this rule with *dvis* and *tris* ending in *sUC*, will avail the *ṣ*-replacement when ending in *sUC*. Thus, *ṣ*-replacement can be availed in the sense of *kṛtvo' rtha* even without making a specification with *kṛtvo' rtha*. But we still get a specification made with *kṛtvo' rtha*. Why? It is specified to indicate non-universality (*anityatva*) of the interpretive convention of *sāhacarya* 'association'. Notice that the *r* of *catur*, irrespective of whether *sUC* is introduced to it, must be replaced with *visarga*. This *visarga*, in both cases, will be non-affixal (*apratyaya*). Consequently, an obligatory replacement in *ṣ* of 8.3.41 will remain applicable. It is therefore stated that *lupe kṛtvo' rthīye* 'after *s*-deletion of *sUC*, *r* in both *sUC* and non-*sUC* conditions must be replaced with *visarga*, this provision of replacement will be an exception to the obligatory replacement of *ṣ*, by way of making an optional replacement.

4. Note that when the rule is formulated as *dvistriścaturiti kṛtvo' rthe, kṛtvo' rtha* is made a qualifier to *catur*. For, *kṛtvo' rtha*, with its sense as a qualifier, may be present in *catur*, or it may abandon *catur*. The same qualifier cannot be used for *dvis* and *tris* because its sense will always be there with them. Since the sense of a qualifier will never abandon (*na vyabhicarati*) *dvis* and *tris*, the qualifier cannot be purposeful. That is why, only *catur* will be qualified to yield the meaning: an optional replacement in *ṣ* comes in place of the *visarga* of *catur*, used with the signification of *kṛtvo' rtha*. The word *catur* will still be denoting the sense of *kṛtvo' rtha* even when *sUC* is deleted. This, on the basis of the maxim: *yaḥ śiṣyate sa tu samānārthābhidhāyī* 'that which remains (after deletion) also denotes the same meaning'.

The author of the *vārttikas* finds another fault. He states that *pada* should be used as a qualifier to *visarjanīya* to yield the meaning: '*ṣ* should come as an optional replacement for the *visarjanīya* which has *i* and *u* in penultimate position, and is part of a *pada* used with the signification of *kṛtvo' rtha'*. This way, we will get the optional replacement in *ṣ* of *catur*. For, after deletion of the affix we will still get *catur* as a *pada* used with the signification of *kṛtvo' rtha*. Now one does not need the use of *dvistriścaturiti*. For, we will get all *padas* used with the signification of *kṛtvo' rtha*. In summary, the author of the *vārttika* has accepted *kṛtvo' rthe* as part of the wording of the rule. He has established that *dvistriścaturiti* is not needed, and the rule should simply be stated as *kṛtvo' rthe*, made a qualified to *pada*.

5. The following *kārikā*-verses sum up the complexity of issues involved:

> *kṛtvasujarthe ṣatvaṃ bravīti kasmāt catuṣkapāle mā*
> *ṣatvaṃ vibhāṣayā bhūn nanu siddhaṃ tatra pūrveṇa/*
> 'Why is he stating replacement in *ṣ* under the denotation of the sense of *kṛtvasUC*? So that an optional replacement in *ṣ* could not apply to *catuṣkapāla* where *ṣ*-replacement can be accomplished obligatorily by the previous rule (5.4.41 *idudupadhasya ca . . .*).'

siddhe hy ayaṃ vidhatte caturaḥ ṣatvaṃ yadāpi kṛtvo' rthe
lupte kṛtvo' rthīye rephasya visarjanīyo hi//
'If this replacement which is established by 8.3.41 but is, optionally offered here, then, when affix *sUC* goes through deletion after *catur* and its *r* is replaced with *visarga*, *catuḥ* will be ending in a non-affixal *visarga* subject to replacement in *ṣ*, obligatorily (8.3.41).'

evaṃ sati hy idānīṃ dvistriścaturity anena kiṃ kāryam
anyo hi nedupadhaḥ kṛtvo' rthaḥ kaścid apy asti//
'This being the case, what purpose is served by making a specification with *dvistriścatur*? (The *sūtra* could simply be formed as *kṛtvo' rthe*.) For, there are no bases other than these which may have a penultimate *i* and *u*.'

akriyamāṇe grahaṇe visarjanīyas tadā viśeṣyeta
caturo na sidhyati tathā rephasya visarjanīyo hi//
'If these words are not specified in this rule then *kṛtvo' rthe* will be interpreted as a qualifier to *visarga*, thereby yielding the meaning, 'a *visarga* of an affix with the meaning of *kṛtvasUC* is replaced with *ṣ*'. This will not apply to *catur* where the *visarga* has its source in *r*, and not in affix *sUC*.'

tasmiṃs tu kriyamāṇe yuktaṃ caturo viśeṣaṇaṃ bhavati
prakṛtaṃ padaṃ tadantaṃ tasyāpi viśeṣaṇaṃ nyāyyam//
'It is, therefore, proper to use *dvistriścatur*, so that *kṛtvo' rthe* could be used as a qualifier to *catur*. Even without the use of *dvistriścatur*, *kṛtvo' rthe* can rightly qualify the domain heading *pada*, interpreted via *tadantavidhi*.'

It is feared that not mentioning *dvis*, *tris* and *catur* in this rule will make *kṛtvo' rtha* qualify *visarjanīya*. That is, an affixal (replacement in) *visarjanīya* used with the sense of *kṛtvasUC* will be optionally replaced with *ṣ*. This will exclude *catur* where we do not get an affixal *visarjanīya*. Using *dvis*, *tris* and *catur* will remove this difficulty. Patañjali insists that *kṛtvo' rtha* will not qualify *visarjanīya*. It will qualify *pada*, instead. This, by means of *tadantavidhi*, will mean: 'the *visarjanīya* of a *pada* which is used with the signification of *kṛtvasUC* is optionally replaced with *ṣ*'. Patañjali, therefore, does not see any need of mentioning *dvis*, *tris* and *catur* in the rule.

Kāśikā still insists that *dvis*, etc., must be used. If not, *catur* will have its *visarjanīya*, obligatorily, replaced with *ṣ* of 8.3.41 *idupadhasya ca*. I omit discussion of *asiddhatva* 'suspension' and *apavādatva* 'exception' for fear of expatiation (*prapañca*). *Kāśikā* seems to be supporting the view of the author of these rules (*sūtrakāra*).

8.3.44 इसुसोः सामर्थ्ये

isusoḥ sāmarthye

/isusoḥ 6/2 = *is ca us ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *sāmarthye* 7/1 = *samarthasya bhāvaḥ* (a derivate of affix *SyaÑ*), *tasmin/*
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37 *ṣaḥ* #39 *anyatarasyām* #43)
'*is, us*' *ity etayor visarjanīyasyānyatarasyāṃ ṣakārādeśo bhavati sāmarthye kupvoḥ parataḥ*
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada* which ends in *is* and *us* is, optionally, replaced with *ṣ* when a sound denoted by a consonant denoted by *kU* and *pU* follows in close proximity, and the two *padas*, both, are syntactically related.

EXAMPLES:

sarpiṣ karoti
sarpiḥ karoti
yajuṣ karoti
yajuḥ karoti

1. The *visarjanīya* of a *pada* which ends in *is* and *us* is, optionally, replaced with *ṣ* when a consonant denoted by *kU* and *pU* follows, and the two *padas* are both syntactically related (*sāmarthye*). Consider *sarpis* and *yajus* which end in *is* and *us*, respectively. The *visarjanīya* of *sarpiḥ* and *yajuḥ*, when used before the *k*-initial syntactically related *karoti*, is optionally replaced with *ṣ*. We thus get *sarpiṣkaroti* and *yajuṣkaroti*.

2. Note that *sāmarthya* 'syntactic relation' has been defined in two ways: (*i*) *ekārthībhāva*, where two or more *padas* with different scope of usage are used together to yield a single integrated meaning (*bhinnapravṛttinimittānāṃ śabdānāṃ ekasminn arthe vṛttiḥ*) and (*ii*) *vyapekṣā*, where two or more *padas* are used together with mutual expectancy yielding no single integrated meaning. The first syntactic relation results into formation of compounds. Commentators accept the second interpretation of *sāmarthya* in this rule. Why accept one over the other? Why not accept them both? The second view of *sāmarthya* is desired (*iṣṭa*). This same can also be supported, though indirectly, by *samāse* 'in a compound' of the next rule.

2. Why do we have the condition of *sāmarthye* 'when in syntactic relation'? Consider *tiṣṭhatu sarpiḥ piba tvam udakam* 'let ghee be left alone, you drink water', where *ḥ* of *sarpiḥ* 'ghee' cannot be replaced with *ṣ* because *piba* 'imperative second person singular of *pā*' is not syntactically related to *sarpiḥ*'.

8.3.45 नित्यं समासेऽनुत्तरपदस्थस्य

nityaṃ samāse' anuttarapadasthasya
/nityam 1/1 *samāse* 7/1 *anuttarapadasthasya* 6/1 = *uttarapade tiṣṭhati* (*tat.*);
na uttarapadasthaḥ (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya/*

(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37 *ṣaḥ* #39 *isusoḥ* #44)
samāsaviṣaye isusor visarjanīyasyānuttarapadasthasya nityaṃ ṣatvaṃ bhavati kupvoḥ parataḥ
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada* which ends in *is* and *us*, and does not combine as final constituent of a compound, is obligatorily replaced with *ṣ* when sounds denoted by *kU* and *pU* follow in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

sarpiṣkuṇḍikā 'pot for ghee'
dhanuṣkapālam 'piece of a bow'
sarpiṣpānam 'drinking of ghee'
dhanuṣphalam 'arrowhead'

1. This rule, obligatorily, replaces the *visarjanīya* of a *pada* which ends in *is* and *us*, and is combined as non-final constituent of a compound. The condition of a *kU*, or *pU*, to follow the *visarjanīya* is still valid. Consider *sarpi(ḥ→ṣ) + kuṇḍikā → sarpiṣkuṇḍikā, dhanuṣkapālam*; and *sarpiṣpānam, dhanuṣphalam* as examples.

2. Why do we have the condition of *anuttarapadasthasya* 'of that which is not part of a final compound constituent'? Consider *paramasarpiḥkuṇḍikā* and *paramadhanuḥkapālam*, where the *visarga* occurs at the end of *sarpiḥ* and *dhanuḥ*. Since these two are final constituents of the compounds *paramasarpiḥ* and *paramadhanuḥ*, we do not get their *ḥ* obligatorily replaced with *ṣ*. Why can we not accept *sarpiḥ* and *dhanuḥ* as non-final constituents of the compounds *paramasarpiḥkuṇḍikā* and *paramadhanuḥkapālam*? We cannot accept *sarpiḥ* and *dhanuḥ* as non-final constituents because they are considered final in relation to *parama* with which they combine. We cannot even get the optional *ṣ* of the preceding rule (*Kāś: pūrvasūtreṇa vikalpo' py atra na bhavati*).

A question is raised against using *anuttarapadasthasya* 'of that which is not a part of the final *pada*' in this rule, mostly in view of the *Paribh.* (24): *pratyayagrahaṇe yasmāt sa vihitas tadādis tadantasya ca grahaṇam* 'a specification made with an affix refers to a form after which the affix is introduced, 'beginning with that and extending upto the end before the affix' (*tadādyantatva*)'. The specification of this rule can refer to a form like *paramasarpis* without any help from *anuttarapadasthasya*. The *ṣ*-replacement can then be, optionally, accomplished by the preceding rule. It is stated that *anuttarapadasthasya* is used as an indicator (*jñāpaka*). For what? To indicate that *Paribh.* (24) does not apply in connection with specifications made with affixes *is* and *us*. Secondly, the preceding rule, since its specification with *sāmarthye* does not cover *ekārthībhāva* 'single integrated meaning', cannot apply to compound derivates. This rule would not even permit the optional *ṣ*-replacement of the preceding rule (*Kāś: pūrvasūtreṇa vikalpo' py atra na bhavati*).

8.3.46 अतः कृकमिकंसकुम्भपात्रकुशाकर्णीष्वनव्ययस्य

ataḥ kṛkamikaṃsakumbhapātrakuśākarṇīṣv anavyayasya
/ataḥ 5/1 *kṛ-kami-kaṃsa-kumbha-pātra-kuśā-karṇīṣu* 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *tāsu*; *anavyayasya* 6/1 = *na avyayam* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *saḥ* #39 *nityaṃ samāse' nuttara-padasthasya* #44)
akārād uttarasya anavyayavisarjanīyasya samāse' nuttarapadasthasya nityaṃ sakārādeśo bhavati 'kṛ, kami, kaṃsa, kumbha, pātra, kuśā, karṇī' ity eteṣu parataḥ
A *visarjanīya* which occurs after the *a* of a non-final, non-indeclinable (*anavyaya*) compound constituent is replaced with *s*, obligatorily, when *kṛ, kami, kaṃsa, kumbha, pātra, kuśā,* and *karṇī* follow in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

ayaskāraḥ 'blacksmith'
payaskāraḥ 'ironsmith'
ayaskāmaḥ 'desirous of getting iron'
payaskāmaḥ 'desirous of milk'
ayaskaṃsaḥ 'iron goblet'
payaskaṃsaḥ 'milkpot'
ayaskumbhaḥ 'iron pitcher'
payaskumbhaḥ 'jar of milk'
ayaspātram 'iron pot'
ayaskuśā 'iron peg'
payaskuśā 'milk-vessel (made of wood)?'
ayaskarṇī 'iron rudder'
payaskarṇī '. . . milk-white ears'

1. A *visarjanīya* which occurs after the *a* of a non-final, non-indeclinable compound constituent is obligatorily replaced with *s* when *kṛ* 'to make', *kami* 'to love', *kaṃsa* 'goblet', *kumbha* 'pitcher', *pātra* 'pot', *kuśā* 'small piece of wood, *kuśa* grass' 'and *karṇī* 'a kind of shaft, rudder' combine to follow. This rule is an exception to 8.3.37 *kupvoḥ °ka*. . . . Thus, *aya(ḥ→s) kāraḥ = ayaskāraḥ, aya(ḥ→s) kāmaḥ = ayaskāmaḥ, aya(ḥ→s) kaṃsaḥ = ayaskaṃsaḥ, paya(ḥ→s) kumbhaḥ = payaskumbhaḥ*, etc. How do we get *ayaskumbhī* and *payaskumbhī* where *kumbhī*, the feminine counterpart of *kumbha*, follows. This is in consonance with *pbh.* (72): *prātipadikagrahaṇe liṅgaviśiṣṭasyāpi grahaṇam* 'a specification made with a nominal stem also refers to its corresponding form in a particular gender'. Why do we not get *śunaskarṇaḥ* as an example here? It is not included here since this specification is made with *karṇī*, ending in a long *ī*. It is a *kaskādi* nominal for which refer to 8.3.48 *kaskādiṣu ca.*

2. Why do we state the condition of *ataḥ* 'after an *a*'? Consider *gīḥkāraḥ*

'one who creates words, Bṛhaspati' and *dhūḥkāraḥ* 'one who makes axles', where the *visarjanīya* occurs after *ī* and *ū*.

Why do we have the condition of *taparakaraṇa* 'making *t* to follow *a*'? So that *a* alone could satisfy the requirement of preceding *visarjanīya*. Consider *bhāḥkaraṇam* 'illumination' where the *visarjanīya* cannot be replaced with *s* of this rule. What about *bhāskaraḥ* 'sun'? It is included within the *kaskādi* group of nominals (8.3.48 *kaskādiṣu ca*).

Why do we have the condition of *anavyayasya* 'of a non-indeclinable'? Consider *śvaḥkāraḥ* and *punaḥkāraḥ* where *śvas* 'tomorrow' and *punar* 'again' are indeclinables.

The condition of *samāse* is still valid. Thus, we do not get a replacement in *s* for the *visarjanīya* of *yaśaḥ karoti* 'brings fame' and *yaśaḥ kāmayate* 'desires fame'.

Why do we have the condition of *anuttarapadasthasya* 'located within a non-final constituent'? Consider *paramapayaḥkāraḥ* and *paramapayaḥkāmaḥ*, where the *visarjanīya* of *payaḥ* is located within the final constituent of the compound *paramapayaḥ*.

8.3.47 अधः शिरसी पदे

adhaḥśirasī pade

/ adhaḥśirasī 1/2 (*prathamā* 'nominative' used with the sense of *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive') = *adhas ca śiras ca* (*itar. dv.*); *pade* 7/1/

(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya* #34 *saḥ* #39 *nityaṃ samāse' nuttarapadasthasya* #44)

'*adhas, śiras' ity etayor visarjanīyasya samāse' nuttarapadasthasya sakāra ādeśo bhavati padaśabde parataḥ*

The *visarjanīya* of *adhas* 'below' and *śiras* 'head' which combines as a non-final constituent before a *pada* in close proximity is replaced with *s*.

EXAMPLES:

adhaspadam 'lower place'
śiraspadam 'higher(upper) place'
adhaspadī 'a lower place'
śiraspadī 'a higher place'

1. Note that *pada* here refers to the word-form *pada*. It does not refer to the technical term *pada*. Note further that *śiraspadam* is a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound. A compound such as *adhaspadam* is formed in view of 2.1.72 *mayūravyaṃsakādayaś ca*.

The condition of *samāse* is still valid. Thus, *adhaḥ* of *adhaḥ pādam* cannot have its *visarjanīya* replaced with *s*.

The condition of *anuttarapadasthasya* 'of that which is not a part of the following constituent' is also valid. Thus, the *visarjanīya* of *paramaśiraḥ* 'best head' cannot be replaced with *s* before *padam* of *paramaśiraḥpadam*.

8.3.48 कस्कादिषु च

kaskādiṣu ca
/kaskādiṣu 7/3 = *kaska ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣu*; *ca* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *visarjanīyasya saḥ* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37 *saḥ* #39)
'*kaska*' *ity evam ādiṣu ca visarjanīyasya sakāraḥ ṣakāro vā yathāyogaṃ ādeśo bhavati kupvoḥ parataḥ*
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada* listed in the group headed by *kaska*, etc., is replaced with *s*, or *ṣ*, when a consonant of the *kU* 'velar', or *pU* 'labial' series follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

kaskaḥ 'which of them'
kautaskutaḥ 'from which place or direction'
bhrātṛṣputraḥ 'brother's son'
sadyaskālaḥ 'right now'

1. This again is an exception to 8.3.37 *kupvoḥ*. . . . Note that a *visarjanīya* which occurs after *i* and *u* (8.3.39 *iṇaḥ ṣaḥ*) of the *kaskādi* nominals will be replaced with *ṣ*. Elsewhere, we will get the *visarjanīya* replaced with *s* (*Nyāsa*: *iṇaḥ paro yo visarjanīyas tasya ṣakāraḥ, yas tv anyas tasya sakāra iti*). The word *kaska* is derived from *kim* + *sU* where *kim* 'which, what' is replaced with *ka* (6.2.103 *kimaḥ kaḥ*) to produce (*kim*→*ka*) + *s*(*U*)) → *ka* + *s* = *kas*. Rule 8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ* is responsible for adding yet another *kas*, thereby producing *kas* + *kas* → *ka*(*s*→*ḥ*→*s*) *kas* = *kaskas*. We similalry get *kautakutaḥ*, where *kutas* goes through doubling of 8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ*. Recall that *kutas* is derived by introducing affix *tasIL* (5.3.7 *pañcamyās tasil*) after *kim*, used in the ablative (*pañcamī*). Rule 7.2.103 *ku tihoḥ* then replaces *kim* with *ku*. Thus, (*kim* + *ṄasI* + *tasIL* → (*kim*→*ku*) + *tas* = *kutas*. Affix *aṆ* (4.3.74 *tata āgataḥ*) is introduced after *kutaskutas* to derive *kautaskutas* through a replacement in *vṛddhi* and deletion of *ṭi* (1.1.64 *aco' ntyādi ṭi*) of *kutaskutas* + *a*(*Ṇ*) → *k*(*u*→*au*) *taskut* (*as*→ϕ) + *a* → *kautaskuta* + *sU* → *kauta*(*s*→*ḥ*→*s*) *kutas* = *kautaskutaḥ*. The word *bhrātuṣputraḥ* is a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound where the genitive ending is saved from deletion (*aluk*; 6.3.23 *ṛto vidyāyonisambandhebhyaḥ*).

Derivates such as *sarpiṣkuṇḍikā, dhanuṣkapālam, barhispūlam* and *yajuspātram* are included within the *kaskādi* group to show that the *visarjanīya* of a non-final compound constituent can also be replaced with *ṣ*.

2. Why do we use *ca* 'and' in this rule? It indicates that the *kaskādi* listing is open ended (*ākṛtigaṇa*). That is, *ca* is used to attract examples which may not be enumerated as part of this list.

Why do we not have this replacement in *sūryaraśmi* 'sun's ray', *harikeśaḥ purastāt* 'brown hairs . . .' and *sa naḥ pāvakaḥ* 'that (is) our fire'? All operations, in the Vedic, are considered optional (*sarve vidhayaś chandasi vikalpyante*).

8.3.49 **छन्दसि वाऽप्राम्रेडितयोः**

chandasi vā' prāmreḍitayoḥ
/ chandasi 7/1 *vā* ϕ *aprāmeḍitayoḥ* 7/2 = *praś ca āmreḍitaṃ ca* (*itar. dv.*) = *prāmreḍite, na prāmreḍite* (*nañ. tat.* with int. *dv.*; *tayoḥ*) /
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *saḥ* #34 *kupvoḥ* #37)
chandasi viṣaye visarjanīyasya vā sakārādeśo bhavati kupvoḥ parataḥ praśabdam āmreḍitaṃ varjayitvā
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada*, in the Vedic, is optionally replaced with *s* when a sound denoted by *kU* and *pU*, with the exclusion of *p* of *pra*, and that of an *āmreḍita*, follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

ayaḥpātram
ayaspātram
viśvataḥpātram
viśvataspātram
uruṇaḥkāraḥ
uraṇaskāraḥ

1. This optional provision of *s* as a replacement for *visarga* is made for the Vedic when a sound denoted by *pU* and *kU*, with the exception of *p* of *pra*, and an *āmreḍita*, follows in close proximity. The *visarga* which was offered as an obligatory replacement for the *s* of the genitive-*tatpuruṣa* compound *ayaspātram* (8.3.46 *ataḥ kṛkami . . .*) is here made optional. Thus, we get *ayaḥpātram* and *ayaspātram*. We similarly get this option where a compound such as *viśvataḥpātram* is formed. A non-combined *viśvataḥ*, as in *viśvataḥ pātram*, will not avail this option since *viśvataḥ* will then be an indeclinable (8.3.46 *ataḥ kṛkami . . .*).

Now consider *uruṇaskāraḥ* and *uruṇaḥkāraḥ*, where *kāra* is a derivate of *GHaÑ* introduced after *kṛ*. The *nas* of *uruṇas* is a replacement of *asmad* (8.1.21 *bahuvacanasya vasnasau*). The *n* of *uruṇas* is replaced with *ṇ* of 8.4.26 *naś ca dhātusthoruṣubhyaḥ*. Thus, *uruṇa*(*s*→*ḥ*) *kāraḥ* = *uruṇaḥkāraḥ* and *uruṇaskāraḥ*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *prāmreḍitayoḥ* 'with the exception of *pra* and *āmreḍita*'? Consider *agniḥ pravidvān* and *paruṣaḥparuṣaḥ pari*, where we get *pra* in the first and doubling of *paruṣaḥ* in the second.

8.3.50 **कः करत्करतिकृधिकृतेस्वनदितेः**

kaḥ karatkaratikṛdhikṛteṣv anaditeḥ
/ kaḥ-karat-karati-kṛdhi-kṛteṣu 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu*; *anaditeḥ* 6/1 = *na aditiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasyāḥ*/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *saḥ* #34 *chandasi* #49)
'kaḥ, karat, karati, kṛdhi, kṛta' ity eteṣu parataḥ aniditer visarjanīyasya sakārādeśo bhavati chandasi viṣaye

The *visarjanīya* of a *pada*, with the exception of one constituted by *aditi*, is replaced with *s* when *kaḥ, karat, karati, kṛdhi* and *kṛta* follow in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

viśvataskaḥ
viśvataskarat
payaskarati
uruṇaskṛdhi
sadaskṛtam

1. This rule allows a replacement in *s* for the *visarjanīya* of a *pada*, other than *aditi*, when *kaḥ, karat, karati, kṛdhi* and *kṛta* follow in close proximity. Note that *kaḥ* is a third person singular active form of *kṛÑ* in *LUṄ* where its *CLI* is deleted by 2.4.80 *mantre ghasahvara. . .* . The third singular active verbal ending *ti* goes through deletion, first of its *i* (3.4.100 *itaś ca*) and then of its *t* (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*). Of course, after *ṛ* of *kṛ* is replaced with its *guṇa* counterpart *ar*. Augment *aṬ* is blocked here by 6.4.75 *bahulaṃ chandasy. . .* . The *r* of *kar* is then replaced with *visarjanīya*. Thus we get *kaḥ*.

We similarly get *karat*, a form of *kṛ* in *LAṄ*, where *aṄ* is introduced after *kṛ* (3.1.59 *kṛmṛdṛruh . . .*). We get *karat* from *kṛ* + *a*(*Ṅ*) + (*LUṄ*→*ti*(*P*)) → *k*(*ṛ*→*ar*) + *a* + *t*(*i*→ϕ) = *karat*, again by replacing *ṛ* with its *guṇa* (6.1.58 *sṛjidṛśor . . .*) counterpart. Here again we do not get augment *aṬ*. Our next form *karati* is derived from *kṛ* + *ŚaP* + *tiP*, where *ṛ* goes through *guṇa* and *ŚaP* is introduced against *u* (3.1.79 *tanādikṛñbhya uḥ*). We have already discussed *uruṇaḥ* (8.3.49 *chandasi vā . . .*) of *uruṇaskṛdhi*, where *kṛdhi* derives from (*kṛÑ* + (*LOṬ*→*siP*)). Rule 3.4.87 *ser hy apic ca* replaces *si* with *hi* which, in turn, is replaced with *dhi* (6.4.102 *śruśṛṇu . . .*). The *vikaraṇa*, i.e., *ŚaP*, itself is deleted by 2.4.73 *bahulaṃ chandasi*. Now consider the other examples: *viśvata*(*ḥ*→*s*)*kaḥ* = *viśvataskaḥ, viśvataskarat, payaskarati, uruṇaskṛdhi* and *sadskṛtam*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *anaditeḥ* 'not of *aditi*'? Consider *yathā no aditiḥ karat*, where, because of this negation of *anaditeḥ*, we cannot get the *visarga* of *aditiḥ* replaced with *s*.

8.3.51 पञ्चम्याः परावध्यर्थे

pañcamyāḥ parāv adhyarthe
/pañcamyāḥ 6/1 *parau* 1/2 *adhyarthe* 7/1 = *adher arthaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin/* (*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *saḥ* #34 *chandasi* #49)
pañcamīvisarjanīyasya sakārādeśo bhavati paṛau parataḥ adhyarthe chandasi viṣaye
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada* which ends in *pañcamī*, in the Vedic, is replaced with *s*, provided *pari*, used with the signification of *adhi*, follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

di̱vaspari prathamaṃ jájñe
agnirhimavataspari
divaspari
mahispari

1. Note that *pari* of example derivates is used in the sense of *adhi* 'over and above'. This rule uses *adhyarthe* 'in the sense of *adhi*' as a qualifier to *parau* 'when *pari* follows'.

Why do we state the condition of *pañcamyāḥ* 'of an ablative'? Consider *ahír iva bho̱gaiḥ pary éti bā̱hum* where *pari* is used after the instrumental plural *bhogaiḥ*.

Why do we state the condition of *parau* 'when *pari* follows'? Consider *ebhyo vā etal lokebhyaḥ prajāpatiḥ samairayat* where *pari* is not used after any *pada* ending in the ablative.

Why do we state the condition of *adhyarthe* 'in the sense of *adhi*'? Consider *divaḥ pṛthivyāḥ payorja udbhṛtam*, where *pari* is construed as denoting the sense of *sarvatobhāva* 'all over'. The sense of *adhi* which *pari* may denote is: *uparibhāva* 'over and above'.

8.3.52 पातौ च बहुलम्

pātau ca bahulam
/*pātau* 7/1 *ca* ϕ *bahulam* 1/1/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *saḥ* #34 (?) *chandasi* #49 *pañcamyāḥ* #51)
pātau ca dhātau parataḥ pañcamīvisarjanīyasya bahulaṃ sakārādeśo bhavati chandasi viṣaye
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada* which ends in *pañcamī*, in the Vedic, is variously (*bahulam*) replaced with *s*, when a form of *pā* 'to protect' follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

divas pātu
rājñas pātu

1. This again is a Vedic rule, whereby a *visarjanīya* before a form of *pā* 'to protect' is, variously, replaced with *s*. Thus, we get *diva*(*ḥ*→*s*) *pātu* = *divas pātu* and *rājña*(*ḥ*→*s*) *pātu* = *rājañas pātu*. But we do not also get **pariṣada*(*ḥ*→*s*) *pātu* = **pariṣadas pātu*.

8.3.53 षष्ठ्याः पतिपुत्रपृष्ठपारपदपयस्पोषेषु

ṣaṣṭhyāḥ patiputrapṛṣṭhapārapadapayaspoṣeṣu

/ṣaṣṭhyāḥ 6/1 *pati-putra-pṛṣṭha-pāra-pada-payas-poṣeṣu* 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu*/ (*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *saḥ* #34 (?) *chandasi* #49)
ṣaṣṭhīvisarjanīyasya sakārādeśo bhavati 'pati, putra, pṛṣṭha, pāra, pada, payas, poṣa' ity eteṣu parataḥ chandasi viṣaye
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada* which ends in *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive', in the Vedic, is replaced with *s* when *pati* 'lord, master, husband', *putra* 'son', *pṛṣṭha* 'back', *pāra* 'beyond, across', *pada* 'place', *payas* 'milk' and *poṣa* 'prosperity, nourishment' follow in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

vā̱caspatíṃ vi̱śvakármāṇam ṛtayé
di̱vasputrāya̱ sūryā́ya
divaspṛṣṭhe dhāvamānaṃ suparṇam
aganma tamasas pāram
iḍaspade samidhyase
sūryaṃ cakṣur divaspayaḥ
rāyaspoṣaṃ yajamāneṣu dhattam

1. The *visarjanīya* of all *padas* which end here in *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive' are replaced with *s* before *putra*, etc. Thus, *vācaḥ patim* → *vācaspatim* and *divaḥ* + *putraḥ* → *divasputraḥ*, etc.

2. Why do we state the condition of *ṣaṣṭhyāḥ* 'of a genitive'? Consider *manuḥ putrebhyo dāyaṃ vyabhajat*, where *putrebhyo* occurs after the nominative.

8.3.54 इडाया वा

iḍāyā vā
/iḍāyāḥ 6/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*padasya* #1.16 *saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *saḥ* #34 (?) *chandasi* #49 *ṣaṣṭhyāḥ patiputrapṛṣṭhapāra-padapayaspoṣeṣu* #53)
iḍāyāḥ ṣaṣṭhīvisarjanīyasya vā sakārādeśo bhavati patyādiṣu parataḥ chandasi viṣaye
The *visarjanīya* of a *pada*, namely *iḍā* in the Vedic, which ends in *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive', is optionally replaced with *s*, when *pati, putra, pṛṣṭha, pāra, pada, payas* and *poṣa* follow in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

iḍāyās patiḥ
iḍāyāḥ patiḥ
iḍāyās putraḥ
iḍāyāḥ putraḥ
iḍāyās pṛṣṭham
iḍāyāḥ pṛṣṭham
iḍāyās pāram

iḍāyāḥ pāram
iḍāyās padam
iḍāyāḥ padam
iḍāyās payaḥ
iḍāyāḥ payaḥ
iḍāyās poṣam
iḍāyāḥ poṣam

1. Note that the preceding rule makes an obligatory provision. This rule makes that provision optional. We thus get *iḍāyāḥ putraḥ* = *iḍāyās putram* 'son of Iḍā', etc.

8.3.55 अपदान्तस्य मूर्धन्यः

apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ
/apadāntasya 6/1 = *padasya antaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *na padāntaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *mūrdhanyaḥ* 1/1 (*mūrdhani bhavaḥ*; a derivate of *yaT* (cf. 4.3.55 *śarīrāvayavāc ca*))/
'*apadāntasya*' *iti*, '*mūrdhanyaḥ*' *iti caitad adhikṛtaṃ veditavyam āpāda-parisamāpteḥ*
A replacement in *mūrdhanya* 'retroflex' comes in place of that which does not occur at the end of a *pada.*

EXAMPLES:

Look under subsequent rules.

1. This is an *adhikāra* 'governing rule'. That 'a non-final *x* is to be replaced with a retroflex' should be understood as given for all rules up to the end of this quarter (*pāda*). Consider 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*, which, when read with *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ, iṇkoḥ* (8.3.56) and *saḥ* (8.3.56) means: *ādeśo yaḥ sakāraḥ, pratyayasya ca yaḥ sakāraḥ iṇkor uttaraḥ, tasya mūrdhanyo bhavaty ādeśaḥ* 'a *mūrdhanya* 'retroflex' comes in place of *s* which occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ* (*Śs.* 1-6; *i, u, ṛ, ḷ, e, o, ai, au, h, y, v, r, l*), and is either a substitute or is part of an affix.' Examples are: *agniṣu, vāyuṣu, kartṛṣu* and *hartṛṣu.*

2. Why do we state the condition of *mūrdhanyaḥ* 'retroflex'? It would be better to state the rule as *apadāntasya* (*ṣaḥ*) where *ṣ* comes, via *anuvṛtti*, and is also a *mūrdhanya.* This rule will be a lot simpler. This rule is formulated so that *ṣ* as a replacement can be blocked in favor of *ḍh* in *akṛḍhvam* and *cakṛḍhve* (8.3.78 *iṇaḥ ṣīdhvaṃluṛliṭāṃ dhoṅgāt*).

3. Why does he state *apadāntasya* 'of the non-final of a *pada*'? Consider *agnis tatra* and *vāyus tatra* where *s* occurs at the end of a *pada.* This qualifier indicates that the *anuvṛtti* of 8.1.16 *padasya* is canceled. If *apadāntasya* is not stated, one will understand that this *s*-replacement is offered to a form which is not a *pada.* This, in turn, will block this replacement in *kariṣyati*, etc., where the *s* is that of a *pada.* Where should this rule apply? Where *kariṣyati*, etc., are

not termed a *pada*. Assignment of the term *pada* is here blocked in favor of the assignment of the term *bha*. Therefore, the word *apadāntasta* must be used in this rule (*Nyāsa*: *kariṣyatītyādau yatra padasaṃjñā nāsti. atra hi bhasaṃjñā padasaṃjñāṃ bādheta. tasmād antagrahaṇaṃ kriyate*).

8.3.56 सहेः साडः सः

saheḥ sāḍaḥ saḥ
/saheḥ 6/1 *sāḍaḥ* 6/1 *saḥ* 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55)
saher dhātoḥ sāḍrūpasya yaḥ sakāras tasya mūrdhanya ādeśo bhavati
The *s* of *sāḍ*, a form of verbal root *sah* 'to endure' is replaced with *ṣ* (*mūrdhanya* 'retroflex') in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

jalāṣāṭ '(that which / he who) endures water'
turāṣāṭ 'name of Indra'
pṛtanāṣāṭ 'name of Indra'

1. This rule applies to the *s* of *sāḍ*, a form of *sah* 'to endure'. Refer to derivational details of *turāṣāṭ*, under 3.2.63 *chandasi sahaḥ* (II:739), for derivational details of *jalāṣāḍ*. Other examples are similarly derived. Recall that the final *a* of *jala* 'water' is replaced with its long counterpart by 6.3.135 *anyeṣām api*. . . .

2. Why do we state the condition of *saheḥ* of *sah*? Consider *saha aḍena* (*vṛścikalāṅgalena*) *vartate* = *saḍaḥ*; *tasyāpatyaṃ sāḍiḥ* 'Sāḍi, a male offspring of Saḍa'. This rule, without the use of *saheḥ*, could have applied also to *sāḍiḥ*.

Why state *sāḍ*? So that this rule applies only where verbal root *sah* yields the form *sāḍ*. It will not apply to *jalāsāham* and *turāsāham*, where *sah* yields the form *sāh*.

Why do we state the condition of *saḥ* 'in place of *s*'? So that this *mūrdhanya* does not apply to *ā* of *sāḍ*, especially since its *ḍ* is already a retroflex (*Kāś*: *ākārasya mā bhūt*).

8.3.57 इण्कोः

iṇkoḥ
/iṇkoḥ 5/1 = *iṇ ca kuś ca* = *iṇku* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt/*
'*iṇkoḥ*' *ity etad adhikṛtaṃ veditavyam*
A non-final *s* is replaced with *ṣ* (*mūrdhanya*) when the same occurs, either after *i* and *u*, or after a consonant of the *k*-series.

EXAMPLES:

Look under subsequent rules.

1. This is also an *adhikāra* 'governing rule'. Hence, rules which follow must read *iṇkoḥ* for their proper interpretation. Consider 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*, which, when read with *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ*, *iṇkoḥ* (8.3.56) and *saḥ* (8.3.56) means: *ādeśo yaḥ sakāraḥ, pratyayasya ca yaḥ sakāraḥ iṇkor uttaraḥ, tasya mūrdhanyo bhavaty ādeśaḥ* 'a *mūrdhanya* 'retroflex' comes in place of a *s* which occurs after *i*, *u*, and is either a substitute or, is a part of an affix'. Thus, *agni* + *su* → *agni*(*s*→*ṣ*) *u* = *agniṣu* and *vāyu* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *u* → *vāyuṣu*, which illustrates a *s* occurring after *i* and *u*, respectively. Examples such as *vāk* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *u* → *vākṣu* and *tvak* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *u* = *tvakṣu* illustrate a *s* which occurs after *k*.

2. Note that *iÑ* is an abbreviatory symbol made with the second *Ñ* of the *Śivasūtra* (*Śs.* 1-6) denoting *i, u, ṛ, ḷ, e, o, ai, au, h, y, v, r, l.* The *kU*, of course, refers to a consonant of the *k*-series (*kavarga*). Why is *iÑ* not interpreted as an abbreviatory symbol formed with the first *Ñ* (*Śs.* 1)? It is known from *vyākhyāna* 'exposition of the learned' (*vyākhyānato viśeṣapratipattiḥ . . .*).

Why do we state the condition of *iṇkoḥ* 'when occurring after sounds denoted by *iÑ* and *kU*'? Consider *dāsyati* and *adas* + *sU* → *asau* where *s* is preceded by *ā* and *a*, respectively. We cannot replace this *s* with its retroflex counterpart *ṣ*.

8.3.58 नुम्विसर्जनीयशर्व्यवायेऽपि

numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi
/ num-visarjanīya-śar-vyavāye 7/1 = *num ca visarjanīyaś ca śar ca = num-visarjanīya-śaraḥ* (*itar. dv.*); *numvisarjanīyaśarbhiḥ vyavāyaḥ* (*tṛt. tat.*), *tasmin*; *api* ϕ*/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57)
numvyavāye' pi, visarjanīyavyavāye' pi, śarvyavāye' pi iṇkor uttarasya sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A *s* which, irrespective of whether intervened by *nUM, visarjanīya*, or a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *śaR* (*ś, ṣ, s*), occurs after a sound denoted by *iÑ* and *kU* is replaced with *ṣ* (*mūrdhanya*).

EXAMPLES:

sarpīṃṣi
yajūṃṣi
havīṃṣi
sarpiḥṣu
yajuḥṣu
haviḥṣu
sarpiṣṣu
yajuṣṣu
haviṣṣu

1. This rule alllows a replacement in *ṣ* for a *s* which occurs after *iÑ* and *kU*,

even though intervened by augment *nUM*, *visarjanīya* and a sound denoted by *śaR* (*ś*, *ṣ*, *s*; *Śs.* 13). The word *vyavāyaḥ*, since it is used at the end of the *dvandva* compound *numvisarjanīyaśar*, is read with each one of its member constituents (*dvandvānte śrūyamāṇaṃ pratyekam abhisambadhyate*). Thus we get: *nuṃ-vyavāye*, *visarjanīya-vyavāye* and *śar-vyavāye*. The word *vyavāya* means 'separation, intervention'. An intervention caused by *nUM* (*numvyavāya*) is impossible to find. For, the *n* of *nUM* invariably gets replaced with *anusvāra* (8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*). This specification with *nUM* is made to refer to the *anusvāra* by way of *nUM* (*PM*: *numgrahaṇam anusvāropalakṣaṇam*; *numāvyavāyāsambhavāt*, *naś cāpadāntasya jhali ity anusvārasya vidhānāt*). Why was this specification not made with *anusvāra*? So that this *ṣ*-replacement only applies when *n* of *nUM* is replaced with *anusvāra*. Consider the *s* of *puṃsu* 'locative plural of *pum* 'male' which, since *ṃ* is a replacement of *m*, cannot be replaced with *ṣ* (*PM*: *anusvāragrahaṇam eva tu na kṛtam*; *numsthānikenaivānusvāreṇa vyavadhāne yathā syāt*, *iha mābhūt puṃsv iti*).

This rule is formulated in view of the ablative specification of *iṇkoḥ*. A specification without any mention of *vyavāya* would have required *s* to be replaced with *ṣ*, only when *s* followed *iṆ* without any intervention (1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*).

Note further that this *ṣ*-replacement applies when *nUM*, *visarjanīya* and *śaR* intervene, individually. It is not desired if any combination of them intervenes. An intervention by more than one of these three will block the replacement (*PM*: *adhikavyavāye ṣatvābhāvaḥ*). A replacement in *ṣ*, for the *s* of *niṃse* and *niṃsve*, cannot be accomplished. For, these forms of verbal root *ṇisI* 'to kiss' have their *s* intervened by *nUM* and *śAR*, both at the same time (*Kāś*: *atra hi numā sakāreṇa śarā ca vyavadhānam*).

Now consider *sarpis* + *Jas* → *sarpīṃṣi*, *yajus* + *Jas* → *yajūṃṣi* and *havis* + *Jas* → *havīṃṣi*, where *Jas* is repalced with *Śi* (7.1.20 *jaśśasoḥ śi*) and augment *nUM* is introduced (7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya khaly acaḥ*). Rule 6.4.10 *sāntamahataḥ* . . . then applies to replace *i*, or *u*, with their long counterparts. The *n* of *sarpis* + *nUM* + (*Jas*→(*Ś*)*i*)) → *sarpi* + *n*(*UM*) + *s* + *i* → *sarp*(*i*→*ī*) + *n* + *s* + *i* → *sarpī* + *n* + *s* + *i* is then replaced with *anusvāra* (8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*). Our present rule replaces the *s* with *ṣ* to produce: *sarpin*→*ṃ*) *s* + *i* → *sarpiṃ*(*s*→*ṣ*) + *i* → *sarpīṃṣi*. Similar rules apply in deriving *yajūṃṣi* and *havīṃṣi*. Examples such as *sarpis* + *su* → *sarpiṣṣu*, *yajus* + *su* → *yajuṣṣi* and *havis* + *su* → *haviṣṣu* are somewhat different. The *s* of *sarpis*, *yajus* and *havis* is optionally replaced with *ḥ* (*visarjanīyaḥ*; 8.3.36 *vā śari*). Thus, we get *sarpi*(*s*→*ḥ*) + *su* → *sarpiḥ* + *su* = *sarpiḥsu*, *yajuḥsu* and *haviḥsu*. We will get *sarpis* + *su*, *yajus* + *su* and *havis* + *su* if the optional replacement of *s* is not accepted. A *s* which occurs after *i* and *u*, and is intervened by *s* (*śAR*), can be replaced here with *ṣ*. Thus, *sarpis* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *u* → *sarpis* + *ṣu*, etc. The *s* after *i* and *u* of these examples will itself be replaced with *ṣ* (8.3.41 *idhupadhasya cāpratyayasya*). We thus get: *sarpi*(*s*→*ṣ*) + *ṣu* → *sarpiṣṣu*, *yajuṣṣu* and *haviṣṣu*.

8.3.59 **आदेशप्रत्यययोः**

ādeśapratyayayoḥ
/ādeśa-pratyayayoḥ 6/2 = *ādeśaś ca pratyayaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58)
ādeśo yaḥ sakāraḥ iṇkor uttaraḥ tasya mūrdhanyo bhavaty ādeśaḥ
A *s* which occurs at the end of a *pada* after *iṆ* and *kU*, and is either a substitute (*ādeśa*) or part of an affix, is replaced with *ṣ*, irrespective of whether intervened by *nUM*, *visarjanīya* and *śaR* (*ś*, *ṣ*, *s*).

EXAMPLES:

siṣeva
suṣvāpa
agniṣu
vāyuṣu
kartṛṣu
hartṛṣu

1. Note that *mūrdhanyaḥ* and *saḥ* are both carried over. Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*) shows four possible interpretations of this rule:

(*i*) *ādeśāvayavo yaḥ sakāraḥ pratyayāvayavo yaḥ sakāraḥ* 'a *s* which is part of a replacement (*ādeśāvayavaḥ sakāraḥ*); a *sa* which is part of an affix (*pratyayāvayavaḥ sakāraḥ*)'

This interpretation accepts *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* as ending in the genitive dual. When construed individually with *ādeśa* and *pratyaya*, in relation to *saḥ*, it denotes *avayava* 'part of a whole'.

(*ii*) *ādeśasya sakārasya pratyayasya sakārasyety ādeśo yaḥ sakāraḥ pratyayo yaḥ sakāraḥ* 'of the *s* of a substitute; of the *s* of an affix', thus, a *s* which is a substitute; a *s* which is an affix'

This interpretation also accepts *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* as ending in the genitive dual. When construed individually with *ādeśa* and *pratyaya* in relation with *saḥ*, it denotes syntactic coordination (*sāmānādhikaraṇya*). Thus, the meaning: 'of a *s* which is a substitute; of a *s* which is an affix (*pratyaya*)'.

(*iii*) *pratyayo yaḥ sakāraḥ ādeśāvayavo yaḥ sakāraḥ*

This interpretation accepts *saḥ* in syntactic coordination with *pratyayasya*, thereby yeilding the meaning: 'a *s* which is an affix'. It accepts the genitive of the substitute (*ādeśa*) as denoting 'part of a whole', thereby yielding the meaning: 'a *s* which is part of a substitute' (*Nyāsa*: *pratyaye samānādhikaraṇādeśe' vayavayogā*).

(*iv*) *tasya viparyayo vā-ādeśo yaḥ sakāras tasya; pratyayāvayavo yas tasya* 'of a *s* which is a substitute'; 'of a *s* which is part of an affix'

This interpretation reverses the relational interpretation of 'affix' and 'substitute' given under (*iii*).

Accepting the first view will create problems in *bisaṃ bisam* and *musalaṃ musalam*. That is, a replacement in *ṣ* will apply after doubling of *bisam* and *musalam* by 8.1.4 *nityavīpsayoḥ*. For, the *s* which occurs as part of replacement after *i* and *u* will be replaced with *ṣ*. Accepting the second view will block the *ṣ*-replacement in *kariṣyati, hariṣyati,* etc. The *s* of *kariṣyati* and *hariṣyati* is not an affix by itself. What is an affix is the full form *sya*. Accepting the third view will also create problems, similar to the first two. It is to resolve problems of the first three interpretations that the fourth view is accepted (*PM*: *tasmād antyaḥ pakṣaḥ āśrīyate*).

It is indicated by the next rule that *ṣaṣṭhī* of a substitute denotes *samānādhikaraṇa* 'same locus of meaning'. It does not denote different loci. If it was not so, *ṣ*-replacement in the next rule could have been accomplished by just using the replacement. The negation of *sāti* (8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ*) also indicates that the genitive of an affix denotes *avayava* 'part of a whole'. It does not denote syntactic coordination. Otherwise, that negation will become vacuous. For, *s* will not be an affix and hence, the question of negating *ṣ*-replacement would not arise. But since these two meanings of genitive cannot be denoted at the same time (*saha-vivakṣā*), a *dvandva* compound such as *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* cannot be formed. Commentators state that such compounds will be formed in view of indications (*jñāpakas*) of these two rules. How do we accomplish two relata of a single genitive? It is stated that *tantra* (see notes under 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*) would enable us to get the co-referentiality (*sāmānādhikaraṇa*) and 'part of a whole' relations of '*s* as replacement' (as in *siṣeva/suṣvāpa*), and '*s* of an affix' (as in *agniṣu/vāyuṣu*).

2. Now consider *siṣeva*, a third singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *ṣivU*, where *tiP* of *LIṬ* is replaced with *ṆaL* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānāṃ . . .*). The initial *ṣ* of the root is replaced with *s* by 6.1.64 *dhātvādeḥ ṣaḥ saḥ*. Doubling (6.1.8 *liṭy dhātor . . .*) and retention of the unit formed with initial consonant (7.4.60 *halādiśeṣa*) then produce *siv + siv + a* → *si* (*v*→ϕ) *+ siv + a*. A replacement in *guṇa* of the short penultimate (*laghūpadha*) will produce *si + s*(*i*→*e*) *v + a = siseva*. We will get *si*(*s*→*ṣ*) *eva = siṣeva*, with the application of our present rule. Deriving *suṣvāpa* from (*ÑI*) *ṣvap + LIṬ* also involves similar rule applications. The *abhyāsa* of *s*(*v*→*u*) *a + svap + a = su+a + svap + a*, however, goes through *samprasāraṇa* (6.1.17 *liṭy abhyāsasyobhayeṣām*). The *u+a* sequence is then replaced with *u* to produce *su + svap + a = susvapa* (6.1.107 *samprasāraṇāc ca*). The penultimate *a* of *susvap* will also be replaced with its *vṛddhi* counterpart (7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*). Our present rule will replace the *s* of *svap* with *ṣ*. Thus, *susv*(*a*→*ā*) *pa* → *su*(*s*→*ṣ*) *vāpa = suṣvāpa*. Note here that the *s* which goes through a replacement in *ṣ* is a replacement (*ādeśa*) of the root-initial *ṣ*.

The *ṣ*-replacement in *su* of *agni* + *su*, *vāyu* + *su*, *kaṭṛ* + *su* and *hartṛ* + *su* is accomplished by accepting *s* as part of an affix.

3. How do we get this *ṣ*-replacement in *vakṣat* and *yakṣat* in *indro mā vakṣat* and *sa devān yakṣat*? These are the third singular active forms of *LEṬ* introduced after verbal roots *vac* and *yaj*, where *LEṬ* is replaced with *tiP*. Affix *sIP* (3.1.34 *sib bahulaṃ leṭi*) after the verbal root, and augment *aṬ* (3.4.94 *leṭo' ḍāṭau*) to affix *tiP*, are then introduced. The *i* of *tiP* then goes through deletion (3.4.100 *itaś ca*). It is the *s* of *sIP* which gets replaced with *ṣ*. How could *sIP* be considered as part of the affix when it itself is the affix. Commentators explain that *sIP* can still be considered as its part while constituting the whole (*PŚ* (31): *vyapadeśivad ekasmin*). Thus, we get *ṣ* replacement in *yakṣat* and *vakṣat*, third singular active forms of *vah* and *yaj* in *LEṬ*.

8.3.60 शासिवसिघसीनां च

śāsivasighasīnāṃ ca
/śāsi-vasi-ghasīnām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57)
'śāsi, vasi, ghasi' ity eteṣāṃ ca iṇkor uttarasya sakārasya mūrdhanyo bhavati
The *s* of *śāsI* 'instruct, rule', *vasI* 'to dwell' and *ghasI* 'to eat' which occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU* is replaced with *ṣ* in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

anvaśiṣat
anvaśiṣatām
anvaśiṣan
śiṣṭaḥ
śiṣṭavān
uṣitaḥ
uṣitavān
uṣitvā
jakṣatuḥ
jakṣuḥ
akṣann amīdanta pitaraḥ

1. Note that 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* cannot replace the *s* of these roots with *ṣ* since *s* is not a replacement form. Refer to the appendix (III:7-23) under 3.1.56 *śarttiśāstyartibhyaś ca* for derivational details of *anvaśiṣat*, *anvaśiṣatām*, *anvaśiṣan*; and *śiṣṭaḥ/śiṣṭavān* under 6.4.34 *śās id aṅhaloḥ*. Derivational details of *uṣitaḥ/uṣitavān* can be found under 6.1.15 *vacisvapiyajādīnām. . . .* Forms such as *jakṣatuḥ / jakṣuḥ* are discussed under the appendix (II:412-13), where 6.4.100 *ghasibhasor. . .* applies to delete the penultimate *a* of *ghas* + *atus*. Derivational details of *akṣan* can also be found there.

This rule is formulated for facilitating *ṣ*-replacement for a *s* which is not a replacement (*anādeśārthaṃ vacanam*). But how could *ṣ*-replacement in *ghas* be accepted as an example of *anādeśa* 'non-replacement'? We know that *ghas* is a replacement of *ad*. Still, *s* is not a replacement (*Kāś*: *sakāras tv ādeśo na bhavati*). It is used here as part of *ghasḶ* which, in turn, refers to *ad* and its replacement in *ghasḶ*, both.

Recall that the condition of *iṅkoḥ* is still valid. Thus, we do not get this *ṣ*-replacement in *vasati* and *jaghāsa*.

8.3.61 स्तौतिण्योरेव षण्यभ्यासात्

stautiṇyor eva ṣaṇy abhyāsāt
/stauti-ṇyoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *eva* ϕ *ṣaṇi* 7/1 *abhyāsāt* 5/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57)
stauter ṇyantānāṃ ca ṣabhūte sani parataḥ abhyāsād iṇa uttarasya ādeśasakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) comes in place of the *s*-replacement of verbal root *ṣṭuÑ* (*stu*)) 'to praise', and also of roots ending in *ṆiC*, when *s* occurs after the *iṆ* sound of an *abhyāsa* and affix *saN*, with a replacement in *ṣ*, follows in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

tuṣṭūṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *ṣṭuÑ* 'to praise' used with affix *saN*'
siṣecayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sic* 'to drip, water' used with affix *iC* followed by *saN*'
siṣañjayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sanj* 'to cling to' used with affix *iC* followed by *saN*'
suṣvāpayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *svap* 'to sleep' used with causal *ṆiC* followed by *saN*'

1. Refer to derivational details of *tuṣṭūṣati* in the appendix of 1.2.9 *iko jhal* (II:434). Derivational details of *suṣvāpayiṣati* are offered under 7.4.67 *dyutisvāpyoḥ samprasāraṇam*. Derivates such as *siṣecayiṣati* and *siṣañjayiṣati* are similarly derived from ((*sic* + *ṆiC*) + *saN*) + *LAṬ*)) and ((*sañj* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*)). Note that the *i*-replacement in the *abhyāsa* of *sañj* is accomplished by 7.4.49 *sani ataḥ*.

2. Note that this *s*-replacement applies to a *ṣ* which itself is a replacement of *s*. Rule 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* can thus account for this replacement. Since this provision is being made against one already made available, this provision must then be accepted as restrictive (*siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaṃ bhavati* 'a provision made against one already established is made for restrictive purposes'). That is, if a replacement in *s* of this rule applies, it must apply only to a *ṣ* which occurs after a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *iṆ*

of the *abhyāsa* of verbal roots *ṣtuÑ* and roots which end in affix *ṆiC*. Additionally, this replacement must occur when affix *saN* with a repalcement in *ṣ* follows (*ṣaṇi parataḥ stauti ṇyeva . . .*). There are two requirements this rule must meet for its application: (*i*) this replacement applies only in the context of *stu* and roots ending in *ṆiC*; (*ii*) this replacement applies only when affix *saN* with its *s* replaced with *ṣ* follows. These requirements both are specified with the use of the word *eva* 'only when'.

Why do we have to state *eva* 'only, alone', when the restrictive nature of this provision can be easily understood by *siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*. The word *eva* is necessary so that what is desired could be clearly understood (*Kāś*: *iṣṭato' vadhāraṇārtham*). There will be two meanings to this restrictive provision if this rule does not use *eva*: (*i*) when *stu*, or a causative root alone, is followed by affix *saN* (*stautiṇyor eva ṣaṇi*) and (*ii*) when affix *saN* alone follows *stu* or a causative root (*stautiṇyoḥ ṣaṇy eva*). Accepting the second interpretation will block this replacement in the third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate *tuṣṭau*. Accepting the first view will make this replacement applicable to the *s* of the *abhyāsa* in *sisikṣati* where *saN* occurs after verbal root *ṣiC*. The use of *eva* is therefore necessary. What is wrong in understanding this restrictive provision as: *stautiṇyoḥ ṣaṇy eva* 'only when affix *ṣaN* follows after *stu* and roots ending in *ṆiC*'. This restrictive provision will facilitate replacement in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*) only before affix *saN*, and not before any other affix. This will block *ṣatva* in the third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate *tuṣṭau*. It will definitely apply in *sisikṣati*. For, exact delimitation of this restrictive provision is not exclusive of replacement in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*).

Why do we have the condition of *ṣaṇi* 'when affix *saN* follows'. So that this restrictive provision does not apply elsewher. If a replacement in *ṣ* applied to the *s* occurring after the *abhyāsa*, it would apply only to the *s* occurring after the *abhyāsa* of *stu* and roots ending in *ṆiC*. Thus, it could not apply to *siṣeca* where *s* is that of a *dhātu* 'verbal root'. As this replacement does not apply to the *s* which occurs after the *abhyāsa* in *sisikṣati*, it should also not apply in *siṣeca* before affix *LIṬ*. This restriction of *saN* is specified to block replacement where *saN* does not follow.

Why do we have to make this specification of *saN* with *vinata*, i.e., its *s* and *n* replaced with *ṣ* and *ṇ* (*Kāś*: *ko vinate' nurodhaḥ*). Note that the *prātiśākhyas* use the term *vinata* for replacements in *ṣ* and *ṇ*. So that this replacement does not apply where *saN* follows without (*avinata*) its *s* and *n* replaced with *ṣ* and *ṇ*. As a *s*-replacement, before *s* of *saN* replaced with *ṣ*, does not apply in context of roots other than *stu* and causatives, so also here in *suṣupsati*, it cannot apply before a *saN* with no replacement of its *s* with *ṣ* (*PM*: *ṣatvabhūte sani dhātvantarasya ṣatvaṃ na bhavati evam ihāṣatvabhūte' pi na syāt*). Refer to derivational details of *suṣupsati* in the appendix (II:434), under 1.2.8 *rudavidamuṣa. . . .*

Why specify *ṣaN* with *N*? A specification with *ṣa* would have made this

restrictive rule to apply before any affix used with the word-form *ṣa*.

Why do we have the condition of *abhyāsāt* 'after the *abhyāsa* of a root'? So that this replacement does not apply to the *s* of a root which occurs after *i* and *u* of the root, or its preverb. Consider *pratīṣiṣati* and *adhīṣiṣati* as examples (*Kāś*: *abhyāsād yā prāptis tasyā niyamo yathā syāt dhātor yā prāptir tasyā niyamo mā bhūt*).

8.3.62 सः स्विदिस्वदिसहीनां च

saḥ svidisvadisahīnāṃ ca
/saḥ 1/1 *svidi-svadi-sahīnām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *ṇeḥ ṣaṇy abhyāsāt* #61)
'*svidi, svadi, sahi*' *ity eteṣāṃ ṇyantānāṃ sani ṣabhūte parato*' *bhyāsād uttarasya sakārasya sakārādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *s* comes in place of *s* of verbal roots *svidI* 'to perspire', *svadI* 'to taste' and *sahI* 'to endure' when ending in *ṆiC*, provided this *s* occurs after a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *iN* of the *abhyāsā*, when affix *saN* with a replacement in *ṣ* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

sisvedayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *svid* 'to perspire' used with *ṆiC* ending in affix *saN*'
sisvādayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *svad* 'to taste' used with *ṆiC* ending in affix *saN*'
sisāhayiṣati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sah* used with *ṆiC* ending in affix *saN*'

1. Note that the initial *s* of these roots derives from *ṣ* (6.1.64 *dhātvādeḥ ṣaḥ saḥ*). This *s*, in turn, is subject to a replacement in *ṣ* of the preceding rule. Our present rule offers *s* as a replacement for *s* to cancel its replacement in *ṣ* (*Kāś*: *sakārasya sakāravacanaṃ mūrdhanyanivṛtyartham*). Refer to numerous examples with similar derivational history already explained.

8.3.63 प्राक् सितादड्व्यवायेऽपि

prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' *pi*
/prāk ϕ *sitāt* 5/1 *aḍvyavāye* 7/1 = *aṭā vyavāyaḥ* (*ṭṛt. tat.*), *tasmin*; *api* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57)
prāksitasaṃśabdanād yān ita ūrdhvam anukramiṣyāmas tatrāḍ vyavāye' *pi mūrdhanyo bhavaty evaṃ tad veditavyam*
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*), from here on prior to *sita* (8.3.70 *parinivibhyaḥ sevasita . . .*), comes in place of an *s* which does not occur at the end of a *pada*, even when augment *aṬ* intervenes.

EXAMPLES:

Look under subsequent rules.

1. This rule is operational (*vidhi*) in nature, though it can also qualify for an *adhikāra* 'domain'. As indicated by *prāk sitāt* 'prior to *sita* 'bound', it governs rules enumerated prior to 8.3.70 *parinivibhyaḥ sevasita. . .* . The word *aṬ* here refers to augment *aṬ*. It does not refer to the abbreviatory symbol formed with *a* of the first *Śivasūtra* and *Ṭ* of the fifth. The word *api* 'also' is used so that this replacement can apply also where augment *aṬ* does not intervene between *s*, and what conditions this replacement.

8.3.64 स्वादिष्वभ्यासेन चाभ्यासस्य

sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya
/sthādiṣu 7/3 = *sthā ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣu*; *abhyāsena* 3/1 *ca* ϕ *abhyāsasya* 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' pi* #63)
sthādiṣu prāk sitasaṃśabdanād abhyāsena vyavāye mūrdhanyo bhavati, abhyāsasakārasya ca bhavatīty evaṃ veditavyam
A *mūrdhanya* 'retroflex' replaces the *s* of verbal roots enumerated beginning with *sthā* 'to stand, stay', prior to *sita*, and also of the *s* of the *abhyāsa* of specified roots, even when the *abhyāsa* intervenes between *s* and what conditions this *s* to be replaced with *ṣ*.

EXAMPLES:

Refer to subsequent rules.

1. Note that *sthā* refers to *sthā* of the next rule. The word *abhyāsa* of *abhyāsasya* does not refer to the *abhyāsa* of any root. It refers to the *abhyāsa* of roots enumerated by rules beginning with 8.3.65 *upasargāt. . .* through rules prior to 8.3.70 *parinivibhyaḥ. . .* . This specification would not be needed if *abhyāsa* of *abhyāsasya* is referred to as *abhyāsa* in general. Rule 8.3.65 *upasargāt. . .* could then have covered its provision. Thus, this use of *abhyāsa* is made for restrictive (*niyama*) purposes. That is, it applies only to the *abhyāsa* of roots which have been specified by this rule. This rule can be interpreted in two parts: (*i*) *sthādiṣv abhyāsena vyavāye ṣatvaṃ bhavati* '*ṣ* comes as a replacement in *sthā*, etc.', when *abhyāsa* intervenes; (*ii*) *abhyāsasya ca ṣatvaṃ bhavati teṣv eva sthādiṣv iti* '*ṣ* comes as a replacement of *s* of the *abhyāsa* of those same *sthā*, etc.' The first part of this rule is purely operational (*vidhyartham*). The second part is restrictive (*niyamārtham*).

2. Refer to derivational details of *tasthau*, under 7.1.34 *āta au ṇalaḥ*. We get *abhitaṣṭhau* from *abhi-sthā* + (*LIṬ*→*tiP*→*ṆaL*), where *a* of *ṆaL* is replaced with *au* (7.1.34 *āta au ṇalaḥ*). The *s* of *tasthau* could not be replaced with *ṣ*

because it is preceded by *a*. Rule 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* could account for this replacement only when *s* occurs after *i* and *u* (*iṆ*). This rule, with the specification of *abhyāsasya ca*, makes the replacement possible. Now consider *pari-sthā* + (*LIṬ→tiP→ṆaL*), where *ṆaL* is also replaced with *au*. The *abhyāsa* here intervenes between *pari*, the preverb which conditions this replacement, and *s*, the sound segment which is to be replaced.

This rule is formulated, also for roots which are not enumerated in the *Dhātupāṭha* with *ṣ* to start with (*Kāś*: *aṣopadeśārthaṃ ca*). Consider *senayā abhiyātum icchati = abhiṣiṣeṇayiṣati* 'wishes to go about with the army' and *senayā paryātum icchati = pariṣiṣeṇayiṣati* 'wishes to go all over the army', where the causative root *senaya* does not begin with *ṣ* (*aṣopadeśārthaṃ ca*).

This rule is also formulated to remove the restrictive provision of *ṣ*-replacement applicable in the context of *stu* and causative roots, as per specification of *ṣaṇi* of 8.3.61 *stauti*. . . . Our present rule will allow a replacement in *ṣ* when affix *saN* follows with its *s* replaced with *ṣ*. Consider *abhiṣiṣikṣati* and *pariṣiṣikṣati* as examples.

Recall that *abhyāsasya* is used here for restrictive purposes (*niyamārtham*). A *ṣ* replaces the *s* of the *abhyāsa* of only those roots which have been specified by 8.3.64 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena* . . . (*Kāś*: *'abhyāsasya' ity vacanaṃ niyamārtham; sthādiṣv evābhyāsasakārasya mūrdhanyo bhavati, nānyatra*). Thus, consider *abhisusūṣati* and *abhisiṣāsati*.

Refer to derivational details of examples under the following rules.

8.3.65 उपसर्गात् सुनोतिसुवतिस्यतिस्तौतिस्तोभतिस्थासेनयसेधसिचसञ्जस्वञ्जाम्

upasargāt sunotisuvatisyatistautistobhatisthāsenayasedhasicasañjasvañjām
/upasargāt 5/1 *sunoti-suvati-syati-stauti-stobhati-sthā-senaya-sedha-sic-sañja-svañjām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' pi* #63 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya* #64)
upasargasthān nimittād uttarasya 'sunoti, suvati, syati, stauti, stobhati, sthā, senaya, sedha, sica, sañja, svañja' ity eteṣāṃ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A *mūrdhanya* 'retroflex' replaces the *s* of verbal roots *ṣūÑ* (*sunoti*) 'press out', *ṣū* (*suvati*) 'to impel', *ṣo* (*syati*) 'terminate', *stu* (*stauti*) 'to praise', *stubh* (*stobhati*) 'to utter, chant', *sthā* 'stay, stand', *senaya* 'attack', *sedha* 'to order', *sica* 'to sprinkle', *sañja* 'to cling to' and *svañja* 'to clasp, embrace' when used after a preverb containing the cause of this replacement, and a *mūrdhanya* also comes in place of the *s* of the *abhyāsa* of *sthā*, etc., even when *aṬ*, or the *abhyāsa* of *sthā*, etc., intervene in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

abhiṣuṇoti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *ṣuÑ* used with the preverb *abhi*'

paryaṣuṇot 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *ṣuÑ* used with the preverb *pari*'
abhiṣuvati 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *ṣū* with *uvAṄ*'
paryaṣuvat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *ṣū* used with the preverb *pari*'
abhiṣyati
paryaṣyat
abhiṣṭauti
paryaṣṭauti
abhiṣṭobhate
paryaṣṭobhat
abhiṣṭhāsyati
abhyaṣṭhāt
paritaṣṭhau
abhiṣeṇayati
abhyaṣeṇayat
pariṣiṣeṇayiṣati
abhiṣedhati
abhyaṣedhat
abiṣiñcati
abhyaṣiñcat
pariṣiṣikṣati
pariririṅkṣati
abhiṣajati
abhyaṣajat
abhiṣiṣaṅkṣati
abhiṣvajate
abhyaṣvajata
pariṣiṣvaṅkṣate

1. This rule replaces the *s* of *ṣuÑ* 'press out', *ṣū* 'impell, inspire', *ṣo* 'to kill, finish', *ṣṭuÑ* 'to praise', *ṣṭubhA* 'to stop, arrest', *ṣṭhā* 'to stand still', *senaya* 'to attack', *ṣidhA* 'move, instruct', *ṣicA* 'sprinkle', *ṣañjA* 'attach', *ṣvañjÅ* 'embrace, clasp' when these roots are used with a preverb containing *i* and *u* (*kU* is impossible) as replacement conditions (*nimitta*). This replacement also applies to the *abhyāsa* of *sthā*, etc., even when *aṬ*, and the *abhyāsa* of *sthā*, etc., intervene in close proximity.

Note that *suvati* is specified here with *Śa*, the *vikaraṇa* of the *tudādi* class. It, therefore, does not refer to *ṣūṄ* 'to give birth' of *adādi* and *divādi* groups. Verbal root *ṣidhA* refers to both *ṣidhA* 'to move' and *ṣidhŪ* 'instruct' of the *bhvādi* group. Recall that 8.3.113 *sedhater gatau* blocks *ṣ*-replacement for the *s* of *ṣidhA* when its signification is *gati* 'movement'. This replacement in *ṣ*, hence, does not apply when *ṣidhA* denotes *gati* 'movement'. Roots with *ṣ* in *upadeśa* 'initial citation' are specified here against the negation of 8.3.111

sāt padādyoḥ, itself an exception to 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*. Roots which do not have *ṣ* in *upadeśa* did not have this replacement available to them by earlier rules. A specification of *sunoti*, etc., with their *vikaraṇa* and *tiP* (*śtip*) is made to exclude their forms which go through deletion of affix *yaṄ*. A specification of *sedh* with *ŚaP* is made to exclude any reference to *sidh* of *sidhyati*.

Note that a replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) may obtain in examples where *s* is replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣatva*). This *ṇatva* is accomplished in view of 8.4.1 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* . . . and 8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅ num.* . . . Notice that examples where augment *aṬ* intervenes are all derivates of affix *LAṄ*. Deriving *abhi-ṣu* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *abhi-*(*ṣ→s*) *u* + (*Ś*) *nu* + *ti* → *abhi-su* + *n*(*u→o*) + *ti* → *abhi-*(*s→ṣ*) + (*n→ṇ*) *o* + *ti* = *abhiṣuṇoti* and *pari-ṣu* + *Śnu* + (*LAṄ→tiP*) → *pariṣuṇoti*, with replacements in *o* (*guṇa*), *ṣ* (*ṣatva*) and *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) offers no difficulty. Similar rules apply in deriving derivates of *LAṄ* with *aṬ*. Thus, *abhi-aṬ-ṣu* + *Śnu* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *abhyaṣuṇot*(*i→ϕ*) = *abhyaṣuṇot* and *pari* + *aṬ* + *ṣu* + *Śnu* + (*LAṄ→tiP*) → *paryaṣuṇot*, where *i* of *tiP* is obligatorily deleted (3.4.100 *itaś ca*). The *LAṬ* and *LAṄ* derivates of *ṣū* 'to impell', where *ṣū* is used with the preverbs *abhi* and *pari*, are not difficult to derive. Note, however, that *Śa* will be introduced as the *vikaraṇa*, and *uvAṄ* (6.4.77 *aci śnudhātubhruvām* . . .) will replace the *ū* of *ṣū*. Thus we get *abhi-ṣ*(*ū→uv*) + *Śa* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *abhiṣuvati*, *pariṣuvati* and *abhy-aṬ-ṣ*(*ū→uvAṄ*) + *Śa* + (*LAṄ→tiP*) = *abhyaṣuvat* and *paryaṣuvat*. Deriving *abhi-ṣo* + *ŚyaN* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *abhiṣyati* and *pari-ṣo* + *ŚyaN* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *pariṣyati* involves deletion of root-final *o* by 7.3.71 *otaḥ śyani*. Derivates of *LAṄ*, as usual, will involve *aṬ* and deletion of *i* of *tiP*. We thus get *abhyaṣyat* and *paryaṣyat*.

Note that 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ* deletes *ŚaP* after roots of the *adādi* group. Derivates of *ṣṭuÑ* will endure this deletion, in addition to the *vṛddhi* of *u* at the end of their presuffixal base (*aṅga*). A replacement in *guṇa* is blocked since deletion of *ŚaP* is accomplished via *ŚLU* (1.1.63 *na lumatāṅgasya*). We thus get *abhist*(*u→au*) + *ti* → *abhi*(*s→ṣ*) + *tau* + *ti* → *abhiṣ* + (*t→ṭ*) *au* + *ti* → *abhiṣṭauti* and *pariṣṭauti* with *LAṬ*. Derivates of *LAṄ*, namely *abhyaṣṭaut* and *paryaṣṭaut*, are derived with *aṬ* and similar applications. Derivates of *ṣṭubhA*, since the root is marked with *anudātta* as an *it*, will be derived with middle endings (*ātmanepada*): *abhiṣṭobhate* / *pariṣṭobhate* (*LAṬ*) and *abhyaṣṭobhata* / *paryaṣṭobhata* (*LAṄ*). Derivates of *abhi-sthā* and *pari-sthā* with affix *LṚṬ* will involve replacements in *ṣ* (*ṣatva*) and *ṭh* (*ṣṭutva*), repsectively. Derivates with *LUṄ* will additionally involve *aṬ* and deletion of *i* (3.4.100 *itaś ca*). We thus get *abhyaṣṭhāt* and *paryaṣṭhāt*. Refer to 7.1.34 *āta au ṇalaḥ* for details of *LIṬ*-derivates *abhitaṣṭhau* and *paritaṣṭhau*. Refer to notes of the preceding rule for *abhiṣeṇayati*, etc. One should also refer to numerous *ṆiC* and *saN* derivates already explained. Derivates of *ṣic* will involve introduction of augment *nUM* (7.1.59 *śe mucādīnām*). Refer to *muñcati* for additional details (II:384). We thus get *abiṣiñcati* and *abhyaṣiñcat*, etc.

Note that *n* of *sañj* is deleted by 6.4.25 *saṃśasanj*. . . . This is how we get *abhiṣajati* and *abhyaṣajat*, etc. This deletion will not apply when *saN* follows. We will get a replacement in *anusvāra*, instead (8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*). The *j* of *sañj* will also be replaced with *g* (*kutva*; 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*), to be subsequently replaced with *k* (*cartva*; 8.4.54 *khari ca*). The *anusvāra* will then be replaced with a nasal similar to *k* which follows (*parasavarṇa* (8.4.57 *anusvārasya yayi* . . .)). We will thus get *abhiṣiṣaṅkṣati*. Similar rules apply in deriving *pariraṅkṣati*. Derivates of *ṣvañj* will take the *ātmanepada* endings and will follow rule applications similar to derivates of *ṣañj*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *upasargāt* 'used after a preverb'? Consider *dadhi siñcati* and *madhu siñcati* where *s* of *siñcati* is not replaced with *ṣ* because no preverb is used. Note that *nirgatā secakā asmād deśāt = niḥsecako deśaḥ* 'a place which people who irrigate fields have left' does not have *nis* as a preverb. We do not get the preverbial relation of *abhi* with *ṣuÑ* in *abhisāvakayati*. What *abhi* relates to is *sāvakīya*. Consequently, we do not get a replacement in *ṣ*. This *ṣ*-replacement is available in *abhiṣāvayati* since *abhi* directly relates to *ṣuÑ*.

8.3.66 **सदिरप्रतेः**

sadir aprateḥ
/ sadiḥ 1/1 (*prathamā*, used with the signification of *ṣaṣṭhī*); *prateḥ* 6/1 = *na pratiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmāt/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' pi* #63 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya* #64 *upasargāt* #65) *sadeḥ sakārasya upasargasthān nimittād aprater uttarasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati*
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) sound replaces the *s* of verbal root *ṣad* 'to sit down', used after a non-*prati* preverb containing the cause of this replacement, even when *aṬ* and *abhyāsa* intervene in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

niṣīdati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *sad* used with the preverb *ni*'
viṣīdati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *sad* used with the preverb *vi*'
nyaṣīdat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *sad* used with the preverb *ni*'
vyaṣīdat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *sad* used with the preverb *vi*'
niṣasāda 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *sad* used with the preverb *ni*'

viṣasāda 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *sad* used with the preverb *vi*'

1. This rule offers a replacement in *ṣ* for the *s* of verbal root *sadḶ*, when used after a preverb other than *prati*. This replacement obtains even when *aṬ*, or an *abhyāsa* intervenes between the preverb and the verbal root. Thus, *niṣīdati, viṣīdati; ny-a-ṣīdat, vy-a-ṣīdat*, where *sad* is replaced with *sīd* (7.3.78 *pāghrādhmā . . .*). Note that *sīd* cannot replace *sad* if no affix marked with *Ś* follows. We thus do not get *sīd* in *niṣasāda* and *viṣasāda*, the third singular *LIṬ* derivates of *sad* with *nis* and *vis*.

This replacement in *ṣ* is offered against the negation of 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ*. A replacement in *ṣ*, for a *s* which occurs after an *abhyāsa*, is blocked in view of the negation of 8.3.118 *sadeḥ parasya liṭi*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *aprateḥ* 'when not used after *prati*'? Consider *pratisīdati* where we do not get this replacement in *ṣ*.

8.3.67 **स्तन्भेः**

stanbheḥ
/stanbheḥ 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' pi* #63 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya* #64 *upasargāt* #65)
stanbheḥ sakārasya upasargasthān nimittād uttarasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) replaces the *s* of *stanbhU* 'to prop up', used after a preverb containing the *nimitta* of replacement, even when *aṬ*, and also an *abhyāsa*, intervenes in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

abhiṣṭabhnāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *stanbhU* used with the preverb *abhi*'
pariṣṭabhnāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *stanbhU* used with the preverb *pari*'
abhyaṣṭabhnāt 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *stanbhU* used with the preverb *abhi*'
paryaṣṭabhnāt 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of *stanbhU* used with the preverb *pari*'
abhitaṣṭambha 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of verbal root *stanbhU* used with the preverb *abhi*'
paritaṣṭambha 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of *stanbhU* used with the preverb *pari*'

1. Note that *stanbhU* is a root found in grammatical rules only. The *vikaraṇa* which is introduced after it is: *Śnā* (3.1.82 *stanbhustunbhu . . .*). Rule 6.4.24

aniditāṃ hala . . . deletes its nasal, thereby yielding *abhi-stanbh* + *Śnā* + (*LAṬ*→ *tiP*) → *abhista*(*n*→ϕ) *bh* + *nāti* → *abhi*(*s*→*ṣ*) *tabhnāti* → *abhiṣ*(*t*→*ṭ*) *abhnāti* = *abhiṣṭabhnāti* and *pariṣṭabhnāti*. Forms of *LUṄ* with *aṬ* can be similarly derived as *abhy-a-ṣṭabhnāt* = *abhyaṣṭabhnāt* and *paryaṣṭabhnāt*. Derivates of *LIṬ* go through doubling of the root where *khaY* (*Śs.* 11-13) of the *abhyāsa* alone is retained (7.4.61 *śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ*). Thus, *abhi-ta-stanbh* + (*LIṬ*→*ṆaL*) → *abhita*(*s*→*ṣ*) + (*t*→*ṭ*) *a*(*n*→*ṃ*→*m*) + *bha* = *abhita-ṣṭambha* and *pari-ta-ṣṭambha*.

2. Recall that *aprateḥ* 'but not after *prati*' is not carried over here. Consequently, there is no negation of forms with *prati*. We will thus also get forms with *prati*: *prati-ṣṭabh-nā-ti* = *pratiṣṭabhnāti*, *praty-a-ṣṭabh-nā-t* = *pratyaṣṭabhnāt* and *praty-a-ṣṭambh-a*.

8.3.68 अवाच्यालम्बनाविदूर्ययोः

avāc cālambanāvidūryayoḥ
/avāt 5/1 *ca* ϕ *ālambana-āvidūryayoḥ* 7/2 = *ālambanaṃ ca āvidūryaṃ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' pi* #63 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya* #64 *upasargāt* #65 *stanbheḥ* #67)
avaśabdād upasargād uttarasya stanbheḥ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati, ālambane' rthe āvidūrye ca
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) replaces the *s* of verbal root *stanbhU*, also when used after the preverb *ava*, provided derivates denote *ālambana* 'resorting to, taking recourse to' and *āvidūrya* 'proximity'.

EXAMPLES:

avaṣṭabhya āste '. . . stays on the support of . . .'
avaṣṭabhya tiṣṭhati 'ibidem'
avaṣṭabdhā senā 'army stays closeby'
avaṣṭabdhā śarat 'autumn is approaching'

1. This replacement in *s* focuses on *stanbhU*, when used after the preverb *ava*, provided derivates denote *ālambana* 'support, resort' and *āvidūrya* 'proximity'. We thus get *avaṣṭabhya tiṣṭhati*, *avaṣṭabhya āste*, *avaṣṭabdhā senā* and *avaṣṭabdhā śarat*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *ālambana* 'support, resort' and *āvidūrya* 'proximity'? Consider *avastabdho śītena* '. . . is stiff with cold'.

This rule is formulated for derivates where a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *iK* (here *i* or *u*) may not be part of a preverb to condition this replacement in *ṣ* (*Kāś*: *anigartha ārambhaḥ*). This replacement may now be conditioned by a sound other than one denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *iK* (*Kāś*: *anigartha ārambhaḥ*).

8.3.69 वेश्च स्वनो भोजने

veś ca svano bhojane
/veḥ 5/1 *ca* ϕ *svanaḥ* 6/1 *bhojane* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' pi* #63 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya* #64 *upasargāt* #65 *avāt* #68)
ver upasargād avāc cottarasya bhojanārthe svanateḥ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) comes in place of the *s* of verbal root *svan* 'to sound' when the same is used after the preverb *vi*, and *ava* as well, with the signification of *bhojana* 'eating', even when *aṬ* and, also its *abhyāsa*, intervene in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

viṣvaṇati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *svan* 'to sound' used with the preverb *vi*'
vyaṣvaṇat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *svan* 'to sound' used with the preverb *vi*'
viṣaṣvāṇa 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of verbal root *svan* 'to sound' used with the preverb *vi*'
avaṣvaṇati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *svan* 'to sound' used with the preverb *ava*'
avāṣvaṇat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *svan* 'to sound' used with the preverb *ava*'
avaṣaṣvāṇa 'third person singular active *LIṬ*-derivate of verbal root *svan* 'to sound' used with the preverb *ava*'

1. Note that this replacement is possible where verbal root *svan* abandons its own meaning and denotes the particular meaning of eating with a smacking noise (*abhyavahārakriyāviśeṣaḥ*). Thus, *vi-ṣvaṇ-a-ti* = *viṣvaṇati*, *vy-a-ṣṇav-a-t* = *vyaṣṇavat* and *vi-ṣvaṣvāṇ-a* → *viṣaṣvāṇa*, derivates of third singular *LAṬ*, *LAṄ* and *LIṬ*, respectively. Similar derivational pattern applies to *avaṣvaṇati*, *avāṣṇavat* and *avaṣaṣvāṇa*, where the preverb is *ava*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *bhojana* 'eating'? Consider *visvanati mṛdaṅgaḥ* 'the Mṛdaṅga drum is sounding'.

8.3.70 परिनिविभ्यः सेवसितसयसिवुसहसुट्स्तुस्वञ्जाम्

parinivibhyaḥ sevasitasayasivusahasuṭstusvañjām
/pari-ni-vibhyaḥ 5/3 (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ*; *seva-sita- saya-sivu-saha, suṭ, stu, svañjām* 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' pi* #63 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya* #64 *upasargāt* #65)

'pari, ni, vi' ity etebhya upasargebhya uttareṣāṃ seva, sita, saya, sivu, saha, suṭ, stu, svañja' ity eteṣāṃ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) replaces the *s* of verbal roots *seva* 'to serve', *sita* 'be bound', *saya* 'be binding', *sivU* 'to sew', *ṣaha* 'to endure', *suṬ* 'an augment', *stu* 'to praise' and *svañja* 'to embrace', when used after the preverbs *pari, ni* and *vi*, even when *aṬ*, and also an *abhyāsa*, intervenes in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

pariṣevate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sev* used with the preverb *pari*'
niṣevate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sev* used with the preverb *ni*'
viṣevate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sev* used with the preverb *vi*'
paryaṣevata 'third person singular middle *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sev* used with the preverb *pari*'
nyaṣevata 'third person singular middle *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sev* used with the preverb *ni*'
vyaṣevata 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sev* used with the preverb *vi*'
pariṣiṣeviṣate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sev* used with the preverb *pari* and the causal affix *ṆiC* followed by *saN*'
viṣiṣeviṣate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sev* used with the preverb *vi* and the causal affix *ṆiC* followed by *saN*'
niṣiṣeviṣate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sev* used with the preverb *ni* and the causal affix *ṆiC* followed by *saN*'
pariṣitaḥ 'derivate of (*pari-ṣiÑ* + *Ktvā*) + *sU*'
viṣitaḥ 'derivate of (*vi-ṣiÑ* + *Ktvā*) + *sU*'
niṣitaḥ 'derivate of (*ni-ṣiÑ* + *Ktvā*) + *sU*'
pariṣayaḥ 'derivate of (*pari-ṣiÑ* + *aC*) + *sU*'
niṣayaḥ 'derivate of (*ni-ṣiÑ* + *aC*) + *sU*'
viṣayaḥ 'derivate of (*vi-ṣiÑ* + *aC*) + *sU*'
pariṣīvyati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sivU* used with the preverb *pari*'
niṣīvyati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sivU* used with the preverb *ni*'
viṣīvyati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sivU* used with the preverb *vi*'
paryaṣīvyat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sivU* used with the preverb *pari*'
nyaṣīvyat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sivU* used with the preverb *ni*'

vyaṣīvyat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sivU* used with the preverb *vi*'
paryasīvyat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sivU* used with the preverb *pari*'
nyasīvyat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sivU* used with the preverb *ni*'
vyasīvyat 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sivU* used with the preverb *vi*'
pariṣahate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sah* used with the preverb *pari*'
niṣahate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sah* used with the preverb *ni*'
viṣahate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *sah* used with the preverb *vi*'
paryaṣahata 'third person singular middle *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sah* used with the preverb *pari*'
nyaṣahata 'third person singular middle *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sah* used with the preverb *ni*'
vyaṣahata 'third person singular middle *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *sah* used with the preverb *vi*'
pariṣkaroti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *kṛÑ* used with the preverb *pari* and augment *sUṬ*'
paryaṣkarot 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *kṛÑ* used with the preverb *pari* and augment *sUṬ*'
pariṣṭauti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *stu* used with the preverb *pari*'
niṣṭauti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *stu* used with the preverb *ni*'
viṣṭauti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of verbal root *stu* used with the preverb *vi*'
paryaṣṭaut 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *stu* used with the preverb *pari*'
nyaṣṭaut 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *stu* used with the preverb *ni*'
vyaṣṭaut 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *stu* used with the preverb *vi*'
paryastaut 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *stu* used with the preverb *pari*'
nyastaut 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *stu* used with the preverb *ni*'
vyastaut 'third person singular active *LAṄ*-derivate of verbal root *stu* used with the preverb *pari*'

1. Note that *ṣevṚ* is read in the *bhvādi* group of roots with *anudātta* as an *it*. It is thus used with middle (*ātmanepada*) endings. A specification of verbal root *ṣiÑ* is here made with its absolutive (*Kta*) form *sita* 'bound'. This same root is also specified as *saya* with affix *aC* of 3.3.56 *er ac*. That is, the *aC* and *Kta*-derivates of verbal root *ṣiÑ*, alone, will avail this replacement in *ṣ*. Recall that a replacement in *ṣ*, prior to *sita* of this rule, also obtains when *aṬ* and *abhyāsa* intervene. These examples have already been discussed. Examples such as *pari-ṣi-ṣev-iṣ-a-te = pariṣiṣeviṣate, viṣiṣeviṣate* and *niṣiṣeviṣate* are *LAṬ*-derivates of verbal root *ṣiÑ* used with *ṆiC* ending in affix *saN*.

Rule 8.3.71 *sivādīnāṃ vāḍ vyavāye' pi* offers optional *ṣ*-replacement to roots enumerated beginning with *ṣivU* 'to sew', when augment *aṬ* intervenes. Thus, we get *pary-a-sīv-yat = paryaṣīvyat* and *paryasīvayat*, etc. Examples of augment *sUṬ* are given only with the preverb *pari*. For, 6.1.135 *sampari-bhyāṃ* . . . allows *sUṬ* only when *sam* and *pari* are used as preverbs. We thus get *pariṣkaroti* and *paryaṣkarot*. Recall that this *ṣ*-replacement is already made available to verbal roots *ṣṭuÑ* and *ṣvañj* by rule 8.3.65 *upasargāt sunoti*. . . . They are here included for availing optional *ṣ*-replacement of the next rule, even when there is intervention of augment *aṬ*. For, it would have become obligatory (*nitya*) under the earlier provision (*Kāś*: *pūrveṇaiva siddhe stusvañjigrahaṇam uttarārtham, aḍvyavāye vibhāṣa yathā syāt*). The deletion of *n*, in *pariṣvajate*, etc., is accomplished by 6.4.25 *daṃsasañjsvañjāṃ śapi*.

8.3.71 सिवादीनां वाड्व्यवायेऽपि

sivādīnāṃ vāḍvyavāye' pi
/siv-ādīnām 6/3 = *siv ādiryeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣām*; *vā* ϕ *aḍvyavāye* 7/1 = *aṭā vyavāyaḥ* (*tṛt. tat.*), *tasmin*; *api* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' pi* #63 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya* #64 *upasargāt* #65 *parinivibhyaḥ* #70)
sivādīnām aḍvyavāye' pi parinivibhya uttarasya sakārasya vā mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) replaces the *s* of verbal roots enumerated beginning with *sivU* and prefixed with *pari, ni* and *vi*, only optionally, even when *aṬ* intervenes in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

Look under rule 8.3.70 *parinivibhyaḥ* . . .

1. Note that this specification with *sivādīnām* refers to roots enumerated by rule 8.3.70 *parinivibhyaḥ*. . . . It does not refer to group of roots enumerated elsewhere. For, the specification of. . . *sivusahasuṭastusvanjām* (8.3.70) is contextually proximate (*Kāś*: *anantarasūtre 'sivusahasuṭstusvañjām' iti sivādayaḥ*).

2. The *anuvṛtti* of *vā* runs through rule 8.3.76 *sphuratisphulatyor. . . .*

8.3.72 अनुविपर्यभिनिभ्यः स्यन्दतेरप्राणिषु

anuviparyabhinibhyaḥ syandater aprāṇiṣu
/anu-vi-pary-abhi-nibhyaḥ 5/3 (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ*; *syandateḥ* 6/1 *aprāṇiṣu* 7/3 = *na prāṇinaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *teṣu/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *upasargāt* #65 *vā* #71)
'*anu, vi, pari, abhi, ni*' *ity etebhya uttarasya syandater aprāṇiṣu sakārasya vā mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *mūrdhanya* comes, optionally, in place of *s* of verbal root *syandŪ* 'to flow, run' when it is used prefixed with *anu, vi, pari, abhi* and *ni*, and the usage does not relate to *prāṇin* 'living'.

EXAMPLES:

These examples are all third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivates of verbal root *syandŪ*, used with the preverbs *anu/ vi/ pari/ abhi/*, and with *s* replaced optionally with *ṣ*:
anu-ṣyandate
anu-syandate
vi-ṣyandate
vi-syandate
pari-ṣyandate
pari-syandate
abhi-ṣyandate
abhi-syandate
ni-ṣyandate tailam
ni-syandate

1. This rule offers *ṣ*-replacement for *s* of *syandŪ* when the root occurs prefixed with *anu, vi, pari, abhi* and *ni*, provided the action does not relate to any living being (*prāṇin*). Note that the root is marked with *anudātta* as an *it.* It will thus take middle endings (1.3.12 *anudāttaṅita ātmanepadam*). This rule is formulated so that *ṣ*-replacement could be made available to this root. For, this root is not listed with *ṣ* in *upadeśa* 'initial citation'.

Note that *vā* is carried over from the earlier rule. Why did we also not carry *pari, ni* and *vi.* This would have shortened this rule formulation to: *anvavibhyāṃ ca syandater aprāṇiṣu.* The *ca* could have thus attracted *pari, ni* and *vi* (*PM: iha paryādigrahaṇaṃ śakyam akartum. evaṃ vakṣyāmi-* '*anvabhibhyāṃ ca*').

2. Questions have been raised against the compound formation of *aprāṇin* 'non-living'. If the negation of *aprāṇin* is interpreted as *prasajya*, we will get the paraphrase: *prāṇiṣu na bhavati* 'does not apply in case of *prāṇin* 'living'.

A replacement in *ṣ* will be blocked where even the slightest indication of *prāṇin* is involved (*Nyāsa: prasajyapratiṣedhe hi yatra prāṇigandho' sti tatra mūrdhanyena na bhavitavyam*). If, on the other hand, the negation of *aprāṇin* is interpreted as *paryudāsa*, we will get the paraphrase: *prāṇibhyo' nyatra bhavati* 'applies, elsewhere, in contexts similar to, but other than, that of a *prāṇin*'. That is, this interpretation will accept *aprāṇin* as 'something similar to yet different from *prāṇin*'. *Kāśikā* offers *anuṣyandete matsyodake* 'fish and water flow'. The integration of *matsyodaka*, with the denotatum of one (*ekavadbhāva*), is based on the paraphrase: *matsyaṃ ca udakaṃ ca* 'fish as well as water'. Rule 2.4.6 *jātir aprāṇināṃ* allows *matsyodaka* to carry this denotatum if *aprāṇin* is interpreted as *paryuḍāsa*. A grouping of *prāṇin* 'living' and *aprāṇin* 'non-living' will thus become something other than *prāṇin*. A *paryudāsa* interpretation of *aprāṇin* is thus accepted.

3. Why do we have the condition of *aprāṇiṣu*? Consider *anusyandate matsya udake* 'fish is floating in water', where *matsya* is *prāṇin* 'living'.

This optional replacement in *ṣ* does obtain where both *prāṇin* and *aprāṇin* are denoted as one. Thus, *anuṣyandete matsyodake* and *anusyandete matsyodake*.

8.3.73 वेः स्कन्देरनिष्ठायाम्

veḥ skander aniṣṭhāyām

/veḥ 5/1 *skadeḥ* 6/1 *aniṣṭhāyām* 7/1 = *na niṣṭhā* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasyām/* (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *upasargāt* #65 *vā* #71)

ver upasargād uttarasya skandeḥ sakārasya vā mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati aniṣṭhāyām

A correrssponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*), optionally, replaces the *s* of verbal root *skandI* 'to move', when the root occurs in combination after the preverb *vi* and a *niṣṭhā* suffix does not follow.

EXAMPLES:

viṣkantā '*tṛC*-derivate of verbal root *skandI*, used with the preverb *vi*'
viskantā 'ibidem (with no *ṣ*-replacement)'
viṣkantum '*tumUN*-derivate . . .'
viskantum 'ibidem (with no *ṣ*-replacement)'
viṣkantavyam '*tavyaT*-derivate . . .'
viskantavyam 'ibidem (with no *ṣ*-replacement'

1. This rule allows an optional replacement in *ṣ* when *skandI* is used after *vi* and a *niṣṭhā* suffix does not follow. Here again we find that *skandI* is not specified with *ṣ* in initial citation (*upadeśa*). The *ṣ*-replacement which was not available is here made available, optionally. We thus get *viṣkantā* and *viskantā*, etc.

2. Why do we have the condition of *aniṣṭhāyām* 'when not used in *niṣṭhā*'?

Consider *viskannaḥ*, where, since verbal root *skandI* is used with the *niṣṭhā* (1.1.26 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) suffix *Kta*, we do not get a replacement in *ṣ*. Incidentally, the *n* of *skandi* is deleted by 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala upadhāyāḥ*. Rule 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto . . .* then replaces the *d* of *skad* and *t* of *Kta*, both with *n*. Thus, *viska*($n \rightarrow \phi$) *d* + (*K*) *ta* → *viska*($d \rightarrow n$) + ($t \rightarrow n$) *a* = *viskanna*.

8.3.74 परेश्च

pareś ca
/*pareḥ* 5/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *upasargāt* #65 *vā* #71 *skandeḥ* #73)
pariśabdāc cottarasya syandeḥ sakārasya vā mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*), optionally, replaces the *s* of verbal root *skandI*, also when the root occurs after the preverb *pari*.

EXAMPLES:

pariṣkantā 'derivate of *pari-skand* + *tṛC*'
pariskantā 'ibidem (with no *ṣ*-replacement)'
pariṣkantum 'derivate of *pari-skand* + *tumUN*'
pariskantum 'ibidem' (with no *ṣ*-replacement)'
pariṣkantavyam 'derivate of *pari-skand* + *tavyaT*'
pariskantavyam 'ibidem (with no *ṣ*-replacement)'

1. Note that *ca* 'and' is used in this rule to attract *skandI* from the preceding rule. Why did Pāṇini not include the provision of this rule within the scope of the preceding rule? That is, why did he not formulate this rule as: *viparābhyāṃ skander aniṣṭhāyām*? He would have preferred this formulation if he did not intend optional *ṣ*-replacement for the *s* of *skandI* when used in combination after *pari* and no *niṣṭhā* suffix followed (*Nyāsa*: *yadi parer uttarasya skander niṣṭhāyāṃ mūrdhanyo nābhimataḥ syāt, tataḥ 'viparābhyām skander aniṣṭhāyām' ity ekayogam eva kuryād ity abhiprāyaḥ*). Since this rule is formulated separately from the preceding rule, and derivates are supposed to go through optional replacement in *ṣ* when a *niṣṭhā* affix follows, *aniṣṭhāyām* is not carried over from the earlier rule. We get the *niṣṭhā* examples: *pariṣkaṇṇaḥ* and *pariskannaḥ*.

8.3.75 परिस्कन्दः प्राच्यभरतेषु

pariskandaḥ prācyabharateṣu
/*pariskandaḥ* 1/1 *prācyabharateṣú* 7/3 = *prācyaś cāmī bharatāś ca* (*karm. tat.*), *teṣu*/
'*pariskanda*' *ity mūrdhanyābhāvo nipātyate prācyabharateṣu prayogaviṣayeṣu*
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) does not, via *nipātana*, replace

the *s* of *pariskanda* when the usage relates to the country of eastern Bharatas.

EXAMPLES:

pariskandaḥ

1. This rule blocks the *ṣ*-replacement made available by the preceding rule. The word *pariskanda* is a derivate of *aC* (3.1.134 *nandigrahi . . .*; *pari-skand + aC*). Or else, it is a derivate of the *niṣṭhā* suffix *Kta* (*pari-skand + Kta*), where *t* of *Kta* gets deleted via *nipātana.*

Note that *bharata* is used here as a qualifier to *prācya* 'eastern' (*Kāś: bharatagrahaṇaṃ prācyaviśeṣaṇam*). We thus get *pariskandaḥ* 'side-guard' with no *ṣ*-replacement in the usage of the eastern Bharatas. Elsewhere, we get *pariṣkandaḥ.*

8.3.76 स्फुरतिस्फुलत्योर्निर्निविभ्यः

sphuratisphulatyor nirnivibhyaḥ
/sphurati-sphulatyoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ; nir-ni-vi-bhyaḥ* 5/3 (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *upasargāt* #65 *vā* #71)
sphuratisphulatyoḥ sakārasya 'nis, ni, vi' ity etebhya uttarasya vā mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*), optionally, replaces the *s* of verbal roots *sphur* 'to move, quiver, throb' and *sphul* when they are used in combination after the preverbs *nis, ni* and *vi,* in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

niṣ-ṣphurati
nis-sphurati
ni-ṣphurati
ni-sphurati
vi-ṣphurati
vi-sphurati
niṣ-ṣphulati
nis-sphulati
ni-ṣphulati
ni-sphulati
vi-ṣphulati
vi-sphulati

1. This again is an optional rule. Note that *sphur* and *sphul* are roots of the *tudādi* group. They did not have this replacement in *ṣ* previously made avail-

able. A specification with *śtip* (*vikaraṇa* and *tiP*) is made here for correct identification of roots. It is not made here to deny *ṣ*-replacement where affix *yaṄ* gets deleted (*yaṅluki*). A *s* after *nir*, etc., is not possible, especially after the *khaY* (7.4.61 *śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ*) sound of the *abhyāsa* is retained subsequent to deletion of *yaṄ* (*Nyāsa*: *na hi yaṅluky abhyāsasya khayaḥ śeṣe kṛte nirādibhyaḥ uttaraḥ sakāraḥ sambhavati*). Notice how the *s* of *nis* also gets replaced with *ṣ*, via *ṣṭutva* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*).

8.3.77 वेः स्कभ्नातेर्नित्यम्

veḥ skabhnāter nityam
/veḥ 5/1 *skabhnāteḥ* 6/1 *nityam* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *upasargāt* #65 *vā* #71)
ver uttarasya skabhnāteḥ sakārasya nityaṃ mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*), obligatorily, replaces the *s* of verbal root *skanbhU* when the same is used in combination after the preverb *vi* and close proximity between sounds finds its scope.

EXAMPLES:

viṣkabhnāti
viṣkambhitā
viskambhitum
viskambhitavyam

1. Note that this obligatory provision applies to *vi-skanbhU* which, in turn, is a root only found in grammatical rules. It has been cited in rule 3.1.82 *stanbhustunbhu . . .*, without *ṣ* in *upadeśa*. Consequently, a non-available replacement in *ṣ* is made available to the intial *s* of *skanbhu*. That *Śnā* is selected as the *vikaraṇa* is also known by rule 3.1.82 *stanbhustunbhu. . . .*

The word *nitya* is used to make this provision obligatory. A specification with *śtip* is again made for clearly identifying the root.

8.3.78 इणः षीध्वंलुङ्लिटां धोऽङ्गात्

iṇaḥ ṣīdhvaṃluṅliṭāṃ dho' ṅgāt
/iṇaḥ 5/1 *ṣīdhvaṃluṅliṭām* 6/3 = *ṣīdhvaṃ ca luṅ ca liṭ ca* = *ṣīdhvaṃluṅliṭaḥ* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*)
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55)
iṇantād aṅgād uttareṣāṃ ṣīdhvaṃluṅliṭāṃ yo dhakāras tasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
The *dh* of *ṣīdhvam*, and of a replacement of *LUṄ* and *LIṬ*, is replaced with its retroflex counterpart *ḍh* when the same occurs after an *aṅga* ending in a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *iṆ*.

EXAMPLES:

cyoṣīḍhvam 'second person plural middle benedictive *LIṄ*-derivate of verbal root *cyu*'
ploṣīḍhvam 'second person plural middle benedictive *LIṄ*-derivate of verbal root *plu*'
acyoḍhvam 'second person plural middle *LUṄ*-derivate of verbal root *cyu*'
aploḍhvam 'second person plural middle *LUṄ*-derivate of verbal root *plu*'
cakṛḍhve 'second person plural middle *LIṬ*-derivate of verbal root *kṛÑ*'
vavṛḍhve 'second person plural middle *LIṬ*-derivate of verbal root *vṛÑ*'

1. This rule replaces the *dh* of *ṣīdhvam*, and of replacements of *LUṄ* and *LIṬ*, with *ḍh* when *ṣīdhvam*, etc., occur after an *aṅga* ending in *i* and *u*. This rule is formulated such that an *aṅga* ending in *iṆ* could be made a qualifier to *ṣīdhvam*. . . . A separate specification of *dh* is intended to focus on what gets replaced with a retroflex (*mūrdhanya*). The *sī* of example derivates has its source in *sīyuṬ* (3.4.102 *liṅaḥ sīyuṭ*).

Consider *cyu* + *sīy*(*UṬ*) + (*LIṄ*→*dhvam*) → *cyu* + *sīy* + *dhvam* → *cyo* + *sīy* + *dhvam* and *plo* + *sīy* + *dhvam* → *plo* + *sīy* + *dhvam*, where *y* is deleted by 6.1.66 *lopo vyor vali*. We get *cyo* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *ī* + *dhvam* = *cyo* + *ṣīdhvam* and *plo* + *ṣīdhvam* after 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* replaces the *s* of *sīdhvam* with *ṣ*. Our present rule can now replace *dh* with *ḍh* to yield: *cyoṣīḍhvam* and *ploṣīḍhvam*.

Now consider *a*(*Ṭ*) + *cyu* + (*LUṄ*→*dhvam*) → *a* + *cyu* + *s*(*IC*) = *dhvam* → *a* + *cy*(*u*→*o*) + *s* + *dhvam* → *a* + *cyo* + (*s*→ϕ) + *dhvam* → *acyo*(*dh*→*ḍh*)*vam* = *acyoḍhvam*, where *sIC* gets deleted and *dh* gets replaced with *ḍh*. We similarly get *aploḍhvam*. Note that augment *iṬ* is blocked in these derivates by 7.2.10 *ekāca upadeśe*. . . . Derivates of *LIṬ* will, as usual, involve doubling. We will get *kṛ* + (*LIṬ*→*dhvam*) → *ka* + *kṛ* + *dhvam* → (*k*→*c*)*a* + *kṛ* + *dhvam*, where *ṭi* of *dhvam* will go through a replacement in *e* (*etva*; 3.4.79 *ṭit ātmanepadānāṃ ṭer eḥ*). Our present rule will then replace *dh* with *ḍh* to produce: *cakṛdhv*(*am*→*e*) → *cakṛ*(*dh*→*ḍh*)*ve* = *cakṛḍhve*. Similar rules apply in deriving *vṛdh* + (*LIṬ*→*dhvam*) → *vavṛḍhve*.

2. Why do we have the condition of *luṅliṭām* 'of *LUṄ* and *LIṬ*'? Consider *studhve* which, because of being a derivate of *LUṄ*, does not get its *dh* replaced with *ḍh*.

Why do we have the condition of *aṅgāt* 'after an *aṅga*'? Consider *parivevīṣīdhvam* where we get *ṣīdhvam* by combining *ṣ* of the root with *īdhvam*. This *ṣīdhvam* cannot be accepted as occurring after an *aṅga* ending in *i* and *u*.

Why is *iṆ* used expressly when it is already available via *anuvṛtti*? An express mention of *iṆ* is made to cancel the *anuvṛtti* of *ku*. Thus, we cannot get the *dh* of *pakṣīdhvam* and *yakṣīdhvam* replaced with *ḍh* before *k*.

8.3.79 विभाषेटः

vibhāṣeṭaḥ
/vibhāṣā 1/1 *iṭaḥ* 5/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55)
iṇaḥ parasmād iṭa uttareṣāṃ ṣīdhvaṃluṅliṭāṃ yo dhakāras tasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*), optionally, replaces the *dh* of *ṣīdhvam*, and of derivates of *LUṄ* and *LIṬ*, when (*ṣī*) *dhvam* occurs after *iṬ* introduced after a sound denoted by *iṆ*.

EXAMPLES:

laviṣīḍhvam 'second person plural middle *LIṄ*-derivate of *lū* 'to cut'
laviṣīdhvam 'ibidem; with no *ḍh*'
paviṣīḍhvam 'second person plural middle *LIṄ*-derivate of *pū* 'to cleanse''
paviṣīdhvam 'ibidem; with no *ḍh*'
alavīḍhvam 'second person plural middle *LUṄ*-derivate of *lū*'
alavidhvam 'ibidem; with no *ḍh*'
luluvidhve 'second person plural middle *LIṬ*-derivate of *lū*'
luluviḍhve 'ibidem; with no *ḍh*'

1. This rule makes the obligatory replacement of the preceding rule optional, especially when *iṬ* follows a form ending in *i* and *u*. Note, however, that some replacements which were not made available earlier are also optionally made available here. *Kāśikā* paraphrases the *vṛtti* as: *iṇaḥ parasmād iṭaḥ uttareṣāṃ ṣīdhvam . . .* 'after *ṣīdhvam* which occurs after an *iṬ*, in turn, occurring after that which ends in *i* and *u*'. That is, *iṆ* is used as a qualifier to *iṬ*; *iṬ*, in turn, is used as a qualifier to *ṣīdhvam*, etc. Additionally, *ṣīdhvam*, etc., are used as qualifiers to *dh*.

It is argued that *ṣīdhvam*, as well as a replacement of *LIṬ*, is not possible to follow *iṬ*. For, *iṬ* is introduced to *ṣīdhvam*. How could *ṣīdhvam* follow *iṬ* when it is already a part of *ṣīdhvam* (*tadgrahaṇena grahaṇāt*)? This argument is well taken, especially in view of grammar (*śāstrakṛta*). That is, *x* becomes *y* if *x* is introduced to *y*. In this sense, *x* cannot be accepted as followed by *y*. But since *iṬ* is still heard in the utterance (*śrutikṛta*) before *ṣīdhvam*, it can be accepted as followed by *ṣīdhvam*.

Consider *lū* + *iṬ* + *sīyUṬ* + (*LIṄ*→*dhvam*) → *lū* + *i* + *ṣīdhvam*, where 8.3.78 *iṇaḥ ṣīdhvaṃ . . .* can apply to replace *dh* with *ḍh*, obligatorily. This rule replaces *dh* with *ḍh*, optionally, against that. Incidentally, *ū* of *lū* goes through a replacement in *guṇa*, followed by a replacement in *av* before *iṬ*. We thus get *l*(*ū*→*o*→*av*) + *i* + *sī*(*y*→ϕ) + (*dh*→*ḍh*)*vam* = *laviṣīḍhvam*. Similar rules apply in deriving *pū* + *iṬ* + *sīyUṬ* + *dhvam* → *paviṣīḍhvam*. We will get *laviṣīdhvam* and *paviṣīdhvam* if the option of *ḍh*-replacement for *dh* is not

accepted. Forms of *LUṄ* and *LIṬ*, i.e., *aṬ+l(ū→o→av) + iṬ + (sIC→ϕ) + dhvam = alaviḍhvam/ alavidhvam* and *lū + (LIṬ→dhvam) → l(ū→u) l(ū→uvAṄ) + iṬ + dhv(am→e) → luluvi(dh→ḍh)ve = luluviḍhve/ luluvidhve,* do not offer anything new in their derivation. Refer to examples of 8.3.78 *iṇaḥ ṣīdhvaṅluṅliṭāṃ* . . . for further details. Note that 6.4.77 *aci śnudhātu* . . . introduces *uvAṄ* as a replacement to the root-final vowel of a derivate of *LIṬ.*

2. The condition of *iṇaḥ* is still valid. We thus do not get *dh* replaced with *ḍh* in *(ās→ā+ās→ās)) + iṬ + sīyUṬ + (LIṄ→dhvam))) = āsiṣīdhvam.* Note that the *s* of verbal root *ās* is not included within the denotatum of *iṆ.* How could *iṬ* then be accepted as occurring after *iṆ*?

Why do we not get this replacement in *dī + (LIṬ→dhvam) → upa + d(i→i) + dī + y(UṬ) + iṬ + dhv(am→e) = upadidī + y + i + dhve = upadidīyidhve*? Some claim that *dh* cannot be replaced with *ḍh* since *yUṬ* (6.4.63 *dīṅo yuṭ aci kṅiti*) intervenes between *iṆ* and *iṬ.* Others claim that the *anuvṛtti* of *aṅgāt* has been canceled. Consequently, we do not have any intervening sound. That is, *dh* should be replaced with *ḍh,* optionally.

8.3.80 समासेऽङ्गुलेः सङ्गः

samāse' ṅguleḥ saṅgaḥ
/samāse 7/1 *aṅguleḥ* 5/1 *saṅgaḥ* 1/1 (nominative used for genitive by transposition *(vyatyaya))/*
(saṃhitāyām #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58)
saṅgasakārasya aṅguler uttarasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati samāse
A *mūrdhanya* replaces the *s* of *saṅga* 'attachment, contact' when the same combines after *aṅguli* 'finger' in a nominal compound.

EXAMPLES:

aṅguliṣaṅgā yavāgūḥ 'finger-sticking barley-gruel'
aṅguliṣaṅgo gāḥ sādayati '. . . has cows run with touch of his finger'

1. This rule facilitates a replacement in *ṣ* against the negative provision of 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ.* Note that *saṅga* is used in the nominative with the sense of genitive. It is here interpreted as *saṃśleṣa* 'contact'. We thus get *aṅguliṣaṅgaḥ.*

2. Why do we state the condition of *samāse* 'in a compound'? Consider *aṅguleḥ saṅgaṃ paśya,* where, because of a non-compound sequence, *ṣ* of *saṅgaḥ* cannot be replaced with *ṣ.*

8.3.81 भीरोः स्थानम्

bhīroḥ sthānam
/bhīroḥ 5/1 *sthānam* 1/1/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58 *samāse* #79)
sthānasakārasya bhīror uttarasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati samāse
A *mūrdhanya* replaces the *s* of *sthāna* 'place, location' when the same combines in a compound after *bhīru* 'fearful, timid, coward'.

EXAMPLES:

bhīruṣṭhānam = *bhīroḥ sthānam* 'home of a coward'

1. Note that *bhīruṣṭhānam* is a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compund where *bhīru* combines with *sthāna* denoting locus (*Nyāsa*: *adhikaraṇasādhaṇena sthānaśabdena ṣaṣṭhīsamāsaḥ*).

8.3.82 अग्नेः स्तुत्स्तोमसोमाः

agneḥ stutstomasomāḥ
/*agneḥ* 5/1 *stut-stoma-somāḥ* 1/3 (*itar. dv.*), *te*/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58 *samāse* #79)
agner uttarasya 'stut, stoma, soma' ity eteṣāṃ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati samāse
A *mūrdhanya* replaces the *s* of *stut, stoma* and *soma*, when these combine in a compound to follow *agni*.

EXAMPLES:

agniṣṭut 'a sacrifice where Agni is the divinity'
agniṣṭomaḥ 'the initial of the seven categories of Soma sacrifices'
agnīṣomau 'Agni and Soma'

1. This rule offers *ṣ* as replacement for *s* at the beginning of a *pada*. This again is an exception to 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ*. Refer to derivational details of *agnicit* in the appendix (II:421-23). Similar rules apply in deriving *agnistut*.

2. An *iṣṭi* 'desideratum' (*Kāś*: *agner dīrghāt somasyeṣyate*) notes that *s* of *soma* is to be replaced with *ṣ* when *soma* combines after *agnī*. Obviously, this reference is to a *devatā-dvandva* 'a *dvandva* compound with constituents denoting divinity'. For, that is where we get this long replacement (*PM*: *devatādvandve ṣatvam ity arthaḥ; tatraiva dīrghasya vidhānāt*).

2. Note that this replacement applies only in a compound. It cannot apply in a sentence: *agne somaḥ*.

8.3.83 ज्योतिरायुषः स्तोमः

jyotirāyuṣaḥ stomaḥ
/*jyotir-āyuṣaḥ* 5/1 = *jyotiś ca āyuś ca* = *jyotirāyuḥ* (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt; stomaḥ* 1/1/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 ***apadāntasya*** *mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58 *samāse* #79)
'*jyotis, āyus*' *ity etābhyām uttarasya stomasakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati samāse*
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) replaces the *s* of *stoma* when this same combines in a compound after *jyotis* 'light' and *āyus* 'life-span'.

EXAMPLES:

jyotiṣṭomaḥ 'name of a sacrifice'
āyuṣṭomaḥ 'name of a sacrifice'

1. These two derivates both are genitive *tatpuruṣa* compounds. The final *s* of *jyotis* and *āyus* is first replaced with *ḥ* (8.3.15 *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ*). An optional *s* then replaces *ḥ* before *stoma* (8.3.66 *vā śari*). The *s* of *stoma*, when replaced with *ṣ*, causes its preceding *s* and following *t* to be replaced with *ṣ* and *ṭ* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). Thus, *jyotiṣṣṭomaḥ/āyuṣṣṭomaḥ* and *jyotiḥṣṭomaḥ/āyuḥṣṭomaḥ*.

2. The condition of *samāse* 'in a compound' is still valid. We cannot get this replacement in *jyotiḥ stomaṃ darśayati*.

8.3.84 मातृपितृभ्यां स्वसा

mātṛpitṛbhyām svasā
/*mātṛ-pitṛbhyām* 5/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām*; *svasā* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58 *samāse* #79)
'*mātṛ, pitṛ*' *ity etābhyām uttarasya svasṛsakārasya samāse mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati*
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) replaces the *s* of *svasṛ* 'sister', when this same combines in a compound after *mātṛ* 'mother' and *pitṛ* 'father'.

EXAMPLES:

mātṛṣvasā 'mother's sister'
pitṛṣvasā 'father's sister'

1. This rule replaces the *s* of *svasṛ* 'sister' when this same combines in a compound after *mātṛ* 'mother' and *pitṛ* 'father'. We thus get *mātṛṣvasā* and *pitṛṣvasā*. This *ṣ*-replacement is offered for a *s* which itself is not a replacement. Note that *mātṛ* and *pitṛ* are placed first in the compound because of respect (*vt. abhyarhitaṃ pūrvaṃ nipatati*; cf. 2.2.34 *ṛtunakṣatrāṇām* . . .).

8.3.85 मातुःपितुर्भ्यामन्यतरस्याम्

mātuḥpiturbhyām anyatarasyām

/ mātuḥ-piturbhyām 5/2 = *mātuś ca pituś ca* = *mātuḥpitarau* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām*; *anyatarasyām* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58 *samāse* #79 *svasā* #84)
'*mātur, pitur' ity etābhyām uttarasya svasṛśabdasyānyatarasyāṃ mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati samāse*
A corresponding retroflex (*mūrdhanya*) replaces the *s* of *svasṛ*, only optionally, when this same combines after *mātur* and *pitur*.

EXAMPLES:

mātuḥṣvasā
mātuḥsvasā
pituḥṣvasā
pituḥsvasā

1. Note that *mātuḥ* and *pituḥ* are here interpreted as genitive singular forms of *mātṛ* and *pitṛ*. This specification of form is made as principal (*tantra*). That is, forms of *mātur* and *pitur* which end in *r* are in focus for this replacement in *ṣ*. The *visarga* of *mātuḥ* is also accepted as *r*, because of associated listing of *mātuḥ* with *pitur*. If this specification is not accepted as made with *mātuḥ* and *pituḥ* ending in *r*, they both must be accepted as ending in *visarga*. A specification accepted as made with *ḥ* at the end will lead to problems. This *ḥ* will then be replaced with an optional *ḥ* (8.3.36 *vā śari*). If this optional *ḥ* is not accepted, it then will be replaced with *s*. We can thus not get a replacement in *ṣ* for the *s* of *svasṛ*. Accepting the forms as ending in the *visarga* will create further problems, especially before *bhyām*. It is to remove this difficulty that *mātuḥ* and *pituḥ* are both accepted as ending in *r*.

It is stated that a replacement in *ṣ* can be gotten with both *mātuḥ* and *pituḥ* ending either in *ḥ* or *s*. This will be in consonance with the *PŚ* (38): *ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat* 'one place modification in forms does not make them different'. It is in view of this that *mātuḥ* and *pituḥ* are accepted as specified here with *r* at the end (*Kāś. mātuḥpitur iti rephāntayor etad grahaṇam. ekadeśavikṛtam ananyatvād visarjanīyāntāt sakārāntāc ca ṣatvaṃ bhavati*).

Note that non-deletion (*aluk*) of *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive' is made possible by 6.3.22 *vibhāṣā svasṛpatyoḥ*. The optional *s* of 8.3.36 *vā śari* will also be replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣṭutva*). Thus, we will get *mātuḥsvasā/ mātuṣṣvasā* and *pituḥsvasā/ pituṣṣvasā*.

8.3.86 अभिनिसः स्तनः शब्दसंज्ञायाम्

abhinisaḥ stanaḥ śabdasaṃjñāyām
/ abhi-nisaḥ 5/1 (*sam. dv.*), *tasmāt*; *stanaḥ* 6/1 *śabdasaṃjñāyām* 7/1 = *śabdasya saṃjñā* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasyām/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58 *anyatarasyām* #85)

'abhi, nis' ity etasmād uttarasya stanatisakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavaty anyatarasyāṃ śabdasaṃjñā gamyamānāyām
A *mūrdhanya* replaces the *s* of verbal root *stan* 'to sound', only optionally, when *stan* is prefixed with *abhi* and *nis*, and the derivate identifies a particular sound.

EXAMPLES:

abhiniṣṭāno varṇaḥ
abhiniṣṭāno visarjanīyaḥ
abhinistāno visarjanīyaḥ

1. Note that *śabdasaṃjñā*, in the context of *abhi-stan* and *nis-stan*, identifies *abhiṣṭāna* and *abhinistāna*. Commentators identify *abhinistāna* or *abhiniṣṭāna* as a name for *visarjanīya* (*Kāś*: *abhinistāno visarjanīyaḥ*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *śabdasaṃjñā* 'name of a sound'? Consider *abhinistanati mṛdaṅgaḥ* 'the Mṛdaṅga drum is sounding'. It is the name of a sound, and not just the sound which conditions this replacement.

The *anuvṛtti* of *samāse* is now canceled.

8.3.87 उपसर्गप्रादुर्भ्यामस्तिर्यच्परः

upasargaprādurbhyām astir yacparaḥ
/ upasarga-prādurbhyām 5/2 = *upasargaś ca prāduś ca = upasargaprādusau* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām*; *astiḥ* 1/1
yacparaḥ 1/1 = *yaś ca ac ca = yacau* (*itar. dv.*), *tau parau yasmāt* (*bv.* with int. *dv.*) /
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58)
upasargasthān nimittāt prādussabdāc cottarasya yakāraparasyācparasya cāstisakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A *mūrdhanya* replaces the *s* of verbal root *as* 'to be' when this same occurs after a preverb containing conditions of this replacement, or occurs after *prādus*, provided *y*, or a vowel (*aC*), follows in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

abhiṣanti
niṣanti
viṣanti
prāduḥṣanti
abhiṣyāt
niṣyāt
viṣyāt
prāduḥṣyāt

1. This rule allows the *s* of verbal root *as* to be replaced with *ṣ* when (*i*) *as* occurs after a preverb which contains conditions of this replacement; (*ii*) or *as* occurs after *prādus*. Additionally, (*iii*) *as* must be followed, either by *y*, or by a vowel. Consider *abhiṣanti, niṣanti, viṣanti* and *prāduḥsanti*, where *ŚaP* gets deleted since the root belongs to the *ad-ādi* group of verbs (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibho . . .*). The *a* of *as* also goes through deletion of 6.4.111 *śnasor al lopaḥ*. Derivates of *LIṄ*, i.e., *abhiṣyāt, niṣyāt, viṣyāt* and *prāduḥṣyāt*, require augments *yāsUṬ* (3.4.103 *yāsuṭ parasmaipade . . .*) and, under certain conditions, *sUṬ* (3.4.107 *suṭ tithoḥ*). Deletion of a non-final *s*, generally of *yāsUṬ*, *sUṬ* and *sīyUṬ*, is accomplished by 7.2.79 *liṅaḥ salopo' nantyasya*. Refer to derivational details of *kuryāt* (III:784) for additional detail. Examples of *sUṬ* and *sīyUṬ* are offered under 7.2.79 *liṅaḥ salopo' anantyasya*.

2. The *dvandva* compound *yacau* is paraphrased as *ya ca ac ca* '*y* and *aC*'. A paraphrase of *yacparaḥ* is then offered as *yacau parau yasmāt sa* 'that after which *y* and *aC* occur'. Haradatta questions the use of *paraḥ*, especially since *yacoḥ* in the locative (*saptamī*) could have served the purpose (*PM*: *yacor iti saptamīnirdeśenaiva siddhe paragrahaṇaṃ cintyaprayojanam*).

3. Why do we have to state *upasargāt* 'after a preverb'? We need an *upasarga* which, in turn, contains conditions of this replacement. We will not get this replacement in *dadhi syāt* and *madhu syāt*, where *as* is used without a preverb.

Why do we use *as*? Consider *anusṛtam* and *visṛtam*, where verbal root *sṛ* is prefixed with *anu*. A specification with *as* blocks this replacement in *ṣ*. But we still do not need the specification of *as*. Since the *a* of *as* gets deleted, a preverb will be understood with reference to *s* of *as*. That is, the preverb will qualify a verbal root found in the form of *s*. There is no verb other that *as* which is found with the form of *s*. We thus do not need the specification of *as*. We do not need this specification of *as* for *prādus* either. For, *prādus* is always used with *kṛ, bhū* and *as*. A reference to *as* without its express specification is also possible when *prādus* is in use.

Commentators explain that this specification of *as* is needed. Consider *anusvoḥ apatyam* = *ānuseyaḥ* ← *anusū* + (*ḍhaK→eya*) 'male offspring of Anusū', where *ū* gets deleted by 6.4.147 *ḍhalopo. . . .* This rule may have the occasion to replace *s* of *anus* + *eya*, had *as* not been specified as the verb.

Why do we state the condition of *yacparaḥ* 'followed by *y* and *aC*'? Consider *nistaḥ, vistaḥ* and *prādustaḥ*, where this replacement cannot apply. Obviously, *s* is not followed here by *y* or *aC*.

8.3.88 सुविनिर्दुर्भ्यः सुपिसूतिसमाः

suvinirdurbhyaḥ supisūtisamāḥ
/ su-vi-nir-dur-bhyaḥ 5/3 (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ*; *supi-sūti-samāḥ* 1/3 (*itar. dv.*), *te/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58)

'su, vi, nir, dur' ity etebhya uttarasya 'sūpi, sūti, sama' ity eteṣāṃ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati

A *mūrdhanya* replaces the *s* of verbal root *supI* (*svapI*), *sūtI* and *sama* when they occur prefixed after *su, vi, nir* and *dur* in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

suṣuptaḥ
niḥṣuptaḥ
duḥṣuptaḥ
suṣūtiḥ
viṣūtiḥ
niḥṣūtiḥ
duḥṣūtiḥ
suṣamam
viṣamam
niḥṣamam
duḥṣamam

1. Note that *supI* refers to *svapI*, which is here specified after applying *samprasāraṇa* (6.1.15 *vacisvapi. . .*; *Kāś*: *'supi' iti svapi kṛtasamprasāraṇo gṛhyate*). The *i* of *supI* is an addition. It should not confuse us about the root's specification with *i* (*PM*: *supīty āgantuka ikāraḥ, na punar ikā nirdeśaḥ*). This *ṣ*-replacement will then apply on forms of *svapI* where *samprasāraṇa* applies. If it was not intended to focus on this particular form, this root should have been specified as *svapI*, in the manner similar to 6.1.15 *vacisvapi. . . .* Verbal root *ṣū* is specified with *KtiN*, thereby implying that this *ṣ*-replacement will apply to its specified *KtiN*-form only (*svarūpa-grahaṇa*). Note that this *ṣ*-replacement is not allowed to *supi* and *sūti* since the *s* occurs at the beginning of a *pada* (8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ*).

Recall that *sama* is listed in the *sarvādi* group as a non-derivable (*avyutpanna*) nominal. This rule offers *ṣ* as a replacement for its *s*, not made available on account of its initial position in a *pada*. This *sama* can also be interpreted as a derivate of affix *aC*, introduced after *ṣamA* 'to be calm' (3.1.134 *nandigrahi. . .*). Accepting *sama* as a derivate of *ṣamA* may be favored, especially in view of its associated listing in this rule with verbal root *supI* (*sāhacaryāt*). Jinendrabuddhi, however, favors *sama*, the form derived with *aC* introduced after *ṣamA*. He emphasizes that, based on *śabdaparavipratiṣedha*, a *sāhacarya* 'association' determined by a form (*śabda*) is considered more powerful than one determined by a corresponding base (*dhātu*; *Nyāsa*: *śabdaparavipratiṣedhena śabdaparaṃ yat sāhacaryaṃ tad balīya iti*).

The specification of *nis* and *dus* is made here with *r* at the end. This *r* then is replaced with *visarga*. We thus get *suṣuptaḥ, viṣuptaḥ, niḥṣuptaḥ,*

duḥsuptaḥ; suṣūtiḥ, viṣūtiḥ, niḥṣūtiḥ, duḥṣūtiḥ; and *suṣamam, viṣamam, niḥṣamam, duḥṣamam.*

2. A *kārikā* verse summarizes issues involved with the application of this rule:

> *supeḥ ṣatvaṃ svaper mā bhūd visuṣvāpeti kena na/*
> *halādiśeṣān na supir iṣṭaṃ pūrvaṃ prasāraṇam//*
> *syādīnāṃ niyamo nātra prāk sitād uttaraḥ supi/*
> *anarthake viṣuṣupaḥ ṣupibhūto dvir ucyate//*
> 'a replacement in *ṣ* is specified with reference to *supi* so that it does not apply to a form in *svap* (*visvapnaḥ/visvapnak*; 3.2.172); why can *ṣ*-replacement not apply in *visuṣvāpa*, where we get *sup* in the *abhyāsa*, though *p* is lost to *halādi-śeṣa* (7.4.60) and is supported by *ekadeśa-vikṛtam* . . .; we do not get *sup* in the *abhyāsa* of *visuṣvāpa*, because *samprasāraṇa* is desired to apply prior to *halādi-śeṣa* (6.1.17); the *s* of *visuṣvāpa* cannot be replaced with *ṣ* since *sup* falls outside the specification of *prāk sitād*. The *niyama* of 8.3.64 *sthādīnām* . . . thus cannot apply (8.3.63-8.3.64). Moreover, the deleted *p* will render *su* meaningless (*anarthaka*). How can we allow the meaningless *ṣup*. Actually, what goes through doubling is *visvap→viṣup*, through *samprasāraṇa* and *ṣ*-replacement. Doubling cannot apply prior to *samprasāraṇa* since a replacement in *ṣ* is not treated as *asiddha* for purposes of doubling'

8.3.89 निनदीभ्यां स्नातेः कौशले

> *ninadībhyāṃ snāteḥ kauśale*
> */ni-nadībhyām* 5/2 = *niś ca nadī ca* = *ninadyau* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām*; *snāteḥ* 5/1 *kauśale* 7/1/
> (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58)
> '*ni, nadī' ity etābhyām uttarasya snātisakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati kauśale gamyamāne*
> A *mūrdhanya* replaces the *s* of verbal root *snā* 'to bathe, cleanse' when the same occurs after *ni* and *nadī* and the signification is *kauśala* 'skill'.

EXAMPLES:

> *niṣṇātaḥ kaṭakaraṇe* 'skilled in making mats'
> *niṣṇāto rajjuvartane* 'skilled in making ropes'
> *nadīṣṇaḥ* 'skilled in swimming'

1. Here again we get a replacement in *ṣ* against the negation of *ṣ*-replacement at the beginning (8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ*). We thus get the *s* of *snā* replaced with *ṣ* when *ni* and *nadī* are used in construction before *snā*.

Consider *nadīṣṇaḥ*, where *snā* derives from *ṣṇā*, via replacement of *ṣ* with *s* (6.1.62 *dhātvādeḥ* . . .). Affix *Ka* is introduced after *snā* with the signification

of 'skilled'. The word *nadī* forms the cooccurrence (*upapada*; 3.2.4 *supi sthaḥ*) condition. We thus get *nadīsnā* + (*K*) *a* → *nadīsnā* + *a*, where *ā* of *snā* gets deleted by 6.4.65 *āto lopa*. . . . We now get *nadīsna*, where our present rule replaces the *s* of *nadīsna* with *ṣ*. This *ṣ* then leads to a replacement in *ṇ* (*ṣṭutva*) for *n* of *ṣnā*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *kauśale* 'when 'skill' is denoted'? Consider *nadyāṃ snātaḥ* = *nadīsnātaḥ* 'river-bathed' where, in the absence of denotation of 'skill', we do not get a replacement in *ṣ*.

8.3.90 सूत्रं प्रतिष्णातम्

sūtraṃ pratiṣṇātam
/ sūtram 1/1 *pratiṣṇātam* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56)
'*pratiṣṇātam*' *ity nipātyate sūtraṃ ced bhavati*
The form *pratiṣṇātam* is derived as a qualifier to *sūtra* 'thread, yarn', via *nipātana*, with a replacement in *ṣ*.

EXAMPLES:

pratiṣṇātam sūtram 'pure thread'

1. This replacement in *ṣ* is again negated by 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ*. This rule makes this possible, though via *nipātana*. Thus, *prati-snā* + *Kta* → *prati-* (*s*→*ṣ*) *nā* + *ta* → *prati-ṣ*(*n*→*ṇ*) *ā* + *ta* → *pratiṣṇāta*.

2. Why was this rule not formulated simply as *sūtraṃ prateḥ*? This could account for *pratiṣṇāta* with the *anuvṛtti* of *snā* from the preceding rule. This *nipātana* with particular mention of *pratiṣṇāta* is used to block *ṣ*-replacement in other bases. Thus, a form ending in *tṛC*, i.e., *pratisnātā*, cannot be allowed this replacement.

8.3.91 कपिष्ठलो गोत्रे

kapiṣṭhalo gotre
/ kapiṣṭhalaḥ 1/1 *gotre* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56)
'*kapiṣṭhalaḥ*' *ity nipātyate gotraviṣaye*
A *ṣ* replaces *s* in deriving *kapiṣṭhala*, via *nipātana*, when the signification is that of a *gotra* 'lineage'.

EXAMPLES:

kapiṣṭhalo nāma yasya sa kāpiṣṭhaliḥ putraḥ 'Kapiṣṭhala, is one whose son is Kāpiṣṭhali'

1. Note that the word *gotra* here means lineage. It does not denote its technical meaning of 'a grandson, and others thereafter (4.1.162 *apatyaṃ*

pautraprabhṛtio gotram)'. A non-technical *gotra* includes reference to the first person in the lineage and others thereafter. If *gotra* was used in its technical sense, we can only get a *ṣ*-replacement in *kāpiṣṭhali*. The head of the lineage, i.e., *kapiṣṭhala* cannot avail this replacement. Why was *kapiṣṭhalaḥ* itself not given as an example. It is noted that Kāpiṣṭhali must have been more famous.

Note that *sthala* of *kapisthala* is derived from verbal root *ṣthalA*. This root is enumerated with *ṣ* at its beginning in accord with: *ajdantyaparāḥ sādayaḥ ṣopadeśāḥ* 'a *s*-initial root which ends in a vowel, and also a non-dental consonant, is considered beginning with *ṣ* in initial citation (*ṣopadeśa*)'.

2. Why do we state the condition of *gotre*? Consider *kapeḥ sthalam* = *kapisthalam* 'place where monkey(s) live'.

8.3.92 प्रष्ठोऽग्रगामिनि

praṣṭho' gragāmini
/*praṣṭhaḥ* 1/1 *agragāmini* 7/1 = *agre gacchati* (*tat.*), *tasmin*/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56)
'*praṣṭhaḥ*' *ity nipātyate agragāminy abhidheye*
A *s* is replaced with *ṣ* in deriving *praṣṭha*, via *nipātana*, when the derivate denotes *agragāmin* 'he who moves ahead'.

EXAMPLES:

pratiṣṭhata iti praṣṭho' śvaḥ 'a horse who moves ahead of his rider'

1. Why do we state the condition of *agragāmin* 'he who moves ahead'? Consider *prasthe himavataḥ puṇye* 'on the auspicious peak of the Himalaya', where *prastha* does not mean *agragāmin*.

8.3.93 वृक्षासनयोर्विष्टरः

vṛkṣāsanayor viṣṭaraḥ
/*vṛkṣāsanayoḥ* 6/2 = *vṛkṣaś ca āsanaṃ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *viṣṭaraḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56)
'*viṣṭaraḥ*' *iti nipātyate vṛkṣe āsane ca vācye*
A *s* is replaced with *ṣ* in deriving *viṣṭara*, via *nipātana*, when derivates denote *vṛkṣa* 'tree' and *āsana* 'something to sit on, a seat'.

EXAMPLES:

viṣṭaro vṛkṣaḥ 'Viṣṭara is name of a tree'
viṣṭaram āsanam '*viṣṭara* means an *āsana* 'seat''

1. Note that *viṣṭara* 'that which is spread about' is derived by introducing affix *aP* (3.3.57 *ṛdor ap*) after verbal root *stṝÑ* 'to cover, spread'. Affix *aP* is introduced, via *nipātana*, against *GHaÑ* of 3.3.33 *prathane vāvaśabde*.

2. Why do we state the twin conditions of *vṛkṣāsanayoḥ* 'when 'tree' and

'something to sit on' is denoted'? Consider *aulapivākyasya vistaraḥ* 'elaboration of Aulapi's utterance', where *vistara* means 'expansion'.

8.3.94 छन्दोनाम्नि च

chandonāmni ca
/chandonāmni 7/1 = *chandasaḥ nāma* = *chandonām* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *viṣṭaraḥ* #93)
'*viṣṭāraḥ*' *iti nipātyate*
A *s* is also replaced with *ṣ* in deriving *viṣṭāra*, via *nipātana*, when the derivate names a meter.

EXAMPLES:

viṣṭārapaṅktiḥ chandaḥ 'a meter named Viṣṭārapaṅkti'
viṣṭāro bṛhatī chandaḥ 'a meter named Bṛhatī'

1. The word *viṣṭāra* is derived from *viṣṭara*. Refer to notes under 3.3.34 *chando nāmni ca* for additional details.

2. Why do we state the condition of *chando nāmni* 'when name of a meter is denoted'? Consider *paṭasya vistāraḥ* 'length and breadth of a cloth'.

8.3.95 गवियुधिभ्यां स्थिरः

gaviyudhibhyāṃ sthiraḥ
/gavi-yudhi-bhyām 5/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām*; *sthiraḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56)
gaviyudhibhyām uttarasya sthirasakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
The *s* of *sthira* 'firm', used after *gavi* and *yudhi*, is replaced with *ṣ* when close proximity between sounds finds its scope.

EXAMPLES:

gaviṣṭhiraḥ 'he who is steadfast in taking care of cows (truthful; a name)'
yudhiṣṭhiraḥ 'he who is steadfast in battles (the eldest among Pāṇḍava brothers)'

1. This rule allows the *s* of *sthira* to be replaced with *ṣ* when it combines after *gavi* and *yudhi*. Thus, *gaviṣṭhiraḥ* and *yudhiṣṭhiraḥ*. These compounds are allowed under the denotational condition of a name (2.1.44 *saṃjñāyām*). Is this non-deletion (*aluk*) of *saptamī* 'locative' accomplished by 6.3.9 *halantāt saptamyāḥ saṃjñāyām*? Yes, but only in case of *yudhiṣṭhiraḥ*. Since *go* does not end in a consonant, non-deletion of locative in *gaviṣṭhiraḥ* is accomplished by this rule, via *nipātana*.

8.3.96 विकुशमिपरिभ्यः स्थलम्

vikuśamiparibhyaḥ sthalam

/vi-ku-śami-paribhyaḥ 5/3 (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ*; *sthalam* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56)
'*vi, ku, śami, pari*' *ity etebhya uttarasya sthalasakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati*
The *s* of *sthala* is replaced with *ṣ* when *sthala* is combined after *vi, ku, śami* and *pari.*

EXAMPLES:

viṣṭhalam 'remote place'
kuṣṭhalam 'bad place'
śamiṣṭhalam 'a place abounding in Śamī trees'
pariṣṭhalam 'surround place'

1. This again is an exception to the negation of 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ.* The example compounds are formed in consonance with 2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ,* with the understanding that *vi, ku* and *pari* are particles (*nipāta*). The word *śamī* is combined with *sthalam* in a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound. The long *ī* of *śamī* goes through the shortening proposal of 6.3.63 *ṅyāpoḥ saṃjñā. . . .* Thus, we get *viṣṭhalam* and *śamiṣṭhalam,* etc.

8.3.97 **अम्बाम्बगोभूमिसव्यापद्वित्रिकुशेकुशङ्कङ्गुमञ्जिपुञ्जिपरमेबर्हिर्दिव्यग्निभ्यः स्थः**

ambāmbagobhūmisavyāpadvitrikuśekuśaṅkvaṅgumañjipuñjiparamebarhir-divyagnibhyaḥ sthaḥ
/amba-āmba-go-bhūmi-savya-apa-dvi-tri-ku-śeku-śaṅkvaṅgu-mañji-puñji-parame-barhis-divy-agni-bhyaḥ 5/3 (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ*; *sthaḥ* 6/3/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56)
'*amba, āmba, go, bhūmi, savya, apa, dvi, tri, ku, śeku, śaṅku, aṅgu, mañji, puñji, parame, barhis, divi, agni*' *ity etebhya uttarasya sthaśabdasakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati*
A *mūrdhanya* replaces the *s* of *stha* when it combines after *amba* 'father', *āmba, go* 'cow, bull', *bhūmi* 'earth', *savya* 'left', *apa* 'water', *dvi* 'two', *tri* 'three', *ku* 'bad', *śeku* '?', *śaṅku* 'peg', *aṅgu* 'finger', *mañji* 'cluster of blossoms', *puñji* 'heap, mass', *parame* 'in the best, highest', *barhis* 'Kuśa grass', *divi* 'in heaven' and *agni* 'fire'.

EXAMPLES:

ambaṣṭhaḥ 'a place'
āmbaṣṭhaḥ 'resident of Ambaṣṭha'
goṣṭhaḥ 'cow-shade'
bhūmiṣṭhaḥ 'located on earth'
savyeṣṭhaḥ 'standing on left'
apaṣṭhaḥ 'end of the elephant goad'
dviṣṭhaḥ 'standing in two places'

triṣṭhaḥ '. . . in three places'
kuṣṭhaḥ 'a plant; leprosy'
śekuṣṭhaḥ '?'
śaṅkuṣṭhaḥ 'placed on a peg'
aṅguṣṭhaḥ 'thumb, big toe'
mañjiṣṭhaḥ 'Indian madder'
puñjiṣṭhaḥ 'heaped, gathered'
parameṣṭhaḥ 'supreme'
barhiṣṭhaḥ 'placed on the Kuśa grass'
diviṣṭhaḥ 'abiding in heaven'
agniṣṭhaḥ 'placed in (on) fire'

1. Note that *stha* is specified here as a derivate of affix *Ka*, introduced after verbal root *sthā*. The *ā* of *sthā* is also deleted (6.4.64 *āto lopa iṭi ca*). Recall that a specification made with a particular form (*svarūpa-grahaṇa*) must apply to that form only. This replacement in *ṣ* must then apply to the *s* of *stha*. The nominative singular of *sthaḥ* should not be confused with the genitive singular of *sthā*. A genitive interpretation would make this rule apply to *gosthānam* and *bhūmisthānam*.

All examples are *upapada* 'conjoined' compounds, where *stha* is combined after *ambā, amba, go*, etc. Affix *Ka* is introduced after verbal root *sthā* under the cooccurrence condition of a *pada* ending in a *sUP* (3.3.4 *supi sthaḥ*). The long *ā* of *ambā* (in *ambaṣṭha*) is replaced with its short counterpart by 6.3.61 *ṅyāpoḥ saṃjñā*. . . . Affix *Ka*, in *goṣṭha*, is introduced with the signification of *GHaÑ* by a *vārttika* proposal (*vt: ghañarthe kavidhānam*; cf. 3.3.58 *grahavṛdṛ* . . .). Non-deletion of *saptamī* 'locative' in *savyeṣṭhaḥ* is allowed in consonance with 6.3.9 *halantād saptamyāḥ*. . . . A replacement in *ṣ* will also lead to a replacement in *ḍh* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*).

2. A *vārttika* proposal is made (*vt: sthāsthinsthṝṇām iti vaktavyam*) to also include *sthā, sthin* and *sthṛ*. Thus, we will get *savyeṣṭhāḥ, parameṣṭhī, savyeṣṭhā* and *sārathiḥ* 'charioteer'.

8.3.98 सुषामादिषु च

suṣāmādiṣu ca
/suṣāmādiṣu 7/3 = *suṣāmā ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣu*; *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *numvisarjanīyavyavāye' pi* #58)
suṣāmādiṣu śabdeṣu sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *mūrdhanya* also comes in place of the *s* of *suṣāmā*, etc.

EXAMPLES:

suṣāmā = *śobhanaṃ sāma yasyāsau brāhmaṇaḥ* 'a brāhmaṇa whose recitation of the *Sāman* hymns is beautiful'

niṣṣāmā brāhmaṇaḥ 'a brāhmaṇa who cannot recite the *Sāman* hymns'
duṣṣāmā brāhmaṇaḥ 'a brāhmaṇa who finds it difficult to recite the *Sāman* hymns'
niṣṣedhaḥ 'not going'
duṣṣedhaḥ 'rough going'

1. Note that *sūṣāmā*, etc., are listed as part of an open-ended group of nominals (*ākṛtigaṇa*). The *s* of *nis* and *dus* is optionally replaced with *visarga* (8.3.36 *vā śari*). If the option of *ḥ* is not accepted, we get the *s* further replaced with *ṣ* after *s* of *sāmā* itself is replaced with *ṣ*. Thus, *nis* + *sāmā* → *ni*(*s*→*ḥ*) + *sāmā* → *niḥ* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *āmā* = *niḥṣāmā* and *duḥṣāmā*. We can also get *niṣṣāmā* and *duṣṣāmā*.

Note that *siṣāma*, etc., are listed as a group for two reasons: (*i*) some of them are denied *ṣ*-replacement by a rule such as 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ*, or (*ii*) no replacement provision for some of them is made (*aprāpta*) by an earlier rule. Consider *suṣāmā* where *su* is a *karmapravacanīya* (1.1.94 *suḥ pūjāyām*). The negation of *ṣ*-replacement conditioned by the *upasarga* status of *su* can thus not apply. A *karmapravacanīya* cannot be assigned the term *upasarga* because of restrictive provision of 'one term' (*ekasaṃjñā*; 1.4.1 *ā kaḍārād ekā saṃjñā*). The term *upasarga* can also not be assigned to *nis* and *dus* of the listed words, especially since these two are assigned the term preverb only in connection with verbal roots *gam* and *krī*. Recall that *pra*, etc., are termed *gati* and *upasarga* in relation to action a root denotes (*Nyāsa*: *yaṃ prati kriyāyuktāḥ prādayas taṃ prati gatyupasargasaṃjñakā bhavanti*). We cannot identify *nis* and *dus* as preverbs in relation to the action denoted by *ṣidh* 'to move, go' or *sedh*. The *ṣ*-replacement of 8.3.65 *upasargāt sunotisuvati* . . . is thus not available to *niṣṣedhaḥ* and *duṣṣedhaḥ*. A replacement in *ṣ* could not be made available in *suṣandhiḥ*, *niṣṣandhiḥ* and *duṣṣandhiḥ*, mostly because their initial *s* does not derive from *ṣ* (8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*; *Nyāsa*: *tenaiṣām anādeśa-sakāratvād aprāpte ṣatve pāṭhaḥ*).

2. The *Uṇādi* suffix *Ku* (I:25: *apaduḥsuṣu sthaḥ*) is introduced after *su-sthā* and *duḥ-sthā* to derive *suṣṭhu* 'beautiful' and *duṣṭhu*. The *bahuvrīhi* (5.4.113 *bahuvrīhau sakthyakṣṇoḥ*) compound *gauryā iva sakthi yasyāḥ* = *gauriṣakthaḥ* 'she whose thigh is similar to Gaurī' is derived with the *samāsānta* affix *ṢaC*, where *s* of *sakthi* is replaced with *ṣ* of this rule. The long *ī* of *gaurī* 'fair complexioned' is replaced with its short counterpart by 6.3.63 *ṅyāpoḥ saṃjñā* . . ., introduced after *sthā* used with *su* and *du*.

8.3.99 एति संज्ञायामगात्

eti saṃjñāyām agāt
/*eti* 7/1 *saṃjñāyām* 7/1 *agāt* 5/1 = *na gaḥ* = *agaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmāt*/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *nuṃvisarjanīyavyavāye' pi* #58)

ekāraparasya sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati iṇkor uttarasyāgakārāt parasya saṃjñāyāṃ viṣaye

A *s* which is followed by *e* and occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU* with the exclusion of *g*, is replaced with *mūrdhanya* when the derivate denotes a name.

EXAMPLES:

hariṣeṇaḥ
vāriṣeṇaḥ
jānuṣeṇī

1. Note that *Kāśikā* lists this rule as a *gaṇa-sūtra* under the *suṣāmādi* group of nominals. *Padàmañjarī* and *Nyāsa* do not recognize it as a rule (*PM*: *etisaṃjñāyām agād iti gaṇasūtram*; *Nyāsa*: *etad grahaṇakavākyam*). We thus get *harayaḥ senā asya = hariṣeṇaḥ*; *paritaḥ senā asya = pariṣeṇaḥ*, etc., where shortening of *ā* of *senā* is accomplished by 1.2.48 *gostriyor upasarjanasya*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *saṃjñāyām* 'when the derivate denotes a name'? Consider *pṛthvī senā asya = pṛthusenaḥ* 'a king', where *s* of *senā* cannot be replaced with *ṣ*.

Why do we state the condition of *iṇkoḥ* 'after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU*'? Consider *sarvasenaḥ*, where *s* occurs after *a*.

Why do we state the condition of *agāt* 'but not after *g*'? Consider *viṣvaksenaḥ*, where a replacement in *k* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*) is treated as suspended (*asiddha*) in view of *g* (*jaśtva*; 8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*).

8.3.100 नक्षत्राद् वा

nakṣatrād vā

/nakṣatrāt 5/1 *vā* ϕ/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *nuṃvisarjanīyavyavāye' pi* #58 *etisaṃjñāyām agāt* #99)

nakṣatravācinaḥ śabdād uttarasya sakārasya vā eti saṃjñāyām agakārād mūrdhanyo bhavati

A *s* before *e* which occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU*, with the exclusion of *g*, is optionally replaced with *mūrdhanya*, when a word with the signification of *nakṣatra* 'constellation' follows and the derivate denotes a name.

EXAMPLES:

rohiṇīṣeṇaḥ
rohiṇīsenaḥ
bharaṇīṣeṇaḥ
bharaṇīsenaḥ

1. This rule is also listed as a *gaṇa-sūtra* in the *suṣāmādi* group of nominals.

Thus, *rohiṇīṣeṇaḥ/rohiṇīsenaḥ* and *bharaṇīṣeṇaḥ/bharaṇīsenaḥ*. We cannot get this optional *ṣ*-replacement in *śatabhiṣaksenaḥ* where *s* is preceded by *k*, perceived as *g* via suspension (*asiddhatva*).

Note that the *suṣāmādi* group is an open ended (*ākṛtigaṇa*) group. It can thus include words whose *ṣ*-replacment cannot be covered by some specific rules (*Kāś: avahitalakṣaṇo mūrdhanyaḥ suṣāmādiṣu draṣṭavyaḥ*). Our earlier rule offers *ṣ*-replacement, obligatorily. This rule makes that optional provision obligatory.

8.3.101 ह्रस्वात्तादौ तद्धिते

hrasvāt tādau taddhite
/hrasvāt 5/1 *tādau* 7/1 = *takāra ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasmin*; *taddhite* 7/1/ (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *numvisarjanīyavyavāye' pi* #58)
hrasvād uttarasya sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati tādau taddhite parataḥ
A *s* which occurs after a short (*hrasva*) *i* and *u* is replaced with *ṣ* when a *taddhita* affix beginning with *t* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

sarpiṣṭaram 'comparatively more buttery'
yajuṣṭaram 'a comparatively better sacrifice'
sarpiṣṭamam 'most buttery'
yajuṣṭamam 'best sacrifice'
catuṣṭaye brāhmaṇānām niketāḥ
'houses of brāhmaṇas in clusters of four'
sarpiṣṭvam 'butteriness'
yajuṣṭvam 'sacrificial performance'
sarpiṣṭā 'butteriness'
yajuṣṭā 'sacrificial action'
sarpiṣṭaḥ 'buttery'
yajuṣṭaḥ 'sacrificial'
āviṣṭyo vardhate 'grows after sprouting'

1. Note that *taraP* (5.3.57 *dvivacanavibhajya . . .*), *tamaP* (5.3.55 *atiśāyane. .*), *tayaP* (5.2.42 *saṃkhyāyā avayave . . .*), *taL* (5.1.119 *tasya bhāvas tvatalau*), *tasI* (5.4.44 *pratiyoge . . .*; 5.4.45 *apādāne . . .*) and *tyaP* (4.2.104 *avyayāt tyap*) are here recognized as the *taddhita* affixes beginning with *t* (*tādi*). This rule facilitates a replacement in *ṣ* which, because of the negation of *apadāntasya* (8.3.55 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ*), was not available. Consider *sarpi*(*s*→*ṣ*) + *taraP* → *sarpiṣ* + (*t*→*ṭ*) *ara* → *sarpiṣṭara* + *sU* = *sarpiṣṭaram*, *yajuṣṭaram*; *sarpiṣṭamam* and *yajuṣṭamam*, where *s* is replaced with *rU* and *visarga*. The *visarga* is then replaced with *s* (8.3.34 *visarjanīyasya saḥ*) before *t*. A replacement of this *s* with *ṣ* further causes *t* to be replaced with *ṣ* (*ṣṭutva*). Consider

catuṣṭaye, a derivate of *tayaP*, in *catuṣṭaye brāhmaṇānāṃ niketāḥ* 'houses of brāhmaṇa's are built in a cluster of four'.

2. Why do we state the condition of *hrasvāt* 'after a short vowel'? Consider *gīstarā* and *dhūstarā*, where *gīr* and *dhūr* do not end in a short vowel.

Why do we state the condition of *tādau* '. . . beginning with *t*' when 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ* can easily block the *ṣ*-replacement before a *t*-initial *taddhita* affix. Consider *sarpissād bhavati* 'becomes full of butter', where the *taddhita* affix *sātI* (5.4.52 *vibhāṣā sāti kārtsnye*) begins with a vowel. The *s* of *sāt* cannot avail a replacement in *ṣ* because of the negation of 8.3.109 *sāt padādyoḥ*. The initial *s* of *sarpis* will also be saved from being replaced with *ṣ* under the condition of *padādi*. However, the negation of 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ* cannot save the final *s* of *sarpis* from being replaced with *ṣ* before affix *sāt*. If this specification with *tādau* was not made, *ṣ*-replacement of affixal *s* will be blocked. But *s* before *sāt* must then be replaced with *ṣ*.

Why do we state the condition of *taddhite* 'when a *taddhita* affix follows'? Consider *sarpis tarati* 'the butter floats', where *t* of *tarati* is not relatable to a *taddhita* affix.

3. A *vārttika* poposal is made to block this replacement from applying to a form ending in a *tiṄ* (3.4.78 *tiptasjhi* . . .). Consider *bhindyustarām* and *chindyustarām* where *taraP* (5.3.56 *tiṅaś ca*) and *āmU* (5.4.11 *kimetiṅ* . . .) are introduced after *Jus* (3.4.108 *jher jus*), a replacement of *jhi* of *LIṄ*.

8.3.102 निसस्तपतावनासेवने

nisas tapatāv anāsevane
/ nisaḥ 5/1 *tapatau* 7/1 *anāsevane* 7/1 = *na āsevanam* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin/* (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56)
nisaḥ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati tapatau parato' nāsevane' rthe
The *s* of *nis* is replaced with *ṣ* when *tapati* follows and *anāsevana* 'not doing over and over again' is not denoted.

EXAMPLES:

niṣṭapati suvarṇam '. . . touches gold with fire'

1. The word *āsevana* is explained as *punaḥ punaḥ karaṇam* 'doing over and over again'. Its negative *anāsevana*, in the context of *suvarṇam* 'gold' and *tapati* 'heats up', is explained as *sakṛd agniṃ sparśayati* 'touches the fire once'.

2. Why do we state the condition of *anāsevane*? Consider *nistapati suvarṇaṃ suvarṇakāraḥ* 'the goldsmith heats up the gold'. That is, touches the gold with fire, over and over again'.

Why do we have this *ṣ*-replacement in *niṣṭaptam* and *niṣṭaptā* of *niṣṭaptaṃ rakṣa* and *niṣṭaptā arātayaḥ*? These examples may not be used with the denotation of *āsevana* 'repeated action'. It is equally possible that this sound modification is Vedic in nature (*Kāś*:. . . *āsevanaṃ na vivakṣyate, chāndaso vā varṇavikāraḥ*).

8.3.103 युष्मत्तत्ततक्षुःष्वन्तःपादम्

yuṣmattattatakṣuḥṣv antaḥpādam
/yuṣmat-tat-tatakṣu-ṣu 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu*;
antaḥpādam 1/1 = *antaḥ* = *madhye pādasya* (*avyayībhāva*)/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *nuṃvisarjanīyavyavāye' pi* #58 *tādau* #101)
'yuṣmat, tat, tatakṣus' ity eteṣu takārādiṣu parataḥ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati sa cet sakāro' ntaḥpādaṃ bhavati
A *s* which occurs after a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbols *iṆ* and *kU* is replaced with *s* when a *t*-initial form of *yuṣmad* 'you', *tad* 'that' and *tatakṣus* follows and the *s* is contained within the quarter (*pāda*) of a hymn.

EXAMPLES:

agniṣ ṭvaṃ nāmāsīt
agniṣ ṭvā vardhayāmasi
apsvágne sadhiṣṭava
agniṣ ṭad viśvam āpṛṇāti
dyāvāpṛthivī niṣṭatakṣuḥ

1. This rule replaces a *s* with *ṣ* in the middle of the quarter of a hymn when a *t*-initial form of *yuṣmad*, i.e., *tvam / tvām / te / tava*, *tat* and *tatakṣus* follow. Recall that *s* must also occur after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU*. Thus, *agni*(*s*→*ṣ*) *tvam nāma āsīt* → *agniṣ* (*t*→*ṭ*)*vam āsīt* = *agniṣṭvaṃ nāmāsīt*; *agnis tvā* → *agniṣṭvā . . .*;*. . . sadhis tava* → *sadhiṣṭava*;*. . . ;agnis tad. . .*;→ *agniṣṭad . . .*;*. . . nis tatakṣuḥ* → *niṣṭatakṣuḥ*. Note that *tādau* is carried over. Consequently, *yuṣmad* here refers to its replacements: *tva* (7.2.94 *tvāhau sau*), *tvā* (8.1.23 *tvāmau dvitīyāyāḥ*), *tava* (7.2.96 *tavamamau ṅasi*) and *te* (8.1.32 *temayāv . . .*). The word *tat* is an indeclinable particle. Finally, *tatakṣuḥ* is a form of *takṣ* 'to fashion, plane' where *LIṬ* is replaced with the third plural *us* (3.4.82 *parasmaipadānām . . .*). Note that this replacement applies at the end of a *pada*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *antaḥpādam* 'inside the quarter of a hymn'? Consider *yanma ātmano mindābhūdagnis tatpunarāha jātavedā vicarṣiṇaḥ* where *s* of *agnis* occurs at the end of the preceding quarter followed by *tat* at the beginning of the next. This replacement thus does not apply here.

8.3.104 यजुस्येकेषाम्

yajuṣy ekeṣām
/yajuṣi 7/1 *ekeṣām* 6/3/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *nuṃvisarjanīyavyavāye' pi* #58 *tādau* #101 *yuṣmattattatakṣuḥṣu* #103)

yajuṣi viṣaye yuṣmattattatakṣus parata ekeṣām ācāryāṇāṃ matena sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati
A *s* which occurs after *iṆ* and *kU*, in the opinion of some in the *Yajurveda*, is replaced with *s* when a *t*-initial form of *yuṣmad*, *tat* and *tatakṣus* follows and the *s* is contained within the quarter (*pāda*) of a hymn.

EXAMPLES:

archibhiṣ ṭavam
archibhis tvam
agniṣ ṭe' gram
agnis te' gram
agniṣ ṭat
agnis tat
archibhiṣ tatakṣuḥ
archibhis tatakṣuḥ

1. The word *ekeṣām* 'in the opinion of some' is used here to denote option (*Nyāsa*: *ekeṣāṃ grahaṇaṃ vikalpārtham*). Note also that *antaḥpādam* cannot be associated with the provision of this rule since occurrence within a *pada* is not possible (*Nyāsa*: *atra pādā na sambhavanti . . .*). This rule also offers replacement at the end of a *pada*. The examples need no further explanations.

8.3.105 स्तुतस्तोमयोश्छन्दसि

stutastomayoś chandasi
/stutas-tomayoḥ 6/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *chandasi* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *numvisarjanīyavyavāye' pi* #58 *ekeṣām* #104)
'*stuta, stoma*' *ity etayoḥ sakārasya chandasi viṣaye mūrdhanyādeśo bhavaty ekeṣām ācāryāṇāṃ matena*
The *s* of *stuta* and *stoma*, in the opinion of some in the Vedic, is replaced with *ṣ* when *s* occurs in close proximity after *iṆ* and *kU*.

EXAMPLES:

tribhiḥ ṣṭutasya
tribhiḥ stutasya
goṣṭomaṃ ṣoḍaśinam
gostomaṃ ṣoḍaśinam

1. Why do we have this rule when *tribhiṣṭutasya*, etc., can be covered by the next rule, under the condition of *pūrvapadāt* 'after a preceding *pada* . . .'? It is correct to think that this rule is formulated for covering instances of *pūrvapada* 'preceding *pada*' of a non-compound string. For, the next rule may also apply to uncompounded strings of *padas*. This rule is merely an

expatiation of the next (*prapañca*). It offers a *ṣ*-replacement against the negation of 8.3.111 *sāt padādyoḥ.*

8.3.106 पूर्वपदात्

pūrvapadāt
/pūrvapadāt 5/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *nuṃvisarjanīyavyavāye' pi* #58 *ekeṣām* #102 *chandasi* #105)
pūrvapadasthān nimittād uttarasya sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati chandasi viṣaye ekeṣām ācāryāṇāṃ matena
A *mūrdhanya*, in the opinion of some scholars, comes in place of an *s* which occurs, in the Vedic, after a preceding *pada* containing the *nimitta* 'cause, condition' of this replacement.

EXAMPLES:

dviṣandhiḥ
dvisandhiḥ
triṣandhiḥ
trisandhiḥ
madhuṣṭhānam
madhusthānam
dviṣāhasraṃ cinvīta
dvisāhasraṃ cinvīta

1. Note that the word *pūrvapada* means the first constituent of a compound, or a *pada* which precedes some other (*Kāś. asamāse' pi yat pūrvapadaṃ tad apīha gṛhyate*). Thus, *triḥ* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *amṛddhatvāya* → *triḥ ṣamṛddhatvāya*, a non-compound string. We can also get this replacement in a compound string: *tri* + (*s*→*ṣ*) *andhiḥ* → *triṣandhiḥ*, *madhuṣṭhānam* and *dviṣāhsram*, etc. Since this *ṣ*-replacement is offered in the opinion of some scholars, others may have the compounds without it. Thus, *trisandhiḥ*, *madhusthānam* and *dvisāhasram*, etc. Incidentally, *trisandhiḥ* is either a genitive *tatpuruṣa*, or a *bahuvrīhi* compound. A similar genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound can be seen in *madhusthānam*. The *bahuvrīhi* of *dvayoḥ sahasrayor bhavati* = *dvisāhasram* is formed in the sense of a *taddhita* affix (2.1.51 *taddhitārthottarapada . . .*). Affix *aṆ* is then introduced with the signification of 4.3.53 *tatra bhavaḥ*. A *vṛddhi* replacement of the first *a* of *sahasra* 'a thousand' is accomplished by 7.3.15 *saṃkhyāyāḥ saṃvatsara. . . .*

8.3.107 सुञः

suñaḥ
/suñaḥ 5/1/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *numvisarjanīyavyavāye' pi* #58 *chandasi* #105 *pūrvapadāt* #106)
'*suñ*' *iti nipāta iha gṛhyate, tasya pūrvapadasthān nimittād uttarasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati chandasi viṣaye*
A *mūrdhanya* replaces the *s* of *suÑ* 'press out, sprinkle' which occurs, in the Vedic, after a preceding *pada* containing the *nimitta* 'condition, cause' of this replacement.

EXAMPLES:

abhīṣuṇaḥ sakhīnām 'bathing together of friends'
ūrdhva ūṣuṇaḥ 'moving upward'

1. Note that the *i* of *abhi* is replaced with its long counterpart before *suÑ* (6.3.132 *ikaḥ suñi*). The *n* of *nas* in *uṣunas* is replaced with *ṇ* (*ṇatva*; 8.4.26 *naś ca dhātustho . . .*). Thus, *abhīṣuṇaḥ sakhīnām* and *ūrdhva ūṣuṇaḥ*. The *suÑ* of this rule is interpreted as a particle (*nipāta*). Pāṇini should have specified *suñaḥ* with indication of its *vikaraṇa* and ending (*śtip*), had he intended it to be a verbal root.

8.3.108 सनोतेरनः

sanoter anaḥ
/*sanoteḥ* 6/1 *anaḥ* 6/1 = *avidyamāno nakāro yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya*/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58 *chandasi* #105 *pūrvapadāt* #106)
sanoter anakārasya sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati chandasi viṣaye
A *mūrdhanya* comes in place of the *s* of verbal root *san*, in the Vedic, when *san* 'to give' does not end in *n*.

EXAMPLES:

goṣāḥ 'giver of cow'
nṛṣāḥ 'provider of men'

1. Note that the *n* of *san* gets a replacement in *ā* (*ātva*; 6.4.44 *viḍvanor . . .*). Refer to derivational details of *goṣāḥ* in the appendix (III:739-40). This replacement in *ṣ* is already made available by 8.3.106 *pūrvapadāt*. This rule then makes a restrictive provision (*niyama*). It applies only to that which does not end in *n*, and not to any other (*Nyāsa*: *avidyamānanakārasyaiva bhavati nānyasya*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *anaḥ* 'of that which does not end in *n*'? Consider *gosani* of *gosaniṃ vācam udīrayan* where this replacement does not take place. But it could hardly be a counter-example. It does not come under the preview of this rule's restrictive provision. Its *san* ends in *n* and it has been covered by the negation applicable to nominals listed in the *savanāni* group (8.3.110 *na raparasṛpi . . . savanādīnām*). Some offer *sisānayiṣati* as a

counter-example. But since this is a causal example and the restrictive provision of this rule is offered for non-causals, others prefer *sisanīḥ* as a better counter-example.

8.3.109 सहेः पृतनर्ताभ्यां च

saheḥ pṛtanartābhyāṃ ca
/saheḥ 6/1 *pṛtanartābhyām* 5/2 = *pṛtanā ca ṛtañ ca* = *pṛtanarte* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām*; *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *chandasi* #105 *pūrvapadāt* #106)
'*pṛtanā, ṛta*' *ity etābhyām uttarasya sahisakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo bhavati chandasi viṣaye*
A *mūrdhanya* comes in place of *s* of *sahA* 'to prevail, win', in the Vedic, also when it occurs after *pṛtanā* 'battle' and *ṛta* 'sacred order'.

EXAMPLES:

pṛtanāṣāham 'to winner of the enemy'
ṛtāṣāham 'to the follower of the sacred order'

1. Note that *sahA* receives affix *ṆvI* (3.2.64 *chandasi sahaḥ*) under the cooccurrence condition of a *pada* ending in *sUP*. The final *a* of *ṛta* is then replaced with its long counterpart (6.3.135 *anyeṣām api . . .*). Some propose a split-interpretation of this rule into two: (*i*) *saheḥ* 'in place of the *s* of *sahA*; (*ii*) *pṛtanārtābhyāṃ ca* 'also when occurring after *pṛtanā* and *ṛta*'. This split-interpretation helps *ṣ*-replacement also in *ṛtīṣaham*. Notice that *sahA* does not occur after *ṛta*. It occurs after *ṛti*, instead. It is a derivate of *KvIP* (3.3.113 *kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam*) where long replacement for the short of *ṛti* is accomplished by 6.3.116 *nahivṛtivṛṣi . . .*, under the condition of *saṃhitāyām* 'when close proximity of sounds . . .'. We will get *ṛtiṣaham* when *saṃhitā* is not considered.

The *ca* of this rule is used to indicate *anukta-samuccaya* 'collecting something which has not yet been stated'. We thus also get *ṛtīṣaham*. That is, the *s* of *sāṭ* is replaced with *ṣ*, not only when it occurs after *i*, *u*, and a consonant of the *k*-series, but also when it occurs after *pṛtanā* and *ṛta* (*Nyāsa*: *na kevalaṃ sāḍbhūtasya iṇkoḥ parasya api tu pṛtanarttābhyāñ ca ṣatvaṃ bhavati*). Those who do not accept split-interpretation claim that *ca* is used here to account for examples yet to be coverered (*anukta-samuccaya*). They offer *ṛtīṣaḥam* as an example.

8.3.110 न रपरसृपिसृजिस्पृशिस्पृहिसवनादीनाम्

na raparasṛpisṛjispṛśispṛhisavanādīnām
/na ϕ *rapara-sṛpi-sṛji-spṛśi-spṛhi-savanādīnām* 6/3 = *raḥ paro yasmāt* = *raparaḥ*; *raparaś ca sṛpi ca . . . svanādayaś* (*savanam ādir yesām* (*bv.*) *ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *nuṃvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *nuṃvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58)
rephaparasya sakārasya 'sṛpi, sṛji, spṛśi, spṛhi, svanādīnāṃ ca mūrdhanyo na bhavati
A *s* which is followed by *r*, or which belongs to verbal roots *sṛp* 'to crawl', *sṛj* 'to fashion, create', *spṛś* 'to touch', *spṛh* 'to long for', or else, to items listed in the group headed by *savana* 'pressing out, soma', is not replaced with *ṣ* even when this *s* occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU*.

EXAMPLES:

visraṃsikāyāḥ kāṇḍaṃ juhoti
visrabdhaḥ kathayati
purā krūrasya vsṛpaḥ
vāco visarjanāt
divispṛśam
nispṛhaṃ kathayati
savanesavane
sūtesūte
aśvasanimaśvasanim

1. This rule blocks a replacement in *ṣ* for a *s* which occurs before *r*, or which belongs to verbal roots *srjI* 'to create', *srpI* 'to crawl', *spṛśI* 'to touch' and *spṛhI* 'to envy, love', or else, is part of a listing headed by *savana* 'pressing out'. This negation is made against provisions of 8.3.106 *pūrvapadāt*, and applies even when *s* occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ*, or *kU*. Consider *visraṃsikāyāḥ* where *visraṃsika* 'the śirīṣa tree' is a derivate of *ṆvuL* (3.3.108 *rogākhyāyām . . .*; 3.3.109 *saṃjñāyām*), introduced after *vi-srans* 'to slip, fall'. We also have *visrabdha* 'without any fear', a derivate of *Kta* introduced after *vi-sranbhU*. Recall that *n* of *sranbhU* 'to confide' is deleted (6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala . . .*). The *t* of *Kta* is replaced with *dh* (*dhatva*; 8.2.40 *jhaṣastathor . . .*). The *bh* of the root is also replaced with *b* (8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). Augment *iṬ* is here blocked by 7.2.15 *yasya vibhāṣā*. These two examples both have a *r* occurring after *s*. This *s* cannot be replaced with *ṣ*. Refer to derivational details of *visṛpaḥ* in the appendix (II:376). Affix *KvIN* (3.2.58 *spṛśo' nudake*) is introduced after *spṛś* to derive *divispṛśa* 'touching heaven', under the cooccurrence condition of a *pada* ending in an affix denoted by *sUP*. Recall that the locative of *divi* 'in heaven' is here not deleted (*aluk*; 6.3.12 *tatpuruṣe kṛti . . .*). We also get *nis-(spṛh + ṆiC) + aC* → *nispṛha*, a derivate of affix *aC* (3.3.56 *er ac*) where *ṆiC* goes through deletion (6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*).

Now consider a *svanādi* derivate: *savanesavane*, where *savane* is iterated, like other examples, with the signification of *vīpsā* 'pervasion'. Note that *savane* is the locative form of *savana* 'pressing out', itself derived with affix

LyuṬ introduced after *ṣuÑ* 'to press out, extract'. Verbal root *ṣūÑ* 'to give birth' yields *sūta* with the *niṣṭhā* suffix *Kta*. *Kāśikā* adds that *aśvasanim* is brought here to indicate that *ṣ*-replacement is possible even when there is no preceding *iṆ*. This is how *jalāṣāham* 'he who can endure water' and *aśvaṣāham* '. . . can endure horse-ride' get their *s* replaced with *ṣ* (*Kāś*: *aśvasanigrahaṇam aniṇo' pi ṣatvama astīti jñāpanārtham. tena jalāṣāham, aśvaṣāham ity etat siddhaṃ bhavati*).

8.3.111 सात् पदाद्योः

sātpadādyoḥ
/sātpadādyoḥ 6/2 = *padasya ādiḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *sāt ca padādiś ca* = *sātpadādī* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *nuṃvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi* #58 *na* #110)
'*sāt*' *ity etasya padādeś ca mūrdhanyādeśo na bhavati*
A replacement in *mūrdhanya* does not come in place of the *s* of *sāt*, and also the *s* at the beginning of a *pada*, when this *s* occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU*.

EXAMPLES:

agnisāt 'fire-engulfed'
dadhisāt 'fully mixed with curds'
madhusāt 'fully mixed with honey'
dadhi siñcati 'sprinkles curds'
madhu siñcati 'sprinkles honey'

1. Note that *sāt* here refers to affix *sātI* (5.4.64 *vibhāṣā sāti kārtsnye*). Its *s* would have been replaced with *ṣ* of 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*. This rule blocks application of *ṣ*-replacement (*ṣatva*). A similar provision of *ṣ*-replacement in place of a *s* at the beginning of a *pada* is also negated here. This is basically against a *s* which may have its origin in the initial *ṣ* of a root (8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*). Thus we get *agnisāt* and *madhu siñcati*, etc., where the *s* of *sāt* and *siñcati* is not replaced with *ṣ*. Recall that *s* of *siñcati* has its source in *ṣ* of *ṣic* 'to sprinkle'. Augment *nUM* is here introduced by 7.1.59 *śe mucādīnām*. The *n* then goes through a replacement in *ñ* (*ścutva*; 8.4.40 *stoś ścunā ścuḥ*).

8.3.112 सिचो यङि

sico yaṅi
/sicaḥ 6/1 *yaṅi* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *na* #110)
sicaḥ sakārasya yaṅi parato mūrdhanyādeśo na bhavati

The *s* of *sic* which occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU* is not replaced with *ṣ* when affix *yaṄ* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

parisesicyate 'sprinkles repeatedly'
abhisesicyate 'sprinkles around . . .'

1. This negation of *ṣ*-replacement is made against the positive provisions of 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* and 8.3.65 *upasargāt sunoti*. . . . Rule 8.3.59 offers a replacement in *ṣ* to a *s*-replacement of a verbal root. Rule 8.3.65 offers a replacement in *ṣ* for the *s* of an *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*). Thus we get *ṣic* + *yaṄ* → *si* + *sic* + *ya* → *pari-s*(*i*→*e*) + *sic* + *ya* → *parisesicya* + *LAṬ* → *parisesicyate*, *s* of *sic* was required to be replaced with *ṣ*. The *s* of the *abhyāsa*, i.e., *si*→*se*, in *abhisesicyate* was required to be replaced with *ṣ* of 8.3.65 *upasargāt sunoti*. . . . Our present rule negates these two *ṣ*-replacements both.

It is argued that the *s* of the *abhyāsa* of *abhisesicyate* should be replaced with *ṣ* by 8.3.64 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena*. . . . The *s* of the root should be similarly replaced with *ṣ* of 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*. Why can we not have *abhiṣeṣicyate* by blocking the negation of this rule by 8.3.65 *upasargāt*. . ., in a manner similar to 8.3.65 *upasargāt sunoti* . . . which blocks the application of 8.3.111 *sātpadādyoḥ*. Rule 8.3.65 *upasargāt*. . . can only block the application of 8.3.111 *sātpadādyoḥ*, under the condition of *padādi* 'at the beginning of a *pada*'. It cannot block the negation of this rule (*Kāś*: *'upasargāt' iti yā prāptiḥ sā padādilakṣaṇam eva pratiṣedhaṃ bādhate, na 'sico yaṅi' iti. tasmāt ayaṃ pratiṣedhaḥ sarvatra bhavati*). The negation of a replacement in *mūrdhanya* 'retroflex' of this rule enjoys a much wider application.

8.3.113 **सेधतेर्गतौ**

sedhater gatau
/sedhateḥ 6/1 *gatau* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *na* #110)
gatau vartamānasya sedhateḥ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo na bhavati
A replacement in *murdhanya* does not come in place of the *s* of *sidh*, when the root is used with the signification of *gati* 'movement' and *s* occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU*.

EXAMPLES:

abhisedhayati gāḥ 'drives the cattles'
parisedhayati gāḥ 'drives the cattles around'

1. This again is a negation of *ṣ*-replacement offered by 8.3.65 *upasargāt sunoti*. . . . A specification with *sedha* in 8.3.65 *upasargāt*. . . can refer to *ṣidhŪ* 'to be auspicious' and *ṣidhU* 'to move' both. This negation can also apply to

them both. Our present rule negates *ṣ*-replacement in the context of *gatau* 'when the signification is movement'.

Why do we state the condition of *gatau*? Consider *śiṣyam akāryāt pratiṣedhayati* 'prohibits the student from non-action', where *ṣ*-replacement applies. Obviously, the derivate does not denote the meaning of *gati* 'movement'.

8.3.114 प्रतिस्तब्धनिस्तब्धौ च

pratistabdhanistabdhau ca
/pratistabdha-nistabdhau 1/2 (*itar. dv.*), *tau*; *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *na* #110)
'*pratistabdha, nistabdha*' *ity etau mūrdhanyapratiṣedhāya nipātyete*
Forms such as *pratistabdha* and *nistabdha* are derived, via *nipātana*, to facilitate no replacement by *mūrdhanya*.

EXAMPLES:

pratistabdhaḥ 'controlled'
nistabdhaḥ 'obstructed'

1. This *nipātana* provision is made against the positive provision of 8.3.67 *stanbheḥ*. Refer to derivational details of *visrabdhaḥ* under 8.3.111 *na raparasṛji*. . . . Similar rules apply in deriving *pratistabdhaḥ* and *nistabdhaḥ*.

8.3.115 सोढः

soḍhaḥ
/soḍhaḥ 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *na* #110)
sahir ayaṃ soḍhabhūto gṛhyate, tasya sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo na bhavati
A replacement in *mūrdhanya* does not come in place of the *s* of *soḍh* 'to endure' when the same occurs after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU*.

EXAMPLES:

parisoḍhaḥ
parisoḍhum
parisoḍhavyam

1. This rule specifies verbal root *sahA* 'to endure' by citing *soḍh*, where *h* has been replaced with *ḍh* (8.2.31 *ho ḍhaḥ*). That is, this negation should apply only when we get this form of *sahA*. Recall that the *a* of *sahA* is replaced with *o* to yield *soḍh* (6.3.110 *sahivahor* . . .). This negation of *ṣ*-replacement is made against the positive provision of 8.3.70 *parinivibhyaḥ sevasita*. . . . Thus, we get *pari-sah* + *Kta* → *pari-sa*(*h*→*ḍh*) + (*K*)*ta* → *pari-saḍh* + (*t*→*dh*→*ḍh*) *a* → *pari-sa*(*ḍh*→ϕ) + *ḍha* → *pari-s*(*a*→*o*) + *ḍha* → *pari*(*s*→*ṣ*) *oḍha* = *pariṣoḍha*, as a

result of at least six operations: (*Nyāsa*: *dhatva-ḍhatva-ṣṭutva-ḍhalopeṣu kṛteṣu 'sahivahor od avarṇasya' ity okāraḥ*).

8.3.116 स्तम्भुसिवुसहां चङि

stambhusivusahāṃ caṅi

/stambhu-sivu-sahām 6/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām*; *caṅi* 7/1/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *na* #110)

'*stambhu, sivu, saha' ity eteṣāṃ caṅi parataḥ sakārasyà mūrdhanyādeśo na bhavati*

The *s* of verbal roots *stanbhU* 'to prop up, support', *sivU* 'to sew', *sahA* 'to endure' which occurs after a sound denoted by *iN* and *kU* is not replaced with *ṣ* when affix *CaṄ* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

paryatastambhat
abhyatastambhat
paryasīṣivat
nyasīṣivat
paryasīṣahat
vyasīṣahat

1. This negative provision of *ṣ*-replacement is made against the positive provision of 8.3.67 *stanbheḥ* in case of *stanbhU*. It is made against the positive provision of 8.3.70 *parinivibhyaḥ* . . . in case of others (*Nyāsa*: *atra ādyasya 'stanbheḥ' iti ṣatve prāpte, ityarayos tu 'parinivibhyaḥ' iti pratiṣedho' yam ārabhyate*). These roots have a *ṣ*-replacement already made available to them by 8.3.64 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena* . . ., and also by 8.3.71 *sivādīnāṃ* . . ., even when augment *aṬ* intervenes. Our present rule makes a negative provision against them. A replacement in *ṣ*, when applicable after an *abhyāsa*, will be accomplished in view of 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*. Refer to derivational details of causative forms in *LUṄ*, i.e., *apīpacat*, etc., under 6.1.11 *caṅi*. Similar rules apply in deriving *paryastambhat*, *paryasīṣivat* and *paryasīṣahat*, etc. What is retained in *paryastambhat* is a sound denoted by *khaY* of the *abhyāsa* (7.4.61 *śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ*). Verbal root *sivU* goes through *guṇa* of the penultimate short vowel (*laghūpadhaguṇa*). The *a* of *sahA* goes through a replacement in *vṛddhi* (7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*) before *ṆiC*. Shortening of 7.4.1 *ṇau caṇy upadhāyāḥ* . . ., followed by operations similar to when affix *saN* follows (*sanvadbhāva*), finally produces derivates such as *paryasīṣivat*, etc.

2. A proposal (*vt*: *stambhisivasahāṃ caṅi upasargād iti vaktavyam*) is made to understand this negation in the context of an *upasarga* 'preverb' containing conditions of replacement. That is, this negation should not apply to a *ṣ*-replacement which obtains after an *abhyāsa* (*Kāś*: . . . *abhyāsād yā prāptis tasyā mā bhūd iti*).

8.3.117 सुनोतेः स्यसनोः

sunoteḥ syasanoḥ
/ sunoteḥ 6/1 *syasanoḥ* 7/2 = *syaś ca san ca*
(*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *na* #110)
sunoteḥ sakārasya mūrdhanyādeśo na bhavati sye sani ca parataḥ
The *s* of verbal root *ṣuÑ*, when occurring after a sound denoted by *iṆ* and *kU*, is not replaced with *ṣ* when affixes *sya* (3.1.33 *syatāsī lṛluṭoḥ*) and *saN* follow in close proximity of sounds.

EXAMPLES:

abhisoṣyati
parisoṣyati
abhyasoṣyat
paryasoṣyat

1. This negation of a replacement in *mūrdhanya* is made against the positive provision of 8.3.65 *upasargāt sunoti*. . . . Consider *abhisoṣyati*, the third singular active *LṚṬ* derivate of *ṣuÑ*, used with the preverb *abhi*. Refer to *kariṣyati* (appendix, II:510-511) for derivational details of derivates of *LṚṬ*. Similar rules apply in deriving *parisoṣyati*. Examples of *abhi-ṣuÑ* + *LṚṄ* and *pari-ṣuÑ* + *LṚṄ*, i.e., *abhyasoṣyat* and *paryasoṣyat*, involve introduction of augment *aṬ* (*abhi* + *aṬ* + *ṣuÑ*) and deletion of *i* of *tiP* (3.4.100 *itaś ca*).

2. Refer to derivational details of *cicīṣati* (appendix, II:435) and derive *abhi-ṣuÑ* + *saN* → *abhi-susūṣa*, a verbal root ending in *saN*. Affix *KvIP* is then introduced. The *a* at the end of *abhisusūṣa* is then deleted (6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*). Affix *KvIP* also goes through total deletion (*sarvāpahārīlopa*; 6.1.67 *ver apṛktasya*). The *ṣ* of *abhisusūṣ* is considered *asiddha* in applying *rU*→*ḥ* (*rutva-visarga*). This is how we get *abhisusūḥ*. Note here that *s* of *saN* is not replaced with *ṣ* (8.3.61 *stautiṇyor eva* . . .) here. The *s* which occurs after the *abhyāsa* indeed qualifies for a replacement in *ṣ*.

3. Why do we state the condition of *syasanoḥ* 'when *sya* and *saN* follow'? Consider *suṣāva* where we get a replacement in *ṣ* in the absence of affixes *sya* and *saN*.

8.3.118 सदेः परस्य लिटि

sadeḥ parasya liṭi
/ sadeḥ 6/2 *parasya* 6/1 *liṭi* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *na* #110)
'*sader dhātor liṭi parataḥ sakārasya mūrdhanyo na bhavati*
A replacement in *mūrdhanya* (here *ṣ*) does not come in place of the

following *s* of *sadI*, when this *s* occurs after *iṆ* and *kU*, and affix *LIṬ* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

abhiṣasāda
pariṣasāda
niṣasāda
viṣasāda

1. The following *s* of *ṣad* (*sadI*) is here blocked from receiving a replacement in *ṣ*. We get two *s* sounds in its derivates of *LIṬ*, especially after reduplication (*dvitva*). The second *s* which now occurs after the *abhyāsa* will qualify for a replacement in *ṣ* (cf. 8.3.64 *sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya*; 8.3.66 *sadir aprateḥ*). Our present rule negates that replacement in *ṣ*. The preceding *s*, of course, will be replaced with *ṣ* of 8.3.66 *sadir aprateḥ*. For, negation applies only to the following *s*.

2. *Kāśikā* reads this *sūtra* as: *sadisvañjyoḥ*. . . . It thus adds verbal root *svañjI* 'to embrace', mainly because the following *s* of this verbal root also qualifies for a replacement in *ṣ* (8.3.65 *upasargāt sunoti* . . .). Haradatta claims that *svañjI* is included as part of a *vārttika* proposal (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *svañjigrahaṇañ ca vārttike darśanāt sūtre prakṣiptam*; *vt*: *sado liṭi pratiṣedhe svañjer upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam*). It thus is an interpolation. Forms of *ṣvañj* are: *pariṣasvaje/ pariṣasvajāte*; and *pariṣasvajire/ abhiṣasvaje*. How is *n*-deletion of *svañj* accomplished? This *n* cannot be deleted because *LIṬ* cannot be accepted as marked with *K* (6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala*. . . . For, *svañj* ends in a conjunct (*saṃyogānta*). Some wish for this *kit*-status with the understanding that *ca* of 1.2.6 *indhibhavatibhyāṃ ca* is used for covering (*samuccayārtham*) examples which have been left out (*anukta*). They consider 1.2.6 *indhibhavatibhyāṃ ca* as a fixed option (*vyavasthita-vibhāṣā*), so that the optional *kit*-status does not apply to it. Or else, they carry the *anuvṛtti* of *vibhāṣā* from 1.2.3 *vibhāṣorṇoḥ*.

8.3.119 निव्यभिभ्योऽड्व्यवाये वा छन्दसि

nivyabhibhyo' ḍvyavāye vā chandasi
/ nivyabhibhyaḥ 5/3 = *niś ca viś ca abhiś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ*; *aḍvyavāye* 7/1 = *aṭā vyavāyaḥ* (*tṛt. tat.*), *tasmin*; *vā* ϕ *chandasi* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ* #55 *saḥ* #56 *iṇkoḥ* #57 *na* #110)
'*ni, vi, abhi*' *ity etebhya upasargebhya uttarasya sakārasyāḍvyavāye chandasi viṣaye mūrdhanyādeśo na bhavati vā*
A replacement in *mūrdhanya* (here *ṣ*) does not, optionally, come in place of the *s* which, in the Vedic, occurs after the preverbs *ni*, *vi* and *abhi*, even when augment *aṬ* intervenes and close proximity of sounds finds its scope.

EXAMPLES:

nyaṣīdat pitā naḥ '. . . sat down; abandoned . . .'
nyasīdat . . .
vyaṣīdat pitā naḥ '. . . was saddened . . .'
vyasīdat . . .
abhyaṣīdat ' . . .; accumulated'
abhyasīdat
vyaṣṭaut '. . . became sad'
vyastaut
abhyaṣṭaut '. . .; praised'
abhyastaut

1. Note that *sad* and *svañj* are not carried over here. The scope of *saṃhitāyām* is still valid. It is for this reason that a replacement in *mūrdhanya* 'retroflex' *ṣ* is, optionally, not ordered, even when augment *aṬ* intervenes between the preverb and *s*, specified as item to be replaced. That is, *ṣ*-replacement is here made optional. This optional negation applies to *ṣ*-replacements, parallel to what particular rule makes its provision for the Vedic. Consider *ny-sad* + *LAṄ* → *ny-a-sīd-at*, where *sad* is replaced with *sīd* (7.3.78 *pāghrādhmā* . . .). The *ṣ*-replacement in this case is optionally negated here against the obligatory provision of 8.3.66 *sadir aprateḥ*. An obligatory provision for *ṣ*-replacement made by 8.3.65 *upasargāt sunoti* . . . is also negated optionally in *vy-a-stau-t* → *vyaṣṭaut*, again a derivate of *LAṄ*. The *vṛddhi* of *stu* is accomplished here by 7.3.89 *uto vṛddhi*. . . . The *ŚaP*, of course, goes through deletion via *LUK* (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ*).

PĀDA FOUR

8.4.1 रषाभ्यां नो णः समानपदे

raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ samānapade
/raṣābhyāṃ 5/2 = *raś ca ṣaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tābhyām*; */naḥ* 6/1 *ṇaḥ* 1/1 *samānapade* 7/1 = *samānañ ca tat padañ ca* (*karm. tat.*), *tasmin/* (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108)
rephaṣakārābhyām uttarasya nakārasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati, samānapadasthau cen nimittinau bhavataḥ
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* when *n* occurs in close proximity, preceded by *r* and *ṣ*, within the same word.

EXAMPLES:

āstīrṇam 'spread out'
vistīrṇam 'expanded'
avapūrṇam 'filled up'

kuṣṇāti '. . . examines'
puṣṇāti '. . . nourishes'
muṣṇāti '. . . steals'

1. A dental *n* which occurs preceded by *r* and *ṣ* in the same word is, hereby, replaced with its retroflex counterpart *ṇ*. This specification requires a *nimitta* 'cause, condition', i.e., *r* and *ṣ*, and *nimittī* 'effect, result', i.e., *ṇ*, to occur within the same word. Note that *samānapade* 'within the same *pada*' is interpreted as *samāna-padasthau* 'contained or located within the same *pada*', where *samāna-padam* is a *karmadhāraya-tatpuruṣa* compound parallel to: *samānam = ekam tat padañ ca = samāṇapadam* 'that which is one and the same *pada* 'word' '; *tasmin = samāna-padasthau* 'located within the same'. Thus, *samānapade* specifies the locus, both, of condition, as well as the conditioned, within the same word. It is for this reason that, for purposes of this replacement in *ṇ*, *agnirnayati / vāyurnayati*, etc., are not considered the same words.

Why do we recognize *ṇ* as the *nimittī* 'effect, conditioned element'? Is it not the fact that the locus of *ṇ* in the same word is realized only after *n* is replaced with *ṇ*? Actually, it is the *n* which is to be brought about in the state of replacement in *ṇ*, the *nimittī* (*PM*: *ṇakāra eva vā nimittī, tasya tu vidhānottarakālaṃ samānapadasthatvam*; *Nyāsa*: *ṇatvabhāvena vipariṇamatau sādhyāyāṃ sa nimittī nakāraḥ*). This replacement is accepted as *nimittī* by way of its relationship with *n*. This question is raised because *n* is impossible to find in a word where *r* and *ṣ* precede. For, *n* is invariably replaced with *ṇ*.

2. Refer to derivational details of *āstīrṇam* and *vistīrṇam* under rule 7.1.100 *ṛta id dhātoḥ*). These examples derive from *ā-stṝ + Kta* and *vi-stṝ + Kta*, where *t* of *Kta* is replaced with *n* (8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto . . .*). This resultant *n*, when occurring after *r*, is, hereby, replaced with *ṇ*.

It is stated that *r* is also heard in *ṛ*. Consequently, we also get the *n* of *mātṝ*(*n*→*ṇ*) *ām = mātṝṇām* and *pitṝ*(*n*→*ṇ*) *ām = pitṝṇām* replaced with *ṇ*. The third person singular present indicative active forms of *kuṣA* 'to examine, test', *puṣA* 'to nourish, be healthy' and *muṣA* 'to steal' are derived with the introduction of the class-marker *ŚnaM*. The *n* of *ŚnaM*, since this same occurs after *ṣ* within the same word, is then replaced with *ṇ*.

Why do we specify *ṣ* in the wording of this rule? We do not need it here. For, a *n* which occurs after *ṣ* can easily be replaced with *ṇ* by retroflexion (*ṣṭutva*) provision of rule 8.2.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*.

Commentators state that *ṣ* is used here for the sake of rules which follow (*uttarārtham*). There is no harm if it can also be used here. A replacement in *ṇ*, for example in *kuṣṇāti*, etc., can be accomplished by 8.2.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*. That is, if *ṣ* is not used here. If *ṣ* is used here for the following rule, we can still replace *n* with *ṇ* by this rule. For, *ṣṭutva* of 8.2.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ* will remain *asiddha* 'suspended' in view of application of our present rule. The question of *vipratiṣedha* 'conflict between rules of equal strength' cannot be raised

here. For, 1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam* does not find any scope in the domain of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham* (*Nyāsa*: *pūrvatrāsiddhīye nāsti vipratiṣedho' bhāvād uttarasya*).

3. A *vārttika* proposal is made to also include *ṛ* in the specification of this rule (*vt*: *ṛvarṇāc ceti ca vaktavyam*). For, *r* and *ṣ* of this rule cannot include *ṛ* within their denotatum. It is true that *ṛ* has *r* included within it. But this inclusion of *r* in *ṛ* is only partial. A *ṛ* is accepted as including *r* in the middle of its two vocalic qualities. The *r* which is included within *ṛ* carries the duration of only half a mora (*mātrā*). A specification made for operations requiring a full sound cannot refer also to part of a sound (*Nyāsa*: *na hi varṇaikadeśo varṇagrahaṇena gṛhyate*). For, part of a sound cannot be accepted as its corresponding whole. It can only be accepted as its shadow, and not the real form (*Nyāsa*: *varṇeṣu ye varṇaikadeśā varṇāntarasamānākṛtayas teṣu tatkāryaṃ na bhavati. tacchāyānukāriṇo hi te, na punas ta eva*).

Why can we not include *ṛ* within the denotatum of the abbreviatory symbol *aṬ*? That way, our next rule can account for replacement in *ṇ*. A replacement in *ṇ*, also when sounds are separated and intervened, should pose no problem. An indication that such a replacement is possible is made by negation of *ṇ* in *nṛnamana* and *tṛpnoti* of the *kṣubhnādi* group (8.4.38 *kṣubhnādiṣu ca*). How could this negation be accepted if no positive provision exists (*Nyāsa*: *prāptipūrvikā hi pratiṣedhā bhavanti*). A negation is always directed against some positive provision. We can accept this negation of *nṛnamana* and *tṛpnoti* for yet another indication: a replacement in *ṇ* also applies after *ṛ* (*Kāś*: *atha vā-ṛvarṇād api ṇatvaṃ bhavatīty etad eva anena jñāyate*). That is, *ṛ* should also be accepted as a causal condition for replacement in *ṇ*, in addition to *r* and *ṣ*.

8.4.2 अट्कुप्वाङ्नुम्व्यवायेऽपि

aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi
/aṭ-ku-pv-āṅ-num-vyavāye 7/1 = *aṭ ca kuś ca puś ca āṅ ca num ca = aṭ . . . numaḥ; etair vyavāyaḥ* (*tṛt. tat.* with int. *dv.*), *tasmin; api* ϕ*/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1)
'*aṭ, ku, pu, āṅ, num*' *ity etair vyavāye' pi rephaṣakārābhyām uttarasya nakārasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* when *n* occurs after *r* and *ṣ*, eventhough intervened by *aṬ, kU, pU, āṄ* and *nUM*.

EXAMPLES:

karaṇam 'doing'
haraṇam 'carrying'
kiriṇā 'instrumental singular of *kiri*'
giriṇā '. . . of *giri*'

kuruṇā '. . . of *kuru*'
guruṇā '. . . of *guru*'
arkeṇa '. . . of *arka*'
mūrkheṇa '. . . of *mūrkha*'
gargeṇa '. . . of *garga*'
argheṇa '. . . of *argha*'
darpeṇa '. . . of *darpa*'
repheṇa '. . . of *repha* (*r*)'
garbheṇa '. . . of *garbha*'
carmaṇā '. . . of *carman*'
varmaṇā '. . . of *varman*'
paryāṇaddham 'tied all around'
nirāṇaddham 'all untied'
bṛṃhaṇam 'nourishing'
bṛṃhaṇīyam 'worth nourishing'

1. This rule allows a *n* which occurs after *r* and *ṣ* to be replaced with *ṇ*, even when *n* occurs after *r* and *ṣ* separated by *aṬ*, *kU* 'consonants of the *k*-series', *pU* 'consonant of the *p*-series', *āṄ* 'a preverb' and augment *nUM*. Note that the preceding rule, mainly due to its specification of *raṣābhyām* with the ablative (*pañcamī*), does not allow a replacement in *ṇ* when *r* and *ṣ* do not occur immediately before *n*. This rule allows a replacement in *ṇ*, even when there is an intervention (*Nyāsa*: *raṣābhyām iti pañcamīnirdeśān nirdiṣṭagrahaṇasyānantaryārthatvāt pūrveṇāḍādivyavadhāne saty aprāptam eva ṇatvam anena vidhīyate*). Why do we have to specifically mention *āṄ* when the abbreviatory term *aṬ* can easily include *āṄ* within its denotatum? This inclusion of *āṄ* within the denotatum of *aṬ* can easily account for a replacement in *ṇ*. How? A vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *aṆ* includes all vowels homogeneous with it (*Nyāsa*: *nanu cāḍvyavāye' tra ṇatvaṃ siddham. 'aṇ savarṇān gṛhṇāti' ity āṅo' py aḍgrahaṇena grahaṇāt kimartham āṅgrahaṇam*). This replacement will be blocked where intervention by *āṄ* involves separate words. It is made available strictly with reference to, and within, a single word. It is to block this replacement across word-boundary that *āṄ* is specifically mentioned here (*Nyāsa*: *asaty āṅgrahaṇe 'padavyavāye' pi*' (8.4.38) *ity āṅvyavāye pratiṣedhaḥ syāt*).

Now consider some illustrations:

(*a*) Where *aṬ* (*a, i, u, ṛ, ḷ, e, o, ai, au, h, y, v, r*) separates *r*/*ṣ* from *n*:
Consider *kṛ* + *a*(*n*→*ṇ*) *am* → *karaṇam*, *hṛ* + *anam* = *haraṇam*; *kiri* + (*n*→*ṇ*) *ā* = *kiriṇā*, *guru* + (*n*→*ṇ*) *ā* = *guruṇā*, etc.

(*b*) Where *kU* (*k, kh, g, gh, ṅ*) separates *r*/*ṣ* from *n*:
Consider *arka* + *Ṭā* → *arka* + *ena* → *arke*(*n*→*ṇ*) *a* = *arkeṇa*; *mūrkha* + *e*(*n*→*ṇ*) *a* = *mūrkheṇa*, etc.

(*c*) Where *āṄ* (*a, i, u, ṛ, ḷ, e, o*) separates *r* / *ṣ* from *n*:

Consider *pari+ā(Ṅ) + nah + (K) ta* → *par(i→y) ā + (n→ṇ) ah + ta* = *(paryāṇaddha + sU)* → *paryāṇaddham* and *(nir+ ā + (n→ṇ) ah + ta* → *(nirāṇaddha + sU)* → *nirāṇaddham.* This separation by *āṄ* is operative since it does not occur across word-boundary.

(*d*) Where augment *nUM* separates *r* and *ṣ* from *n*:

Consider *(bṛ(nUM) hI + (LyuṬ→ana))* → *bṛ(n→ṃ) h + a(n→ṇ) a))* = *bṛṃhaṇa* and *(bṛṃh) + a(n→ṇ) īya(R)) + sU = bṛṃhaṇīyam.* Note that augment *nUM* is introduced by 7.1.58 *idito num dhātoḥ.* Its *n* is then replaced with *anusvāra* by 8.3.24 *naścāpadāntasya jhali.* Why do we have to specify *nUM* when what intervenes is an *anusvāra*? This specification of *nUM* is made with implications of intervention of *anusvāra.* It is not made to directly specify intervention by *nUM* (*Nyāsa: anusvāropalakṣaṇārthaṃ hy atra numgrahaṇam na numaḥ pratipādanārtham*). Consider *tṛṃhaṇam* and *tṛṃhaṇīyam* where *nUM* is not introduced. What we have is the *anusvāra* of *tṛṃhA* and *stṛṃhA.* We thus get a replacement even when *nUM* is absent. We, however, do not get this replacement when *anusvāra* is not heard (*Kāś: saty api yatrānusvāro na śrūyate, tatra na bhavati*). Consider *(pra+ivI + (LyuṬ→ana))* → *pra+ (i+nUM) v) + ana))* → *pr(a+i→e) nv + ana = prenvana + sU = prenvanam* and *prenvanīyam,* where *nUM* occurs but, in the absence of its replacement in *anusvāra,* we do not get a replacement in *ṇ.*

How is this made possible? Consider the injunction: *nakṣatraṃ dṛṣṭvā vācaṃ visṛjet* 'should make offering after seeing the star', where 'seeing the star' marks 'time'. Since stars are generally seen at nights, one would comply with this injunction at nights. One would not comply during the daytime, even when one sees a star (*PM: divā nakṣatradarśane na visṛjyate*).

Kāśikā remarks that these intervening items, either individually or collectively, can cause this replacement in *ṇ.* How? Consider the following injunction: *devadatta-yajñadatta-viṣṇumitraiḥ saha nādhyetavyam* 'one should not study with Devadatta, Yajñadatta and Viṣṇumitra'. As this injunction is followed when one, two, or all three, are present, we will get *ṇ* as a replacement even when one, or a combination of these intervening items obtain (*Kāś: vyavāyopalakṣaṇārthatvād aḍādīnām iha vyastai samastaiś ca vyavāye' pi ṇatvaṃ bhavati*). Note that it is impossible to find a *n* which occurs after *r* and *ṣ* in the same word intervened by all four elements, *aṬ, kU, pU* and *āṄ,* concurrently. This rule will apply where one or more intervening options obtain in a single operational context. Consider *arkeṇa* where a velar stop and a vowel, i.e. *ke,* jointly intervene.

Why do we have to accept *api* 'also, even' in the wording of this rule? So that a replacement in *ṇ* can be gotten even when there is no intervention (*avyavāye' pi*)? No. That purpose can be served by the earlier rule. The word *api* is used here for allowing replacement in the following rules. Consider *upasargād asamāse' pi ṇopadeśasya,* whereby we get a replacement in *ṇ* in place of *n* after an *upasarga,* i.e., *pra.* Consider *pra-nayati = praṇayati* where, on

account of the ablative of *upasargāt*, we get the replacement in a context non-contiguous (*avyavahita*) with intervention. We can also get the replacement in *nir-nayati* = *niṛṇayati* where there is no intervention, at the strength of the use of the word *api* in this rule.

8.4.3 पूर्वपदात्संज्ञायामगः

pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām agaḥ
/pūrvapadāt 5/1 = *pūrvañ ca tat padañ ca* (*karm. tat.*), *tasmāt*; *saṃjñāyām* 7/1 *agaḥ* 1/1 = *avidyamāno gakāro yasmin* (*bv.*)/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2)
pūrvapadasthān nimittād uttarasya gakāravarjitād nakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati saṃjñāyāṃ viṣaye
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* when *n* occurs in a *pada* combined after another *pada* containing *r* and *ṣ* as condition of replacement, but not containing *g*, provided the derivate denotes a name (*saṃjñā*).

EXAMPLES:

druṇasaḥ 'a person with a large nose'
vārdhrīṇasaḥ 'a rhinoceros; a kind of deer'
kharaṇasaḥ 'a person with a sharp nose'
śūrpaṇakhā 'Rāvaṇa's sister; she whose nails have the shape of a winnowing basket'

1. This rule permits *n* to be replaced with *ṇ* when *n* occurs after *r* and *ṣ*, even when intervened by *aṬ*, *kU*, *āṄ* and *nUM*, provided *r* and *ṣ* are part of a preceding *pada* which denotes a name (*saṃjñā*) and does not contain any *g*.

Note that *r* and *ṣ* condition *n* to be replaced with *ṇ*. Our earlier rule accepts *r*, *ṣ* and *n* as part of the same *pada*. This rule requires *r* and *ṣ* to be part of a preceding *pada*, though not containing a *g* but used with the signification of a name (*saṃjñā*). They, however, cannot be interpreted as constituting the final sound of the preceding *pada*. How do we know it? We know it from interpretations of the learned (*PM*: *rephaṣakārāntāt pūrvapadād ity ayaṃ tv artho na bhavati, vyākhyānāt*).

2. Our examples are all *bahuvrīhi* compounds where *n* of their following constituent is replaced with *ṇ*. Refer to notes (IV:738) under rule 5.4.118 *añ nāsikāyāḥ saṃjñāyām* . . . for derivational details. Recall that *śūrpaṇakhā* is derived as a name (*saṃjñā*). We will, instead, get *śūrpanakhī* 'she whose nails are shaped like a winnowing basket', where *n* is not replaced with *ṇ*. Affix *ṄīṢ*, as against *ṬāP*, is introduced after *śūrpanakha*, where the derivate does not denote a name.

Why do we state the condition of *saṃjñāyām* 'when a name . . .'? Consider *carmanāsikaḥ* 'a whip' where, because of non-denotation of a name, *n* is not replaced with *ṇ*.

Why do we state *agaḥ* '. . . not a *g*'? Consider *ṛgayanam* 'a text' where, with *g* contained within *ṛg*, *n* of *ayanam* cannot be replaced with *ṇ*. But this replacement is blocked, via *nipātana* (4.3.73 *aṇṛgayanādibhyaḥ*).

Why state *g* when *nipātana* can block *n* from being replaced with *ṇ*. One must state *g* in this rule because *nipātana* may not serve the purpose of blocking such replacements (*Nyāsa*: *abādhakāny api nipātanāni bhavanti*). That is, we may also get *ṛgayaṇam* where *n* may be replaced with *ṇ*. Haradatta (*PM*) considers it *śakyam avaktum* 'not possible to speak'.

3. Questions have been raised whether this rule should be accepted as operational (*vidhi*), or restrictive (*niyama*), in nature. Some describe this rule as a *niyama* 'restrictive provision'. Others accept it as a *vidhi* 'operational'. The preceding rule offers a replacement in *ṇ* where both the 'condition' (*nimitta*) and 'conditioned' (*nimittī*) occur as part of a single whole *pada*. A compound such as *druṇasaḥ* cannot be accepted as a single *pada*. For, it contains the 'condition' (*r* of *dru*) of replacement as part of the preceding *pada* and the 'conditioned' (*n* of *nasaḥ*) as part of the following. This way, *druṇasaḥ*, etc., cannot be accepted as a single *pada*. A replacement in *ṇ* for *n* of *drunasaḥ* is thus not available (*aprāpta*) under provisions of the preceding rule. It is this non-availability (*aprāpti*) of replacement in *ṇ* that goes against accepting this rule as restrictive (*niyama*) in nature. Consequently, it is operational (*vidhi*).

It is true that 1.1.63 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam* allows individual compound constituents to be called *padas*, even after their nominal endings go through deletion. They can thus be viewed as constituting different *padas*, especially in view of compound constituency. Still, since nominal endings are introduced after a compound nominal stem to derive a single *pada*, the compound as a whole (*samudāya*) constitutes a single *pada*. This way, a replacement in *ṇ* is still available to compounds from the earlier rule. That is, if both the 'condition' and 'conditioned' are part of the same compound word. Since Pāṇini formulates this rule even when the preceding rule can cover its provision, this rule should be treated as a *niyama* (cf: *siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*). If this view is correct then, as the restrictive provision of *saṃjñāyām* rules out *ṇ* as a replacement in *carmanāsikā*, it should also rule out *ṇ*-replacement in *kharapasyāpatyam* = *khārapārāyaṇaḥ* 'male offspring of Kharapa' and *mātṛbhogāya hitam* = *mātṛbhogīṇaḥ* 'beneficial to mother's pleasure'. So also in the preceding constituent of *karaṇaṃ priyam asya* = *karaṇapriyaḥ* 'he to whom doing is dear'. It is argued that terms such as 'preceding' and 'following' are relative in nature. A 'preceding' always attracts its corresponding 'following', as, even when 'one's own' is not stated, a 'following' *mātari* 'mother' will always attract *svasyām* 'in one's own', its corresponding 'preceding', in *mātari bhaktyā pravartitavyam* 'one should treat one's mother with respect' (*Nyāsa*: *yathā hi 'mātari bhaktyā pravartitavyam' ity ukte svasyām iti nocyate, tahāpi svasyāṃ mātarīti gamyate*). A replacement in *ṇ* which

is conditioned by its cause in the preceding constituent and effect in the following, can be easily restricted on grounds of its cause and effect not present in the same word. For, it is made available by the preceding rule. This is how *ṇ*-replacement in *carmanāsikā* can be blocked. But this replacement cannot be blocked in case of a *n* which has its replacement condition contained within the preceding constituent of a *taddhita* derivate. Thus, replacement in *ṇ* cannot be blocked in *khārapāyaṇaḥ, mātṛbhogīṇaḥ* and *karaṇapriyaḥ.*

This restrictive interpretation will create problems in understanding the negation of *agaḥ.* Since *agaḥ* is part of a restrictive provision, it must negate the restriction of *saṃjñāyām* 'when a name is denoted'. It cannot negate replacement in *ṇ.* Commentators explain that *agaḥ* only negates *ṇ*-replacement. This, however, is made possible via *yoga-vibhāga* 'split interpretation'. Thus, *pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām* will be recognized as one split-rule. The second split-rule will, of course, be recognized as *agaḥ.* This *agaḥ* will block all possible *ṇ*-replacements. It should, however, not block all possible *ṇ*-replacements of the following rules. For, in that case, a split interpretation of *pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām agaḥ* will become vacuous (*vyartha*).

Others do not treat this rule as a *niyama* 'restrictive provision'. They consider it a *vidhi* 'operational provision'. The word *samānapadam* thus becomes a single indivisible word for them. This rule becomes a *vidhi* since it accounts for *ṇ*-replacement in a compound which is not a single indivisible word, especially with reference to the nominal inflection used after the compound. This view must also accept split-interpretation of *pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām agaḥ.*

8.4.4 वनं पुरगामिश्रकासिध्रकाशारिकाकोटराग्रेभ्यः

vanaṃ puragāmiśrakāsidhrakāśārikākoṭarāgrebhyaḥ

/vanam 1/1 (nominative used for genitive); *puragā-miśrakā-sidhrakā-śārikā-koṭarā-agre-bhyaḥ* 5/3 (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ/*

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnuṃvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām* #3)

'puragā, miśrakā, sidhrakā, śārikā, koṭarā, agre' ity etebhyaḥ pūrvapadebhyaḥ uttarasya vananakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati saṃjñāyāṃ viṣaye

A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of the *n* of *vana* 'forest' when *vana* occurs in combination after *r* and *ṣ* contained within a preceding *pada* constituted by *puragā, miśrakā, sidhrakā, śārikā, koṭarā* and *agre,* and derivates denote a name (*saṃjñā*).

EXAMPLES:

puragāvaṇam 'a forest full of *puragā* trees'
miśrakāvaṇam 'a forest full of *miśrakā* trees'
sidhrakāvaṇam 'a forest full of *sidhrakā* trees'

śārikāvaṇam 'a forest full of *śārikā* trees'
koṭarāvaṇam 'a forest full of *koṭarā* trees'
agrevaṇam 'name of a forest; a forest in front . . .'

1. Note that *pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām* (8.4.4) is carried over. Thus, this rule offers *ṇ* as a replacement for *n* of *vana*, provided *vana* occurs in combination after *puragā, miśrakā, sidhrakā, śārikā, koṭarā* and *agre*, and derivates denote a name (*saṃjñā*). Why do we have to state this rule when a replacement in *ṇ* can be accounted for by the preceding rule? This rule is formulated for making a restrictive provision (*niyama*). That is, this rule will offer a replacement in *ṇ* only to the *n* of *vana*, and not to the *n* of any other word. This *vana*, additionally, must be used in combination, only after *puragā*, etc. We cannot get a replacement in *ṇ* for the *n* of *vana*, for example, of *kuberavanam, śatadhāravanam* and *asipatravanam*.

How come *vanam* is specified in the nominative? Should it not be specified in the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*) with the signification of 'in place of' (*sthāna-ṣaṣṭhī*)? This nominative is used for genitive by way of transposition (*vyatyaya*). A long replacement for the short final *a* of *puraga, miśraka, sidhraka, śārika* and *koṭara* of cited examples is in consonance with 6.3.117 *vanagiryoḥ saṃjñāyām*. . . . The examples are all genitive *tatpuruṣa* compounds where *vanam* is placed as the following constituent. Thus, consider *vanasya agre = agrevaṇam*, an obligatory compound, formed in consonance with 2.2.31 *rājadantādiṣu param*. The non-deletion (*aluk*) of *saptamī* 'locative' of *agre* is in consonance with 6.3.9 *haladantāt saptamyāḥ*. . . .

8.4.5 प्रनिरन्तःशरेक्षुप्लक्षाम्रकार्ष्यखदिरपीयूक्षाभ्यो ऽसंज्ञायाम् अपि

pranirantaraḥśarekṣuplakṣāmrakārṣyakhadirapīyūkṣābhyo' saṃjñāyām api
/pra-nir-antar-śara-ikṣu-plakṣa-āmra-kārṣya-khadira- pīyūkṣā-bhyaḥ 5/3 (*iatr. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ*; *asaṃjñāyām* 7/1 = *na saṃjñā = asaṃjñā* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasyām*; *api* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnuṃvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām* #3 *vanam* #4)
'*pra, nir, antar, śara, ikṣu, plakṣa, āmra, kārṣya, khadira, pīyūkṣā' ity etebhya uttarasya vananakārasya saṃjñāyām asaṃjñāyāyām api ṇakārādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of the *n* of *vana* when *vana* occurs in combination after *pra, nir, antar, śara, ikṣu, plakṣa, āmra, kārṣya, khadira* and *pīyūkṣā*, irrespective of whether the derivate signifies a name (*saṃjñā*).

EXAMPLES:

pravaṇam 'an excellent forest'
antarvaṇam 'inside the forest'
śaravaṇam 'forest of reeds'

ikṣuvaṇam 'cane-forest'
plakṣavaṇam 'a forest full of *plakṣa* trees'
āmravaṇam 'a forest full of mango trees'
kārṣyavaṇam 'a forest with clearings inside for farming'
khadiravaṇam 'a forest full of *khadira* trees'
pīyūkṣāvaṇam 'a forest full of *pīyukṣā* trees'

1. This rule offers *ṇ* as a replacement for *n* of *vana*, provided *vana* occurs in combination after *pra, nir, antar, śara, ikṣu, plakṣa, āmra, kārṣya, khadira* and *pīyūkṣā*, whether or not, the derivate denotes a *saṃjñā* 'name'. Compounds such as *pravaṇe* and *nirvaṇe* are formed in consonance with 2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ*. The *avyayībhāva* compound of *antarvaṇe* is formed with the signification of *vibhakti* 'a nominal ending used with the denotatum of a *kāraka*' (2.1.6 *avyayaṃ vibhakti* . . .). All other examples involve genitive-*tatpuruṣa* compounds. These examples also illustrate 'name' and 'non-name' significations.

2. Note that the next rule requires *n* of *vana* to be, optionally, replaced with *ṇ* when *vana* combines after a *pada* denoting *oṣadhi* 'plants/herbs' and *vanaspati* 'vegetation/trees'. If the *prādi* '*pra*, etc.' words are not used with the denotation of vegetation and if the preceding rule is accepted as a *niyama* 'restrictive provision', a replacement in *ṇ* for *n* of their following *vana* will be accomplished under the denotation of *saṃjñā* 'name'. If the preceding rule is accepted as a *vidhi* 'operational provision', the following rule will apply. In cases where these two applications are not possible, *ṇ* replacement will be allowed by this rule. This same way we can also get *ṇ*-replacement where the denotation is not a name (*saṃjñā*). This rule cannot serve any purpose when the derivate does not denote a name. This rule also offers *ṇ* as a replacement for *n* in contexts where *saṃjñā* is denoted and either *niyama* 'restrictive provision' or *vidhi* 'operation' interpretations are followed. In the context of non-denotation of *saṃjñā*, this rule offers an obligatory *ṇ* (*ṇatva*), against the optional *ṇ* of the next rule.

Why is the word *api* 'even, also' used in this rule? If *api* was not used in this rule we could not get a replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) where *saṃjñā* is not the denotatum. What if one did not read *saṃjñāyām* 'when a name . . .' in this rule? This rule will then become a general operational rule capable of accounting for both instances of *saṃjñā* and *asaṃjñā*. If that is accepted, *api* will be interpreted as used for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*).

8.4.6 विभाषौषधिवनस्पतिभ्यः

vibhāṣauṣadhivanaspatibhyaḥ
/vibhāṣā 1/1 *auṣadhivanaspatibhyaḥ = oṣadhayaś ca vanaspatayaś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ/*

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt* #3 *vanam* #4)
oṣadhivāci yat pūrvapadaṃ vanaspativāci ca tatsthān nimittād uttarasya vananakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati vibhāṣā
A replacement in *ṇ* comes, optionally, in place of the *n* of *vana* 'forest' which occurs in combination after a *pada* used with the signification of *oṣadhi* 'plants (nutritional/herbal)' and *vanaspati* 'vegetation, trees', and contains *r* and *ṣ* as condition of replacement.

EXAMPLES:

dūrvāvaṇam 'forest full of grass'
dūrvāvanam
mūrvāvaṇam 'a forest full of creepers'
mūrvāvanam
śirīṣavaṇam 'a forest full of *sirīṣa* trees'
śirīṣavanam
badarīvaṇam 'a forest full of *badarī* (berry) trees'
badarīvanam

1. Note that *vanam* is still carried over. Rule 8.4.4 *saṃjñāyāṃ vanam . . .*, because of its controlled enumeration, and attendant condition of *saṃjñā*, cannot account for replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) of *vana*, used after *padas* signifying *oṣadhi* 'plants' and *vanaspati* 'vegetation'. This rule should be understood as offering optional *ṇatva* to residual instances of 8.4.4 *saṃjñāyāṃ . . .*, under the meaning condition of a name (*saṃjñā*). If one believes that this optional provision is also applicable to contexts of names (*saṃjñā*) and non-names *asaṃjñā*), one must put in some effort to establish it. That is, *vibhāṣā* must be read as a split-rule (*yogavibhāga*). This way, one split rule will allow replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) with the restrictive meaning of *saṃjñā*. The other will establish *vibhāṣā* 'option' between derivates with the meanings of 'name' and 'non-name'. Those who interpret *samānapada* as a single *pada* with no constituency, they will interpret this 'option' as *aprāpta* 'that which was not made available'. It will be interpreted as *prāpta-vibhāṣā* 'that which was made available' for others. Refer to *Nyāsa* ad *Kāśikā*, for further details.

2. There are two *vārttika* proposals under this rule:

(*i*) This rule applies only when a two-syllable or three-syllable *pada* combines with *vanam* (*vt: dvyakṣaratryakṣarebhya iti vaktavyam*). Thus, it will not apply in case of *devadāruvanam* 'a forest of teak trees' and *bhadradāruvanam* 'a forest of beautiful trees'.

(*ii*) This rule should be blocked from applying where the *irikā* group of nominals combine with *vanam* (*vt: irikādibhyaḥ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ*). Thus, *irikāvaṇam* and *mirikāvanam*.

3. Note that it is difficult to establish a clear distinction between *vanaspati* and *vṛkṣa* on the one hand, and between *vanaspati* and *oṣadhi* on the other. The *vanaspati* of this rule includes *vṛkṣa* 'tree' but excludes *oṣadhi* 'herbs'. Consider the following verse:

> *phalī vanaspatir jñeyo vṛkṣāḥ puṣpaphalopagāḥ/*
> *oṣadhyaḥ phalapākāntā latā gulmāś ca vīrudhaḥ//*
> 'a *vanaspati* bears fruits; a tree bears both flowers and fruits; an *oṣadhi* dies out after ripening of its fruits; creepers and shrubs are called 'forward growing' (*vīrudha*)'

Even though there exists a distinction between *vanaspati* and *vṛkṣa*, and there also are differences of opinion on their exact definition, these two terms have been used here with no clear distinction (*Kāś. saty api bhede vṛkṣavanaspatyor ihābhedena grahaṇaṃ draṣṭavyam*). The word *vanaspati* can, here, also include reference to trees.

8.4.7 अह्नोऽदन्तात्

> *ahno' dantāt*
> */ahnaḥ* 1/1 (nominative for genitive); *adantāt* 5/1 = *at ante yasya* (*bv.*), *tasmāt/*
> (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt*#3)
> *adantaṃ yat pūrvapadaṃ tatsthān nimittād uttarasyāhno nakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati*
> A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* of *ahna* 'day' when *ahna* occurs after a *pada* which ends in *a* (*aT*) and contains *r* and *ṣ* as condition of replacement.

EXAMPLES:

> *pūrvāhṇaḥ* 'first half of a day; morning'
> *aparāhṇaḥ* 'other half of a day; afternoon'

1. Note that *ahna* is a replacement of *ahan* 'day' (5.4.88 *ahno' hna etebhyaḥ*). Its nominative (*prathamā*) is here used in the sense of the genitive (*ṣaṣṭhī*). For those who interpret *samānapadam* 'same word' as referring to a single word with no constituency, this rule is operational (*vidhyartham etat*). For others, it is restrictive (*niyamārtham*). One can also interpret subsequent rules in this manner. The word *anta* 'end, final' is used for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*). This can be understood only with the help of *vyākhyāna* 'interpretation of the learned'. For, in this section of grammar, *tadantavidhi* 'interpreting *x* as also that which ends in *x*' cannot be established without using the word *anta*. If the specification of *aT*, i.e., *a*, qualifies the preceding *pada*, we can still get the sense of *tadantavidhi*. That is, we need not use the word *anta* 'end'.

2. Why do we state the condition of *adantāt* 'after that which ends in *a*'? A specification with final *a* is made so that, elsewhere, replacement in *ṇ* could be blocked. If the specification was made without *a* at the end, the *n* of *ahn*, which occurs prior to the affix in *pūrvāhṇe* 'in the forenoon', would be replaced with *ṇ*. This replacement will also apply to the *n* of *dīrghāhnī śarat* 'autumn of long days'. Also consider *nirahnaḥ* 'a day gone past' and *durahnaḥ* 'bad day' where, because of the specification of *a*-final (*adanta*), no replacement in *ṇ* is allowed. Since this rule makes the specification of *ahna* with *a* at the end, it cannnot apply to any other specification. That is, it cannot replace the *n* of *ahnī*, of *dīrghāhnī*, with *ṇ*, as in *dīrghāhnī śarat*.

Refer to derivational details under the appendix of 2.4.29 *rātrāhnāhāḥ puṃsi* (II:696).

8.4.8 वाहनमाहितात्

vāhanam āhitāt
/vāhanam 1/1 *āhitāt* 5/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnuṃvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt* #3)
āhitavāci yat pūrvapadaṃ tatsthān nimittād uttarasya vāhananakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of the *n* of *vāhana* 'carriage' when *vāhana* combines after a *pada* which contains *r* and *ṣ*, and is used with the signification of *āhita* 'that which is carried'.

EXAMPLES:

ikṣuvāhaṇam 'a cart by means of which sugarcane is carried'
śaravāhaṇam 'a cart by means of which reeds are carried'
darbhavāhaṇam 'a cart by means of which grass is carried'

1. The word *āhita* is explained as 'that which is placed in a carriage for transportation'. A word which denotes *āhita* is here required to contain the condition, i.e., *r* and *ṣ*, of replacement. The word *vāhana* 'carriage' is derived with affix *LyuṬ*, introduced after verbal root *vah* 'to carry'. The penultimate lengthening of *a*, of *vah*, is also accomplished by this rule, via *nipātana*.

Why do we have the condition of *āhitāt*? Consider *dākṣivāhanam* 'carriage of Dākṣi' where *dākṣi* is a name and does not denote the sense of *āhita*. The example is a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound denoting ownership.

8.4.9 पानं देशे

pānaṃ deśe
/pānam 1/1 *deśe* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnuṃvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt* #3)

pānanakārasya pūrvapadasthān nimittād uttarasya deśe' bhidheye ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* of *pāna* 'drinking' when *pāna* combines after a *pada* containing *r* and *ṣ* as condition of replacement, and derivates denote a particular place.

EXAMPLES:

kṣīrapāṇā uśīnarāḥ 'milk-drinking Uśīnaras'
surāpāṇāḥ prācyāḥ 'liquor-drinking easterners'
sauvīrapāṇā bāhlīkāḥ 'juice-drinking Bāhlīkas'
kaṣāyapāṇā gāndhārāḥ 'juice-drinking Gāndhāras'

1. This rule offers *ṇ*-replacement to *n* of *pāna* 'that which is drunk' (*Kāś. pīyate iti pānam*). Note that cited examples denote people by way of their country names (*Kāś. manuṣyābhidhāne' pi deśābhidhānaṃ gamyate*). Thus, *kṣīraṃ pānaṃ yeṣām uśīnarāṇām, te = kṣīrapāṇāḥ uśīnarāḥ* 'they, the people of Uśīnara whose drink is milk'. What is so special about this 'milk-drinking' of the Uśīnaras'? Others drink milk, as well. The Uśīnaras drink milk excessively.

Why do we have to state the condition of *deśe* 'when name of a place of residence is denoted'? Consider *dākṣīṇāṃ pānam* 'drinking of the Dākṣis', a counter-example.

8.4.10 वा भावकरणयोः

vā bhāvakaraṇayoḥ
/vā ϕ bhāvakaraṇayoḥ 7/2 = *bhāvaś ca karaṇañ ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt* #3 *pānam* #9)
bhāve karaṇe ca yaḥ pānaśabdas tadīyasya nakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati vā pūrvapadasthān nimittād uttarasya
A replacement in *ṇ* comes, optionally, in place of *n* of *pāna* 'drinking' when *pāna* is used with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense' and *karaṇa* 'means' and occurs in combination after a preceding *pada* which contains *r* and *ṣ* as condition of replacement.

EXAMPLES:

kṣīrapāṇaṃ 'milk-drinking'
kṣīrapānam . . .
kaṣāyapāṇam . . . 'drinking of juice'
kaṣāyapānam . . .
surāpāṇam . . . 'drinking of liquor'
surāpānam . . .
kṣīrapāṇaḥ kaṃsaḥ 'a vessel for drinking milk'
kṣīrapānaḥ . . .

1. This rule optionally replaces *n* of *pāna* with *ṇ*, provided *pāna* 'drinking' denotes *bhāva* 'action' and *karaṇa* 'instrument'. Thus, *kṣīrapāṇaṃ vartate = kṣīrapāṇam* 'drinking of milk goes on'; *kṣīrapāṇaḥ kaṃsaḥ* 'a vessel by means of which one drinks milk'. The word *pāna* can be explained as *pītiḥ* 'drinking', when denoting an action. It can be explained as *pīyate anena* 'that by means of which something is drunk', when denoting *karaṇa* 'instrument, means'. Recall that affix *LyuṬ* is introduced after *pā* 'to drink' to derive *pāna* with the signification of *bhāva* (3.3.114 *napuṃsake bhāve ktaḥ*) and *karaṇa* (3.3.117 *karaṇādhikaraṇayoś ca*). Since this rule is optional, we will get two forms: *kṣīrapāṇam* and *kṣīrapānaḥ* (*kaṃsaḥ*), etc.

2. A *vārttika* proposes this optional replacement, also for words enumerated in the class headed by *girinadī* 'mountain-river' (*vt: vāprakaraṇe girinadyādīnām upasaṃkhyānam*). Thus, *giriṇadī / girinadī*; *cakraṇadī / cakranadī* 'circular river'; *cakraṇitambā / cakranitambā* 'she who has circular buttocks'.

8.4.11 प्रातिपदिकान्तनुम्विभक्तिषु

prātipadikāntanumvibhaktiṣu ca
/prātipadikānta-num-vibhaktiṣu 7/3 = *prātipadikasya antaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*); *prātipadikāntaś ca nuṃ ca vibhaktiś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu*; *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnuṃvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt* #3 *vā* #10)
prātipadikānte numi vibhaktau ca yo nakāras tasya pūrvapadasthān nimittād uttarasya vā ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati.
A replacement in *ṇ* comes, optionally, in place of a *n* which either occurs at the end of a nominal stem, or occurs as part of *nUM* and *vibhakti* 'nominal ending', provided a *pada* containing *r* and *ṣ* as condition of replacement combines to precede.

EXAMPLES:

māṣavāpiṇau 'the two who plant the Māṣa beans'
māṣavāpinau
māṣavāpāṇi 'planting of Māṣa beans'
māṣavāpāni
vrīhivāpāṇi 'planting of rice'
vrīhivāpāni
māṣavāpeṇa 'by means of planting of beans'
māṣavāpeana

1. The word *anta* 'end, final' is used in the sense of *avayava* 'part of a whole'. The word *prātipadikānta* thus means 'the final of a nominal stem'. Since *prātipadikānta* is used as a modifier to *n* and also since *pūrvapadāt* is carried, this interpretation of *prātipadikānte*, with its locative, is expanded as: 'a *n* which occurs as final (part) of a nominal stem which, in turn, occurs in combination after a preceding *pada* containing *r* and *ṣ* as condition . . .'. A

similar interpretation of *n* in relation to *numvibhakti* can also be gotten as: 'a *n* which is part of *nUM* and *vibhakti* 'nominal ending' of a *pada* which occurs in combination after a preceding *pada*'. Of course, this replacement in *ṇ* is optional.

Now consider *māṣavāpiṇau* and *māṣavāpinau*, the nominative dual of *māṣavāpin* 'he who plants the *māṣa* beans'. Recall that affix *ṆinI* (3.2.81 *bahulam ābhīkṣṇye*) is introduced after verbal root *vap* 'to sow, plant', used in combination after a nominal *pada* ending in *sUP*. Thus, (*māṣa* + (*am*→ϕ)) + (*v*(*a*→*ā*)*p* + *in*))) → *māṣavāpi*(*n*→*ṇ*) + *au* = *māṣavāpiṇau* and *māṣavāpinau*, etc. Notice here that *vāpin* is combined with *māṣa* + *am* prior to introduction of *sUP* (*pbh.* 76): *gatikārakopapadānāṃ kṛdbhiḥ saha samāsavacanaṃ prāksubūtpatteḥ* 'a compound-formation of constituents which are termed *gati*, denote a participant, or are termed an *upapada* 'conjoined word', is accomplished with a constituent ending in an affix termed *kṛt*, prior to introduction of nominal endings denoted by *sUP*'. This is how *n* will be considered fit for *ṇ*-replacement as final of the nominal stem *vāpin*.

We will get *māṣavāpāṇi* and *māṣavāpāni*; *vrīhivāpāṇi* and *vrīhivāpāni* as examples, where *n* is part of augment *nUM*. We similarly get *māṣāvāpa* + (*Ṭā*→*ina*) → *māṣavāp*(*a*+*i*→*e*)*na* → *māṣavāpe*(*n*→*ṇ*)*a* = *māṣavāpeṇa* and *māṣavāpena*, where *n* is part of a nominal ending. Incidentally, *māṣavāpāṇi* is a neuter nominative-accusative plural of *māṣavāpa*, an *upapada-tatpuruṣa* formed by combining *vāpa* with *māṣa* + *am* (2.2.19 *upapadam atiṅ*). The final constituent of this compound, i.e., *vāpa*, is derived by introducing affix *aṆ* (3.2.1 *karmaṇy aṇ*) after *vap* 'to sow, plant seeds', used in combination after *māṣa* + *am*. We get *māṣavāpa* + *Jas* → *ṃāṣavāpāni* by first replacing *Jas* with *Śi* (7.1.20 *jaśśasoḥ śiḥ*). Augment *nUM* is then introduced (7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ*) to *māṣavāpa* + *nUM* + (*Ś*)*i*. We thus get *māṣavāp*(*a*→*ā*) + *n* + *i*)) → *māṣavāpāni*, by replacing the final short *a* of *māṣavāpa* (6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne cāsambuddhau*) with its long counterpart.

2. Recall that this *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) is desired in place of the final *n* of a nominal stem which follows a preceding constituent. This, however, will block *ṇ*-replacement (*ṇatva*) in *gargabhaginī* 'a sister of the Gargas'. Why? Our final constituent, i.e., *bhaginī* 'sister', is not a nominal stem ending in *n*. It, instead, ends in *ī*, a feminine affix. It will be blocked from being termed a *prātipadika* 'nominal stem' because of the *apratyayaḥ* 'non-affix' exclusion of 1.2.45 *arthavad-adhātur-apratyayaḥ*. . . .

Note that *n* of *gargabhaginī*, when not used with the signification of a 'sister of the Gargas', will qualify for a replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*). That is, when *gargasya bhagaḥ* = *gargabhagaḥ* 'auspicious prosperity of the Gargas' is derived as a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound. Affix *inI* can then be introduced to derive a feminine form, i.e., *gargabhaginī*, with the signification of *matUP*. That is, *gargāṇāṃ bhago' syāstīti* = *gargabhagiṇī* 'she who possesses the auspicious prosperity of the Gargas'.

3. A *vārttika* proposal is made to negate the *ṇ*-replacement (*ṇatva*) of *yuvan*, etc. (*vt. yuvādīnāṃ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ*). Thus, *āryayūnā* 'noble (trader) youth', *kṣatriyayūnā* 'a kṣatriya youth' and *paripakvāni* 'fully ripe'. This is not any different from examples of nominal stems ending in *n*, i.e., *mātṛbhogīṇaḥ*, etc.

8.4.12 एकाजुत्तरपदे णः

ekāj uttarapade ṇaḥ
/ekāc 1/1 = *eko' c yasmin sa* (*bv.*); *ekāj uttarapadaṃ yasmin sa* (*bv.* with internal *bv.*), *tasmin*; *ṇaḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnuṃvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt* #3 *vā* #10 *prātipadikāntanuṃvibhaktiṣu* #11)
ekāj uttarapadasamāse prātipadikāntanumvibhaktiṣu pūrvapadasthān nimittād uttarasya nakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of a *n* which occurs as final of a nominal stem contained within a monosyllabic *pada*, or occurs contained within augment *nUM*, or a *vibhakti* 'nominal ending', when this monosyllabic *pada* combines after a *pada* containing *r* and *ṣ* as condition of replacement.

EXAMPLES:

vṛtrahaṇau 'the two slayers of Vṛtra'
vṛtrahaṇaḥ 'slayers of Vṛtra'
kṣīrapāṇi 'milk-drinking'
surāpāṇi 'liquor-drinking'
kṣīrapeṇa 'by one who drinks milk'
surāpeṇa 'by one who drinks liquor'

1. This rule allows a *n* to be replaced with *ṇ* if *n* occurs in a monosyllabic *pada* at the end of its nominal stem, or occurs as part of augment *nUM*, or *vibhakti*, when a *pada* containing *r* and *ṣ* as replacement condition combines to precede. Consider *vṛtrahaṇau* and *vṛtrahaṇaḥ*, the nominative dual and plural of *vṛtrahan* 'slayer of Vṛtra', where *vṛtra* is combined to precede the monosyllabic constituent *han*, a derivate of *KvIP* introduced after *han* 'to harm, kill' (3.2.87 *brahmabhrūṇa* . . .). We thus get *vṛtraha*(*n*→*ṇ*) + *au* → *vṛtrahaṇau*. Similarly, *vṛtraha*(*n*→*ṇ*) + (*J*)*as* → *vṛtrahaṇ* + *a*(*s*→*r*→*ḥ*) = *vṛtrahaṇaḥ*. Now consider *kṣīraṃ pibanti* = *kṣīrapā* + (*K*)*a* → *kṣīrap* (*ā*→ϕ) + *a* = *kṣīrapa*, where affix *Ka* is introduced by 3.2.3 *āto' nupasarge kaḥ*. The *ā* of *pā* is deleted by 6.4.64 *āto lopa*. . . . Given *kṣīrapa* + (*J*)*as*, we get *kṣīrapāṇi*, similar to *kuṇḍāni*, with *nUM* (II:377-78). One can similarly derive *surāṃ pibanti* = *surāpāṇi*. Finally, examples of *vibhakti* are given as: *kṣīrapeṇa* and *surāpeṇa*, derived from *kṣīrapa* + *Ṭā* and *surāpa* + *Ṭā*.

2. Why is *ṇ* used explicitly when it could have been easily brought here via

anuvṛtti? It is used to show that *vā* 'option' of the preceding rule is canceled. But that option could be automatically canceled at the strength of this new formulation (*ārambha-sāmarthya*). This rule is then formulated to clearly show that its provision is obligatory (*nitya*; *Kāś*: *ṇaḥ iti vartamāne punar ṇagrahaṇaṃ vikalpādhikāranivṛtter viṣpaṣṭīkaraṇārtham*).

8.4.13 कुमति च

kumati ca

/kumati 7/1 = *kur asminn astīti* = *kumat* (a derivate of *matUP*), *tasmin*; *ca* ϕ/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *aṭkupvāṅnuṃvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt* #3 *vā* #10 *prātipadikāntanuṃvibhaktiṣu* #11)

kavargavati cottarapade prātipadikāntanumvibhaktiṣu pūrvapadasthān nimittād uttarasya nakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati

A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of a *n* which occurs at the end of a nominal stem contained within a *pada* with *kU* (velar stops), or contained as part of *nUM* or *vibhakti* 'nominal ending', when a *pada* containing *r* and *ṣ* as replacement condition combines to precede.

EXAMPLES:

vastrayugiṇau 'possessor of two dresses'
vastrayugiṇaḥ 'possessor of many dresses'
svargakāmiṇau '(the two) desirous for heaven'
vṛṣagāmiṇau '(the two) bull-riders'
vastrayugāṇi 'sets of two clothes each'
kharayugāṇi ' pairs of donkeys'
vastrayugeṇa 'instrumental singular of *vastrayuga*'
kharayugeṇa 'instrumental singular of *khara-yuga*'

1. This rule offers a replacement in *ṇ* for the *n* of a following *pāda* which is not monosyllabic (*ekāc*). The *ca* is used to attract *prātipadikāntanumvibhaktiṣu*. This also helps stop this *anuvṛtti* to go beyond this rule (*Pbh* (79): *cānukṛṣṭaṃ nottaratra* 'that which is attracted by menas of *ca* is not carried any further'). This *pada* is required to have a velar stop, instead. Why did Pāṇini not use *kau* 'when *kU* follows'? This locative *kau* would have yielded an undesired reading: *kavargādau uttarapade* 'when a following constituent beginning with a consonant of the *k*-series follows'.

Why do we have the condition of *kumati* 'when that which has *kU* follows'. A specification with *kau* 'locative singular of *ku*' will drastically reduce number of constituents which may follow in combination. For, they all must begin with a velar sound. But the sense of *matUP* becomes available with *kumat*? Pāṇini does not use *kau* because he wanted to get the sense of *matUP*. What purpose can this sense of *matUP* serve? It will require the following *pada* to

contain a consonant of the *k*-series (*KU*), and not to begin with one. A specification made with *ku* in the locative (*kau*) would allow *tadādividhi* 'interpreting *x* to also refer to that which begins with *x*'. That is, a following *pada* which has a sound denoted by *kU* at its beginning. This will allow *ṇ*-replacement in *māṣakumbhavāpiṇau*, explained as *vapanaṃ = vāpaḥ* 'sowing, planting of seeds'; *kumbhasya vāpaḥ = kumbhavāpaḥ* 'sowing a jar-full of seeds'; *māṣāṇāṃ kumbhavāpaḥ = māṣakumbhavāpaḥ* 'sowing of a jar-full of beans'. One will now get *māṣakumbhavāpin*, as in *māṣakumbhavāpiṇau*, with introduction of affix *iN* of 5.2.115 *ata iniṭhanau*. But this replacement in *ṇ* will not be available in *vastrayugiṇau*. It is to resolve such difficulties that *ku* is specified with the possessive suffix *matUP*, as in *kumati*.

Consider *vastrayor yuginau = vastrayugiṇau* and *vastrayugiṇaḥ*, the nominative dual and plural forms of *vastrayugin*, where *yugin* is a derivate of *yuga* with affix *inI* (5.2.115 *ata iniṭhanau*). Examples of *nUM* and *vibhakti* are offered as: *vastrasya yugāṇi = vastrayugāṇi, kharayugāṇi*; and *vastrayugeṇa, kharayugeṇa*. Additionally, we get *svargakāmiṇau* and *vṛṣagāmiṇau*, etc. These forms can be derived similarly to derivates of the preceding rules.

8.4.14 उपसर्गाद् असमासेऽपि णोपदेशस्य

upasargād asamāse' pi ṇopadeśasya
/upasargāt 5/1 *asamāse* 7/1 = *na samāsaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *api* ϕ *ṇopadeśasya* 6/1 = *ṇa upadeśe yasya* (*dhātoḥ*) = *ṇopadeśaḥ* (*bv.*), *tasya*/ (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṃnumvyavāye' pi* #2) *ṇopadeśasya dhātor yo nakāraḥ tasya upasargasthān nimittād uttarasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati asamāse' pi samāse' pi*
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* of a verbal root which contains *ṇ* in *upadeśa* 'initial citation', and is used after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as conditions of replacement, whether or not there is a compound formation.

EXAMPLES:

praṇamati '. . . pays respect to'
pariṇayati '. . . weds . . .'
praṇāyakaḥ 'good leader'
pariṇāyakaḥ 'he who leads around'

1. The word *ṇopadeśa* is used in the sense of 'that which has *ṇ* in its initial citation (*upadeśa*)'. Thus, consider *pra-ṇam* + (*LA→tiP*) = *praṇamati*, *pari-ṇī* + (*LAṭ→tiP*) = *pariṇayati*; and *praṇāyakaḥ*, *pariṇāyakaḥ* (II:524), where both *ṇam* and *ṇī* are roots with *ṇ* in their initial citation.

Why do we state the condition of *upasargāt* 'after a preverb'? Consider *pragatā nāyakā asmād deśāt = pranāyako deśaḥ*, a compound termed *prādi* (2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ*). Note here that *pra* is a *gati*. The *upasarga* status of *pra* should

be understood in relation to *gam*, and not in relation to *nī* 'to lead'. For, *pra* can be termed an *upasarga* only in relation to the root with which it is used. Consequently, we do not get a replacement in *ṇ*.

Why do we say *asamāse' pi* 'even when not part of a compound-formation'? The *anuvṛtti* of *pūrvapada* 'a constituent *pada* which precedes', which limits the scope of application of this rule only to compounds, would block a replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) in non-compound examples. Why need *asamāse' pi* when *pūrvapadāt* is no longer marked with *svarita*. That is, it cannot be carried over to this rule, anyway. Absence of *svarita* can simply indicate that this rule does not require the reading of *pūrvapadāt*. It does not make clear that the *anuvṛtti* of *pūrvapadāt* has been canceled. That is, it cannot be carried over to subsequent rules. Or else, see what *Nyāsa* has to say: *mandabuddhir ya evaṃ pratipattum asamarthas taṃ prati vispaṣṭīkaraṇārtham asamāse' pīty ucyate* 'a slow-wit who is not able to comprehend it this way, it is to make it clear to him that '*asamāse' pi*' is used here'.

8.4.15 हिनुमीना

hinumīnā
/ hinumīnā (deleted genitive) /
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅ-numvyavāye' pi* #2)
'*hinu, mīnā' ity etayor upasargasthān nimittād uttarasya nakārasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* of *hinu* and *mīnā* when they are used with a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as condition of replacement.

EXAMPLES:

prahiṇoti '. . . incites'
prahiṇutaḥ 'they two incite'
pramīṇāti '. . . destroys'
pramīṇītaḥ 'they two destroy'

1. This specification of *hinu* is made by combining verbal root *hi* 'to go' with its *vikaraṇa* 'class sign' *Śnu* (3.1.73 *svādibhyaḥ śnuḥ*). A similar specification with *mīnā* is made by combining *mī* 'to hurt' with *Śnā* (3.1.81 *kryādibhyaḥ śnā*). Consider *pra-hi* + (*Ś*) *nu* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) = *prahiṇoti*, where *nu* has changed to *no*, through replacement in *guṇa*. Note that a specification with *nu* also includes references to *no*. This same way, a specification made with *nā* will also include references to *nī*, as in *pramīṇītaḥ*. For, a substitute of *aC* is treated as similar to what it replaces (1.1.57 *acaḥ parasmin pūrvavidhau*). This can also be supported by (*Pbh.* 38): *ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat* 'that which is modified in one place is treated as if non-different'. But this view goes against the interpretive maxim of *pūrvatrāsiddhīye na sthānivat* 'a replacement is not treated as what it replaced in the domain of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*'.

This interpretive convention is at fault in the application of conjunct-initial deletion (*saṃyogādilopa*), replacement in *l* (*lādeśa*), and *ṇ* (*ṇatva*), as well (*Nyāsa*: *asyāḥ doṣaḥ saṃyogādilopalatvaṇatveṣv iti*). Incidentally, the *ā* of *Śnā* is replaced with *ī* by 6.4.113 *ī haly aghoḥ*.

8.4.16 आनि लोट्

āni loṭ
/āni loṭ (both used with deleted genitive)*/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅ-numvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14)
'*āni*' *ity etasya loḍādeśasyopasargasthān nimittād uttarasya nakārasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* of *āni*, first person singular (*miP→ni*) replacement of *LOṬ*, when the root occurs after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as replacement conditions.

EXAMPLES:

pravapāṇi 'first person singular active *LOṬ→miP→ni* derivate of verbal root *vap*, used with the preverb *pra*'
parivapāṇi 'first person singular active *LOṬ→miP→ni* derivate of verbal root *vap* 'to sow, plant seeds', used with the preverb *pari*'
prayāṇi 'first person singular active *LOṬ→miP→ni* derivate of verbal root *yā* 'to reach, go' used with the preverb *pra*'
pariyāṇi 'first person singular active *LOṬ→miP→ni* derivate of verbal root *yā* 'to reach, go' used with the preverb *pari*'

1. Note that *āni* refers to *ni*, used in construction after augment *āṬ* (3.4.92 *āḍ uttamasya*). The *ni*, itself, is interpreted as a replacement of *miP* (3.4.89 *mer niḥ*), the first person singular active replacement of *LOṬ* 'imperative' (3.4.77 *lasya*; 3.4.78 *tiptasjhi . . .*). Since a specification made with that which may carry a meaning cannot refer to that which does not carry any meaning *PM* ad *Kāś*: *arthavad grahaṇe nānarthakasya* (*pbh.*15), *LOṬ* should not be used in this rule. One can easily understand that *āni* is meaningful. For, its *ni* is a replacement of *miP* 'first person singular active ending', itself a replacement of *LOṬ* 'imperative', used in combination after augment *āṬ*. This *āni* cannot be misinterpreted as the plural nominative-accusative neuter nominal ending *āni*, as in *pravapāni*. For, the *pra* of *pravapāni*, a nominal used in the neuter plural, is not a preverb (*upasarga*).

A preverb belongs to the class of *prādi* '*pra*, etc.' and is termed an *upasarga* 'preverb', only when used in association with a verbal root (*yat kriyāyuktāḥ prādayas taṃ prati gatyupasargasaṃjñe bhavataḥ* 'the terms *gati* and *upasarga* are assigned to words listed under the group headed by *pra* only when they are used in connection with action denoted by a root'). An action is viewed

in the context of its usage. It cannot be viewed in isolation. It thus should be related to its usage as a whole. This rule can thus be interpreted as: '*ṇ* comes as a replacement of *n* of *āni* which, in turn, is part of that which occurs after a preverb (*PM* ad *Kāś*: *upasargāt parasyāvayavo ya āniśabdas tannakārasya ṇatvam*). This description itself will make clear that *āni* is nothing but the first person singular imperative ending. An additional specification with *LOṬ* is thus not needed.

2. Why do we have the condition of *LOṬ*? Consider *pravapāni māṃsāni* 'very fatty flesh', where, since *āni* is neuter nominative-accusative plural, replacement in *ṇ* is blocked.

8.4.17 **नेर्गदनदपतपदघुमास्यतिहन्तियातिवातिद्रातिप्सातिवपतिवहतिशाम्यतिचिनोतिदेग्धिषुच**

ner gada-nada-pata-pada-ghumāsyati-hanti-yāti-vāti-drāti-psāti-vapati-vahati-śāmyati-cinoti-degdhiṣu ca

/ neḥ 5/1 *gada-nada-pata-pada-ghu-mā-syati-hanti-yāti- vāti-drāti-psāti-vapati-vahati-śāmyati-cinoti degdhiṣu* 7/3 (*itar. dv.*), *teṣu/*

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅ-nuṁvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14)

'*ni*' *ity 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*

A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* of *ni* which occurs after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as replacement condition, when *gadA* 'to speak', *nadA* 'to sound, roar', *patA* 'to fall', *padA* 'to go, move', (a word-form termed) *ghu*, *māṄ* 'to measure', *syati* (*ṣo* 'to destroy'), *hanti* (*han* 'to harm, kill'), *yāti* (*yā* 'to go, move'), *vāti* (*vā* 'to blow, move'), *drāti* 'to run, move fast', *psāti* (*psā* 'to eat'), *vapati* (*vap* 'to sow'), *vahati* (*vah* 'to carry'), *śāmyati* (*śam* 'to be tranquil'), *cinoti* (*ci* 'to heap') and *degdhi* (*dih* 'to anoint') follow.

EXAMPLES:

praṇigadati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *gad* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'

pariṇigadati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *gad* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'

praṇinadati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *nad* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'

pariṇinadati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *nad* used with the preverb *pari-ni*'

praṇipatati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *pat* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'

pariṇipatati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *pat* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'

praṇipadyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *pad* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇipadyate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *pad* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇidadāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *dā* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇidadāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *dā* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇidadhāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *dhā* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇidadhāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *dhā* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇimimīte 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *māṄ* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇimimīte 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *mā* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇimayate 'third person singular middle *LAṬ*-derivate of *mā* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇimayate 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *mā* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇiṣyati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ṣo* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇiṣyati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ṣo* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇihanti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *han* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇihanti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *han* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇiyāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *yā* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇiyāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *yā* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇivāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vā* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇivāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vā* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇidrāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *drā* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇidrāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *drā* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇipsāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *psā* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'

pariṇipsāti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *psā* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇivapati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vap* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇivapati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vap* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇivahati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vah* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇivahati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *vah* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇiśāmyati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *śam* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇiśāmyati 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *śam* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇicinoti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ciÑ* used with the preverbs *pra-ni*'
pariṇicinoti 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *ciÑ* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
praṇidegdhi 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *dih* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'
pariṇidegdhi 'third person singular active *LAṬ*-derivate of *dih* used with the preverbs *pari-ni*'

1. Note that *ghu* refers to verbal roots termed *ghu* (1.1.20 *dādhāghv adāp*). A specification with *mā* refers more directly to *māṄ* 'to measure'. It also refers, though technically, to roots which may yield the form *mā* where *ā* may be a replacement (6.1.50 *ṃīnātiminoti . . .*). The *mā* of this rule refers only to *ṃāṄ* and *meṄ* 'to give, entrust'. It does not refer to *mīÑ* 'to harm, kill', *ḌUmiÑ* 'to hurl, throw' and *mā* 'to measure, compare, bellow'.

It can be argued that *mā* should refer to all roots which yield the form *mā*. This is what is desired by general specifications made with *gā*, *mā* and *dā* (*Nyāsa*: *gāmādāgrahaṇeṣv aviśeṣaḥ*). Why do we have to retstrict this reference with *mā* only to *māṄ* and *meṄ*? Jinendrabuddhi notes that Pāṇini places *ghu* in the middle of this rule. He should have followed 2.2.32 *dvandve ghi* and 2.2.34 *alpāc taram*. That is, he should have placed *ghu* at the beginning of this rule. This indicates that he is not following rules. He is following his desire, instead. The reference is limited only to *māṄ* and *meṄ*. *Kāśikā* summarizes this desideratum (*iṣṭi*) as: '*mā*' *iti māṅmeṅor grahaṇam iṣyate* 'a reference to *mā* and *meṄ* is desired by this specification made with *mā*'.

Yet another desideratum is offered to indicate that a replacement in *ṇ* is desired even when *aṬ*, etc., intervene (8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi; aḍvyavāye' pi nergadādiṣu ṇatvam iṣyate*). Thus, we get *pra-ṇyagadat* and *pari-ṇyagadat*.

2. Refer to derivational details of *praṇidadāti*, etc., in the appenix (II:352-54). Deriving example derivates offers a little or no difficulty. A replacement in *ṣ*, of *praṇiṣyati*, is accomplished by 8.3.65 *upasargāt sunoti*. . . . A long replacement for *a* of *śam*, in *praṇiśāmyati*, is accomplished by 7.3.74 *śamām aṣṭānāṃ*. . . . The *h* of *dih*, in *pra-ni-dih* + *ŚaP* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) = *praṇidegdhi*, is replaced with *gh* (*ghatva*; 8.2.32 *dadāter dhātor ghaḥ*). Recall that *ŚaP* has already gone through deletion (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ*). The *t* of *tiP*, i.e., *pra-ni-di*(*h→gh*) + (*ŚaP→ϕ*) + *tiP*, is then replaced with *dh* (*dhatva*; 8.2.40 *jhaṣastathor dho' dhaḥ*). We thus get *pra-ni-digh* + *dhi*. The *gh* of *digh* is further replaced with *g* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). We get *pra-ni-di*(*gh→g*) + *dhi* → *pra-*(*n→ṇ*) *i-d*(*i→e*) *g* + *dhi* = *praṇidegdhi*, through *ṇ*-replacement and *guṇa*. We similarly derive *pariṇidegdhi*. Refer to derivational details of *mimīte* under 7.4.76 *bhṛñām it*. One cam similarly derive *praṇimimīte*.

2. Note that some roots, i.e., *syati*, etc., are specified in this rule with *tiP*. This is done to indicate that this rule does not apply to forms where deletion of *yaṄ* (*yaṅ-luk*) applies. Refer to my notes under 7.1.6 *śīṅo ruṭ* for additional details.

8.4.18 शेषे विभाषाऽकखादावषान्त उपदेशे

śeṣe vibhāṣā' kakhādāv aṣānta upadeśe
/*śeṣe* 7/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1 *akakhādau* 7/2 = *kaś ca khaś ca* = *kakhau*; *tāv ādī yasya sa kakhādiḥ* (*bv.*); *na kakhādiḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *aṣānte* 7/1 = *ṣa ante yasya* = *ṣāntaḥ* (*bv.*); *na ṣāntaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *upadeśe* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅ-numvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14 *neḥ* #17)
akakārādiḥ, akhakārādiḥ, aṣakārāntaś copadeśe yo dhātuḥ sa śeṣaḥ; tasmin parataḥ upasargasthān nimittād uttarasya ner nakārasya vibhāṣā ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ṇ*, optionally, comes in place of *n* of *ni*, used after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as replacement conditions, when a verbal root, not enumerated thus far, does not, in its initial citation, begin with *k* and *kh* and ends in *ṣ*, follows.

EXAMPLES:

pra-ni-pacati = *praṇipacati*
pranipacati
pra-ni-bhinatti = *praṇibhinatti*
pranibhinatti

1. Note that *neḥ* and *upasargāt* are both carried. This rule replaces the *n* of *ni* with *ṇ*, only optionally, provided *ni* occurs after an *upasarga* which contains the condition of *ṇ*-replacement. Additionally, *ni* is to be followed by a verbal root which, in *upadeśa*, does not begin with *k*, *kh*, or end in *ṣ*.

Such roots are here referred to by *śeṣe* 'remainder'. Why did Pāṇini not formulate the rule with *akakhe aṣe*? These two could have given us the intended meaning of *ādau* 'at the beginning' and *ante* 'at the end'. He used *ādau* and *ante* for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*). Still, *anta* 'end' should be specified in this rule. For, there will be confusion in correctly interpreting *akakhe aṣe*, via *tadādividhi* 'an operational specification made with a sound segment also refers to that which begins with that sound segment' (*Paribh.* (34): *yasmin vidhāv tadādāv algrahaṇe*). This confusion will also arise in *tadantavidhi* 'an operational specification made with a sound segment also refers to that which ends in that sound segment'. How would one know which one of these two should be interpreted, via *tadādividhi* or *tadantavidhi*. If *tadādi* and *tadanta* interpretations were made available, optionally, to *akakhe aṣe*, Pāṇini should have made his specification with the *dvandva* compound *akakhaṣe*. Interpretation of the learned must be our only recourse (*vyākhyānam eva śaraṇam*) in arriving at the correct interpretation.

2. Refer to derivational details of *bhinatti* in the appendix (III:726). One can similarly derive *praṇibhinatti* and *pranibhinatti*, etc.

3. Why do we state the condition of *akakhādau* 'when not beginning with *k* and *kh*'? Consider *pranikaroti* and *pranikhādati* where this option is not available because *karoti* and *khādati* begin with *k* and *kh*.

Why do we state the condition of *aṣāntaḥ* 'not ending in *ṣ*'? Consider *pranipinaṣṭi* where verbal root *piṣ* 'to powder' ends in *ṣ*. Incidentally, *pinaṣṭi* is derived from *piṣ* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*) → *pi*(+*ŚnaM*) *ṣ* + *ti*(*P*→ϕ)) = (*pi*(*Ś*→ϕ) *na* (*M*→ϕ) *ṣ*)) + *ti* → *pinaṣ* + (*t*→*ṭ*) *i* = *pinaṣṭi*, via *śnaM* (3.1.78 *rudhādibhyaḥ śnam*; 1.1.47 *mid aco' ntyāt . . .*) and *ṭ*-replacement of *t* (8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*).

Why do we state the condition of *upadeśe* 'in initial citation'? So that this option is negated in *pranicakāra*, *pranicakhāda* and *pranipekṣyati*, where the roots begin with *k* and *kh* in *upadeśa*. This negation, however, will not apply to *viś* which yields *praṇiveṣṭā* and *praṇivekṣyati*. These forms do not have a root-final *ṣ* in *upadeśa*, but develop one in course of derivation. Recall that *praṇiveṣṭā* develops *ṣ* with the application of 8.2.36 *vraścabhrasj. . . .*

Nyāsa notes that *śeṣe* 'remainder, residual' is used in this rule for clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*). For, if *gad*, etc., are allowed an optional replacement in *ṇ*, our preceding rule would become vacuous (*vyartha*). Pāṇini could have brought *upadeśe* from 8.4.14 *upasargād asamāse' pi ṇopadeśasya*, via *maṇḍukapluti* 'frog's leap'. He used it explicitly for clarity.

8.4.19 **अनितेः**

aniteḥ
/aniteḥ 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅ-numvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14)
aniter nakārasyopasargasthān nimittād uttarasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati

A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* of verbal root *anA* 'to breath', when a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as replacement condition precedes.

EXAMPLES:

prāṇiti
parāṇiti

1. Consider *prāṇiti* which is derived as *pra-an* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *pra-an* + (*ŚaP→ϕ*) + *ti* = *prān* + *iṬ* + *ti* → *prā*(*n→ṇ*) + *i* + *ti* → *prāṇiti*. We similarly get *parā-an* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) → *parā-an-iṬ* + *ti*→ *parāṇiti*. Verbal root *an* is a root enumerated in the class headed by *ad* 'to consume' (*adādi*) where *ŚaP* gets deleted (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ*). Augment *iṬ* is then introduced by 7.2.76 *rudādibhyaḥ sārvadhātuke*. Note that this specification of *aniti* with *śtip* (*ŚaP-tiP*) is not made here for indicating non-application of affixal deletion of *yaṄ* (*yaṅluki*). It is, instead, used for specifying the root. Besides, the question of *yaṄ*-deletion could not be raised in connection with *an*. For, it does not begin with a consonant. Consequently, affix *yaṄ* could not be made available to it (3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco halādeḥ . . .*).

8.4.20 **अन्तः**

antaḥ
/antaḥ 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14 *aniteḥ* #19)
upasargasthān nimittād uttarasyānitinakārasya padānte vartamānasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of the *pada*-final *n* of verbal root *anA* 'to breathe', when used after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as conditions for this replacement.

EXAMPLES:

he prāṇ
he parāṇ

1. The word *anta* 'end' is used here in the sense of *avayava* 'part of a whole', as an 'end' is to a 'piece' of cloth (*vastrāntavat*). Note that *prāṇ* and *parāṇ* are address (vocative singular; *sambuddhi*) forms of *pra-an* + *KvIP*, where *KvIP* goes through total deletion. The nominative (vocative) singular ending *sU* termed *sambuddhi* is also deleted (6.1.68 *halṅyābbhyo . . .*). Note that this *sambuddhi* form has *n* at the end of its nominal stem (*prātipadikānta*). This *n* must go through deletion (8.2.7 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya*). However, 8.2.8 *na ṅisambuddhyoḥ* blocks this deletion. Our present rule offers *ṇ* as an optional replacement.

2. Why do we need this rule when the preceding could easily offer this

replacement. Recall that 8.4.36 *padāntasya* 'in place of that which occurs at the end of a fully inflected word' blocks a replacement in *ṇ* for a *pada*-final *n*. This rule uses *antaḥ* in anticipation of *padānta* 'end of a fully inflected word' of that rule. This way, our present rule is an exception to 8.4.36 *padāntasya*. The word *anta* 'end' is not used here in relation to *aniti*, per say.

Some combine this rule with the preceding to formulate a single rule as *aniter antaḥ*. They interpret *anta* as *samīpa* 'proximate'. This meaning facilitates *ṇ*-replacement, when *r* is not separated from *n* by more than one sound. Thus, we will not get the replacement in *par(i→y) an + i + ti → paryaniti*. A single rule will have to read *anta* twice so that *ṇ*-replacement could apply to *he prāṇ* and *he parāṇ* (*Kāś*:. . . *dvitīyam api padāntasya ṇatvārtham antagrahaṇam āśrayitavyam eva*). The second *antaḥ* will give us the sense of *padānta*. Some still claim that *paryaṇiti* is a valid form. For them, no purpose can be served by including *anta* as part of the preceding rule.

8.4.21 उभौ साभ्यासस्य

ubhau sābhyāsasya

/ubhau 1/2 *sābhyāsasya* 6/1 = *abhyāsena saha = sābhyāsaḥ* (*bv.*), *tasya/* (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14 *aniteḥ* #19)

sābhyāsasyāniter upasargasthān nimittād uttarasyobhayor nakārayor ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati

A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of both *n* sounds of a reduplicated verbal root *anA*, when *anA* occurs after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as condition of replacement.

EXAMPLES:

prāṇiṇiṣati
prāṇiṇat
parāṇiṇiṣati
parāriṇat

1. This rule allows *ṇ*-replacement for both *n* sounds of verbal root *anA* when reduplicated. The use of a preverb containing replacement condition is again required. The two *n* sounds relate to one in the *abhyāsa* and the other which may follow the *abhyāsa*. This rule allows *ṇ*-replacement even when *abhyāsa* intervenes between the preverb and the verb. This replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) was not made available by earlier rules.

Consider *pra-an + i(Ṭ) + sa(N)* where we get reduplication by 6.1.9 *sanyaṅoḥ*. (read with 6.1.2 *ajāder dvitīyasya*). This yields: *pra-a + ni + ni + sa = pr(a+a→ā) + (n→ṇ) i + (n→ṇ) i + sa = prāṇiṇisa*. A causal *LUṄ*-derivate of (*pra-anA + ṆiC = prāṇi*), with affixal deletion of *ṆiC*, introduction of *CaṄ* and reduplication of *ni*, via *sthānivadbhāva* (1.1.59 *dvirvacane' ci*, is derived

as *prāṇiṇat* with two *ṇ*-replacements. One can similarly derive *parāṇiṇiṣati* and *parāṇiṇat*. Refer to *āṭitat* (II:416-17) for additional details of derivates of *LUṄ*.

2. It is claimed that a subsequent (*para*) rule of *tripādī* 'last three quarters of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*' is treated as suspended (*asiddha*) in view of application of a prior rule (*pūrva*) of *tripādī*, only when a non-doubling (*advitve*) operation of the *sapādasaptādhyāyī* 'seven books and one quarter of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*' is to be performed (*pbh.* (127): *pūrvatrāsiddhīyam advirvacane*). Now consider *prā* + *ni* + *sati* where *saN* requires reduplication and our present rule requires *n* of *ni* to be replaced with *ṇ*. We will get *prā* + *ni* + *ni* + *sati* if reduplication applies first by treating replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) of this rule as *asiddha* 'suspended'. If *n* of the first *ni* is then replaced with *ṇ*, we will get *prā* + *ṇi* + *ni* + *sati*. Since the *ṇ* of *ṇi* will intervene between *prā* and *ni*, we cannot get the *n* of *ni* replaced with *ṇ*. If one accepts this interpretive convention (*paribhāṣā*) and replaces *n* of *prā* + *ni* + *sa* with *ṇ*, reduplication will apply to *ṇi*. We will thus get *prā* + *ṇi* + *ṇi* + *sati*. This way, we do not need this rule. *Kāśikā* claims that this rule is formulated to oppose recourse to this interpretive convention (*paribhāṣā*; *Kāś*: *etat tu nāśrayitavyam*). A formulation of this rule also shows how this *paribhāṣā* is non-universal (*anitya*). Refer to derivational details of *aujaḍhat* (8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*), where reduplication of *hta* will be blocked if replacements, i.e., *ḍh* (*ḍhatva*), etc., are treated as *asiddha* 'suspended'.

3. Why do we state *ubhau* 'both'? That is, when *ṇ*-replacement of *abhyāsa* can be accomplished by the preceding rule and *ṇ*-replacement of the verbal root, even when intervened, can be accomplished by this rule. True. But this is possible only when there is intervention (*vyavāya*). Instances where there is no intervention in between the condition (*nimitta*) and conditioned (*nimittī*) elements cannot be covered. For, replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) will apply there in accord with *takra-kauṇḍinya-nyāya*, a maxim whereby 'buttermilk', absence of *ṇatva*, in contexts of non-intervention, must be offered to Kauṇḍinya. It does not matter if Kauṇḍinya is a *brāhmaṇa* and, as such, qualifies to receive 'yogurt'. A replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) which is reserved for contexts where 'condition-conditioned' occur intervened, cannot be offered to contexts where they do not happen to be intervened. This is why *ubhau* must be used here.

8.4.22 हन्तेरत्पूर्वस्य

hanter atpūrvasya
/hanteḥ 6/1 *atpūrvasya* 6/1 = *at pūrvo yasmat* (*nakārāt*) *sa* = *atpūrvaḥ* (*bv.*), *tasya/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14)
akārapūrvasya hantinakārasya upasargasthān nimittād uttarasya nakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo bhavati

A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of *n* of verbal root *han*, when *n* occurs preceded by *a* (*aT*) and followed by *v* or *m*, provided *han* 'to harm, kill' occurs after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as replacement conditions.

EXAMPLES:

prahaṇyate
parihaṇyate
prahaṇanam
parihaṇanam

1. This rule replaces *n* of *han* with *ṇ*, when *n* is preceded by *a*, and *han* occurs after a preverb with *r* and *ṣ*. Consider *prahaṇyate*, *parihaṇyate*, and *prahaṇanam*, *parihaṇanam* as examples. Note that *prahaṇyate* and *parihaṇyate* are middle (*ātmanepada*; 1.3.13 *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ*) derivates of *han* with affix *yaK* (3.1.67 *sārvadhātuke yak*). The next two, i.e., *prahaṇanam* and *parihaṇanam*, are derivates of *LyuṬ* (3.3.115 *lyuṭ ca*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *atpūrvasya* 'when *n* is preceded by *aT*'? Consider *praghnanti* and *parighnanti* where *h* is replaced with *gh* (7.3.54 *ho hanter*. . .) and *a*, before *n*, goes through deletion. This, in turn, blocks *ṇ*-replacement. Recall that the penultimate (*upadhā*) *a* is deleted by 6.4.98 *gamahana*. . . . This rule does not apply where penultimate *a*-deletion is applied.

Why do we state *a* (*aT*)? Consider (*pra-han*) + (*LUṄ→anti*)) → *praghnanti*, where *n* is preceded by *gh* (7.3.54 *ho hanter*. . .). The penultimate *a* of *han* is here deleted by 6.4.98 *gamahana*. . . . There is no replacement in *ṇ* since *a* does not precede *n*. This same also happens in *parighnanti*.

Why do state *T* after *a* (*taparakaraṇa*)? Consider (*pra-han* + (*LUṄ→ta* = *prāghāni*)), where *CiṆ* replaces *CLI* under the signification of *karman* 'object' (3.1.66 *ciṇ bhāvakarmaṇoḥ*). The *h* of *han* is replaced with *gh*, and a long *ā* (*vṛddhi*) replaces the penultimate short vowel (7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*). The third singular *ātmanepada* (1.3.13 *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ*) suffix *ta* is deleted by 6.4.104 *ciṇo luk*. The *n* which follows *ā*, thus, cannot be replaced with *ṇ*. It can only be replaced with *ṇ* when a short *a* (*aT*) precedes *n*. We witness the same thing in *paryaghāni*. A specification of *han* with *tiP* is intended for proper identification of verbal root. It does not indicate any blocking of replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) where affix *yaṄ* gets deleted (*yaṅluki*).

8.4.23 वमोर्वा

vamor vā
/ vamoḥ 6/2 = *vaś ca maś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *vā* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14 *hanter atpūrvasya* #22)

vakāramakārayoḥ parato hantinakārasyopasargasthān nimittād uttarasya vā ṇakārādeśo bhavati

A replacement in *ṇ* comes, optionally, in place of *n* of verbal root *han*, where *n* occurs preceded by *aT* and followed by *v* or *m*, and when *han* occurs after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as a condition of this replacement.

EXAMPLES:

prahaṇvaḥ
parihaṇvaḥ
prahanvaḥ
parihanvaḥ
prahaṇmaḥ
parihaṇmaḥ
prahanmaḥ
parihanmaḥ

1. This rule allows a replacement in *ṇ* for *n*, also when *v* and *m* follow the *n* of *han*. Consider (*pra-han* + (*LAṬ→vas*) → *pra-han* + (*ŚaP→ϕ*) + *vas* → *praha*(*n→ṇ*) + *vas* → *prahaṇva*(*s→r→ḥ*) = *prahaṇvaḥ*, where *n* is followed by first personal dual active *vas*. We similarly get *parihaṇvaḥ*; *prahaṇmaḥ* and *parihaṇmaḥ*, where the last two forms have *n* followed by first personal plural active *mas*. The preceding rule offers a replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*), obligatorily. This rule makes that optional before *v* and *m*. That is why we also get *prahanvaḥ*, *parihanvaḥ*; *prahanmaḥ* and *parihanmaḥ*.

8.4.24 अन्तरदेशे

antar adeśe

/*antar* ϕ *adeśe* 7/1 = *na deśaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14 *hanter atpūrvasya* #22)

antaḥśabdād uttarasya hantinakārasyāt pūrvasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati adeśābhidhāne

A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place of the *n* of verbal root *han* when *han* occurs after *antar* with its *r* as condition of replacement, and *n* of *han* occurs preceded by *aT*, provided the derivate does not denote *deśa* 'place'.

EXAMPLES:

antarhaṇyate '. . . is killed in the middle . . .'
antarhaṇanaṃ vartate 'killing in the middle . . .'

1. Recall that *antaḥ* is a *gati* (1.4.65 *antar aparigrahe*). It can also be used as an *upasarga* 'preverb' in conjunction with a verbal root, especially when it is not used as a *gati*. We thus get *antar-han-yaK-te* = *antarhaṇyate*, where *yaK* is

introduced with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense' or *karman* 'object' (3.1.67 *sārvadhātuke yak*). We similarly get *antarha(n→ṇ) anam*, a derivate of *LyuṬ→ana* with the signification of *bhāva* 'root-sense'. This *antar* is a *gati* and the compound with *hanana* 'killing' is formed by 2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *adeśe* 'when not denoting a place'? Consider *antarhanano deśaḥ* where *antarhananaḥ* 'killing-field' denotes a place (*deśa*). The condition of *aT* is still valid. Thus, consider *antarghnanti* where the *n* of *ghna* cannot be replaced with *ṇ* since *a* does not precede it. The condition of *taparakaraṇa*, with *a* followed by *T*, blocks *ṇ*-replacement in *antarghāni* where *n* is preceded by a long *ā*.

8.4.25 अयनं च

ayanaṃ ca
/ayanam 1/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #14 *antaradeśe* #24)
ayananakārasya cāntaḥśabdād uttarasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati adeśābhidhāne
A replacement in *ṇ* comes in place, also, of the *n* of *ayana* 'going' when it occurs after *antar* with *r* as condition of this replacement, provided derivates do not denote *deśa* 'place'.

EXAMPLES:

antarayanam 'a particular sojourn'
antarayaṇaṃ śobhanam 'beautiful sojourn'

1. Note that 8.4.28 *upasargād bahulam* 'variously after a preverb' could account for this replacement. This rule is formulated so that derivates which do not denote a place could be covered. Consider *antar-ay* + (*LyuṬ→ana*) = *antaraya(n→ṇ) a* = *antarayaṇa* + *sU* → *antarayaṇam*. The condition of *adeśe* 'when the signification is not a place' is still valid. Consider *antarayano deśaḥ* 'a place of sojourn', where *ṇ*-replacement is blocked.

2. Note that *ayana* means a particular *gati* 'movement', especially at the end of a compound. It is generally characterized as a movement which begins and ends at the same place. Thus, we get *rāmasya ayanam* = *rāmāyaṇam* 'return (to Ayodhyā) of Rāma'; *uttrāyaṇam* 'sun's movement to the north' and *dakṣiṇāyanam* 'sun's movement to the south'.

Note that *ca* is used to attract *upasargāt* and *adeśe*. It is also used to cancel their *anuvṛtti* in the following rule.

8.4.26 छन्दस्यृदवग्रहात्

chandasy ṛdavagrahāt
/chandasi 7/1 *ṛdavagrahāt* 5/1 = *ṛc cāsau avagrahaś ca* = *ṛdavagrahaḥ* (*bv.*), *tasmāt/*

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *pūrvapadāt* #3)
ṛkārāntād avagrahāt pūrvapadād uttarasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati chandasi viṣaye
A *n* which occurs as part of a *pada*, combined after a preceding *pada* which ends in *ṛ* and may be read as contracted (*avagṛhya*) in the *pada-pāṭha* 'recitation by separating words', is replaced with *ṇ* in the Vedic.

EXAMPLES:

nṛmaṇāḥ 'he whose mind is in (the welfare of) men'
pitṛyāṇam 'father's carriage'

1. This rule applies to the Vedic usage where texts are recited by separating individual words (*padas*; *pada-pāṭha*). The *n* of a following *pada* which occurs in combination after a preceding, can be replaced with *ṇ*, provided the preceding ends in *ṛ*. This *ṛ* must also constitute the focus of contraction in the *pada-pāṭha* recitation of the text.

Note that *ṛ* does not constitute a *pada* by itself. It is, therefore, interpreted as denoting a *pada* which ends in *ṛ*. Additionally, this *pada* does not have to be separated from the following. A replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) applies to *n*, even when a final *ṛ* at the end of a preceding *pada* forms the focus of contraction (*avagraha*).

2. The word *avagrahaḥ* = *avagṛhya paṭhyate* is explained as 'that which is read after having been separated'. Thus, *nari mano' sya* = *nṛmaṇāḥ*, in the *saṃhitāpāṭha* 'connected recitation', and *nṛ manāḥ*, in the *pada-pāṭha* 'disconnected recitation'. We similarly get *pitur yānam* = *pitṛyāṇam* and *pitṛyāṇam*.

3. This *ṇ*-replacement is valid only in the *saṃhitā-pāṭha*. For, this rule is placed in the domain of *saṃhitā*. Since an *avagraha* separates two words in the *pada-pāṭha*, it refers here to a *ṛ* which may be qualified for contraction at the word-boundary. This is why I have not shown replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) in the *pada-pāṭha* text.

But why do we state the word *avagraha* in this rule? To clearly define the scope of application of this rule.

8.4.27 नश्च धातुस्थोरुषुभ्यः

naś ca dhātusthoruṣubhyaḥ
/naḥ (no nominal ending used); *ca* ϕ *dhātusthoruṣubhyaḥ* 5/3 = *dhātau tiṣṭhati* = *dhātusthaḥ* (*sapt. tat.*); *dhātusthaś ca uruś ca ṣuś ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tebhyaḥ/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *chandasi* #26)
'nas' ity etasya nakārasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati dhātusthān nimittād uttarasyoruśabdāt ṣuśabdāc ca chandasi viṣaye

A *n* which, in the Vedic, either occurs after a verbal root containing *r* and *ṣ* as replacement conditions, or occurs after *uru* and *ṣu* combined to precede, is replaced with *ṇ*.

EXAMPLES:

agnẹ rakṣấ ṇa̲ḥ 'O Agni, protect us'
śikṣấ ṇo a̲smin 'please teach this to us'
u̲ru ṇás kṛdhi 'grant us an opportunity to prosper'
a̲bhī ṣu ṇa̲ḥ sakhínām
ūrdhva ū ṣu ṇa ūtaye

1. The word *dhātustha* 'placed in a verbal root' is explained as 'that which is part of a verbal root'. The words *uru* and *ṣu* are specified here to represent their forms (*svarūpagrahaṇam*). Incidentally, *ṣu* refers to *suÑ*, a particle (*nipāta*), which gets its *s* replaced with *ṣ* (8.3.107 *suñaḥ*).

A specification with *nas* is generally made to refer to *nas* as a replacement of *nāsikā* 'nose'. This rule, however, specifies *nas* to refer to a replacement of *asmad* 'first personal pronominal' (8.1.21 *bahuvacanasya vasnasau*).

3. Consider *rakṣā ṇaḥ* where *rakṣ*(*a*→*ā*) = *rakṣā*, a second person singular imperative (*LOṬ*) form of *rakṣ* 'to protect', gets its final *a* replaced with long (6.3.125 *dvyaco' tas tiṅaḥ*). The following *asmad* is, of course, replaced with *nas*. This same is also witnessed in *śikṣā ṇo* (*asmin*). Refer to derivational details of *uru*+ *ṇas*+ *kṛdhi* → *uruṇaskṛdhi* (6.4.102 *śruśṛṇu . . .*), where *kṛdhi* is a second person singular imperative of *kṛÑ*. The second personal active singular ending *siP* is here replaced with *hi* (3.4.87 *ser hy apic ca*). This *hi* is again replaced with *dhi* (6.4.102 *śruśṛṇu . . .*). We thus get: *kṛ* + (*si*→*hi*→*dhi*) = *kṛdhi*. The *visarga* of *ṇaḥ* is replaced with *s* of 8.3.59 *kaḥ karatkarati . . .*). A long replacement for *i* of *abhi* is accomplished by 6.3.134 *ikaḥ suñi*. The *s* of *suÑ* is replaced with *ṣ* of 8.3.107 *suñaḥ*. A long replacement for the short *u* of (*u*→*ū*) + *ṣu* is accomplished by 6.3.136 *nipatasya ca*.

8.4.28 उपसर्गाद्बहुलम्

upasargād bahulam
/upasargāt 5/1 *bahulam* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *naḥ* #27) .
upasargasthān nimittād uttarasya naso nakārasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati bahulam
The *n* of *nas*, combined after an *upasarga* 'preverb' with *r* and *s* as replacement conditions, is variously (*bahulam*) replaced with *ṇ*.

EXAMPLES:

praṇaḥ śūdraḥ 'old śūdra'

praṇasaḥ 'he who has a beautiful nose'
praṇo rājā 'old king'

1. This rule is also found as: *upasargād anotparaḥ*. The phrase *anotparaḥ* is then interpreted as 'that which is not preceded, or followed, by *o*'. This dual interpretation of *taparakaraṇa* 'making *T* precede and follow' will, however, create difficulties. Thus, a *ṇ*-replacement may be available in *prano muñcatam* where *n* occurs after *o*. The second interpretation will block *ṇ*-replacement in *praṇo vanirdevatā*. This dual consideration of *taparakaraṇa*, especially as it relates to this rule, is very complex. I omit any further details.

Kāśikā reads *bahulam* to account for this, as well as usages of the classical language. That is, *chandasi* is not carried over. The *n* of *nas*, when occurring after an *upasarga*, is variously replaced with *ṇ*.

Consider *praṇaḥ śudraḥ*, *praṇasaḥ*, etc., as examples. Note that *praṇasa* is derived with the *samāsānta* affix *aC*, where *nāsikā* is concurrently replaced with *nas* (5.4.119 *upasargāc ca*). Why use *upasargāt* when *pra* cannot be termed an *upasarga* without association of a verbal root? This *upasarga* is then used to refer to items enumerated in the class headed by *pra* (1.1.58 *prādayaḥ*).

8.4.29 **कृत्यचः**

kṛty acaḥ
/kṛti 7/1 *acaḥ* 5/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #28)
kṛtstho yo nakāro' c uttaras tasyopasargasthān nimittād uttarasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati
A *n* which occurs after a vowel (*aC*) in a *kṛt* affix is replaced with *ṇ*, provided the affix occurs after a root whose preverb contains *r* and *ṣ* as conditions of this replacement.

EXAMPLES:

prayāṇam 'journey'
pariyāṇam
pramāṇam 'measure, standard'
parimāṇam 'measure'
prayāyamāṇam
pariyayamāṇam
prayāṇīyam
pariyāṇīyam
aprayāṇiḥ
apariyāṇiḥ
prayāyiṇau
pariyāyiṇau

prahīṇaḥ
parihīṇaḥ 'renounced'

1. This rule replaces the *n* of a *kṛt* suffix with *ṇ*, when *n* occurs after a vowel and the *kṛt* affix occurs after a root whose preverb contains *r* and *ṣ* as replacement conditions. The *n* of the following *kṛt* affixes forms the focus of this *ṇ*-replacement: *ana* (a replacement of *yu*), *māna* (*āna* with augment *mUK*; 7.2.82 *āne muk*): *ŚānaC* (3.2.124 *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv . . .*), *KānaC* (3.2.106 *liṭaḥ kānaj vā*) and *CānaŚ* (3.2.129 *tācchīlyavayovacana . . .*), *anīyaR* (3.1.96 *tavyattavyānīyaraḥ*), *ani* (3.3.112 *ākrośe nañy aniḥ*), *inI* (*ṆinI*: 3.2.78 *supy ajātau . . .*; 3.3.170 *āvaśyakādhamarṇyayor . . .*) and replacements of *niṣṭhā* (1.1.26 *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā*) offered in the domain of 8.2.42 *radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto ṇaḥ*.

Now consider some illustrations:

(*a*) *ana*: *pra-yā* + (*LyuṬ*→*ana*) → *prayāṇa* + *sU* → *prayāṇam*, where *ana* is a replacement of *LyuṬ* (3.1.133 *ṇvultṛcau*; 7.1.1 *yuvor anākau*). A similar example with the preverb *pari* will be: *pari-yāṇam*.

(*b*) *ŚānaC*: Consider *pra-yā* + (*LAṬ*→*ŚānaC*) → *pra-yā* + *yaK* + *ŚānaC* → *pra-yā* + *yaK* + *mUK* + *ŚānaC* = *prayāyamā*(*n*→*ṇ*) *a* = *prayāyamāṇa* + *sU* = *prayāyamāṇam*, where *ŚānaC* (3.2.124 *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv . . .*) replaces *LAṬ* (3.2.123 *vartamāne laṭ*) with the signification of *karman* 'object'. Affix *yaK* (3.1.67 *sārvadhātuke yak*) is then introduced under the condition of *ŚānaC*, an affix termed *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*). Augment *mUK* (7.2.82 *āne muk*) is then introduced to complete the string for deriving *pra-yāyamāṇa*. A similar derivate with *pari* will be: *pari-yāyamāṇam*.

(*c*) *anīyaR*: Consider *pra-yā* + *anīya*(*R*) = *pra-yā* + *anīya* = *pra-y*(*ā*+*a*→*ā*) *nīya* = *prayā*(*n*→*ṇ*) *īya* = *prayāṇīya* + *sU* = *prayāṇīyam*, where *anīyaR* is introudced by 3.1.96 *tavyattavyānīyaraḥ*. A similar example with *pari* will be: *paryāṇīyam*.

(*d*) *ani*: Consider (*naÑ*→*a*) + *pra-yā* + *ani* = *aprayāṇi* + *sU* = *aprayāṇiḥ*, where *ani* (3.3.112 *ākrośe nañi aniḥ*) is introduced after verbal root *yā* 'to move, go' under the cooccurrence condition of *naÑ* 'not'. A similar derivate with *pari* will be: *apariyāṇiḥ*.

(*e*) *inI*: Consider *prayāyiṇau* and *prayāyiṇaḥ*, the nominative dual form of *pra-*(*yā* + (*Ñ*) *in*(*I*) = *prayā* + *y*(*UK*) + *in*. We get *prayāyi*(*n*→*ṇ*) + *au* → *prayāyiṇau*. Recall that affix *ṆinI* is introduced by 3.2.78 *supy ajātau. . .* . Rule 7.3.33 *āto yuk ciṇkṛtoḥ* then introduces augment *yUK*. A derivate with *pari* will be: *pariyāyiṇau*.

(*f*) *niṣṭhādeśa* 'replacement of affixes termed *niṣṭhā*:

Consider *pra-OhāK* + *Kta* → *pra-hā* + (*t*→*n*) *a* → *pra-h*(*ā*→*ī*) + *na* → *prahī*(*n*→*ṇ*) *a* = *prahīṇa* + *sU* = *prahīṇaḥ*, where *t* of the *niṣṭhā* suffix *Kta* is replaced with *n* (8.2.45 *oditaś ca*). A long *ī* then replaces the *ā* of verbal root

OhāK (6.4.66 *ghumāsthāgāpā . . .*) before the *niṣṭhā* suffix termed *ārdhadhātuka* (3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*). We can similarly derive *parihīṇaḥ* from *pari-OhāK + Kta*. Derivates of the *niṣṭhā* suffix *Ktavat*, when used after *OhāK* 'abandon' with *pra* and *pari*, will be: *prahīṇavat + sU = prahīṇavān* and *parihīṇavat + sU = parihīṇavān*.

(2) Why do we state the condition of *acaḥ* 'occurring after a vowel'? Consider *pra-masj + (K) ta = pra-ma + n(UM) + sj + ta → prama + (n→ϕ) + sj + ta → pra-ma + (s→ϕ)j + ta → pra-ma + (j→g) + ta → pra-mag + (t→n) a = pramagna + sU = pramagnaḥ*, where this rule cannot replace the *n* of *niṣṭhā* suffix *Kta* with *ṇ*. For, *Kta* does not occur after a vowel. Incidentally, augment *nUM* is introduced by 7.1.60 *masjinaśorjhali*. The *n* of *nUM* is then deleted by 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala. . . .* The *s* of *masj*, since it occurs at the beginning of a conjunct (*saṃyoga*), also goes through deletion (8.2.29 *skoḥ saṃyogādyor . . .*). The *j* is, of course, replaced with *g* (*kutva*; 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*). We can similarly get *parimagnaḥ*.

3. A *vārttika* proposal is made for deriving *nir-vid + (K) ta → nir-vid + (t→n) a → nir-vi(d→n) + na → nir-vid + (n→ṇ) + na → nir-viṇ + (n→ṇ) a = nirviṇṇa*, where *vid* means *lābha* 'to gain, reflect'. It cannot mean *vid* 'to know', since it is a root which allows augment *iṬ*. Thus, *nirviṇṇo' smi khalasaṅgena* 'I am saddened by this company of crooks'; *nirviṇṇo' ham atra vāsena* 'I am saddened by living here'.

8.4.30 णेर्विभाषा

ṇer vibhāṣā

/ṇeḥ 5/1 *vibhāṣā* 1/1/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #28 *kṛty acaḥ* #29)

ṇyantād yo vihitaḥ kṛtpratyayaḥ tatsthasya nakārasyopasargasthān nimittād uttarasya vibhāṣā ṇakārādeśo bhavati

The post-vocalic *n* of a *kṛt* (3.1.93 *kṛd atiṅ*) affix which occurs after a verbal root ending in *ṆiC* (*ṇyanta*; 3.1.26 *hetumati ca*) is, optionally, replaced with *ṇ*, provided the affix occurs after a root whose preverb contains *r* and *ṣ* as conditions of this replacement.

EXAMPLES:

prayāpaṇam
prayāpanam
pariyāpaṇam
pariyāpanam
prayāpyamāṇam
prayāpyamānam
prayāpaṇīyam
prayāpanīyam
aprayāpaṇiḥ

aprayāpaniḥ
prayāpiṇau
prayāpinau

1. Why use *vibhāṣā* 'optionally' when this rule, at the very strength of its formulation (*ārmbhasāmarthya*), could be easily understood as optional. It could also be understood, otherwise. How? Some may claim this rule to be obligatory (*nitya*), especially if one interprets the preceding rule as optional, by carrying the *anuvṛtti* of *bahulam* (*Nyāsa*: *pūrveṇa nitye prāpte vikalpārtham idam ārabhyate . . .*).

2. This rule, optionally, allows a replacement in *ṇ* for the post-vocalic *n* of a *kṛt* affix which occurs after a verbal root ending in *ṆiC*. Consider *pra-(yā+ṆiC)* → *pra-(yā+pUK+ṆiC)* = *prayāpi* + (*LyuṬ*→*ana*) = *prayāp*(*i*→ϕ) + *ana* → *prayāpa*(*n*→*ṇ*) *a* = *prayāpaṇa* + *sU* = *prayāpaṇam*, where the root ends in *ṆiC* (3.1.26 *hetumati ca*). Affix *LyuṬ* (3.1.133 *ṇvultṛcau*), which gets replaced with *ana* (7.1.1 *yuvor anākau*), forms the right condition for introduction of augment *pUK* (7.3.36 *arttihrīvlī . . .*). Affix *ṆiC*, however, goes through deletion (6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*). We similarly derive *pariyāpaṇam*. Corresponding derivates with no replacement in *ṇ* are: *prayāpanam* and *pariyāpanam*. Derivates of affixes *ṆānaC*, etc., can be derived with *ṆiC*, and desired *mUK*, etc., with no difficulty.

3. *Kāśikā*, in its paraphrase of this rule, uses *vihitaḥ* 'operationally introduced' as an adjective to *kṛtpratyayaḥ* 'an affix termed *kṛt*'. This it does to indicate that *n* can be replaced with *ṇ*, even when the root and *kṛt* affix are intervened by something else. The ablative of *ṇeḥ* would, in view of 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*, expect the *kṛt* affix to follow the causal root immediately. Consider, for example, *prayāpyamāṇam* where *yaK* intervenes between the root and the *kṛt* affix (*Kāś*: *vihitaviśeṣaṇaṃ kim? prayāpyamāṇam ity atra yakā vyavadhāne' pi yathā syād iti*).

8.4.31 हलश्चेजुपधात्

halaś cejupadhāt
/ halaḥ 5/1 *ca* ϕ *ijupadhāt* 5/1 = *ic upadhā yasya* = *ijupadhaḥ* (*bv.*), *tasmāt*/ (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #28 *kṛty acaḥ* #29 *vibhāṣā* #30)
halādir yo dhātur ijupadhas tasmāt paro yaḥ kṛtpratyayaḥ tatsthasya nakārasyāca uttarasyopasargasthān nimittād uttarasya vibhāṣā ṇakārādeśo bhavati
The *n* of a *kṛt* affix which occurs after a vowel is, optionally, replaced with *ṇ* when the affix occurs after a consonant-initial verbal root which has a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory term *iC* in its *upadhā*, and occurs after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as replacement conditions.

EXAMPLES:

prakopaṇam
prakopanam
parikopaṇam
parikopanam

1. Note that *kṛty acaḥ* is carried over. This rule uses *ca* 'and' to attract *vibhāṣā* 'optionally'. It will also block the *anuvṛtti* of *vibhāṣā* from applying to subsequent rules. Our present rule thus requires the *n* of the *kṛt* affix to occur after a vowel. It also requires the root after which the *kṛt* affix is introduced to begin with a consonant and contain a vowel denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *iC* in its *upadhā* 'penultimate position'. Of course, the root is to be used after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as conditions of *ṇ*-replacement. Consider (*pra-kup* + (*LyuṬ*→*ana*)) → *prakopa*(*n*→*ṇ*) *a* = *prakopaṇa* + *sU* → *prakopaṇam* and *prakopanam*. We will similarly get *parikopaṇam* and *parikopanam*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *halaḥ* 'beginning with a consonant'? Consider *prehaṇam* and *prohaṇam*, where the roots begin with *ī* (*īhA* 'to strive') and *ū* (*ūhA* 'to ponder, argue'). The *n* of these derivates must obligatorily be replaced with *ṇ* (8.4.29 *kṛtyacaḥ*). Incidentally, *halaḥ* is here interpreted as *halādiḥ* 'that which begins with a consonant'. How can one get the sense of *ādi* 'beginning' without using it in the rule? This specification with *halaḥ* will become useless if it meant *halantāt* 'after that which ends in a consonant'. All roots which have an *iC* vowel in their *upadhā* end in a consonant. Since *halaḥ* cannot specify something which is obligatorily there, it is interpreted as *halādiḥ* 'that which begins with a consonant'.

Note that the requirement of *acaḥ* 'after a vowel' must also be satisfied. We cannot get the *n* of the affix replaced with *ṇ*, for example, in *pari-bhuj* + *K*(*t*→*n*) *a* → *paribhu*(*j*→*g*) *na* = *paribhugna*.

Why do we state the condition of *ijupadhāt* 'after that which has *iC* in its *upadhā*'? To easily infer that such roots always end in a consonant. This is why *halaḥ* is interpreted as *halādiḥ* 'that which begins with a consonant'. There is no point stating something obvious with *halaḥ*?

8.4.32 इजादेः सनुमः

ijādeḥ sanumaḥ
/ijādeḥ 5/1 = *ic ādir yasya* (*bv.*), *tasmāt*; *sanumaḥ* 5/1 = *numā saha* = *sanum* (*bv.*), *tasmāt/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #28 *kṛty acaḥ* #29 *halaḥ* #31)
ijādeḥ sanumo halantād dhātor vihito yaḥ kṛt tatsthasya nakārasyopasargasthān nimittād uttarasya ṇakāro bhavati

A *n* after the vowel of a *kṛt* affix is replaced with *ṇ*, when the *kṛt* affix occurs after a verbal root which begins with a vowel denoted by *iC*, ends in a consonant and is used with augment *nUM*, provided a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as conditions of replacement precedes.

EXAMPLES:

preṅkhaṇam
pareṅkhanam
preṅgaṇam
pareṅganam

1. Note that *halaḥ* is carried over. It is interpreted as 'after a root which ends in a consonant'. There is no root which begins with an *iC* vowel and is, at the same time, also consonant-initial. Recall that *halaḥ* was interpreted as *halādiḥ* 'that which begins with a consonant' in the earlier rule. For, all roots beginning with an *iC* vowel end in a consonant. A *tadantavidhi* interpretation '*x* is also that which ends in *x*' was thus not possible. It is for this reason that *halaḥ* of the preceding rule was interpreted, via *tadādividhi* 'interpreting *x* as that which begins with *x*'. A *tadādividhi* interpretation of *halaḥ* is blocked here because of *ijādeḥ* 'after that which has an *iC* vowel at the beginning'. We therefore interpret *halaḥ* here, via *tadantavidhi*.

Recall that a specification made with *nUM*, in 8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi*, marks an *anusvāra*. A root which is here desired to be used with *nUM* cannot qualify as such when *nUM* is replaced with *anusvāra*. What is desired here can be accomplished only via *sthānivadbhāva* 'treating a replacement similar to what it replaced'. Consider *pra-ikh(I)* + (*LyuṬ*→*ana*) → *pra-i+nUM+kh* + *ana* → (*pr*(*a*+*i*→*e*)+*n*(*UM*)+*kh*) + *ana* → *pre*(*n*→*ṅ*)*khana* → *preṅkha* (*n*→*ṇ*) *a* = *preṅkhaṇa* + *sU* = *preṅkhaṇam*. We will similarly get *preṅgaṇam*. Note that *nUM* is introduced to *ikhI* 'to move' and *igI* 'to move' by 7.1.58 *idito num dhātoḥ* on account of their *I* as an *it*. The *n* of *nUM* is then replaced with *anusvāra* (8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*). Rule 8.4.57 *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ* then replaces the *anusvāra* with *ṅ*, a nasal homogeneous with what follows (*parasavarṇa*). If the homogeneous nasal replacement is treated as *asiddha* 'suspended', we will have the *anusvāra*. The *n* of *unbh* 'to fill' is part of the root. We thus get *pra-unbh* + *LyuṬ* → *pro*(*n*→*m*) *bh* + *ana* → *prombhana* + *sU* → *prombhaṇam*. We cannot prove here that we had *nUM* from the beginning. But this can be accepted as marking the *anusvāra*. That is why *n* can be replaced with *ṇ*.

A specification, made via *nUM*, which does not offer an operation relative to *nUM*, is subject to restrictive interpretation (*niyamārtham*). *Kāśikā* states that *ṇ*-replacement, via specification of *nUM*, can already be accomplished by 8.4.29 *kṛty acaḥ*. This new formulation must then be intended for what cannot be accomplished by 8.4.29 *kṛty acaḥ*. This is why a provision made

against one which already exists becomes restrictive (*siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*). That is, this *ṇ*-replacement applies only after a root which begins with an *iC* vowel, and is used with *nUM* (*Kāś: ijāder eva sanumaḥ, nānyasmād iti*), and not after any other root used with *nUM*. Consider *pramaṅganam* and *parimaṅganam*, derivates of *magI* 'to crawl' which is not an *ijādi* '*iC*-initial' root with *nUM* (*ijādeḥ sanum*).

This replacement in *ṇ* has many requirements. As usual, the *n* must be part of a *kṛt* affix and it must occur after a vowel. The root after which this *kṛt* affix is introduced must (*i*) begin with a vowel denoted by *iC*, (*ii*) end in a consonant, (*iii*) be used with augment *nUM*, and (*iv*) occur after a preverb which may contain *r* and *ṣ* as replacement conditions.

8.4.33 वा निंसनिक्षनिन्दाम्

vā niṃsanikṣanindām
/vā ϕ niṃsanikṣanindām 6/3 = *niṃsaś ca nikṣaś ca nind ca = niṃsa . . . nindaḥ* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyām no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #28 *kṛty acaḥ* #29)
'*niṃsa, nikṣa, nind' ity eteṣāṃ nakārasyopasargasthān nimittad uttarasya vā ṇakārādeśo bhavati*
A replacement in *ṇ* comes, optionally, in place of the *n* of verbal roots *niṃsA*, *nikṣA* and *nind*, when a *kṛt* affix follows and the roots occur after a preverb containing *r* and *ṣ* as conditions of replacement.

EXAMPLES:

praṇiṃsanam
praniṃsanam
praṇikṣaṇam
pranikṣaṇam
praṇindanam
pranindanam

1. Note that *ṇisI* 'to kiss', *ṇikṣA* 'to be angry' and *ṇidI* 'to censure' are roots where *n* at the beginning has its source in *upadeśa* 'initial citation'. This *ṇ* is replaced with *ṇ* by 6.1.63 *ṇo naḥ*. Additionally, the root with *I* as an *it* receives *nUM* (7.1.58 *idito num dhātoḥ*). We thus get *niṃsA*, *nikṣA* and *nindA*. Now consider (*pra-niṃs* + (*LyuṬ→ana*)) + *sU* = *praṇiṃsanam* and *praniṃsanam*. We similarly get *praṇikṣaṇam* and *pranikṣaṇam*, etc.

2. Note that rule 8.4.14 *upasargād asamāse' pi . . .* will account for this *ṇ*-replacement on the basis of its root-initial *ṇ* in *upadeśa*. But that provision is obligatory (*nitya*). This rule is formulated for offering *ṇ*-replacement, optionally.

8.4.34 **न भाभूपूकमिगमिप्यायीवेपाम्**

na bhābhūpūkamigamipyāyīvepām
/ na ϕ bhābhūpūkamigamipyāyīvepām 6/3 = *bhāś ca bhūś ca pūś ca kamiś ca gamiś ca pyāyīś ca vep ca = bhā . . . vepaḥ* (*itar. dv.*), *teṣām/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *upasargāt* #28 *kṛty acaḥ* #29)
'*bhā, bhū, pū, kami, gami, pyāyī, vep' ity eteṣām upasargasthān nimittād uttarasya kṛtsthasya nakārasya ṇakārādeśo na bhavati*
The vowel-initial *n* of a *kṛt* affix which occurs after verbal roots *bhā* 'to shine', *bhū* 'to be, become', *pū* 'to cleanse', *kamI* 'to glow, love', *gamI* 'to go' and *vep* 'to tremble' is not replaced with *ṇ*, when these roots are used after a preverb containing *r* and *s* as conditions of this replacement.

EXAMPLES:

prabhānam
paribhānam
prabhavanam
prapavanam
paripavanam
prakamanam
parikamanam
pragamanam
parigamanam
prapyāyanam
paripyāyanam
pravepanam
parivepanam

1. This rule negates a *ṇ*-replacement which was, in turn, made available by 8.4.28 *kṛty acaḥ*. *Kāśikā* adds a desideratum (*iṣṭi*) in connection with the specification of *pū* 'to cleanse'. That is, *pū* is desired to be interpreted as *pūN̄* 'to cleanse, purify', a root of the *kryādi* group. It is not desired to refer to *pūṄ* of the *svādi* group. A *ṇ*-replacement in derivates of *pūṄ* is obligatory. Thus, *prapavaṇaṃ somasya* 'detailed purification of Soma'.

2. A *vārttika* proposal is made to block *ṇ*-replacement in the *kṛt*-derivates of these roots, even when these roots are used with the causal affix *ṆiC* (*vt.* *ṇyantānāṃ bhādīnām upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam*). Consider *prabhāpanam* and *paribhāpanam* as examples.

8.4.35 **षात्पदान्तात्**

ṣāt padāntāt
/ṣāt 5/1 *padāntāt* 5/1 = *pade antaḥ* (*sapt. tat.*), *tasmin/*

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *na* # 34)
ṣakārāt padāntād uttarasya nakārasya ṇakārādeśo na bhavati
A *n* which occurs after a *pada* terminating in *ṣ* is not replaced with *ṇ*.

EXAMPLES:

niṣpānam
duṣpānam
sarpiṣpānam
yajuṣpānam

1. Note that 8.3.41 *idudupadhasya ca* replaces the *visarga* of *nis* and *dus* with *ṣ*. We thus get *niṣpānam* and *duṣpānam* where 8.4.29 *kṛty acaḥ* requires the *n* of *pānam* 'drinking' to be replaced with *ṇ*. A similar blocking of *ṇ*-replacement is seen in *sarpiṣpānam* 'drinking of ghee' and *yajuṣpānam* 'drinking by chanting a *yajus* hymn' (?), the two genitive *tatpuruṣa* compounds where the first combines with a *ṣaṣṭhī* denoting *karman* 'object' (2.2.14 *karmaṇi ca*). The second compound is formed by 2.1.32 *kartṛkaraṇe*. . . . The *ṣ*-replacement in this second compound is accomplished by 8.3.45 *nityaṃ samāse*. . . . The replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) in this example is made available by 8.4.10 *vā bhāvakaraṇayoḥ*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *ṣāt* 'after a *ṣ*'? Consider *nirṇayaḥ* 'decision, resolve' where, because of an absence of *ṣ*, *ṇ*-replacement cannot be blocked.

Why do we state the condition of *padāntāt* 'after the final in a *pada*'? Consider *kuṣṇāti* where *ṇ*-replacement must apply.

3. Note that *pade antaḥ padāntaḥ* of *padāntāt* is not a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound. It is a locative *tatpuruṣa*, instead. How do we know it? We know it from the specification by *anta* 'end' of *antāt*. Otherwise, a specification made with a sound segment will require *tadantavidhi* interpretation. This, in turn, will give us the meaning: 'after a *pada* which ends in *ṣ*'. It is for this reason that *ṇ*-replacement in *susarpiṣkeṇa* and *suyajuṣkeṇa* cannot be blocked by this rule. The first example is a *bahuvrīhī* (*śobhanaṃ sarpir asya* 'he whose ghee is good'), where affix *ka* is introduced (5.4.254 *śeṣād vibhāṣā*).

8.4.36 नशेः षान्तस्य

naśeḥ ṣāntasya
/naśeḥ 6/1 *ṣāntasya* 6/1 = *ṣ ante yasya* (*bv.*), *tasya/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *na* # 34)
naśeḥ ṣakārāntasya ṇakārādeśo na bhavati
A replacement in *ṇ* does not come in place of *n* of verbal root *naś* 'to disappear, be destroyed' when the same ends in *ṣ*.

EXAMPLES:

pranaṣṭaḥ
parinaṣṭaḥ

1. This negation is made against replacement in *ṇ* (*ṇatva*) of 8.4.14 *upasargād asamāse' pi*. . . . Consider *pra-naś* + *Kta* = *pranaṣṭa*, where augment *nUM* is introduced by 7.1.60 *masjinaśor jhali*. This *n* goes through deletion of 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala*. . . . The final *ś* of the root is replaced with *ṣ* of 8.2.36 *vaścabhrasj*. . . . Finally, *t* of *Kta* goes through a replacement in *ṭ* (*ṣṭutva*; 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*). We similarly get (*pari-naś* + *Kta*) + *sU* → *parinaṣṭaḥ*.

Why do we state the condition of *ṣāntasya* '. . . ending in *ṣ*'? Consider *pra-naś* + *ya* + *ti* → *pra-*(*n*→*ṇ*) *aś* + *ya-ti* = *praṇaśyati* '. . . gets destroyed', where *naś* does not end in *ṣ*. Thus, replacement in *ṇ* cannot be blocked here. This same also applies to *pariṇaśyati*.

The word *anta* 'end' is used here so that *ṇ*-replacement can be blocked, also where *ṣ* was witnessed at the end, previously (*bhūtapūrvao' pi*). Consider *pranaṅkṣyati* '. . . will get destroyed' where the *ś* of *naś* is replaced with *k* (8.2.41 *ṣaḍhoḥ kaḥ si*), via *ṣ* (8.2.36 *vraścabhrasj* . . .). Notice here that *ṣ* at the end of *naś* is further replaced with *k*. This same is also witnessed in *parinaṅkṣyati*.

8.4.37 पदान्तस्य

padāntasya
/*padāntasya* 6/1 = *padasya antaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasya*/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *na* # 34)
padānto yo nakāras tasya ṇakārādeśo na bhavati
A replacement in *ṇ* does not come in place of a *n* which occurs at the end of a *pada*.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣān 'accusative plural of *vṛkṣa*'
plakṣān '. . . of *plakṣa*'
arīn '. . . of *ari*'
girīn '. . . of *giri*'

1. This negation is made against what was made available by 8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi*. Consider *vṛkṣa* + (*Ś*) *as* → *vṛkṣa* + *as* → *vṛkṣ*(*a*+*a*→*ā*) *s* → *vṛkṣā*(*s*→*n*) → *vṛkṣān*, where a single long replacement in *ā* is accomplished by 6.1.101 *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇaḥ*. The final *s* of *vṛkṣās* is replaced with *n* by 6.1.102 *tasmāc chaso naḥ puṃsi*.

8.4.38 पदव्यवायेऽपि

padavyavāye' pi
/padavyavāye 7/1 = *padena vyavāyaḥ* (*tṛt. tat.*), *tasmin*; *api* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye' pi* #2 *na* # 34)
padena vyavāye' pi nimittanimittinor nakārasya ṇakāra ādeśo na bhavati
A replacement in *ṇ* does not come in place of a *n* which occurs separated by its condition, i.e., *r* and *ṣ*, even by a *pada.*

EXAMPLES:

māṣakumbhavāpena 'by sowing a full jar of seeds'
caturaṅgayogena 'in association with that which has four limbs'
prāvanaddham
paryavanaddham
pragān-nayāmaḥ
parigān-nayāmaḥ

1. The word *pada-vyavāya* 'intervention of a fully inflected word' refers to separation of 'condition' (*nimitta*; *r/ṣ*) and 'conditioned' (*nimittin*; *n*) by a *pada.* Consider *māṣāṇāṃ kumbhaḥ* = *māṣakumbhaḥ* 'a jar full of beans (*māṣā*)', a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound. Affix *aṆ* (3.2.1 *karmaṇy aṇ*) is now introduced after verbal root *vap* 'to sow', under the cooccurrence condition of a *pada* with the denotation of *karman* 'object', i.e., *kumbhamāṣa* + *am.* We thus get *kumbhamāṣavāpa*, where instrumental singular ending *Ṭā* is introduced to derive *māṣakumbhavāpena.* The *n* of *vāpena* may qualify for a replacement in *ṇ* under the provision of 8.4.11 *prātipadikāntanumvibhaktiṣu ca.* For, *kumbha* of *māṣakumbhavāpena* is not included within the specification of 8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅ*. . . . This rule blocks *ṇ*-replacement of *n* even when there is an intervention of a *pada* between *māṣa* and *vāpena.* We witness similar blocking of *ṇ*-replacement in *caturṅga-yogena*, an instrumental singular with a *bahuvrīhi* compound *catvāri aṅgāni yasya* = *catyuraṅgaḥ* 'he of whose there are four limbs'. Rule 2.1.32 *kartṛkaraṇe kṛtā bahulam* combines it in a compound with *yoga* + *Ṭā* to produce *caturaṅgena yogaḥ* = *caturaṅgayogaḥ.* An instrumental singular *Ṭā* is then introduced to produce *caturaṅgayogena.* The *n* of *yogena* can now be replaced with *ṇ* of 8.4.13 *kumati ca.* Our present rule blocks it again. A replacement in *ṇ* is also available to *pra-ava-naddham*, a compound termed *gati* (2.2.18 *kugatiprādayaḥ*). Refer to derivational details of *naddham* under 8.2.34 *naho dhaḥ.* This rule blocks *ṇ*-replacement under the intervention of a *pada*, i.e., *ava.* The *ṇ*-replacement is available to *pra-ava-naddham* from 8.4.14 *upasargād asamāse' pi.* This same is also applicable to *pary-ava-naddham.*

Now consider *pra-gām-nayāmaḥ*, a Vedic usage (*chāndas*), where *gām*, a *pada* ending in the accusative (*dvitīyā*), intervenes between the preverb *pra*

and the first plural present active form of verbal root *nī*, i.e., *nayāmaḥ*. The *n* of *nayāmaḥ* is again not replaced with *ṇ*. Usages where a preverb is separated from the verbal form are not found in the Classical language (*bhāṣā*). They are found in the Vedic only (1.4.81 *chandasi pare' pi*). Incidentally, *ā* of *g(o+a→ā) m = gām*, is a single replacement of *o+a* (6.1.93 *auto' ṃśasoḥ*). We thus get *pragānnayāmaḥ* and *parigānnayāmaḥ*.

2. A *vārttika* proposal is made to qualify this blocking of *ṇ*-replacement. That is, it should exclude instances where a *taddhita* intervenes (*vt: padavyavāye' taddhite*). Thus, *ṇ*-replacement should not be blocked in *ārdragomayeṇa* 'by wet cow-dung' and *śuṣkagomayeṇa* 'by dry cow-dung', where *gomaya* is a derivate of the *taddhita* affix *mayaṬ* (4.3.145 *goś ca purīṣe*). What intervenes here is *go* 'cow, bull', a *pada* in view of 1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*.

8.4.39 क्षुभ्नादिषु च

kṣubhnādiṣu ca

/kṣubhnādiṣu 7/3 = *kṣubhnā ādir yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣu; ca* ϕ/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ* #1 *aṭkupvāṅ-numvyavāye' pi* #2 *na* # 34)

'*kṣubhnā' ity evam ādiṣu śabdeṣu nakārasya ṇakārādeśo na bhavati*

A replacement in *ṇ* also does not come in place of the *n* of stems enumerated in the group headed by *kṣubhnā*.

EXAMPLES:

kṣubhnāti
kṣubhnītaḥ
kṣubhnanti
nṛnamanaḥ

1. Note that a specification with *kṣubh + Śnā → kṣubhnā* is made here to refer to the form of the word *kṣubhnā*. It is not made to refer to verbal root *kṣubh* 'to move'. Consequently, *ṇ*-replacement in *kṣobhaṇam* 'disturbing' cannot be blocked.

2. This rule also blocks *ṇ*-replacement in stems listed under the group headed by *kṣubhnā*. This provision goes against provisions of 8.4.1 *raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ . . .* and 8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅ . . .* (*kṣubhnāti / kṣubhnītaḥ*), etc. Negation of *ṇ*-replacement in *nṛn* (*manuṣyān*) *namati= nṛnamanaḥ* 'he who pays respect to humans' goes against 8.4.3 *pūrvapadāt . . .*, or 8.4.25 *chandasy ṛdavagrahāt*. Incidentally, the *ā* of *kṣubh + Śnā + ti* is replaced with *ī* of 6.4.113 *ī haly aghoḥ*. The *ā* of *Śnā* is deleted (6.4.112 *śnābhyastayor . . .*) in *kṣubh + Śnā + anti = kṣubhnanti*, before a vowel-initial suffix.

If *kṣubhnā* specifies its word-form, a replacement in *ṇ* cannot be blocked in *kṣubhnītaḥ* and *kṣubhnanti*. For, we get the forms as *kṣubhnī* and *kṣubhn* on

account of *ī*-replacement and *ā*-deletion. This *ṇ*-replacement, in *kṣubhnītaḥ* and *kṣubhnanti*, is negated on the basis of *sthānivbadbhāva* 'treating a replacement as what it replaced'. That is, by treating *ī*-replacement and *ā*-deletion similar to *ā*. It is also supported by *PŚ* (38): *ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat* 'that which is modified in one place is treated as not any different'.

Now consider *harinandī, harinandana* and *harinagara* where *nandin* (a derivate of *ṆiniI*), *nandana* and *nagara* combine in a compound as final constituents, and denote a name (*saṃjñā*). A replacement in *ṇ* is here made available by 8.4.3 *pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām agaḥ*. A similar *ṇ*-replacement is also negated in *narīnṛtyate*, against the provision made by 8.4.2 *aṭkupvāṅ*. . . . Incidentally, rule 7.4.90 *rīgṛdupadhasya ca* introduces augment *rīK* in *narīnṛtyate*. This same way we get *ṇ*-replacement blocked in *tṛpA* + *Śnu* + (*LAṬ→tiP*) = *tṛpnoti*, where *Śnu*, against *ŚyaN*, is introduced by transposition (*vyatyaya*). We also find negation of *ṇ*-replacement in *parinarttanam* and *parigahanam*, etc., both *LyuṬ*-derivates of *nṛt* 'to dance'.

3. A proposal (*vt. ācāryād aṇatvaṃ ca*) negates *ṇ*-replacement for a *n* which occurs after *ācārya*. Thus, we get *ācāryabhogīnaḥ* and *ācāryānī*.

Yet another proposal (*vt. irikādibhyo vanottarapadebhyaḥ saṃjñāyām*) requires negating *ṇ*-replacement when *vana* is combined to follow *irikā, timira, samīra, kubera, hari* and *karmara*. Thus, *irikāvanam*, etc. These are all names.

8.4.40 स्तोः श्चुनाश्चुः

stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ
/stoḥ 6/1 = *saś ca tuś ca* = *stuḥ* (*sam. dv.*), *tayoḥ*; *ścunā* 3/1 *śaś ca cuś ca* = *ścuḥ* (*sam. dv.*), *tena*; *ścuḥ* = *śaś ca cus ca* (*sam. dv.*)/
(*saṃhitāyām*)
sakāratavargayoḥ śakāracavargābhyāṃ sannipāte śakāracavargāv ādeśau bhavataḥ
A replacement in *ś*, and a sound denoted by *cU* as well, comes, respectively, in place of a *s*, and a sound denoted by *tU* 'a consonant of the *t*-series', when *ś*, and a sound denoted by *cU* 'a consonant of the *c*-series', occur in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣaś śete
plakṣaś śete
vṛkṣaś cinoti
plakṣaś cinoti
vṛkṣaś chādayati
plakṣaś chādayati
agnicic chete
agnicic cinoti

agnicic chādayati
agnicij jayati
agnicij jhakāraḥ
agniciñ ñakāraḥ
majjati
bhṛjjati
vṛścati

1. This rule allows sound segments, namely *s* and any consonant of the *tU*-series, to be replaced by *ś* and a corresponding consonant of the *c*-series, when *ś*, and any consonant of the *t*-series, follows in close proximity. This is what generally is referred to by *cutva*. Note that assignment of equivalents (1.3.10 *yathāsaṃkhyam . . .*) is not desired here to be made in accord with order of enumeration of *s* and *tU*. For a *s*, when followed by *ś*, and *cU*, both, can be replaced with *ś*. We will similarly get a *tU* replaced with *cU*, when either *ś* or *cU* follow in close proximity. This question of assignment of equivalency in accord with order of enumeration arises since the two operational foci (*s* and *tU*) are equal in number to two conditions, *ś* and *cU*. If an equivalency in order of enumeration was intended in relation to replacement conditions, a *tU* after *ś* would simply not be available for a replacement in *cU*. Pāṇini should then not have made a negative provision for this (8.4.44 *śāt*). For, a negation is only made against some positive provision (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*: *prāptipūrvakā hi pratiṣedhā bhavanti. yadi nimittaṃ prati yathāsaṃkhyaṃ syāt, evaś sati śāt parasya tavargasya cutvaprāptir eva nāstīti 'śāt' iti pratiṣedhaṃ na kuryāt, kṛtaś cāsau, ataḥ sa jñāpayati-saṃkhyātānudeśo na bhavati*). Pāṇini's negative provision of 8.4.44 *śāt* thus indicates that equivalency in order of enumeration of conditions is not desired. An assignment of equivalency in accord with order of enumeration is, however, desired in selection of replacements. That is, a *s* will be replaced with *ś* and a sound segment of the *t*-series will be replaced with a corresponding sound segment of the *c*-series. It should be noted here that equivalency in order of enumeration only applies to *sthānī* 'that which is replaced' and *ādeśa* 'that which replaces'. It does not apply to *yoga* 'proximity connection'.

2. We thus get examples: *vṛkṣas śete* → *vṛkṣaś śete* and *plakṣas śete* → *plakṣaś śete*. The *visarga* (*ḥ*) of *vṛkṣa* + (*sU*→ *rU*→*ḥ*) = *vṛkṣaḥ* is replaced with *s* (8.3.36 *vā śari*). We similarly get *vṛkṣas cinoti* → *vṛkṣaś cinoti, palkṣaś cinoti; vṛkṣaś chādayati* and *plakṣaś chādayati*.

Examples of *tU* replaced with *cU* before *ś* are: *agnicit śete = agnicic* (*ś*→*ch*) *ete = agnicic chete* and *somasu*(*t*→*c*) *śete = somasuc* (*ś*→*ch*) *ete = somasuc chete*. Similar examples of *tU* replaced with *cU* before *cU* are: *agnici*(*t*→*c*) *chinoti* → *agnicic cinoti, somasuc cinoti; agnic chādayati, somasuc chādayati; aginicij jayati, somasuj jayati; agnicijjhakāram, somasuj + jhakāram* and *agnici*(*t*→*ñ*) + *ñakāram = agniciññakāram, somasuñ + ñakāram*. Similar replacements are witnessed in verbal forms: *majjati* ← *masj, bhrajjati* ← *bhrasj*; and *vṛścati* ← *vraśc*.

We similarly get (*yaj* + *naṄ*) + *sU*→ *yajñaḥ* 'sacrifice' (3.3.90 *yajayāca . . .*) and *yācñā* 'begging'. Note that Pāṇini did not formulate his rule as *stoḥ ścau . . .*, with *ścu* in the locative (*saptamī*). He used the instrumental *ścunā*, instead, so that a replacement with a preceding or following *ś* and *c* could both be accomplished. If the specification was made with the locative, only a following *ś* and *c* could have allowed this replacement (*Kāś*: '*stoḥ ścau*' *iti saptamīnirdeśo na kṛtaḥ; pūrveṇa pareṇa ca ścunā sannipāte ścutvaṃ yathā syād iti*).

8.4.41 ष्टुना ष्टुः

ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ
/ṣṭunā 3/1 = *ṣaś ca ṭuś ca* = *ṣṭuḥ* (*sam. dv.*), *tena*; *ṣṭuḥ* 1/1 (*sam. dv.*)*/* (*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *stoḥ* #40)
sakāratavargayoḥ ṣakāraṭavargābhyāṃ sannipāte ṣakāraṭavargāv ādeśau bhavataḥ
A replacement in *ṣ*, and any sound denoted by *ṭU*, comes in place of *s*, and any sound denoted by *tU*, respectively, when *ṣ*, and any sound denoted by *ṭU*, follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣas ṣaṇḍe
plakṣaṣ ṣaṇḍe
vṛkṣaṣ ṭīkate
plakṣaṣ ṭīkate
vṛkṣaṣ ṭhakāraḥ
plakṣaṣ ṭhakāraḥ
peṣṭā
peṣṭum
peṣṭavyam
kṛṣīṣṭa
kṛṣīṣṭhāḥ
agniciṭ ṭīkate
agniciṭ ṭhakāraḥ
agniciḍ ḍīnaḥ
agniciḍ ḍhaukate
agniciṇ ṇakāraḥ
aṭṭati
aḍḍati

1. Note that *stoḥ* is still carried over. This rule becomes very similar to the preceding. A *s*, and a sound denoted by *tU*, is replaced with *ṣ*, and any sound denoted by *ṭU*, respectively, when a *ṣ*, and any sound denoted by *ṭU*, follows in close proximity. Here again there is no assignment of equivalency in order

of enumeration. That is, insofar as equivalency relation between the two conditions is concerned. If this was not so, Pāṇini would not have made the negative provision of 8.4.43 *toḥ ṣiḥ* (see notes under the preceding rule). Thus, we get examples of *s→ṣ*: *vṛkṣas + ṣaṇḍe → vṛkṣaṣ ṣaṇḍe, plakṣaṣ ṣaṇḍe*; *vṛkṣa(s→ṣ) ṭīkate = vṛkṣaṣ ṭīkate, plakṣaṣ ṭīkate*; *vṛkṣaṣ ṭhakāraḥ* and *plakṣaṣ ṭhakāraḥ*.

Examples of *tU→ṣ* are as follows: *(piṣ + tṛC) + sU→ (peṣ + tṛC) + sU→ peṣṭā, piṣ + tumUN = peṣṭum* and *(piṣ + tavyat) + sU = peṣṭavyam*. We similarly get *kṛṣīṣṭa* (II:437-38) and *kṛṣīṣṭhāḥ*. Now consider examples of *t→ṭ*: *agnici(t→ṭ) ṭīkate = agniciṭ ṭīkate, somasuṭ ṭīkate*; *agniciṭ ṭhakāraḥ, somasuṭ ṭhakāraḥ*; *agnicid ḍīnaḥ, somasud ḍīnaḥ*; *agnicid ḍhaukate, somasud ḍhaukate*; *agniciṇ ṇakāraḥ, somasuṇ ṇakāraḥ*. We also find similar replacements in verbal forms: *aṭṭati ← aṭṭ* 'to insult' and *aḍḍati ← aḍḍ* 'to exert'. These roots are derived with *KvIP* and are listed in the *Dhātupāṭha* with *ṭ* and *ḍ* as their penultimate. Their final *ṭ* and *ḍ* go through deletion by 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*.

8.4.42 न पदान्ताट्टोरनाम्

na padāntāṭ ṭor anām
/na ϕ padāntāt 5/1 = *padasya antaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*), *tasmāt*; *ṭoḥ* 5/1 *anām* (deleted 6/1) = *na nām* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya/*
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *stuḥ* #40 *ṣṭuḥ* #41)
padāntāṭ ṭavargād uttarasya stoḥ ṣṭutvaṃ na bhavati 'nām' ity etad varjayitvā
A *s*, or any sound denoted by *tU*, is not replaced with *ṣ*, or any sound denoted by *ṭU*, when *s* and *tU*, except for occurring as part of *nām*, occur after a *pada*-final sound denoted by *ṭU* in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

śvaliṭ sāye
madhuliṭ tarati

1. This rule does not allow a replacement in *ṣ* or *ṭU* for a *s* or *tU*, with the exception of *nām*, when *s* and *tU* occur after a *pada*-final *ṭU*. Note that *anām* specifies the negation of *ām* used with augment *nUṬ* (*āgatanuṭkasya*). Consider *śvaliṭ sāye* and *madhuliṭ sāye* as examples. Recall that 8.3.29 *ḍaḥ si dhuṭ* introduces augment *dhUṬ* to a *pada* which begins with *s* and follows a *pada* ending in *ḍ*. Our examples qualify for application of this rule only when the option of *dhUṬ* is not accepted. The *s* then goes through replacement in *ṣṭU* (*ṣṭutva*) when *dhUṬ* is not introduced. The *dh* of *dhUṬ* goes through *ṣṭutva* when the option of *dhUṬ* is accepted. An example with *ṭ* will be: *madhuliṭ tarati*.

2. Why do we state the condition of *padāntāt* 'after the *pada*-final'? Consider *īṭṭe* 'I praise' which is a third singular middle present derivate of *īḍA* 'to praise'. This root takes middle endings because of its *anudātta* as an *it* (1.3.12 *anudāttaṅita . . .*). The *ŚaP* after this root is deleted on account of its listing

in the *adādi* group (2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ . . .*). Rule 8.4.55 *khari ca* replaces *ḍ* with *ṭ*.

Why do we state the condition of *ṭoḥ* 'after *ṭU*'? Consider (*sarpiṣ + tamaP*) + *sU* = *sarpiṣṭamam*, where this replacement cannot be blocked. Recall here that *sarpiṣ* 'ghee' is termed a *pada* before *tamaP* (1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*). A replacement in *ṭ* for *t*, after the *pada*-final *ṣ*, could have been negated in the absence of of *ṭoḥ*. This would have yielded a wrong form.

Why do we state *anām* 'with the exception of *nām*'? Consider *ṣaṣ + nām*, where *nām* follows. The final *ṣ* of *ṣaṣ* is replaced with *ḍ* (8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*). This *ḍ* is then replaced with *ṇ* of 8.4.45 *yaro' nunāsike' nunāsiko vā*.

Kāśikā states that negation of *anām* is not enough to cover other instances. Consequently, a proposal (*vt. anāmnavatinagarīṇām iti vaktavyam*) is made to specify *nām, navati* and *nagarī* as exceptions. Thus, *ṣaṇṇām* 'of the six . . .', *ṣaṇṇavatiḥ* 'sixty-nine' and *ṣaṇṇagarī* 'a group of six cities'.

8.4.43 तोः षि

toḥ ṣi
/toḥ 6/1 *ṣi* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *na* #42)
tavargasya ṣakāre yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
What replaces a sound denoted by *tU* when *ṣ* follows in close proximity does not apply here.

EXAMPLES:

agnicit ṣaṇḍe
bhavān ṣaṇḍe
mahān ṣaṇḍe

1. Note that *na* is still carried over. What is stated for *tU* when *ṣ* follows does not apply here. Consider *agnicit ṣaṇḍe, bhavān ṣaṇḍe* and *mahān ṣaṇḍe*, where a sound denoted by *ṭU* 'retroflex stop and nasal' cannot replace a sound denoted by *tU* 'dental stop and nasal', here *t* and *n*, when occurring in close proximity before *ṣ*. This rule is an exception to 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*.

Note that a *stU* is indeed replaced with *ṣṭu* when *ṣṭu* precedes in close proximity (*pūrvabhūtena sannipātena*). This becomes clear from the locative specification of *ṣi*. Consider *peṣṭā* and *peṣṭum* as examples.

Recall that *ṣṭu* is carried over. However, the negation of this rule applies only to a *ṭU* sound which replaces a *tU*. For, we do not get a *ṣ* in place of a *ṭU*. This rule can also be technically considered suspended (*asiddha*) in view of application of 8.4.41 *ṣṭu nā ṣṭuḥ*. Here again, Pāṇini's own formulation saves this rule from suspension.

8.4.44 शात्

śāt
/śāt 5/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *na* #42 *ṣi* #43)
śakārād uttarasya tavargasya yad uktaṃ tan na bhavati
What replaces *tU*, when occurring after *ś* in close proximity, does not apply here.

EXAMPLES:

praśnaḥ 'question'
viśnaḥ 'splendor'

1. This rule negates the provision of *cutva* (8.4.39 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*). Consider (*pracch* + *naṄ* → *praśn*) + *sU* = *praśnaḥ* and (*vicch* + *naṄ*) + *sU* = *viśnaḥ* which are both derivates of *naṄ* (3.3.90 *yajayāca* . . .). Note that *ś* is here a replacement of *cch* (6.4.19 *cchvoḥ śūḍ* . . .). An application of *cutva*, in *praśna*, will produce a wrong form: **praśña*. Recall that Pāṇini's own formulation of rule 3.2.117 *praśne cāsannakāle* indicates that *cutva* does not apply to *tU* when occurring after *ś*. Note that this rule should be technically considered suspended (*asiddha*; 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*) in view of application of 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*. A wrong form *praśña* will result if results of 8.2.40 are not negated. This rule, at the strength of its formulation by Pāṇini (*vacana-sāmarthya*), negates *ñ*. Refer to derivational details under 3.3.90 *yajayāca* . . . (III:764).

It is stated (*PM* ad *Kāś*) that, in the Vedic, all operations may be seen as optional (*sarve vidhayaś chandasi vikalpyante*). Thus, in the *Taittirīyaka* recension, we do not find this negation: *ayo' śñāti*. But we find this in the *Kāṭhaka* recension: *brahmacāriṇe praśnān procya prajighāya*.

8.4.45 यरोऽनुनासिकेऽनुनासिको वा

yaro' nunāsike' nunāsiko vā
/yaraḥ 6/1 *anunāsike* 7/1 *anunāsikaḥ* 1/1 *vā* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *padāntāt* #41)
yaraḥ padāntasyānunāsike parato vā' nunāsikādeśo bhavati
A *pada*-final sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *yaR* (* Śs* 5-13) is optionally replaced with an *anunāsika* 'nasal' when an *anunāsika* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

vāg nayati
vāṅ nayati
śvaliḍ nayati
śvaliṇ nayati
agnicid nayati

agnicin nayati
triṣṭub nayati
triṣṭum nayati

1. Note that *padāntāt* (8.4.42) is carried over with the sense of the genitive, via transposition of its nominal ending (*vibhakti-viparināma*) in tune with *padāntasya* 'in place of that which occurs at the end of a *pada*'. This rule optionally replaces a *pada*-final sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *yaR* (*Śs* 5-13) with a corresponding nasal (*anunāsika*) when a nasal follows in close proximity. Thus, we get *vā*(*g*→*ṅ*) *nayati* = *vāṅ nayati* '. . . speech leads', *vāg nayati*; *śvali*(*ḍ*→*ṇ*) *nayati* = *śvaliḍ nayati* 'dog-licker leads', etc. Recall here that a nasalized vowel (*aC*) is not found occurring after a sound denoted by *yaR*. Examples of this rule thus involve nasal consonants. A nasal replacement will, of course, be selected in view of similarity of place of articulation with the sound denoted by *yaR* (1.1.50 *sthāne' ntaratamaḥ*).

Why do we state the condition of *padāntasya* 'in place of a *pada*-final'? So that a sound denoted by *yaR* could not be replaced with a nasal, when not occurring at the end of a *pada*. Consider *vedmi* 'first person singular active present of *vid* (to know)' where *d* is not replaced with a nasal because it does not occur at the end of a *pada*. We similarly do not get this replacement in *kṣubhnāti*.

2. A proposal (*vt*: *yaro' nunāsike pratyaye bhāṣāyāṃ nityavacanaṃ kartavyam*) is made for obligatory replacement in the classical language. That is, when an affixal nasal follows in close proximity. Thus, (*vāg* + *mayaṬ*) + *sU* → *vāṅmayam*, *tvaṅmayam*. These examples can also be accepted as instances of *vyavasthita-vibhāṣā* 'fixed option' (*Kāś*: *vyavasthitavibhāṣājñānāt siddham*).

8.4.46 अचो रहाभ्यां द्वे

aco rahābhyāṃ dve
/*acaḥ* 6/1 *rahābhyām* 5/2 *dve* 1/2/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *yaraḥ vā* #45)
aca uttarau yau rephahakārau tābhyām uttarasya yaro dve bhavataḥ
A sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *yaR*, when occurring in close proximity after a vowel followed by *r* and *h*, is optionally replaced with two.

EXAMPLES:

arkkaḥ
markkaḥ
brahmmā
apahnnute

1. Note that *yaraḥ* and *vā* are carried over. This rule replaces a single *yaR* sound with its corresponding two when *yaR* occurs after a vowel, followed by

r and *h*, in close proximity. Consider (*arc* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU*→ (*ar*(*c*→*k*) + *a*)) + *sU* → *ar*(*k*→*kk*) *a* + *sU* = *arkkaḥ*, where *c* is replaced with *k* (7.3.52 *cajoḥ ku ghiṇyatoḥ*). This resultant *k* is, optionally, replaced with *kk*. We similarly get *markkaḥ*, a derivate of *kaN* introduced after *marcI*. This root is *sautra* 'mentioned in the *sūtras*'. The *c* of *marcI* is also replaced with *k* (8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*). Now consider *brahmmā* and *apahnnute*, where *m* and *n* are replaced with *mm* and *nn*.

Why do we have the condition of *acaḥ* 'after a vowel'? Consider *hanute*, where *h* does not occur after a vowel. Consequently, *n* cannot be replaced with *nn*. A similar negation of doubling (of *m*) is also witnessed in *kim hmalayati*.

8.4.47 अनचि च

anaci ca
/anaci 7/1 = *na ac* = *anac* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasmin*; *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *yaro vā* #45 *aco dve* #46)
aca uttarasya yaro dve bhavataḥ anaci parataḥ
A sound denoted by *yaR* and occurring after one denoted by *aC* is, optionally, replaced with two, even when *aC* does not follow.

EXAMPLES:

daddhy atra
maddhv atra

1. Note that *acaḥ* and *yaraḥ* are both carried over. This rule allows doubling of a *yaR* sound, optionally, when this *yaR* occurs after a vowel and is followed by a non-vowel. Consider *dadh*(*i*→*y*) *atra* = *da*(*dh*→*dhdh*) *y* + *atra* = *dadhdhy atra*, where *dh*, when occurring after *a* and followed by a non-*aC* sound, i.e., *y*, is replaced with *dhdh*. The *dh* is then replaced with *d* (8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*) to produce: *daddhy atra*. We similarly get *madh*(*u*→*v*) *atra* → *ma*(*dh*→*dhdh*) *v atra* → *ma*(*dh*→*d*) *hv atra* = *maddhvatra*.

2. The negation in *anaci* 'when followed by a sound other than one denoted by *aC*' is generally interpreted as *paryudāsa* = *tadbhinna-tatsadṛśa* 'similar to but different from what is negated'. Thus, *aco' nyo' nac, sa paro yasmāt so' nacparaḥ anac* means 'that which is different from *aC*'; *anacparaḥ* means 'that which occurs before that which is different from *aC*'. Note that this interpretation does not serve any special purpose. In fact, it is not free of fault. That is, it will create applicational problems at the end, especially before pause. We cannot get two *k* sounds in *vākk*. For, there is nothing similar to but different from a vowel here (*PM*: *vākk, acsadṛśasya varṇāntarasyābhāvāt*). Why is the *paryudāsa* interpretation accepted? To save us from *pratipatti-gaurava* 'prolixity of comprehension', for example, *vākk*. Others claim the negation to be *prasajya*: *na acparaḥ* = *anacparaḥ* 'no doubling when *aC* follows'.

That is, doubling will be negated only when a vowel follows, and not when a consonant follows. These scholars consider forms such as *vākk* as attested by usage. Obviously, accepting a *paryudāsa* interpretation cannot permit doubling at the terminal pause (*avasāna*). They also argue that if Pāṇini intended this negation to be *paryudāsa*, he would have simply stated *hali*, and not *anaci*. This would also have been economical (*lāghava*). No matter what view is accepted, the negation will still be prolix.

Why do we state the condition of *acaḥ* 'after a vowel'? Consider *smitam* and *dhmātam*, where a *yAR* sound does not occur after a vowel.

3. Now note some *vārttika* proposals:

(*i*) *yaṇo mayo dve bhavata iti vaktavyam.* Commentators interpret this *vārttika* in two ways:

(*ii*) where *yaṇaḥ* and *mayaḥ* are interpreted as ending in *pañcamī* 'ablative' and *ṣaṣṭhī* 'genitive', respectively. That is, a sound denoted by *maY* is replaced with two when *maY* occurs after a sound denoted by *yaṆ*. This will give us *teṣām ulkkā* and *vālmmīkaḥ* as examples.

(*iii*) where *yaṇaḥ* and *mayaḥ* are interpreted as ending in *ṣaṣṭhī* and *pañcamī*, respectively. That is, a sound denoted by *yaṆ* is replaced with two when *yaṆ* occurs after *maY*. This gives us *daddhy atra* and *madhdhv atra* as examples.

(*iv*) *śaraḥ khayo dve bhavata iti vaktavyam.* Here also, *śaraḥ* and *khayaḥ* can be interpreted either (*i*) as *pañcamī* and *ṣaṣṭhī*; or (*ii*) as *ṣaṣṭhī* and *pañcamī*. The first interpretation will give us *stthālī* and *stthātā* as examples. The second interpretation will give us: *vatssaḥ, ikṣṣuḥ, kṣṣīram* and *apssarāḥ*.

(*v*) *avasāne ca yaro dve bhavataḥ* 'a sound denoted by *yaR* is replaced with two at the end before pause'. Thus, we get: *vākk, vāk*; *tvakk, tvak*; *ṣaṭṭ, ṣaṭ*; and *tatt, tat*.

8.4.48 नादिन्याक्रोशे पुत्रस्य

nādiny ākrośe putrasya
/na ϕ ādinī (deleted locative); *ākrośe* 7/1 *putrasya* 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *dve* #46)
ādinī parata ākrośe gamyamāne putraśabdasya na dve bhavataḥ
Two do not come in place of one in *putra* when *ādinī* follows and the derivate denotes *ākrośa* 'anger'.

EXAMPLES:

putrādinī tvamasi pāpe 'O sinful one! you are your sons' eater'

1. The locative (*saptamī*) of *ādini* here marks 'what follows' (*parasaptamī*). Doubling is not permitted when *ādini* combines in a compound to follow

putra 'son' and the derivate denotes 'anger'. Recall that *ādini* is a derivate of *ṆinI*, used with the signification of *tācchīlya* 'characteristic nature'. The *t* of *putrādinī tvam asi pāpe* is not doubled because *pāpe*! denotes anger.

Why do we state the condition of *ākrośe* 'when anger is denoted'? If one wants to make a statement with no anger, *t* will be doubled up. Thus, *puttrādinī vyāghrī* 'a tigress who eats up her cubs'. We also get *śiśumārī vyāghrī* 'a tigress who eats up her young ones'.

2. Note that *parasaptamī*, with a *vārttika* proposal (*vt: tatpare ceti vaktavyam*), is also extended to derivates where *ādini* may not follow *putra* immediately. Thus, we also get: *putrapautrādinī tvam asi pāpe*, where *ādinī* follows *putra* with intervening *pautra* 'grandson'. The *t* is not doubled up because *pāpe*! denotes anger.

Yet another proposal (*vt: vā hatajagdhapara iti vaktavyam*) is made to allow non-doubling of *t* when *hata* and *jagdha* are combined to follow *putra*. Thus we get *putro hataḥ anayā* (*bahuvrīhi*) 'she by who her own son was killed'. We similarly get *putrajagdhī*. The feminine affix *ṄīṢ* is here introduced by 4.1.53 *asvāṅgapūrvapadād vā*.

A third proposal (*vt: cayo dvitīyā śari pauṣkarasādeḥ*) offers the opinion of Pauṣkarasādi. Thus, a sound denoted by *caY* is replaced with the second sound of its class (or series) when a sound denoted by *śaR* follows. Thus we get: *vatsaḥ / vathsaḥ; kṣīram / khṣīram; apsarāḥ / aphsarāḥ*.

8.4.49 शरोऽचि

śaro' ci
/śaraḥ 6/1 *aci* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *dve* #46 *na* #48)
śaro' ci parato na dve bhavataḥ
Two do not come in place of one when a sound denoted by *śAR* occurs followed by a vowel.

EXAMPLES:

karṣati '. . . drags'
varṣati '. . . rains'
ākarṣaḥ 'touchstone'
akṣadarśaḥ 'a judge'

1. A sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *ŚaR* is not doubled up when a vowel (*aC*) follows in close proximity. Recall that 8.4.46 *aco rahābhyāṃ dve*, of which this rule becomes an exception, allows such doubling. Thus, *karṣati*, *varṣati*, (*ā-kṛṣ* + *GHaÑ*) + *sU* → *ākarṣaḥ* and *akṣadarśaḥ*.

Why do we state the condition of *aci* 'when a vowel follows'? Consider *darśśyate*, where *ś* is doubled up since no vowel follows.

8.4.50 त्रिप्रभृतिषु शाकटायनस्य

triprabhṛtiṣu śākaṭāyanasya
/ tri-prabhṛtiṣu 7/3 = *trayaḥ prabhṛtayo yeṣām* (*bv.*), *teṣu*; *śākaṭāyanasya* 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *dve* #46 *na* #48)
triprabhṛtiṣ varṇeṣu saṃyukteṣu śākaṭāyanasyācāryasya matena dvitvaṃ na bhavati
Two, as per Śākaṭāyana, do not come in place of one of a conjunct of three.

EXAMPLES:

indraḥ 'Indra'
candraḥ 'moon'
uṣṭraḥ 'camel'
rāṣṭram 'nation, kingdom'
bhrāṣṭram 'roasting (place/oven)'

1. This rule, in the opinion of Śākaṭāyana, does not allow two in place of one of a conjunct with three or more consonants. Thus, we get *indraḥ*, *candraḥ* and *mandraḥ*, where the bases are derivates of affix *raK*, introduced after *idI* 'to be extremely affluent', *cadI* 'to be happy' and *madI* 'to praise, be happy'. We thus get *indraḥ*, but not *inndraḥ*. Similar observations can be made about *uṣṭraḥ*, etc.

Note that mention of *Śākaṭāyana* is made for denoting respect (*pūjā*). It cannot be interpreted as denoting option. For, this operational provision is *nitya* 'obligatory'. Why should one formulate this rule when the following could account for its derivates (*Nyāsa*: *anyathottarasūtreṇaiva siddhatvād asyārambho nirarthakaḥ syāt*)?

8.4.51 सर्वत्र शाकल्यस्य

sarvatra śākalyasya
/ sarvatra ϕ *śākalyasya* 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *dve* #46 *na* #48)
śākalyasyācāryasya matena sarvatra dvirvacanaṃ na bhavati
Two, in the opinion of Śākalya, do not come as replacement for one, anywhere.

EXAMPLES:

arkaḥ 'sun'
markaḥ 'life-breath'
brahmā 'brahman; the Supreme'
apahnute '. . . hides'

1. Here again, mention of Śākalya is made for respect. This operational provision is obligatory.

8.4.52 दीर्घादाचार्याणाम्

dīrghād ācāryāṇām
/dīrghāt 5/1 *ācāryāṇām* 6/3/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *dve* #46 *na* #48)
dīrghād uttarasyācāryāṇāṃ matena na dvitvaṃ bhavati
Two do not come as a replacement for one which occurs after a long vowel, in the opinion of all scholars.

EXAMPLES:

dātram 'sickle'
pātram 'vessel'
mūtram 'urine'
sūtram 'thread'

1. This rule does not permit consonantal doubling after a long vowel. This is in consonance with the opinion of all scholars. Mention of the word *ācārya* is again made for respect. This operational provision is again obligatory. Consider *dātram, pātram,* etc., where 8.4.47 *anaci ca* may apply.

8.4.53 झलां जश् झशि

jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi
/jhalām 6/3 *jaś* 1/1 *jhaśi* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108)
jhalāṃ sthāne jaśādeśo bhavati jhaśi parataḥ
A sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jaŚ* comes in place of one denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jhaL* when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jhaŚ* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

labdhā '*tṛC*-derivate of *labh* (to obtain)'
labdhum '*tumUN*-derivate . . .'
labdhavyam '*tavyaT*-derivate . . .'
dogdhā '*tṛC*-derivate of *duh* (to milk)'
dogdhum '*tumUN*-derivate . . .'
dogdhavyam '*tavyaT*-derivate . . .'
boddhā '*tṛC*-derivate of *budh* (to know)'
boddhum '*tumUN*-derivate . . .'
boddhavyam '*tavyaT*-derivate . . .'

1. A sound denoted by *jhaL* (*Śs* 8-14) is replaced with a corresponding sound denoted by *jaŚ* (*Śs* 10) when a sound denoted by *jhaŚ* (*Śs* 8-10) follows. Consider (*labh* + *tṛC*) + *sU* → *labdhā, labh* + *tumUN* = *labdhum* and (*labh* + *tavyaT*) + *sU* = *labdhavyam,* where *bh* (of *labh*) before *dh* (of *Kta*→*dha;*

8.2.40 *jhaṣas . . .*) is replaced with *b* (*jaśtva*) of this rule. We similarly get: *dogdhā, dogdhum* and *dogdhavyam* where 8.2.32 *dāder dhātor . . .* replaces the root-final *h* with *gh*. This rule replaces the root-final *dh* with *d* in *boddhā, boddhum* and *boddhavyam*.

Why do we state the condition of *jhaśi* 'when *jhaŚ* follows'? Consider the following forms of *dā* 'to give': *dattaḥ, datthaḥ* and *dadhmaḥ* where this replacement cannot take place since no *jhaŚ* follows.

8.4.54 अभ्यासे चर्च

abhyāse car ca
/ abhyāse 7/1 *car* 1/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *jhalām jaś* #53)
abhyāse vartamānānāṃ jhalāṃ car ādeśo bhavati cakārāj jaś ca
A sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *caR*, and *jaŚ* as well, comes in place of one denoted by *jhaL* occurring as part of an *abhyāsa* 'reduplicated syllable', when a sound denoted by *jhaŚ* follows and close proximity between sounds finds it scope.

EXAMPLES:

cikhaniṣati
citchitsati
ṭiṭhakārayiṣaḥ
tiṣṭhāsati
piphakārayiṣati
bubhūṣati
jighatsati
ḍuḍhaukiṣate
cicīṣati
jijaniṣate

1. Note that *jaŚ* is also carried over. This, in turn, cancels its *anuvṛtti* beyond this rule (*cānukṛṣṭaṃ nottaratra*). A sound denoted by *jhaL* is here to be replaced with a corresponding sound denoted by *caR*, and also *jaŚ*, when a sound denoted by *jhaL* occurs as part of an *abhyāsa* (6.1.4 *pūrvo' bhyāsaḥ*). Consider *cikhaniṣati*, where the root is a derivate of *saN*, introduced after *khan* 'to dig'. Thus, *khan* + *saN* → *kha*(*n*→ϕ) + *khan* + *saN* → *kh*(*a*→*i*) + *khan* + *iṬ* + *saN* → (*kh*→*ch*)*i* + *khan* + *iṬ* + *saN* → (*ch*→*c*)*i* + *khan* + *i* + *saN* = *cikhanisa* + (*LAṬ*→*tiP*) = *cikhanisa* + *ŚaP* + *tiP* → *cikhani*(*s*→*ṣ*) + *a* + *ti* = *cikhaniṣati*. Follow derivational patterns of many *saN*-derivates already discussed (II:431-35). This derivate involves reduplication of *khan* with applications of 7.4.60 *halādi śeṣaḥ*, replacement in *i* (*itva*; 7.4.79 *sany ataḥ*), introduction of augment *iṬ* (7.2.35 *ārddhadhātuka . . .*), and *ṣ* (8.3.59 *ādeśa-pratyayayoḥ*) as a replacement for *s* of *saN*. Notice that *kh* is replaced with *ch*

(*cutva*; 7.4.62 *kuhoś cuḥ*). Our present rule then replaces it with *c*.

Our next derivate (*chi* + *tUK* + *chid* + *saN*) + *LAṬ* → *cicchiṣati* involves introduction of augment *tUK* (6.1.73 *che ca*). This *t* is then replaced with *c* (*cutva*; 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*). Now consider (*ṭhakāra* + *ṆiC*) + *saN* → *ṭhakārayiṣa* + *LAṬ* → *ṭiṭhakārayiṣati* and (*phakāra* + *ṆiC*) + *saN* → *phakārayiṣa* + *LAṬ* → *piphakārayiṣati*, where *ṆiC* is introduced by a *vārttika* (*tatkaroti tad ācaṣṭe* ad 3.1.25 *satyāpa* . . .). Affix *saN* is then introduced to derive a root after which *LAṬ* could be introduced (cf. *paṭayati*; II:400-401). Thus, *ṭhakaray* + *saN* → *ṭha* + *ṭhakāray* + *saN* → *ṭa* + *ṭhakāray* + *saN* → *ṭ*(*a*→*i*) + *ṭhakāray* + *saN* → *ṭi* + *ṭhakāray* + *iṬ* + *saN* → *ṭiṭhakārayiṣa* + *ŚaP* (*LAṬ* → *tiP*) → *ṭiṭhakārayiṣati*. We similarly get *piphakārayiṣati*. Refer to notes under 7.4.61 *śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ* for derivational details of *tiṣṭhāsati*, again a derivate of *saN*, introduced after *sthā* 'to stay, stand', with *LAṬ*. Recall that, given *sthā* + *sthā* + *saN*, *thā* of the *abhyāsa* alone is retained (7.4.61 *śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ*). Deriving *bubhūṣati*, *jighatsati* and *ḍuḍhaukiṣate* from *bhū* + *bhū* + *saN* → (*bh*→*b*) *ū* + *bhū* + *saN* → (*b*(*ū*→*u*) + *bhū* + *saN*) + *LAṬ*; (*ad*→*ghas*) + *saN* → *gha*(*s*→ϕ) + *ghas* + *saN* → (*gha*→*ga*) + *ghas* + *saN* → *g*(*a*→*i*) + *ghas* + *saN* → *g*(*a*→*i*) + *ghas* + *saN* → (*g*→*j*) *i* + *ghas* + *tUK* + *s* + *saN* → (*jighat*(*s*→ϕ) + *saN*) + *LAṬ*; and *ḍhauk* + *ḍhauk* + *saN* → *ḍu* + *ḍhauk* + *iṬ* + *saN* → *ḍuḍhaukiṣa* + *LAṬ* → *ḍuḍhaukiṣate* should not be very difficult. Follow derivational details of many *saN*-derivates already discussed (II:431-35). Refer to *cicīṣati* (II:435) which *Kāśikā* cites here to back the claim that an original *caR* is retained as is: *prakṛticarāṃ prakṛticaro bhavanti*. An additional example is offered in *ṭīk* + *ṭīk* + *saN* → *ṭī* + *ṭīk* + *iṬ* + *saN* → *ṭ*(*ī*→*i*) + *ṭīk* + *iṬ* + *saN* → *ṭiṭīkiṣa* + *LAṬ* = *ṭiṭīkiṣate*. *Kāśikā* also offers *jan* + *jan* + *iṬ* + *saN* → *ja* + *jan* + *iṬ* + *saN* → *jijani*(*s*→*ṣ*) *a* = *jijaniṣa* + (*LAṬ*→*te*) = *jijaniṣate*, *budh* + (*LIṬ*→*ta*) = *budh* + (*ta*→*eŚ*) → *bubudhe* (of *budh* 'to know') and *dadau* (of *dā* 'to give'; cf. *papau* under 7.1.34 *āt au ṇalaḥ*) as examples where an original *jaŚ* is retained as is (*Kāś*: *prakṛtijaśāṃ prakṛtijaśo bhavanti*).

8.4.55 खरि च

khari ca
/*khari* 7/1 *ca* ϕ/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *jhalām* #53 *car* #54)
khari ca parato jhalāṃ car ādeśo bhavati
A sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jhaL* (*Śs* 8-14) is replaced with a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *caR* (*Śs* 11-13), also, when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *khaR* (*Śs* 11-13) follows and close proximity between sounds finds it scope.

EXAMPLES:

(*bhid* + *ṭṛC*) + *sU* = *bhettā*
(*bhid* + *tumUN*) + *sU* = *bhettum*
(*bhid* + *tavyaṬ*) + *sU* = *bhettavyam*

(*yuyudh* + *sa*) + (*LAṬ→te*)) = *yuyutsate*
(*ā-rabh* + *sa*) + (*LAṬ→te*)) = *āripsate*
(*ā-labh* + *sa*) + (*LAṬ→te*)) = *ālipsate*

1. Note that *jhalāṃ* and *car* are both carried over. A replacement in *t* for *d* in (*bhid* + *tṛC*) + *sU* → (*bhe*(*d→t*) + *tṛC*)) + *sU* = *bhettā* 'he who will break', *bhettum* 'for breaking' and *bhettavyam* 'should be broken' illustrates this. We similarly get *yuyutsa* + (*LAṬ→te*) = *yuyutsate* 'wishes to fight', where *dh* is replaced with *t*. Refer to notes under 7.4.54 *sanimīmāghurabhalabha* . . . for derivational details of *āripsate* and *ālipsate* where *bh* is replaced with *p*.

8.4.56 वावसाने

vāvasāne
/*vā* ϕ *avasāne* 7/1/
A sound denoted by *caR* comes, optionally, in place of one denoted by *jhaL*, when this *jhaL* occurs at *avasāna* 'cessation of speech; pause'.

EXAMPLES:

vāk
vāg
tvak
tvag
śvaliṭ
śvaliḍ
triṣṭup
triṣṭub

1. Refer to derivational details of *vac* + (*KvIP→*ϕ) = *v*(*a→ā*)*c* → *vāc* + (*sU→*ϕ) = *vā*(*c→g→k*) = *vāk* 'speech', where this replacement in *k* is made optional to *g* (8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo' nte*). That is, if the option of this replacement in a sound denoted by *caR* (*cartva*) is not accepted, we will get a replacement in a sound denoted by *jaŚ* (*jaśtva*). Recall that this provision of a sound denoted by *jaŚ* is made obligatorily (*nitya*).

8.4.57 अणोऽप्रगृह्यस्यानुनासिकः

aṇo' pragṛhyasyānunāsikaḥ
/*aṇaḥ apragṛhyasya* 6/1 = *na pragṛhyam* = *apragṛhyam* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya*; *anunāsikaḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *vāvasāne* #56)
aṇo' pragṛhyasaṃjñasyāvasāne vartamānasya vā' nunāsikādeśo bhavati
A vowel denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *aṆ* (*Śs* 1), but other than one termed *pragṛhya* (11.11 *īdūded* . . .), is, optionally, replaced with its nasalized counterpart (*anunāsika*) at *avasāna* 'pause, end of speech'.

EXAMPLES:

dadhī̃
dadhi
madhū̃
madhu
kumārī̃
kumārī

1. Note that this abbreviatory symbol *aṆ* is formed with the first *Ṇ* (*Śs* 1: *aiuṆ*). Recall that 1.1.11 *īdūdeddvivacanaṃ pragṛhyam* assigns the term *pragṛhya*. The *sU* after *dadhi* and *madhu* is deleted, via *LUK* (7.1.23 *svamor napuṃsakāt*).

2. Why do we state the condition of *aṇaḥ* 'of that which is denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *aṆ*'? Consider *kartṛ* and *hartṛ* where *ṛ* is not included within the denotatum of *aṆ*.

Why do we state the condition of *apragṛhyasya* 'of that which is not termed *pragṛhya*'? Consider *agnī* and *vāyū* where, on account of the assignment of the term *pragṛhya*, *ī* and *ū* are not replaced with their nasalized counterparts.

8.4.58 अनुस्वारस्य ययि परसवर्णः

anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ
/anusvārasya 6/1 *yayi* 7/1 *parasavarṇaḥ* 1/1 = *parasya savarṇaḥ* = *parasavarṇaḥ* (*ṣaṣ. tat.*)/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108)
anusvārasya yayi parataḥ parasavarṇa ādeśo bhavati
An *anusvāra* (*ṃ*), when followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *yaY* (semivowel, stop and nasal), is replaced with a sound homogeneous with what follows.

EXAMPLES:

śaṅkitā
śaṅkitum
śaṅkitavyam
uñchitā
uñchitum
uñchitavyam
kuṇḍitā
kuṇḍitum
kuṇḍitavyam
nanditā
nanditum
nanditavyam
kampitā

kampitum
kampitavyam

1. This rule allows an *anusvāra* to be replaced with a sound homogeneous with what follows, provided a *yaY* sound follows. Consider *śakI* + *tṛC* → *śa* + *nUM* + *k* + *tṛ*(*C*) → *śa*+*n*(*UM*) +*k* + *tṛ* → *śank* + *i*(*Ṭ*) + *tṛ* → *śa*(*n*→*ṃ*) *k* + *i* + *tṛ* → *śa*(*ṃ*→*ṅ*) *k* + *i* + *tṛ* = *śaṅkitṛ* + *sU* = *śaṅkitā*, where augment *nUM* is introduced, based on *I* as an *it* (7.1.58 *idito num dhātoḥ*). The *n* of *nUM* is then replaced with *anusvāra* (8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*). Our present rule replaces it with *ṅ*, a nasal homogeneous with *k* which follows *ṃ*. Similar rules apply in deriving *tṛC*, *tumUN* and *tavyaT* derivates of *uchI* 'to cut, abandon', *kuḍI* 'to burn, be hot', *ṬUnudI* 'to be happy' and *kapI* 'to move'. Thus, *uñchitā*, *uñchitum* and *uñchitavyam*, etc.

Now consider *kṛ* + *u* + *anti* → *k*(*ṛ*→*ur*) + *u* + *anti* → *kur* + (*u*→*v*) + *anti* = *kurvanti* and *kṛṣanti*, where, after *jhi* is replaced with *ant*, we get a replacement in *ṇ* for *n*. How come this *ṇ*-replacement does not apply? The *n* is first replaced with *ṃ* because *ṇ*-replacement will remain suspended (*asiddha*) at this time. The *anusvāra* will then be replaced with a homogeneous nasal similar to the dental *t*. That is, *n*. A replacement in *ṇ* cannot be applied again at the strength of *asiddhatva* 'suspension' of this last replacement in *n*. The *Mahābhāṣya*, therefore, calls it: 'that which transgresses the *n* turned *ṃ* in matters of *ṇ*-replacement (*evam anusvārībhūto ṇatvam atikrāmati*).

Why do we state the condition of *yayi* 'when a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *yaY* follows'? Consider *ā-kram* + (*LṚṬ*→*te*) = *ākraṃsyate*, and also the *saN*-derivate *ācikraṃsyate*, where *ātmanepada* is introduced by 1.3.40 *āṅ udgamane* and 1.3.62 *pūrvavat sanaḥ*. The *anusvāra*, since it does not occur followed by a *yaY*-sound, cannot be replaced with a nasal homogeneous with what follows.

8.4.59 वा पदान्तस्य

vā padāntasya
/*vā* ϕ *padāntasya* 6/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ* #58)
padāntānusvārasya yayi parato vā parasavarṇādeśo bhavati
A sound, homogeneous with what follows, optionally comes in place of an *anusvāra*, when the *anusvāra* occurs at the end of a *pada* and a sound denoted by *yaY* (semivowel, stop and nasal) follows.

EXAMPLES:

taṅ kathañ citrapakṣaṇ ḍayamānan nabhaḥstham puruṣo'
vadhīt 'how was the man able to kill that bird of colorful wings which was flying in the sky'
taṃ kathaṃ citrapakṣaṃ ḍayamānaṃ nabhaḥsthaṃ puruṣo' vaḍhīt 'ibidem'

1. A word-final (*padānta*) *ṃ* (*anusvāra*), when followed by a sound denoted by the abbreviatory term *yaY* (semivowels, nasals and stops), is optionally replaced with a sound homogeneous with what follows (*para-savarṇa*). Thus we get (*taṃ→n̓*) *katha*(*ṃ→ñ*) *citrapakṣa*(*ṃ→ṇ*) *ḍayamāna*(*ṃ→n*) *nabhastham . . . = taṅ-kathañ-citrapakṣaṇ-ḍayamānan-nabhastham. . . .*

Note that the *vā* 'option' of our present rule also indicates that provisions made by the earlier rule are obligatory (*nitya*). Recall also that 8.4.56 *vāvasāne* makes an optional provision. Consequently, provisions made in between two optional provisions will be considered *nitya* 'obligatory' (*Nyāsa: vāvacanaṃ pūrvasya nityatvajñāpanārtham. dvayor vibhāṣayor madhye ye vai vidhayas te nityā bhavantīti kṛtvā*). The operational provision of this rule could also be interpreted as obligatory. That is, if *vā* was not used. For, in that case, operational provisions made by preceding rules would have remained optional. Provisions of this rule, at the strength of its incompatible formulation (*ārambha-sāmarthya*), would have then been considered obligatory.

8.4.60 तोर्लि

tor li

/toḥ 6/1 *li* 1/1/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *parasavarṇaḥ* #58)

tavargasya lakāre parataḥ parasavarṇādeśo bhavati

A replacement, homogeneous with what follows (*parasavarṇa*), comes in place of a consonant (stop and nasal) of the *t*-series when *l* follows in close proximity.

EXAMPLES:

agnicil lunāti
somasul lunāti
bhavā l lunāti
mahā l lunāti

1. This rule allows a dental consonant to be replaced with *l* when *l* follows. Note that *t* is replaced with a clear *l* (*śuddho lakāraḥ*). The *n*, however, is replaced with a nasalized *l*. Thus, *agnici*(*t→l*) + *lunāti* = *agnicil lunāti* and *bhavā*(*n→l*) + *lunāti* = *bhavā l lunāti.*

8.4.61 उदः स्थास्तम्भोः पूर्वस्य

udaḥ sthāstambhoḥ pūrvasya

/udaḥ 5/1 *sthāsthambhoḥ* 6/2 = *sthāś ca stambh ca* (*itar. dv.*), *tayoḥ; pūrvasya* 6/1/

(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *savarṇaḥ* #58)

uda uttarayoḥ 'sthā, stambha' ity etayoḥ pūrvasavarṇādeśo bhavati

A replacement, homogeneous with what precedes, comes in place of *s* of *sthā* 'to stay, stand' and *stambhU* 'to prop, support', when they occur after the preverb *ud* and close proximity between sounds finds its scope.

EXAMPLES:

utthātā
utthātum
utthātavyam
uttambhitā
uttambhitum
uttambhitavyam

1. This rule specifies a replacement for *sthā* and *stambhU* when these two occur preceded by the preverb *ud*. Since this replacement is specified for *sthā* and *stambhU*, which occur after *ud*, this replacement should come in place of the initial sound segment (1.1.54 *ādeḥ parasya*) of *sthā* and *stambhU*. Finally, recall that the *anuvṛtti* of *savarṇaḥ* 'homogeneous' is still valid. Consequently, this replacement must also be homogeneous with *d* which precedes *s* (*ut-sthā*). Note that the *d* of *ud* itself is replaced with *t* before *s* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*). We thus get *u*(*d*→*t*) + (*s*→*t*) *thātā* = *utthātā*, *u*(*d*→*t*) + (*s*→*t*) *thātum* = *utthātum* and *u*(*d*→*t*) + (*s*→*t*) *thātavyam* = *utthātavyam*, the *tṛC*, *tumUN* and *tavyaT* derivates of *sthā*, with the preverb *ud*. We similarly get *uttambhitā*, *uttambhitum* and *uttambhitavyam* with augment *iṬ*. Incidentally, the *th* of *sthā* also goes through a replacement in *t* (*cartva*; 8.4.55 *khari ca*). The preceding *t* is doubled up in view of 8.4.47 *anaci ca*. One of these two *t* sounds may also go through optional deletion (8.4.65 *jharo jhari savarṇe*). We will thus get *utthātā* and *uitthātā*.

2. Some consider *th* as a replacement for *s*, based on similarities of external articulatory efforts (*bāhya-prayatna*). We thus get *ut* + (*s*→*th*) *thātum* → *ut*-(*th*+*th*) *āthum* → *utththātum*. A sequence of two *th* sounds which results from application of 8.4.47 *anaci ca* is retained. The preceding *th* of the sequence cannot go through *cartva* of 8.4.55 *khari ca*. For, the homogeneous replacement of this rule will then become suspended (*asiddha*).

3. Why do we state the condition of *sthāsthambhoḥ*? Consider *utsnātā* where we do not find *sthā* or *stambhU*. This rule is thus blocked from applying.

4. A *vārttika* proposal is made for the Vedic, where *s* of *ud-skand* also qualifies for a replacement in *t*. Consider *agne dūram utkandaḥ*. This proposal is also recommended for deriving *utkandaka*, an affliction (*roga*). Some yet claim that *utkanda* is a form of verbal root *kand* (*Kāś*: *kandater vā dhātvantarasyaitad rūpam* 'or it is a form of a different verbal root, i.e., *kand*').

8.4.62 झयो होऽन्यतरस्याम्

jhayo ho' nyatarasyām

/jhayaḥ 5/1 *haḥ* 6/1 *anyatarasyām* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *savarṇaḥ* #58 *pūrvasya* #61)
jhaya uttarasya hakārasya pūrvasavarṇādeśo bhavati anyatarasyām
A replacement, homogeneous with what precedes, comes in place of *h*, optionally, when *h* occurs after a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jhaY* (non-nasal stops), and close proximity between sounds finds its scope.

EXAMPLES:

vāggh hasati
vāg hasati
śvaliḍḍ hasati
śvaliḍ hasati
agniciddh hasati
agnicid hasati
somasuddh hasati
somasud hasati
triṣṭubbh hasati
triṣṭub hasati

1. Note that all replacements must be selected in consonance with 1.1.50 *sthāne' ntaratamaḥ* 'a replacement must be most similar to what it replaces'. That is, they should be selected in view of similarities in place (*sthāna*) and manner (*prayatna*) of articulation. For example, in *vāg + hasati = vāg + (h→gh) asati = vāgghasati*, *h* gets replaced with *gh*, a sound (*g*) homogeneous with what precedes (*pūrvasavarṇa*) *h*. We will similarly get *h*, which occurs after *ḍ*, *d* or *b*, replaced with *ḍh*, *dh* or *bh*, in this order of enumeration.

2. Why do we state the condition of *jhayaḥ*? Consider *prāṅ hasati* and *bhavān hasati*, where *h* is not replaced because it does not occur after a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jhaY*.

8.4.63 शश्छोऽटि

śaś cho' ṭi
/śaḥ 6/1 *chaḥ* 1/1 *aṭi* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *jhayo' nyatarasyām* #61)
jhaya uttarasya śakārasyāṭi parataś chakārādeśo bhavaty anyatarasyām
A replacement in *ch* comes, optionally, in place of *ś* which, in turn, occurs after a sound denoted by *jhaY*, provided a sound denoted by *aṬ* (vowels and *y*, *v*, *r*) follows, and close proximity between sounds finds its scope.

EXAMPLES:

vāk chete

vāk śete
agnicic chete
agnicit śete
śvaliṭ chete
śvaliṭ śete
triṣṭup chete
triṣṭup śete

1. Note that *jhaY* and *anyatarasyām* 'optionally' are both carried over, via *anuvṛtti*. A specification with *anyatarasyām* is also made here to indicate that provisions made by preceding rules are obligatory (*nitya*).

This rule allows *ś* to be optionally replaced with *ch* (*chatva*) if *ś* occurs after a non-nasal stop (*jhaY*), and what follows is a vowel or *y*, *r* or *l*. Thus, we get *vāk* + (*ś*→*ch*) *ete* = *vākchete*; *agnici*(*t*→*c*) + (*ś*→*ch*) *ete* = *agnici*(*t*→*c*) + *chete* = *agnicic chete* and *agnicit śete*, etc. Recall also that a dental stop is replaced with its palatal counterpart when followed by a palatal (*t*→*c*) (8.4.40 *stoś cunā ścuḥ*).

2. It is stated that our present rule remains suspended (*asiddha*) in view of both 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ* and 8.4.55 *khari ca*. From among these two, Rule 8.4.55 *khari ca* remains suspended in view of 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*. It is in view of this suspension provision that order of applications remains: 8.4.40 *stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ*, 8.4.55 *khari ca* and 8.4.63 *śaś cho' ṭi*.

3. A *vārttika* proposal states that *aṭi* 'when a sound denoted by *aṬ* (*Śs* 1-5) follows' is not enough. The right condition of this replacement operation should be stated with *ami* 'when *aM* (*Śs* 1-7) follows'. This, in addition to sounds denoted by *aṬ*, will also include *l* and nasals. Thus, *tat* + *ślokena* and *tac* + *chlokena*; *tat* + *śmaśruṇā* and *tac* + *chmaśruṇā*.

8.4.64 हलो यमां यमि लोपः

halo yamāṃ yami lopaḥ
/halaḥ 5/1 *yamām* 6/3 *yami* 7/1 *lopaḥ* 1/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *anyatarasyām* #61)
hala uttareṣāṃ yamāṃ yami parato lopo bhavaty anyatarasyām
A deletion by *LOPA* comes optionally in place of a sound denoted by *yaM* occurring after a consonant (*haL*), when a sound denoted by *yaM* follows and close proximity between sounds finds its scope.

EXAMPLES:

śayyā 'bed'
śayyyā
aditer apatyam = *ādityaḥ* 'male offspring of Aditi'
ādityo devatā asya sthālīpākasya = *ādityyaḥ* '*āditya*, the divinity of this *sthālīpāka* sacrifice'

1. This rule offers optional deletion of a sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *yaM*, under the condition of a following sound denoted by *yaM*. Refer to derivational details of *śayyā* (III:765). We get two *y* sounds in *śayyā*. A third *y* results subsequently (*kramajaḥ* = *ānupūrvyāṃ jātaḥ* 'produced in a sequence') from the doubling application of 8.4.47 *anaci ca*. Our present rule then applies to delete one, or both, medial *y* sounds (*Kāś*: *tatra madhyamasya madhyamayor vā lopo bhavati*). We thus get *śayyā* and *śayyyā*. Now consider *ādityaḥ* and *ādityyaḥ*, parallel to *aditer apatyam pumān* 'male offspring of *aditi*', where we get one *y* which follows *t*. This *y* is part of affix *Ṇya* (4.1.85 *dityadityāditya* . . .) which, in turn, is introduced after *aditi* + *Ṅas* with the signification of 4.1.92 *tasyāpatyam*. A second *y* is gotten, again as part of *Ṇya*, when this affix is introduced by the same rule in the sense of 4.2.24 *sāsya devatā* 'she is the divinity of . . .'. This *y* is doubled up in view of a *vārttika*: *yaṇo mayo dve bhavataḥ* (cf. 8.4.47 *anaci ca*). The optional deletion of one, or both, medial *y* sounds can now yield; *ādityaḥ* and *ādityyaḥ*. We can even get *ādityyyaḥ*, with three *y* sounds, where doubling of *y* is accomplished with two *y* sounds to start with.

2. Why do we state the condition of *halaḥ* 'after a consonant'? Consider *ānnam* 'food' which derives from *anna* + *am* + *Ṇa* (4.4.85 *aṇṇāṇṇaḥ*). We do find a *yaM*, i.e., *n*, followed by a similar *n*. But this *n* does not occur after a consonant.

Why do we state the condition of *yamām* 'of sounds denoted by *yaM*'? Consider *arghyam* where *gh* occurs after *r*, a consonant. It also happens to be followed by *y*, a sound denoted by *yaM*. However, this *gh* cannot be accepted as a sound denoted by *yaM*. Why? It is not included within the denotata of *yaM* (*Nyāsa*: *na tv ayaṃ yam ghakāraḥ*; *tasya yamtvasanniveśāt*). The deletion of *gh* is thus blocked. This same happens to the *g* of *agniḥ* 'fire'.

Why do we state the condition of *yami* 'when a sound denoted by *yaM* follows'? Consider *śārṅgam* which derives with *aṆ*, introduced with the signification of 4.3.134 *tasya vikāraḥ*, parallel to *śṛṅgasya vikāraḥ* 'modification (product) of horn'. Here again we find that *ṅ*, a sound denoted by *yaM*, occurs after a consonant. However, the following *g* is not a sound denoted by *yaM*. The deletion of *gh* is thus blocked. Some claim that the initial *vṛddhi* of (*śṛ*→*ār*) *ṅga* = *śārṅga* is externally conditioned (*bahiraṅga*). Deletion of *gh* is, of course, internally conditioned (*antaraṅga*). Consequently, this external *vṛddhi* will become suspended (*asiddha*) in view of accomplishing this internal deletion. This suspension of *vṛddhi* will also render the consonant, i.e., *r*, suspended (*asiddha*). The *gh* will thus not occur after a consonant. The question of deletion of *gh* will thus not arise. This view is, however, not accepted. I prefer not to discuss this any further.

8.4.65 झरो झरि सवर्णे

jharo jhari savarṇe

/jharaḥ 6/1 *jhari* 7/1 *savarṇe* 7/1/
(*saṃhitāyām* #2.108 *anyatarasyām* #61 *halo lopaḥ* #64)
hala uttareṣāṃ yamāṃ yami parato lopo bhavaty anyatarasyām
A deletion by *LOPA* comes, optionally, in place of a sound denoted by *jhaR* when this *jhaR* occurs after a consonant and is followed by a *jhaR* sound homogeneous with it, provided close proximity between sounds finds its scope.

EXAMPLES:

pratttam 'derivate of (*pra-dā*) + *Kta*)) + *sU*'
prattam
avatttam 'derivate of (*ava-dā*) + *Kta*)) + *sU*'
avattam
marutttam 'derivate of (*marut* (*dā* + *Kta*)) + *sU*'
maruttam

1. A sound denoted by the abbreviatory symbol *jhaR* (voiced-voiceless aspirated-unaspirated stops and sibilants) which occurs after a consonant is optionally deleted, when a homogeneous sound denoted by *jhaR* follows. Refer to derivational details of *prattam* under rule 7.4.74 *aca upasargāt taḥ*. Recall that this rule offers a replacement in *t* to an *aṅga* termed *ghu*, namely *dā*, when a *t*-initial affix marked with *K* as an *it* follows. Note that *pra-dā* + *Kta* yields a string with three *t* sounds: (*pra-d*(*ā*→*t*) + *ta* → *pra-*(*d*→*t*) + *t* + *ta* → *pra-t* + *t* + *ta*. Notice here that the *ā* of *dā* is replaced with *t* (7.4.47 *aca upasargāt taḥ*). The *d* itself is then replaced with *t* (8.4.54 *khari ca*). We thus have three *t* sounds: two replacements and one as part of the affix (*Nyāsa*: *evaṃ tāvat tryas takārāḥ, dvāv ādeśau, ekaḥ pratyayāvayavaḥ*). We also get a fourth (*Kāś*: *kramajaś caturthaḥ*), as a result of the application of 8.4.46 *anaci ca*. Consequently, we get four *t* sounds in a sequence: *pra-t* + *t* + *t* + *ta*. The two medial *t* sounds, or optionally just one, then go through deletion (*Kāś*: *tatra madhyasya madhyamayor vā lopo bhavati* 'there obtains an optional deletion of one or both medials'). We thus get: *pra-t* + (*t*+*t*→ϕ) + *ta* = *pratta*. Deletion of a single medial *t* will give us: *pra-t* + (*t*→ϕ) + *t* + *ta* → *prattta*. A similar sequence of four *t* sounds, with similar results, is also witnessed in *ava* + *dā* + (*K*) *ta* → *ava-d*(*ā*→*t*) + *ta* → *ava-*(*d*→*t*) + *t* + *ta* → *ava-t* + (*t*→*tt*) + *ta*. This gives us: *avatta* and *avattta*.

Now consider *marut-dā* + (*K*) *ta* → *marut-d*(*ā*→*t*) + *ta* → *marut-*(*d*→*t*) + *t* + *ta*, where *marut* 'wind', via a *vārttika* proposal under 1.4.58 *prādaya upasargāḥ kriyāyoge*), is extended the status of a preverb (*vt*: *marucchabdasyopasaṃkhyānam*). It is this extensional provision (*ātideśika*) of *marut* which, even in the absence of *marut* not ending in a vowel, facilitates the *t*-replacement of *ā* of *dā*. An application of 7.4.47 *anaci ca* produces the sequence of five *t* sounds. Thus, *marut-t* + (*t*→*tt*) + *t* + *ta*. Deleting one, two or three medial *t* sounds will

yield: *maruttta, maruttta,* or *marutta.* We will thus have to apply deletion as many times as we can find a *jhaR* followed by another *jhaR.*

2. Why do we state the condition of *jharaḥ* in place of a sound denoted by *jhaR*? Consider *śārṅgam* where *ṅ* is not a sound denoted by *jhaR.* Although it occurs after a sound denoted by *jhaR,* but it does not go through deletion.

Why do we state the condition of *jhari* 'when a sound denoted by *jhaR* follows'? Consider *priyapañcñā,* a *bahuvrīhi* compound paraphrased as: *priyāḥ pañcāsya* 'he to whom five are dear'. Note that *priyapañcñā* is an instrumental singular where *priya* 'dear' is combined as initial of the compound (2.3.35 *saptamī viśeṣaṇe . . .; vt. vā priyasya pūrvanipātaḥ*). The *ā* of *priyāpañcan* is deleted by 6.4.134 *allopo' naḥ.* The final *n* of *priyapañcan* is then replaced with *ñ* (*PM: nakārasya cutvam;* 8.4.40 *stoś cunā ścuḥ*). The *c* of *priyapañcañ,* which occurs after a consonant (*halaḥ*), is also a sound denoted by *jhaR.* It is also followed by *ñ,* a sound homogeneous with it. However, *ñ* is not a sound denoted by *jhaR.* Consequently, even if the *c* occurs after a consonant, and is followed by *ñ,* it cannot be allowed to go through deletion. One can argue here that the question of *c*-deletion does not arise. For, specifications made for deletion require uninterrupted contiguity. This *c* is not immediately followed by *ñ.* How? The deleted *ā* of *priyāpañcan* will reappear, via *sthānivadbhāva* 'treatment of a replacement as the item it replaced' (1.1.57 *acaḥ parasmin pūrvavidhau*). A specification made with *jhari* thus does not serve any purpose. This cannot be accepted. For, this deletion cannot be treated as what was deleted, especially in view of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham* (*Kāś. alllopasya ca 'pūrvatrāsiddhe na sthānivat' iti sthānivadbhāvapratiṣedhād . . .*). That is, *c* is accepted as immediately followed by *ñ.* One could not stop this deletion of *c* if *jhari* 'when a sound denoted by *jhaR* follows' is not specified as a right condition.

Why do we state the condition of *savaraṇe* 'when a homogeneous sound denoted by *jhaR* follows'? Consider *tarptā, tarptum* and *tarptavyam,* the *tṛC, tumUN* and *tavyaT* forms of *tṛp* 'to be satisfied, be pleased'. The word *savarṇa* is primarily used to block the assignment of equivalency in the order of elements (*saṃkhyātānudeśa*) in each specified set (1.3.10 *yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām*). Had the rule been formulated as *jharo jhari* without the use of *savarṇe,* assignment of equivalency would have followed the order of enumeration in two sets of elements denoted by *jhaR.* The use of the word *savarṇe* cannot serve the purpose of blocking selection of a sound which was not homogeneous. For, assignment of equivalency in order of enumeration would have already assured a *jhaR* parallel to another. Accepting *saṃkhyātānudeśa* with no consideration for homogeneity (*sāvarṇya*) would make it impossible to derive *śiṇḍhi* and *piṇḍhi.* Consider *śiṣ* + (*LOṬ→siP*) → (*śi+ŚnaM+ṣ*) + *si* → *śi* + *na* + *ṣ* + (*si* → *hi*) → *śi* + *na* + *ṣ* + *hi.* Rule 6.4.111 *śnaso al . . .* now deletes *a* of *na.* The final *hi* of this string produces *ḍhi* through replacements of *hi* with *dhi* (6.4.101 *hujhalyor . . .*) and *dh* with *ḍh* (8.4.41

ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ. The *ṣ* of *śi* + *n* + *ṣ* + *ḍhi* is then replaced with *ḍ* (*jaśtva*; 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*). Our present rule then deletes *ḍ* under the condition of its homogeneous relationship with the following *ḍh*. This deletion could not be accomplished without the use of the word *savarṇe*. Incidentally, the *n* of *śi* + *n* + (*ḍ*→ϕ) + *ḍhi* is first replaced with *anusvāra* (8.3.24 *naś cāpadāntasya jhali*). It is then replaced with *ṇ* (8.4.58 *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ*) to produce *śi* + (*n*→*ṃ*→*ṇ*) + (*ṣ*→*ḍ*→ϕ) + (*hi*→(*dh*→*ḍh*)*i* → *śiṇḍhi*. A similar second person singular imperative form of *piṣ* 'to grind' can be derived as *piṇḍhi* from *pi* + *śnaM* + *ṣ* + (*LOṬ*→*si*→*hi*→*dhi*→*ḍhi*) → *piṇḍhi*. Refer to derivational details of *śiṇḍhi* and *piṇḍhi* under the appendix (II:407-9) of rule 1.1.58 *na padānta*. . . .

8.4.66 उदात्तादनुदात्तस्य स्वरितः

udāttād anudāttasya svaritaḥ
/*udāttāt* 5/1 *anudāttasya* 6/1 = *na udāttaḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *tasya*; *svaritaḥ* 1/1/
udāttād uttarasyānudāttasya svaritādeśo bhavati
An *anudātta* which occurs after an *udātta* is replaced with a *svarita*.

EXAMPLES:

gārgyáḥ 'a male descendant of Garga'
vātsyáḥ 'a male descendant of Vatsa'
pacáti 'he cooks'
paṭháti 'he reads or recites'

1. This rule offers a replacement in *svarita* to an *anudātta* which occurs followed by an *udātta*. Consider *gārgyaḥ* and *vātsyaḥ* which both are derivates of affix *yaÑ* (4.1.105 *gargādibhyo yañ*). These words are both marked with initial *udātta*. Their *ya* is marked with *anudātta* in view of 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam*. . . . The accentual sequence here is: *udātta-anudātta-udātta*. The *anudātta* which here occurs after an *udātta* is replaced with *svarita*. Refer to the appendix of 3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau* for accentual details of *pacáti* and *paṭháti*. Note, however, that the *a* of *pac* is marked with *udātta* (6.1.159 *dhātoḥ*). Affixes *ŚaP* and *tiP* are marked with *anudātta* (3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*). The accentual sequence is: *udātta-anudātta-anudātta*. The *anudātta a* of *ŚaP*, which occurs after an *udātta*, is to be replaced here with *svarita*. The *ti* of *pacati* must then go through *ekaśruti* 'monotone' (1.2.39 *svaritāt saṃhitāyām anudāttānām*).

2. Why is this rule stated? Why was it not placed after 6.1.182 *tit svaritam*? This way, one need not use the word *svaritam*. That is, it could have been carried over via *anuvṛtti*. Rule 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam* . . . would have become applicable here if this rule was placed there after 6.1.182 *tit svaritam*. The accentual result would have been: *anudātta-svarita*. What we have here

is *udātta-svarita.* Placing this rule here makes the *svarita* suspended (*asiddha*). The application of 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam . . .* is thus blocked. We can thus get both the *udātta* and *svarita.*

8.4.67 नोदात्तस्वरितोदयमगार्ग्यकाश्यपगालवानाम्

nodāttasvaritodayam agārgyakāśyapagālavānām
/na ϕ udāttasvaritodayam 1/1 = *udāttaś ca svaritaś ca = udātta-svaritau* (*itar. dv.*); *udāttasvaritau udayau yasmāt* (*bv.*), *tat; a-gārgyakāśyapagālavānām = gārgyaś ca kāśyapaś ca gālavaś ca* (*itar. dv.*); *na gārgya . . . gālavāḥ* (*nañ. tat.*), *teṣām/*
(*anudāttasya svaritaḥ* #66)
An *anudātta,* in the opinion of scholars other than Gārgya, Kāśyapa and Gālava, is not replaced by a *svarita* when the same occurs followed by an *udātta* and *svarita.*

EXAMPLES:

gārgyas tatrá 'Gārgya is there'
vātsyas tatrá 'Vātsya is there'
gārgyaḥ kvá 'where is Gārgya'
vātsyaḥ kvá 'where is Vātsya'

1. An *anudātta,* in the opinion of scholars other than Gārgya, Kāśyapa and Gālava, is not replaced with *svarita* when the same occurs after an *udātta* and *svarita.* That is, an *anudātta,* in the opinion of Gārgya, Kāśyapa and Gālava, is replaced by a *svarita* when the same occurs followed by an *udātta* and *svarita.*

Mention of many preceptors (*ācāryas*) is made here for denoting respect (*Kāś: anekācāryasaṃkīrtanaṃ pūjārtham*). It is not used for stating an option.

The word *udaya* 'rise, prosperity' is associated here with both *udātta* and *svarita.* Thus, we interpret *udāttasvaritodayam* as *udāttasvaritau udayau yasmāt tat* 'that from which rise the *udātta* and *svarita*': *udāttodayaḥ* and *svaritodayaḥ.* It is used in the *prātiśākhya* treatises as synonymous with *para* 'following' (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś: udayaśabdo' tra pratyekam abhisambadhyate . . . paraśabdasyārthe vartate*). This rule uses *udaya* also in the sense of *para* 'subsequent'. Commentators also recognize that *udaya* 'rise' is used here for invoking auspiciousness (*Kāś: . . . udayagrahaṇaṃ maṅgalārtham*). Refer also to my comments under the next rule.

2. Now consider some examples. The word *tatra* 'there', in *gārgyas tatra,* ends in affix *traL* (5.3.10 *saptamyās tral*). It is also marked with *udātta* at the beginning, based on *L* as an *it* (6.1.190 *liti*). The *ya* of *gārgya,* on the other hand, is marked with *anudātta* (6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam . . .*). The *ya* of *gārgya,* an *anudātta,* here occurs followed by the *udātta* of *ta* of *tatra.* The

svarita which was made available to the *ya* of *gārgya* by the preceding rule is here negated under the following condition of the initial *udātta* of *tatra*. The result is: *gārgya̲s tatrá*. This same applies also to *vātsya̲s tatrá*. Recall here that the word *gārgya* is a derivate of affix *yaÑ* (4.1.105 *gargādibhyo yañ*). Consequently, the word *gārgya* will be obligatorily marked with initial *udātta* (6.1.194 *ñnityādir nityam*). The *ya* of *gārgya* will then be marked with *anudātta* in view of 6.1.155 *anudāttaṃ padam*. . . . The accentual sequence involved here is: *udātta-anudātta-udātta*.

Now consider *gārgya̲ḥ kvá*, where *kva* is marked with *svarita* (cf. 1.2.31 *samāhāraḥ svaritaḥ*). The *ya* of *gārgya* is *anudātta*. This *anudātta* is occurring here followed by the *svarita* of *kva*. The *svarita* which was made available to *ya* of *gārgya* is here negated. That is, the *anudātta* is retained. This same also applies to *vātsya̲ḥ kvá*. Recall that, in the opinion of Gārgya, Kāśyapa and Gālava, the *svarita* of the preceding rule applies. The accentual sequence here happens to be *udātta-anudātta-svarita*.

8.4.68 अ अ इति

a a iti
/a ϕ a ϕ iti ϕ/
akāro vivṛtaḥ saṃvṛto bhavati
An open *a* is, hereby, made closed.

EXAMPLES:

vṛkṣaḥ
plakṣaḥ

1. Note that, prior to this point in this *śāstra* 'grammar', the first *a* was assumed to be 'open' (*vivṛta*). This assumption is based on articulatory efforts involved in the production of *a* as a 'closed' (*saṃvṛta*) short (*hrasva*) vowel and 'open' (*vivṛta*) long (*dīrgha*), or extra-long (*pluta*; *vivṛtakaraṇāḥ svarāḥ*; *saṃvṛtastv akāraḥ*). Such a description created problems in formulating abbreviatory terms (*pratyāhāra*), particularly *aṆ*, and, thereby, denoting homogeneous vowel qualities by means of them. Recall that 1.1.9 *tulyāsyaprayatnaṃ savarṇam* requires that sounds which share homogeneous relationship must involve similar articulatory efforts in the oral cavity. This, in turn, cannot ensure homogeneous relationship of individual sound qualities denoted by vowels of the abbreviatory term *aṆ*. It is to resolve this difficulty that *a* was assumed to be *vivṛta* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

But since its usage is open, and also since, contrary to this usage, this 'open' quality does not become the standard articulation in usage (*loka*), this rule declares it to be accepted as 'closed' (*saṃvṛta*; *Kāś*: *iha śāstre kāryārtham akāro vivṛtaḥ pratijñātaḥ, tasya tathābhūtasyaiva prayogo mā bhūd iti saṃvṛtapratyāpattir iyaṃ kriyate*).

A specification made at the end of the *śāstra* 'grammar' applies through its entirety. Besides, what was previously specified as *vivṛta* 'open' is now, through the suspension provision of 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*, becomes established here (*atra*) as *saṃvṛta* 'open'. For example, *a* in *vṛkṣaḥ* and *plakṣaḥ* should be articulated as 'close short' as is the practice in the usage.

One can view this relationship between two specified *a* sounds as that of a *sthānī* 'that which is replaced' and *ādeśa* 'that which replaces'. How could such a relationship be perceived between them when there is no formal difference. How could one *a* be called another if there was extreme non-difference (*atyantābheda*)? Such a statement will be useless. But there is a difference. They differ with respect to their articulatory efforts (*prayatna-bhedāt*). That which is articulated with an 'open' articulatory effort is 'one which is to be replaced'. That which is articulated with a 'closed' articulatory effort is 'one which replaces'. It is the *a* which is articulated with 'closed' articulatory effort that experiences the status of being a replacement.

Now, there is no *a* which is articulated with 'open' articulatory effort. Not in the usage. Not in the Vedic. Not in the classical usage, either. For, in all instances, we only see a 'closed' *a*. Why go through the stipulation of an 'open' *a* which is now to be considered as 'closed'? It is true that, in the Vedic as well as in the classical usage, *a* is articulated as 'closed'. Still, for certain functional necessities, the *a* was stipulated to be articulated as 'open'. What is that functional necessity? Commentators identify this functional necessity as 'the establishment of homogeneous relationship between the class of sounds characterized as *a*'. If *a* was accepted as 'closed' to start with, it would have been impossible to establish its homogeneous relationship with *ā*. For, *ā* is articulated with the articulatory effort characterized as *vivṛta* 'open'. This, in turn, would go directly against the stipulation that 'a homogeneous sound shares the same articulatory effort with others in the oral cavity' (1.1.9 *tulyāsyaprayatnaṃ savarṇam*). The notion of homogeneity is established so that, among other things, a specification with a *hrasva* 'short' *a* can also include reference to its corresponding *dīrgha* 'long'. If a specification with 'short' cannot include a reference to its 'long' counterpart, long replacement (*savarṇa-dīrgha*) of 6.1.100 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* cannot be accomplished in *daṇḍa* + *agram* = *daṇḍāgram*. But such a replacement cannot be accomplished in *daṇḍa* + *āḍhakam* = *daṇḍāḍhakam*. But this inability of accomplishing long replacement in *daṇḍāḍhakam* should not be accepted as a fault (*doṣa*). For, here in this *śāstra* 'grammar', qualities (*guṇāḥ*) are considered non-distinctive (*abhedakāḥ*). The very idea of establishing the notion of *sāvarṇya* 'homogeneity' supports it. This reasoning is not valid. For, the *sūtra* which establishes the notion of homogeneity also considers differences in articulatory efforts as one of the variables. If not, the effort of establishing homogeneity on the basis of *prayatna* 'articulatory efforts' will become useless.

2. A specification of 'open' *a*, via the abbreviatory term *aṆ*, includes reference to a class of eighteen vowels distinguished by qualities such as *udātta*, etc. Consequently, we get a 'close short' vowel as a substitute in place of a similar vowel quality. A 'long' or 'extra-long' vowel quality can also be similarly gotten as a replacement. Or else, one can accept the *a* as 'close'. But since this 'close' vowel quality is not included within the reference of the abbreviatory term *aṆ* it cannot include any reference to a 'long' or 'extra-long' vocalic quality. Accepting *a* as a specific 'close' vowel quality of the duration of one mora (*mātrā*) is also problematic. For, it can then not include any reference to similar vowel qualities of the duration of one mora. The only way this can be resolved is: let a specified vowel quality refer to its own specific quality, and not to any other. Jinendrabuddhi (*Nyāsa* ad *Kāś*) asks two questions which, in turn, sum up the problems invloved in accepting the specification of *a* of *aṆ* as 'open' or 'close':

> *kathaṃ punar dīrghaplutayor anena vivṛtenākāreṇa grahaṇam iṣyamāṇam api na bhavati* 'how is a reference to 'long' and 'extra-long' qualities, eventhough desired, cannot be accomplished by accepting this *a* as *vivṛta* 'open'?'
> *kathaṃ ca saṃvṛtena sarvaguṇayuktasya mātrikasya grahaṇam iṣyamāṇam api labhyate* 'how is a reference to all 'close' vowel qualities of the duration of one mora accomplished by accepting this *a* as *saṃvṛta* 'close'?'

Others claim that this problem of reference, which is caused by the specification of *a*, via *aṆ*, can be resolved by formulating this rule as *ad a*. That is, by specifying *a* with *t* (*taparakaraṇa*; 1.1.70 *taparas tatkālasya*), as Patañjali states in the *Mahābhāṣya*: *siddhaṃ tu taparanirdeśāt* 'it is established on the basis of specification with a following *t*'. This new formulation would yield two interpretations of *taparaḥ*: *taḥ paro yasmāt* 'that after which *t* occurs'; and *tāt paraḥ taparaḥ* 'that which occurs after *t*'. The first interpretation will apply to the first *a*. The second interpretation will apply to the following *a*. The *taparakaraṇa* of the first vowel, i.e., *vivṛta* 'open', will help exclude reference to any corresponding *dīrgha* 'long' and *pluta* 'extra-long'. A replacement, eventhough not included within the reference of *aṆ*, will be able to refer to vowels of same duration, though used with different qualities.

Some also see the formulation of this rule as a specification made in view of the process of *ekaśeṣa* 'only one of many remains'. Thus, six vowels of the duration of one mora (*mātrā*) are specified as *sthānī* 'that which is replaced'. Their corresponding replacements are also specified in equal number. One of each set is then retained. Thus, *ekaśeṣa* applies to both sets of six vowels. The assignment of an equivalent replacement is made on the basis of duration. Replacements of a 'long' or 'extra-long' duration are thus excluded. Six replacements of 'close' duration come in place of six vowels of similar duration in the order of enumeration. This accomplishes what is desired.

3. Commentators accept that those who, for reasons of achieving desired goals (*iṣṭa-siddhi*) of formulating a *śāstra*, invoke auspiciousness (*maṅgala*) at the beginning, in the middle, and also at the end, become celebrated and long-living:

> *yato maṅgalādīni maṅgalamadhyāni maṅgalāntāni ca śāstrāṇi prathante vīrapuruṣāṇi bhavanty āyuṣmatpuruṣāṇi ca/*

Pāṇini follows this practice of invoking auspiciousness so that the formulation of his *śāstra* could not only be accomplished without any obstacle (*vighna*), but could also accrue him merit (*puṇya*) and fame (*yaśas*). He thus used *a* at the beginning (in *aN* of the *Śs aiuN*), *a* in the middle (the first 'open' *a* of this rule) and at the end (the final 'close' *a* of this rule). This is fully in consonance with his practice of invoking auspiciousness in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Thus, at the beginning (1.1.1 *vṛddhir ādaic*) he uses the word *vṛddhi* 'growth'; in the middle he uses the word *śiva* (4.4.143 *śivaśamariṣṭasya kare*); and, at the end (8.4.67 *nodāttasvaritodaya . . .*), he uses the word *udaya*.

Bibliography

Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudeva (Ed.)
1960 *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgeśa*, edited and explained by F. Kielhorn, II, new edition, with preface by K.V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
1961 *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar.* Baroda: Oriental Institute.
Agrawal, Vasudev Sharan
1963 *India as Known to Pāṇini.* Varanasi: Prithivi Prakashan.
Avanindra Kumar
1981 *Savyākhya Aṣṭādhyāyī Padānukrama-kośa* (*A Word-index of Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī*). Delhi: Parimal Publications.
Ayachit, S.M.
1961 'Gaṇapāṭha: A Critical Study,' *Indian Linguistics* 22: 1–63.
Bahulikar, Saudamini
1972 'Some Criteria for Determining the Insertions in the Aṣṭādhyāyī.' Harvard University, Ph.D. dissertation, unpublished.
Banerjee, Rabi Sankar
1984 *Concept of Asiddhatva in Pāṇini.* Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.
Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna
1976 *An Account of the Different Existing Systems of Sanskrit Grammar,* reprint. Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.
Bhate, Saroja and Johannes Bronkhorst (Eds.)
1993 *Bhartṛhari, Philosopher and Grammarian*: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Bhartṛhari, University of Poona, January 6–8, 1992. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Bhate, Saroja and Yashodhara Kar
1993 *Word Index to the Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari* (together with the complete text of the *Vākyapadīya*). Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.
Bhattacharya, Ram Shankar
1966 *Pāṇinīya Vyākaraṇa kā Anuśīlana* (in Hindi). Varanasi: Indological Book House.
Bhimasen Shastri
1969 *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāraḥ, Bhaimī Vyākhyopetaḥ* (in Hindi). Delhi: Bhaimi Prakashan.
1979 *Nyāsa-paryālocanam* (a critical study of the *Nyāsa* of Jinendrabuddhi (in Hindi). Delhi: Bhaimi Prakashan.
1983–88 *Laghu-siddhānta-kaumudī*, I–IV (in Hindi). Delhi: Bhaimi Prakashan.

Bloomfield, Leonard
1931 *Language.* New York: Henry Holt.
Böhtlingk, Otto
1964 *Pāṇinis Grammatik,* reprint. Hidelsheim: Olms.
Brahmadatta Jijñāsu/Prajñā Devī
1964–68 *Aṣṭādhyāyībhāṣya,* prathamāvṛtti, I–III (in Hindi). Sonepat: Ramlal Kapur Trust.
Bronkhorst, Johannes
'Asiddha in the Aṣṭādhyāyī: A Misunderstanding among the Traditional Commentators', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 8: 69–85.
Buiskool, Herman E.
1939 *The Tripādī: being an Abridged Recast of Pūrvatrāsiddham.* Leiden: Brill.
Burrow, Thomas
1973 *The Sanskrit Language.* London: Faber and Faber.
Cardona, George
1967 'Negations in Pāṇinian Rules', *Language* 43: 34–56.
1968 'Pāṇini's Definition, Description and Use of Svarita', *Festschrift for F.B.J. Kuiper,* 448–61.
1969 *Studies in Indian Grammarians,* I: The Method of Description Reflected in the Śivasūtras. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
1970 'Some Principles of Pāṇini's Grammar', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* I: 40–74.
1971 'Cause and Causal Agent: The Pāṇinian View', *Journal of the Oriental Institute.* Baroda 16: 1–2: 22–40.
1974 'Pāṇini's Kārakas: Agency, Animation and Identity', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 3: 231–6.
1975 'Paraphrase and Sentence Analysis: Some Indian Views', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 3: 259–81.
1976a *Pāṇini, A Survey of Research.* The Hague, Mouton. [Indian edition, 1980: New Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass; reprinted, 1997.]
1976b 'Some Features of Pāṇinian Derivations', in H. Parret, ed., *History of Linguistic Thought and Contemporary Linguistics.* Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 137–58.
1976c 'Subject in Sanskrit', in M.K. Verma, ed., *The Notion of Subject in South Asian Languages.* Madison: University of Wisconsin, South Asian Studies.
1980 'On the Paribhāṣā upapadavibhakteḥ kārakavibhaktir balīyasī,' *Studien Zur Indologie Und Iranistik. Festschrift Und Paul Thieme,* pp. 5–6.
1981 'On the Domain of Pāṇini's Metarule 1.3.10: yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām', *Festschrift K. Kunjunni Raja,* pp. 394–409.
1983 *Linguistic Analysis and Some Indian Traditions* (Pandit Shripad Shastri Deodhar Memorial Lectures). Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
1997 *Pāṇini, His Work and its Traditions,* vol. I: *Background and Introduction*

(sec. rev. and enl. edn.). New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Chakravarti, Shrish Chandra (Ed.)
1925 *Kāśikāvivaraṇapañcikā*, the *Nyāsa*, a commentary on Vāmana-Jayāditya's Kāśikā by Jinendrabuddhi. Rajshahi: The Varendra Research Society.
Charudev Shastri
1969–73 *Vyākaraṇa-candrodaya* (in Hindi), 5 vols. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Chatterji, Ksitish Chandra
1935 'The Aṣṭādhyāyī and the Siddhāntakaumudī', *Calcutta Oriental Journal* 3: 1–2.
1953–61 *Cāndravyākaraṇa of Candragomin*, 2 vols. Poona: Deccan College.
1964 *Technical Terms and Techniques of Sanskrit Grammar*, part I (new edition). Calcutta: Calcutta University.
Chomsky, Noam
1957 *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
1965 *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press.
1970 'Remarks on Nominalization', *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, P. Jacobs and P.S. Rosenbaum, eds. Waltham: Ginn and Company.
1971 'Deep Structure, Surface Structure and Semantic Interpretation', *Semantics*, Danny D. Steinberg and Leon A. Jakovovits, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Das, Karunasindhu
1984 *Paribhāṣās in the Pāṇinian System of Grammar*. Calcutta: Sanskrit Book Depot.
Dash, Keshab Chandra
1994 *Indian Semantics, A Computational Model*. Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan.
Dash, Radha Madhab
1998 *Idioms in Kāśikā*. Delhi: Pratibha Prakashan.
Deshpande, Madhav M.
1980 *Evolution of Syntactic Theory in Sanskrit Grammar: Syntax of the Sanskrit Infinitive-tumUN*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.
Devasthali, G.V. (Ed.)
1967a *The Phiṭsūtras of Śāntanava*. Poona: University of Poona.
1967b *Anubandhas of Pāṇini*. Poona: University of Poona.
1968 *Sārasiddhāntakaumudī of Varadarāja*. Poona: University of Poona.
Dvivedi, H.P.
1977 *Studies in Pāṇini: Technical Terms in the Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Delhi: Inter-India Publications.
Dvivedi, Kapil Deva
1964 *Arthavijñāna aur Bhāratīya Darśana* (in Hindi). Allahabad: Hindustani Academy.
Dwarikadas Shastri (Ed.)
1965–67 *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛttiḥ of Sāyaṇācārya*. Varanasi: Pracya Bharati.

1971 *Bhāṣāvṛtti of Puruṣottamadeva.* Varanasi: Tara Publications.

Dwarikadas Shastri and Kalika Prasad Shukla (Eds.)

1965–67 *Kāśikāvṛtti, Nyāsapadamañjarīsahitā,* 6 vols. Varanasi: Tara Publications.

Emeneau, Murray

1955 'India and Linguistics', *Journal of American Oriental Society* 7: 145–53.

Faddegon, Barend

1936 *Studies on Pāṇini's Grammar.* Verhandeningen der Koninlijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam.

Fillmore, Charles J.

1968 'The Case for Case', *Universals of Linguistic Theory,* B. Bach and R.T. Harms, eds. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fowler, Murray

1965 'How Ordered are Pāṇini's Rules', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 85: 45–47.

Giridharaśarmā Caturveda and Parameśvarānandaśarmā Bhāskara (Eds.)

1958–61 *Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhāntakaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita with *Bālamanoramā* of Vāsudeva Dīkṣita and *Tattvabodhinī* of Jñānendra Sarasvatī, 4 vols. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Goldstucker, Theodor

1965 *Pāṇini: His Place in Sanskrit Literature,* rep. Varanasi: Chowkhambha.

Iyengar, V. Krishna Swamy

1981 *Pāṇinīya Vyākaraṇa Praveśa* (in Hindi). Agra: Uma Mehra.

1983 *Pāṇinīya Vyākaraṇa kī Bhūmikā* (in Hindi). Delhi: Prabhat Prakashan.

Iyer, K.A. Subramania

1969 *Bhartṛhari, A Study of the Vākyapadīya in the Light of Ancient Commentaries.* Poona: Deccan College.

Joshi, D.H.

1971 'On Expressing Kārakas apropos of Pāṇini 2.3.1', *Indian Linguistics* 33: 94–97.

Joshi, S.D.

1966 'Two Methods of Interpreting Pāṇini', *Journal of the University of Poona,* 23: 53–61.

1968 (ed., tr.) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Samarthāhnika* (p. 2.1.2). Poona: University of Poona.

1969 (ed., tr.) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Avyayībhāvāhnika* (p. 2.1.2–2.1.49). Poona: University of Poona.

Joshi, S.D. (Ed., tr., with J.A.F. Roodbergen)

1971 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Karmadhārayāhnika* (p. 2.1.51–2.1.72). Poona: University of Poona.

1973 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Tatpuruṣāhnika* (p. 2.2.2–2.2.23). Poona: University of Poona.

1975 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Kārakāhnika* (p. 1.4.23–1.4.55). Poona:

University of Poona.
1976 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Anabhihitāhnika* (p. 2.3.1–2.3.7). Poona: University of Poona.
1980 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Vibhaktyāhnika* (p. 2.3.18–2.3.45). Poona: University of Poona.
1981 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Prātipadikārthaśeṣāhnika* (p. 2.3.46–2.3.71). Poona: University of Poona.
1982 'The Function of *asiddhatva* and *sthānivadbhāva* in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*', Center for Advanced Studies in Sanskrit (*CASS Studies* 6: 153–68).
1984 *The Fundamentals of Anuvṛtti* (= *PCASS B 9*). Pune: University of Poona.
Kak, Subhash
1987 'The Pāṇinian approach to natural language processing', *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 1987.1: 117–30.
Kapil Deva Shastri
1961 *Sanskrit Vyākaraṇa meṃ Gaṇapāṭha kī Paramparā aur Ācārya Pāṇini* (in Hindi). Ajmer: Bharatiya Pracyavidya Pratishthan.
1975 *Vaiyākaraṇa-Siddhānta-Paramalaghumañjūṣā of Nāgeśa* (in Hindi). Kurukshetra: Kurukshetra University.
Katre, S.M.
1968–69 *Pāṇinian Studies*, II–III: *Dictionary of Pāṇini*. Poona: Deccan College.
1971 *Pāṇinian Studies*, V–VII: *Dictionary of Gaṇapāṭha*. Poona: Deccan College.
1981 *A Glossary of Grammatical Elements and Operations in the Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
1989 *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Kielhorn, F.K.
1963 *Kātyāyana and Patañjali: Their Relation to Each Other and to Pāṇini*, new edition. Varanasi: Indological Book House.
1972 'Notes on the Mahābhāṣya: Some Devices of Indian Grammarians', in *Staal* 1972 (123–34).
Kiprasky, Paul
1979 *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. Poona: University of Poona / Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
1982 *Some Theoretical Problems in Pāṇini's Grammar*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
Kiprasky, Paul and J.F. Staal
1969 'Syntactic and Semantic Relations in Pāṇini', *Foundations of Language*, 5: 83–117.
Laddu, S.D.
1974 *Evolution of the Sanskrit Language from Pāṇini to Patañjali*. Poona: University of Poona, Center for Advanced Studies.
Mahavir
1978 *Pāṇini as a Grammarian*. Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.

Mishra, Chavinath
1978 *Nyāyoktikośa* (in Sanskrit). Delhi: Ajanta Publications.
Mishra, Harsh Nath (Ed., tr.)
1978 *Nāgeśabhaṭṭakṛtaḥ Paribhāṣenduśekharaḥ* with Sanskrit and Hindi commentaries. Delhi: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth.
1979 *Cāndravyākaraṇavṛtteḥ Samālocanātmakam Adhyayanam* (in Sanskrit). Delhi: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth.
Mishra, Vedapati
1970 *Vyākaraṇa Vārttika, eka Samīkṣātmaka Adhyayana* (in Hindi). Varanasi: Prithivi Prakashan.
Mishra, Vidya Niwas
1966 *The Descriptive Technique of Pāṇini: An Introduction.* The Hague: Mouton.
Miśra, Ādyāprasāda
1966 *Prakriyākaumudīvimarśaḥ* (in Sanskrit). Varanasi: Sanskrit University.
Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa
1973–74 *Prakriyāsarvasvam,* rep. Tiruvanantapuram, University of Kerala.
Palsule, G.B.
1961 *The Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas: A Critical Study.* Poona: University of Poona.
Pathak, Shridhar Shastri and Siddheshvar Shastri Chitrao
1927 *Word-index to Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya.* Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
Pawate, I.S.
1935 *The Structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī.* Hubli: Self.
Rangacharya, M. (Ed.)
1916/1927 *Rūpāvatāraḥ of Dharmakīrtti,* 2 vols. Madras: G.A. Natesan and Company.
Rau, Wilhelm
1977 *Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya* (Kārikā text). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
Roodbergen, J.A.F. (Ed., tr., with S.D. Joshi)
1974 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya* (p. 2.2.23–2.2.38). Poona: University of Poona.
Sarma, K. Madhav Krishna
1968 *Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali.* Delhi: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth.
Scharfe, Hartmut
1971 *Pāṇini's Metalanguage.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
1977 *History of Grammatical Literature* (*History of Indian Literature*), vol. 5 (part II: 77–210). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.
Sharma, Mahesh Dutt
1974 *Kāśikāvṛttisiddhāntakaumudyoḥ Tulanātmakam Adhyayanam* (in Sanskrit). Poona: University of Poona, Center for Advanced Studies.
Sharma, Rama Nath
1975 'Referential Indices in Pāṇini,' *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17: 31–39.

1976a *Pāṇini Vyākaraṇa meṃ Prajanak Pravidhiyāṃ* (in Hindi). Agra: Central Hindi Institute.

1976b 'Word Derivation in Pāṇini,' *Folia Linguistica* IX: 1–4: 215–28.

1978 'Review of Roodbergen 1974', *Indo-Iranian Journal* XX: 280–90.

1982 'Review of Kiparsky 1979,' *Language in Society* 12: 349–415.

1983 'Pāṇini aur unkī Aṣṭādhyāyī', *Bhāṣāśāstra kī Rūparekhā* (in Hindi). Delhi: National Publishing Co.

1987 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, vol. I, Introduction to the Aṣṭādhyāyī as a Grammatical Device, sec. rev. and enl. edn., 2002. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

1992 'Pāṇini and Reference to Variable Antecedents,' in R.N. Srivastava et al. (eds.), *Language and Text: Studies in Honour of Ashok R. Kelkar* (pp. 29–42). New Delhi: Kalinga Publications.

1992 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, vol. II, English translation of *adhyāya* One with Sanskrit text, Transliteration, Word-boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

1995 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, vol. III, English translation of *adhyāyas* Two and Three with Sanskrit text, Transliteration, Word-boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

1999 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, vol. IV, English Translation of *adhyāyas* Four and Five with Sanskrit text, Transliteration, Word-boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

1999 'Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali: An Overview of Sanskrit Grammatical Tradition', in G.C. Pande et al. (eds.), *The Dawn of Indian Civilization (up to c. 600 BC)*; Project of History of Indian Science, Culture and Philosophy, vol. 1, part I (pp. 747–58). New Delhi: Center for Studies in Civilizations.

2001 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, vol. V, English translation of *adhyāya* Six with Sanskrit text, Transliteration, Word-boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Shefts, Betty

1961 'Generative Semantics and Pāṇini's Kārakas', *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda 23: 27–39.

Sītārāmaśāstrī (Ed.)

1974 *Prauḍhamanoramā of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita*, with the commentaries Bṛhat and Laghuśabdaratna of Hari Dīkṣita, vol. I. Varanasi: Sanskrit University.

Śrīnārāyaṇa Miśra

1969, 1972 *Kāśikā* with commentary Prakāśa (in Hindi), 2 vols. Varanasi: Chowkhambha.

Staal, J.F. (Ed.)
1972 *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians.* Cambridge (Mass.): The M.I.T. Press.
Thieme, Paul
1956 'Pāṇini and the Pāṇinīyas', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76: 1–28.
Trivedi, Kamalashankar Pranshankar (Ed.)
1925, 1931 *The Prakriyā Kaumudī of Rāmacandra,* with the commentary *Prasāda* of Viṭṭhala, 2 vols. Bombay: Sanskrit and Prākṛta Series.
Varma, Siddheshwar
1978 *Pāṇini and Elision: Being an Analytic Study of Pāṇini's Sūtras on LOPA (elision) in Sanskrit.* Chandigarh. Panjab University Indological Series.
Vasu, S.C. (Ed., tr.)
1962 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini* (reprint), 2 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
1962 *The Siddhāntakaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita* (reprint), 2 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Vedālaṅkāra, Raghuvir
1977 *Kāśikā kā Samālocanātmaka Adhyayana* (in Hindi). Delhi: Nag Publishers.
Veda Vrata (Ed.)
1962–63 *Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣyam, Pradīpodyotavimarśaiḥ samalaṅkṛtam,* 5 vols. Gurukula Jhajjar.
Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka
Saṃskṛta Vyākaraṇaśāstra kā Itihāsa (in Hindi), 3 vols. Sonepat: Ramlal Kapur Trust.

Index of Derivations

(in notes)

akṣaṇvatā (7.1.76) 74
acakāt tvam (8.2.74) 573
acinvata (7.1.5) 7
acīkarat (7.4.1)323/(7.4.93) 404
acīkṛtat (7.4.7) 330
ajarghāḥ (8.2.37) 539
añjijiṣati (7.2.74) 173
aḍuḍhaukat (7.4.59) 369
atijarasam (7.2.101) 204
atijarāṃsi (7.2.101) 204
atiṣṭhipat (7.4.6) 329
atutraukat (7.4.59) 369
atṛṇeṭ (7.3.92) 300
atrāsmai ((7.1.14) 14
adāyi (7.3.33) 247
aduhra (7.1.8) 9
adhāyi (7.3.33) 247
adhijigāṃsate (8.3.24) 629
anaḍvān (7.1.82) 79
anayoḥ (7.2.112) 213
anena (7.2.112) 213
apākṣīt (7.2.3) 99
apāspāḥ (8.3.14) 619
apīpavat (7.4.1) 323
apīpyat (7.4.4) 328
ababhrājat (7.4.3) 327
abibhrajat (7.4.3) 327
abudhvam (8.2.37) 540
abhiṣuṇoti (8.3.65) 673
abhiṣuvati (8.3.65) 674
abhyaṣuṇot (8.3.65) 675
amaṃsta (8.2.26) 525
amunā (8.2.3) 488
amuṣmai (8.2.1) 474
aririṣati (7.2.74) 173
alabdhāḥ (8.2.40) 545
avagūrṇam (8.2.41) 546
avatsyat (7.4.49) 362
avadigye (7.4.9) 332
avātta (8.2.26) 525
aṣṭau ((7.1.21) 21
asā ādityaḥ (8.2.1) 474
asau (7.2.1) 478
asmā uddhara (8.2.1) 474
asmān (7.1.29) 29
asrāk (8.2.62) 563
āganīganti (7.4.65) 375
āṭa (7.4.60) 370
ādīdhitā (7.4.53) 364
ānaṅga (7.4.70) 383
ānañja (7.4.70) 383
ānṛdhatuḥ (7.4.70) 384
āpanīphaṇat (7.4.65) 375
āvayoḥ (7.2.92) 193
āvābhyām (7.2.92) 193
āvām (7.2.87) 187
āvevīta (7.4.53) 364
āśīrvān (8.2.15) 511
āsaniṣyadat (7.4.65) 377
āsīḥ (7.3.96) 304
āsīt (7.3.96) 304
āstaraṇa (7.1.102) 95
āstīrṇam (7.1.100)94/(8.2.42) 546
imau (7.2.109) 212
iyaṣṭha (7.2.62) 161
īyatuḥ (7.4.69) 382
īyuḥ (7.4.69) 382
uḍḍīnavān (7.2.15) 118
uttavīti (7.3.95) 303
uttauti (7.3.95) 303
udasṛjo (8.1.57) 458
udavoḍhām (7.2.3) 100
upadidīyidhve (8.3.79) 690
eṣaḥ (7.2.102) 205
aujaḍhat (8.2.1) 475
kaḥ (7.2.103) 206
kariṣyatī (7.1.80) 77
karīkṛṣyate (7.4.64) 374

karṣṭā (7.2.62) 162
kā̃skān (8.3.12) 616
kāṃskān (8.3.12) 616
kāka āste (8.3.18) 625
kākay āste (8.3.18) 625
kāṣṭhadhak (8.2.32) 531
kiṃvān (8.2.9) 505
kīdṛṅ (7.1.84) 80
kurvanti (7.1.3) 5
kurvīta (7.2.79) 177
kṛṇutāt (7.1.41) 44
kṣāmimān (8.2.1) 475
kroṣṭre (7.1.97) 91
gāvaḥ (7.1.90) 85
guḍaliṇmān (8.2.1) 475
godhuk (8.2.32) 535
cakarṣitha (7.2.62) 162
cakāddhi (8.2.25) 522
cakāra (7.4.62) 373
cakhāna (7.4.62) 373
catasṛbhiḥ (7.2.99) 202
cikhaniṣati (8.4.54) 777
cinvate (7.1.5) 7
cinvatām (7.1.5) 7
jambhayati (7.1.61) 56
jigāya (7.3.57) 271
jigīṣati (7.3.57) 271
jighāṃsati (7.3.55) 269
jijaniṣate (8.4.54) 777
jijāvayiṣati (7.4.80) 390
jīvatāt (7.1.35) 33
ṭiṭhakārayiṣati (8.4.54) 777
ḍuḍhaukiṣate (7.4.59) 369
tava (7.1.27) 27
tiṣṭhāsati (7.4.61) 372
tudatī (7.1.80) 77
tubhyam (7.1.28) 28
tutraukiṣate (7.4.59) 369
tṛṇekṣi (7.3.92) 300
tṛṇeḍhi (7.3.92) 300
tvattaraḥ (7.2.98) 199
tvadīyaḥ (7.2.98) 199
tvām (7.2.87) 187
dattvāya (7.1.47) 46
dadanti (7.1.79) 77
dadhātana (7.1.45) 45
ditsati (7.4.54) 365
didiviṣati (7.2.49) 149
dudyūṣati (7.2.49) 149
dūraktam (8.3.14) 619
droḍhā (8.2.33) 533
dvā atra (8.2.1) 474
dhitsati (7.4.54) 365
nenijāni (7.3.87) 294
naṃṣṭā (7.1.60) 54
nighokṣyate (8.2.37) 539
nirāṇaddham (8.4.2) 722
nīraktam (8.3.14) 619
ṇyakna (8.2.48) 553
nyanuvīt (7.2.1) 97
pacāmahai (7.2.81) 182
pacāvahai (7.2.81) 182
pacet (7.2.80) 178
pacetām (7.2.81) 178
papau (7.1.34) 32
payaskumbhī (8.3.46) 655
paya×pibati (8.3.38) 645
pariṣuṇoti (8.3.48) 675
parisesicyate (8.3.112) 714
piṇḍhi (8.4.65) 788
pipaviṣate (7.2.74) 173
pipāvayiṣati (7.4.80) 389
piphakārayiṣati (8.4.54) 777
pispandiṣate (7.4.61) 372
praceto ı̄jan (8.2.70) 569
prajighāyayiṣati (7.3.57) 271
praṇidegdhi (8.4.17) 742
prattam (7.4.47) 360
prayāpaṇam (8.4.30) 755
prayāyamāṇam (8.4.29) 753
prāvāriṣuḥ (7.2.40) 140
priyakroṣṭune (7.1.97) 92
preṅkhaṇam (8.4.32) 758
prenvanam (8.4.2) 723
plakṣa idam (8.2.3) 491
bibhāvayiṣati (7.4.80) 390
bhavavān (7.3.101) 310
bhavā̃ś chādayati (8.3.7) 613
bhavāñ cchete (8.3.31) 635
bhavāñ cśete (8.3.31) 635
bhavāṃś chādayati (8.3.7) 613
bhotsyate (8.2.37) 540
maṅktā (7.1.60) 54
magna (7.1.60) 55
mat (7.1.32) 75
madīyaḥ (7.2.98) 199

mama (7.1.27) 27
mayā (7.2.89) 188
mām (7.2.87) 187
mārṣṭā (7.2.115) 215
māṣavāpāni (8.4.11) 733
mitradhruk (8.2.33) 533
mimīte (7.4.76) 387
mumukṣate (7.4.57) 368
yaṣṭā (7.2.62) 537
yuvayoḥ (7.2.89) 188
yuvābhyām (7.2.89) 188
yuvām (7.2.88) 197
yuṣmān (7.1.29) 29
yūyam (7.2.93) 195
rājavatī (8.2.2) 483
rājāyate (8.2.2) 485
rāddhā (7.2.62) 162
revān (8.2.15) 511
līḍham (8.3.13) 617
vayam (7.2.93) 195
vavṛdhve (8.3.78) 688
vigāḍhā (7.2.44) 144
vididyute (7.4.67) 380
videdyutyate (7.4.67) 380
vidvān (7.1.36) 36
vṛkṣa idam (8.2.3) 491
vṛkṣa×karoti (8.3.36) 643
vṛkṣa×pacati (8.3.36) 643
vṛkṣav karoti (8.3.17) 623
vyatire (7.4.51) 363
vyatise (7.4.51) 362
vyānaśe (7.4.72) 384
vyānaśāte (7.4.72) 384
vyānaśire (7.4.72) 384
śaṃvān (8.2.9) 505
śaye (7.1.41) 42
śvaliḍ ḍhaukate (8.3.13) 618
śīnaḥ (8.2.47) 551
śiṇḍhi (8.4.65) 788
śuṣkajaṅghā (8.2.1) 475
śuṣkikā (8.2.1) 475
ṣaṇṇām (7.1.55) 51
saḥ (7.2.102) 205
sakhā (7.1.93) 87
sakhāyaḥ (7.1.92) 87
sarvasyāḥ (7.3.114) 319
samarṇaḥ (7.2.24) 126
sarveṣām (7.1.52) 49
sisrāvayiṣati (7.4.81) 391
suṣvāpayiṣati (7.4.67) 380
susrāvayiṣati (7.4.81) 391
saubhāgineyaḥ (7.3.19) 235
soḍhā (8.2.31) 530
sauhārdam (7.3.19) 235
suṣvāpayiṣati (7.4.67) 380
he aghoḥ (8.3.2) 604
he bhagoḥ (8.3.2) 604

Index of Terms

akarmaka 121; 127, 368
aṅga 1, 3, 5–13, 17, 19–24, 26–33, 35–39, 41–44, 46–57, 59–67, 70–85, 87–102, 104–8, 112, 114–15, 118–20, 122, 124–26, 128–31, 135–36, 142–44, 147–48, 150–54, 156, 158–59, 162, 165–66, 169–76, 178–79, 181–89, 191, 193, 195–200, 202–9, 211–17, 323–52, 354–57, 359–62, 364–69, 374, 377, 380–93, 395–97, 399–404, 406–8, 440–41, 478, 484, 488, 503–4, 519, 526, 577, 592, 675, 687–88, 787
ajādi 20, 22, 57, 105, 188, 203, 291, 298
adupadeśa 412
adhikaraṇa 451, 554
adhikāra 191, 200, 409, 421, 426–27, 475–77, 581, 601, 605–6, 662, 664, 672
anajādi 74
anavakāśa 572
anādeśādi 496
anitya 2, 3, 10, 13, 23, 71, 125, 205, 492, 577, 747
anuktasamuccayārthaḥ 120
anudātta 61, 74–75, 93, 108–9, 111, 114, 116, 131, 136, 144–46, 151, 156, 163–64, 170–74, 183–84, 248, 411–12, 421, 427–33, 436–71, 474, 490–93, 497–500, 514, 594–96, 598, 600, 602–3, 675, 682–83, 768, 789, 790–91
anunāsika 1, 81, 384, 396, 496–97, 605–13, 615–16, 631, 770–71, 780
anuvṛtti 25, 37, 39, 46, 60, 67, 82–83, 219–20, 246, 272, 283, 303, 310, 322, 332, 338, 343, 351, 454–55, 460, 468, 492, 497, 514, 523, 538, 544, 581, 587, 600, 612, 619, 621, 629, 632, 639, 641, 644, 647, 649–50, 662, 683, 688, 690, 694, 698, 718, 736, 738, 750, 756–57, 777, 783, 785, 790
anusvāra 37, 59–60, 62–64, 66, 78, 81, 129, 146, 154, 269, 325, 379, 397, 496, 538, 605–11, 613, 615–16, 623, 628–31, 636, 639–40, 665, 676, 723, 758, 780–82, 789
antaraṅga 14, 69, 97, 103, 181, 201, 243, 324, 349, 372, 487, 490–91, 507, 517, 520, 522, 577, 618, 786
antodātta 275, 447, 485
anyatarasyām 10, 20, 33, 37, 203–4, 226, 252, 254, 327, 338, 356, 373, 424, 555, 557, 648, 653, 692–93, 784–85, 787
apavāda 179, 204, 482
apādāna 31, 552
apṛkta 25, 299–300, 304–9, 493, 562
aprāpta 130, 319, 392, 505, 534, 558, 650, 703, 725, 729
abhyasta 6–7, 76–77, 183, 294–95, 298, 400
abhyāsa 33, 57–58, 161, 165–70, 174, 177, 183, 269–72, 295–97, 302, 324, 326–31, 335–36, 340, 342, 345, 347, 350, 366–68, 543, 575, 577, 619, 667, 669–74, 676–80, 682, 687, 697, 714, 716–18, 746–47, 777–78
avayava 181, 228, 230, 305, 532, 540, 544, 619–20, 666–67, 733, 745
avayavin 305
avyaya 38, 207, 306, 413, 415, 470, 488, 500, 645
avyayībhāva 424–25, 500, 707, 728
asiddha 25, 55, 69, 71–72, 101, 118, 123, 147, 180, 334, 349, 372, 400, 461, 475–76, 478–82, 484–88, 492–96, 499, 507, 511–12, 515, 517, 525, 528, 543, 547, 556, 563–64, 571, 576–77, 579, 584, 601–2, 618, 621, 623, 635–36, 639–40, 648, 697, 704, 717, 720, 747, 758, 769–70, 781, 783, 785–87, 790
asiddhatva 29, 69, 280, 373, 400, 475–78, 481, 484–85, 487–88, 491, 502, 517, 519–20, 522, 526, 567, 602, 609, 636, 652, 705, 781
ākṛtigaṇa 237, 657, 703, 705
āgama 69, 148, 251, 306, 565
ātideśika 90–91, 182, 418–19, 788
ātmanepadam 200, 347, 393, 514, 683

ādeśa 83, 181, 184, 191, 208, 265, 331, 477–78, 608, 633, 666–67, 766, 792
ādyudātta 4–6, 248, 440, 458, 470, 500
ābhīkṣṇya 64, 412–13, 423, 436–37, 459
ārdhadhātuka 38, 44, 86, 114, 134–36, 287–88, 290, 292–93, 295, 297, 341, 361–62, 530, 577, 755
iganta 70, 89, 486
iglakṣaṇā 105
iḍāgama 58, 172
itva 141, 210, 220–21, 256, 259–62, 324, 327, 330, 336, 358, 377–78, 388, 390–92, 394, 405–8, 421, 480, 778
ītva 329, 354, 387, 580
uttarapada 222
utsarga 478, 482
udātta 4–6, 22, 38, 61, 69, 73–75, 84, 89, 90–92, 114, 144, 152, 155, 157, 163, 170, 173, 183, 203, 227, 247–48, 275, 314, 412, 417, 420–22, 428–29, 437–40, 442, 446–47, 449, 451, 453–55, 457–58, 461, 463–66, 469–74, 485–86, 490–93, 495, 497–500, 581–96, 600, 602–3, 789–91, 793
udit 133, 144, 152, 154, 173–74, 283
upadeśa 58, 86, 108–9, 113–14, 136, 144, 159–63, 184, 247–48, 265, 292, 440, 533, 674–75, 683–84, 687, 737, 743–44, 759
upadhā 55, 57, 60, 90, 268–70, 276, 289–95, 323–25, 327, 329, 362, 371, 373, 376, 378, 380, 400–402, 421, 505–7, 576, 647, 748, 756–57
upadhālopa 168, 177, 328, 524
upadhāhrasva 250, 324–25, 327, 330
upapada 81, 243, 246, 255, 288, 518, 565, 698, 702, 734
upasarga 62–63, 333–34, 414, 444, 459, 467, 469, 514–15, 557, 695, 703, 716, 723, 737–39, 743, 749, 752–53
upasarjana 23, 51, 85, 260, 313, 338
ekādeśa 33, 490–93, 498, 499, 648
ekavacana 52, 188, 432
ekaśeṣa 52, 793–94
ekāc 55, 58, 86, 108–9, 113–14, 116, 125, 131, 135, 167–68, 171, 362, 735–36
etva 7–9, 11–12, 30, 32, 42, 49, 58, 165, 167, 170, 176, 204, 210, 214, 296, 311, 314–15, 348, 364, 496, 580, 688
karaṇa 452, 554, 624, 732–33
karmadhāraya 52, 197, 262, 306, 370, 420–22, 424–26, 452–53, 524, 614
karman 121, 137, 140, 143, 247, 286, 345, 347–48, 364, 452–54, 551–52, 748, 750, 754, 761, 763
karmapravacanīya 63, 414, 500, 703
karmavyatihāra 224–25, 363
karmasādhana 484
kāraka 255–56, 452–53, 552, 728
kārya 30, 60, 145, 180, 216, 246, 404, 455, 475, 516, 652, 721
kāryin 409, 506
kāla 232, 415
kutva 55–56, 66, 80, 100, 161, 169, 246, 270–77, 295, 306, 368, 377, 494, 528, 530, 563–64, 645, 676, 755
kṛtākṛtaprasaṅga 11
kriyāsamabhihāra 423, 619
gati 99, 254, 274, 283, 366, 452–55, 458–60, 467–70, 493, 647, 649, 674, 703, 714–15, 734, 737, 739, 749–50, 763
guṇa 2, 5, 7–8, 13, 16–17, 34–36, 39, 42–45, 54, 56, 68, 73, 78, 85–86, 88–92, 95, 97–98, 101–4, 121–22, 127, 131–32, 136, 140, 142–44, 150–53, 155, 159, 162–63, 165–66, 174, 179–80, 191–92, 203, 206, 208, 221, 224, 238, 270, 275, 284, 286–99, 301–3, 307, 314–17, 330–31, 333–36, 339, 341–42, 347–50, 368, 374, 376–77, 380–83, 386, 390, 392–93, 400, 403, 411, 413, 447, 451, 458, 482, 494, 500, 502, 513, 517, 521, 523, 526–27, 532, 538, 546, 551, 567, 579, 659, 667, 675, 689, 716, 738, 743
guṇavacana 237, 244, 630
guru 53, 290, 292–93, 334, 378, 405–6, 585–86, 624, 722
gaurava 27, 60, 555
gha 3, 4, 362, 373, 512, 517–18, 778
ghatva 146, 496–97, 743
ghi 316–17, 321–23, 488, 490, 742
ghu 278, 359–60, 365, 740, 742, 787
caturthī 28, 189, 197, 430–35
cartva 33, 55, 200, 301, 331, 359, 366–67, 387, 496, 528, 532, 535–36, 538, 541,

561, 563, 573, 630, 634, 676, 704, 779, 783
ciṇvadbhāva 138
jaśtva 51, 55, 119, 133, 146, 224, 268, 269, 306, 361, 369, 374, 378, 394, 403, 480–81, 507, 519, 521–22, 528, 532, 535, 538, 541, 543–44, 547, 563, 618, 620, 630, 645, 704, 743, 777, 779, 789
jñāpaka 4, 22, 34–36, 201, 267, 291, 294, 492, 623, 654
ḍhatva 144, 146, 300, 480–81, 496, 747
ṇatva 29, 50, 67, 75, 82, 126, 243, 285, 307, 496–97, 535, 548, 560, 675, 710, 728–29, 734–35, 738–39, 746–49, 751, 761–62
ṇijanta 242
tatpuruṣa 126, 180, 197, 452, 483, 561, 564, 611, 656–58, 691–92, 701, 709, 720, 727–28, 731, 734, 761, 763
tadantavidhi 23, 25, 38, 93, 97, 160, 185, 195–98, 219, 228–29, 236, 264, 311, 501, 518, 574, 613, 620, 629, 638, 652, 730, 744, 758, 761
tadādividhi 19, 223, 226, 283, 311, 516, 737, 744, 758
taddhita 5, 21, 218, 220–21, 223, 226, 228–32, 234–37, 239–45, 247, 337, 458–59, 547, 621, 649, 705–6, 709, 726, 764
taparakaraṇa 85–86, 88, 163, 170, 179, 184, 242, 256, 278, 321–22, 331, 347, 397, 400, 403, 407, 626, 656, 748, 750, 753, 793
tācchīlya 246, 774
tṛtīyā 72–74, 91, 319, 423, 433–34, 443
dīrgha 24, 32, 50–51, 70, 84, 94, 179, 185, 239, 345, 347, 351, 371, 374, 382–83, 394, 399–400, 482, 489–90, 551, 567, 569, 573–76, 581, 602, 614, 791–93
dvandva 2, 52, 103, 426, 483, 665, 667, 691, 695, 744
dvigu 69, 485
dvitīyā 28, 187, 319, 415, 423, 430–35, 466, 763, 774
dvitva 76, 161, 165–67, 199, 250, 269–70, 288, 295, 324, 327–28, 331, 345, 366–70, 372, 377, 379, 381–382, 388, 390–91, 403, 421, 718
dvirvacana 33, 80, 328, 381, 412–13, 496
dvivacana 75, 187, 431, 576
dvyac 485
dhātu 48, 53, 65, 94–95, 201, 215, 501, 516, 532, 573, 670, 696
natva 94–95, 118, 121, 212, 496–97, 552, 554
napuṃsaka 2, 23, 52, 204, 213, 245, 486, 579
nitya 7, 11, 23, 37, 52, 57, 64, 71, 98, 100, 115, 151, 160, 166, 171, 201, 299, 309, 324, 336, 342, 412, 436, 477, 516, 591, 598, 622, 626, 682, 687, 736, 756, 759, 775, 779, 782, 785
nipāta 439, 446, 460, 493, 701, 710, 752
nipātana 38, 43, 46–47, 119, 121–24, 127–34, 163, 165, 170, 248, 267–68, 273–75, 277, 291–92, 297, 352–53, 358, 375–78, 385–86, 402, 425–26, 450, 495, 502, 508–10, 512, 530, 554–57, 559–61, 566, 685–86, 698–700, 715, 725, 731
nimitta 137, 391, 477–78, 487, 614–15, 617, 674, 677, 709–10, 720, 725, 747, 763
niyama 116–17, 135–36, 224, 414, 450, 672, 697, 710, 725–28
niyamārtha 167
niranubandhaka 19, 144
niravakāśa 179
niṣṭhā 94–95, 113, 118–22, 124–26, 128–32, 135, 147, 150–54, 359, 494–95, 513, 528, 546–60, 627, 684–86, 713, 754–55
pañcamī 30–31, 70, 112, 181, 183–84, 189, 210–11, 227, 292, 360, 414, 443, 481, 516, 559, 605, 607–8, 634, 638, 657, 659–60, 722, 773
pada 68, 71–72, 74, 81, 124, 127, 159–60, 221–22, 226–27, 234, 353, 365, 375, 385, 395–97, 426–73, 487, 490, 493, 496–97, 499, 507, 510, 518, 520, 522, 525, 528–37, 539, 543–44, 562–68, 570–74, 579, 581, 583, 586–87, 589–92, 594–98, 601, 603–4, 610, 612–14, 618, 619–21, 624–38, 644–49, 651–54, 656–63, 666, 671, 691, 696, 702, 707–14, 720, 724–26, 728–38, 740, 745–46,

751, 761–64, 768–71, 781
para 11, 14–16, 57, 160, 194, 203, 342, 382, 422, 472, 481–82, 488, 608, 612, 632, 636, 641, 790
paratva 10–11, 23, 33, 70, 75, 95, 129, 168, 208, 321, 324, 345, 361, 379, 482, 492, 551
pararūpa 500
parasavarṇa 59–60, 62–63, 66, 78–79, 129, 200, 267, 325, 379, 397, 496, 632, 636, 676, 758, 780, 782
parasmaipada 7, 42, 96–99, 101–2, 104–5, 137, 140–41, 143, 156–59, 171–73, 178, 282, 295, 333, 343, 376, 386
paryāya 245, 329, 592
puṃvadbhāva 242, 418–21, 479, 554
purastāpavāda 106
pūrva 423, 472, 475, 481–82, 747
pūrvapada 708–9, 738
pūrvapadaprakṛtisvara 486
pūrvarūpa 500, 579
pūrvasavarṇa 784
prakṛti 201, 577
prakṛtibhāva 602, 639
pragṛhya 600–601, 639–40, 780
pratipadokta 71, 266, 318, 627
pratiṣedha 26, 98, 112, 137, 146, 153, 157–58, 160, 578
pratyayalakṣaṇa 291, 305–6, 503–4, 638
pratyayasvara 446, 449
pratyāsatti 415, 460, 628
pratyāhāra 611, 791
prathamā 28, 187, 189–90, 196, 211, 435–36, 460–65, 506, 597, 613, 615, 656, 676, 730
prapañca 113, 530, 579, 641, 652, 709
prasajya 256, 289, 552, 568, 683, 772
prātipadika 201, 338, 424, 491, 500–504, 575, 734
pluta 345, 411, 417, 457, 462, 495, 581, 639, 648, 791, 793
bahiraṅga 14, 97, 201–2, 231, 334, 349, 491–93, 507, 520, 522, 547, 577, 621, 786
bahuvacana 51, 188, 580
bahuvrīhi 19, 22–23, 92, 103, 200, 337–38, 418–20, 479, 504, 562–63, 576, 585, 611, 641, 703, 709, 724, 763, 774, 788
bāhulaka 48, 96, 216, 264, 590
bha 20, 83–84, 223, 265, 291, 293, 378, 503–4, 506–7, 578, 663, 678
bhāva 107, 120–22, 126, 136–37, 143, 185, 244, 247, 286, 342, 348, 483–85, 488, 551–52, 563, 732–33, 750
bhāvasādhana 484
bhāvyamāna 82, 331
maṇḍūkapluti 570, 572, 640–41, 649
mātrā 587, 593, 599, 721, 793
yakārādi 342, 348–49, 364
yaṇādeśa 577
yathāsaṃkhya 267, 373, 637
yogavibhāga 26, 219, 644, 729
rapara 91, 94, 113, 141, 163, 331, 333, 348, 367, 379, 384, 394, 520
lakṣaṇa 101, 475–76
laghu 105–6, 289–91, 294–96, 331, 334, 394, 404–8, 586, 623–25
laghūpadhaguṇa 716
lopa 2, 9, 25–36, 51, 68, 79–80, 101, 126, 177, 189, 200, 215, 268, 280, 336, 358, 522, 619, 698, 702, 735
vākyabheda 420
vikaraṇa 7, 304, 384, 439, 454–55, 578
vidhi 476–77, 483–84
vidheya 371, 409
vipratiṣedha 70–71, 95, 117, 129, 145, 170, 180–81, 194, 413, 482
vibhakti 67–68, 74, 184–89, 192, 198, 200–209, 211–14, 461, 466
vibhāṣā 8, 63, 65, 91, 96, 104–5, 113, 118, 120–22, 128, 133, 148, 150, 152–53, 165–66, 169, 171, 243, 252–53, 258, 262, 271–72, 298, 319, 338, 340, 357, 407, 414, 435–36, 445–48, 451, 455, 463–65, 516, 528, 565, 569, 586, 589–90
viṣaya 488
viṣaya-saptamī 443
visarjanīya 570, 601
vṛtti 44, 136, 213, 220, 306, 410
vṛddha 489
vṛddhi 10, 32, 34–36, 43, 57, 64, 85–87, 90, 95, 128–29, 140, 173, 210, 212, 215–46, 248–49, 254, 267–68, 270, 288–89, 291–92, 297–99, 303–4, 307,

317, 324, 330–31, 333, 335, 362, 371, 373, 378, 380, 382, 390–92, 500, 507, 517–18, 521, 525, 527, 531, 537, 545, 547, 563, 566, 599
vṛddhinimitta 242
vyatyaya 303–4, 376, 449, 576
vyadhikaraṇa 181, 501
vyapadeśivadbhāva 19, 219, 532
vyabhicāra 571
vyavadhāna 256
ścutva 216, 251, 525
ṣatva 49, 55, 78, 147–48, 150–51, 161, 214–15, 270, 298, 300–301, 329, 368–69, 372, 377
ṣaṣṭhī 112, 172, 180, 183–84, 189, 210–11, 292, 360, 410, 430–35, 479, 481, 483, 539, 576
ṣṭutva 45–46, 51, 55, 100, 118, 129, 146, 148, 150, 161–62, 166, 215, 280, 329, 480, 521, 531, 537, 554, 613, 618, 634, 640, 675, 687, 692–93, 698, 702, 705, 720, 762, 768
saṃkhyā 51, 231–33, 410
saṃjñā 18, 63, 233–34, 481–86, 495, 508–9, 693, 701–3, 724, 726–29, 765
saṃyoga 58, 65, 105, 143, 290, 292–94, 332–33, 349, 518, 547, 755
saṃyogādi 55, 143
saṃyogānta 80, 84, 519, 718
saṃhitā 127, 588, 603–5, 623, 711, 751
sandhi 81, 209, 306, 359, 500, 602, 639
sanvadbhāva 327, 330–31, 369, 405–6, 408, 480
saptamī 60, 85, 97, 160–61, 183–84, 207, 488, 620–21, 638, 695, 700, 702, 727, 767, 773, 788
samāsānta 202, 419, 703, 753
samuccaya 434, 463, 711
samprasāraṇa 109, 119, 151, 153, 161, 165, 266, 271, 378, 380–81, 401, 458, 480, 494, 511, 513, 538, 549, 551–52, 556, 627, 667, 696–97
sambandha 483
sambuddhi 25, 68, 85, 87–89, 93, 209–11, 313–15, 411, 457, 495, 502–4, 566, 603–4, 745
sarvanāmasthāna 20, 64–67, 72, 82–85, 87–90, 92, 315–16, 501, 519
sarvānudātta 429, 437, 457
savarṇa 500, 512, 527, 601, 788
savarṇadīrgha 13–14, 49, 75, 80, 255, 318–19, 601
sāmānādhikaraṇya 218, 501, 532, 666
sāmānya 472–74, 514
sārvadhātuka 54, 78, 134–35, 137, 173, 175–79, 181–84, 287–88, 290–97, 299–300, 341, 344–45, 455, 464, 499, 516, 754
sāhacarya 21, 120, 460, 517, 611, 651, 696
siddha 476, 488, 490–97, 511, 601–2, 618, 635, 640
subanta 466, 470
sthānī 32–33, 83, 100, 105, 180, 191, 259, 265, 331, 360, 397, 477, 766, 792–93
svarita 61–62, 409, 412, 417, 428, 438–40, 446, 449, 461, 490–92, 497–500, 595–98, 600, 602–3, 738, 789–91
halanta 99–101
halādi 22, 105, 149, 167, 214, 291, 299–300, 328, 335, 342, 349, 370, 372, 377, 380–81, 394, 480, 541, 778
hetu 253, 442
hrasva 52, 73, 85, 245, 260, 285, 314–15, 318–19, 489, 581, 705, 791–92

Index of Sūtras

(translated and explained)

a a iti (8.4.68) 791
akṛcchre priyasukha . . . (8.1.13) 424
akṛtsārvadhātukayoh . . . (7.4.25) 344
agnītpreṣaṇe parasya ca (8.2.92) 589
agneḥ stutstomasomāḥ (8.3.82) 691
aṅgayuktaṃ tiṅākāṅkṣam (8.2.96) 592
aṅgāprātilomye (8.1.33) 440
aca upasargāt taḥ (7.4.47) 360
acas tāsvat thaly . . . (7.2.61) 159
aci ra ṛtaḥ (7.2.100) 203
aci vibhāṣā (8.2.21) 516
aco' ñṇiti (7.2.115) 215
aco rahābhyāṃ dve (8.4.46) 771
ac ca gheḥ (7.3.119) 321
ajivrajyoś ca (7.3.60) 273
añceḥ pūjāyām (7.2.53) 152
añco' napādāne (8.2.48) 552
añjeḥ sici (7.2.71) 171
aṭkupvāṅnuṃvyavāye' pi (8.4.2) 721
aḍ gārgyagālavayoḥ (7.3.99) 308
aṇo' pragṛhyasyānunāsikaḥ (8.4.57) 779
ata ādeḥ (7.4.70) 383
ata upadhāyāḥ (7.2.116) 216
ataḥ kṛkamikaṃsakumbha . . . (8.3.46) 655
ato dīrgho yañi (7.3.101) 309
ato bhis ais (7.1.9) 10
ato' m (7.1.24) 24
ato yeyaḥ (7.2.80) 178
ato lrāntasya (7.2.2) 98
ato halāder laghoḥ (7.2.7) 104
atra lopo' bhyāsasya (7.4.58) 368
atrānunāsikaḥ pūrvasya . . . (8.3.2) 605
at smṛdṛtvaraprathamrada . . . (7.4.95) 407
adaḥ sarveṣām (7.3.100) 308
ad abhyastāt (7.1.4) 6
adasa au sulopaś ca (7.2.107) 209
adso' ser dād u do maḥ (8.2.80) 578
aḍḍ ḍatarādibhyaḥ . . . (7.1.25) 24
adhaḥśirasī pade (8.3.47) 656
anaṅ sau (7.1.93) 87
anaci ca (8.4.47) 772
anantyasyā'pi praśnā'khyānayoḥ (8.2.105) 598
anāpy akaḥ (7.2.112) 213
aniteḥ (8.4.19) 744
anudāttaṃ sarvam apādādau (8.1.18) 427
anudāttaṃ ca (8.1.3) 411
anudāttaṃ praśnāntā . . . (8.2.100) 594
anunāsikāt paro' nusvāraḥ (8.3.4) 607
anupasargāt phullakṣība . . . (8.2.55) 556
anuviparyabhinibhyaḥ . . . (8.3.72) 683
anuśatikādīnāṃ ca (7.3.20) 236
anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ (8.4.58) 780
ano nuṭ (8.2.16) 511
antaḥ (8.4.20) 745
antar adeśe (8.4.24) 749
apacitaś ca (7.2.30) 130
apadāntasya mūrdhanyaḥ (8.3.55) 662
aparihvṛtāś ca (7.2.32) 131
apo bhi (7.4.48) 361
abhāṣitapuṃskāc ca (7.3.48) 261
abhinisaḥ stanaḥ . . . (8.3.86) 693
abheś cāvidūrye (7.2.25) 126
abhyāsāc ca (7.3.55) 269
abhyāse car ca (8.4.54) 777
amo maṭ (7.1.40) 41
amnarūdharavar ity ubhaya . . . (8.2.70) 568
ambāmbagobhūmisa . . . (8.3.97) 701
ambārthanadyor hrasvaḥ (7.3.107) 313
am sambuddhau (7.1.99) 93
ayaṅ yi kṅiti (7.4.22) 341
ayanaṃ ca (8.4.25) 750
artipipartyoś ca (7.4.77) 387
arttihrīvlīrīknūyīkṣmāyyātāṃ pug ṇau (7.3.36) 249
ardeḥ saṃnivibhyaḥ (7.2.24) 125
ardhāt parimāṇasya . . . (7.3.26) 240
avayavād ṛtoḥ (7.3.11) 227
avayāḥ śvetavāḥ . . . (8.2.67) 566
avāc cālambanāvidūryayoḥ (8.3.68) 678
aśanāyodanyadhanāyā . . . (7.4.34) 351
aśnoteś ca (7.4.72) 384

aśvakṣīravṛṣalavaṇānām . . . (7.1.51) 48
aśvāghasyāt (7.4.37) 353
aṣṭan ā vibhaktau (7.2.84) 184
aṣṭābhya auś (7.1.21) 21
astisico' pṛkte (7.3.96) 304
asthidadhisakthyakṣṇām . . . (7.1.75) 73
asya cvau (7.4.32) 350
asyates thuk (7.4.17) 339
ahan (8.2.68) 566
aheti viniyoge ca (8.1.61) 461
aho ca (8.1.40) 445
ahno' dantāt (8.4.7) 730
āṅi cāpaḥ (7.3.105) 312
āṅo nā' striyām (7.3.120) 322
āṅo yi (7.1.65) 60
ācchīr nadyor num (7.1.80) 77
āj jaser asuk (7.1.50) 47
āṇ nadyāḥ (7.3.112) 317
āt au ṇalaḥ (7.1.34) 32
āto ṅitaḥ (7.2.81) 181
āto' ṭi nityam (8.3.3) 606
āto yuk ciṇkṛtoḥ (7.3.33) 246
ātmanepadeṣv anataḥ (7.1.5) 6
ād ācāryāṇām (7.3.49) 263
āditaś ca (7.2.16) 119
ādeśapratyayayoḥ (8.3.59) 666
āni loṭ (8.4.16) 739
āne muk (7.2.82) 183
āpo' nyatarasyām (7.4.15) 338
āpjñapyṛdhām īt (7.4.55) 366
ābādhe ca (8.1.10) 419
āma ekāntaram āmantritam anantike (8.1.55) 456
āmantritaṃ pūrvam . . . (8.1.72) 471
āmantritasya ca (8.1.19) 429
āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ (7.1.52) 49
āmreḍitaṃ bhartsane (8.2.95) 591
āyaneyīnīyiyaḥ . . . (7.1.2) 3
ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ (7.2.35) 134
āsandīvadaṣṭhīvaccakrī . . . (8.2.12) 508
āhas thaḥ (8.2.35) 535
āho utāho cānantaram (8.1.49) 451
iko' ci vibhaktau (7.1.73) 67
ijādeḥ sanumaḥ (8.4.32) 757
iṭa īṭi (8.2.28) 526
iṭ sani vā (7.2.41) 141
iḍ attyartivyayatīnām (7.2.66) 166
iḍāyā vā (8.3.54) 661
iṇaḥ ṣaḥ (8.3.39) 646
iṇaḥ ṣīdhvaṃluṅliṭāṃ . . . (8.3.78) 687
iṇkoḥ (8.3.57) 663
iṇ niṣṭhāyām (7.2.47) 147
ito' at sarvanāmasthāne (7.1.86) 82
idanto masi (7.1.46) 45
idamo maḥ (7.2.108) 211
idito num dhātoḥ (7.1.58) 53
idudupadhasya cāpratyayasya (8.3.41) 647
idudbhyāṃ (7.3.117) 320
ido' y puṃsi (7.2.111) 213
iṣugamiyamāṃ chaḥ (7.3.77) 282
iṣṭvīnam iti ca (7.1.48) 46
isusuktāntāt kaḥ (7.3.51) 265
isusoḥ sāmarthye (8.3.44) 652
ī ghrādhmoḥ (7.4.31) 350
ī ca gaṇaḥ (7.4.97) 408
ī ca dvivacane (7.1.77) 75
īḍajanordhve ca (7.2.78) 176
īd āsaḥ (7.2.83) 184
īśaḥ se (7.2.77) 175
ugidacāṃ sarvanāmasthāne' dhātoḥ (7.1.70) 64
uñi ca pade (8.3.21) 626
uto vṛddhir luki hali (7.3.89) 297
uttarapadasya (7.3.10) 227
ut parasyātaḥ (7.4.88) 399
udaḥ sthāstambhoḥ pūrvasya (8.4.61) 782
udanvān udadhau ca (8.2.13) 509
udāttasvaritayor yaṇaḥ . . . (8.2.4) 497
udāttād anudāttasya . . . (8.4.66) 789
udito vā (7.2.56) 154
udīcām ātaḥ sthāne . . . (7.3.46) 258
ud oṣṭhyapūrvasya (7.1.102) 95
upadeśe' tvataḥ (7.2.62) 161
upadhāyāṃ ca (8.2.78) 576
upadhāyāś ca (7.1.101) 94
uparisvid āsīd iti ca (8.2.102) 596
uparyadhyadhasaḥ sāmīpye (8.1.7) 415
upasargaprādurbhyām . . . (8.3.87) 694
upasargavyapetaṃ ca (8.1.38) 444
upasargasyāyatau (8.2.19) 514
upasargāt khalghañoḥ (7.1.67) 62
upasargāt sunotisuvati . . . (8.3.65) 673
upasargād asamāse' pi . . . (8.4.14) 737
upasargād hrasva ūhateḥ (7.4.23) 342
upasargād bahulam (8.4.28) 752
upāt praśaṃsāyām (7.1.66) 61

ubhayatharkṣu (8.3.8) 613
ubhau sābhyāsasya (8.4.21) 746
ur at (7.4.66) 379
ur ṛt (7.4.7) 330
ūrṇāter vibhāṣā (7.3.90) 298
ūrṇoter vibhāṣā (7.2.6) 104
ṛcchatyṛtām (7.4.11) 334
ṛṇam ādhamarṇye (8.2.60) 560
ṛta id dhātoḥ (7.1.100) 93
ṛtaś ca (7.4.92) 402
ṛtaś ca saṃyogādeḥ (7.2.43) 143
ṛtaś ca saṃyogāder guṇaḥ (7.4.10) 332
ṛto ṅisarvanāma . . . (7.3.110) 315
ṛto bhāradvājasya (7.2.63) 162
ṛduśanaspurudaṃso' . . . (7.1.94) 87
ṛdṛśo' ṅi guṇaḥ (7.4.16) 338
ṛddhanoḥ sye (7.2.70) 170
ekaṃ bahuvrīhivat (8.1.9) 418
ekavacanasya ca (7.1.32) 31
ekāc upadeśe' nudāttāt (7.2.10) 108
ekāco baśo bhaṣ . . . (8.2.37) 538
ekāj uttarapade ṇaḥ (8.4.12) 735
ekādeśa udāttenodāttaḥ (8.2.5) 498
ekānyābhyāṃ samarthābhyām (8.1.65) 464
eco' pragṛhyasyā . . . (8.2.107) 599
eta īd bahuvacane (8.2.81) 580
eti saṃjñāyām agāt (8.3.99) 703
eter liṅi (7.4.24) 343
ehimanye prahāse lṛṭ (8.1.46) 449
oḥ puyaṇjy apare (7.4.80) 389
oka ucaḥ ke (7.3.64) 274
otaḥ śyani (7.3.71) 278
oto gārgyasya (8.3.20) 626
oditaś ca (8.2.45) 550
om abhyādāne (8.2.87) 586
osi ca (7.3.104) 311
auṅa āpaḥ (7.1.18) 17
aut (7.3.118) 321
kaḥ karatkarati . . . (8.3.50) 658
kapiṣthalo gotre (8.3.91) 698
karmadhārayavad uttareṣu (8.1.11) 420
kavyadhvarapṛtanasyarci . . . (7.4.39) 354
kaskādiṣu ca (8.3.48) 657
kānāmreḍite (8.3.12) 616
kiṃvṛttaṃ ca ciduttaram (8.1.48) 450
kiṃ kriyāpraśne' nupa . . . (8.1.44) 447
kiti ca (7.2.118) 217
kimaḥ kaḥ (7.2.103) 206
kiraśca pañcabhyaḥ (7.2.75) 174
ku tihoḥ (7.2.104) 207
kutsane ca supy . . . (8.1.69) 467
kupvoḥ . . . (8.3.37) 642
kumati ca (8.4.13) 736
kuhoś cuḥ (7.4.62) 373
kṛcchragahanayoḥ kaṣaḥ (7.2.22) 124
kṛty acaḥ (8.4.29) 753
kṛpo ro laḥ (8.2.18) 513
kṛṣeś chandasi (7.4.64) 374
kṛsṛbhṛvṛstudrusruśruvo liṭi (7.2.13) 115
kekayamitrayupralayānāṃ . . . (7.3.2) 220
ke' ṇaḥ (7.4.13) 336
ktvāpi chandasi (7.1.38) 38
ktvo yak (7.1.47) 46
kyaci ca (7.4.33) 351
kramaḥ parasmaipadeṣu (7.3.76) 282
kliśaḥ ktvāniṣthayoḥ (7.2.50) 150
kvāti (7.2.105) 207
kvinpratyayasya kuḥ (8.2.62) 562
kṣāyo maḥ (8.2.53) 555
kṣiyāśīḥ praiṣeṣu tiṅ ākāṅkṣam (8.2.104) 597
kṣiyo dīrghāt (8.2.46) 550
kṣubdhasvāntadhvānta . . . (7.2.18) 121
kṣubhnādiṣu ca (8.4.39) 764
ksasya āci (7.3.72) 278
kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ (8.3.15) 620
khari ca (8.4.55) 778
gatir gatau (8.1.70) 468
gatyarthaloṭā lṛṇ . . . (8.1.51) 452
gamer iṭ parasmaipadeṣu (7.2.58) 155
gaviyudhibhyāṃ sthiraḥ (8.3.95) 700
guṇo' pṛkte (7.3.91) 299
guṇo yaṅluko̱ḥ (7.4.82) 392
guṇo' rtti saṃyogādyoḥ (7.4.29) 348
guror anṛto' nantyasy . . . (8.2.86) 585
goḥ pādānte (7.1.57) 52
goto ṇit (7.1.90) 84
grasitaskabhitastabhito . . . (7.2.34) 132
graho' liṭi dīrghaḥ (7.2.37) 137
gro yaṅi (8.2.20) 515
ghuṣir aviśabdane (7.2.23) 124
gher ṅiti (7.3.111) 316
ghor lopo leṭi vā (7.3.70) 278
ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṇ nityam (8.3.32) 637
ṅasiṅyoḥ smātsminau (7.1.15) 14

ṅe prathamayor am (7.1.28) 27
ṅer ām nadyāmnībhyaḥ (7.3.116) 320
ṅer yaḥ (7.1.13) 13
ṅṇoḥ kukṭuk śari (8.3.28) 632
cajoḥ ku ghiṇyatoḥ (7.3.52) 266
caturanaḍuhor ām udāttaḥ (7.1.98) 92
canacidivagotrādi . . . (8.1.57) 458
caraphaloś ca (7.4.87) 399
cavāyoge prathamā (8.1.59) 460
cādilope vibhāṣā (8.1.63) 463
cādiṣu ca (8.1.58) 459
cāhalopa evety avadhāraṇam (8.1.62) 462
cid iti copamārthe . . . (8.2.101) 595
coḥ kuḥ (8.2.30) 529
cvau ca (7.4.26) 346
chandasi vā' prāmreḍitayoḥ (8.3.49) 658
chandasīraḥ (8.2.15) 510
chandasy anekam api . . . (8.1.35) 441
chandasy api dṛśyate (7.1.76) 74
chandasy ṛdavagrahāt (8.4.26) 750
chandonāmni ca (8.3.94) 700
jaṅgaladhenuvalajānta . . . (7.3.25) 240
janivadhyoś ca (7.3.35) 248
japajabhadahadaśabhañja . . . (7.4.86) 397
jarāyā jaras anyatarasyām (7.2.101) 203
jaśśasoḥ śiḥ (7.1.20) 20
jasaḥ śī (7.1.17) 16
jasi ca (7.3.109) 315
jahāteś ca ktvi (7.4.43) 357
jāgro' viciṇṇaliṭsu (7.3.85) 288
jātv apūrvam (8.1.47) 450
jighrater vā (7.4.6) 329
jusi ca (7.3.83) 286
jṝvraścyoḥ ktviḥ (7.2.55) 153
je proṣṭhapadānām (7.3.18) 234
jñājanor jā (7.3.79) 284
jyotirāyuṣaḥ stomaḥ (8.3.83) 691
jhayaḥ (8.2.10) 507
jhayo ho' nyatarasyām (8.4.62) 783
jharo jhari savarṇe (8.4.65) 786
jhalāṃ jaśo' nte (8.2.39) 544
jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi (8.4.53) 776
jhalo jhali (8.2.26) 524
jhaṣas tathor dho' dhaḥ (8.2.40) 544
jho' ntaḥ (7.1.3) 5
ṭāṅasiṅasām inātsyāḥ (7.1.12) 12
ṭhasyekaḥ (7.3.50) 264
ḍaḥ si dhuṭ (8.3.29) 633
ḍho ḍhe lopaḥ (8.3.13) 617
ṇal uttamo vā (7.1.91) 86
ṇijāṃ trayāṇāṃ guṇaḥ ślau (7.4.75) 386
ṇer adhyayane vṛttam (7.2.26) 127
ṇer vibhāṣā (8.4.30) 755
ṇau caṅy upadhāyā hrasvaḥ (7.4.1) 323
ṇya āvaśyake (7.3.65) 275
tatpratyayasya ca (7.3.29) 243
tadoḥ saḥ sāvana . . . (7.2.106) 208
taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ (7.2.117) 217
taptanaptanathanāś ca (7.1.45) 44
tayor yvāv aci saṃhitāyām (8.2.108) 601
tavamamau ṅasi (7.2.96) 197
tasmān nuḍ dvihalaḥ (7.4.71) 383
tasya tāt (7.1.44) 44
tasya param āmreḍitam (8.1.2) 411
tāsastyor lopaḥ (7.4.50) 362
tāsi ca kḷpaḥ (7.2.60) 158
tiṅi codāttavati (8.1.71) 469
tiṅo gotrādīni kutsanābhīkṣṇyayoḥ (8.1.27) 436
tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ (8.1.28) 437
ti ca (7.4.89) 400
titutratathasisusaraka . . . (7.2.9) 107
tipy anasteḥ (8.2.73) 572
tiraso' nyatarasyām (8.3.42) 648
tiṣṭhater it (7.4.5) 329
tīṣasahalubharuṣariṣaḥ (7.2.48) 148
tupaśyapaśyatāhaiḥ pūjāyām (8.1.39) 444
tubhyamahyau ṅayi (7.2.95) 197
turustuśamyamaḥ sārvadhātuke (7.3.95) 303
tuhyos tātaṅāśiṣy anyatarasyām (7.1.35) 33
tṛjvat kroṣṭuḥ (7.1.95) 89
tṛṇaha im (7.3.92) 300
tṛtīyādiṣu bhāṣitapuṃskaṃ . . . (7.1.74) 72
temayāv ekavacanasya (8.1.22) 432
toḥ ṣi (8.4.43) 769
tor li (8.4.60) 782
tyadādīnām aḥ (7.2.102) 205
tricaturoḥ striyāṃ tisṛcatasṛ (7.2.99) 201
triprabhṛtiṣu śākaṭāyanasya (8.4.50) 775
tres trayaḥ (7.1.53) 49
tvamāv ekavacane (7.2.97) 198
tvāmau dvitīyāyāḥ (8.1.23) 432
tvāhau sau (7.2.94) 196
tho nthaḥ (7.1.87) 83
dadhas tathoś ca (8.2.38) 542

dadhāter hiḥ (7.4.42) 357
dambha ic ca (7.4.56) 367
dayater digi liṭi (7.4.9) 332
daś ca (7.2.109) 212
daś ca (8.2.75) 573
dāder dhātor ghaḥ (8.2.32) 531
dādhartidardhartidardharṣi . . . (7.4.65) 375
div aut (7.1.84) 81
divo' vijigīṣāyām (8.2.49) 553
diśo' madrāṇām (7.3.13) 229
dīrgha iṇaḥ kiti (7.4.69) 382
dīrghāc ca varuṇasya (7.3.23) 239
dīrghād aṭi samānapāde (8.3.9) 614
dīrghād ācāryāṇām (8.4.52) 776
dīrgho' kitaḥ (7.4.83) 393
dīrgho laghoḥ (7.4.94) 406
durasyurdraviṇasyur . . . (7.4.36) 353
dūrādd hūte ca (8.2.84) 583
dṛkṣvavassvatavasām . . . (7.1.83) 80
dṛḍhaḥ sthūlabalayoḥ (7.2.20) 123
devatādvandve ca (7.3.21) 237
devasumnayor yajuṣi . . . (7.4.38) 354
devikāśiṃśapā . . . (7.3.1) 218
do dad ghoḥ (7.4.46) 358
dyatisyatimāsthām itti kiti (7.4.40) 355
dyutisvāpyoḥ samprasāraṇam (7.4.67) 380
dvandvaṃ rahasyamaryādāvacana . . . (8.1.15) 425
dvārādīnāṃ ca (7.3.4) 222
dvitīyāyāṃ ca (7.2.87) 186
dvistriścatur . . . (8.3.43) 649
dhi ca (8.2.25) 521
dhṛṣiśasī vaiyātye (7.2.19) 122
dhvamo dhvāt (7.1.42) 43
na kapi (7.4.14) 337
na karmavyatihāre (7.3.6) 224
na kavater yaṅi (7.4.63) 374
na kvādeḥ (7.3.59) 272
nakṣatrād vā (8.3.100) 704
na ṅisambuddhyoḥ (8.2.8) 502
na cavāhāhaivayukte (8.1.24) 433
na chandasy aputrasya (7.4.35) 352
nañaḥ śucīśvarakṣetra . . . (7.3.30) 244
na dhyākhyāpṛmūrcchi . . . (8.2.57) 558
nanv ity anujñaiṣaṇāyām (8.1.43) 447
na padāntāṭ ṭor anām (8.4.42) 768
napare naḥ (8.3.27) 632
napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ (7.1.72) 66
napuṃsakāc ca (7.1.19) 20
na bhakurchurām (8.2.79) 577
na bhābhūpūkamigami . . . (8.4.34) 760
namaspurasor gatyoḥ (8.3.40) 646
na mu ne (8.2.3) 488
na yāsayoḥ (7.3.45) 257
na yvābhyāṃ padāntābhyāṃ . . . (7.3.3) 221
na raparasṛpisṛjispṛśispṛhi . . . (8.3.110) 711
na liṅi (7.2.39) 139
na luṭ (8.1.29) 438
nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya (8.2.7) 500
nalopaḥ supsvarasaṃjñātugvidhiṣu kṛti (8.2.2) 482
na vṛdbhyaś caturbhyaḥ (7.2.59) 156
naśeḥ ṣāntasya (8.4.36) 761
naśer vā (8.2.63) 563
naś ca (8.3.30) 634
naś ca dhātusthoruṣubhyaḥ (8.4.27) 751
naś cāpadāntasya jhali (8.3.24) 629
naś chavy apraśān (8.3.7) 612
nasattaniṣattānuttapratūrtasūrta . . . (8.2.61) 561
na sudurbhyāṃ kevalābhyām (7.1.68) 62
naha pratyārambhe (8.1.31) 439
naho dhaḥ (8.2.34) 534
nāglopiśāsvṛditām (7.4.2) 325
nātaḥ purasya (7.3.27) 241
nādiny ākrośe putrasya (8.4.48) 773
nād ghasya (8.2.17) 512
nābhyastasyāci piti sārvadhātuke (7.3.87) 294
nābhyastāc chatuḥ (7.1.78) 75
nāmantrite samānādhikaraṇe . . . (8.1.73) 472
nigṛhyā' nuyoge ca (8.2.94) 590
nityaṃ samāse' anuttarapadasthasya (8.3.45) 653
nityaṃ chandasi (7.4.8) 331
nityavīpsayoḥ (8.1.4) 412
ninadībhyāṃ snāteḥ kauśale (8.3.89) 697
nipātair yadyadihantaku . . . (8.1.30) 438
niraḥ kuṣaḥ (7.2.46) 146
nirvāṇo avāte (8.2.50) 553
nivyabhibhyo' ḍvyavāye vā chandasi (8.3.119) 718
nisas tapatāv anāsevane (8.3.102) 706
nīg vañcuśraṃsudhvaṃsu . . . (7.4.84) 395

nug ato' nunāsikāntasya (7.4.85) 396
nudavidondatrāghrāhrībhyo' nyatarasyām (8.2.56) 557
numvisarjanīyaśarvyavāye' pi (8.3.58) 664
nṝn pe (8.3.10) 615
neṭi (7.2.4) 101
neṭy aliṭi radheḥ (7.1.62) 57
neḍ vaśi kṛti (7.2.8) 106
netarāc chandasi (7.1.26) 26
nedamadasor akoḥ (7.1.11) 12
nendrasya parasya (7.3.22) 238
ner gada-nada-pata-pada . . . (8.4.17) 740
nodāttasvaritodaya . . . (8.4.67) 790
nodāttopadeśasya . . . (7.3.34) 247
nyagrodhasya ca kevalasya (7.3.5) 223
nyaṅkvādīnāṃ ca (7.3.53) 267
paco vaḥ (8.2.52) 554
pañcamyā at (7.1.31) 30
pañcamyāḥ parāv adhyarthe (8.3.51) 659
pataḥ pum (7.4.19) 340
pathimathyṛbhukṣām āt (7.1.85) 81
padavyavāye' pi (8.4.38) 763
padasya (8.1.16) 426
padāt (8.1.17) 427
padāntasya (8.4.37) 762
padāntasyānyatarasyām (7.3.9) 226
parinivibhyaḥ sevasitasayasivu . . . (8.3.70) 679
parimāṇāntasyāsaṃjñāśāṇayoḥ (7.3.17) 233
pariskandaḥ prācyabharateṣu (8.3.75) 685
parer varjane (8.1.5) 414
pareś ca (8.3.74) 685
pareś ca ghāṅkayoḥ (8.2.22) 517
paśyārthaiś cānālocane (8.1.25) 434
pāghrādhmāsthāmnādā . . . (7.3.78) 283
pātau ca bahulam (8.3.52) 660
pānaṃ deśe (8.4.9) 731
puṃso' suṅ (7.1.89) 84
pugantalaghūpadhasya ca (7.3.86) 289
pumaḥ khayy ampare (8.3.6) 610
purā ca parīpsāyām (8.1.42) 446
pūṅaḥ ca (7.2.51) 151
pūjanāt pūjitam anudāttam . . . (8.1.67) 466
pūjāyāṃ nānantaram (8.1.37) 443
pūrvatrāsiddham (8.2.1) 474
pūrvaṃ tu bhāṣāyām (8.2.98) 593
pūrvapadāt (8.3.106) 709
pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām agaḥ (8.4.3) 724
pūrvādibhyo navabhyo vā (7.1.16) 15
prakāre guṇavacanasya (8.1.12) 421
praṇavaṣ ṭeḥ (8.2.89) 587
pratiśravaṇe ca (8.2.99) 594
pratistabdhanistabdhau ca (8.3.114) 715
pratyabhivāde' śūdre (8.2.83) 582
pratyayasthāt kāt pūrvasyāta . . . (7.3.44) 255
pratyayottarapadayoś ca (7.2.98) 199
prathamāyāś ca dvivacane bhāṣāyām (7.2.88) 187
pranirantaraḥśarekṣuplakṣāmrakārṣya . . . (8.4.5) 727
prabhau parivṛḍhaḥ (7.2.21) 123
prayājānuyājau yajñāṅge (7.3.62) 273
prayojyaniyojyau śakyārthe (7.3.68) 277
pravāhaṇasya ḍhe (7.3.28) 242
praṣṭho' gragāmini (8.3.92) 699
prasamupodaḥ pādapūraṇe (8.1.6) 414
prastyo' nyatarasyām (8.2.54) 555
prāk sitād aḍvyavāye' pi (8.3.63) 671
prācāṃ grāmanagarāṇām (7.3.14) 230
prācāṃ nagarānte (7.3.24) 239
prātipadikāntanumvibhaktiṣu ca (8.4.11) 733
plutāv aica idutau (8.2.106) 598
pvādīnāṃ hrasvaḥ (7.3.80) 284
babhūthātatanthajagṛmbha . . . (7.2.64) 164
bahulaṃ chandasi (7.1.8) 9
bahulaṃ chandasi (7.1.10) 11
bahulaṃ chandasi (7.1.103) 95
bahulaṃ chandasi (7.3.97) 306
bahulaṃ chandasi (7.4.78) 388
bavhuvacanasya vasnasau (8.1.21) 431
bahuvacane jhaly et (7.3.103) 311
bruva īṭ (7.3.93) 301
brūhipreṣyaśrauṣaḍvauṣaḍ . . . (8.2.91) 588
bhavater aḥ (7.4.73) 385
bhastraiṣājājñādvāsvā nañpūrvāṇām api (7.3.47) 259
bhasya ṭer lopaḥ (7.1.88) 83
bhittaṃ śakalam (8.2.59) 560
bhiyo hetubhaye ṣuk (7.3.40) 253
bhīroḥ sthānam (8.3.81) 690
bhujanyubjau pāṇyupatāpayoḥ (7.3.61) 273

bhuvaś ca mahāvyāhṛteḥ (8.2.71) 569
bhūsuvos tiṅi (7.3.88) 296
bhṛñām it (7.4.76) 386
bhojyaṃ bhakṣye (7.3.69) 277
bhobhagoaghoapūrvasya . . . (8.3.17) 622
bhyaso bhyam (7.1.30) 29
bhrājabhāsabhāṣadīpa . . . (7.4.3) 327
matuvaso ru sambuddhau . . . (8.3.1) 603
maparyantasya (7.2.91) 190
maya uño vo vā (8.3.33) 638
masjinaśor jhali (7.1.60) 54
mātuḥpiturbhyām anyatarasyām (8.3.85) 692
mātṛpitṛbhyāṃ svasā (8.3.84) 692
mād upadhāyāś ca mator . . . (8.2.9) 505
mider guṇaḥ (7.3.82) 285
mīnāter nigame (7.3.81) 285
muco' karmakasya . . . (7.4.57) 368
mṛjer vṛddhiḥ (7.2.114) 215
mo' nusvāraḥ (8.3.23) 628
mo no dhātoḥ (8.2.64) 564
mo rāji samaḥ kvau (8.3.25) 630
mvoś ca (8.2.65) 564
yaḥ sau (7.2.110) 212
yaṅi ca (7.4.30) 349
yaño vā (7.3.94) 302
yajadhvainam iti ca (7.1.43) 43
yajayācarucapravacarcaś ca (7.3.66) 276
yajuṣy ekeṣām (8.3.104) 707
yathātathayathāpura . . . (7.3.31) 245
yathāsve yathāyatham (8.1.14) 424
yaddhituparaṃ chandasi (8.1.56) 457
yadvṛttān nityam (8.1.66) 465
yamaramanamātāṃ sak ca (7.2.73) 172
yaro' nunāsike' nunāsiko vā (8.4.45) 770
yasya vibhāṣā (7.2.15) 118
yājyāntaḥ (8.2.90) 588
yāḍ āpaḥ (7.3.113) 317
yāvadyathābhyām (8.1.36) 442
yīvarṇayor dīdhīvevyoḥ (7.4.53) 364
yujer asamāse (7.1.71) 65
yuvāvau dvivacane (7.2.92) 193
yuvor anākau (7.1.1) 1
yuṣmattattatakṣuḥṣv antaḥpādam (8.3.103) 707
yuṣmadasmadoḥ ṣaṣṭhīcaturthī . . . (8.1.20) 430
yuṣmadasmador anādeśe (7.2.86) 185
yuṣmadasmadbhyāṃ ṅaso' ś (7.1.27) 27
yūyavayau jasi (7.2.93) 195
ye yajñakarmaṇi (8.2.88) 586
yo' ci (7.2.89) 188
radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto . . . (8.2.42) 546
radhādibhyaś ca (7.2.45) 145
radhijabhor aci (7.1.61) 56
rabher aśab liṭoḥ (7.1.63) 59
raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ samānapade (8.4.1) 719
rājanvān saurājye (8.2.14) 510
rāt sasya (8.2.24) 520
rāyaḥ hali (7.2.85) 185
riṅ śayagliṅkṣu (7.4.28) 347
ri ca (7.4.51) 363
rīg ṛdupadhasya ca (7.4.90) 401
rīṅ ṛtaḥ (7.4.27) 346
rugrikau ca luki (7.4.91) 401
rudaś ca pañcabhyaḥ (7.3.98) 307
rudādibhyaḥ sārvadhātuke (7.2.76) 175
ruṣyamatvarasaṅghuṣāsvanām (7.2.28) 128
ruhaḥ po' nyatarasyām (7.3.43) 254
roḥ supi (8.3.16) 621
ro ri (8.3.14) 618
ro' supi (8.2.69) 567
rvor upadhāyā dīrgha ikaḥ (8.2.76) 574
labheś ca (7.1.64) 59
liṅaḥ saiopo' nantyasya (7.2.79) 177
liṅsicor ātmanepadeṣu (7.2.42) 142
līlor nuglukāv anyatarasyāṃ . . . (7.3.39) 252
lug vā duhadihalihaguhām . . . (7.3.73) 279
lubho vimohane (7.2.54) 152
loṭ ca (8.1.52) 453
lopaḥ pibater īc cābhyāsasya (7.4.4) 328
lopaḥ śākalyasya (8.3.19) 625
lopas ta ātmanepadeṣu (7.1.41) 42
lope vibhāṣā (8.1.45) 448
lvādibhyaḥ (8.2.44) 548
vaca um (7.4.20) 341
vaco' śabdasaṃjñāyām (7.3.67) 276
vañcer gatau (7.3.63) 274
vadavrajahalantasyācaḥ (7.2.3) 99
vanaṃ puragāmiśrakāsidhrakā . . . (8.4.4) 726
vamor vā (8.4.23) 748
varṣasyābhaviṣyati (7.3.16) 232
vasatikṣudhor iṭ (7.2.52) 151
vasusraṃsudhvaṃsvanaḍuhāṃ daḥ (8.2.72)

570
vasv ekājādghasām (7.2.67) 167
vākyasya ṭeḥ pluta udāttaḥ (8.2.82) 581
vākyāder āmantritasyāsūyā . . . (8.1.8) 416
vā dāntaśāntapūrṇadastaspaṣṭa . . . (7.2.27) 127
vā druhamuhaṣṇuhaṣṇihām (8.2.33) 533
vā napuṃsakasya (7.1.79) 76
vā niṃsanikṣanindām (8.4.33) 759
vā padāntasya (8.4.59) 781
vā bhāvakaraṇayoḥ (8.4.10) 732
vāvasāne (8.4.56) 779
vā śari (8.3.36) 642
vāhanam āhitāt (8.4.8) 731
vikuśamiparibhyaḥ sthalam (8.3.96) 700
vicāryamāṇānām (8.2.97) 592
vitto bhogapratyayayoḥ (8.2.58) 559
videḥ śatur vasuḥ (7.1.36) 36
vibhāṣā gamahanavidaviśām (7.2.68) 168
vibhāṣā ciṇṇamuloḥ (7.1.69) 63
vibhāṣā ceḥ (7.3.58) 271
vibhāṣā chandasi (7.4.44) 357
vibhāṣā tṛtīyādiṣv aci (7.1.97) 91
vibhāṣā dvitīyātṛtīyābhyām (7.3.115) 319
vibhāṣā pṛṣṭaprativacane heḥ (8.2.93) 590
vibhāṣā bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ (7.2.17) 120
vibhāṣā veṣṭiceṣṭyoḥ (7.4.96) 407
vibhāṣā sṛjidṛśoḥ (7.2.65) 165
vibhāṣitaṃ viśeṣavacane . . . (8.1.74) 473
vibhāṣitaṃ sopasargam anuttamam (8.1.53) 455
vibhāṣeṭaḥ (8.3.79) 689
vibhāṣauṣadhivanaspatibhyaḥ (8.4.6) 728
visarjanīyasya saḥ (8.3.34) 640
vṛkṣāsanayor viṣṭaraḥ (8.3.93) 699
vṛto vā (7.2.38) 138
veḥ skander aniṣṭhāyām (8.3.73) 684
veḥ skabhnāter nityam (8.3.77) 687
vetter vibhāṣā (7.1.7) 8
veś ca svano bhojane (8.3.69) 679
vaivāveti ca cchandasi (8.1.64) 464
vo vidhūnane juk (7.3.38) 251
vyatho liṭi (7.4.68) 381
vyor laghuprayatnataraḥ . . . (8.3.18) 624
vraścabhrasjasṛjamṛjayajarāja . . . (8.2.36) 536
śader agatau taḥ (7.3.42) 254
śapśyanor nityam (7.1.81) 78
śamām aṣṭānāṃ dīrghaḥ śyani (7.3.74) 280
śaro' ci (8.4.49) 774
śarpare visarjanīyaḥ (8.3.35) 641
śarpūrvāḥ khayaḥ (7.4.61) 371
śaś cho' ṭi (8.4.63) 784
śaso na (7.1.29) 29
śācchāsāhvāvyāvepāṃ yuk (7.3.37) 250
śācchor anyatarasyām (7.4.41) 356
śāt (8.4.44) 770
śāsivasighasīnāṃ ca (8.3.60) 668
śi tuk (8.3.31) 635
śīṅaḥ sārvadhātuke guṇaḥ (7.4.21) 341
śīṅo ruṭ (7.1.6) 7
śuṣaḥ kaḥ (8.2.51) 554
śṛdṛprāṃ hrasvo vā (7.4.12) 335
śe mucādīnām (7.1.59) 53
śeṣe lopaḥ (7.2.90) 189
śeṣe vibhāṣā (8.1.41) 445
śeṣe vibhāṣā (8.1.50) 451
śeṣe vibhāṣā' kakhādāv . . . (8.4.18) 743
śyo' sparśe (8.2.47) 551
śrīgrāmaṇyoś chandasi (7.1.56) 51
śryukaḥ kiti (7.2.11) 111
śvayater aḥ (7.4.18) 340
śvāder iñi (7.3.8) 225
śvīdito niṣṭhāyām (7.2.14) 117
ṣaṭcaturbhyaś ca (7.1.55) 50
ṣaḍbhyo luk (7.1.22) 22
ṣaḍhoḥ kaḥ si (8.2.41) 545
ṣaṣṭhyāḥ patiputraṛṣṭhapāra . . . (8.3.53) 660
ṣāt padāntāt (8.4.35) 760
ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ (8.4.41) 767
ṣṭhivuklamyācamāṃ śiti (7.3.75) 281
saḥ sy ārdhadhātuke (7.4.49) 361
saḥ svidisvadisahīnāṃ ca (8.3.62) 671
saṃyogāder āto dhātor yaṇvataḥ (8.2.43) 547
saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ (8.2.23) 518
sakhyur asambuddhau (7.1.92) 86
sagatir api tiṅ (8.1.68) 467
saṃkhyāyāḥ saṃvatsara . . . (7.3.15) 231
saṃjñāyām (8.2.11) 508
satyaṃ praśne (8.1.32) 440
sadir aprateḥ (8.3.66) 676
sadeḥ parasya liṭi (8.3.118) 717
saniṃsasanivāṃsam (7.2.69) 169
sani grahaguhoś ca (7.2.12) 114

sani mīmāghurabhalabhaśakapadām . . . (7.4.54) 365
sanīvantardhabhrasjadambhuśri . . . (7.2.49) 149
sanoter anaḥ (8.3.108) 710
sany ataḥ (7.4.79) 388
sanliṭor jeḥ (7.3.57) 271
sanval laghuni caṅpare' naglope (7.4.93) 404
sapūrvāyāḥ prathamāyā vibhāṣā (8.1.26) 435
samaḥ suṭi (8.3.5) 608
samāse' ṅguleḥ saṅgaḥ (8.3.80) 690
samāse' nañpūrve ktvo lyap (7.1.37) 37
sambuddhau ca (7.3.106) 313
sarvatra śākalyasya (8.4.51) 775
sarvanāmnaḥ smai (7.1.14) 13
sarvanāmnaḥ syāḍḍ hrasvaś ca (7.3.114) 318
sarvasya dve (8.1.1) 409
sasajuṣo ruḥ (8.2.66) 565
sasūveti nigame (7.4.74) 385
saheḥ pṛtanartābhyāṃ ca (8.3.109) 711
saheḥ sāḍaḥ saḥ (8.3.56) 663
sātpadādyoḥ (8.3.111) 713
sāma ākam (7.1.33) 31
sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ (7.3.84) 287
sāv anaḍuhaḥ (7.1.82) 79
sici ca parasmaipadeṣu (7.2.40) 140
sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu (7.2.1) 96
sico yaṅi (8.3.112) 713
sipi dhāto rur vā (8.2.74) 572
sivādīnāṃ vāḍvyavāye' pi (8.3.71) 682
suñaḥ (8.3.107) 709
sudhitavasudhitanema . . . (7.4.45) 358
sunoteḥ syasanoḥ (8.3.117) 717
supāṃ sulukpūrvasavarṇāc . . . (7.1.39) 39
supi ca (7.3.102) 310
suvinirdurbhyaḥ supiṣūtisamāḥ (8.3.88) 695
suṣāmādiṣu ca (8.3.98) 702
susarvārdhāj janapadasya (7.3.12) 228
sūtraṃ pratiṣṇātam (8.3.90) 698
sedhater gatau (8.3.113) 714
se' sici kṛtacṛtacchṛdatṛdanṛtaḥ (7.2.57) 154
soḍhaḥ (8.3.115) 715
so' padādau (8.3.38) 644
some hvaritaḥ (7.2.33) 132
skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ca (8.2.29) 527
stambhusivusahāṃ caṅi (8.3.116) 716
stanbheḥ (8.3.67) 677
stutastomayoś chandasi (8.3.105) 708
stusudhūñbhyaḥ parasmaipadeṣu (7.2.72) 171
stoḥ ścunā ścuḥ (8.4.40) 765
stautiṇyor eva ṣaṇy abhyāsāt (8.3.61) 669
striyāṃ ca (7.1.96) 90
sthādiṣv abhyāsena cābhyāsasya (8.3.64) 672
snātvyādayaś ca (7.1.49) 47
snukramor anātmanepadanimitte (7.2.36) 135
sphāyo vaḥ (7.3.41) 253
sphuratisphulatyor nirnivibhyaḥ (8.3.76) 686
smipūṅrañjvaśāṃ sani (7.2.74) 173
sravatiśṛṇotidravatipravatiplavati . . . (7.4.81) 391
svatavān pāyau (8.3.11) 616
svamor napuṃsakāt (7.1.23) 23
svaratisūtisūyatidhūñūdito vā (7.2.44) 144
svaritam āmreḍite' sūyāsammati . . . (8.2.103) 596
svarito vā' nudātte padādau (8.2.6) 499
svāgatādīnāṃ ca (7.3.7) 225
ha eti (7.4.52) 363
hanas to' ciṇṇaloḥ (7.3.32) 245
hanta ca (8.1.54) 456
hanter atpūrvasya (8.4.22) 747
halaś cejupadhāt (8.4.31) 756
halādiḥ śeṣaḥ (7.4.60) 370
hali ca (8.2.77) 575
hali lopaḥ (7.2.113) 214
hali sarveṣām (8.3.22) 627
halo yamāṃ yami lopaḥ (8.4.64) 785
hi ca (8.1.34) 441
hinumīnā (8.4.15) 738
hṛdbhagasindhvante pūrvapadasya ca (7.3.19) 235
hṛṣer lomasu (7.2.29) 129
heti kṣiyāyām (8.1.60) 461
he mapare vā (8.3.26) 631
her acaṅi (7.3.56) 270
haiheprayoge haihayoḥ (8.2.85) 584
ho ḍhaḥ (8.2.31) 530
ho hanter ñṇinneṣu (7.3.54) 268

hmyantakṣaṇaśvasajāgṛṇi . . . (7.2.5) 102
hrasvaḥ (7.4.59) 369
hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ (7.1.54) 50
hrasvasya guṇaḥ (7.3.108) 314
hrasvāt tādau taddhite (8.3.101) 705
hrasvād aṅgāt (8.2.27) 525
hru hva᳡eś chandasi (7.2.31) 131