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1. The1 Mahābhāṣya on Aṣṭādhyāyī 6.3.109 (पृष्ठदातीनि यथोपदिष्टम्) has a well known discussion concerning model Sanskrit speakers, referred to as शिष्यः. The question is posed: If the शिष्यas are the authority with respect to correct speech forms, what purpose does the Aṣṭādhyāyī serve? The answer is: The Aṣṭādhyāyī serves to make one know the शिष्यas, as follows. Someone who is studying the Aṣṭādhyāyī observes that someone else, although he is not studying this grammar, uses the correct forms that are provided for therein. The student then reasons: Due to the grace of fate that is his or to his nature, this person uses the correct forms provided for in the Aṣṭādhyāyī without studying it. I reason that he knows other correct forms too2. According to Patañjali, then, a शिष्यa is not only a model for the correct speech forms explicitly provided for (विहित: शब्दः:) through operations stated in sūtras of the Aṣṭādhyāyī but he also knows other correct speech forms (अन्यानि ज्ञातः), which are not explicitly provided for in this manner. In this way, the Aṣṭādhyāyī serves not only to account directly for correct speech forms but also to account indirectly for such forms, by referring to the usage of accepted model speakers. As Hari puts it3: the grammar serves as a means for conveying the correctness of items of the type पृष्ठदाता by virtue of their being शिष्यa usage, because one knows who the शिष्यas are.

What Pāṇinīyas say concerning Aṣṭādhyāyī 6.3.109 thus has important implications for the concept of what a grammar is supposed to accomplish. To begin with, a grammar is a means of explaining (अन्वाख्यातं) through derivation the accepted usage that is the object of description. In addition, it is taken for granted that this usage includes open sets of items the grammar does not account for directly through description4, so that Pāṇini recognizes a living native language that is developing. The distinction in question is
comparable to the one between ordered sets of elements—gaṇas—
exhaustively listed with respect to certain operations and groups of
elements—referred to as आकृतिगण—which only represent a part of an open
set of items with some common characteristic(s). The question remains
whether the view Patañjali espouses in the Mahābhāṣya on 6. 3. 109 can be
considered to reflect Pāṇini’s approach.

2. Consider now a group of sūtras which have two features in
common: they refer to something as ‘seen’ and speak of other elements,
using अन्य or इतर.

2.1. 6. 3. 137 अन्येनानांपि स्यते (दीर्घा: [१९१])।

2.1.1. 6. 3. 137 comes after a series of rules that provide for long-
vowel substitution. For example, 6. 3. 195 कणं लक्षणस्याविद्यायापि-
मणिभिक्षणक्षिधिमुखस्वरतिकरणं। 6. 3. 196 निहीणृच्छित्वच्यविद्याचिंसहितं नुयः। 6. 3. 122
उपसर्गित्य घूम्यमनुषे चतुलम्।

According to 6. 3. 115, before कण ‘ear’ in a compound, the final vowel
of a term denoting a mark used as a brand (लक्षणस्य) is replaced by a long
vowel, except for the vowels of विह्र, अष्ट्र ‘eight’, पञ्चः ‘five’, मणि ‘jewel’, भ्रष्ट
‘broken’, छन्द ‘cut’, छिद्र ‘a cut’, सुच ‘sruva spoon’, स्वरस्तिक, e.g., दानकरण (→दानकरण)
an animal with a sickle symbol as a brand on its ear’ but अष्ट्रकरण ‘an animal
with eight stripes on its ear’. By 6. 3. 116 long-vowel replacement applies to
a final vowel of a prior term in a compound if this is followed by a derivate
in क्त्वं from one of the following verbs: नर ‘gird, put on’, वृष ‘turn, occur’, वृष
‘rain’, वृष ‘pierce’, श्रव ‘shine, please’, सह ‘bear’, तन्त्र ‘stretch’, e.g., उपमन्त्र (→०-उपमन्त्र)
‘sandal’, नौक्त (→नौक्त) ‘a district’, प्रवृष्ट (→प्रवृष्ट) ‘rain season’. 6. 3. 122 provides
that the final vowel of a preverb is replaced by a long vowel before a derivate
in यथि except in derivates that refer to a human (अमन्त्); in addition, the
sūtra provides that this replacement applies variously (बहुलम्). For example:
तोरलान (→विलान) ‘wetting particularly’, अवमान्य (→अवमान्य) ‘wiping away’, with
lengthening, and ध्रस्त prasāra ‘spreading, expansion’ without lengthening.
नियम ‘a Niṣāda’, which refers to a particular human being, also does not
show lengthening.

None of the rules from 6. 1. 115 to 6. 1. 136 provides for the long
vowels of क्रेसा- in क्रेसकिंक ‘fighting in which opponents grab each other by
the hair’, कर्त्ता- in कर्त्तकिंक ‘fighting in which opponents grab each other by
the hair of the head', दण्ड- in दण्डादिन्द 'fighting in which opponents hit each other with sticks', पुष्ट- in पुष्टिमुििि 'fighting in which opponents hit each other with their fists'. Moreover, Pāṇini explicitly provides for such derivates. 6.3. 137 allows for the required long-vowel replacement. The rule does not, however, specify any domain of application in the way that preceding sūtras do. It simply says that the replacement applies also to others (अन्येषार्थि). In other words, this rule lets long-vowel substitution apply to elements for which this operation has not been provided for, terms which occur with long vowels in actual usage. This is said explicitly in the Kāśikā, which also notes that this accords with the usage of śiṣṭas.

I think there can be no doubt whatever concerning two points. First, what the Kāśikā says agrees with what Patañjali and Bhartṛhari said about śiṣṭa usage. Second, this is the only reasonable way to account for Pāṇini's formulation. The Aṣṭādhyaśī has a series of sūtras providing explicitly for long-vowel replacement as illustrated. This substitution applies in specified domains. In addition, in some domains it applies variously. That is not to say that the replacement takes effect optionally, for this would mean the optional substitution would apply in every instance of the specified domain. Instead, the replacement applies obligatorily in some instances, not at all in others, and optionally in still others (see note 26). The replacement by a long vowel applies also to elements for which this operation has not been provided explicitly. Moreover, the rule stating this does not specify a domain: Pāṇini says simply अन्येषार्थि 'also of others'.

2.2. 31 १०१ अन्येषार्थि हृष्टे।

2.2.1. 3.2.101 is connected with the following sūtras: 31 21 ६७ सत्मयाःनादेषि। 31 22 ६८ पठयाःमजाति। 31 21 ९९ उपस्त्र च सत्मयाः। 31 21 १०० अन्येषार्थि।

All these rules serve to introduce the suffix ह after जन् 'be born, arise, come into being' construed with certain items, as follows:

3.2.97: जन् construed with a term containing a seventh-triplet nominal ending; e.g., सरसिज़: 'born in a lake' and मन्दुज़: 'born in a stable', equivalent to सरसिः जातः and मन्दुयाःजातः:

3.2.98: जन् construed with a term containing a fifth-triplet nominal ending, provided the nominal term in question does not designate a generic class of substances (अजातः); e.g., बुधज़: 'arisen from the intellect' and दुःखज़:
resulting from suffering', equivalent to वृक्षेजात: and दु:खान्तः; but no comparable formation corresponding to अस्मातज्ञान: 'born from a horse'.

3.2.99 : जन्तू construed with a preverb, provided the derivate formed is a term referring to a particular thing (सम्पाद्यम्) and not to just anything born; e.g., प्रजा ‘living creature’.

3.2.100 : जन्तू used with the preverb अनु (अनु जन्तू‘be born after, follow...in succession’) and construed with a term signifying an object (कर्मणि); e.g., पुष्करिज: 'born after a male', equivalent to पुष्करिजतात:.

3.2.101 then provides that जन्तू construed also with coöcurring terms other than those specified in the preceding rules (अनेकद्विर). 3.2.97 specifies a term with a seventh-triplet ending, but there are derivates like अज 'not born', such that जन्तू is construed with a term that contains a first-triplet ending: जन्तू. 3.2.98 requires a term that does not refer to a class of individual substances characterized by a generic property, but there are derivates such as भाद्रपदज: ‘which has arisen from Brāhmaṇa’s’. 3.2.101 requires not only a complex अनु जन्तू but also a coöcurring item signifying an object. On the other hand, there are derivates such as अनुज: ‘one born later, younger sibling’, not construed with an object-signifying term. All such cases are taken care of by 3.2.101.

Once more, a sūtra provides for an operation with a domain that is simply additional to the particular domains stated in related rules but not specified any more. Consequently, one must observe usage to know just what is allowed and what is not

2.3. अश्रृंवत्स्य अन्येऽस्योदयति दस्यते।

2.3.1. This sūtra is related to 3.2.177 प्राज्ञानांपुरविविधान्तव्युष्ण्युपातिकुस्वः: विस्मृति which introduces the affix विस्मृतै after प्रज्ञा ‘shine’, भासू ‘shine, appear’, हुर्वै ‘harm’, द्वृतु ‘flash’, कर्ज: ‘be strong’, धृ ‘fill’, सु ‘speed’, and स्तू ‘praise’ construed with प्रायज्ञ ‘stone’. The derivates refer to agents which perform the acts in question habitually, as part of their nature, or well9. For example, विस्मृते ‘lightning’. 3.2.178 states that विस्मृति is seen to occur also after other verb bases under the same conditions, thus accounting for derivates like चिदं ‘...which cuts...

2.4. अन्तर्ज्ञोपि दर्शते। concerns taddhita affixes optionally introduced after padas formed from बहु ‘much, many' and pronominals
other than those of the subset beginning with ह्र but including the interrogative किम्

2.4.1. This sutra is related to the following: तस्मायसतस्मित्वः। तस्मायसतस्मित्वः। यत्सः। यत्सः। विभाषणः। विभाषणः। विभाषणः। किमेन्तः। किमेन्तः। तस्मायसतस्मित्वः।

5.3.7-9 provide that a pada with a fifth-triplet ending is followed by तस्मिन्, which also replaces तस्मिन् and follows padas with परि, अभि; e.g., तत्सः (←तद्-अस्-तस्मि) ‘from that’, यत्सः ‘from which’, परित्सः ‘round about in all directions’, अभित्सः ‘from both sides’. 5.3.10-13 introduce affixes after padas with a seventh-triplet ending. In general, त्रुः follows any such pada formed with a base of the group stated in 5.3.2 (see 2.4 with note 10), but द्रृढः follows such padas containing इत्म. A pada with किम् takes the suffix अति. In Vedic usage, moreover, त्रृः optionally follows such a pada. For example: तत्र (←तद्-इ-त्र) ‘in that, there’, तत्र ‘in which, where’, इत्म (←इत्म-इ-ह) ‘in this, here’, इत्र (←किम्-इ-अ) ‘in which, where?’, कुह ‘in which, where?’. According to 5.3.14, the affixes introduced by preceding rules also are seen to occur after padas with other vibhaktis (हस्तम्). That is, तस्मिन् and त्रृः can follow padas with endings of triplets other than the fifth and seventh. One can say, for example, तत्रभवनः and तत्रभवनः, where तत्र is coreferential with a nominative and an accusative, so that it is derived with त्रृः after padas with endings of the first and second triplets.

Moreover, one must appeal to usage in order to know what particular nominal bases enter into such formations. From what is said in the Mahābhāṣya, it is clear that, at Patañjali’s time, the affixation provided by 5.3.14 applied for padas with the bases भवति ‘you’, दीर्घायु ‘long lived’, देवानामिति ‘beloved of the gods’, and आयुभवति ‘long lived’, all used as equivalents of a second person pronoun. It is also clear from the way Pāṇini formulates 5.3.14 that at his time the domain of the affixation was not definite.

2.5. तस्माय सतस्मित्वः।

2.5.1. This sutra is related to तस्माय सतस्मित्वः। आलो युध्य (इष्टदुहुसु: कु: चक्षु: चारेश्यु: [२६])।

According 3.3.128, यूध् (←अन्त) is affixed to verbs in -अ construed with इष्टदुहुसु and सु to form derivate meaning ‘easy to...’ and ‘difficult to...’; e.g., इष्टदुहुसु ‘easy to drink’, दुरुस्म ‘hard to give’, सुदुहु ‘easy to give’. By 3.3.129, यूध्
follows verbs of movement (नत्यन्यथा:) to form comparable derivatives in Vedic (इन्द्रिण). For example: सुता 'easy to cross' (e.g., RV 4. 19. 6a: सुतर्यां अस्त्रोपनिन्द्र सिन्धुम् 'Indra, you made the rivers easy to cross...'), दुष्यर्य 'hard to shake' (e.g., RV 10. 103. 2bc: दुष्यर्याणां दुष्यर्यर्येः स्वरूपः 'Win, prevail...with Indra who does battle, is hard to shake, is daring.'); see also Debrunner 188 (section 83). According to 3. 3. 130, युद्ध is seen to occur in Vedic usage also after other verbs, under the same conditions. For example, सुवेदन 'easy to find', as in RV 10. 112. 8d: सुवेदनामंकर्णोत्सहिण्यागम् 'You made the cow easy to find...'

From what Panini says, then, in the Vedic traditions known to him, such derivatives with युद्ध were generally formed from verbs of motion and occurred also with other verbs, but he could not determine any definite distribution as to the semantics or formal properties of the other bases in question.

2.6. 3. 2. 74 allows विच्छ and also रक्ष, क्वतिप and विच्छ to follow verb bases that end in -ā, provided these verbs are used in construction with a co-occurring item terminating in a nominal ending. The derivatives formed, moreover, occur in Vedic. For example: सुदाम (nom. sg. सुदाम) ‘one who gives well’ (←दा-न्ा : मन्न), सुनीत्न (सुनीत्न) ‘one who places, makes well’ (←दा-न्ा : क्वतिप), सृष्टिस्वरूप (सृष्टिस्वरूप) ‘one who gives much’ (←दा-न्ा : विच्छ), कौलिक (कौलिक) ‘one who drinks किंला’ (←पा- : विच). 3. 2. 75 states that these affixes occur (हेतुत्ते ‘are seen’) after other verbal bases also (अयोध्यादि); for example, सुरण (सुरण) ‘one who destroys well’ (←पा- : विच्छ), भावित्तिप (भावित्तिप) ‘one who goes in the morning’ (←पा- : क्वतिप). विज्ञान (विज्ञान) ‘one who is born, one who procreates’ (←जन-न्ा : विच्छ), रेत (रेत) ‘one who suffers harm’ (स्व- : विच)...

2.6.2. 3. 2. 76 is related to two other sūtras: 3. 2. 76: सत्यस्यंतदेहदेहसत्यसस्मानन्तिका क्विप: 3. 2. 76: सत्यस्यंतदेहदेहसत्यसस्मानन्तिका क्विप

According to 3. 2. 61, क्विप is introduced after certain verbal bases if these are used in construction with a co-occurring item terminating in

3. 2. 87 introduces किंवत् after हन्न ‘kill’ if this is construed with any of the terms ब्रह्मन ‘Brāhmaṇa’, भूण ‘foetus’, व्र ‘Vṛtra’ signifying an object of killing, provided also that the act is referred to the past: ब्रह्मन् (nom. sg. ब्रह्म) ‘one who has killed a Brāhmaṇa’, प्रभुण, कुर्भन्. This sūtra provides a two-fold restriction with respect to 3. 2. 76. There is a restriction regarding the base हन्न used with reference to past killing, such that this takes किंवत् only if it occurs with one of the terms given in 3. 2. 87; thus, to refer to a person who has killed a man, one uses हतवद् (nom. sg. masc. हतान), as in पुर्वव हतान्. Moreover, there is a restriction regarding past time reference, such that only किंवत् is allowed to occur after हन्न used with reference to past killing and construed with the terms ब्रह्मन, and so on; this accounts for the use of a derivate like भिन्निर्धात: ‘one who has killed his paternal uncle’ but not ब्रह्मानिर्धात:.

3. 2. 87 thus restricts the scope of 3. 2. 76 so that हन्न cannot take किंवत् without limitation. 3. 2. 61 applies to introduce किंवत् only to bases construed with a cooccurring nominal (उपपद), which may be a preverb, but 3. 2. 76 does not have this limitation.

2.6.3. As Kātyāyana and Patañjali go on to remark, if one considers 3. 2. 87 to apply in the manner described, then the formulation of the next sūtra, 3. 2. 88: बहुङ्क्षन्दति, serves a purpose. This sūtra provides for Vedic usage (चन्दस), wherein हन्न takes किंवत् variously (बहुलम्). Thus, हन्न occurs with upapadas other than those specified in 3.2.87, as in यो मात्या पितृहा भ्रात्तहा भ्रात्रहा ‘who has killed his mother, his father, his brother’; and अभ्रात्रहा: ‘slayer of enemies’, contains -घात-, derived with the suffix अघृ.

2.6.4. Now, consider 3.2.71 अन्ते श्रेष्ठवोऽक्षकामसूत्रोऽविचन्त:। 3.2.72 अवे यजः। 3.2.73 विचत्रेण कान्दसि। According to 3. 2. 71-72, in usage found in mantras विचत्र, follows श्रेष्ठवह, वक्षकाम, and पुरोहित as well as यजः used with the preverb अवे. 3. 2. 73 introduces विचत्र after यजः used with उप to form derivates found in general Vedic usage.
3.2.74-76 apply as shown in 2.6.1. It is reasonable, I think, to accept what the Kāśikā says about 3.2.75. The Kāśikā remarks that 3.2.75 uses रखते in order that usage be followed (प्रयोगानुसारार्थम्)\textsuperscript{21}. This accords with what Patañjali said much earlier (see 1 with note 2), since the accepted usage is that of model speakers. That is, the Vedic usage known to Pāṇini was such that he could determine particular domains in which विच्छिन्न and विच्छृ occurred. Moreover, verbs in -ा could form derivates with मनित् and so on (3.2.74 [2.6.1]) in compounds. In both Vedic and the spoken language Pāṇini describes, the same suffixes occur with verbs in -ā and also other verbs, as could विच्छिन्न, too, both in compounds and independently. In other words, for Vedic मनित् and so on had a restricted domain of usage, which could be described formally. In Pāṇini’s bhāṣā, on the other hand, the domain of these affixes had spread, but the development was still at a stage where Pāṇini could not formally describe this with precision. In fact, these affixes were being generalized fully. He therefore provides that these affixes, and विच्छिन्न, are seen to occur elsewhere also. The exact extent of their usage, then, is still in flux within the community of model speakers.

2.6.5. One final point has to be taken into account, concerning 3.2.1 (see note 20). This is formulated as a very general rule, whereby अष्ट could occur with any verb whatever. Accordingly, the sūtra allows derivates such as आदित्यदर्श ‘one who looks at the sun’. The discussion of this sūtra in the Bhāṣya ends with Kātyāyana’s statement that such derivates are not used to signify the meanings in question, so that the grammar does not have to state an exhaustive listing of possible derivates in order to preclude these and some others\textsuperscript{22}. That is, formally derivates like आदित्यदर्श are comparable to derivates like कुष्ठकार ‘pot maker’, yet in the spoken language of Kātyāyana’s time and place they were not used to express what one expressed using a phrase आदित्यमण्डिति. Pāṇini recognizes the fact that derivates with अष्ट have a very general domain. He therefore formulates a general rule. In effect, he understands that अष्ट can indeed be used with any verb construed with an object. The resulting derivate might not immediately appear the best usage to a native speaker, but such a speaker has to admit its grammatical correctness and acceptibility. It is as though a modern speaker of English used a derivate like ṣxe referring to someone who wields an axe. This is not the best of usage, but one has to admit it is grammatically well formed and acceptable.
The difference between 3. 2. 1 and 3. 2. 75, then, is that भवन्त् and so on, used after verbs construed with upapadas, did indeed have a restricted specifiable domain at one stage of the language and were being generalized, so that one has to observe the usage of model speakers to determine grammatically appropriate usage.

2.7. 3.3.1 उपादाय बहुलम् (वर्तमाने [3.2.123] सञ्ज्ञायाम् [3.2.85]) 3। श। 2 भवन्तैपि रघुनाथे। 3। श। 3 भविष्यति गम्यादय:।

2.7.1. 3.3.1 states that the affixes of the set beginning with उप् occur variously (बहुलम्) when an action signified by verbal bases to which they are introduced is referred to current time (वर्तमाने). For example: काल ‘artisan’, वायू ‘wind’, पांशु ‘anus’, जात्र ‘medicinal herb, physician’, मात्र ‘bile’, स्वादु ‘sweet’, साधु ‘noble person, साधुह’, आश्र ‘fact’. 3.3.2 then provides that the same affixes also are seen to occur when an action is referred to the past. For example, वर्तम् vartman ‘path’ refers to something that has been gone on (बहुलम्). Further, 3.3.3 states that the derivates गम्यन् and so on refer to the future: गम्यन् ‘one who will go, a traveller’, आगमिन् ‘one who will come’, प्रस्थापिन् ‘one who will depart’, प्रतिवेदिन् ‘one who will oppose’, प्रतिबंधिन् ‘one who will awaken’, प्रतियोगिन् ‘one who will oppose’, प्रतियेविन् ‘one who will be contrary to’, प्रतियोगिन् ‘one who will come back’, आयातिन् ‘one who will come’, पाविन् ‘which will be’.

2.7.2. A शोकवार्त्तिका on 3.3.1 gives reasons why Pāṇini formulates this sūtra with बहुलम् instead of simply saying उपादाय: thereby providing that derivates with the affixes of the set beginning with उप् are acceptable correct usage. The property of applying variously (बहुलकर्म) is taken into account because the affixes उप् and so on appear, in derivations actually provided for, after a small number of the possible bases, not all the bases after which such affixes could occur, and because only most of the actually possible affixes are actually introduced in derivations provided, not all of the possible affixes. In addition, there is a residue of operations that is not taken care of in the derivations as actually provided. The Kāśikā captures the major emphasis of this by noting that the affixes in question appear also with bases other than those after which they are explicitly provided for and some, though they are not explicitly provided for, are inferred from usage.

2.7.3. In 3.3.2, Pāṇini uses द्यापि, and the Kāśikā remarks that this is meant in order that one follow usage in determining which particular
affixes of the उणादि set are used when an action is referred to the past. Although, according to the Kaśikā, both Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 thus involve a necessary recourse to usage for determining what the rules are to allow, there is nevertheless a difference between the two, which justifies their different formulations. Now, if instead of 3.3.1 as formulated, Pāṇini had stated उणादि वा, thereby providing that unādi affixes occur optionally (वा), this sutra would provide that all unādi affixes apply optionally under conditions stated. As shown in 2.7.2, this is clearly different from what 3.3.1, with बहुलम्, allows. Moreover, even given the very broad variation that 3.3.1 thus allows for, it does not obviate the need for a separate rule 3.3.2. The former provides for unādi affixes under a single condition of time reference: an action is referred to current time (वर्तमाने). 3.3.2, on the other hand, allows for some unādi affixes when an action is referred to the past. In addition, 3.3.1 applies in general (प्रायः ‘for the most part’), but 3.3.2 applies with respect to only a subgroup of unādi affixes: some of these also are used with past-time reference. In addition, there is an enumerable subgroup of items used with future reference, covered by 3.3.3.

2.8. दैवती भोव छलस्याय दस्ये। I provide that certain operations are seen to apply also in Vedic.

2.8.1. 6.4.73 has to do with augments added to verbal stems followed by endings that replace the L-affixes लुड़ लाहः लूडः. By 6.4.73 लुड़लाहलूड़क्षणादत् I such stems receive high-pitched आद as an initial augment. आद occurs only with consonant-initial bases, however, since this general rule has an exception: 6.4.72 आङ्कादीनात् I provides that high-pitched आद is added as an initial augment to vowel-initial stems. In addition, 6.4.73 states that आद is also seen to occur in Vedic usage. Now, 6.4.71-72 do not specify that the augments in question are added in the currently spoken language alone, so that it would make no sense to say that 6.4.73 simply provides for the use of आद also in Vedic. This sutra must, on the contrary, provide for a broader use of this augment than is the norm in the currently spoken language. That is, the rule provides that आद occurs also with stems other than those for which specific provision is made in 6.4.72, thus accounting for the fact that in Vedic आद occurs with consonant-initial as well as vowel-initial stems. For example: आयुक्त्य / अयुक्त्य ‘yoked’.
2.8.2. According to अस्थ्यावशेषामनवुद्यतां (तुलीयादित्रु [७४] अचि [७३]), अनही substitutes for the final -ढ of अस्थि ‘bone’, वधि ‘curds’, सजिय ‘thigh’ and अक्षि ‘eye’ before a vowel-initial ending of triplets starting from the third; e.g., अस्थिः-आ (instr. sg.: third-triplet ending य ) → अस्थन्-आ → अस्थन्32, वधि-आ →...ढण्णा, सजि-आ →...सजण्णा, अक्षि-आ →...अक्षण्णा, but अस्थिप्राम् (instr.- dat.- abl. du), दधिप्राम, सजिप्राम, अक्षिप्राम, with the endings प्राम of the third, fourth, and fifth triplets. In addition, जाने (बद्रयणि हरणे ) states that अनहिः is also seen to occur as a replacement for the -ढ of these stems in Vedic usage.

The situation here is comparable to that of 6.4.73 (2.8.1): Since 7.1.75 does not apply specifically in the spoken language alone, thus excluding Vedic usage, 7.1.76 cannot be meant to provide for Vedic usage involving the same endings as covered by the preceding sūtra. On the contrary, 7.1.76 has to allow the replacement in places where this is not provided for by the preceding rule: before consonant-initial endings, before endings other than those of the triplets starting with the third, and before elements other than endings33. For example: अस्वथि:, अस्वचि: (instr. pl.); अस्त्यानि (acc. pl.); अस्थिता (instr. sg.) ‘which has eyes’, अस्थ्यानतम् (acc.sg.) ‘corporeal’, with अस्थन् and अस्थन्- before the suffix चतु, which is not a vibhakti.

3. The evidence considered here is best accounted for on the thesis that Pāṇini34 has described a living spoken language of his time35, a language that exhibits traits found in any living language. In particular, Pāṇini has to take into account that there are relations among variants which can be described in a determinate fashion and others which cannot. Thus, there are instances where elements or operations A and B are complementary, each occurring in a specifiable domain. There are also instances where A and B vary within a stateable domain. In addition, there are instances such that, in a determined domain, there is indeterminate variation. This is the situation for which Pāṇini says that certain operations apply variously (बहुस्य) in a stated domain. Conversely, there are instances where the operations are determined but the domains in question remain partly indeterminate. This is the situation for which Pāṇini states that given operations are seen to occur under conditions other than those already stated. To reiterate the first example considered: Pāṇini can indeed specify certain places where long-vowel replacement applies in prior members of compounds (2.1.1). He must also accept, however, that this substitution applies to vowels of items which he cannot specify. Accordingly, he says
(6.3.137 [2.1]) that such long-vowel substitution is seen to apply to items other than those he has previously specified. Similarly, having gone as far as possible in stating the domains of certain affixes, he has to admit that they are seen to occur under additional, indeterminate, conditions.

Clearly, Panini does not consider it his task to put a strait-jacket on some state of a language to have it go on as a frozen fossil. On the contrary, he describes a living language used by native speakers who were carrying out innovations and generalizations. Moreover, Panini’s rules recognize, as should any grammar, that the final results of developments which have started cannot be predicted. Hence, the Astadhyayi appropriately includes what I call ‘escape rules’, statements which, I think, testify to the acumen and insight of Panini.36

Annotations:

2. Bh. III.174.10-15: तदि तांह शिशु:। सन्तुष्ट प्रमाणं किमवश्च्यायम् कियते। शिशुनाथार्थायायी। कथं
पुनर्वश्च्याय। शिशु:। द्वारा विज्ञातम्। अन्तःविश्लेषोत्तरोत्तरं परस्परत्वान्यं ये च चत्रं
विहितः।
शब्दाक्षरमुद्यागम्। स पश्चात् पूर्णस्वत: देशसूच:। तब्जोनो वा योश्नो न कार्यावमयीकिते ये
चार्यं किमवश्च्याय। श्लेष्यस्वत: प्रयुक्तः। नूतनन्यता: जनाति। एवंकथा शिशुनाथार्थायायी।
The Bhāṣyā on 6.3.109 has been discussed often; see most recently Cardona 1997: 551-553 (834).

3. VP\(\nu\) 1.12 (43.8-9): शिशुनाथाचूँ पुषोदस्तरणां शिशुप्रयोगमत्ततामपुर्णम्प्रकरणम समिति यः कारणम्।

4. Vṛṣaśāhadeva refers to the two types as अन्तःविश्लेषात् and अन्तःविश्लेषा:। Paddhāti 1.12
(43.22, 24-26): एवं तदन्तःक्षानां व्यक्तकरणपुर्ण:। अन्तःविश्लेषाततामपरिति दर्शयित:।
शिशुनाथ:। छः। तैयं उपदिशा लक्षणनां नामवश्च्याय। पुषोदस्तरण:। तत्प्रका:। तत्प्रकाशुल्लभाव:। इति
जावते। एवं पारम्परिषेव यस्मात: समुच्चयते। तत्प्रकाश:।

5. Bahuvarīhi compound by 2.2.27: तत: तेनीमिति सरुः। Samāsānta 840 by 5.4.127: इत्यविधतिहै।

6. Kaś 6.3.137: अन्तःविश्लेषात् दृष्ट:। स शिशुनाथोद्नमत्वतः। यथस्य दृष्ट:। न किमवश्च्याय।

7. The Kaśikā includes all these and more. In particular, it considers that Pāṇini’s use
of अर्थ is intended to allow all the conditions given in previous rules to be superseded,
so that, for example, a derivate with \( \hat{c} \) can refer to a kāraka other than an agent,
as in ‘परिला moat’, which is derived from ‘खन dig’ and refers to something that has
been dug: अन्तःविश्लेषात् मुदु:। अस्मात्मापिम् हस्यय:। न

d:। तत:। धिरूत:। धिरूत:। प्रभु:। अश्वायतविश्लेषात्। जात:। हस्यय:। ब्रह्मणो:। भम:। श्लेष्यस्वते।
युद्ध:। उपसंग:। सहस्यात्तत्सत्य:। अस्मात्मापिम् हस्यय:। अभिज्ञ:। परिला। केस:। अच्छ:। कर्मण्यात्तत्सत्।
अंकंविश्लेष:। हस्यय:। अनु जात:। अनु:। अधिष्ठ:। सम्भविक्यान्वित:। तेन धातवन्तर:। पत्ति

c:। पत्ति:। परिला:। अनु दृष्ट:। अनु:। अधिष्ठ:। सम्भविक्यान्वित:। तेन धातवन्तर:। पत्ति

c:। पत्ति:। परिला:। अनु दृष्ट:। अनु:। अधिष्ठ:। सम्भविक्यान्वित:। तेन धातवन्तर:। पत्ति

c:। पत्ति:। परिला:। अनु दृष्ट:। अनु:। अधिष्ठ:। सम्भविक्यान्वित:। तेन धातवन्तर:। पत्ति

c:। पत्ति:। परिला:। अनु दृष्ट:। अनु:। अधिष्ठ:। सम्भविक्यान्वित:। तेन धातवन्तर:। पत्ति

c:। पत्ति:। परिला:। अनु दृष्ट:। अनु:। अधिष्ठ:। सम्भविक्यान्वित:। तेन धातवन्तर:। पत्ति

c:। पत्ति:। परिला:। अनु दृष्ट:। अनु:। अधिष्ठ:। सम्भविक्यान्वित:। तेन धातवन्तर:। पत्ति

8. 3.2.134: आ केसाः सच्चितम्बरमक्षान्तरकाः। is a heading valid through 3.2.177, providing
that the affixes introduced by rules of this section are introduced to signify agents
thus qualified. अर्थ ‘up to and including’ is used, so that किपि by 3.2.177 is introduced
under these conditions, as is also the same affix introduced by 3.2.178.

9. Kaś 3.2.178 अन्तःविश्लेषात् धातुविश्लेषात्तत्सत्य:। कित्यक:। प्रत्यक:। हस्यय:। युनो:। धिरूत:।
I cannot take up
here the reasons—given in the Bhāṣyā on 3.2.178 and elsewhere—for stating
this sūtra.

10. 5.3.14 is part of the section of rules headed by 5.3.2: किपिन्धुःभस्सित:।

11. 5.4.48-69: प्रतिसाधनोपनिः। अभागाण:। चाहीयस्थिः। अतिप्राय:।

dअस्तित्वाधोधकतार:। श्लेष्यस्वात:। यात्र:। रोचकत:।
12. Bh. II.405. 14-15 : इह कस्मात्र चयति से | तौ ते | त्वादित्यियोऽञ्जित वचन्यम | के पुनर्भवद्यस्य | भवन्तू | दीर्घस्यु | देखायमिये | आयुष्मानिति | Later Pāṇinīya consider that हर्स्ये in the sūtra has the effect of so delimiting its application; e.g., Kāś. 5.3.14 : द्विभयवच्छ ग्रामविध्यतम | तेन भवादित्यिये अद्वेष्ठयतम | | VS 6.18 : ‘(Fat.) you are harmed; may the fire cook you...’

13. With the affix विनिय भन्द (विनिय [98]).

15. In his first vārttika on 3.1.87, Kātyāyana says this sūtra serves to formulate a restriction : भ्राह्मदियु हते | विवधवच्छ नियमार्थम | In the Bhāṣya, Patañjali notes that the restriction is two-fold, with respect to verbal base (भावनियम) and the time reference (कालनियम) : Bh. II. 112.9-12 : नियमार्त्यौ विहारः | भ्राह्मदिये हते : विवधवार्त्यात् | किंविबोद्वेषे | नेत्यह | उपपद्वेषीय एवस्तिता | विवेषे | अथ भ्राह्मदियु हतोनियनिननददियत्यम | न भ्राह्मदियत्यम | किं साराः | उपयोगी | नियनताः | उपयोगी | नियमोनियम | भ्राह्मदिये हतेन्तदे विवधवार्तित विवेषे च भ्राह्मदियति | As Kāyapa points out in his Pradīpa on this passage, Patañjali accepts only these two restrictions, not the four-fold restriction — such that the upapada and affix are also restricted — which others accept. Kāyapa also remarks that this four-fold restriction is not to be granted acceptance, since it conflicts with the Bhāṣya : Pr. III. 255 : एवेव नियमद्वय भाष्करस्त्रितित्म भ्राह्मदियु हतोहार्त भूतिविवधवार्तित भ्राह्मदियु हते : विवक्षापूर्व एवेवेछतु नियमद्वय भाष्करगाः | अन्नैस्वप्नोऽपरिवर्तनाः | चतुर्विवेर्याः | नियमोऽच्छायाः | स भाष्करायामा कामिनी भथितिम् | The source Kāyapa ridicules here is the Kāśikā, which, in its commentary on 3.1.87, does indeed say the rule involves four restrictions. Additional details need not be discussed here, since they do not affect my main topic.

16. Here too there is a difference of opinion. The Kāśikā interprets 3.2.76 as introducing विनिय after all verbs, whether or not they are construed with an upapada, and to form derivatives used both in Vedic and in the spoken bhāsa of Pāṇini’s time : सर्ववाक्याव : औपसार्थस्य निरपसार्थस्य राज्यस्य भवन्ति | विवधवार्तय भवन्ति | The Dipaprabhā on Vāś 23 (p. 58), on the other hand, says 3.2.76 introduced the affix only to bases construed with an upapada : तित्वातकोरत तीमुदेयश्च तित्वातकोरत समायोऽनेिति | विवधवार्त्योऽनेिति | If a derivative like गिर (nom. sg. म: ‘speech’ is derived with विनिय by 3.2.76 — thus, e.g., SK 2983 (= 3.2.76 [IV.70]) — then obviously the sūtra does not require a verb to be used with an upapada. On the other hand, if the 5kṛtika समपदादि along with vārttika 9 on 3.3.108 (सर्ववाक्याव: विनिय) is invoked to account for derivatives like गिर (thus Bhānuji on Amarakośa 1.6.1), then one can adopt the alternative view. The consequence of this is that such derivatives as गिर, which must have been known to Pāṇini, since they were used from earliest Vedic on, have to be accounted for by an addition to the grammar. I therefore consider the Kāśikā’s interpretation preferable.
17. 3.2.87 vt. 2: तथा चौतत्त्वम वचनार्थः || Bh. II. 112.14-15: एवं कृत्वतत्त्वम वोगस्य वचनार्थं उपयोगः घवति बहुरूः छन्दसीति। यो मानुषाः पिलुहा प्राप्तुहा। न च घवति अभिव्यक्तातः।

18. The Paippalāda Atharvaaveda has (19.46.14): यो मात्राः पिलुहा स्वसुहा, with स्वसुहा ‘one who has killed his sister’.

19. Atharvaaveda Paippalāda 2.88.lab: शास इत्य यहाः अस्थित्रिवाचायो अद्यायुः। The Śaunakīya Atharvaaveda (1.20. 4ab) has शास इत्य यहाः अस्थित्रिवाचायो अद्यायुः। and the Rgveda (10.152.1ab) has शास इत्य यहाः अस्थित्रिवाचायो।

20. 3.2.1. कम्येतु॥ See 2.6.5.

21. Kāś 3.2.75: छन्दसीति नित्याः। अन्येऽपि धिक्ष्यत्वं नाकारानोत्सरं मन्त्रं कवित्वम वर्णित्वेऽपि प्रत्ययं रक्षये विनयव च। शुभाः। कवित्वव प्रातिवत्य प्रातिवत्यानी। नित्यां विज्ञाया अप्रेयये वि। निचु खलचः रेवतिः पर्यं न चे। अपिविद्य; सत्त्वपायक्सविवायः। नित्येपनादायः भवति भोजा पीवा। हस्ताक्रमशः प्रयोगामुसर्गायतेः।

22. 3.2.1 vt. 4-5: अपरिकन्येत् वा। अपिविद्यात्।

23. These are derivatives with the affix उपः by Unādisūtra 1.1 : कृष्टशोभिस्वदिसाध्यसूचय उपः। Note that स्वादुः has a general reference, to anything that is sweet to the taste (स्वादव), but that कालः refers specifically to an artisan (शिल्पिन), not just anyone who does something (करति). Pāṇinīyas are therefore doubtless correct when they say that स्वादवाम is understood in 3.3.1. Accordingly, the sūtra provides that the affixes in question are introduced to form derivatives with specific referents and this variously, so that some of the derivatives can have general referents.

24. This is a derive with मन्त्रम by Unādisūtra 4.144: सर्वशाधृथो मन्त्रम्, which allows this affix to follow all verbal bases. मन्त्रम् is the first example given in the Kāśikā on 3.3.2, which also gives the examples वर्मम् 'skin' and भस्मम 'ashes', derived from चर् 'go about' and भस् 'shine'. In his comments on Unādisūtra 4.144, Ujjvaladatta also gives these derivatives and refers to Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.3.2.

25. These are the derivatives given in the Kāśikā, which treats the set gamyādi as an exhaustive listing (सर्वगम्याद), of these, only गमग, आगमग, भागग, and प्रभागग are directly derivable by known Unādisūtras: 4.6-9: नकरिन्ह:। आहि विनः। मुखव ते स्वः। The Padamanjari on Kāśikā 3.3.3 refers to these — but with variants आहि गिर्य and प्रभाग्: for Unādisūtra 4.7, 9 — and notes alternative ways of accounting for the other examples: प्रतिभागिन, प्रतियोगिन, प्रतियोगिनः and प्रतियोगिन: are derived with गिर्य by Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.1.134: नन्दग्रहितवाचाद्य लघुखुस्ताः। प्रतिभागिन: is derived with विनः by Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.2.142: सामुखः। others say some of the derivatives are formed with गिर्य by Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.2.78: सुप्रस्तृत गिर्यनित्ताचीते। and still others say that these derivatives are simply given as ready-made in the list accompanying Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.3.3. PM
26. 3.3.1 vt. 1: बाहुलकं पूर्तस्तुततुंके: प्रथमकुश्ययनादिपि सेवाम्। कार्यसंशोधविभेद तदुक्तम्।.. This ślokavārttika and Patañjali’s comments on it appear to assume, as later Pāṇinīyas explicitly state, that the derivations are according to sūtras of another grammar, the Unāḍisūtras. I do not enter into this question here, except to remark that, in the Indian context, a mere list of affixes without rules introducing them to bases, would indeed be anomalous. Jīnendrabuddhi (Nyāsa III.1) cites a traditional verse stating on what basis the property of applying variously is attributed to operations: because an operation sometimes applies, sometimes does not apply, sometimes applies optionally, and because sometimes some other operation applies: क्लिचित्रवर्णः क्वचिदवर्णः: क्वचिदिन्द्वभाय क्वचिदन्देवते। चिन्हिन्द्राणां बहुः समीक्षाणां चतुर्विंश बाहुलकं वर्णित। This verse is well known, cited elsewhere in full (e.g., Anantabhaṭṭa on Vājasaneyāpāṭiśākhya 3.18, Hemacandra on Siddhahemāśabdānuśāsana 8.1.2) or in part (e.g., PM III.1) as well as simply alluded to indirectly (e.g., Uvata on Vājasaneyāpāṭiśākhya 3.18).

27. Kāś 3.3.1: उपाध: प्रत्यय: वर्तयानेनसे सम्भवायं विषये वहं भविष्यति। यतो विनिद्वस्तो व्यक्तिपरिवर्तित। केवलविविधता: एव प्रयोगम उपयोग।

28. Kāś 3.3.2: पूर्तं वर्तयानविभक्तसात: भूतत्त्वेषकं भवनम्। भूतं काल उपाध: प्रत्यय: ज्ञयते। वृत्तमेषकं भवनम्। नरमृ: च विनिद्वविधि मृ: ।

29. This is brought out in the Bālamanoromā on Siddhāntakaumudi 3169 (= 3.3.1 [IV.307] explaining Bhaṭṭoṭi’s statement that some affixes not explicitly provided for are to be inferred (केवलविविधता: अप्रकटः) उपाधयो वे तत्सुलुध्या बहुतारण्यस्य प्रयोजनमाहे केवलविविधता: अप्रकटः।

30. Siddhāntakaumudītattvabodhini IV.308: नवेशों वर्तमानग्रह: च उपाधयो बहुतारण्यस्य नात्तीर्यतां। एतत्तीर्यस्तु च स्वत्त्वतां। अविशेषेष्ठ कालस्वेष: प्रत्ययतात्परिवर्तितैः च बुद्धिः। बाहुलयो वर्तमाने भवति भुतैविश्वतिस्तु: क्वचिदेवते विवेकावर्तमानग्रहैः। Candrakalā on Laghuśabdenduśekhara 3.3.1 (II.816): न क च वर्तमाने श्रेणी सूमाज्ज्ञानमाहे श्रेणी नामवर्तमानेण। एवं सूमाज्ज्ञाने वर्तमाने च स्वरुपतिं दश्यामुग्धेऽवेद्यावर्तमाने। वर्तमाने च वेद्यावर्तमानाय च वर्तमानाय च वेद्यावर्तमानाय च वेद्यावर्तमानाय च वेद्यावर्तमानाय च वेद्यावर्तमानाय। Similariy, Nyāsa and Padamaṇjari on Kāśikā 3.3.2 (III.6).

31. Kāś. 6.4.73: यतो हि विनिद्वस्तो व्यक्तिपरिवर्तित।

32. 6.4.134: अवेशोपावः।
33. Kāś 7.1.76 : यथो विहितस्ततोऽन्यायपि दश्यते । अचीत्यकम् । अनन्तादानिः दश्यते । इति द्वृत्तः
अस्त्यत्रः (RV 1.84.13a) पुद्दद्म्यास्यमाब्ध्यास्यज्ञानं । (VS 25.21 = RV 1.89.85) । दृष्टिया—
दिशितपूर्वः । अनर्तीयविद्यापि दश्यते । अस्त्यानुस्कृता जुहोऽति । विभक्तितपूर्वः अविभक्तावपि दश्यते ।
अस्त्यन्ति ताक्षुन्त्र । अस्त्यन्ति तत्त्वद्वैभाष्यगति (RV 1.164.4b).

34. I have considered only the Pāṇinian evidence because of space limitations. Comparable statements are found elsewhere in early Pāṇinīya works : 2.1.33 vt. 1 (कृत्वाधिकाराय कथितस्ततोऽन्यायपि दश्यते ॥), 5.1.57-58 vt. 6 (अनेर्योधपि दश्यते कारणात्यायम् ॥), 5.2.112
vt. 1 (कल्पनकश्चतुर्योऽन्यायपि दश्यते ॥), 5.2.120 vt. 1 (नृपकर्णस्तुद्योऽन्यायपि दश्यते ॥). Bhāṣya
on 3.2.48 (II. 103. 14 : अथ आद डृष्टिकर्णस्तुद्योऽन्यायपि दश्यते । अनेर्योधपि दो भवतोऽति वल्लभः ॥).

35. Of course, he also takes earlier archaic usage into account, as has been noted in
sections above.

36. This is connected with the issue of how, in ancient India, one viewed the usage we
refer to as Sanskrit, including both the spoken language of Pāṇini's period, with
its dialect variations, and earlier Vedic : as manifestations of a single eternal
language or a product of human beings. Although the Aṣṭādhyāyī does not say
anything explicit concerning this, Kātyāyana and Patañjali do consider the issue
whether speech is eternal or produced. I cannot enter into a discussion of these
questions here. They have been dealt with recently by Deshpande; see his Sanskrit
Let me say only that I see no contradiction between Pāṇini's describing a state of
language such that certain developments had begun but not yet been carried out
and Pāṇinīyas' maintaining theoretically that all manifestations of Sanskrit speech
represent an eternal language. There can be, in the Pāṇinian scheme of things,
a perennity of a flow (प्रचालनाभ्यास्तत) such that what appear to be newly created
elements are merely manifestations of entities always there in the eternal flow.
Obviously, I do not think that the conclusions I have reached on the basis of the
evidence considered here require one to consider Pāṇini a linguist who claims
to be describing a language historically.