CHAPTER - III

RULES OF PĀṇini DESIGNATED AS PARIBHAṢĀ 
AND RULES SIMILAR TO PARIBHAṢĀ
PAÑINI : HIS ORIGINALITY.

As it is established, Panini cannot be later than the fifth century B.C. Linguistic studies in ancient India however had started long before he flourished. Panini seems to have reaped a good harvest of grammatical traditions of the past and has himself referred to some predecessors as notable sages in his work viz. ASTĀDHYAYĪ. In the circumstances, the question that pertinently presents itself is how far Panini has displayed the traits of his masterly talents and originality in the field of Sanskrit Grammar. According to Gold stücker, Panini is acclaimed to be not the inventor of the grammatical style as represented in his work. But that does not detract him from the credit of contributing the resources of his overwhelming intellect and critical scholarship. I.S. Pawate in his Structure of the ASTĀDHYAYĪ has made an endeavour to show to what extent Panini was indebted to his predecessors and to what extent he improved upon the old corpus of the traditions. In this opinion, Panini got handed down to him as upadesa from his teachers a manual of sutras which confirmed to the paribhāṣās now found in the ASTĀDHYAYĪ together with the Dhatupātha and the Gangpātha as companion volumes to that book of the sutras. But the manual of the rules which came

(1) Gold stücker puts Panini in the pre-Buddha era. V.S. Agrawala in his essay in the Cultural Heritage of India, (Vol I Page 307) shows that Panini cannot be later than fifth century B.C. Paninian meaning of the term, nirvāṇa (P. 8.2.30), the list of stars (P. 8.3.34) beginning with Śravistā in conformity with the Vedanga Astronomy and so on are interesting clues to the determination of Panini's date. For a critical determination of Panini's date, vide NAGADHAM 1973, editorial Pages 19-26.
over to Pāṇini was found by him to be incomplete and inadequate as a science of Sanskrit Grammar. Accordingly Pāṇini proceeded to enlarge it by incorporating rules borrowed from other grammatical works and also by adding up fresh rules of his own wherever needed.

This opinion of Mr. Pawate is to be taken with a grain of caution. For no early commentators have ever looked upon Pāṇini as a mere compiler or editor of an older text just to fill up lacuna or to enlarge the old model. It is only in the sphere of euphonic combinations of which there had been much progress in pre-Pāṇinian Schools that Pāṇini showed due regard to the views of his predecessors. Barring this field his reference to older views is scant indeed. This naturally leaves room for reasonable conjecture that before Pāṇini, system of rules of kāraṇa, samāsa, taddhita etc. seemed to have gained no strong foundation. Judging from this standpoint, Pāṇini may very well be credited with the honour of building up the edifice of grammar to its stature of scientific dignity. Even relying on Pawate’s view, we may observe without fear of contradiction that the task which was carried out by Pāṇini to execute a well co-ordinated structure of grammatical discipline with the help of his consummate learning and outstanding skill bears ample evidence of his originality.

Pāṇini’s commentators have recognised him as the able formulatrix of Grammatical rules. Scholars of repute viz. Vyādi, Kātyāyana, Patanjali, Bhartṛhari, Vāmana, Jayāditya, Kātyāṭa, Pranabhūta Ācārya, Mahātā prayatnena gṛutaṃ pravṛtti sma (Mahābh. on P.1.1.1.). Also vide Mahābh. on P.2.3.66, P. 5.3.55, P. 8.3.59.
Bhattachari, Nagadha together with those of various post-Paninian Schools of Sanskrit Grammar follow his suit to explain in their own way peculiarities of Sanskrit language up-to-date. Moderns too accept him as the inspired seer of a perfect grammatical system. The clue to the withering away of older schools of grammar at the wake of Panini's is to be sought in this sort of overwhelming popularity and perfection of his work. Max Müller has very pertinently gone to the extent of observing that there is no grammar in a language that could vie with his eight books of grammatical rules. Indeed, a mere compiler or editor never dreams of such perpetual fame in any discipline of learning.

Panini's ASTĀDHYAYI consists of eight chapters each of which is divided into four sections (Pāda). A group of some fifty rules only deals with the views of earlier grammarians. Panini may have borrowed the planning of the division of his rules from the work of Apiśali whose work too had eight chapters. But it is too nominal to claim a mention. Of the notable features of Panini's work, we marvel at the perfect sequence of his rules specifically in the groups headed by the governing rules, Purvatraśiddham (P. 8.2.1) and Asiddhavat etc. (P. 6.4.22). He has technical terms and interpretative canons of his own and has still liberally adopted familiar terms and canons of his


(4) Astaka Apiśala-Pārīnīyāh (Amogha vṛtti of Pānyakṛtī on Sākatayana 3.2.161, quoted by Y. Mimamsaka in his history of Sanskrit Grammar, Vol I.)
predecessors. Frequently do words and particles in his rules indicate canons of liberal acceptance. This absorption of older traditions adds to the glory of his work as the most complete text of Sanskrit grammar. Some older terms viz. ani (now & acc. dual ending), an (case-ending in instrumental singular), vyakti, vaśana etc. run side by side with Panini's in his rules. Panini holds meaningful traditions of high esteem in these adoptions. It is noticeable too that he has offered a comprehensive explanation of the impact of indicatory letters that profusely appear in stems, prefixes, suffixes, augments and substitutes in his system. It is a wonderful improvement upon earlier discourses on the employment and impact of indicatory letters in phenomenal grammar. With regard to the long drawn controversy over derivation of words Panini has reconciled the two extreme views expressed by Śāktaśayana on the one hand and Gārgya on the other. He admits undervisible words and still gives a birth to the uṇādi suffixes which tend to analyse words at large. All this tends to prove the worth of the familiar saying that the great science of Panini's grammar which is an all-beneficial discipline of correctness of (5) words should be accepted in its entirety.

The Astaśāhyāyī offers some thirty Paribhāṣā in the form of its rules. A moderner may find a few more rules to add to this list. A number of other canons, if not compiled in a book, was certainly prevalent in Panini's time. Patañjali's interpretation of many words and particles in the Paninian rules in favour of indicating interpretative canons is a pointer to this fact. Nagarj
endorses it in his first sentence of the Paribhasaṇḍusūkhara. He
proposes there a discourse on the canons which were in the
form of rules of the older grammarians and which were later
indicated in the Pāṇiniya text. It is fairly possible that Pāṇini
put his seal of recognition upon the familiar canons of his time
and formulated his own where needed. The canons in the form of
his own formulations are however most essential for the inter-
pretation of his rules. The selection of certain aspects in the
formulation of his canons as against indication of the bulk in
his text should be appreciated in this light of utility. Thus, as
commentators say, an indicated canon, unlike the formulated, lacks
universal application. Puruṣottama chiefly refers to those
indicated canons when he endorses that a Paribhasa is appealed to
as the last resort. He pertinently observes that canons which
are precepts of various linguisticōns must not in any way stand
in the way of the proper functioning of the rules of Pāṇini.

We propose a critical analysis of the concept and utility
of the interpretative canons in the form of Pāṇini's rules in
the following pages. Other canons as acceptable to this school of
Sanskrit Grammar will follow in the subsequent chapters.

(5) Pāṇiniyaṇa māhāśāstraṇa pada-sādhutva-lakṣaṇam,
sarvopakārakanā grahyāṇa kṛṣṭaṇa tva-jāyam na kīñcana.
(Parāśaroṣāpurāṇa)

(6) Pṛacīnā-vaiyākaraṇa-tantra vaśikāṇy etra Pāṇiniya-tantra
jñāpañaya-siddhāni etc.

(7) Jñāpana-siddhāna na servatra (P 125/Pu 119/Sā 129).

(8) Agatyā khalu Paribhasaśāriyate (Pu 119).
—— Paribhasa hi na Pāṇiniyaṃ vaśenāni. Kiṣī terhi,
nanācaryāṇām. (Puruṣottama on Agatyā khalu, etc.)
1. CLUE TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE LOCUS OF A GRAMMATICAL OPERATION.

As stated earlier, Pāṇini shares along with other rules, the interpretative canons viz. Tasmin niti nirdiste pūrvasya (P.1.1.66), Tasmād ityuttarasya (P. 1.1.67), Saśṭḥī sthāneyogā (P.1.1.49) etc. with the Vaij-pr. of Kātyāyana. Some may suggest that such rules are borrowed from some earlier sources unknown to us. Of the three canons mentioned here, the last one is employed even in the Rk-pr. 2.18 and 2.19 to mark the locus of change with the possessive case-ending, although it has its own canon viz. Āsāvamum iti etc. (Rk-pr. 1.56) employed in the Rk-pr. 2.15, 2.16, 2.17 etc. The other two canons viz. Tasmin etc. and Tasmād etc. on the significance of case-endings in rules, we think, are Pāṇini's formulations and are adopted by Kātyāyana in his text of the Vaij-pr. The latter formulates a vārttika on these two maxims to clarify that in a rule where both these maxims are relevant, the latter will prevail.

Recognition of the locus of grammatical operations in the rules of precepts is the sole objective of the above Paribhāṣā rules. Beside the particle iti in P. 1.1.66 and P. 1.1.67, the words 'tasmin and tasmāt derived from the pronominal stem tad with the locative and ablative case-endings in singular respectively, represent in rules the words with these two endings in singular, dual or plural i.e. condition subsequent and condition precedent respectively. The closest contiguity of a conditioning cause, subsequent or precedent, with the locus of operation is indicated by the word nirdiśta. It is argued that without these two canons viz. Tasmin niti nirdiśte pūrvasya (P.1.1.66) and Tasmād ityuttarasya (P. 1.1.67) an operation just before the

(9) Paresvaikāram ojayoh (Rk-pr-2.18) and Aukāram yugmeyoh (Rk-pr 2.19).
(10) Ubhaya-nirdeśe vīpratiśedhāt pañcami-nirdesah.
(11) Yasmāt param pare yasmin tamnimitam dvidāh matam.
(Durgādāsa quoting in his commentary on the Mūgḍhābodha).
(12) . . . . . . pūrvottarayor yogaviśeṣān niyamārtham vacanam.
(Vē. on P. 1.1.66-67).
condition subsequent and after the condition precedent could not be ascertained. By determining the locus of grammatical operations in numerous rules, these two canons have thus proved their worth as interpretative canons in a grammatical discourse. In 'Iko yan aci' (P. 6.1.77), an ik (i, ி, u, ु, r, ร, 1) vowel is stated to be replaced by a yan (y, ย, r, 1) before any vowel (ac) e.g. sudhi upāsya > sudhy upāsya etc. The word 'ik' is given in the possessive case-ending and the condition subsequent i.e. 'ac' in the locative here.

It is to note that the locative case-termination governed by a verb only is acceptable to the first canon viz. Tasmin etc. Thus the Pradīpa of Kaiyāta under P. 6.4.23 observes on the authority of the Mahābhārata that in 'kātī' linked to this rule, the case-termination is justified by P. 2.3.37 (Yasya ca bhāvāna etc.) is not a case-ending (kāraka-vibhakti) in the Paninian standard and cannot determine the locus of the operation viz. elision of n. Similar is the case with the termination in the word 'kāti' in P. 2.3.65, says Nāgāsa in the Uddyota on the Pradīpa. In 'Iko yan aci' (P. 6.1.77) however, locative case (kāraka) is denoted by the case-termination in 'ac' and hence according to P. 1.1.66 (Tasmin etc.) an 'ik' vowel is stated to be replaced by a yan before 'ac' e.g. sudhi upāsya > sudhy upāsya. According to Patañjali, it is 'satsaptamī' in P. 6.4.23 and P. 2.3.65 but 'para-saptamī' in P. 6.1.77. The rules viz. Samaḥ sutī (P. 8.3.5), Osī ca (P. 7.3.104), Kam amṛjīte (P. 8.3.12), Bahuvācane jhalyet (P. 7.3.103), Idagneh somavarunayoh (P. 6.3.27) are a few of
the many rules coming within the purview of the maxim Tasmin etc.

As regards the second canon i.e. Tasmad etc. (P. 1.1.67) the unintervening proximity of the locus of operation with the condition precedent may be noticed in the all-anudatta 'nighata' in a verb just after a word other than a conjugated verb(ati) in the veda by the rule Triñatineh (P. 8.1.28). Here in this canon, the ablative case-ending is governed by a word other than a verb. The Vāj-pr. reads this canon with the word 'ādeh' at the end and it is certainly an improvement on the Pāṇinian rule. For it includes Pāṇini's 'ādeh parasya (P. 1.1.54) within its fold to obviate the scope of Alo'ntyasya (P. 1.1.52). Otherwise, the ultimate letter of a word after the condition precedent would be the locus of operation and consequently there would be intervention of a few syllables between the condition (nimitta) and the locus. By 'Udaḥ sthā-stambhoḥ pūrvasya (P. 8.4.61) it is the initial 's' of sthā- and stambh- that is replaced by its homogeneous 'th' after the prefix ud-

(13) e.g. ud + sthāsyati = ud ththāsyati = ut-thāsyati, ut thāsyati.

The third canon viz. Saṣṭhī sthāneyogā (P. 1.1.49) refers a locus of operation with possessive case-termination in the Pāṇinian grammar. As already stated the Vāj-pr. also reads (14) this canon, according to Dr. K.C. Chatterjee it is necessitated there only to refer to elision. In Pāṇini, letters,

(13) For the term 'nimitta' vide the article 'Nimitta' by G. Gonda, Charudeva Shastri Felicitation Volume, 1974, Pages 233-240.

syllables and words with possessive case-endings generally represent the locus of various grammatical operations including religion. Thus by Jhālam jas' jhasī (P. 8.4.53), a jhal consonant (any consonant other than y, v, r, l, n, n, n, n, m) is replaced by a jas' (d, b, g, d, d) before a jhas (jh, bh, gh, dh, dh, j, b, g, d, d) e.g. sudhāhy upāsya = sud dhy upāsya. By Jharo jhari savarne (P. 8.4.65), a jhar consonant (any consonant other than nasals and h, y, v, r, l) before the same jhar consonant is elided optionally e.g. ut-thāsyati, ut thāsyati. Some fifty rules at least of Pāṇini in the chapter on euphonic combinations only benefit by this canon of interpretation viz. Sāsthi etc.

Moreover, with the help of locative and ablative case-terminations, when a locus is determined in a rule of precept, it is referred to with possessive case-ending in the course of interpretation. In a rule where both ablative and locative case-endings are employed, according to the relative prominence of the canon Tasmād etc., a locus immediately follows the condition precedent and the locative case-ending is changed into the possessive to indicate the locus. By Dah si dhut (P. 8.3.29), s after d is optionally augmented with dh(ut) e.g. sas'santah = sad santah = sad dh santah = saṭ t santah. This change of the locative case-ending into the possessive is universal in all such rules employing both ablative and locative case-endings in Pāṇini's work.
It is presumable that there are hundreds of meanings of possessive case-terminations. Proximity (sāmīpya), the state of part and whole (avayava), place (sthāna) etc. are very common of them. Thus every possessive case-ending in Pāṇini’s rules may not determine the locus of an operation. By Īḍapadāyā gohah (P. 6.4.89), we mean replacement of the penultimate vowel letter in the verbal stem by u(t) as in guhita etc. Similarly, by Sāsa idānbaloh (P. 6.4.34), i(t) replaces the penultimate vowel letter of the root sās as in sista etc. If the possessive case-ending denote sthāna (place), then the ultimate letters of guh- and sās- are bound to be replaced by ū and i respectively according to Alontyasya (P. 1.1.52). Of course all other meanings of a possessive case-ending are primarily prone to ‘place’ (sthāna) as the celebrated commentaries observe. Even then the rules viz. P. 6.4.89 and P. 6.4.34 enjoining replacement of penultimate letters are exceptions to the maxim, Sāsthi etc. Thus the Mahābhārata proposes to take recourse to the dictum (Vyākhyānamato visēṣapratiṣṭhitāt etc.) that specific import is to be arrived at by way of appropriate interpretation.

One point more. We need not interpret a nominative case-termination after an ablative one in Panini’s rules with the possessive for it will invite worthless cumbersome. By Gup-tij-kidbhyaḥ san (P. 3.1.5) we mean affixation of -san after these verbal roots and not the replacement of -san by -san

(15) Vide padamanjarī and Nāgęśa on P. 1.1.49.
(16) Praudha-manoramā, Šādā-zatna, Šādendu-šakhara etc.
after them. So far as suffixes are concerned, this complexity is averted in Panini. It is to note that Panini's maxim Saṣṭhī etc. and the Vārttika Mirdiśyamānasasyā-deśā bhavanti are of identical significance and either of the two can be left aside.

Not with a mere sixth case-ending, it is possible to ascertain the locus of a grammatical operation in many instances. The interpretative canons viz. Alōntyasya (P. 1.1.52), Ādeḥ parasya (P. 1.1.54), Anēkāl śīt sarvasya (P. 1.1.55) and Niśca (P. 1.1.53) contribute here this way or that. Ordinarily, an operation takes place in the ultimate letter of a word or a group of syllables that is given with sixth case-ending in (17) a rule by Alōntyasya (P. 1.1.52) fully aided by P. 1.1.49 (Saṣṭhī sthāneyogā). But for the canon Alō etc. the word in its entirety would have been affected. Thus by Samah-suṭi (P. 2.3.5) in sam-suṭ-kartā, it is the ultimate m which is replaced by r just before the augment viz. suṭ. Problems in interpretation arise in some cases on account of the fact that by 'Yena vīḍhis-tadantasya' (P. 1.1.72) letters or groups of letters are made representative of themselves as well of words that end in such letters or groups of letters. In such a situation, we can conveniently invoke the aid of the maxim Alō etc. which restricts an operation to the ultimate letter of such words.

(17) Rules to benefit from the canon viz. Alō etc. are P. 8.3.7, 8.3.12, 8.2.66, 8.2.53-54, 7.3.103, 7.3.104, 7.3.105, 7.3.110, 7.3.119, 7.2.107, 7.2.108, 6.4.127, 6.4.140, 6.4.127, 7.1.55, 6.3.61, 6.3.27, 6.1.131, 7.4.50, 3.4.98, 3.4.100 etc. Of them P. 6.4.140, 6.4.147, 7.4.50, 3.4.98 and 3.4.100 enjoin elision whereas the rest replacement.
The rule Samyogāntasya lopah (P. 8.2.23) however expressly incorporates the word 'anta' in itself to mean that in a word that ends in a conjunct consonant the last letter will be dropped e.g. abhavan (= abhavant = a-bhū + a + imperfect ant). But the rule Āto dhātoḥ (P. 6.4) will ratify the elision of the ultimate vowel of a word which has as its last member a verbal root ending in ā e.g. viśva-pā + accusative plural ṣas = viśvapah. A Pāṇinian scholar has to pursue this circuitous path on account of the fact that a part of a word can undergo an operation as but a part of the word. According to him the compound word 'parama-sarva' is a pronoun as a whole and becomes parama-sarvasmi (ṅe; > -sami) in dative singular. Here declension pertains to the whole of the compound stem, not to its last member alone.

The Mahabh. under P. 1.1.65 (Alōntyāt pūrva upadā) refers to a view that excepting in a change of the first part (abhyāsa) of a reduplicated verbal stem, the maxim Alōntyasya will not function with regard to meaningless syllables.

(18) Patañjali has cited a number of examples the formation (19) of which has been arrived at therein without the help of this modification in the maxim, Alo etc. Accordingly he is prepared to dispense with the need of such modifying vārttiṇa.

(18) Nāmarthaka'lo'ntyavidhir anabhāsavikāre (Pā 105/Pu 38/ Si 116/Nī 95).

(19) In bibharti, mimite, jihite etc., derived from the verbal root bhr, māṅ, ohaṅ etc., in present indicative, the last vowel (i.e. r of bhr and a of māṅ and ohaṅ) of the first part of reduplicated verbal stems is replaced by i(t) (P. 7.4.76). Again in iyarti and piparti which are third person singular forms in present indicative of the roots
$r$ and $pr$ respectively, it is the last letter of the first part of reduplicated stems which is replaced by $i(t)$ by the rule P. 7.4.77. In all these instances a change (vikāra) of abhyāsa is concerned and the maxim, P. 1.1.52 (Alo etc.) is adhered to. But with patiti (- patat-iti) the case is not the same. Here the earlier word being a meaningless imitative sound, its last two letters i.e. 'at' is swallowed by the initial 'i' of iti (P. 6.1.98). In dehi (dā+hi) and dhehi (dhā+hi), active forms of dā and dhā in imperative second person singular, the last letter i.e. 'a' of the roots are replaced by 'e' (P. 6.4.119). The same rule however enjoins the loss of 'abhyāsa' in its entirety, not in its last letter alone.

\[
\begin{align*}
dā+ hi &= dā = dā hi = dā hi = dehi \\
dhā + hi &= dhā = dhā hi = dhā hi = dhehi.
\end{align*}
\]

The loss is treated here as different from change (vikāra). Before all the case-terminations beginning with a consonant in instrumental dative, ablative, genitive and locative, id- of the pronominal stem 'idam' drops altogether (P. 7.2.113) e.g.

\[
\text{idam + bhyam} = \text{ida + bhyam} \quad \text{(P. 7.2.108)} = \text{a bhyam}
\]

\text{abhyām} \quad \text{(P. 7.3.102)}.

Again, when an operation has taken place by any of the four rules viz. P. 7.4.54-57 (which admit certain consequential changes in the verbal root before the desiderative suffix 'san') the abhyāsa is elided in entirety (P. 7.4.58) as in ipsati (āp+san+ti = āp = sa + ti = āp ip sa ti = ipsati). Here are the examples in the formation of which the maxim Alo etc. is inoperative. The varttika viz. nanarthake etc. is an attempt at the analysis of such formation.

But the Mahābhāṣya has found it convenient to explain their formation in some other ways. Thus Panini himself prohibits the rule P. 6.1.98 by P. 6.1.99 in the second part of a reduplicated word (Amṛdita) and admits optional swallowing of the last letter of the earlier word by 'initial 'i' of 'iti' e.g. paṭatapaṭad iti and paṭatapaṭeti (paṭatapaṭat iti = paṭatapaṭa iti). This option indicates Panini's own disapproval of the employment of the maxim Alo etc. in the combination of paṭat with iti. Panini ignores the word 'lopa' that might be linked from an earlier rule to P. 3.4.119 and incorporates it here once again certainly to point out non-acceptibility of Alontyasya in this rule. In abhyām etc. the loss is admitted of an-, the substitute of id- and not of id- itself. As for ipsati etc.
The maxims, Ādeḥ parasya (P. 1.1.54) and Anekālśūt sarvasya (P. 1.1.55) are two exceptions to Alo etc. (P. 1.1.52).

We have already noticed the utility of Ādeḥ etc. in the rule P. 8.4.61 (ūdeḥ sthā etc.) with regard to the formation of utthāsyati etc. It is welcome to the following rules too.

(a) Dvyantarupasargabhya'pa it (P. 6.3.97).
\[ \text{dvi} + \text{ap+}a = \text{dvi-}ip \text{ a} = \text{dvipa} \]
\[ \text{antar} + \text{ap+}a = \text{antar} \text{ ip} \text{ a} = \text{antaripa} . \]
\[ \text{sam} + \text{ap+}a = \text{sam ip a} = \text{samāpa} . \]

(b) Údanor dese (P. 6.3.98)
\[ \text{anu+ap+a = anu īp a = anūpa} . \]

(c) Jyādād Īyasah (P. 6.4.160).
\[ \text{praśasya + īyas = jya + īyas = jya āyas = jyāyas} , \]

(d) Śasō na (P. 7.1.29).
\[ \text{asmad + (s)as = asmā as (P. 7.2.87) = asmā ns = asmān} . \]
\[ \text{yusmad + (s)as = yusmā as = yusmā ns = yusmān} . \]

(e) Īdāsah (P. 7.2.83)
\[ \text{as + śanač = ās āna = ās īna = āsina} . \]

the word 'atra' in P. 7.4.58 may be a clue to ignore Alo etc. Patanjali discards the vārttika mentioned above with these favourable circumstances at his disposal. Nāgāsa ratifies this stand but Bhāṭṭoṣji's Sk. on P. 7.2.113 and its two commentaries viz. Bālamanorāma (on P. 6.1.98 and P. 1.1.65) and Tattvābodhini (on P. 7.2.113) favour the retention of the vārttika. The last work on P. 6.4.119 however favours total elision on account of the amībandha s' (P. 1.1.55).
In all these rules, there is sixth case-ending affixed to a word the first letter of which undergoes a change. The precedent conditioning cause appears in ablative. As the Kāśīkā observes, these very endings will themselves suggest the scope of their jurisdiction under P. 1.1.54 (Ādeḥ etc.). It is true that an operation immediately after the precedent conditioning cause cannot be allowed to take place in the last letter of the following word. But without proper canonical directives there may be confusion in the matter of selecting scope for a particular genre of forms. It is thus clear that where a precedent conditioning cause is given with the fifth case-ending the canon, Ādntyasya is barred from functioning. Operation in the last part just before the subsequent conditioning cause and in the initial part just after a precedent conditioning cause is noticed by the Rk-pr. (2.5) too.

Bhatṭojī on P. 1.1.54 in his Pm examines the reading viz. Tasmād ityuttarasyādeḥ as in the Vāj-pr. 1.135. He comments that a replacement in the initial part if it is provided by P. 1.1.67 would run counter to total replacement admitted by P. 1.1.55, of -bhis by -ais and so on. The scope of the canon Anekāl etc. (P. 1.1.55) in that case would be restricted to simple cases viz. Aster bhūḥ (P. 2.4.52) etc. But in the present state of affairs, the total replacement is a ‘para vidhi’ in relation to initial replacement (P. 1.1.54) and therefore it does not suffer from any such apprehension. As for the Vāj-pr.
There is no scope of such apprehension at all and the canon set forth there is quite sound and not dubious.

The canon, Anekal śīt sarvasya (P. 1.1.35) formulates the replacement of neither the last letter nor the initial letter but the whole word or group of letters altogether. It is laid down that multi-lettered substitutes and any other substitutes with indicatory ś replace the whole of a stem or suffix which they intend to replace. For instance, the whole of the stem div is replaced by dyāvā by the rule, Divo dyāvā (P. 6.3.29) and the whole of the pronominal stem, idem by i(s) by the rule Idem iś (P. 5.3.3). Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
div + bhūmi + au &= dyāvā-bhūmi. \\
div + pṛthivi + au &= dyāvā-pṛthivyau. \\
idem + ha &= i(s)ha = iha. 
\end{align*}
\]

(20) Some twenty two rules of Pāṇini derive benefit from this paribhāṣā. Of them, the first ten referred to in the footnote are concerned with substitutes of stems whereas the rest with those of endings and suffixes. Substitutes dealt with in all these rules are either multi-lettered or with indicatory ś.

The question of the elision of ś is there in śī (P. 7.1.17), śi (P. 7.1.20), anś (P. 7.1.21), iś (P. 5.3.3) and iś (P. 6.3.90). The first three of them are concerned with case-endings.

Of course, the substitutes apparently multi-lettered, of the conjugational endings in āti, ātu, ātin etc. as enjoined

(20) (a) P. 4.1,116; 5.3.3, 4, 5; 5.4.88; 6.3.23, 30, 48, 90, 110;
(b) P. 2.4.85; 3.4.82, 101, 105, 108; 7.1.9, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 37,
in P. 3.4.82, 2.4.85, 3.4.105, 3.4.108 and so forth lose some indicatory letters. Thus -nal in place of -tip in lit active third person singular loses both η and λ. Such loss in the substitute is found among many other cases in-lyap which replaces -ktvā when the verbal root is preceded by a prefix other than nam (P. 7.1.37). The question here is whether elision of the indicatory letter precedes replacement of the ending or the suffix. If -nal loses η and λ before replacing -tip, its multi-lettered character is lost. If however we accept an indicatory letter as a component part (ekānta) of the parent body of the substitute, this problem can be averted.

As for substitutes with indicatory s, we must note, they can replace their former occupant (sthāniṃ) altogether as multi-lettered units and the word šit in Anekāl etc. (P. 1.1.35) can easily be excluded (being redundant). The replacement of the ultimate η of the stem, arvan, before case-endings excepting (21) nominative singular by tr (P. 6.4.127) is noticeable too. This rule, Arvaṇas etc. (P. 6.4.127) together with šit in Anekāl etc. (P. 1.1.55) tends to prove Pāṇini's option for replacement after elision of an indicatory letter. Thus even though substitutes with indicatory s are multi-lettered before elision of s, Pāṇini incorporates the word šit in P. 1.1.55 only to indicate that by anekāl (= multi-lettered), we should consider what is multi-lettered even without indicatory letters. So t(r) (22) replaces the ultimate η alone of arvan in arvantau etc.

(21) Arvan + au (nominative, accusative dual) = arvat au = arvan(um) tau = arvantau.

(22) Nānubendha-kṛtam anekāltvam (Mahāb. on P.1.1.55 and P. 1.3.9).
As regards $\tilde{s}, \tilde{s}$, and $\tilde{a}$ referred to above, the question of the elision of $^t_s$ arises only after these substitutes attain the character of suffixes (i.e. endings) by replacing suffixes (i.e. endings). Hence in their case, replacement takes place on the strength of their multi-lettered character and $\tilde{s}$ is (23) of no use. In the case of -nal, -dā etc. too, these substitutes replace -tip first, attain the character of a suffix and then lose their indicatory letters. The scope of $\tilde{s}$ is now restricted to is, ī $\tilde{e}$ etc. which replace stems. As for the Uddyota on P. 1.1.55, replacement by $\tilde{s}$ etc. of the whole of the ending takes place on account of the apprehension of the ensuing loss of $^t_s$ of the substitute. Otherwise, it is argued there, the suffix -ka could not be similar (sārūpa) to the suffix -an at the time of injunction and option between the two would be inevitable by the rule Vāsarūpo etc. (P. 3.1.94) of course, $\tilde{s}$ is an ending due to replacement of another ending whereas -ka and -an are suffixes by themselves. Still similarity of -ka and -an at the time of affixation certainly presupposes consciousness of the ensuing elision of k and n in them. In this view, however, replacement by -nal, dā etc. invites cumbersomeness. Whatever it may be, that an indicatory letter is not recognised as an 'al' (letter) is agreed upon.

Of the multi-lettered substitutes, those with indicatory $\tilde{n}$ replace, not the whole of a stem or a suffix but its ultimate letter only by the canon Nīcā (P. 1.1.53) which is thus an exception to the canon, Anekāl etc. (P. 1.1.55). Such substitutes

(23) Vide Sk on P. 7.1.17.
are eight in number discussed by Pāṇini in no less than
(24) fourteen rules. Of them, the first four rules deal with
the substitute, anā in four different cases. For instance,
sakhi + s(u) = sakh an(an)s = sakhāns = sakhā (P.7.1.93),
kroṣṭu + s(u) = kroṣṭān = kroṣṭān =
kroṣṭā (P. 7.1.94).
ghaṭā-ūdhāsa + nīś = ghaṭā-ūdhāsa an(an)ī = ghaṭodhānaī =
ghaṭodhāna (P. 5.4.131).
dvī-dhanus = dvī-dhanu an (ān) = dvī-dhanvan (P. 5.4.132).

Since the rule P. 4.1.93 pertains to the governing rule
(adhikāra) about anā (stem with adjuncts before suffix), a
compound word with sakhi at the end and having the prominence
of the word sakhi undergoes the same operation as sakhi e.g.
paramasakhi = s(u) = paramasakhā. Even when sakhi is the
secondary stem derived from sakhi + kyać + kvip, we get sakha
in nominative singular. By P. 7.1.94 which too pertains to
the governing rule about anā (P. 6.4.1), both in bhārtī and
bhūbhārtī, the last letter viz. ī is replaced by an(an) in
nominative singular and the forms are bhārtā and bhūbhārtā.

The next four rules (P. 6.4.77-80) as enumerated in the
foot note deal with iyān and the first two of those four treat
uvān together with iyān. For examples,
sudhī + (j)as = sudh iy as = sudhiyah.
bhū + (j)as = bh uv as = bhuvah
ukh + liṭ tip = u = okh = a = uv okh a = uvokha.
strī + (j)as = str iy as = striyah.
strī + (ś)as = str iy as = strīhay, strīḥ.

Some other instances are given below. In them, the ultimate letter of the stems are replaced by multi-lettered substitutes with indicatory ṇ.

- sudhāṭṛ + in = sudhāṭ ak(ā) = saudhātaki (P. 4.1.97).

(25) Mitra-varuṇa + au = Mitr ān(ā)-varuṇa + au
Mitra-varuṇau (P. 6.3.26).

- māṭṛ - pitr + au = māt ān(ā)-pitr au
māṭā-pitarau (P. 6.3.25).

- sitā-jāyā = sitā-jāy ni(ā) = sitājāni (P. 5.4.124).
- go + agra = g ava(ā) agra = gavağra (P. 6.1.123).

kalyāṇī + dhak = kalyāṇ ina(ā) + eya
= kalyāṇineya (P. 4.1.126).

The only exception to the maxim, Niśca (P. 1.1.53) is the rule P. 7.1.35 (Tuyhos etc.), that enjoins the total replacement by tātān of -tu and -hi which are the substitutes of tip and sip in imperative. It is an optional phenomenon e.g. bhū + tu = bhavatu, bhavatāt, bhū + hi = bhava, bhavatāt.

This indicatory ṇ in tātān effects (i) the prohibition of

(25) Retention of n in ā(n) and its subsequent loss are admitted with a view to prohibiting introduction of r after 'a' which was inevitable due to the rule Uraṇ raparāṇ (P. 1.1.51). Cp Raparāṇān ma bhūḍ iti (Mahābhīṣṇu on P. 6.3.25).
guration (e.g. dvistat), vrddhi (e.g. stutat, yutat), and 
it (e.g. brutat) and (II) introduction of samprasarana
(e.g. ustat from vas-). All this exhausts the utility of the
indicatory letter ū in tātān and instead of the ultimate letters
of tu and hi, they are replaced altogether by tātān, the multi-
lettered substitute (P. 1.1.55).

One point more. Pāṇini optionally accommodates the view
of his predecessor, Sphoṭāyana on euphonic combination between
'go' in the one hand and agra etc. in the other. Thus beside
retention of both the elements of which the earlier is a
'pragṛhya' to cause hiatus (e.g. go agra) and swallowing of the
latter element by the former (e.g. go gra), there is as the
third possibility the replacement of the ultimate letter of the
word: go, by avan before a vowel (P. 6.1.123) e.g. go agra>
gava(ū) agra > gavagra. The last possibility is in recognition
of Sphoṭāyana's view. From this it follows that the utility
(vis. replacement of the last letter) of an indicatory ū in a
multi-lettered substitute was not unknown to Sphoṭāyana. So
the concept of the canon, Niśā (P. 1.1.53) is not a Pāṇinian
innovation but is either borrowed from or shared with the
grammar of Sphoṭāyana. It is further found that the substitute
avan which is proposed by Sphoṭāyana and endorsed by Pāṇini
derives benefit from the canon, Niśā in the way a purely
Pāṇinian substitute with ū would do. This however seems to run

(26) Vide kāśikā on P. 1.1.53 and Sk on P. 7.1.35.
counter to the statement in the Mahābhārata on Aunāḥ āpah.

(27) (P. 7.1.15) There to disown the impact (viz. augment of yāt by the rule yādāpah P. 7.3.113) of ā in male (i.e. nālā + āu in nom. acc. dual) etc. the Mahābhārata states that the rule (P. 7.1.15) is borrowed from an earlier source (pūrva-sūtra-nirdosā) and that in a pre-Pāṇinian rule an indicatory letter has no impact, whatsoever, in the Pāṇinian system. Of course, this statement of the Mahābhārata comes by way of an alternative suggestion. Moreover, Pāṇini gives his seal of recognition in his system to āu as a substitute while āu is not admitted here as the ending in nominative and accusative dual. The favourable impact of a pre-Pāṇinian indicatory letter, when admitted in the Pāṇinian system is further indicated in the rule Unādyo bahulam (P. 3.3.1). It is generally accepted that Sakatāyana is the first formulator of unādi rules. He was certainly aware of the role of ā as an anubandha. When admitted in Pāṇini, this ā effects vṛddhi in the same way (e.g. kṛ + uṇ = kāru) as that in the Pāṇinian suffix an does (e.g. kumbha - kṛ + an = kumbha-kāra) by the rule, Aśo vānti (P. 7.2.115).

Some distinguishing features of substitutes, suffixes including endings and augments may be pointed out in this connection. As Pāṇini states, a suffix is generally placed after a stem. The only exceptions are bahuc, ekac and śnau; the first is added before a stem (e.g. paṭu-bahuc - bahupatū) and the second is inserted just before the last of the vowels.
in pronominal and adverbial stems (e.g., mayā + akaḍ = maya-
akaḍ = mayakā; uccaais + akaḍ = uccaakaais = uccaakais)
while the lāst appears after the last of the vowels in a
verbal root of rudhādi class (e.g., rudh+am+bti = ru-na-dh-
ti = runaddhi). Moreover, conjugational endings in certain
tenses and moods are preceded by conjugalional signs (i.e.
vikaranas) via. śap, śa, śyan, śa etc. each of which is a
suffix in the Pāñinian view-point (e.g., bhū+ap+ti = bhū-
a-ti = bhavati; prāča-ti, maṇ-ya-te, kriṇa-ti etc.). As
for the effect of a suffix, consequential changes in the stem
are very frequently noticeable. Thus some secondary suffixes
(taddhita) including some of those suffixes at the end of a
compound word (samāśanta) cause the elision of the ultimate
letter-group via. 'an' (e.g., mahārajan + tad = mahāraja)
or the ultimate vowel via. a, i (e.g., daśaratha + in. = daśa-
rat-hi) of the stem. Such a suffix is not however called a
substitute of the last letter-group or letter of the stem.
Conversely, a multi-lettered substitute of the last letter
of a stem is never branded as a suffix though loss of the
ultimate letter(s) is their common. In Pāñinian rules,
while a stem before a suffix is generally marked with the
(29) fifth ending, the sixth ending is employed in some cases
of samāśanta suffixes where either replacement or simple
(30) elision is the result. In augmentation, on the other
hand, there is neither replacement nor elision but the simple
advent of a new element. This is more or less indicated in

(29) P. 4.1.1; 4.1.120; 4.3.54; 5.4.151; 5.4.107; 5.4.154 et
(30) P. 5.4.88, 129, 134, 138, 146, 148 etc.
(31) the Mahābh. on P. 3.1.1. Difference among suffixes, augments, is changes (vikāra) substitutes and elision, noted in the kāṭāntra-vṛtti.

A moderner however, may not be satisfied with this old line of demarcation. As Dr. Nath observes augments and suffixes are really confusing. The learned professor shows that while Panini admits a few vikāraṇa suffixes in verbal formations, a number of similar elements he brands as augments in his work. Thus, in bhav-a-ti, prāch-a-ti, div-yati, suno-ti, karoti, kri-nā-ti and runa-ādhī a(sap), a(sā), ya(syen), o(kāma), o(nā, nā(ñā) and na(ñem) are suffixes. But 'a' in tūrīṣat, josīṣat (in subjunctive), arodā, asvapot (in imperfect) etc. is an augment. Similar is the fate with a(ṭ) (e.g. paṭānī, vadānī etc. in imperative, paṭātī etc. in subjunctive and so on), i(ṭ) (e.g. gamīṣyaṭi) and i(ṭ) (e.g. bravīṭi, arodīt etc.). In janāsah and Indrāṇi Panini finds asuk and ānuk as augments between the stem and the suffix (i.e. jana-asuk-jas, Indra-ānuk-nīs) though mere asūke suffixing (i.e. jana-as-as, Indra-ā-nī) can do. In parentapa, priyamvada etc. instead of the augment nam, it is fairly the second case-ending that joins the two members of the compound. Of course, while reviewing the

(31) Sāsthi-nirdistam vikārāgama-yuktan bhavati. Pañcānī- nirdistadē pratyayo vidhityate (Mahābh. on P. 3.1.1).

(32) Āgamōnapaghātena vikārasācopeśārānāt ādesastu prasārīgama lopah sarvāpākārānāt.

Between change (vikāra) and replacement (ādesa), the difference in Apiśāli's view was this that the former concerns a single letter but the latter concerns more than one letter (vide Kaviraja on Kāṭāntra 2.3.33). For details vide Technical Terms and Technique of Sanskrit Grammar, Page 273.
Paninian interpretation vis-a-vis modern suggestions on the suffixes and augments in Sanskrit language, we must not lose sight of the fact that an augment excepting yāsuṣṭ (P. 3.4.103) is never accented while a suffix has its own accented vowel (P. 3.1.3).

As for confusion between a substitute and a suffix, it is admitted that the replacement of the last letter of a stem by a larger substitute and affixation of a suffix with consequential elision of a portion of the stem are phenomenally the same. Still while a suffix has the first vowel accented a substitute inherits the acute accent (udātta) if any of its former occupant. Thus ava(h) the substitute of o in the word 'go' must be accented in the last vowel because 'o' the alleged last vowel of 'go' is accented. But the proposed augment viz. ak is unaccented and the resultant gava (i.e. go - a[k]) has the first vowel accented (vide Pradipa on the rule Avah etc., P. 6.1.123).
2. VOWEL GRADATION.

There is still a number of instances where replacement occurs neither in the ultimate letter before a subsequent conditioning cause (paranimitta) nor in the first letter after a precedent conditioning cause (pūrvanimitta) nor in the whole of a stem and suffix. Some of such cases are regularised in the two pāṇinian dicta viz. Iko guruṇvṛddhi (P. 1.1.3.) and Āčāśaḥ (P. 1.2.28). The first canon enjoins as Patañjali sees, that whenever transformation in the form of guru and vṛddhi is referred to with incorporation of either of these two words in rules without normal token of sthānā, the former occupant should invariably be any of the ik vowels i.e. i, í, u, ū, ō, ō, l wherever its position may be in a stem. According to the second canon, a transformation in the form of shortening (hmasva), lengthening (dīrgha) and plutation (pluta), concerns vowels alone. As Patañjali observes, guru and vṛddhi of 'a' are indicated as undesirable by the rules P. 3.2.3. and P. 3.2.8. Those of ai and au too can safely be declared unnecessary on the strength of the fact that Pāṇini reads the verbal roots glai, mlai etc. with ai instead of a weaker vowel. But there is no indication whatsoever to nullify guru and vṛddhi with regard to consonants. It is for their exclusion that the canon, P. 1.1.3 is necessitated. We shall see later on that the claim of consonants with regard to accentuation too is apprehended and canons are necessitated to deny it. A common sense view will be however this that guru, vṛddhi, shortening, lengthening, accentuation etc. are

(33) Vide Kāśikā, Nyāsa etc. on 1.1.3.
(34) Āto' nupasarge Kāḥ (P. 3.2.3.). Gāpostak (P. 3.2.8).
the phenomena pertaining to vowels alone and have nothing to do with consonants. Transformation of some consonants to vowels through certain stages is not however rare in the pāñinian system. Thus, sīvas - bhandyah > sīva-u-bandyah > śivo bandyah, saś-dasa > sau-dasa > sodaśa. Still the above mentioned phenomena are far away from consonants. Again the fate of 'a' is not spelt out here in P. 1.1.3.

The rules that derive benefit from the parībhasā, ḫko etc. (P. 1.1.3) are not very few in the pāñinian grammar. Such rules invariably accommodate the words guna or vṛddhi either by direct incorporation or by an award from some other rule. An analysis of the instances will reveal that in many cases, 'ik' vowels do not form the ultimate letter of the stems, e.g. mid-ta > modyate (P.7.3.2) (P

mrj-tip > māṛati (P. 7.2.114)
hrī-nic-tip > hropayati (P. 7.3.83)
Vid-tip > votti (P. 7.3.86)
a(t)-ārs-lun tip > adarśat (P. 7.4.16)
ksipra-isthan > keśipistha etc. (P. 6.4.156)

There are again a few rules that contain or inherit the term 'guna' but allow gunation only when an 'ik' vowel is the ultimate letter of the stem. Thus, ḫr-trc kartr but ih-trc ḫṁty (P. 7.3.84);
Agni-vocative-su > Agne (P. 7.3.108), but Agnicit-su > agnicit,
Agni-(j)as > Agnayah, but Agnicit-(j) as > Agnicitah (P. 7.3.109);
Agni-no > Agnaye, but Agnicit-no > Agnicite (P. 7.3.111).
As for exceptions to the paribhāṣā Iko etc., some are grappled by pāṇini himself with the rule 1.1.4. Thus in the words lolūva (35) (lū-yaṅ-ac), marīṃrja (mrj-yaṅ-ac), sarīrpa (sr-yaṅ-ac) bebhiditā (bhid-yaṅ-tṛc) etc., neither guna nor vrddhi can take place. Here yaṅ, the frequentative suffix, after reduplication of the verbal root, forms an integral part of the secondary root and is dropped. The rule P. 1.1.4 prohibits guna and vrddhi of the ik vowel in the stem under such circumstances. Patañjali however thinks that due to the presence of the vowel 'a' of yaṅ by 'Sthānivadhūva' before tṛc, -nvul etc., guna and vrddhi are prohibited. But it is a very twisted device and Patañjali's rejection of the sūtra P. 1.1.4 is not invulnerable. There is another rule to note non-occurrence of 'guna' and vrddhi' of an 'ik' vowel, before a suffix with indicatory k, g, n (Kāṭi ēa P. 1.1.5) as in stu-(k)ta > stuta etc. In some verbs and of the augment it, the rule Dīdhīveitām (1.1.6) prohibits gunaṇa and vrddhi.

The phenomena of shortening, lengthening and plutation are stated to be pertaining to vowels alone by P. 1.2.28. Here too, in many cases these phenomena are not restricted to ultimate vowels only. Thus lengthening of vowels of the verbal roots vač-, pračč-, śam-, han-, gam-, klām- etc. takes place in many operations. But in shortening of vowel, it is the ultimate letter that is taken into consideration (e.g. ati-rī, ati-nu). Consequently in suvāk (brāhmaṇakulam), the penultimate a of the neuter compound noun
undergoes no change. Moreover, the final vowel of roots viz. 
*ci-, ji- etc. is lengthened in *ciyate, *jiyate etc. by the rule 
P. 7.4.25, but in *chidyate, *bhidyate etc. the penultimate vowel of 
the stems is intact. Keeping in *such instances the canon *Aaśaśa 
is to be construed as enjoining the phenomena of shortening etc. 
either in the ultimate vowel or in the non-ultimate as circumstances 
demand. According to *Patanjali the canon *Aaśaśa means that when 
the three phenomena viz. shortening lengthening and plutation are 
enjoined with the terms viz. *hrasva, *drgha and *pluta, the word *aśaṃ 
will invariably appear. It is thus clear that the two canons P. 1.1.3 
and P. 1.2.28 have been given new dimensions by *Patanjali. We may 
call them the twin canons of ablaut or vowel gradation.

A number of still inoorderly replacements is individually 
mentioned by *Panini himself in some rules. As for example, we refer 
to the six rules, P. 7.2.91-96, where a certain portion of the two 
pronominal stems, 'asmad' and 'yusmad' is stated to be replaced 
(e.g. asmad+su = aska am = asham). This is in the way of the *Paninian 
formulation. After regularisation of general cases, exceptions are 
mentioned here. Thus after *vṛddhi is codified by 'Aśo ṝniti 
(P. 7.2.115) the phenomenon is restricted before a taddhita suffix 
to the first vowel of the nominal stem by the rules P. 72.117 and 
(36) P.7.2.118 (e.g. Dakṣa+ṝṇa = Dakṣi, Kuntṛ+ṇaḥk = Kaunteya).

The phenomenon of vowel gradation may be discussed in some 
details in introducing the interpretation of the rule *Ṛṇa ṛghrasvādeśa (P. 1.1.48). In Sanskrit alphabet we know, a, i, u, ṛ, ṝ 
are short original vowels, ā, ī, ū, ṛ́ are long ones and e, o, aṅ, 
aṅ are diphthongs (i.e. sandhyaksara) treated as long too in

*aśaṃ

*hrasva

*drgha

*pluta

*aśaṃ

*Panini

*Patanjali

*Paninian
As for diphthongs it is referred to in the Rk-pr. 13.39 that according to Śakātayana, \( e = a+i \), \( o = a+u \), \( ai^a = a+i \) and \( au^a = a+u \). Of them the twin vowels are inseparably mixed in \( e, o \) (Rk-pr. 13.40) whereas in \( ai \) and \( au \), some say, the component vowels can be separately heard (Rk-pr. 13.41). Kaiyāṭa on P. 1.1.48 and on the alphabet rules Eōh and Ai Au c’ admits that ‘\( a \) is inseparable in \( e, o \) (prasāliṣṭa)’ but separable in \( ai, au \) (Visliṣṭa). The Sātyamugrī and Rāmāyaniya groups of the Chandogas, as referred to in the Mahābh. on Eōh, Ai Auc and P. 1.1.48 however admit half of \( e \) and \( o \) for musical purposes in Sujāte eśvasūrte (Sujāte-asvasūrte) etc. Pāṇinian scholars generally recognised greater importance of the latter elements in \( ai \) and \( au \) (cp Aion cottara-bhuyastvāt) on P. 1.1.48). Thus the nature of diphthongs was widely speculated in ancient India.

The history of Sanskrit vowels is interesting indeed. As it is resolved by linguists, very scanty remnants of Indo-European vowels are left in Sanskrit. In IE there were short monophthongs viz. \( i, u, e, o, a, \) long monophthongs viz. \( ī, ū, ē, ō, ā \)

(36) Taddhīteśvacānādeḥ. Kiti ca.

(37) Astau samānākarānyādītah (Rk-pr. 1.1.) Tatas ētvāri Sandhyakārānyuttarānī (Rk-pr. 1.2). Cp. Vāj-pr. 1.44-45. According to Tait-pr. there are sixteen vowels (Tair-pr. 1.5). Short and long stages are generally counted in alphabet. With pluta stage and udātta, anudātta, svarita accents and nasalisation, each vowel can have much variety. Thus \( a, i, u \) can have eighteen, \( r \) thirty and \( e, o, ai, au \) twelve varieties each.

(38) Enah prasālistāvarṇatvāt....., na tu visliṣṭāvarṇayar aicoriti. (Kaiyata on P. 1.1.48)
short diphthongs viz. ei, oi, ai, i, eu, ou, au, u, and long
diphthongs viz. øi, øi, øi, øu, øu, øu. Their changes in Sanskrit are given below:

IE i > Skt ī; IE ī > Skt ī;
IE u > Skt ū; IE ū > Skt ū;
IE ø, ø, a > Skt a; IE ø, ø, ø > Skt ā;
IE ø > Skt ī (sometimes ī);
IE ei, oi, ai > Skt e; IE øi > Skt ø;
IE eu, ou, au > Skt o; IE œu > Skt o;
IE øi, øi, øi > Skt ai; IE œu, œu, œu > Skt àu.

Indo-European sonant nasals viz. m, n, ŋ, ŋ, ŋ, ŋ when occurring in the final syllable or before consonants are changed into 'a' in Skt e.g. IE*dekm > Skt dasa. Before vowels and semi-vowels, however, they become 'am' & 'an'. IE ŋ, ŋ, become a in Skt. There were again short sonant liquids viz. r&l and long ones viz. r&l in IE. Before consonants, IE r&l become r in Skt whereas before vowels and semi-vowels they become ir, ur and occasionally ul. (IE* p>r-su Skt pitṛsu. IE*pl(t)n > Skt prthu. IE*pl(t)a > Skt tula, IE*guru > Skt guru etc.). According to some, IE r before semi-vowel becomes ri; some again think of ur as the result as in kriyate, kuryat etc. It may be mentioned here that long sonant liquids and nasals in IE are not universally admitted. In Skt we have r which results in ur&ir (jīrna, jūrna etc.). May be, r, ŋ& ŋ are analogical developments.

From this summary it is clear that Skt vowels have many predecessors to represent. As we see, Skt e&ø result from IE short diphthongs and (are not original e, o) Skt ai&au from IE long diphthongs. Sometimes original long diphthongs lost their
second element and became long vowels in Skt (e.g. *IE* rāis > Skt rāḥ. *IE* 3rd ḍum > Skt gam etc.). Skt ā is treated as a long and vyādhi vowel. According to Skt grammar, e and o are gunated forms of ā and ū; similarly ai and au are vyādhi forms of the same. The vowels a and ā followed by r & l represent gunated and vyādhi forms of r & l. The treatment of vowels in Skt is however, a bit different from that in comparative philology wherein e, o belong to normal grade and are treated as original and two steps, one forward and one backward are stipulated. In other words, ē & o become ē & u in weak grade and ai & au in lengthening therein. But Skt grammarians consider weak grade vowels as original and two steps forward are stipulated for gunated and vyādhi forms i.e. 1 — e — ai; u — o — au.

It is now certain that e, o, ai & au are upgraded vowels and deserve weakening, if necessary, in final member of a compound word and so on. Since they have no corresponding short vowels, either of their parts may be proposed as the short form i.e. to say, either a or i may shorten e and ai and similarly either a or u may shorten o and au. The Pāṇinian rule Bā ḍa ṭī etc. as a paribhāṣa (P. I.1.48) restricts representation of e and ai by 1 and of o and au by u only in shortening. Thus ati+rāi > atirī. ati+nau > atinu. In absence of this rule, as a vārttika notes, there might be search for the half of e or o where 'a' is inseparably inserted and for either a or ā in ai, ū where the first member is discernible (viśliṣṭa). Some might even think of taking up any of the short vowels. Nāgesea, however, admits that possibility of a and ā only is there in shortening of both e and ai and of a and u only in case of
both o and au. It is to note that even though both Ik (1, u, r, l) and e& (e, o, ai, au) vowels number four, only 1 is intended for e & ai and u for o & au on the ground of reasoning. As for the other short vowel viz. 'a' which is non-Ik, representation of diphthongs by it in shortening is denied in the rule itself by the word 'Ik'.

The proposition of half of e and o being admitted only by Sātyamugris and Rāṇāyanīyas of the Īḍandoga schools without universal recognition and second member of two diphthongs viz. ai & au being admitted as more prominent in the Mahābh., the rule P. 1.1.48 seems superfluous. But Nāgeśa in Śś on the authority of P. 8.2.106 and the Mahābh. thereof acknowledges similar importance (39) of two portions in diphthongs. If his view be agreed to, the utility of the rule Ėāig etc. stands unquestionable. Bhaṭṭoji is in favour of retaining this rule. He employs it to justify the formation of pra-dyu (=pra-dye=pra-div), pra-ri (=pra-rai) and su-nu (su-nau). A commentary on Bhaṭṭoji's Sk on P. 1.1.48 suggests the word su-smṛti (=su-smṛte=su-smṛta-i) where the ultimate letter 'i' is the short form of 'e'.

(39) Plutāvalīḍa idutau (P. 8.2.106). According to this rule when pluta of ai and au is sought, their latter half (i.e. i or u) will have three mātrās (e.g. aistikāyana, aṣṭpāgava) and ai or au will have four mātrās in all. Here division of aig au into two exact halves is admitted by Patañjali. If it be not a case of pragṛhya, each of e, o, ai and au while having pluta grade, has it in the first half viz. 'a' (P. 8.2.107) — vide Mahābh. and Sk on the rules.
3. PECULIARITY IN THE REPLACEMENT OF THE VOWELS R AND L.

According to the rule Uraṇ raparāh (P. 1.1.51), when there is any scope of ṛ being replaced by any of the an vowels, short or long (a, ā, ı, ī, u, ū), the substitute is always complemented by a subsequent r which stands as the last letter before the condition subsequent (paranimittā). As the Kāśikā, followed by its commentaries observes, the rule in collaboration with those that enjoin replacement of ṛ by an vowels presents r at the very time of replacement. This rule is thus concerned, in a sense with augmentation of an vowels when they replace ṛ. But it is nothing but a simple case of vowel modulation and it is quite natural that the cerebral vowel ṛ, when replaced is survived by the consonant r of the same place of utterance. Primarily, we see that by guṇa and vyāddhi, ṛ becomes a(r) and ā(r) respectively. In the same way, l would change into a(l) and ā(l). For this purpose either ṛ should be regarded as a pratyāhāra representing both ṛ and l or lraparāh should be the reading in the rule P. 1.1.51. As for example, to show replacement of ṛ and l we may cite the following cases:

Kṛṣṇa+vyāddhi = Kṛṣṇardāhi.
Kṛ+tr̥ = Kartr̥.
Bṛgu+an = Bṛrgava.
tava+lkāra = tavalkāra etc.

This phenomenon of inserting r or l finds an extension in connection with ı, ī, ū and u by the rule Uraṇ etc. Thus,
Kroṣṭr̥-(n)as = Kroṣṭurs = Kroṣṭur = Krośṭuḥ.
gṛ+Kvip = gir, giryate.
pr+Kvip = pur, pūryate etc.
Similarly, piparuh (pr*), Kirati (Kr), narpatya (nrpati+nya), āstarita (str), dvaimātura etc. undergo such operation. The utility of the present maxim is felt in so many sutras of Panini and its role as an interpretative rule is beyond question.

It is to note that the vowel r undergoes some other changes elsewhere and those operations are in no way concerned with the present canon. For example,

(40) sudhātr+an = saudhātaki, r being replaced by akan.
pitṛsvasr+dha = paitṛsvaseya, last r being elided.
hotr+potr+an = hotāpotārānu, r of hotr being replaced by ānā.
kartr+su = kartans = kartā, r being replaced by anaḥ.
mātr+kyāc+tip = mātrīyati, r being changed to ri.
kr+lat.ta (passive) Kriyate, r being changed into ri.

Nowhere in these instances r follows an an vowel. In ri and ri, r precedes the vowels; somewhere no cerebral remnant is present at all. The loss of the ultimate r of nominal stems before secondary suffixes is on par with the elision of a and i under the same circumstances by P., 6.4.143. There are still a few cases of multisyllabic substitutes of r. All these are specifically formulated by Panini. Naturally the scope of the canon, P., 1.1.51 is beyond them.

(40) P., 4.1.97, 4.1.133, 6.3.25, 7.1.94, 7.4.27, 7.4.23.
4. POSITION OF AUGMENTS AND SUFFIXES.

The Mahābhārata seems to accept the rule Adyantau takitau (P. 1.1.46) as an interpretative canon, against the anonymous scholar who took it for a definition rule. This canon exclusively seeks to serve the cases of augments by deciding their position. Moreover, it bars the influence of another canon Saṭṭhī sthāneyogāsūrya (P. 1.1.49) which if allowed to operate, would favour replacement (41) of what is sought to be supplemented. The case of the canon P. 1.1.47 which is another maxim mostly related to augmentation, is still special for here all prospective rules, namely Parasēă (P. 3.1.2) and P. 1.1.49 etc., are forthwith neutralised for the (42) sake of its mere existence.

According to the canon Adyantau etc., augments with indicative t and k form the initial and the ultimate part respectively of the beneficiary which is referred to in a rule in the sixth ending (Nyāsa). Since a suffix never forms a part of the stem concerned, this canon is solely concerned with augments. As we see, the present canon aided by the rule Yathāsamkhya (P. 1.3.10) makes a tit augment stand before its beneficiary and a kit augment after. For example, by P 8.3.29 saṣ+santah = saṣat santah = saṣat dhsantah = saṣat tsantah = saṣat tsantah (optional duṇḍ forming the initial part of s after q). By P 8.3.31 t(uk) forms the ultimate part of n before s as in san-sambhuh = sant Šambhuh = sant Chambhuh = sanūchambhuh. Both tuk and the change of s into Šh being optional, we get sanūchambhuh, sanū Šambhuh and sanū Šambhuh too. The augment at is the initial part of the verbal root in agamet, abhūt, abhāvīṣyat etc. Prof. Nath however finds fault with Pāṇini's
(43) System of augmentation and opines that many of these augments are nothing but suffixes. As stated earlier, his arguments are not without reason. Of course, they have no bearing upon the position of augments. It is determined partly by the present canon that benefits at least twenty-five sūtras of Pāṇini.

According to the interpretative rule Mīdāco' ntyāt paraḥ (P. 1.1.47), an augment or a suffix with indicatory m is placed after the last vowel of a stem even when it ends in a consonant. As for example, kunda-(j)as, (s)as > kunda+(s)i > kundani. Here the augment n(um) appears after the last vowel 'a' of the stem. In phalāni, puspāni etc., the same operation takes place:

Again, payas+(j)as, (s)as > payas (s)i > payansi > payānsi (P. 7.1.72). Here num is augmented after the last vowel even before the ultimate consonant letter of the stem. Thus anadv-u(s)> anaduahs (ām by P. 7.1.13) anadvānās (num by P. 7.1.32) anadvān; anadv+u(s)> anaduahs (P. 7.1.99) > anadvāh > anadvāh (num by P. 7.1.82) > anadvan (vocative). The scope of the present canon in this way extends over a number of sūtras of Pāṇini an illustrative list of which may be prepared. To multiply instances, we may cite that the augment m(um) proposed by Pāṇini in P. 6.3.67 is operative in

(44)
all the operations formulated by the rules from P. 3.2.28 upto 3.2.44 (the only exception being P. 3.2.40) which ratify words like Janamejaya, stanaōhaya, kūlamudruja etc. Similarly, the rules P. 6.3.70, 71 and 72 regularise augmentation of mum in satyānkāra, tailampāta, rātriṇēcara etc. Patinī enjoins num in (vadi-) vandate, (spadi-) spandate etc. by P. 7.1.58, in (mabhavat s > maghavants) maghavān by P. 7.1.70, in (yaj+s(u) > yun j s > yunj > yun>) yun by P. 7.1.71, in kāndāni and bārini etc. by P. 7.1.72 and P. 7.1.73. By P. 3.1.78, the vikarana śānam is allowed with verbal roots of the rudhādi class as in (rudh+ti > ) runaddhi etc. By P. 7.3.92 an 'im' is augmented to the verbal root ṭhēg e.g. ṭhē-ti ṭunāh ti > ṭunāhīti > ṭunādhi. Of all these cases, that case of śānam is treated as a case of suffix in the Paninian system.

An analysis shows that in all the words where mum is said to be the augment, it is not very difficult to find out the accusative case-ending singular in the first members of the compound words, the second members being always derived with primary suffixes from some verbal roots which govern the accusative case in the first members e.g.

rātriṇēcara = rātrim-ēcara (rātri+acc. sing. + ēcara)

priyamvadē = priyam-vadē (priya+acc. sing + vadē) etc.

(45) This view proposed by moderners is quite reasonable. Its indication is again quite clear even in two of Paninī's rules viz. P. 6.3.62 and P. 6.3.63. These rules enjoin an and not mum in words like gām-manya, striyam-manya, naram-manya, vēcēm-yama, pura-ndara(puram-ēcara) etc. These are some of the cases where union takes

(45) Dr. Nath: Pārinīan Interpretation of the Sanskrit Language.
place between inflected words and verbal nouns. We know that the union even between inflected words and conjugated verbs is found in such compound verbs as *īkṣāṇ-cakre* (īkṣāṇ-cakre), *dāsāyem-babhūva* (dāsāyem-babhūva) etc. This analysis is further strengthened by the separate use of such two members in Sanskrit poems, e.g.

\[ \text{prabhranesavam yo Nahanam cakaraj} \]
\[ \text{tam patavam prathamam āsa, papāta pascat; } \]
\[ \text{sambhāyavam Rāghavam āsa Vṛstih etc.} \]

So, the augments *um*, *am* (p. 3.6.68-69) and *ūm* (p. 3.1.35-36) are nothing but the case-ending *-am*.

The rule *Mīdaśo* etc. is not without exceptions. Some vārttikas show that in a few cases, an augment with indicatory *m* posits just (46) before the ultimate letter of the stem e.g.

\[ \text{masj(t)ta} > \text{masnjta} > \text{mas(n)ja} > \text{masjna} > \text{magna.} \]
\[ \text{masj-tum(un)} > \text{masnjtum} > \text{mas(n)ja} > \text{mangtum} > \text{marktum.} \]

Similarly \[ \text{bhrjatā} > \text{bharujā; marē+i} > \text{marīci.} \]

To explain these exceptional cases, *Patañjali* observes that bharujā and marīci are of irregular derivation (nipātana) and need not be abiding by the *Paṇinian* maxim 1.1.47. The *Uddyota* of Nāgēśa even goes further to say that *um* and *ūm* of these two words are unādi augments. It follows from it that the present canon cannot have flourished in a grammatical school that recognises regular derivation of all unādi words. We shall see later on that *Paṇini* extends qualified support only to some unādi words. For many such words do not come within the fold of *Paṇinian* interpretation. Irregularity with masj-however cannot but be nipātana.

(46) *anugaṇa-sanyogādi-lopaṛtham* (Kāśikā on p. 1.1.47). In *magnā* both *anugaṇa* i.e. penultimate *n* and *s* the initial of the conjuncts *vis. sj* are lost.
The rule Paraśa (P. 3.1.2) formulates the position of a suffix in general after the stem. Though accepted as an adhikāra, the Kāśika admits its paribhāṣā character. Thus suffixes including unādi ones and endings appear after respective stems, verbal nominal or pronominal. Of the very few exceptions, the suffix bahuț (P. 5.3.68) appears before the stem (in bahu-patru etc.), akac (P. 5.3.71) is inserted within before the last vowel of either a pronoun or an indeclinable as in mayakā (maya-akaça), uccākaih (uccāih-akaça) etc. and śām appears after the last vowel of the stem e.g. ranaddhi (rudh-ti). These cases being specifically mentioned in rules, arrangement for general suffixes is necessitated. Otherwise, like a calf preceding or following its mother in the meadow, these could have posited before or after stems. The role of the present rule is thus restrictive with regard to position of suffixes. As Patanjali resolves, this restriction pertains to both the stem and the suffix. Thus even if simple position could be available with the canon viz. (47) P. 1.1.67, the rule P. 3.1.2 makes the position mandatory. Otherwise, as the Sabda-kaustubha observes, to mean measurement even the suffix (48) dvayasa(c) itself alone could stand. Thus the prohibition of the lone use of either stem or suffix and disfavour of non-inflected and non-conjugated words in use is deduced from this rule. Bhaja reads the rule Pratyayah parah (Bh. 1.2.134) as a canon for the same purpose. Needless to mention, hundreds of rules of Pāṇini derive benefit from this rule.

(47) Para eva syāt ityevam-arthaṃ para-grahānāṃ. (Mahābh. on P.3.1.2)
(48) Kim pramāṇam kim dvayasam. Vide 36 of Nāgoso on P. 3.1.2 too.
5. QUESTION OF THE BARE FORM OF THE STEM.

In popular practice, we understand by a word the thing it denotes. In grammatical practice, however, a word or a stem is mentioned in a rule with reference to certain grammatical operation concerned with that word or stem. This difference between the popular and the grammatical practices is noted in the Paninian rule Svam rūpam śabdasyāśabdasaṃjña (P. 1.1.68). When we speak 'the fire is blazing' we mean by the word 'fire' the thing which is blazing and not the word 'fire'. But in Pāṇini's grammar, the rule Agnir ḍhak (P. 4.2.33) will enjoin the secondary suffix-ḥak to the stem 'agni'. Since the meaning of the word has nothing to do with this precept, ḍhak cannot be affixed to the synonyms of the word agni. If however, the particle 'iti' follows a word in a rule, the meaning of the word is meant for. For example, in the rule Na veti vibhāṣā (P. 1.1.44) the word vibhāṣā is the technical term not for the particles na and va but for the meaning of the two. Similarly, tasmin (P. 1.1.66) and tasmāt (P. 1.1.67) followed by 'iti' stand for their meaning i.e. condition subsequent and condition precedent given in the locative and the ablative case-endings respectively.

Moreover, a technical term in grammar always presents itself to mean what it stands for. It is an exception to the general practice of grammar. For example, the word 'ghu' in Pāṇini is either a verbal root by itself or a technical term for the verbal roots dā, dhā etc. (49) In the rules P. 3.3.92 and P. 7.4.54 it is this technical term for the roots concerned which undergo certain operations. The word 'āśabdasaṃjña' in the rule Svam rūpam etc. excludes technical terms

(49) P. 1.1.20.
from the purview of this rule. Barring a few other exceptions, hundreds of rules of Panini derive benefit from the rule Svam rūpam etc.

A close analysis however proves that the necessity of this rule is exhausted by a logical maxim 'Arthavadgrahane nanarthakahasya' which, as the Mahābh. elaborated by the Uddyota seems to mean, was even known to the grammatical circles of Panini's time. In this opinion, the rule P. 1.1.68 is a mere echo of the aforesaid maxim.

It is found that the word rūpam in the rule Svam rūpam etc. points out the role of this sutra as identical with that of the logical maxim. Moreover the utility of the rule cannot be logically established. There is a vārttika to explain the futility of the rule on logical grounds. It signifies that since a grammatical operation is concerned with a word and not with its meaning, we are competent to accept primarily the pronounced word alone in a rule in other words, synonyms are understood secondarily and cannot be taken in operations.

As regards technical terms, their role in presenting that they stand for is universally known. From this it follows that the rule P. 1.1.68 has very little to pronounce anew. It is however found that both the aforesaid logical maxim and the rule Svam rūpam etc. are utilised in grammatical treatises. For example, the Sk of Bhaṭṭojī Dīksita welcomes the rule in P. 1.1.72 and takes recourse to the former while explaining euphonic combinations enjoined by the Vārttika viz. Pradūhdha etc. to show that pra-ūḍha> praudha, but pra-ūḍhavan>prodhavan etc. The only exception to the 'arthavat' maxim will be in cases

(50) Etannyāyānuvādakam idam sutram — Uddyota on P. 1.1.68.
(51) Na vā sabdāpurvako hyarthama sampratīyastasmād arthanivṛttih (vā).
where letters or syllables are concerned. It is envisaged in the sūtra ‘Lasya’ (P. 3.4.77).

Certain vārttikas of Kātyāyana have very ably enlisted some exceptions to the rule P. 1.1.68. His contention is elaborately supported by Patañjali. In the rule P. 2.4.12, it is not the word ‘vrksa’ but names of trees viz. plaksā, nyagrodha etc. that are meant for. In the rule P. 2.4.23 synonyms of the word rājan are acceptable whereas the word rājan itself along with the names of kings is excluded. So we have inasabham but rajasabha, Ėndraguptasabhā etc. In P. 3.4.40 both synonyms of the word sva (wealth) and names of its varieties are meant along with the word sva itself as in suaposam, dhanaposam, goposam etc. In P. 4.4.35, by the word matsya, we desire the words matsya, its synonym mīna and the names of varieties of fish viz. śaphari, śakulī etc. as stems before the suffix-thak; as regards paksin and mṛga, they themselves along with their synonyms and names of their varieties are acceptable.

Under these circumstances, two ways are open: either to accept the Pāñinian rule and to rely on the benefit of convenient interpretation in the above-mentioned rules or to ignore the rule altogether and to rely on logical maxim, popular practice and convenient interpretation according to circumstances. The first way, we think, is preferable on the plea of brevity and simplicity.

One thing more. Kātyāyana in his Vārttikas while summarising exceptions to the rule P. 1.1.68 uses such terms as sit (related to P. 2.4.12), jit (related to P. 2.4.23), pit (related to P. 3.4.40) and jhit (related to P. 4.4.35). These terms are of rare use in our
grammatical literature. Interestingly, the Vāj-pr. uses them. This
tends to prove the sameness of the authority of the vārttikas on
Pāṇini and the text of the Vāj-pr.

6. THE EXTENT OF THE SCOPE OF LETTERS.

The twin rules of Pāṇini viz. Taparastatkālasya (P. 1.1.70)
and Anuditsavarnasya ēa-pratyayāḥ (P. 1.1.69) aim at discerning
representative letters in his rules. Of the two, while the former
concerns vowels alone, the latter has besides vowels the mutes, semi-
vowels and h to deal with. The former has a more defined scope
for it applies to those rules only where a vowel is immediately
followed by t as the anubandha added to it. The latter envisages
such device only with reference to mutes. The first letter of a
group (varga) of mutes, when followed by the vowel u as the anu-
bandha in a rule stands for all constituents of the group to which
it belongs. The import and utility of these two maxims can be
studied here in some details.

According to the rule Taparāh etc., a vowel short or long,
when it appears in a rule with the indicatory t, represents sixfold
varieties of the same viz. nasalised and free types, each having
three varieties with acute (udāttta) non-acute (anudāttta) and
suarīta accents. The familiar example will be the rule īdūdet etc.
(P. 1.1.11). It admits the pragṛhyā character of ī, ū and e in dual
each of which is aided by the anubandha t in this rule. It results
in hiatus in mun īnau, sādhū īnau, late īme etc. (P. 6. 1. 125).
The short and pronounced pluta i and u on the one hand and pluta
e on the other are exempted from such consequences. Many other rules
of Pāṇini are found to have resorted to the device of the indicatory t with vowels mentioned therein. An illustrative list of such rules is furnished here. The utility of the rule Taparah etc. can amply be illustrated in this list. It further swells with Patañjali’s liberal unfolding of the word ‘taparah’ in P. 1.1.70. The word by-way of explanation is made to qualify a vowel either followed or preceded by the consonant t as an anubandha in a rule. For example, in the rule Vṛddhir ādaic (P. 1.1.1) both ā and aic (i.e. ai and au) by dint of their appearance with the indicatory t stand for their respective sixfold varieties.

The consonant is however voiced (t > d) due to euphonic combination. In the rule Aden gunah (P. 1.1.2) too, on account of t (which later becomes d), the vowels a, e and o are treated as gunated in their respective sixfold varieties only. The exception to this trend is the rule Rdorap (P. 3.3.57). In spite of the anubandha t (which is later voiced) preceded and followed as well by vowels, it is only r and not u as well to derive benefit from t. Otherwise, verbal roots ending in short u alone along with those ending in short r would be affixed to with the primary suffix-ap and consequently the formation of lava (lū-ap), pava (pū-ap) etc. could not be justified. Under the Māheśvara rules Eon and Aiauc and the Pāṇinian rule P. 1.1.1, the opinion of the Mahābh. is this that the indicatory letter in the rule (P. 3.3.57) is d and not t. From this it appears that the indicatory d has nothing to do with the rule Taparah etc. But the fate of the

(52) P. 1.1.11, 15, 16, 4.1.5, 65, 66, 93, 122, 175, 4.3.78, 4.4.49, 5.2, 115, 5.3.4, 6.1.61, 84, 111, 113, 123, 6.3.25, 23, 27, 28, 97, 6.4.124, 139, 7.1.9, 24, 26, 94, 7.3.110, 117, 118, 140, 8.2.31, 8.3.20, 41, 86, 99.
Vṛddhi and guna vowels enumerated in P. 1.1.1 and P. 1.1.2 will be uncertain in that case. Moreover, the view will suffer from self-contradiction. According to the exposition of the Pradīpa, t in the rule Tapaṇah etc. stands for d as well which appears here in its devoiced form. In other words, d to has its indicatory value as envisaged in the rule Tapaṇah etc. Under such circumstances, the exclusion of u in the rule Rdoṣap from the purview of the rule Tapaṇah etc. cannot but be treated as an exceptional case. As for the exclusion of the rule P. 6.1.87 (Ad gamah) and P. 6.3.46 (Ammahataḥ etc.) the reason is this that the word āt is the inflected form of 'a' in ablative singular and not the vowel a followed by the anubandha t. Interesting indeed is the absence of t in 'A ā (P. 4.3.31) and A a (P. 8.4.68). In the latter case, however, the rule itself is ineffectual (asiddha) with regard to all early rules and there is no locus standi for P. 1.1.69 etc.

The importance of the rule Anudit etc. lies in signifying that a vowel, as pronounced in the first four rules of Mahāśvarā on alphabet, stands for all its possible varieties in a rule, that the semi-vowels y, v, l stand for both their nasalised and free forms and that the first letter of a varga of mutes, when followed by the vowel u as the anubandha added to it, represents all the five mutes of that varga (group). The word ‘apratyaya’ restricts this precept to a letter only when it means the letter itself and nothing else. The effect of this restriction is noticed in the rule Senāsānphikaṣa uh (P. 3.2.163). There u; is a primary suffix and not a simple letter and consequently it can stand for itself.
alone and not the varieties of the letter u. Similarly i(s) in the rule Idama is (P. 5.3.3) is a substitute of the pronominal stem idam and is exempted from the influence of the rule Anudit etc. This restriction is analytically preserved in the canon (53) Bhāvyamānena etc. in the later works. It has its indication in the word apratya in P. 1.1.69. The term 'pratyaya' accommodates beside suffixes, substitutes, augments etc. too. Of course, this restriction is not without exception. For example, in the rule Adaso'ser dādudomah (P. 8.2.30), u is enjoined as a substitute of the 'as' portion of the stem adas e.g. adas+am > ada (P. 7.2.102) am > aduam > amuam > amum. But in nominative and accusative dual, the form is amū (adas+au > ada au > adau > amū) with the long ā. Thus in the rule Adaso etc. u enjoins both short and long varieties. Bhāṭṭoji on P. 8.2.30 tables as the solution his view (54) that u is the common appearance of both short and long varieties in the rule Adaso etc. But the exception is further supported by insertion of t as the anubandha to ut (in Diva ut P. 6.1.131) and ṭ (in ṛtā ut P. 6.1.111). It has no role to play excepting the restriction of u to its short varieties and the consequent prohibition of long and ānūta varieties. This is justified in the wake of anticipated long and ānūta varieties as the substitutes. Upon this is founded another canon viz. Bhāvyamānopi (55) etc. These two modificatory canons upon the rule Anudit etc. have the approval of Patañjali and are found to be indicated

(53) Bhāvyamānena savarnān grahanam na (ps 19 P u 31/Si II).
(54) U iti hrasva-dīrghayoh samāhāra-dvandvah (Sk on P. 8.390).
(55) Bhāvyamānopolyukārah savarnān gṛñāti (Ps 20).
by Pāṇini himself. The case of the suffix u (P. 3.2.163) should now be treated as an exception to the latter canon.

The effect of the rule Anudit etc. is discernible in the letter-groups (pratyāhāras) viz. ad, ak, an, ik, etc. when they (56) are mentioned in rules. In the rules of Mahēśvara, short monophthongs and long diphthongs are read as vowels. The group (pratyāhāras) formed on the basis of the se alphabet rules would however conveniently stand for all possible varieties of the relevant vowels. For this, some may suggest the cognition of all possible varieties of each of the vowels in Mahēśvara's rules themselves with the help of the rule Anudit etc. But in fact, the rule Anudit etc. is verbally and intentionally subsequent to the alphabet rules and cannot influence their import. It is beneficial only after the import of the term savarṇa is established. It is on this ground that the insertion of ā beside ad is justified in the rule Nājjhalau (P. 1.1.10) to prohibit homogeneity between vowels (i.e. short monophthongs and long diphthongs) and consonants in general and between ā and h in particular. With this situation in view some go to the extent of suggesting that all vowels in their varieties should be pronounced in the very alphabet rules. Of course, this will make the word an in the rule Anudit etc. quite irrelevant and unnecessary. The Mahābhāṣya has minutely studied the suggestion that the word an is redundant and that a vowel ė, y, v and l, by nature, are capable of representing their varieties.

(57) Savarṇa's grahaṇam aparibhāsyam ākṛti grahaṇat (vā).

(56) P. 1.1.3, 23, 52, 57, 65, 69, 1.3.7, 2.2.33, 4.1.6, 6.1.77, 94, 101, 109, 127, 128, 7.1.70, 73, 7.2.100, 7.4.32, 8.2.36, 8.4.2, 13, 43, 60 etc.
It is to note that an in the rule Anudit etc. means not a, i and u alone but other vowels including h, y, v, r and l as well. But h and r have neither nasalised forms nor any other variety. Still their inclusion in the list is for the sake of referring to other semi-vowels (i.e., y, v and l) at a stroke. On account of the absence of nasalised form of koni r, we have Kān-Kān = Kār Kān = Kā skān.

Kimśhayayati

As the substitute of a nasal letter, r is assisted by the preceding vowel which has got nasalised. But in mahan labha=maha-nilabha the nasal mute is replaced by nasal l.

7. ORDER OF ENUMERATION.

As stated earlier the canons viz. Yathāsambhyam etc. (P.1.3.10) and Samkhyaśātanām etc. (Vāj-pr. 1.143) have identical intent. It is this that when two sets of words or letters appear as the subject and the predicate in a rule, the relationship between constituent parts of the first set in the one hand and those of the second in the other should be determined in order of enumeration. For instance we may cite the rule viz. MNoh Kuktuk Sari (P. 2.3.29) according to which n and ū are augmented by K(uk) and t(uk) respectively before s, g and s. By P. 2.4.40, dental s and the five dental mutes viz. t, th, d, dh and n are changed into palatal s' and the five palatal mutes viz. c, ch, j, jh and n, on account of the proximity of any of these palatal letters, strictly in order of enumeration. Instances as deriving benefit from this can may be multiplied. The suffixes viz. dhak, chan, dhan and yak are related to the four nominal stems respectively in the rule P. 4.3.94. At least ten
other Paninian rules positively depend upon this canon for their proper interpretation. In spite of considerable exceptions to it, the utility of this canon is naturally beyond question. On several occasions, Patanjali opines that with the acceptance of a canon in general, exceptional cases should be counteracted with the help of reasonable interpretation of these exceptional rules. It is like sowing barley and preventing animals from destroying it at the same time.

It will not be irrelevant to note here that the device of Yathāsāmkhya was widely adopted in different branches of learning. The Sāhityadarpana of Visvānātha names Yathāsāmkhya as a figure of sense (arthālāmkkāra) and defines it by the line vis. Yathāsāmkhyam omnudesa uddistānām kramaṇa yat (Sd 10.97). Vāmana calls it 'Krama'. Jayaratha, Jagannātha etc. take it for the mere absence of the fault named 'apakrama'. Dandin knows apakrama (3.144) and still admits yathāsāmkhya as the figure (2.273). For details vide Sāhityadarpana, edited by P.V. Kane, page 266, ed. 1965.

As for application of this device in Panini's rules, controversies may crop up in many cases. For example, the rule Iko yan añ (P. 6.1.77) which enjoins the change of at least seven ik vowels (i.e. i, ī, u, ū, r, ṛ, ḷ) into four yan letters i.e. semi-vowels (vis. y, v, r and l) cannot be properly aided by the Yathāsāmkhya canon. Here the changes keep in view the propriety of substituting a letter by its homogeneous stock especially of identical place of utterance (cp. Sthānêntaratamah — P. 1.1.50). In P. 3.4.101, the conjugational endings viz. -tas, -thas, -tha

(58) P. 4.2.80, 6.1.63, 6.3.90, 6.4.157, 7.1.2, 7.1.12, P.1.15, 8.3.32, 8.4.41, 8.4.64.
and -mip are replaced by -tan, -tam, -ta, and -an respectively. It is more due to the fitness of a singular dual or plural substitute in place of a singular dual or plural ending than to mere order of enumeration in the rule. Replacement of i vowels and u vowels by iyan and uvan respectively (P. 3.4.77) is primarily due to homogeneity in respect of the place of utterance. The role of the canon, Yathāsamkhya etc. is easily dispensed with in such rules.

The question arises whether the canon should be employed in course of the explanation of rules. We see that the words 'lut' 'parasmaipada' and 'ec' in P. 2.4.85, 3.4.82 and 6.1.78 respectively having been explained, the three third person lut endings have three substitutes, the nine active lit endings have nine and the four 'oc' (e, o, ai, au) vowels are replaced by four modifications, all in accordance with the present canon. But the same approach proves itself abortive in P. 3.1.33, 3.1.134 (59) and 4.3.93. Because lr denotes both lrt and lrm in P. 3.1.33 while the word adi in the other two rules accommodates some stems with consequent disturbance in the balance of number in both sides. It is safe here to accept their face value and understand them with the help of the canon, P. 1.3.10. The case with P. 1.3.12, 6.4.111, 6.1.109-110, 8.2.42 etc. is still peculiar. If the words (60)ātmamepada, sārvadhatuka, en and niṣṭha be explained, the present canon finds its scope in these four cases only to put forth some most undesirable pronouncements in way of explanation of these rules. Under the circumstances, the Mahābh. opts for the employment

(59) Patanjali refers to 17 suffixes namely vun etc. beside a large number of stems like arihana etc. in addition to these three sūtras.

(60) 1.4.100, 3.4.113, 83 (Māheśvara.3), 1.1.26.
of the paribhāṣā in those sūtras only where the canon seems to be beneficial without awaiting the explanation of some words in the rules. Thus P. 2.4.85, 3.4.82 and 6.1.78 give us the desirable verdict with the help of the canon Sthāneṁṭarataṁah (P. 1.1.50) while the rules P. 3.1.33, 3.1.134 and 4.3.93 take recourse to the canon, Yathāsamkhya (P. 1.3.10) and P. 1.3.12, 6.4.111, 6.1.109-10 and 8.2.42 totally ignore the latter.

The Mahābh. refers to a few more instances where there were nothing apparent against the employment of the device of Yathāsamkhya. For example, in the rule P. 1.1.5, which prohibits guṇa and vṛddhi three indicatory letters viz. k, g and n are taken to be present and consequently there is no balance of number in two sides to claim the help of the canon, P. 1.3.10. In P. 3.2.31, ud- is a prefix before both ruṣ- and vah- but 'kūla' is an nominal prefix (upaśāda) to precede both ud-ruṣ- and ud-vah. Here/this canon is ineffective. The rules P. 3.3.28, 3.3.120, 3.3.145, 3.4.61 etc. with their reasonable associates, do not come within the purview of the canon P. 3.1.10. Because both sides are not verbally present (61) within these rules at the first hand. P. 4.2.56 refers to adhīte and Veda in P. 4.2.59 and deserves the same fate. Moreover, the two problems formulated in the vārttikas viz. Kartaṇkarmasārābhūkrṇoh and Vesṣyaśāśādērībhagūḏyātkhau, are proposed to be excluded from the scope of the present canon. The particle 'ca' in the Vāttika Yusnadasmadoścādesāḥ under the same sūtra may be construed in this direction.

(60a) Cp. 'Pratipattikālikam eva samkhya-sāmyam etascḥāstra-pravṛttyupayogiḥ' as decided in the Mahābh. on N. m m n m m (Śeśvarī rule 7) — (Ss P. 129 on P. 1.2.10).

(61) Na Va śāmāṇyogavacaṇāt.
As for exclusion of the rule P. 3.4.83 from the scope of the canon, the word parasmaipada which presents itself from the previous rule and awaits explanation is the guiding force. By P. 3.2.30 either nādi or mustī being the nominal prefix (upapada), both the roots dhma- and dhet - admit the suffix -khas and give four words, namely nādindhama, nādindhayā, mustindhama and mustindhayā. Here the verbal roots and the nominal prefixes are originally incorporated in two different rules. Interestingly, the nominals stems which are incorporated in the rule P. 4.2.50 have their suffixes enjoined in P. 4.2.51 in order of enumeration. Similar is the case with P. 4.3.32 and P. 4.3.33. In spite of reading stems and suffixes in separate rules, the order of enumeration is followed here even without technical possibilities of the employment of the relevant canon.

With such perplexing instances with exceptions and counter-exceptions, one may like to demarcate the actual scope of this canon with some technical device. It is with this view that marking with svarita was proposed in the rules actually falling in the purview of the canon. The same device is however stated to be resorted to for marking the whole or a part of a rule which re-appears in the subsequent rules (Cp. Svaritenā-dhikārah P.1.3.11). It would certainly invite confusion regarding the actual objective of a marking. In that case explanation alone of the rule concerned in the proper perspective can save the situation.
3. THE FORM OF THE STEM WITH ATTRIBUTE APPENDED TO
AT THE END (TADANTAVIDHI).

As the rule Añchtvyasya (P. 1.1.52) determines grammatical operations in the ultimate letter of a base which is pronounced in rules with the sixth ending so the canon, Yena vidhīs tadantasya (P. 1.1.73) in the very opposite way, helps the extension of a grammatical operation to such words as contain at their end the letter(s), syllable(s) or the word with which a sūtra formulates the operation. For example, when a sūtra runs as 'Aco Yat' (P. 3.1.97), primarily meaning to ratify the verbal suffix yat after a vowel that stands as a verbal root, the maxim, P. 1.1.72 helps the rule to mean that a verbal root with a vowel at its end is affixed with yat e.g. dā+yat = deya, ji+yat = jeya etc. The reference to the verbal root is obtained from P. 3.1.97 being under the jurisdiction of the adhikāra rule 'Dhatoh' (P. 3.1.91). Similarly, on account of the maxim P. 1.1.72, i+ac = aya, ji+ac = jaya by P. 3.3.56; r+nyat = ārya, kr+nyat = kārya, grah+nyat = grāhya by P. 3.1.124; kr+ap = kara, stu+ap = stava, pū+ap = pava etc. by P. 3.3.57 etc. It is noticeable that the rules accommodate both letter-stems (i-, r- etc.) and qualified ones (ji-, kr etc.) where possible, the latter under the influence of P. 1.1.72 and the former on account of P. 1.1.62. Those who prefer rejection to retention of P. 1.1.68 may insert the particle 'ca' in P. 1.1.72 to accommodate the pronounced stem in a sūtra. With this in view, a vārttika 'Tasya ca' is planned and

(62) Since this rule is not of restrictive character in the proper sense, sanskrit grammarians call it a definition rule which liberally reconstructs sthānin of grammatical operations. As interpretative rule, however, it has an important role to play and deserves discussion. Similar is the case with P. 1.1.68, 69 and 70.
along with jī-, cī- etc., i- also becomes the stem before -ac in P. 3.3.56. It is again to note that the rule Yena etc. (P.1.1.72) must not influence the rule Alontyasya (P. 1.1.52) for in that case, every phenomenon pertaining to letter would be misunderstood and consequently in dyaun (div-s = dias = dyauh), panthāh etc. instead of the last letter, the whole of the stem would be substituted resulting in awkward formations. Conversely, in many a place, once the locus is reconstructed with P. 1.1.72, the actual operation takes place at its ultimate letter by virtue of the rule P. 1.1.52. For example, by P. 8.2.64 we mean that a verbal root with n at its end, when standing for a noun gets 'n' as a substitute of 'm' only under certain circumstances as in prasān (prasam-su) etc.

Variety of sutras the present rule helps and a list of such sutras can be cited after Patañjali. Thus by tadantavidhi along with sarva, paramasarva is regarded as a sarvanāman by the rule P. 1.1.27. Similarly, we have —

(a) bhayankara and abhayankara (P. 3.2.41).
(b) bhavati and atibhavati etc. (P. 4.1.6).
(c) dvi-vistā and dvi-paramavistā (P. 4.1.22).
(d) daitya and āditya (P. 4.1.85 where the word 'aditi' is redundant).
(e) rauna and ājakarona etc. (P. 4.2.78).
(f) rathya and paramarathya (P. 4.4.76),
   sītya & paramasītā (P. 4.4.91),
   halyā and paramahalyā (P. 4.4.97)
(g) supancalaka etc., along with panchalaka etc. (P. 4.2.125),
(h) sarada and purvasarada (P. 4.3.16).
(i) dharmika and adharmika (P. 4.4.41).
(j) dvishaṭhika etc. by P. 5.1.18.

All these rules are concerned with suffixes and are operative in extended bases due to P. 1.1.72. It is interesting to note that in many instances the preliminary base alone bears the imprints of consequent changes inspired by suffixes as in (g), (h), (i) and (j) of the aforesaid list. Thus the replacement of ‘jarā’ by jaras takes place in the compound word nirjarā in the second member only by P. 7.2.101 as in nirjarasā etc. It is due to the rule Saṣṭhi etc. (P. 1.1.49). In the words, sauhārda, saubhāgya etc. both members of the compound bases undergo the change of vowel; in gurulāghava (gurulaghu+an) however, the last member only sustains change. Thus the rules P. 7.2.117–118 have exceptions formulated in P. 7.3.19, 20 and P. 7.3.10.

The influence and result of tadanta-vidhi are minutely studied by commentators of Pāṇini from different aspects. We shall now be dealing with them. It is to note here that Puroṣottama (no. 111) and pīrardeda (no. 13) discuss a canon which demands the subject (vidhībhāj), object (vidhī) and instrument (vidhāna) present either bodily or in meaning in a rule as prequisites of tadantavidhi. Rightly do they observe that this formulation is an explanatory statement on the rule P. 1.1.72. (cp. Vidhi-vidhāna-vidhībhājāṃ trayāṇāṃ sannidhāne tadantavidhībhavati).
Sūtras belonging to the jurisdiction of uttarapada (P. 6.3.1-6.3.139) and of the aṅga (P. 6.4.1 - P. 7.4.97), under necessary circumstances are dependant upon the rule P. 1.1.72, though not without reservation. From the Mahābh. downward, these cases are dealt with separately under the maxim Padāṅgādhiḥkāre tasya cā tadantasya cā (Ps 29/ Pu 85/ Si 80) which as the Praudhamana, (62a) the Tattvabodhini and the Paribhāsenādevaśekhara legitimately say, is nothing but a repetition of P. 1.1.72 for two particular groups of sūtras of Pāṇini. This practice of referring to some individuals beside their species (go-bālivardanyāya) is not quite uncommon in Sanskrit. But, whatever may be the origin of the maxim referred to here its indispensability in a precise grammatical discourse must be in question, Both Purusottama and Siradeva exclude the word 'pada' from it but Nīlakantha (36) does not.

The Mahābh. refers to a single rule viz. P. 6.3.65 to illustrate the utility of the maxim, Padāṅga etc. with reference to the rules under the governing rule Acuguṭtarapade (P.6.3.1).

Thus,

istakacita: pakveśṭakačita.  
isdikūta: muniśesikūla.  
mālabhārini: utpalamālabhārini etc.

Aṅga-sūtras to explain the influence of this maxim are however numerous. Thus,

mahān and paramamahān

(62a) Padam aṅgam cā Viśesyaṃ Viśesanenena cā tadanta-vidyāhin (Praudhamanorāma on P. 7.2.101); paribhāseyan yenā vidhīfityasya prapañcābhiṣṭa (Tattva on P. 7.2.101); yenā vidhiṛ ityasyāyaṃ prapañcāḥ (Ps 29); Pm echoed in SS on P. 7.2.101.
āpah and svāpah
svasēraḥ and paramasvasēraḥ
napta and paramanapta
yugam and atiyūyam.

Phenomena formulated by P. 6.4.79; 7.1.63, 75, 84, 85, 89, 90, 93, 98; 7.2.106, 7.3.47, 102 etc. abide by the maxim. In the last of these sutras (Supī ca - P. 7.3.102), a letter represents the stem (e.g. abhyām and ghatābhyyām). The tadantarīdhi related (63) to a letter is not however restricted to the jurisdiction of the rule, Āṅgaṣya (P. 6.4.1). By Ata inī (P. 4.1.95) the nominal suffix inī is affixed to a nominal stem that ends in 'a' as well e.g. a+ī(n) = ā; Dakṣa+i(ī(n)) = Dākṣi. By Erah (3.3.56), we get, i+aē = oya, ī1+aē = jaya,

Some might have proposed the invocation of the familiar practice of vyāpadesivadbhaiva (i.e. the assumption of a part as the whole) for accommodating the preliminary base after tadantarīdhi and reject both the rule, Svam rūpam-etc. (1.1.68) and the vārttika 'Tasya ca.' But the Mahābh. clearly shows that this popular logic may be invoked only where something other than (64) a pratīpadika (uninflected word) is concerned. Again reference (65) to a word in a rule, involves its feminine form too. So neither a simple pratīpadika nor its feminine form should have anything to do with the 'vyapadesivadbhaiva'. It is suggested by Pāṇini himself in 5.2.33-37. where he favours the suffix-inī after the word 'pūrva' and any compound word that contains 'pūrva'.

---

(63) Varnagrahanam ca sarvatra (vārttika).
(64) Vyapadesivadbhavo pratīpadikena (Ps 32/Pu 79/Śi 59).
(65) Pratīpadikagrahane lingavisistasyāpi grahanam.
as the last member. Were the practice of assuming a part as the whole universally accepted, Panini would not formulate one rule in excess in this connection. According to Kayyata, the prohibition of 'vyapadesivadhāvā' of a prātipadikā is limited to such words as are accompanied by the word 'anta' in rules e.g. P. 4.2.60, 122; 4.3.63; 4.4.70 etc. He opines that P. 5.2.36 suffices to enjoin -ini after 'pūrya' and any compound word having 'pūrya' as its last member. The rule P. 5.2.37 would then signify that when a particular 'prātipadikā' is pronounced in a rule, it cannot invoke P. 1.1.72. According to Nāgasa, this is a repetition of the prohibition of tadantavidhi in the cases of suffixes and compounds observed by Kayyana. The same authority has noted that so far as suffixes are concerned the prohibition is not universal. For instance, in case the suffix drops any of the i, u, y vowels while forming a stem or a stem is represented by a single letter, tadantavidhi is quite possible. Thus, bhavati (bhu+davatu = bhavat. bhavat+ṇip = bhavati), atibhavati; a+in = 1, Daksahini = Daksi etc. Moreover, rules on affixes of feminine suffixes admit tadantavidhi in the stem excepting 'upasārjana' on account of the governing rule Anupasārjanāt (P. 4.1.14). The word Bahukuruçārā has no ūp as kurucara is upasārjana (sub-ordinate). As for the prohibition of P. 1.1.72 in formulations on compounds, it does not hold good in some cases which regularised in the maxim, 'Krūgrahane gatikārakapūrvavasyāpi grahanam;' Thus by P. 2.1.32

(66) Grahaṇavātā prātipadikena, tadantavidhir nāsti
(Ps' 31/Pu 78/ Sf 58).

(67) Samāsapratisayavādham pratisedhah (Pu 80/Sf 60). As the Pu on P. 8.2.66 informs, the maxim 64 and 65 are admitted as solely concerned with the phenomenon of suffixes by both Patanjali and Kayyana on P. 5.1.20. The earlier one 64 is rejected in the Sādakaustubha on P. 1.1.72.
nakha-bhinna and nakhi-nirbhinnna are justified. But kṛṣṇa-ārtha is acceptable due to P. 2.1.24 whereas due to prohibition of P. 1.1.72, in kṛṣṇa-paramārtha there is no compound. Similarly, nāda-phak = nādayaṇa, but we cannot add-phak to sūtra-nāda. This vārttika ex prohibition of tadanta-vidhi along with its restrictive rejoinder, as stated above is believed to have been discarded by Patañjali. Taking recourse to another vārttika vis. Siddhantu. vīśeṣaṇa-vīśeṣyayocrayathṣṭatvat on P. 1.1.72 it is construed that inflexed śrīta etc. alone should be the latter member in compound and that nāda etc. alone can have -phak as the suffix.

The suffix-akac added to pronominal stems and indeclinables (P. 5.3.71) as well as the Vīkaraṇa vis. śnam added to the rudhādi class of verbal roots (P. 3.1.78) no doubt is the stumbling block of tadanta-vidhi. We see that sarve (sarva-jās) and sarvako (sarv-akac-a-jas), nīcāiḥ and nīcakniḥ (nīc-akac-aiḥ), bhid- and bhinad- are not the same and that the enlarged words do not simply result from the preliminary words by way of the tadanta-vidhi. Still the enlarged stems enjoy all operations with preliminary ones. Some would like to solve the problem by resorting to a twisted meaning of the word tadanta (tadanto 'ntyaṇya-(68) tadantah) without the last member as in uṣṭramukha etc. and thus bringing all those stems within the fold of the rule P. 1.1.72. According to Kaiyata and Nāgasa, there is simple tadantavidhi in these stems. From this standpoint sarvaka has

(68) Siddham tu tadantāntavacanāt P. 1.1.72.
sarva i.e. its last vowel, at its end; bhinad- has bhid- i.e. its last consonant, at its end and so on. To recognise the ultimate letter as the representative of the stems viz. sarva, bhid- etc., in the enlarged forms is reasonable indeed on the strength of vyapadesivabahaya. This move will be supported by a follower of the theory of sphaṭa who does not mind comprehend-ing a word in its ultimate part. The second solution is the (69) representation of the same idea from a different corner. It proposes to take with the whole all its component parts. As the Ganges, when referred to, means her tributaries too, or Devadatta means the child too in her womb, so with akeś and śuṇam the stems do and are not essentially different. Patanjali deduces the second solution from Panini's rule 7.1.11 which prohibits the replacement of bhis with āis after the pronominal stems 'idam' and 'adas'. The prohibition holds good only when the stems are not enlarged with ka by a suffix. idam+bhis = ebhiṣ (masculine and neuter) — ∫ ida a (7.2.102)+bhis > ida+bhis > a(7.2.113)+bhis > o (7.3.108)+bhis > ebhiṣ The prohibition of tadautavidhi in the stem before suffixes, a large number of exceptions may crop up. All such exceptional instances are more or less regularised in Panini's

(69) Tadakadesavijñānād va siddham P. 1.1.72.
school of grammar under a few canons. Nāgasa in his Paribhāṣen-
dusékha compiles the following:-

(a) Pratyayagraheṇe yasmāt sa vihitastadādes-
tadantasya grahanem (Ps 23/Pu 44/Si 25),
(b) Pratyayagraheṇe cāpaṃcanyāh (Ps 24),
(c) Uttrapadādhiḥkāre pratyayagraheṇa na tadantagrahānem
(Ps 25),
(d) Strīpratyaye cānupasārjane na (Ps 26/Pu 45/Si 26),
(e) Semnjāvidhau pratyayagraheṇa tadantagrahānem nāsti
(Ps 27/ Pu 31/ Si 27),
(f) Aninamangrahaṃānyarthavatā cānarthakeṇa ca
tadantavidhim prayojayanti (Ps 16/ Pu 77/ Si 68),
(g) Kṛdgrahān gatikārakapūrvasyāpi grahanem
(Ps 28/ Pu 46/ Si 65),
(h) Yasmin vidhīstadādāvalgrahānem (Ps 33/ Pu 75/ Si 12).

(a) The first of this group of canons is partially the
offshoot of the sutra that defines anā (P. 1.4.13) where it
is referred to in a vārttika and partially of P. 1.1.72, the
former being concerned with tadādi and the latter with tadanta.
It is utilised in the Mahābh. on P. 6.4.1 even to compensate
the proposed rejection of the adhikāra viz. 'Aṅgasya' (P. 6.4.1)
although the Uddyota thereupon brands the proposition as a
mere reference to an alien view. When in a rule a stem, before a
second suffix, is referred to by the first suffix with which the
stem was framed earlier, the reconstructed stem (before the second
suffix) would be the resultant of the first suffix, of which the
previous stem forms the initial part (tadādi) and the first.
suffix forms the ultimate part (tadanta). Thus in Nyāp prātipadikāt (P. 4.1.1.), before nominal endings, the stem is referred to by the suffix nī (nīp, nīn and nīc) and thus would be a word, framed with nī, and of which the initial part is the preliminary stem before nī (mabati = mabati). By Yānīnoseka (P. 4.1.101) before the suffix -phak, words formed with -yan or -in are stated to be stems e.g. Gargya (Garga+yan)+ -phak = Gargyayanā.

Dākṣi (Dakṣa+īk)+ -phak = Dākṣayana.

But, Parana Gargya+ -phak = Parana-Gargyayanā where consequential operations take place in the last member because it alone is the stem before the suffix (Vide Mahābh. 1.1.72). Again by Vanara (P. 4.1.7), the feminine suffix nīpis added to those words which are framed with -kvanip, -vanip and -hvanip. These compound words of which such words (framed with -kvanip, -vanip or -hvanip) form the ultimate member are accommodated too with a further step of tadantavidihi inspired by the arrival of the word prātipadikā here. e.g.

sutvan (su+vanip)+ nīp = sutvari;
atisutvan+īp = atisutvari;
(dhā+kvanip) dhāvan+īp = dhāvari;
atidhāvan+īp = atidhāvari;
śravān (śr+vanip)+ nīp = śravarī;
atishravān+īp = atishravarī, etc.

Brhatoji refers to the present canon under P. 4.1.7. In Sanādyantā dhātavaḥ (P. 3.1.32) the word ‘anta’ is present in the rule and so tadādi only is necessary for interpretation.
According to this rule, the resultant of -san, -yan etc. affixed to a verbal root is again regarded as a verbal root before a suffix e.g.

\[ \text{ji\u09ae+san = jijn\u09b8s; jijn\u09b8s+\textit{(la}t)\text{ta} = jijn\u09b8sate} \]

Puruṣottama quotes the formulation of the utility of this canon from the Mahābhārata with regard to verbal and nominal stem, compound, secondary suffix and accentuation. Thus in viprāh ēkīrṣakāḥ, the group up to -san is not regarded as the stem. The nominal stem coming out with primary suffix is ēkīrṣaka. In mahāntam putram īēchati there is no-kyad to form a denominative. Moreover there is no compound in krudhsāya rājñāḥ putraḥ etc.

(b) The scope of the first canon is restricted by another canon, namely pratyaya - grhane ēpaṃsamyāh (read as grahanam in Mahābhārata 1.1.72) in those cases where suffixes uttered after a group of letters, read with the ablative ending and where something else is sought to be enjoined. For example, the rule P. 3.2.42 with the first canon would have meant replacement by 'n' of 't' which belongs to a word constituted with the suffix, (K)ta and which is just after a 'd' or 'r'. Thus in āṛṣṭirṇā, parīṣṭirṇā etc., the initial 't' of the verbal root tr would have been replaced by n, just before 'd' of āṛṣṭad or parīṣad. The second canon saves the situation for due to it, 't' is simple 't' of -(k)ta (not of a word framed with -(k)ta) after 'd' or 'r' which is inflected in the ablative. Thus,

\[ \text{vid-(k)ta = vidna = Vinna.} \]
\[ \text{tṛ-(k)ta = tir ta = Tirna.} \]

(70) Yatra panāṃsanyantāḥ paraḥ pratyayām kārīntaraḥ - vidhanāya parīṣṭirṇāḥ, tatra tadantavidhir mā bhūt (Pradīpa 1.1.72).
By P. 7.1.54, the ending -ām (possessive plural) after some stems receives an augment nu(t); by P. 7.1.9/instrumental plural) is replaced by -aís after stems ending in 'a'. In both these rules, a locus (kārya) undergoes an operation (kārya) after something which is referred to with the ablative ending. So the first canon does not operate here. Rules defining Kṛt (P. 3.1.93), sārvadhatuka (P. 3.4.113), ārdhadhatuka (P. 3.4.114-115) etc. inherit dhatoh (P. 3.1.91) in the fifth ending while those defining tadrāja (P. 4.1.174, P. 5.3.119) etc. inherit 'prāti-padikāt' (P. 4.1.1) in the fifth ending and the relevent suffixes alone are meant by such terms. Even P. 1.1.22 awaiting prātipadikāt would easily mean by 'gha' the twin suffixes -tarap and -tamap alone. Thus the importance of the second canon lies in prohibiting the advent of the first one in certain cases (71).

(c) We have already seen that in the adhikāra of 'Aṅga' and 'Uttarapada', tadántavidhi has a fair scope. The third canon in the present discussion prohibits tadántavidhi in the adhikāra of uttarapada (P. 6.3.1 - 6.3.139) where a suffix is concerned and tadántavidhi was certain due to the first canon. According to Patanjali, the rule P. 6.3.50 indicates it. The indication is this that along with -an, a kṛt suffix the word 'lekha' (likh-+an, when an upapada precedes the verbal root) is separately mentioned in this sūtra. If we were in a position to employ tadántavidhi with a suffix here, mere -an would suffice to refer to the word 'lekha'.

(71) Aparicamyāṁ iti pratīṣedhārtham vaśanam (Pradīpa onP.1.1.72).
separate pronunciation of lekha testifies to the proposition of the third canon. Due to this canon, in the rule P. 6.3.43, gha refers to -tarap and -tamap (not words framed with -tarap, -tamap) alone; -rupap and -kalpap represent nothing but themselves. On account of it, before -kalpap, the vowel ā in Brāhmāṇi is shortened by P. 6.3.43 but in Kumārī-brāhmāṇikalpā ā remains intact in Kumārī before a word that ends in -kalpap. All this is clarified in Pā by Nāgārja. Bhāṭṭoṇjī's consent of this indication in Sk no. 982 may be referred to here.

(d) The fourth of the present series (of interpretative canons) is a prohibition of tadādividhi in a case where the stem is represented by a suffix, pregnant of the meaning of something feminine and is independent so far as the meaning is concerned (anupasārjana). Thus from kumbhakārī where nip is affixed to kāra which is preceded by the nominal prefix viz. kumbha we have kaumbha-kāreya with -dhak which affects the compound word, especially the first vowel in kumbha. The sūtra P. 6.1.13 indicates this canon. Thus even though kārīsagandhyā is the resultant word with -ṣyaṁ, in paramakārīsagandhyā-putra (or-patī) in tatpuruṣa compound we get from y by samprasāraṇa an'ti' (P. 6.1.13) which is subsequently lengthened (P. 6.3.139) and the word is paramakāri-sagandhi-putra ( -pati). Kārīsagandhyā (karīsa-gandhi-pati replaced by ṣyaṁ due to P. 4.1.78 + ēapy by P. 4.1.74) in a compound with 'parama' is prominent in the denotation (anupasārjana) and has the suffix, -ṣyaṁ, pregnant of feminine meaning. As a result, orthodoxy on tadādi is ingorned due to the prohibitory maxim under review. But for this maxim, karīsa-gandhi only as the stem-
before -yan would constitute the initial part (tadādi) of the stem and under no circumstances 'parama' — could be accepted as tadādi of a resultant form with -yan and no change of y in paramakāriṣa-gandhyā-putra (-pati) could take place. But in a compound of 'ati' and kāriṣa-gandhyā the meaning of the latter is subdued (upasārāṇa), the last letter is shortened (P. 1.2.43) and in atikāriṣa - gandhyā-putra or -pati it is a simple compound without any change (i.e. samprasāraṇa) of y. Here tadādi-niyama is devoutly followed i.e. to say the prohibitory canon under review has no scope here.

The Mahābhāṣya examines the possibility of tādantavidhi here in absence of tadādi and opines that since pati or putra must be the last member of the tatpurusa compound, a sixth ending tatpurusa compound of paramakāriṣa-gandhyā and patikula would not change y of syaṅ into i (samprasāraṇa) and a compound of tatpurusa type of paramakāriṣa-gandhyā-putra and kula would not oppose i from syaṅ. By 'putrapatyōh' in P. 6.1.13 no tādanta vidhi is sought. So kāriṣa-gandhyā-paramaputra experiences no samprasāraṇa of y (syāṅ).

(e) The fifth maxim is concerned with prohibition of tādantavidhi with reference to a suffix in cases of samjña (definition) rules. This is a deduction by Patañjali from the (72) word 'anta' in Pāṇini's rule P. 1.4.14. Even without 'anta' in the rule, with tādantavidhi by virtue of the first maxim of this series, we might understand by the word 'pada' a word that

(72) Suptiṇantaḥ padam (P. 1.4.14).
ends in either sup (nominal ending) or tin (conjugational ending). So the incorporation of the word 'anta' may signify that excepting this case, all other rules that interpret technical terms (samjña) with suffixes have no relation to tadantavidhi. For example, by 'gha' we mean the suffixes, -tarap and -tarm and nothing else (P. 1.1.22), niṣṭhā means -kta and -ktavatu (P. 1.1.26), -satr and -śāne are termed as 'sat' (P. 3.2.127) and so on.

(g) If in a rule, a primary (kṛt) suffix represents a word constituted with it, we mean not only that word but also those compound ones of which that word forms the last member. The earlier member is in that case either a gati (prefix) or a (case) Karaka in relation to the latter member. This canon is dealt with by Patanjali in the Mahābh. on 1.4.13 with reference to a Vārttika. Where there is possibility of 'gati' or 'Karaka', we understand by a kṛt, the resultant of the kṛt suffix or that preceded by either (73) gati or Karaka. But where no such possibility remains, the word formed with kṛt will be accepted due to the first canon of the series. Thus by P. 2.1.32, both a compound word or a single word associated and unassociated formed with a primary suffix form the ultimate member of compound words the first member of which is either a nominative (kartra) or an instrumental (75) case (karana) e.g. nakha- bhinna and nakha-nirbhinna;

(73) P. 1.4.53-79.
(74) Kartrkarane Kṛta ūkahalum.
(75) P. 1.4.54-55.
(76) P. 1.4.42-44.
Hari-trāta and Hari-vipattrāta etc. In the first instance nir-precedes bhimma (bhīd+ktā) as a gati (prefix), and in the second, 'vipāda' as the ablative case governed by trāta precedes it. In the word 'avatapte-nakulasthita, nakula is a case-word which precedes sthitā, a kṛdanta word. Both as a whole form the latter part of the compound word of which 'avatapte' is the first member, in locative case governed by sthitā. The non-elision of the seventh case-ending is peculiar. The rule P. 5.4.14, ratifies the secondary suffix -āṇ after a word constituted with -ṇā and preceded by a gati (prefix) e.g. vyāvalekṣāḥ (vi-ava-līkh-ṇāḥ = Vyāvalekhā; Vyāvalekha+āṇ = Vyāvalekhā; then feminine suffix ńip). The canon has some exceptions too. Thus in prajñā-sukara there is neither shortening (6.3.66) nor num (6.3.67). In mūla-kopadāsāṃ the 3rd ending is not dropped (2.4.71) because in absence of compound, the twin words cannot form a single nominal stem. The word 'anantara' in P. 6.2.49 is a pointer to this (77) maxim under review. But for the maxim, while ratifying accentuation of a prefix, before the latter member constituted with -(k)ta, the word 'anantara' which signifies unintervening juxtaposition would be redundant in P. 6.2.49. It is thus clear that the rule apprehends the influence of the maxim already in vogue and opposes insertion of an intervening word with this word. According to Kālayātā, this maxim was formulated by some older grammarian and Pāṇini merely recognises it by the word (78) 'anantara'. It may here be clarified that the insertion

(77) Yañ anantaragrāhān ā karoti taj jñāpayatya-āryah -bhavatyesā pariḥāsā irigrahān gatikārakapūrvasyāpi iti. (Mābh. under P. 6.2.49).
(78) Purvācāryaśa tāvadesā pariḥāsā pauthitā - (Pradīpa on P. 6.2.49).
apprehended and prohibited by the word 'Anantara', might be of
another gati and that it approves of a part of the maxim. Still
the whole of the maxim is acceptable in the Pāṇinian system of
grammar as an inheritance partly verified by Pāṇini himself.
Similarly the maxim viz. Gatikārakopapadānam Krūbhīḥ soha
samāsavacanam prak subutpatteḥ has its partial root in Pāṇini's
2.2.18 and 3.2.19 and the remaining part, concerned with 'Kāraka',
is assumed to have blessings of Pāṇini. This argument of accept­
ing a whole while it is partially testified is landed in the
(79) Yājñavalkyasamhitā, Ch. 2, Sl 20.

(f) The Mahābh. sees that -an, -in, -as and -man either
as meaningful suffixes or as meaningless syllables, when refer
referred to some grammatical phenomena in rules, invoke tadantavidhi.
It is a formulation of Kātyāyana. The peculiarity of this maxim
is this that it neutralises the canon 'Arthavadgrahane
nāmartakasya' in certain instances testifying its optional
use and allows tadantavidhi with -an, -in, -as and -man even
when they are meaningless syllables. As a result by P. 6.4.124
-an of both rājan and sāman loses 'a' as in rājā, sāmā etc.
The word rājan is from rāja-kōrin (=rāj-an) but sāman is from
so+manin (=sā-man). As such, -an in rājan bears the meaning
of a suffix but in sāman -an as a mere part of the suffix has
no meaning for itself. Similarly, by P. 6.4.12, daṇḍin+su =
daṇḍins = daṇḍi (daṇḍarini = daṇḍin), vāgmin+su = vāgmins =
vāgmini. (vāc+gāmini = vāgmin) In both words, compensatory

(79) -ekadesē vibhāvitah ādyāh sarvam nrpegartham... (2.20)...
... ekadesē satyavāditvanicayāt ekadesāntareṣu satyavāditvasambhavat (Mitā-kṣarā on the same).
lengthening of the last vowel takes place, irrespective of the status of -in. By P. 6.4.14, supayasusu = supayah.

suarotasasu = sustrotah.

(pawasun payasu but srutasa = srotas, -as in srotas is meaningless). In P. 4.1.11, -man may either be a suffix (-manin) on a simple syllable (āmanic) e.g. in sārman (śr-manin) and prathiman (prthi-manic) respectively and both are disqualified for hip by the rule P. 4.1.11.

The present canon can be deduced from the accommodation of both -trē and -tram in P. 6.4.11 with a view to excluding tr which is the ādesa of the nominal stem viz. arvan (P. 6.4.127). The exclusion is with clear apprehension that in spite of this tr being meaningless, the arthavat paribhāṣā fails to exclude it.

(h) The last of this series of maxims propounds a simple takedibdhi to reconstruct the condition subsequent (para
-nimitta) represented by a letter in the seventh case-ending. Even when the subsequent conditional cause is a single vowel, it will be regarded as its initial part by P. 1.1.21. This is something like calling the only issue as the first one. Thus, bhū+au = bhuvan. The diphthong 'au' is the ending. Here uvan replaces u by P. 6.4.77 before the paraninitta that begins with a vowel. Besides this, the following sutras, at least derive benefit from this maxim: P. 6.1.79, 91, 94, 103; 6.4.52; 7.2.25, 22; 7.3.72, 101, 103, 104; 7.4.51. Rightly does
Bhatṭojī call it the apavāda vārttika of P. 1.1.72 (vide Pm on P. 6.1.69 No.63). As Puruṣottama reports, Vāmana deduces it from the significance of the word viz. aprkta in P. 7.3.91 which can inherit the word 'hal' from P. 7.3.39. Aprkta i.e. one-lettered suffix is there to contract what would have been otherwise a suffix beginning with a consonant (halādi), as the inherited word 'hal' would mean with the help of the present canon. Thus in praunot (<pra- uṣṇa+lañ tip), the desired operation takes place before the conjugational ending, represented by -t, a single letter. According to Nāgėśa (Ś on P. 6.1.79), the present canon is vāćanika, a pronouncement. It may however, be noted that formulation of the rule P. 6.4.69, 6.3.102, 7.3.103 and 7.3.104 indicates this canon. (vide Footnote 1 page 90, PŚ of Nāgėśa, Kashi Sanskrit Series 27, ed. 1954).
9. HOMOGENEITY BETWEEN THE ORIGINAL AND ITS SUBSTITUTE.

The rule Sthāneśtaratamah (P. 1.1.50) regularises the phenomenon of replacement or change of letters or words in the basis of some sort of affinity between a former occupant (sthānin) and its substitute (ādesa). According to Haradatta, this is a special Vidhi, not a restriction. Somewhere identity of meaning may serve the purpose; somewhere again, a former occupant and its substitute referred to in a sūtra are related in order of their enumeration with the help of the rule P. 3.1.10, elsewhere the present maxim of Pāṇini is a safe guideline. For instance in the rule Tas-thaṁ-tha-mar pāṁ tām-taṁ-taṁ (P. 3.4.101), -tas, -thas, -tha and -mip are to be replaced by -tām -tam, -ta and -am respectively. By I-kō yan aśi (P. 6.1.77) however, y replaces i, v replaces u, r replaces r, r and l replaces l on the basis of the present maxim because the number of the former occupants and their substitutes is not the same here. One may however opine that l vowels, u vowels, r vowels and l vowel being replaced by y, v, r and l respectively the rule Iko etc., may take recourse to P. 1.3.10 as well. The rule Akāh savarṇa etc. (P. 6.1.101) is however an undisputed instance of P. 1.1.50. But for this maxim any of the long vowels would have replaced the combination of two homogeneous ak vowels (a, ṛ, i, ī, u, ū, r, ř, l). The utility of the rule Sthāne etc., is thus proved beyond doubt. The import of the present maxim is however a recognition of our phonetic tendencies so far as homogeneity of letters.
is concerned. It is on par with popular practice too. In ceremonial congregations, dinner meetings or other assemblies, (80) persons of affinity sit together; after grazing all day long cows get back their own calves. Similar is the case with letters that are related to and represent their homogeneous ones as far as possible.

With fear of meaningless repetition of popular practice, some might propose to reject this rule. According to the Uddyota, (81) this rule is a logical deduction. In fact, it is not a defect but perfection on the part of a canon to have popular and logical basis. Of course, the rule may give rise to certain discrepancies. For instance,

\begin{align*}
yaja & = \text{ista with i in lieu of y,} \\
\text{Kumariatra} & = \text{kumaryatra, y in lieu of i.}
\end{align*}

The duration of articulation (mātrā) being one in 'i', two in 'ī' and half of one in 'y', some might hesitate to replace one by the other on the testimony of the rule Sthāne etc. But their duration being unchangeable we must accept their case as it is. (Vide Padmanājari on P. 1.1.50). With this pragmatism, the guna and vṛddhi vowels which have always two mātrās are made to replace three or four mātrās in many places e.g. khatvā-upagava khatvāupagava (vide Mahābh. on Eon). Again a and ā, followed by r (P. 1.1.51) are accepted as guna and vṛddhi forms respectively

(a) The Mahābh. on 1.1.50 Vol I, Page 272 (Govt. of India publication).

(b) Kaunapadanta's view on appointment of ministers quoted in the Arthasastra of Kautilya. Book I, Ch. VIII.

(81) Antaratamo bhavatīt yatraṃṇakvaśāṃ iti cā nyāyasiddham. (Uddyota on P. 1.1.50, Vol I, P. 272).
When guna and vrddhi take place in 1, '1' follows 'a' and 'a'. With such exceptions, the retention of P. 1,1.50 is subservient to practical ability. Maxims drawing their import and inspiration from practical life and popular behaviour are not very few in grammar. It is a pride on the part of a linguistic chronicler to keep pace with popular practice.

Homogeneity of letters, the grammarians say, can be cognised with the criteria viz. place of utterance (sthana), effort of utterance (guna) and duration of utterance (pramāṇa). For example, in dadhi-atra, the replacement of the palatal i would be by the palatal semi-vowel y (in dadhy atra). In bāk-hari ( > bāg-ghari), the voiced aspirate h is replaced by the voiced aspirate gh on account of their maximum homogeneity with efforts of articulation in addition to the place of utterance. This utility of the external efforts (bāhyā prayatna) of utterance is specifically upheld by Bhāṭṭoʃjī Diʃṣṭa in his Sk with reference to the rule Tulyāṣya etc. The duration of utterance as the criterion of homogeneity of letters is noticeable in the rule Adasṛceṣṭādu do maḥ (P. 3.2.30). According to this rule, the replacement of a consonant (viz. r) or a short vowel (viz. a) would be by the short u (e.g. adas-aṅc'su > adadri-aṅc's > adadryac's > amumuyan > amumuyan) and that of a long vowel would be by ū (adas in feminine + au > ada āl > ade > āmū). Surely, it is pragmatic to replace the semi-vowel r by a short vowel (i.e. ū) than by a long vowel (i.e. ū), on the plea of duration.
of utterance. Some think that in this rule, 'u' is the compound
neuter singular from u and ū. Others however are of opinion that
'ũ' is representative of its varieties by the rule Anudit etc.,
and the subsequent canon viz. Bhāvyamāṇopūnakāh savarnān grāhāti.
As for meaning as the criterion of homogeneity, the case of the
replacement of the word kroṣṭu by kroṣṭr may be cited as an
instance (P. 7,1.95). Here a word altogether and not a letter
alone is subject to replacement.

It is to note here that of the four criteria of homogeneity,
the place of utterance is highly favoured in grammatical practices.
It is found prevailing over the rest in case they collide. For
instance, in the word, ētum (ēi-tum), the palatal vowel i in the
verbal root is changed in guration into gutturé-palatal 'e' and
not into 'a' though both 'i' and 'a' are short and have affinity
in respect of duration of utterance. In the rule, Yadhunāsike
etc. (P. 8,4.45), however, optional nasal replacement is restricted
to mutes which have nasal counterparts, homogeneous in respect
of both place and effort of utterance (e.g. etat-murāri > etad-
murāri, etan-murāri). As a result, the case of the semi-vowel r
is ignored in ēatur-mukha etc. For the possible corresponding
nasal of r viz. ŋ is homogeneous in place but heterogeneous in
effort of utterance. Still the predominance of the place of
utterance over other criteria of homogeneity in general is
unquestionable. It is formulated in a maxim viz. Yatrāneka-viđhan
Antaryam tatra sthānata Antaryam va-liyāh. It is codified in the
Mahābhārata with the proposal of the reappearance of the word 'sthāne' from P. 1.1.49 in the rule Sthāne etc. (P. 1.1.50). It is in this sense nothing but an elucidation of the rule P. 1.1.50. Very often Patanjali has tried to deduce such interpretative maxims as far as possible from the rules of Panini evidently with a view to seek for them the saintly approval.

10. THE SINGLE LETTER TREATED AS EITHER INITIAL OR FINAL.
11. THE SINGLE EUPHONIC SUBSTITUTE TO BE TREATED AS ORIGINAL, WHETHER AS PRECEDENT OR AS SUBSEQUENT.

The two rules, Ādyantavaḍ ekasmin (P. 1.1.21) and Antādiyacca (P. 6.1.85), though marked as 'atidesa' rules by grammarians, may very reasonably be included in the list of interpretative rules of Panini. For certain rules and grammatical operations enjoined therein derive benefit from these two rules. As stated earlier, the word 'paribbāsā' in our work has a broader meaning, the essence being some sort of influence upon interpretations of the rules on grammatical phenomena. This viewpoint has blessings of the Mahābhārata under the rule Samarthāh etc. (p. 2.1.16).

According to the first of the twin rules, a single letter, while it is a stem or a suffix may be regarded as initial (adī) or ultimate (anta) element of itself for the sake of technicality in certain operations. According to the second rule, a letter, which is the compound substitute of two letters belonging to two contiguous words in euphonic combinations, will be regarded either
as the last part of the earlier word or as the initial part of the latter word. The verbal root ‘i’ is treated as its part in reduplication of the same by P. 6.18 as in iyāya (i-līṭ tip) on account of the former rule of interpretation (P. 1.1.21). In the word khatvāsa (khatvā+isa) e represents both a and i and may be either the ultimate part of the word khatvā (khatvē) or the initial part of the latter word (esā) by P. 6.1.85.

An analysis reveals that the rule P. 1.1.21 serves a little more than popular behaviour could. The Mahābhāṣya with this in view favours the retention of this sūtra. It is opined that (83) but for it we may call a letter its adi or anta but cannot put it to a subsequent operation, its adi and anta being secondary. With this argument the Mahābhāṣya prefers this rule to the vyapadeśīvadbhāva which was proposed by a vārttikā as the compensatory device in case of the rejection of the rule. In fact, popular practice goes as much as this sūtra implies. Moreover, shift of a role from the whole to the part is widely acknowledged in many branches of learning with popular support. For example, the Mahābhāṣya while counteracting the idea of vyapadeśīvadbhāva in favour of the rule adhyāntavād says that it is nothing but a formulation of popular practice. As we refer to

(83) The favour to the rule is of Somādiya, whom both Kātyāyaṇa and Nāgasaṇa recognise as Patanjali himself. According to Haridīkṣita, this is an epithet of an author of vārttikās. P. B. S. Sastri in his Lectures on Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya admits the latter view. Prof. K. C. Sastri however in his Bengal’s Contribution to Sanskrit Grammar, Part I, Page 156 subscribes to the former view.

(84) Antareṇaīva vacanam lokaviṣṇuḥ siddham, (Mahābhāṣya on P. 1.1.21 Vol. I Page 188)
the single son as the eldest or the juniormost, so is the case with the logic behind vyapadeśivadbhāva. But Pāṇini's rule is a repetition of this logic as well and it has nothing of distinction. Thus a later grammarian defends the rule Adyantavād, only to dispel an indecision that might crop up (85) among commoners at the time of extending an operation to mono-lettered words. We must bear in mind in this connection that Patañjali is not averse altogether to the idea of vyapadeśivadbhāva. In his annotation on P. 1.1.72, he deduces from P. 5.2.86-87 the fact that this logic does not operate with reference to a prātipadika. The formulations based upon popular practice are given due recognition by Patañjali even though a sutra according to him should impart something new. Where there is nothing to impart anew, a sutra of our old sage is honoured for the sake of clarification.

The Mahābhārata while discussing the utility of the rule P. 1.1.21 shows that in P. 3.1.2, 6.1.197, 6.4.72, 6.4.77, 7.2.35 etc. single letters are regarded as initial elements of their own. Thus in cūpāagava, Gārgya etc., the last vowel is the remnant of the suffix and it is accentuated on the plea that it is the initial part of a suffix. Moreover in adhyāstä (adhi-i-lau-na), the verbal root 'i' itself is regarded as its initial element to which the augment āt is added. To multiply instances, we may cite bhūvai (bhū-ai) where uvaṇ replaces ū before a suffix beginning with a vowel or āg joṣisat where i(i) precedes s(ip) even though it ought to precede what begins with

(85) gamatvāt kāryena na bhavitavyam iti yasya bhrāntiḥ syāt tām prati yogō'yaṃ ārabdhah (Pradīpa Vol I. Page 190).
any consonant excepting y. In the rules, P. 1.1.11, 47, 64, 31.97, 7,31.102 etc. however, single letters play the role of the ultimate element of their own. For example, in (i) māle iti the earlier word is praghṛya, in (ii) yāni, tāni etc. the stem is lengthened, in (iii) kurute etc. in the ending -ta, 'a' is regarded as the portion and is replaced by 'e', in (iv) adhyeya (adhi-1-yat), -yat is affixed to 'i' and in (v) ābhyaṁ, 'a' representing the stem is lengthened. It is to note that P. 1.1.47, 1.1.52, 1.1.72 and the tadādividihi with a letter benefit from P. 1.1.21. Interestingly, what svam rūpam (P. 1.1.68) or the vārttika tasya ca does with reference to P. 1.1.72 can be well served by this rule (P. 1.1.21) as well.

As already stated the rule Antādivacca discerns the role of a letter with reference to two contiguous words from which it comes out in euphonic combinations. It is pledged that a letter must not be the ultimate part of the former and the initial of the latter word at a time. The Mahābhārata establishes it with a popular instance that a page can not be appointed for two jobs by two masters at a time. If he be appointed he may either be directed to discharge his two duties one by one or be relieved of his service from both quarters. Similar is the case here. By this rule a word even after a change either in the ultimate or initial letter continues to enjoy the status of its original form. For example, in the word kṣirapena

(Bhārata has referred to this instance in his exposition of the twin maxims on vipratisedha (no. 20 and 21 in his Paribhāṣāvṛtti).
(ksīra-pa = instrumental sing.) 'pe' is the latter member of the compound word and facilitates cerebralisation of n by P. 8.4.12. (vide S's on 6.1.85, Kashi Sanskrit Series 27 ed. 1954 Page 101-2).

A number of rules is referred to by Patanjali to show the utility of the rule P. 6.1.85. The following instances necessitate letters as ultimate parts of the earlier words or syllables. In (dvādaśa + anya) + thek > dvādaśānyika, the earlier member in the compound stem being multi-syllabic with the help of 'a' which precedes 'nya'. In the word ksīrapaṇa, n is cerebralised by P. 8.4.12 on the plea that after ksīra and before the ending, 'pe' is the mono-syllabic member. With the same privilege P. 6.1.85, 6.2.2, 6.2.139 etc. are utilised to ratify accentuation whereas P. 6.2.80-81 explain formation of amī, amū etc. As for the rules, P. 1.1.11, 1.3.28, 6.1.90 etc. in certain cases a letter is treated as the initial element of the latter member in combination e.g. agni + au = agni, where ā is regarded as the initial vowel of the suffix and hence no combination in sandhi in agnī iti etc. (P. 6.1.125); in bhṛṣe, pāce, mālā etc. the last vowel is initial part of the suffix.

The Mahābhārata mentions some exceptions to this maxim too. The following instances can be studied:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{upa + iyāja} & = \text{upeyāja} ; \\
\text{amba + atra} & = \text{ambātra} ; \\
\text{kumārī + idam} & = \text{kumāridam}
\end{align*}
\]

(87) P. 1.2.47, 1.2.48, 7.3.107, 7.4.50 etc.
In the first case, if the vowel resulting from combination is taken for the initial part of the verb, preceded by the prefix, shortening of 'a' is unavoidable (P. 7.4.59). In the rest, the vowel resulting from combination must not be the ultimate part of the first members because in that case it will involve shortening once again by P. 7.3.107, 1.3.107, 1.2.47 and 1.2.48 respectively. Of course, as the Mahābhārata shows, shortening as a more intimate (antaranga) phenomenon will invalidate these external (bhāraṅga) phenomena. Thus no undesirable formations with the maxim, P. 6.1.85 crop up. Again in mālā + -bhis, there is no -ais to substitute-bhis, no au of -nal in jahavā and no loss of 'a' in asyā asvah (asyal + asvah) due to limitations of atidesa (extension) envisaged by the maxim P. 6.1.85.

12. SVARITA INDEX FOR A GOVERNING WORD OR RULE.

A word (or words) constituting a part of a sutra or the rule itself sometimes reappears in some successive sutras according to necessity. This is adhikāra i.e. the governing word(s) or rule. In the Pāṇinian system of grammar, a word or a rule which is to be reappearing is marked with svarita index to indicate its governing role, notwithstanding the legitimate (88) accent it should bear in usual utterance. As a man appointed for a particular job sticks to it, so does this svarita

(88) ...adhikāraṁ有人说 pratiṁnayata (Pradīpa on P. 1.3.11).
being employed by Panini, says the Nyasa. As it sees, an adhikāra may be both forward and backward, instances of the latter being very few. According to Goldstücker the rule Svaritenādhikāraḥ (P. 1.3.11) is a clear indication of early writing in India. We admit his comment. Panini’s acquaintance (90) with ‘grantha’ is another proof to it. The art of writing is not however, an innovation of the Paninian period; we know that the Indus Valley civilisation of Pre-vedic period had letters, put in various plates recovered in our times. That Patanjali proposes to bifurcate some sutras of Panini to suit the purposes is simply an attempt at plausible explanations of the rules read and written traditionally in samhitā form.

The utility of the rule Svaritenādhikāraḥ (P. 1.3.11) is immense so far as the reduction of cumbrousness of Panini’s Astādhyāyī is concerned. An inherited element, uttered only once serves successive rules up to a limit, thus being beneficent (91) as memoria technica. Moreover, if we be anxious about the limit of an adhikāra, a slight change in the splitting of the rule P. 1.3.11 as svarite nādhiṅkarā is competent to allay such doubts. Because the sutra in that form will give the verdict that a governing word or rule continues to reappear until another svarita is met. Thus a svarita index in P. 5.1.32 prevents the governance of pṛīti tripūrvat (P. 5.1.30) from encroaching

(89) Panini — Chowkhamba Series, 1965 Page 51-64.
(90) P. 4.3.87.
(91) Adhikāraḥ pratiyogam tasyānirdēśarthah (vārttika on P. 1.3.11).
on it and determines that the previous adhikāra has only two rules to serve. When a svarīta is construed, it is argued, as an indication for discontinuing a governing word or rule, the continuance of the governing word or rule is to be recognised with the logic of popular practice. If, however, the element to be reappearing is marked with a svarīta, Patañjali likes to restrict its scope with a letter which represents the number of its place in order of enumeration in the rules of Mahāśvara. According to this proposal, P. 5.1.30 should be annexed with '1' (the second letter in the Mahāśvara sūtra 1) to indicate that two sūtras only would benefit from this adhikāra. If however, the number of rules to benefit exceeds that of letters, the scope should be limited by referring to the first rule beyond (92) its range. Of course, like a nasal vowel, a svarīta index is admitted on the basis of traditional sayings of the commentators. In fact, the benefit of interpretation has the final say in every case.

Still Patañjali does not favour the rejection of the rule Svaritena etc. (P. 1.3.11). He defends Pāṇini by imparting new utilities to this rule. Thus, according to the Mahābhārata a svarīta on the word strī in P. 1.2.48 would take up those cases alone that come within the jurisdiction of the rule 'Strīyam' (P. 4.1.3). Moreover, a grammatical operation which is liable to be inefficient due to conflict between rules stands unmoved, when a svarīta stands with the formulation concerned. It is like the
strengthening of a weak party against a strong rival in popular strife. Grammatical principles are largely based on popular practice. The retention of the present maxim (P.1.3.11) is reasonably favoured in this light.

13. CLUES TO THE SOLUTION IN CASE OF CONFLICTS.

Cases are numerous where two sutras even though having their own scope of application collide in a place and claim superiority to each other. Subsequently one prevails over the other. As the role of the present maxim viz. Vipratisadhe param kāryam (P. 1.4.2) envisages, keeping in view the sequence of the Paninian rules, the latter of the conflicting rules will prevail over the earlier and will be responsible for necessary operations. It is identical in significance with the Mīmāṃsā rule J. 6.5.54 which formulates relative inferiority of the former to the latter. With the help of this maxim, followed by

(92) P. 4.1.83; 4.4.1; 4.4.75; 5.1.1; 5.1.19.

(93) Here is a list of governing words or rules and their scope in the Āstādhyāyī:-

P. 1.4.23: (31 sutras); 1.4.63 (15); 2.3.1 (72); 2.1.5 (16); 2.1.22 (72); 2.2.23 (5); 3.1.1 (18); 3.1.2 (12); 3.1.15 (35); 3.1.31 (540); 3.4.77 (40); 4.1.1 (12); 4.1.3 (79); 4.1.5 (103); 4.1.23 (223); 4.1.23 (407); 4.1.57 (682); 4.4.1 (74); 4.4.75 (73); 4.1.76 (112); 5.1.1 (35); 5.1.18 (36); 5.3.2 (24); 5.4.63 (92); 6.1.22 (56); 6.1.84 (at least 27); 6.2.19 (572); 6.3.1 (23); 7.2.19 (6); 8.1.1 (14); 8.2.1 (294); 8.1.18 (220); 8.1.17 (51); 8.1.19 (56); 8.3.15 (64); 1.4.60 (19); 5.4.69 (43); 1.1.9 (2); 6.4.32 (153); 6.4.129 (46), etc.

(94) Paurvāparye pūrvadaurvalyam prakṛtivat (J. 6.5.54).
(95) a verse of identical contention, Vacaspati in his Bhamati on Saṅkara's Introduction to his Commentary on the Vedāntasūtra establishes superiority of the Vedic knowledge to our popular perception, the two being independent of each other. But in both the Rk-pr. and the Tait-pr. euphonic combinations are allowed in the consecutive words in gradual order, irrespective (96) of the importance of relationship between them, and the position of the sūtras concerned.

The term 'vipratisedha' denotes a conflict between two equally powerful rivals on a thing. They resemble two masters ordering the same servant to get something done at once. The servant may perform the duties entrusted on him one by one or may seek to be relieved of the duties of both the masters. On this analogy with popular practice, some might explain/get both operations done one by one or leave both the rules in disgust. Instances are not rare where both operations take place side by side. The subsequent appearance of the suffixes nyul, tro, aś etc. after a particular verbal root is an instance in point. Here the present paribhāṣā favours a latter rule and then allows the other if necessary conditions are created. Somewhere, again, a latter rule prevails over an earlier sūtra which finds no role to play before or after the

(96) Ānupūrvyena sandhiḥ (Rk-pr. 2.7). Tatra pūrvam pūrvam prathamam (Tait-Pr. 5.3).
(97) Punah prasaṅgaviśeṣanāt siddham (Vārttika on P. 1.4.2.).
(98) Sakṛdgaṇṭu vipratisedhe yaḥ bādhitaḥ tad bādhitaḥ. (Vārttika on P.1.4.2.)
latter rule operates. Both these interpretations of the maxim are conveniently adopted by scholars. Some think that where an earlier rule will mar the results of the latter rule, the second canon is accepted and where no such risk is there, the first canon allows an earlier rule. Śrīdeva disfavours this analysis on the ground that in that case, even after ī is affixed in dual by P. 7.1.77 in the Vedic form aksī etc., the augment num cannot be spared due to P. 7.1.73. According to the Uddyota, these two principles are proposed by Kātyāyana whose sole aim here is to unfold two dimensions of the Paninian maxim. Here too, as the Uddyota on P. 1.2.64 comments, circumstantial demands are given free hand to choose either of the two ways. Thus the principle of convenient interpretation is regarded as supreme.

A few instances may be cited to show how the first principle is operating in the Paninian system.

1. Between - tithuk (P. 5.2.52) and loss of the feminine suffix (P. 6.3.35), both antaranga (internal) the latter occurs first as a paravidihi and then -tithuk is affixed as in the word bahutithī (bahvi + -tithuk-sīp).

2. In chindhaki, bhindhahi etc., between -aṅka (P. 5.3.71) and -dhi (=hi = sip; P. 6.4.101), -dhi prevails over the former and subsequently -aṅka is affixed. Thus, bhid- + -hi = bhindhi; bhindhi + aṅka = bhindhaki.

(99) Bhāsyācāryo vārttikakaraḥ (Uddyota on P. 1.4.2).

(100) Bhāsyādhe taddhite (vā, on P. 6.3.35).
In dvi-mūrdha, tri-mūrdha etc. between samāsānta suffix sa (P. 5.4.115) and accentuation in the last vowel (P. 6.2.197), the latter prevails over the former which again is subsequently resurrected by the first principle.

The second principle is a bold assertion of the original maxim and disallows revitalisation of the which became ineffective. Numerous instances can be cited in favour of this maxim. Thus shortening of the ultimate long vowel of the stem (6.3.43) prevails over the potential loss of feminine element (pumvadhāva) in pāṭvītarā (pāṭvī + tarā + ā). Similar is the case with (101) pāṭvikā (pāṭvī + ka + ā), Kālimāṇyā (kāli-man + khaś + ā) etc. Between shortening of an 'īk' vowel and lengthening of sampratāraṇa (P. 6.3.149), the latter takes place in kāriśagandhiputra etc. and no shortening once more. Between the representative endings in neuter (7.1.20 etc.) and those after yuśmad and asmad (P. 7.1.22), the latter triumph over the former in yuśam, vayam etc. in neuter. In Rāmebhyah etc., lengthening of the last vowel of the stem (7.3.102) is rejected in favour of its replacement by 'et' (p. 7.3.103). Even between two interpretative maxims, namely P. 1.1.66 and 1.1.67, or 1.1.69 and 1.1.70 etc., the latter is taken recourse to in case conflict is apprehended. Excluding all these instances the Mahābh. refers to no less than eighty five vārttikas concerned with the conflict between numerous pairs of Pāṇini's rules in formation of words.

(101) P. 7.4.13.
Some of them are solved otherwise by Patanjali. Thus the occasion referred to by the first vārttika of this kind under P. 3.1.67 is solved by a bifurcation of the rule; the 20th, 23rd and 25th vārttikas under P. 4.2.104 are nullified since apavāda takes the charge in their favour whereas the third under P. 6.1.35 bows out in favour of an indication (jñāpaka) in P. 7.3.22 etc. Furthermore the Mahābhārata itself refers to (103) some unavoidable instances of conflict, three of which (P. 6.2.197, 6.4.101, 7.2.1) are already mentioned above as ratifying the resurrection of an early rule and one under P. 7.1.54 finds no scope for such resurrection.

There are still certain cases where an earlier rule triumphs over its latter rival. Katyāyana bundles them as exceptions to Pāṇini’s rule of vipratisedha (P. 1.4.2) in no less than eighteen vārttikas under some eleven rules. Patanjali

(102) P. 2.1.68 (1); 3.1.3(3); 3.1.20(1); 3.1.67(2); 3.2.1(1); 4.1.114(3); 4.1.170(2); 4.2.39(1); 4.2.71(1); 4.2.104(25); 5.3.68(1); 5.3.73(1); 6.1.12(1); 6.1.35(3); 6.1.91(3); 6.1.108(2); 6.1.186(1); 6.2.52(4); 6.2.165(1); 6.2.108(1); 6.2.121(1); 6.2.177(1); 6.3.43(1); 6.3.47(1); 6.4.148(2); 7.2.28(1); 7.2.70(10); 7.2.101(1); 7.3.10(1); 7.4.10(1); 3.2.122(2); 3.3.126(2); 4.1.55(1); 4.1.95(2); 4.3.155(1).

Figures in the bracket show the number of vārttikas referred to in the sutra. The rule Kritavat parimanat mentioned as P. 4.3.155 is somewhere marked as 4.3.154, somewhere again as 4.3.156.

(103) P. 3.1.36(1); 3.1.37(1); 6.1.8(1); 6.2.117(1); 6.2.197(1); 6.3.9(1); 6.3.112(1); 6.4.101(1); 7.1.72(1); 7.2.1(1); 7.3.33(1); 7.4.1(1); 7.1.54(2) etc.

(104) P. 1.2.5; 4.1.85; 4.2.39; 5.1.119; 5.3.72; 6.4.48; 6.1.12; 7.1.96; 6.2.130; 4.2.137; 5.1.2 etc.
comes to the rescue of Panini's 1.4.2 with the explanation of
the word 'para' in this rule as 'desirable' (ista). What is desired
must defy any other operation formulated in any other rule. It
is thus in the vārttikas and the Mahābh. that the Paninian rule
finds new avenues for itself.

With all these intricacies, the present Paninian rule
can have a most extensive scope of employment. Thus the Pś of
Nāgęśa devotes a whole chapter to this phenomenon of conflict
of rules. It will be shown later that this maxim has nothing to
do with those instances where one of the contending sūtras
belongs to the chapters of the governing word, asiddha (i.e.
relative inefficiency). Another thing to note here is this that
(105) antaraṅga (internal), nitya and apavāda (exceptional),
being more powerful than their opponents, the viprātisṛeda
composer leaves them aside.

(105) Utsargāpavāda-nityānityā-ntaraṅgabhirāṅgeṣu tulyaṃvatā
nāśṭiTi nāyāmaṣya yogasya viśayāḥ (Kāśikā on P. 1.4.2).
The Sś of Nāgęśa explains this idea with illustrations on
the same.

(105 a) The word 'kārya' in the rule Viprātisṛeda etc. (P. 1.4.2)
would denote any rule on technical term, interpretative
canon, injunction, restriction etc. and grammatical
operations concerned. Prevalence of the canon Tasmāt etc.
(P. 1.1.37) over the other, Tasmin etc. (P. 1.1.66) is
well known. As for rules which define technical terms,
the rule A Kaḍārāt etc. (P. 1.4.1) formulates that of
any two terms defined within the rules P. 1.4.1 —
P. 2.2.38, only one is prevalent in a place though
there is no conflict between the two terms. The Mahābh.
prefers reading 'P. 1.4.1 as 'A' Kaḍārad ekasamghā' to
'Prāk Kaḍārāt param kāryam' and cites fifteen vārttikas
to illustrate the utility of the rule P. 1.4.1. Thus a
dirgha (Long) or pluta is not hrasva (short - P. 1.2.27),
benedictive (aśīrīh) and perfect (lit) endings being
ārdhadhatuka (P. 3.4.115-116) are not sarvadhatuka
(P. 3.4.113), yuvan (P. 4.1.163-165) is not vṛddha
i.e. gotra (P. 4.1.163), nadi (P. 1.4.3) is not ghi (P. 1.4.7-8);
guru (P. 1.4.11-12) is not laghu (P. 1.4.10), bha (P. 1.4.18-20) is not pada (P. 1.4.17), sampradâna etc. (P. 1.4.32-55) are not apadâna (P. 1.4.27-31), Karman (P. 1.4.33) is not sampradâna (P. 1.4.37), Kârtya (P. 1.4.54) is not adhikarâna (P. 1.4.45), Karmâpâra-vaçâniya (P. 1.4.87-88) is neither gati (P. 1.4.55-60) nor upasarga (P. 1.4.58-59), âtmanepada (P. 1.4.100) is not para- samipada (P. 1.4.99), avyayibhava (P. 2.1.21) and bahuvrîhi (P. 2.2.23-22) are mutually exclusive and so on. Excluding a few, these terms are defined within the rules P. 1.4.1 - P. 2.2.38. Herein, an exceptional rule or a latter rule in sequence of rules is preferred to a general or an earlier rule.

It is however noticeable that co-existence of terms is widely recognised in both popular practice and grammatical treatises. The role of the rule a Kadarat etc. (P. 1.4.1) lies in promoting relative exclusiveness of certain terms even if technically there is no conflict between the two of them (vide Mahâbh. on P. 1.4.1). Devices are adopted reasonably to discern co-existence of technical terms. For example, the term âgâ (P. 1.4.13) co-exists with both bha (P. 1.4.18-20) and pada (P. 1.4.17) by way of reappearance (anuvrtti). As for Karmadhâraya (P. 1.2.42) and tâtpuruṣa (P. 2.1.22), no bar is there in co-existence, the earlier term being outside the arena of P. 1.4.1 - P. 2.2.38. Moreover the earlier term may be incorporated in P. 2.1.3. In that case, its co-existence with tâtpuruṣa will be by way of reappearance. A particle 'ca' is there in P. 2.1.23 to treat a 'qâgha' as tâtpuruṣa too for the benefit of saṁâsânta suffixes (P. 5.4.68 - P. 5.4.160) etc. The term, saṁâsâ co-exists with avyayibhava etc. on account of incorporation of the word prak instead of a in P. 2.1.3. An upasarga (P. 1.4.59) is a gati (P. 1.4.60) too with the help of conjunctive 'ca' in the latter rule. A Karana governed by the verbal root dîv — is a karma too (P. 1.4.48) with the same device. Similar is the case with hûtâ (causative nominative) being a kartr as well (P. 1.4.54-55). The terms guru (P. 1.4.11 - 12) and nadi (P. 1.4.3) co-exist in the word vâtsibandho etc. to effect pluta in vocative (P. 8.2.36) and accent in the last vowel of the earlier member of the compound (P. 6.2.100) respectively. Similarly, ghi (P. 1.4.7) and laghu (P. 1.4.10) affect earlier position of 'Vî' in Vîn (P. 2.2.32) and affixation of -an to the compound stem to form vânîra or replacement of nic with ay (P. 6.4.56) in vîvinîîya (vî-vîn - nic - lyap vî-vîn-ay-ya). Here too, reappearance (anuvrtti) is the guiding force. On account of the co-existence of parasmipada (P. 1.4.59) and purusa (P. 1.4.101), there is lengthening of the radical vowel before active endings in Kârmati etc. (P. 7.3.76). These are the cases of exception to the intent of the rule P. 1.4.1. Specific efforts in such cases underline the co-existence of terms. But for this interpretation, two co-existente terms would have been synonymous to each other.
According to the rule Vāsarpūpō striyām (P. 3.1.94), a suffix treated as the particular and a general suffix which it is likely to oppose under the jurisdiction of the governing rule of the Dhātoḥ (P. 3.1.91 - 3.4.117) minus that/governing rule Striyām (P. 3.3.94 - 112) have alternative occurrence if they are totally dissimilar in appearance. For example, the rule P. 3.1.96 enjoins some general suffixes vis. -tavyn, -tavyat and anīyar whereas P. 3.1.97 is concerned with the suffix -yat after verbal roots that end in a vowel. No physical identity can be found between -yat and -tavya etc. Consequently, -yat and these suffixes appear optionally in ēya, ēstavya, ēyanīya etc. The present paribhāṣā is thus a restriction imposed on the canon of exceptional rules. It is an evidence to familiarity of the latter in the age of (107) Pāṇini who finds it unnecessary to pronounce it once more as a rule.

As for the rules on technical terms which are beyond the jurisdiction of the rule P. 1.4.1. (P. 1.4.1 - P. 2.2.38) but still abide by the intent of P. 1.4.1, reasons are not far beyond. For example, the Mahābh. studies the case of the terms hrasya dirgha and pluta in details on the rule P. 1.2.27. It is argued that separate injunction of the three would make them mutually exclusive. Even the proposal of inclusion of the rule ikalā etc. (P. 1.2.27), in the jurisdiction of P. 1.4.1, is favoured. The disjunctive particle 'tu' in the rule jyāti tu etc. (P. 4.1.163) separates the scope of vṛddha (i.e. gotra) from that of yuvan. The confirmative indeclinable 'eva' in the rule Lānah etc. (P. 3.4.111) confirms the term ārdhvadhātuka for perfect and benedictive endings and consequently excludes them from the scope of sārvadhātuka. Thus co-existence and mutual exclusiveness of technical terms are correctly discerned in the Pāṇinian school of grammar.

(106) Vādāhakatya vikalpita yatra pakṣa apravādasya bādhakatvam nāsti tatra bādhakatvābhavat utsargah pravartate (Pradīpa on P. 3.1.94).

(107) Vide Rk-pr. 1.53.
The Mahābhārata carries on a fruitful discussion on the word 'asarūpa'. The suffixes -an and -ka are regarded as physically similar because their only difference lies in indicatory elements \( (k)a : a(n)^7 \). Some like to admit indicatory letters as component parts of substitutes, suffixes etc. to which they are attached. In fact, to accept these letters as parts of suffixes is more logical. If this view be adopted, we must follow the Mahābhārata to take recourse to the rule P. 3.1.139 which is construed as indicating that dissimilarity by indicatory elements is negligible. In other words, dissimilarity by something other than these letters is meant for here in the (108) rule P. 3.1.94.

As regards various transformations of 'la' i.e. conjugational endings, the present paribhāṣā is however ineffective even though in various tenses and moods terminations take physical novelties. According to Patañjali, the rule P. 3.2.116 which enjoins lan (past imperfect) along with lil (past perfect) in connection with two indeclinables, namely 'ha' and 'śāsvat' indicates that in spite of differences of different sets of substitutes of the original conjugational endings in tenses and moods, any two of such sets have no chance of alternative use. Herein lies the necessity of this rule. Thus the scope of present paribhāṣā (P. 3.1.94) is restricted to certain verbal suffixes only.

(a) ...nārubhandaḥārtam asārūpyam bhavatīti. Yad ayam dadaī-tadāhyōr vibhāgām sāsti (Mahābhārata on 3.1.94).
(b) ...rūpāṇyatvamaṇsārūpyam tadāśrayisyāmaḥ (Ibid).

(109) ...na lādeśoṣu vā'asarūpo bhavatīti. Yad ayam ha-śāsvatōr lan da ityāha. (Mahābhārata on P. 3.1.94).
There are two other exceptions to this canon. According to the first formulation on exceptions, the canon Vāsarūpo etc. does not operate when the apavāda rule falls within P. 3.2.135 and P. 3.2.177, both being inclusive and the general rule falls either within this list or beyond. Here the all-surpassing role of an exceptional rule is reinstated. That an apavāda (exceptional rule) rule within the list concedes nothing to an utsarga (general rule) that is beyond this list is indicated \((110)\) by sanctioning-vunā in P. 3.2.146. But for absence of the canon P. 3.1.94, here-nvul would have sufficed to give the same form as-vunā. That between an exception rule and a general rule both belonging to the list, the former is predominant \((111)\) is indicated by formulation of -yue after pada etc. in P. 3.2.150. Otherwise, P. 3.2.149 would be competent to enjoin the same. Thus in the first case, -tṛṇ (P. 3.2.135) as an exception totally ignores-nvul (P. 3.1.133), isnu (P. 3.2.136) ignores nvul (P. 3.1.133) and so on. In the second case, the rule P. 3.2.146 is a total exception to P. 3.2.135; P. 3.2.154 totally obstructs P. 3.2.149; P. 3.2.175 is opposed to P. 3.2.149; P. 3.2.136 opposes P. 3.2.135 and so on.

But this exception to the rule Vā'sarūpo etc. is not \((112)\) without exception. Thus P. 3.2.153 prohibits -yue after süd-, déip- and dīks-. As we have seen before, the rule P. 3.2.167 which enjoins -ra after nām-, kamp-, kam-, déip- etc. by virtue

\((110)\) Tāčhilikeṣu vāsarūpavidhir nāsti (Pā Ṛṣa/Pu 28/Sī 46).

\((111)\) Tāčhilikeṣu parasparam vāsarūpavidhir nāsti (Sk on P. 3.2.150).

\((112)\) Tāčhilikeṣu vāsarūpavidhir nāsti iti prāyikam (Sk on P. 3.2.153).
of its exceptional character would be competent to oppose -yuc after dip-, enjoined by P. 3.2.149 in this chapter. Still the prohibitory rule P. 3.2.153 is formulated only to indicate that defiance of the 'Vā' sarūpa' canon here has some exceptions. As a result, according to P. 3.1.94, both -yuc (P. 3.2.149) and -ra (P. 3.2.167) are affixable to nam-, kam- etc. as in namra, namana, kamra, kamana etc. but after dip- there is only -ra.

The canon Vāsarūpo etc. (P. 3.1.94) is voluntary (anītya) (113) from another standpoint too. In P. 3.3.169, as Nāgėsa (114) interprets the Mahābh., kṛtya and -tṛc are pronounced with a view to preventing them from being prohibited by līn. It proves that līn can totally prohibit kṛtya and -tṛc, that is to say, the apavāda somewhere concedes nothing to an utsarga in this chapter. On the voluntary character of the canon i.e. reinstating of the all-surpassing power of apavāda in certain cases, it is justified that hasitam or hasanam (-kta and -lyut, meaning nothing but the action in the verbal root) is not accompanied by a form with -ghan; in itācchati bhoktum (bhuj-tumun), -tumun (P. 3.3.155) obstructs līn and lot (P. 3.3.157) but P. 3.3.159 sanctions līn again; in īṣatpāna (īsat-pā - yuc) by P. 3.3.128, -yuc obstructs -khal (P. 3.3.126).

(113) Ktalyut, tumunkhalartheṣu vā'sarūpavidhīr nāsti (Ps 69/Pu 76/Si 32).
(114) Kṛtya means -tavya, -tavyat, -yat, -nyat, -kyap, -antyak and - kelinak.
14. RELATIVE INEFFECTIVENESS IN ORDER OF ENUMERATION.

The term 'asiddha' is pronounced in the Astadhyayi (115) at least thrice and everywhere it is concerned with relative ineffectiveness of a rule. The first one leads the chapter of 'asiddha', the second 'asiddhavat' governs the abhiya chapter named after 'abhāt' in the rule and the last one is simply confined to a single rule without any external affairs. Both the chapters of 'asiddha' and 'asiddhavat' are arranged with the governing rules, viz. pūrvatrasiddham (P. 8.2.1) and Asiddhavat etc at the forefront. While the earlier governs 234 rules the latter governs 153 rules.

Kaiyāta in his Pradīpa under P. 8.2.1 makes a differentiation between 'adhikāra' and 'Paribhāṣā' to see that the rule (116) P. 7.1.12 does not lose the precedent conditional cause (pūrvenimitta) namely -a acquired by P. 7.2.102 for the sake of P. 8.2.1 and thus tena (tad - tā) tasya (tad - ūnas) etc. are correct words. Appreciating this illumination, the Uddyota (117) adds that nothing is there as a sign to introduce P. 8.2.1 as a 'paribhāṣā'. Moreover the rule cannot be of any use beyond the last three parts of the eight-book of the Astadhyaśī. Of course, we have already noticed that P. 1.4.2 and the paribhāṣā on antarāṅga have no scope in the chapters of

(115) P. 8.2.1; P. 6.4.22 and P. 6.1.36.
(116) Sakalasastravyāpitarvauśārtho tu paribhāṣātvam nāsritam.
(117) Lingavisāṣānapādānācā.
(118) Mahābh. under P. 1.1.14; P. 1.1.49 etc.
the governing words asiddha and asidhavat and still they are paribhāṣas. Again P. 8.2.1 and P. 6.4.22 are favourably concerned with a large number of sūtras. In addition to this, more than once, Patañjali refers to essential similarities of adhikāra, (108) paribhāṣā etc. So discussions on P. 8.2.1 and P. 6.4.22 are not out of place in our discourse on interpretative canons of the Pāṇinian grammar.

According to the rule P. 8.2.1 a rule belonging to this chapter (P. 8.2.1 - P. 8.4.68) is relatively inefficient to any rules of the rest of Pāṇini’s work. Between any two rules of this chapter too, the latter is relatively inefficient with reference to the earlier. An exception to this system of arrangement is P. 8.2.3. By the rule P. 8.2.1, the ultimate rule of Pāṇini (P. 8.4.68), propounding samvṛtta (close) effort of articulation of ‘a’ which has vivṛtta (open) effort lies inefficient with regard to all of Pāṇini’s sūtras excepting itself and thereby signifies that in actual use, the short ‘a’ will be vivṛtta (open) though it is samvṛtta (close) by itself. The rule Pūrvatrāśiddham (P. 8.2.1) itself is not however inefficient because in that case the whole chapter under its jurisdiction would be efficient and the rule would be worthless.

In P. 6.1.86 a vārttika which is referred to again P. 6.4.22 and P. 8.2.1 generalises the significance of the word ‘asiddha’. As it says, it either obstructs a substitute from replacing its sthānin (former occupant) or makes a general rule
triumph over a special rule (apavāda), ignoring the grammatical
(119) norm. Thus in rājabhīn, taksābhyām, rājasu etc., the rule
P. 8.2.2 that formulates the loss of n in the stem viz. rājan
e tc. is regarded as inefficient and there is no change of -bhis into -ais (P. 7.1.9), no lengthening of the last vowel of the
stem (P. 7.3.102) and no replacement of this 'a' by e(t)
(P. 7.3.103). In amuṣma, amuṣmat etc. substitutes of endings,
namely -smā, -smāt etc. which are liable to be affixed only
to a stem, ending in 'a', are found even after the ultimate 'u'
of the stem. Because in relation to the rules (P. 7.1.14-15 etc.)
which formulate nominal endings, the sūtra (P. 8.2.80) that
enjoins 'u' is inefficient. The Pradīpa simplifies that the
(120) phenomenon of 'u' takes place after -smā etc. have
appeared. The Mahābh. apprehends dha (P. 8.2.31) in dogāh,
dogāhun etc. and the elision of the last letter in conjuncts
(P. 8.2.23) in kāṣṭhatat, kūtataṣ etc. and finds a way out with
(121) the vārttika which allows retention of the all-surpassing
power of an 'apavāda' rule even if it is pronounced in the
chapter of 'asiddha'. As stated earlier, this is not the case
everywhere. Excepting these unavoidable cases, the power of
'apavāda' (exceptional rule) is blunt in this chapter as both the
vārttikas and the Mahābh. have observed.

(119) ...āḍeśalaksana-pratipadāhārtham utsargalaksanabhāvārtham(Va).
(120) ...purvam smāyādayah paścad utvam (Pradīpa on P. 8.2.1).
(121) Apavādo vacanaprāmānyat (Va. on P. 8.2.1 etc.).
There are however glaring exceptions to the 'asiddha' phenomenon. Pāṇini himself prohibits it in the rule P. 8.2.3 which signifies bold retention of 'mu' before n (i.e. nā = ṭā) as in amunā. Under P. 8.2.6 Patanjali reads as many as fifteen vṛttīkās to collect exception to the spirit of this chapter. Thus in the expression vī. in harivo medinam tvā the rule on elision of the last member of the conjuncts (P. 8.3.1.) is not inefficient to the rule on the change of 'r(u)' into 'u' (P. 6.1.113) (hari-vat = harivat s = harivants = harivan = harivar = harivan = harivo) (vā.3). In āṭīt (at + lūḥ tip = ā(t)-at-ī(t) s(īc)-ī(ṭ)t = āt i s ī t = āṭīt-āṭīt) etc. elision of sic (P. 8.2.28) is not impotent to the lengthening (P. 6.1.101) by combination of the two vowels of same place and effort of utterance. Rules on i and u of 'adas' (P. 8.2.30-31) are valid in the eyes of P. 1.1.12 which proposes amī, amū as pragṛhyā (vā. 10). The rule P. 8.4.40 dealing with the change of s, t, th, d, dh, n into ś, ċ, čh, j, jh, ń respectively is valid to the rule on augment dantu (P. 8.3.29), that is to say, s being ś in scyotati (scyutir + tip) there is no dantu, which requires s as its condition subsequent, in at ścyotati etc. (vā.12). Instances need not be multiplied. Stil], as Patanjali opines many a time, exceptions must not stand in way of a formulation that has a larger number of beneficiaries.

In the 'abhiyā' chapter falling under 'Asidhavat etc.' either obstructs a rule concerned with replacement or makes a general rule triumph over an exceptional rule (apavāda). The rule
on elision of hi (= sip in imperative second person singular) after a verbal stem ending in 'a' (P. 6.4.105) does not operate in ā gahi, jahi etc. on this principle that the rule on elision of m (P. 6.4.37) or replacement of han- by 'ja' (P. 6.4.36) is asiddha i.e. inefficient to the elision of -hi. In eñhi (as+ sip in lot), sāhi (śas+sip in lot) etc. the general rule regarding the change of -hi (sip in lot) into -dhi after some particular stems (P. 6.4.101) triumphs over the special rules of replacing as- by 'e' (P. 6.4.119) and śas by śā (P. 6.4.35) etc. on account of the relative inefficiency of the latter ones. But in rāga (ranj + ghan) etc. the elision of the nasal element is valid to the vṛddhi of the vowel (P. 7.2.115); the elision paves the way for vṛddhi which is allowed only in a penultimate vowel.

The distinction between the chapters of asiddha, and asiddhavat or abhiya is this that the latter (i.e. asiddhavat) functions only when two contending rules arranged in this chapter tend to affect the same element under same conditions in the formation of a word. Some like to construe the word 'atra' in P. 6.4.22 to confine this phenomenon to this chapter; others demark its scope with 'ā bhat' (upto the end of the jurisdiction of 'bha' i.e. P. 6.4.175) and opine that by 'atra' Pāṇini admits it only when the same thing is likely to be affected by two contending rules (that belong to this chapter).

(122) (a) Samānāśrayayaśa nāt siddham (Mahābh. on 6.4.22).

(b) Aśrayanam atānityaśa nimitatvenaśa iti nāgrahān
kintu yathākathancit (uddyota on the same).
The rule on elision of the nasal element in gata, āgahi etc. is relatively inefficient because both the rules belong to this chapter. In rāga etc. however P. 7.2.115 is beyond its jurisdiction and so elision of n is valid. In prāśamayya etc. (pra-śam + nić + lyap) both shortening of the penultimate vowel of the stem before the causative suffix viz. nić (P. 6.4.22) and change of 'i' of nić into ay before -lyap (P. 6.4.56) belong to the ābhiya chapter but their locus and condition being different, there is no apprehension of inefficiency. This condition of the same locus and conditional cause (samānāśraya) seems to be an innovation of the Mahābh. which rejects (123) two of the vārttikas referring to some exceptions to this phenomenon with this reason that cases referred to there do not satisfy the condition of 'samānāśraya'. Exceptions detected by vārttikas and their solution in the Mahābh. decisively prove that both these works admit the scope of asiddhavat upto the end of the jurisdiction of 'bha'. Nāgasa in the Uddyota supports it. (cp upadhā-grahaṇam-eva bhādhikāram abhivyāpyāyam adhikāra ityarthē mānam - uddyota on P. 6.4.22).

(123) Vā. 9, 10 under P. 6.4.22.)
The rule Samarthanah padavidhih (P. 2.1.1.) is regarded as an important paribhasa in the Pāṇinian system covering pada-vidhi (i.e., treatment of complete words) that constitutes the largest part of a grammatical discourse. The word pada-vidhi comprises, as Patanjali comments, samāsa (compound) vibhakti-vidhih (enjoining case-endings) and pareṅgavat-bhāva (P. 2.1.2.)—enjoining of an ending either to denote a case or to oblige a proximate word (pada) is certainly pada-vidhi, the first by providing arrangement for forming a complete word (pada), and the second due to the governing pada responsible for the ending in view. The third phenomenon viz. pareṅgavat-bhāva is a peculiar union of two words that keep their individual traits but claim common accentuation as in subhaspati and is pertinently treated as a pada-vidhi. As for samāsa, the Uddyota of Nāgęśa elaborates that the word samāsa here would stand for all vṛttis viz. formation with kṛt (primary) and taddhita (secondary) suffixes, compound ekāsa and secondary roots formed through the suffixes viz. -sam, -yan, -kṣa, -kya, -kya, -ṣa, -ni, -ni etc. Since a compound and ekāsa (retention of only one member in a compound) generally take place between two or more inflected words and taddhita suffixes are affixed to inflected words, padavidhi in them is easily understandable. Formation of kumbha-kāra etc. with -aṅ, a kṛt suffix too is concerned with pada, the earlier member. Suffixes viz. -saṁ, -yan etc. too have the same role of standing for a pada. Thus the
denotation of pada-vidhi being wide, the canon has a vast scope and cannot be denied of its importance. Exclusion of varna-vidhi enables euphonic combination of two letters in consecutive words that may have no relationship in meaning. But this is impossible in pada-vidhi that owes its origin to mutual relationship in meaning (sāarthya).

As the canon signifies, the resultant of a pada-vidhi is capable of meaning what its analytical substitute (i.e., vigraha) means; again, constituent parts in such places are capable of denoting related meanings that are in both vigraha and the compressed resultant. Here is power of abhidhāna vested in these phenomena, as Bhoja formulates though partially, in his Sarasvatī-Kanṭhābharana no. 1,2,133. When this abhidhāna is questionable, affinity of kṛt and taddhita suffixes, -sena, -ya etc. and endings, compound, and ekāsa are non-appearing. Patañjali, the kāśikā etc. show special interest in this interpretative canon. It is clear that Bhoja's aforesaid formulation is a partial repetition of the same.

The analysis of words into their component parts and formation of words being the central theme of vyākaraṇa, the present canon is a fundamental paribhāṣā. Rules on samāsa, primary and secondary suffixes etc. constitute the larger portion of Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī. The secondary suffixes alone have claimed 1112 rules out of 3996 ones of the Pāṇinian text. Naturally the rule Samarthah etc. has claimed attention of all grammarians of the Pāṇinian school.

(124) Abhidhāna-lakṣaṇah kṛt-taddhita-samāsah.
Like the Pāṇinian rule viz. Parāścā (P. 3.1.2) the rule Ādyudāttascā (P. 3.1.3) is an adhikāra rule which in the Kaśikā is treated as a paribhāṣā. According to it, a pratyaya, leaving aside exceptions, has the first vowel accentuated. It is restrictive in the sense that otherwise disorder would prevail in accentuation with reference to suffixes which may not be monosyllabic and which are not specifically awarded an accent by a rule. With relation to P. 3.1.1. the present rule pleads that whatever is known as pratyaya is accented in the first vowel. As for erstwhile accents in both the root and the suffix, the latter prevails in the resultant word by the vārttika viz. (125) Sati śīstasvarā etc. In kartavya ( kartavya), Taittirīyaka etc. the accent is there in the first vowel of the suffix. As the governing rule pratyaya (P. 3.1.1.) governs there chapters (P. 3.1.1. - 5.4.160) dealing with Kṛt (primary suffixes), taddhita (secondary suffixes), conjugalational and declensional endings, feminine and samāśānta suffixes etc. the scope of the present rule on accentuation too is vast. Exceptions are not however rare here. For example, Pāṇini himself formulates that declensional endings (sup) and suffixes with indicatory p have no acute accent (P. 3.1.4) at all.

Another important canon on accentuation is the Pāṇinian rule Anudāttam padam ekavarjam (P. 6.1.158) which means that

(125) The Sk on the rule no., 3650.
in a word, excepting one udātta or svarīta, all vowels are anudātta (unaccented). Determination of udātta or svarīta is however is a complex task. Stems and suffixes, members of compounds etc. have their own accented vowels and resultant forms acquire their own in favour of one of the components.

(126) Thus, if not prevented otherwise, resultant forms from stems with suffixes have udātta in latter part. As regards svarīta, it may be either original or acquired. In kva, svar etc. the only vowel is svarīta for no reasons (jātya); in kanyā, the last one is svarīta and the initial one unaccented (anudātta). Again svarīta can result from abhinihita, kṣaipra and prasāsta types of euphonic combinations of vowels as in yo'hya (yā-ha), yuyodhyasmā (yuyodhī+asmā), abhidām (127) (ahhi-idām) etc. These are cases of kampa-svara and are accompanied by numerals viz. 1 and 3 to explain its short and long character respectively in the samhitā text of the Vedas. Moreover, the amudātta preceded by an udātta in a word becomes svarīta. Excepting these svarīta and udātta vowels, all is amudātta, as observed in our present canon. Of these, unaccented ones, the one that follows a svarīta is called 'pracaya' in samhitā text (P. 1.2.39) while what is followed by either svarīta or udātta is named śnatara, a very weak stage of amudātta (P. 1.2.40).

(126) Sati siṣṭa-svara-valīyastvam etc. (vā. on rule no.3650 Sk Vol IV).

(127) Rk-pr. 2.15-20, 21-23, 34.

(128) The canon is inefficient in respect of 'asiddha' chapter (P. 8.2.1 - 8.4.68) SS Page 114.