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1. Introduction
1.1 Background

It is generally agreed upon that the major part of Pāṇini’s grammar is based on his firsthand linguistic knowledge,¹ although some of his description may have been handed down from his predecessors. Since his language is naturally different from the Sanskrit of much older literature such as the Rgveda, Pāṇini includes sūtras which are specifically meant for Vedic usage, marking them with provisions such as chandasī, mantrē, yajūṣī, or brāhmaṇe. But his language must have overlapped with Vedic Sanskrit to some extent, and it is conceivable that Pāṇini referred to a phenomenon which appears distinctly Vedic to us, but which may not have been different from the spoken language in his eyes, without marking the rule as Vedic.

Judging from the variety of sūtras labeled Vedic, Pāṇini was well versed in the usage of both hymnal and liturgical literature of the Veda. The relationship between Pāṇini and the Veda has drawn the attention of Western scholars since the mid-nineteenth century. Among crucial contributions to this subject is Thieme (1935): according to Thieme (1935:63), Vedic Saṃhitās which served as material for Pāṇini’s grammar are the Rgveda, the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, the Kaṭha-Saṃhitā, the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā and the Atharvaveda, and probably the Sāmaveda as well. In recent years, Bronkhorst (1991) argued that Pāṇini knew at least certain parts of the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, the Kaṭha-Saṃhitā, the Lātṛyāṇa-Śrautasūtra, the Mānava-Śrautasūtra, the Vārāha-Śrautasūtra, and the Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa, while certain parts of the Sāmaveda, the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā, the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, the Atharvaveda, the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, the Kaṇḍarāṇya-Brāhmaṇa, the Pañcabṛhad-Bṛhadāraṇya, and the Šatapatha-Brāhmaṇa show deviation from Pāṇini’s rules.

In this paper, we will compare the sūtras in Aṣṭādhyāyī 8.2, which is a section mainly on morphophonological rules and lexical exceptions, with the language of the Vedic corpus, and look at the problem from a phonological point of view.

---

*I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Werner Knobl for reading and commenting on the drafts of this paper in great detail, and to Dr. George Cardona for giving me valuable suggestions at every stage of my research. I thank Dr. Eijirō Dōyama, Dr. Brendan Gillon and Dr. Arlo Griffiths for their kind help and comments.

¹For the controversy on the language described by Pāṇini, see Cardona (1976:238f).
1.2 Method

As we just mentioned, the sūtras of the Aṣṭādhyāyī dealing with Vedic peculiarities often contain provisions, such as $c^b\text{andasi}$, which limit the scope of the rule to Vedic, and only such rules are compared with the Veda in some studies. But if Pāṇini’s language is closer to Vedic than to what we call Classical Sanskrit, it is worth comparing all the rules with Vedic, unless application to Vedic is precluded by provisions like $b^h\text{āśāyām}$ ‘in the spoken language’. For example, Aṣṭ. 6.1.7 $tuj-\text{ādīnām dirg}^b\text{o }b^h\text{yāsasya}$ is not limited to Vedic, but it describes forms such as RV (ŚS, VS) $tātu\text{jāna-}$/$tātu\text{jānā}$-, which occur only in Vedic according to the commentators since Kātyāyana.\(^2\)

Based on these arguments, we compare Pāṇini and the Veda according to two working hypotheses: One is that Pāṇini intended his grammar to be a descriptive one, and his rules are grounded either on an actual language or texts he had at hand. The other is that Vedic usage is not excluded from the scope of his description unless Pāṇini explicitly says $b^h\text{āśāyām}$ ‘in the spoken language’.

Following these hypotheses, we compared all relevant sūtras of Aṣṭ. 8.2 with Vedic, and tried to retrace the thread of his thought. We first looked for actual examples in the Samhitās using Vishva Bandhu’s indices, Schwarz’s reverse index, Bloomfield’s concordance, and electronic texts wherever available. When we could not find enough examples there, we turned to the Brāhmaṇas, and then to the Sūtras. Of course, existence of an actual Vedic example for Pāṇini’s rule does not automatically mean his knowledge of the text in which it occurs. We do not have all the texts known to him, in the same form as in his days, and we do not know for sure the criteria by which he included certain forms or phenomena in his grammar.\(^3\) Instead of trying to judge Pāṇini’s knowledge of the Veda by just studying the sūtras of Aṣṭādhyāyī 8.2, we should rather try to accumulate evidence which will ultimately form a more complete picture when a similar effort is made on the rest of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. In the following sections, we will present sūtras which we think contribute to our topic, and Vedic examples for them.

\(^2\)Renou (1955:107f.) also points out the existence of non-Vedic rules which practically refer to Vedic.

\(^3\)Even in nipātana-rules where exceptional forms are listed, for example, it is often unclear why certain forms are listed. Ozono (2006), in his paper discussing the exceptional gerundive forms in the nipātana-sūtra Aṣṭ. 3.1.123, suggests the possibility that Pāṇini listed Vedic forms only because they have irregular accent.
2. Material
2.1 Rules of Aṣṭ. 8.2 labeled \( c^h \) andasi ‘in Sacred Literature’

2.1.1 Retention of stem-final /n/ before -vant-, -tama- and -tara-

The possessive taddhita suffixes -vant- and -mant-, together called matUP, are equivalent in meaning and alternate in a phonologically conditioned allomorphy (Macdonell §224:140, §235:142, Debrunner AiGr. II-2 §708:880ff.). Although -vant- is three times as common as -mant- in the Rgveda, the latter being limited to contexts such as after a rounded vowel, Pāṇini first groups them together as matUP, and then explains their distribution by defining the contexts of -vant- in Aṣṭ. 8.2.9–16. The last two of these sūtras, 15 and 16, have \( c^h \) andasi as their condition.

Aṣṭ. 8.2.15 \( c^h \) andasīrah (9 mator vah) “Dans le domaine du Veda (l’élément v est le substitut de m du suffixe -mant-) s’il y a un i (i) ou un r (à la fin du thème nominal).” (Renou 1966:371)

Except cakrīvat-, dād\( ^h \)ivant- and raśmivātī-, listed examples of the suffix -vant- attached to stems ending in i, ī, r and r are all attested from the Rgveda or the Khila onwards. For tāviśīvant- and raśivīnt-, the Rgveda already has -mant- forms, 5.58.1 tāviśīmantam and 10.36.10, 10.74.1 raśimānt- (cf. Debrunner AiGr. II-2 §708cc:880f.)

Examples:
-\( i-\)vant-, \( i-\)mant-: RV, TS aṅgivānt- from aṅni- m. ‘fire’ (accent on the suffix according to Aṣṭ. 6.1.176 hrasvanudbh\( ^b \)yāṁ matup) :: MS, KS, KapKS, ŚŚ aṅnimānt-. RV, Kh, SV, VS, TS, MS, KS, ŚŚ ādivānt- from ādī- m. ‘stone’. RV, SV arcivānt- from arcī- m. ‘radiance’ (accent: Aṣṭ. 6.1.176). RV 8.2.28 iśivānt- from iśi- m. ‘seer’. TS 7.2.1.3 cakrīvatī- from cakrī- f. ‘wheel’. RV 5.31.2, 5.44.7 jānivānt- from jāni- f. ‘woman’. RV tāviśīvant- from tāviśi- f. ‘power’ vs. RV 5.58.1 tāviśimānt-. ŚŚ 18.4.17 dād\( ^h \)ivant- from dād\( ^h \)i- n. ‘curds’. RV d\( ^h \)ivant- from d\( ^h \)i- f. ‘poetic insight’. RV 10.85.21 pāṭivātī- from pātī- m. ‘husband’. RV, VS, TS, MS, KS, KapKS, AV pātivānant- from pātīni- f. ‘wife’, RV 9.72.4 pūrandāvant- from pūrand\( ^h \)i- f. ‘gratification’. Kh, TS 1.5.4.3 bhāspatīvant-, MS 4.9.8, 9 bhāspatīvant- from bhāspāti- m. ‘Brhaspati’. Kh, MS, KS, KapKS b\( ^h \)āratīvant- from b\( ^h \)ārati- f. ‘Bhārati’. RV, AV, MS, VS, TS, SV

\(^{+}\)For the meaning of \( c^h \) andasi, see Thieme (1935:67f.) and Ozono (2006:1004). As to the question whether \( c^h \) andasi applies to the Śrautasūtras, see Hoffmann (1974:75= Aufsätze 543) and Bronkhorst (1991:82).

\(^{5}\)While -vant- has cognates in other Indo-European languages such as Greek, -mant- is an Indo-Iranian innovation (Debrunner, AiGr. II-2 §708b:880).

\(^{6}\)AB, ŚB asandivānt- (place name), AB, PB, TB, ŚB aṅśivānt- ‘knee’, KB, PB cakrīvant- ‘wheeled’, and RV+ kaksivānt- (p.n. with unclear etymology), which are also somewhat relevant to this sūtra, are separately treated in a nipātana-rule Aṣṭ. 8.2.12 asandivānt-aṅśiv-cakrīvant-kaksivānt-rumāṇeac-carmāṇeac, which is not limited to Vedic.

-svant-, -r-mant-, -r-vant-, -r-mant-: RV, Kh, SV, KS, KapKS aśīrvant- from aśīr- f. ‘soma juice mixed with milk’ vs. MS 4.7.1 aśīrmant-. RV, ŚŚ 3.16.3, PS 4.31.3, VSM 34.36 nrvānt- from nī- m. ‘man’ (accent: Asṭ. 6.1.176). RV, SV, MS, KS, AV svārvānt-, TS sūvarvant- from svār- n. ‘heaven’

Asṭ. 8.2.16 ano nūṭ (9 mator vah, 15 ch’ andasi) “A matUP which, in the Vedic, occurs after a nominal stem ending in an is augmented with nUT [nūṭ],” (Sharma 2003:511)

When the -vant- suffix is attached to an n-stem, the stem-final /n/ is first deleted by Asṭ. 8.2.7 nālopah prātipadikāntasya, and then the sound n, in the shape of the augment nūT, is re-introduced before matUP (-vant-), by the metarule Asṭ. 1.1.46 āgyantau ṭakītau. Of the actual forms in the Veda, eight are attested in the Rgveda, and the other four are first attested in the Black Yajurveda Saṃhitās, both in the mantra and in the brāhmaṇa sections.

Examples:

¹Since the Ab Ultimo index of Vishva Bandhu’s concordance gives a large number of stems ending in -vat/-vad, we looked up only the accented ones. Therefore, we may have left out important forms in unaccented Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa texts.

Asṭ. 8.2.17 nād gha asya (15 čandaśi, 16 nut) “That which is termed a gha, and occurs after that which ends in n, is augmented with nUT [nuT] in the Vedic.” (Sharma 2003:512)

In Vedic, the stem-final /n/ is also retained when the comparative and superlative suffixes taraP and tamaP (called gha according to Aṣṭ. 1.1.22 taraptamapau gha.) are attached (cf. Debrunner AiGr. II-2 §454a:606). All the examples of this rule in the Veda are first attested in the Rgveda, so it is rightly taught here as Vedic.

Examples:


2.1.2 Exceptional verbal adjectives in -ta-

In Aṣṭ. 8.2.61, Pāṇini lists irregular Vedic verbal adjectives that end in -ta- instead of -na-, which is expected according to Aṣṭ. 8.2.42 radāḥyāṁ niṣṭḥato naḥ pūrvasya ca daḥ “The t of a niṣṭḥā suffix which occurs after r and d is replaced with n, with an additional provision that d be also replaced with n” (Sharma 2003:546).

Aṣṭ. 8.2.61 nasatta-niṣattānutta-pratūrtā-sūrta-gūrtāni čandaśi (42 niṣṭḥātō naḥ, 57 na) “Dans le domaine du Veda les noms verbaux nasatta (sens?) niṣatta ‘assis’ anutta ‘invincible’ pratūrtā ‘rapide’ sūrta ‘lumineux’ gūrtā ‘approuvé’ (sont tout-faits avec non-substitution de n à t et autres irrégularités).” (Renou 1966:379f.)

niṣṭḥā- suffixes refer to Kta (-ta-) and KtavatU (-tavant-) according to Aṣṭ. 1.1.26 ktaktavatū niṣṭḥā.
Of the six forms nasatta-, niśatta-, anutta-, prātūrta-, sūrta- and gūrta-, all but the first occur in the Rgveda and Yajurveda Saṃhitās such as the Vājasaneyi-, Māitrāyaṇī, and Kaṭha-Saṃhitās. On the other hand, nasatta- as a word is not attested in Vedic literature, and if it is a verbal adjective as are the others, prefixing na- instead of a- is rather uncommon, although a few Sanskrit words are taught by Panini as having na- instead of a- in Asā. 6.3.75 nabhran-napān-... (73 naN). If we interpret this form to refer to two words, na satta-, that sequence occurs in the Kaṭha-Saṃhitā, in the same stanza in which sūrta- occurs.9

Examples:

‘nasatta-‘: nā sattā in *KS 18.1:265:8 asūrtā sūrite rājasī nā sattā yē b̄uhānī samākṛṣṇvann imānī “who created these living beings, placed in unilluminatedness as if in an illuminated space”. If we read na satta- as Knobl suggests (footnote 9), sattā- occurs in the following passages: RV 1.105.13, 14, 2.36.6, 3.41.2, 7.42.2, 7.56.18, KS 18.1:265:8, SS 20.23.2.

niśatta- ‘placed down’: RV, SV, VSM 18.53 (VSK 20.3.3), TS 2.6.12.4, 4.7.13.2, MS 2.12.3:146.13, 4.9.11:132.8, ŚB 9.4.4.5, TĀ 4.11.6 niśatta-; RV 1.146.1, 10.82.4 asūrte sūrte rājasī niśattē yē b̄uhānī samākṛṣṇvann imānī, VSM 17.28 (VSK 18.3.4), MS 2.10.3:134.7 niśattā- (accent!); KS 18.15:276.2, KapKS 28.2:140.16, 29.4:151.20, niśattaḥ. Cf. RV 5.60.1, MS 4.14.11:232.12 prasattāḥ (accent!); RV 5.15.1 gṛtā-prasattāḥ.

ánutta-: This form can be analyzed as á-nutta- ‘not pushed away’ or án-uttā- ‘not moistened’. But Panini provides that nud ‘push away’ and ud/und ‘moisten’ can make verbal adjective forms with -tā- as well as with -nā- in Asā. 8.2.56 nudavidondatṛāḥbhṛṭhī yo ’nyatarasyām, and it is strange that he mentions this form here again. ánutta- should be taken as ánu-tta- ‘conceded, given in’, a verbal adjective form of the verb dā ‘give’, attested in RV, SV, (RV 1.165.9a ~) VSM 33.79 (VSK 32.6.10), MS 4.11.3:169.7, KS 9.18:122.5 (given under á-nutta- in Vishva Bandhu’s index).

prātūrta- ‘conquered’: VSM 11.12 (VSK 12.2.1), TS 4.1.2.1, 5.1.2.1, MS

---

9Citation across a word boundary is not unknown in grammatical literature: Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya 3.83, for example, treats the sequence yāsi sat- in VSM 33.27 yāsi satpate as if it were one word.

Another possible interpretation of nasatta-, suggested to me by Werner Knobl (p.c.), is to take it as na satta-, where na negates the substitution of -na- for the suffix -ta- taught in Asā. 8.2.42 radābhāyām niśbhātō naḥ ... -na- substitution taught in Asā. 8.2.42 is once negated in 8.2.57 na d̄ya-k̄ya-pīr-mārečhi-madām, but since three nipātāna-rules coming after it make the negation ambiguous, it is possible that na is stated here once again to make clear that -na- substitution does not take place in the listed forms. According to this interpretation, sattā-, a verbal adjective of sad ‘sit’ attested almost only in the Rgveda and a form highly characteristic of it, is aptly included here in the list of exceptional -ta-forms, and all the forms except prātūrta-, which occurs in the Yajurveda Saṃhitās first, are attested in the Rgveda. In this paper, I followed the traditional interpretation, for I could not find enough sūtras (e.g. Asā. 6.2.91 and 101) supporting the collocation of na with a nominative form.
2.7.2:74.19, KS 16.1:221.8, 19.2:2.5 prātūrtam.

sūrta- ‘sunny’: RV 10.82.4, VSM 17.28 (VSK 18.3.4), MS 2.10.3.134.7, KapKS 28.2:140.16 sūrte in the same verse as niṣattē. KS 18.1:265.8 sūrte in the same verse as na sattā, gūrtā- ‘accepted respectfully’: RV, SŚ gūrtā-. VSM 25.37 (VSK 27.1.41), TS 4.6.9.2, abhigūrtam. Compounds not exhausted.

2.1.3 Sandhi of final /s/ and /r/

In Pāṇini’s sandhi system, an underlying pada-final /s/ first undergoes wholesale replacement by an intermediate sound element rU (/r/), which surfaces as h, s, s. etc. depending on the following sound. An underlying final /r/ is different from a final /s/ in that it remains /r/ in such contexts as /-a_V-/; in some words, such persistent /r/ is labeled rA (or simply r) instead of rU. The final sound of the three words listed in Aṣṭ. 8.2.70 is treated both as rA and rU in Vedic according to Pāṇini.

Aṣṭ. 8.2.70 amnār-ūdhar-avar ity ubh ayat śv āndasi (8.1.16 padasya, 66 ruh., 69 rah.) “The final sound segment of a pada in the Vedic, particularly one constituted by amnas ‘...’, udhas ‘...’, and avas ‘...’, is replaced either way (ubhayathā), with rA or rU.” (Sharma 2003:568f.)

Actual examples of /amnas V-/ appearing as amnār V- are first attested in the Āpastamba Śrautasūtra, a Śrautasūtra ascribed to the Taittiriya school of the Black Yajurveda. The stem ūdhar undergoes sandhi like that of an s-stem in the Ṛgveda, the Maitrāyaṇī Śaṁhitā and the Kaṭha-Saṁhitā, and avār shows both types once each in the Ṛgveda. Pāṇini probably knew RV 1.133.6 and the Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra, or rather, some Śaṁhitā text on which the latter is based.

Examples:

amnās ‘just now’ (Wackernagel, AiGr. I §285bγ:339): MS 1.6.10:102.8 amnā e-, KS 6.5:54.4 a/mnas s-, KS 8.8:92.11 amno ‘-, MS 1.10.10:150.12 ‘mṇḍo j-, KS 36.5:72.7, KapKS 4.4:49.2 amnah s-, 7.3 amno ‘-, SŚ 8.6.19 amnō j- :: *ApSS 6.4.6 amnār astamite hotavym, 6.6.5 amnār adhīśritam vā. ūdhar ‘udder’: RV4 ūdhr V-/C[voiced]*, MS 3.10.4:134.1 ūdhr kʰ-, KS 7.5:67.10 ūdhr e-, etc. :: RV 26 ūdh ar V-/C[voiced]*, MS 2.1.8:90.2 ūdh ar a-e etc.

avār ‘down’ (Wackernagel, AiGr. I §284a:335): RV 1.163.6 avār divā (Padapāthā avāḥ) =TS 4.6.7.2-3, VSM 29.17 (VSK31.3.6), KS Aśv. 6.3:175.15 :: *RV 1.133.6 avār mahā indra ādṛṭhi (Padapāṭha avāḥ)

Aṣṭ. 8.2.71 bhuvas ca mahāvyāhṛteḥ (8.1.16 padasya, 70 ubh ayat śv āndasi)10 aThe final sound segment of bhuras is replaced with rU,
or \( rA \), in the Vedic, when \( bhuvas \) denotes \( mahāvyāhṛtī ‘...’." \( \text{(Sharma 2003:570)} \)

This sūtra, to which the provision \( \text{\textit{c\textbf{h}andasi}} \) is carried over, addresses the final sandhi of the second word of the Mahāvyāhṛtī, namely \( bhūvah \) of the mantra \( bhū\text{ār} bhūvah svāh \) (Taitt. \( sivāh \)) etc. For \( bhūvah \), sandhi of the \( s \)-stem type is attested in the Maitrāyanī Śaṃhitā, the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa and the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, while \( bhuvah \) with -\( r \) is found only in the Kaṭha-Śaṃhitā. As far as the extant Vedic texts are concerned, it is highly possible that Pāṇini knew the Kaṭha-Śaṃhitā passages.

Examples: \( bhuvah \):
\( ∗KS 6.7:56.9 \), 8.4:87.13, 22.8:65.8 \( bhuvah \) iti, 7.13.75.6 \( bhū\text{ār} bhūvah \) áṅgirasām :: TB 1.1.5.2 \( bhū\text{ā} ity āha, SB 2.1.4.14 sa vai bhū\text{ār} bhūvah iti, MS 1.6.1:86.7 bhū\text{ār} bhūvah áṅgirasām, KapKS 35.2:208.29 bhūvah iti.

2.2 Rules which are not labeled \( \text{\textit{c\textbf{h}andasi}} \) but are relevant to Vedic texts

2.2.1 \textit{udanvánt-} ‘sea’ or ‘river’

In 2.1.1, we discussed the section from Āṣṭ. 8.2.9 to 16 where the suffix -\textit{vant-} is exceptionally used instead of -\textit{mant-}. The following sūtra, which is not limited to Vedic, also occurs in that section.

\( Aṣṭ. 8.2.13 \) udanvān udād\( \text{ā} \)u ca (9 mator vaḥ) “Le mot udanvān (N. sg.) est également (tout-formé) au sens de: océan.” \( \text{(Renou 1966:370)} \)

According to this rule, the exceptional form \( \text{\textit{udanvánt-}} \) m. is used when it refers to udād\( \text{ā} \)i-, which means not only ‘sea’ as Renou translates, but also ‘river’.\footnote{\text{Words like } samudr\( \text{ā} \)- do not necessarily mean ‘sea’ but also ‘river’, cf. Klaus (1989). As Pāṇini is a native of Salātura, which is in the upper Indus valley and is more than a thousand kilometers from the sea, it is possible that udād\( \text{ā} \)- rather meant ‘river’ than ‘sea’ to him. Böhtlingk (1887:440), Katre (1987:992) and Sharma (2003:309) also take this word as ‘sea, ocean’.

\( \text{As } Pāṇini \text{ is a native of Salātura, which is in the upper Indus valley and is more than a thousand kilometers from the sea, it is possible that } udād\( \text{ā} \)- \text{rather meant ‘river’ than ‘sea’ to him. Böhtlingk (1887:440), Katre (1987:992) and Sharma (2003:309) also take this word as ‘sea, ocean’.)} \)

Examples:
\( \text{udanvānt-:} \) RV 5.83.7, TS 3.1.11.6, KS 11.13:160.20 udanvātā rā\text{ā}thena; \( \text{ŚBK 2.6.3.11} \) udanvātā kaṁsēna vā camasēna vāmyṇumayena/a; MS 4.1.3:5.16, KS 31.2.3.17, KapKS 47.2 ∼ TB 3.2.3.12 (havyām) udanvāt; MS 3.8.8:106.14, KS 25.9:116.17, KapKS 40.2:230.24 udanvāntah (prānāh); \( \text{JB 3.239} \) kat\( \text{ā} \)odanvāh/ paṇāyasi.
2.2.2 kṣitā-, śīnā- and aknā-

The sūtras Asṭ. 8.2.42 to 61 treat the allomorphy of the verbal adjectives in -tā-, which is replaced by -nā- and other suffixes (Debrunner, AiGr. II-2 §423:553). Pāṇini first gives phonological conditions in 42 and 43, then lexicographical conditions in 44 and 45, referring respectively to the Dhātupātha and to the marker o- of the root; then he teaches idiosyncratic forms word by word from 46 onward.

Asṭ. 8.2.46 kṣiyo dīrgḅāt (42 nisṭḅāto nah.) “(L’élément n est le substitut du t du suffixe -ta- -tavant-) après la racine kṣi- “périr” ayant la voyelle longue (…)” (Renou 1966:377)

This sūtra only teaches that the root kṣi (EWAia KṢAY3 ‘waste away’), when the vowel i is long, takes the suffix -na- and forms a verbal adjective kṣinā-. According to Asṭ. 6.4.60 nisṭḅāyām anyad-arth, the final short vowel of kṣi is replaced by its long counterpart when followed by the nisṭā suffixes -ta- and -tavant- used in a sense other than that of ṆyaT; namely karman ‘object’ or ḅāva ‘act’ according to Asṭ. 3.4.70; in other words, lengthening takes place only when the resulting form refers to an agent. Then according to Asṭ. 6.4.61 vākrośadainyayoh, lengthening of the root vowel i is optional when ākroṣa- ‘reviling’ or dainya- ‘pitiable state’ is denoted. Thus we get another verbal adjective form kṣitā-, which should have these meanings according to Pāṇini. The following are the Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇa passages where kṣinā- and kṣitā- occur.

Examples:
ŚB 2.4.2.7 (ŚBK 1.3.3.7) kṣinā-. ŚS 10.3.15 prākṣiṇa-. :: RV+ ākṣita-..

kṣinā- in the Šatapatha-Brāhmaṇa refers to the invisible state of a new moon, and prākṣiṇa- in the Śaunaka-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda to trees which have fallen down due to wind, and in neither case does it seem to involve ‘reviling’ or ‘pitiable state’. On the other hand, the passages where kṣitā- (kṣita-) occurs, namely, TS 6.5.10.1–2 yāṭḅā pitā putrāṁ kṣitā upadhāvati ... yāṭḅā putrāḥ pitāraṁ kṣitā upadñava "as when a father in destitution has recourse to his son" ... “as when a son in destitution has recourse to his father” (Keith 1914:545), MS 4.8.9:117:16 yāṭḅā pitā putrāṁ kṣitā upadñava "as a forworn father has recourse to [his] sons", and 118.1-2 yāṭḅā putrāḥ pitāraṁ kṣitā [sic] upadñavanty, refer to an unarguably miserable state. Here Pāṇini’s distinction between kṣitā- and kṣinā- agrees with
the actual difference found in Vedic, although this sūtra is not marked as Vedic.

Aṣṭ. 8.2.47 śya 'sparśe (42 niṣṭḥāto naḥ) “The t of a niṣṭḥā suffix which occurs after verbal root śyaiN ‘to be coagulated’ is replaced with n, provided sparśa ‘touch’ is not the signification.” (Sharma 2003:551)

This sūtra derives the verbal adjective śinā- if the sense of touch is not referred to. For root śyā (EWAia ‘gefrieren, gerinnen, erstarren’), Pāṇini gives two meanings, ‘coagulation’ and ‘touch’ in Aṣṭ. 6.1.24 dravamūrti-sparśayoh śyāh. In Vedic Saṁhitās, sītā- in the Rgveda and the Taittiriya-Saṁhitā means ‘cold’ or ‘coldness’. śinā-, which is used in the formula niḥārām uṣmāṇā śināṃ vāsāyā in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā and the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā, seems to mean not ‘cold’ but ‘ice’, because śinā- and vāsa- ‘fat’ here must have similarity in their appearance as the parallel pair niḥārā- ‘haze’ and uṣmān- ‘vapor’ do. Since ‘coldness’ belongs to the sense of touch (sparśa-) while ‘ice’ does not, Pāṇini’s description agrees with the actual usage in Vedic.

Examples:
sītā-: RV+. RV 10.34.9 sītāḥ ‘kalt’ (Geldner), TS 6.2.2.7 nir hy āgniḥ sītēṇa vāyati “for fire goes out through [the contact with] cold” (Knobl) :: VSM 25.9 (VSK 27.9.1), MS 3.15.8:180.1–2 niḥārām uṣmāṇā śināṃ vāsāyā “haze with vapor, ice with fat”.

Aṣṭ. 8.2.48 aṅco ‘napādāne (42 niṣṭḥāto naḥ) “(L’élément n est le substitut du t du suffixe -ta- -tavant-) après la racine aṅc- “courber”, quand il n’y a pas notion ablative.” (Renou 1966:377)

The actual examples of aknā-, the verbal adjective of aṅc ‘bend’ are attested in the Katha-Saṁhitā and the Taittiriya-Brāhmaṇa, while aktā- formed from aṅc ‘scoop’ (EWAia AṅC2 ‘[Wasser] schöpfen’) occurs in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. Here, too, Pāṇini’s rule, although it is not labeled cḥ andasi, agrees with Vedic usage.

Examples:
KS 29.9:179.1–2 Ms. nyaknās (emended as nyaknās by Schroeder), and ŚBK 4.2.1.3 sāmaknāṅgulih, with unexpected retroflexion of /n/.12 TB 1.6.4.2 nyāknaḥ. Cf. VSM 10.19 (VSK 11.6.4), ŚB 5.4.2.5 (ŚBK 7.3.2.5) uḍaktāḥ ‘die herausgeschöpften [Wasser]’ (Hoffmann 1965[=Aufsätze 163]). Not exhaustive.

---

12 According to Caland’s critical apparatus to the latter, two manuscripts have the reading sāmaknā- with dental n.
2.2.3 Adjective \( \text{ṛṇa} - \) ‘indebted’

Aṣṭ. 8.2.60 \( \text{ṛṇam ad}^\text{ḥ} \text{amarṇya} \) “The word \( \text{ṛṇa} \) is derived, via \( \text{nipātaḥ} \), when \( \text{adhamarṇya} \) ‘state of being in debt’ is signified.”\(^{13}\) (Sharma 2003:560)

Bohtlingk, Renou and Katre seem to take this sūtra as simply teaching the noun \( \text{ṛṇa} - \) ‘debt’.\(^{14}\) However, the fact that \( \text{ṛṇa} - \) is treated as a \( \text{nisṭaḥ} \) form which can function as a verbal adjective referring to the past action (cf. Aṣṭ. 3.2.102 \( \text{nisṭaḥ} \) \( [84 \text{ bḥūte}] \)), and that the meaning is given not as a concrete noun for ‘debt’ but as an abstract noun \( \text{ad}^\text{ḥ} \text{amarṇya} - \) ‘the state of being a debtor’, which is formed from a unique compound \( \text{ad}^\text{ḥ} \text{ama-ṛṇa} - \) ‘debtor’ (vs. \( \text{uttama-ṛṇa} - \) ‘creditor’), makes us suspect that Pāṇini was conscious of the adjectival origin of this word.

The word \( \text{ṛṇa}- \), which is usually a neuter noun meaning ‘debt’, can be taken as an adjective in one of its oldest examples, in RV 6.12.5 cited below. This sūtra suggests that Pāṇini was aware of the adjective origin of this word, or possibly, Pāṇini had this very passage in mind when he made this sūtra.

Examples:
\( \text{ṛṇa}- \): RV+ n. ‘debt’, but RV 6.12.5 \( \text{ṛṇó nā tāyūr} \) m.sg.adj. ‘Wie ein Schuldner, der zum Dieb wird’ (Geldner).\(^{15}\)

2.2.4 Sandhi of the final \( \text{s} \) of \( \text{naś} \)

Generally speaking, /\( \text{s} \)/ and /\( \text{j} \)/ from the Proto-Indo-Iranian primary palatals *\( \text{c} \) and *\( \text{j} \) surface as a retroflex stop /\( \text{ṭ} \text{–d} \)/ in Sanskrit (Wackernagel, AiGr. I §149a:173f, §156:180). However, they end up as velar in a few words either by archaism or by dissimilation to a preceding /\( \text{ṛ} \)/, e.g. \( \text{ṛtv-ṛj-} \), \( \text{dṛś-} \) and \( \text{(-)dṛś-} \), and Pāṇini marks such words by suffixing \( \text{KṛIN} \) (Aṣṭ. 3.2.58 to 60), which is then replaced with a velar stop by Aṣṭ. 8.2.62 \( \text{kvinpratyaśya} \) \( \text{kuḥ} \).

According to Aṣṭ. 3.2.58 to 60, the suffix \( \text{KṛIN} \) is attached to nominal stems ending in \( \text{sprs} \) - (root noun of \( \text{spars/sprś} \) ‘touch’), \( \text{dṛś} \) - (root noun of \( \text{dars/dṛś} \) ‘look’), \( \text{sṛṣ} \) - f. ‘wreath’, \( \text{dīś} \) - f. ‘direction’, \( \text{ṛtvṛj} \) - m. ‘priest’, \( \text{dadṛṣ-} \) ‘firm, confident’, \( \text{uṣṇḥ} \) - f. (a kind of meter), \( \text{-aṅc} \) - (suffix of direction attributed to \( \text{aṅc} \) ‘bend’), \( \text{kruṇc} \) - m. ‘crane’ (attributed to \( \text{kruṇc} \) ‘be crooked’, Dhātupāṭha 1.201), \( \text{yuj} \) - (root noun of \( \text{yoj/yuṣ} \) ‘yoke’). The suffix \( \text{KṛIN} \) itself is deleted by Aṣṭ. 6.1.67 \( \text{ver apṛktasya} \), but operations related

\(^{13}\)In the light of Kāśikā-Vṛtti \( \text{ad}^\text{ḥ} \text{amarṇya-viśaye} \), it might be better to translate it as ‘when a debtor is involved’. I thank George Cardona for the reference.


\(^{15}\)Knobl (p.c.) pointed out to me that any neutre noun can be used adjectivally by ‘motion’.
to this suffix are still valid by the power of the paribhāṣā rule Aṣṭ. 1.1.62 pratyayaloke pratyayalakṣaṇam, and a corresponding velar sound replaces the final sound by Aṣṭ. 8.2.62 cited above. In the case of the verbal root naś ‘perish’, the /s/ can end up either as k or t.

Aṣṭ. 8.2.63 naśer vā (8.1.16 padasya, 62 kuh) “(La gutturale est le substitut) optionnel (de la consonne finale) de la racine naś- “périr” (à la fin d’un mot).” (Renou 1966:380)

The Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā has a root noun jīva-nāṭ, which is also given as an example in the Kaśikā Vyākaraṇa. Neither MS jīva-nāṭ nor RV, VS prāṇak is ungrammatical because of vā ‘optionally’. Although this is not a Vedic rule and we cannot be absolutely sure, Pāṇini might have phrased vā deliberately, knowing both the MS and the RV/VS forms.

Examples:

2.2.5 Exceptional rU substitution for primary palatal stems

Aṣṭ. 8.2.67 lists three exceptional stems whose final sounds, all from Proto-Indo-Iranian primary palatals, become h via /rU/.

Aṣṭ. 8.2.67 avayāḥ śvetavāḥ puroḍāṣ ca (8.1.16 padasya, 66 ruh) “Les Nomin. avayāḥ (...) śvetavāḥ (...) puroḍāṣ (...) (sont) aussi (tout-fois avec “ru” comme substitut de la consonne finale).” (Renou 1966:381)

Of these three words, avayāḥ- (in the form avayāḥ) and puroḍāṣ- are amply attested in Vedic texts from the R̄gveda on, whereas śvetavah- is not attested anywhere in the Vedic literature. Although this sūtra is not labeled Vedic, the same words and uktʰaśas- are given in Aṣṭ. 3.2.71 mantrे śvetavahokhᵗʰaśaspurodāṣo yin and 72 ave yajah as Vedic Mantra words, and so śvetavah- must have occured in some lost Vedic text Pāṇini knew.

Examples:
avayā-, or rather ava-yā- ‘deprecation’ from yā ‘entreat’ (EWAia. YĀ² ‘bitten, anflehen’): RV 1.173.12, VSM 3.46 (K 3.5.3), MS 1.10.2:141.12, 13, KS 9.4:107.11, 35.12:59.4, KapKS 8.7:101.3, ŚB 2.5.2.28 (K1.5.1.25) avayāḥ. TS 1.8.3.1, 3.2.8.3, MS 2.3.8:36.17, KS 9.4:107.12, KapKS 8.7:101.3, SS 2.35.1, PS 1.88.3 avayā[h]/ ‘expiation’ (Whitney, Keith).
śvetavah-: Not attested in Vedic.
puroḍāṣ-, -lāṣ- ‘sacrificial pancake’: RV 3.28.2, 7.18.6 purolāḥ etc.
Pluti (proloration) is sporadically found in the Vedic literature, most typically as a marker of a yes-no or alternative question, such as TS 2.6.5.6 āgāžn agnīd “Has he gone, O Agnīdh?” (Keith 1914:211), or MS 1.8.7:125.13 hotavyāžn ná hotavyāžm iti māṁsante “The theologians consider, ‘Should the offering be made, or should it not be?’”.

Aṣṭ. 8.2 has a relatively large section of twenty-seven sūtras from Aṣṭ. 8.2.82 to the end of 8.2, which describe the triggering contexts of pluti. Since none of them are provided as Vedic and some treat discourse contexts as in daily transactions, it is difficult to identify which Vedic passage Pāṇini had or did not have in mind when he composed these rules, except the sūtras from 88 to 92, which are related to specific ritual contexts.

Aṣṭ. 8.2.88 ye yajñakarmaṇi “La voyelle du pronom ye (reçoit la pluti et le ton aigu) au commencement d’un texte sacré.” (Renou 1966:385)

According to the explanation in ĀśŚS 1.5.5.4 to 1.5.5.20, the Hotr priest recites a Yājyā hymn whose last syllable is prolated, preceded by an āgur call which is ‘ye3 yajāmahe’, and followed by a vāṣat call which is ‘vau3sāt’. Pāṇini’s sūtras Aṣṭ. 8.2.88, 90, and part of 91 address these three kinds of pluti in the same order, and it is quite likely that Pāṇini knew this part of the ritual.

In the Saṃhitā texts, the Padapāṭha of the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā has prolated ye3 according to Schroeder’s footnote.

Examples:
MS 1.4.11:59 (Padapāṭha) ye3 yajāmahe (Strunk 1983:36). ĀśŚŚ 1.5.5 ye3 yajāmahe ity āgur vāṣatākaro ‘ntyah sarvatra, 1.5.15.

Aṣṭ. 8.2.89 pranavas teḥ “La particule om (avec pluti et ton selon 87) est substitut de la dernière voyelle (avec la consonne éventuellement subséquente, dans un texte récité au cours d’une action sacrificielle).” (Renou 1966:385)

According to this sūtra, the rhyme of the last syllable of a ritual utterance is replaced by o3m. This may be a common practice in the ritual context, but as far as the textual evidence is concerned, the Śatapatha and the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇas, and the Āpastamba Śrautasūtra, actually give such reading.

Examples:
subrahmanyāṃ: ŚB 3.3.4.17 (ŚBK 4.3.4.13) subrahmanyो3म subrahmanyो3म iti (Strunk 1983:34), TĀ 1.12.3, JB 2.783, 2.79. ĀpŚŚ 2.15.3 śrāvayom. Single replacement of the final vowel by om is provided for by Aṣṭ. 6.1.95 omāṇioṣ ca.
Asṭ. 8.2.90  yājyāntah “La dernière voyelle d’une formule dite yājyā (‘adorande’) (reçoit la pluti et le ton aigu, au cours d’une action sacrificielle).” (Renou 1966:385)

Since the Yājyā hymns are recited by Hotṛ priests, the Āśvalāyana Śrutasūtra of the Rgveda school to which they belong, has an explanation and an actual example of such prolation.

Examples:

*ĀśSS 1.5.8 yājyāntam ca (7 plāvayet), with an actual example in ĀśSS 1.5.15.

Asṭ. 8.2.91  brūhi-presya-śrausad-vausad-āvahānām ādeḥ “La première voyelle des expressions brūhi ‘dis’ presya ‘invite’ śrausaṭ “qu’il entende” vausat “qu’il conduise” āvaha ‘amène’ (reçoit la pluti et le ton aigu, au cours d’une action sacrificielle).” (Renou 1966:385)

Pluti occurs in the initial syllable of the listed ritual calls. Although présya and āvaha are not attested with pluti, the other three calls occur with pluti in the Padapāṭha of the Maitrāyaṇi Śaṅhitā, and the Āśvalāyana- and the Āpastamba-Śrutasūtras.

Examples:

brūhi: MS 1.4.11:59 (Padapāṭha) ānu brū3hi (Strunk 1983:36).
śrausaṭ: MS 1.4.11:59 (Padapāṭha), ĀśSS 1.4.13 śrausṣaṭ, ĀpŚŚ 3.7.9 śrauṣṣad ity āgniḍ raḥ.
vausat: MS 1.4.11:59 (Padapāṭha), ĀśSS 1.5.15 vausṣaṭ.

Asṭ. 8.2.92  agnīl-preṣaṇe paraṣya ca “In einer an den Agnīdh gerichteten Aufforderung ist auch die nachfolgende Silbe pluta.” (Böhtlingk 1887:450) “(La première voyelle) ainsi que la suivante (reçoivent la pluti et le ton aigu) dans l’invite à l’officiant agnīdh (au cours d’une action sacrificielle).” (Renou 1966:386)

In this sūtra, the first and the second syllables undergo pluti in ritual instructions regarding an Agnīdh priest. The expression agnīl-preṣaṇe can mean both ‘in an instruction to an Agnīdh’ and ‘in an instruction by an Agnīdh’. In Vedic ritual, an Agnīdh priest plays a role auxiliary to an Adhvaryu, who performs major ritual acts, and it is rather rare that the former verbally instructs someone. One of the utterances of an Agnīdh found in the Śrutasūtras is astu śrausaḍ, which he says in reply to the Adhvaryu when they request a Hotṛ priest to recite a Yājyā hymn; however, śrausaḍ is already treated in the last sūtra Asṭ. 8.2.91. Another phrase, ā śrāvaya ..., which the Kāśikā Vṛtti also cites, is more relevant to our context, and Rudradatta’s commentary on the Āpastamba Śrutasūtra actually teaches
pluti of the first and second syllables of it. This phrase is not uttered by an Agnīdh but uttered to an Agnīdh by an Adhvaryu.\textsuperscript{16} Therefore, the expression *agnīt-presanā* in this sūtra must be understood as ‘the instruction to an Agnīdh’ as Böhtlingk, Renou and Katre translate and not as ‘the instruction by an Agnīdh’.

Examples:

\begin{itemize}
  \item `astu śrausad`: TS 1.6.11.1 (Adhvaryu:) ā śrāvayēti cāturakṣaram (Agnīdh:) āstuvṛāsaḥ iti cāturakṣaraṁ (Adhvaryu:) yājēti dvaṅkṣaraṁ (Hotr;) yē yājāmaḥ iti pāṅcākṣaraṁ dvaṅkṣaraō (Hotr;) vaṣaṅkārāḥ. See Vedic Concordance s.v. astu śrāṣaṭ for more occurrences in the Samhitās. ĀŚŚ 1.4.13 pratyāśravayed āgniḍa-ra utkaraḍeṇa tiṣṭan spṛyam idaṃ masamnahanānity ādāya daksināmuḥ a iti śāṭyayanakam/ astu śrāvaṣaḥ ity aukāraṁ pāvayan. KāŚŚ 3.2.4 āstuvṛāsaḥ ity āgniḍ. ĀpŚŚ 2.15.4 āstuvṛāsaḥ ity āgniḍa-raḥ ... ĀpŚŚ 3.7.9 agān āgniḍ ity adhavṛyaḥ aha/ agān ity āgniḍa-raḥ/ śrāvayet adhavṛyaḥ/ śrāvaṣaḥ ity āgniḍa-raḥ.
  \item `ā śrāvaya`: VSM 19.24, TS 1.6.11.1–4 (Darṣāputramāsa), 3.3.7.2–3 (Soma), KS 31.13:15.13. \textsuperscript{⋆} ĀpŚŚ 2.15.3 brahmaṇ pravarāyāśravayisyāmiiti brahmānaṃ āmantrāyāśravyaya śrāvaya śrāvayom āśravayeti vāśravayati, with comm. atra tvatiyō nigadas tryākṣaraś caturḍaḥ praṇavādiḥ// teṣu cādyayor āgniḍipreṣaṇe parasyā ceti prathamadvatīyāv acau plavete nāṇyatra/.
\end{itemize}

Cf. RPr. 7.32 śrāvaya yavaya ... adyakṣaram plutaṁ teṣām.

\subsection{2.3 Non-Vedic rules of which counterexamples are found in Vedic}

\subsubsection{2.3.1 Final sandhi of *upānah*- ‘sandal’}

The /h/ of the root *nah* ‘bind’ is replaced by /dʰ/ when it is word-final (cf. Wackernagel, AiGr. I 149bc:175).

\begin{quote}
Asṭ. 8.2.34 naho dʰaḥ (26 folio, 29 ante ca, 31 hah, 32 dʰatoh)
\textquotedblleft L'élément *dh* (est le substitut du h) de la racine *nah*– courtre\textquotedblright
\textquotedblleft (devant un suffixe [primaire commençant par une consonne autre que semi-voyelle et nasale; ainsi qu’en] fin de mot).\textquotedblright \ (Renou 1966:374)
\end{quote}

Against this rule, the final /h/ of the root-noun *upānah* f. ‘sandal’ ends up as *d* instead of *d* before the dual ablative ending -bʰyāṁ, which is a pada-form, in ŚBM 5.5.3.7.

Examples:

\begin{itemize}
  \item ![ŚBM 5.5.3.7 (=ŚBK 7.5.2.8) upānāḍbʰyāṁ āḍi.]
\end{itemize}

2.3.2 Final sandhi of áhar ‘day’

In 2.1.3 above, we mentioned that a pada-final /s/ is replaced by rU, but an underlying /r/ is marked rA in Pāṇini’s sandhi system. The following rules state that in the declension of the heteroclitic stem áhar/āhan-, áhar appears in the nominative and accusative singular.

Asṭ. 8.2.68 ahan (66 ruḥ). “(L’élément “ru” est le substitut du n final) du mot ahan “jour” (...).” (Renou 1966:381)

Asṭ. 8.2.69 ro ’supi (68 ahan). “L’élément r (est le substitut du n final du mot ahan) quand il n’y a pas de désinence casuelle (...).” (Renou 1966:381)

This concise description usually holds true for the final sandhi of áhar-/āhan- in Vedic as well, but the Rgveda has one form which the latter rule fails to cover (see §3 for further discussion).

Examples:
RV 3.48.2 áhar asya, 6.9.1 áhar árjunam, 7.66.11 áhar yajñām :: !RV 6.48.17 áha evá (Padapāṭha áhar iti/ evá/).

2.3.3 Sandhi of prolated e and o

When e and o undergo pluti (for which see §2.2.6), they revert to the original diphthongs and become a3i and a3u with the nucleus /a/ prolated, according to Asṭ. 8.2.107 eco ‘pragrhyasyādārād-dūte pūrvasyārdāsyād uttarasyedutau “... the first half of eC [=/e/, /o/, /ai/ and /au/] is replaced with a pluta vowel, namely a, and the second half is replaced with i or u, provided the context does not relate to calling out at a distance and eC is not a vowel termed praghya” (Sharma 2003:599f.). The next sūtra states that when a vowel follows a3i and a3u, i and u of them become corresponding glides y and v respectively, e.g. TS 6.6.2.3 yajñāpatādv iti.

Asṭ. 8.2.108 tagor yvāv aci samhitāyām “Les éléments y et v sont les substituts respectifs desdites (voyelles i et u) devant une voyelle (du mot suivant) en phrase continue.” (Renou 1966:389)

In Vārttika 2 yan-ādeśah pluta-pūrvasya ca “Substitution by y, v, r and l occurs [respectively to word-final i, u, r and l followed by a vowel] when they are preceded by a prolated vowel as well” to Asṭ. 6.1.77 iko yan aci, Kātyāyana tries to confirm that the sandhi /i/ → y / __V applies to the i and u of /a3i/ and /a3u/ in spite of Asṭ. 6.1.101 aḥah savarṇe dīrgah which

17Cf. Sāyaṇa’s commentary on c mōtā sāro dha evā: ‘ata’ api ca, ‘sūrah’ prerakah sattruh, ‘evā’ evam, ‘mā’ ‘ahah’ asmān mā hārsīt, where he takes aḥa as an aorist form of the verb har ‘take’.
provides single substitution of homogeneous final and initial vowels by their long counterpart, and Patañjali gives examples such as āgnā3y indram. If Pāṇini had the same idea, the following passages, again from the Taittirīya School, do not agree with his teaching:

Examples:
!TS 6.5.8.4 āgnā3ū āhyā voc.sg., instead of āgna3y āhyā. !TB 2.3.6.1 prajāpatih prajāh srṣṭā vy asraṃsata. sā hṛdayaṃ bātyo śayat. ātman hā3 āhyā āhyayat. āpah praty aṣṭīvan.

2.4 Non-Vedic rules which are irrelevant in Vedic

In the preceding sections, we discussed sūtras which are pertinent to the actual Vedic usage, if not intended exclusively for Vedic. Unlike the Prātiśākhyaśyas which are intended for the sacred texts of their schools, Pāṇini’s grammar treats the living language and often covers colloquial usage, and as such, it naturally contains descriptions which have nothing to do with Vedic, or of which examples are nowhere to be found in the Vedic literature. The following are some of such sūtras found in Āṣṭ. 8.2.

Āṣṭ. 8.2.14 rājanvān saurājye “Le mot rājanvan (N. sg.) (est tout-formé) quand il s’agit d’un bon gouvernement (…)” (Renou 1966:370). Vedic examples of rājanvant- simply mean ‘containing the word rājan-’ and the meaning ‘good reign’ is not attested: JB 3.330 rājanvaj janad-vad virāṣāryayac caturtāsyāhno rūpam, PB 10.6.4 rājanvaj janadvadevat sūryayad virāṇanudodavac caturtāsyāhno rūpam.

Āṣṭ. 8.2.20 gro yañi “(L’élément l est le substitut du r) de la racine gṛ- “avaler” devant l’affixe -ya- d’intensif” (Renou 1966:372). Āṣṭ. 8.2.21 aci nibāśā “… devant un affixe commençant par une voyelle” (Renou). Āṣṭ. 8.2.22 pareś ca gṛāṁkayoh “(L’élément l est) aussi (le substitut du r) du prēverbe pari devant l’élément gha et le mot arika “courbe” ” (Renou).

The small subsection from Āṣṭ. 8.2.18 to 22 treats verbal forms and preverbs in which /r/ is replaced by /l/. While paly-ay ‘walk around’ (KS, KapKS+) and paḷāy ‘flee’ (TS+) taught in Āṣṭ. 8.2.19 upasargaṣya ayaṭāu are attested from the Black Yajurveda Saṃhitās on,18 no actual forms for these three sūtras are found in Vedic.

Āṣṭ. 8.2.74 sipi ḍoḥo rur vā, 8.2.75 daś ca “where the ending in question is siP, R and d optionally replace not only -s but also -d of a verb” (Cardona 1997a:353). In Āṣṭ. 8.2.73 tipy an-asteh (8.1.16 padasya, 66 sa-sajusah, 72 daḥ), root-final /s/ becomes /d/ (>t/) if it is word-final and the form is in the third person singular, probably to make clear the distinction between the second and third person singular in paradigms such as the root aorist. For this rule, there are Vedic examples such as asrat (VS etc.) to sraṃs ‘fall apart’ or aḍh at (VS etc.) to gṛḥ as ‘eat’ (Whitney, Gr. §555a,

18See Witzel (1990:40ff).

Insofar as our limited research is concerned, the functions of pluti described in the sūtras from As. 8.2.94 niṃryāṇuyoge ca to 8.2.106 plutāv aica idutau are not confirmed in the actual Vedic literature, except 8.2.100 anudāttam prauṇāntānābhipūjityogah “(La dernière voyelle d’une phrase) au terme d’une interrogation ou d’un énoncé laudatif (reçoit la pluti, mais) avec ton grave” (Renou 1966:387) for which SS 11.3.26 brahmavidino vādanti pārāṇcam oḍānaṃ praśīḍh pratyāṅcāsām īti “The theologues say: hast thou eaten the rice-dish as it was retiring, or as it was coming on?” (Whitney) would be counted as an example, and 8.2.102 upari svid āśid īti ca (100 anudāttam) which is found verbatim in RV 10.129.5b, VS 33.74 adhāv svid āśiṣd upāri svid āśiṣt (Strunk 1983:97).

3. Discussion

We compared the sūtras of As. 8.2 based on a working hypothesis that Pāṇini’s general sūtras (sūtras without a provisory statement such as cāndasi) do not exclude Vedic usage unless he explicitly says so. As we saw in §2.4, there are certainly many rules for which the extant Vedic corpus does not have any actual example. However, the general rules discussed in §2.2 agree with Vedic quite well, and Pāṇini’s general sūtras are well worth comparing with the Vedas. And even among the general sūtras, there are cases where Pāṇini seems to have particular texts in mind, such as As. 8.2.88 and 90 which agree with the Āśvalāyana-Śrutasūtra, and 92 to which the Āpastamba-Śrutasūtra is quite relevant.19

As far as As. 8.2 is concerned, the sūtras labeled cāndasi usually address forms which are first attested in the Rgveda. Although Pāṇini’s cāndasi rules draw upon the Rgveda most often, we also saw that the Rgveda forms are not always covered by Pāṇini’s rules, in the case of RV 6.48.17 āha evā (§2.3.2) where āhar is expected according to As. 8.2.69. In this connection, Cardona (1997b:35ff.) discusses the variation of the type aduskat vs. adhukṣat in the Rgveda and concludes that Pāṇini does not account for forms which were paraphrased by the Padapātha with a more general form. Here also, the Padapātha paraphrases āha[h]ī as āhar īti, and Pāṇini probably considered it unnecessary to explain the irregular sandhi in his grammar as it had already been explained by Śākalya.20

As to the Black Yajurveda text which Pāṇini was most familiar with, Schroeder (1881:xvii), Thiene (1935:63) and Bronkhorst (1991:89) consider

19Of course, there is a possibility that Pāṇini learned ritual procedures from other sources.

20We might also have to consider textual problems of the Rgveda. For example, Deshpande (1979:239ff.) argues that the Rgveda which Pāṇini knew was different from the current recension.
that Pāṇini knew the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā best, and next comes the Katha-Saṃhitā, and according to Thieme, he knew the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā as well. For the ‘c\textit{h}andasī’ rules Asṭ. 8.2.61 and 8.2.71, the Rgveda does not have an actual example for the taught forms, but Black Yajurveda texts, especially the Katha-Saṃhitā, attest actual forms. The Katha-Saṃhitā, the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā and the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā have no form that deviates from the sūtras of Asṭ. 8.2, and the Katha-Saṃhitā (Asṭ. 8.2.61 in §2.1.2, Asṭ. 8.2.71 in §2.1.3) and the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā (Asṭ. 8.2.47 in §2.2.2, Asṭ. 8.2.63 in §2.2.4, Asṭ. 8.2.88 and 91 in §2.2.6) attest forms taught there. On the other hand, the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā (Asṭ. 8.2.108 in §2.3.3), the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa (id.) and the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Asṭ. 8.2.34 in §2.3.1) show small differences from Pāṇini’s description.

In a study on Asṭ. 7.2.69 \textit{saniṁ sanasivāṃsam}, Hoffmann (1974:75) points out that forms taught by Pāṇini with \textit{c\textit{h}andasī} are attested not only in the mantra part but also in the brāhmaṇa part of the Black Yajurveda Saṃhitās.\footnote{Hoffmann (1974:75) “Pāṇini versieht übrigens diese Belege, die nicht etwa in einem Opferspruch (Mantra), sondern in der darstellenden Prosa der Yajurveda-Saṃhitās vorkommen, mit der Marke \textit{chandasi} ‘in der heiligen Literatur’.”} Furthermore, Ozono (2006:1000) argues that the term \textit{c\textit{h}andas-} covers the brāhmaṇa part of the Black Yajurveda, pointing out that the periphrastic aorist forms taught in Asṭ. 3.1.42 \textit{ab\textit{h}yutsādāyaṁ-praṇayāṇīcikayāṁ-ramayāṁ akāh pāvayāṁ kriyād vidām akṛann iti cc\textit{h}andasī occur only there. We also saw a similar distribution of \textit{-n-vant} forms in our discussion on Asṭ. 8.2.16 (§2.1.1).\footnote{Cf. the suggestion of Bronkhorst (1991:95) that Pāṇini may not have known the Brāhmaṇa portions of the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā.}

Bronkhorst (1991:90) suggests that Pāṇini knew the Lāṭyāyana-Śrautasūtra, the Māṇava-Śrautasūtra and the Vārāha-Śrautasūtra, but with respect to the rules in Asṭ. 8.2, the Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra of the Rgveda school and the Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra of the Taittirīyas have pertinent sūtras as mentioned above.
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