

RISS is an Italian journal intended to provide a forum for the interaction among the various domains of South Asian studies (philology, philosophy, anthropology, linguistics, etc.) as well as between South Asian studies and other disciplines. The journal aims at involving scholars in a wide-ranging debate, encouraging the in-depth study of cultural exchanges between South Asia and adjacent areas such as Central Asia and South-East Asia, grafting classical themes of South Asian scholarship onto the contemporary intellectual debate, exploring comparative perspectives and fostering high standards in South Asian studies, with special emphasis on methodological issues.

## COMITATO SCIENTIFICO

Presidente: Raffaele Torella.

Daniela Bredi	Marc Gaborieau	Mario Prayer
Giuliano Boccali	Phyllis Granoff	Cristina Scherrer-Schaub
Claudia Ciancaglini	Giorgio Milanetti	Francesco Sferri
Rahul Peter Das	Patrick Olivelle	Ernst Steinkellner
Elena De Rossi Filibeck	Sheldon Pollock	Romila Thapar

Direttore responsabile: Raffaele Torella.

Redazione: Federico Squarcini (programmazione editoriale), Elisa Freschi (segreteria di redazione), Maria Sernesi (amministrazione), Andrea Acri, Daniele Cuneo, Alessandro Grabella, Artemij Keidan, Chiara Letizia, Cristina Pecchia, Fabrizio Speciale, Vincenzo Vergiani.

Impaginazione e progetto grafico: Artemij Keidan.

Redazione e segreteria: Rivista di Studi Sudasiatici (RISS) c/o Istituto di Studi Orientali, Via Principe Amedeo 18ab, 00185 Roma, Italia.

e-mail: [riiss@studisudasiatici.net](mailto:riiss@studisudasiatici.net)

Per abbonamenti/ For subscriptions: Firenze University Press, Borgo degli Albizi 28, 50122 Firenze, Italia. Tel.: +39 055 2743051. Fax: +39 055 2743058.  
e-mail: [ordini@fupress.com](mailto:ordini@fupress.com)

Pubblicazione periodica annuale di proprietà dell'Associazione per gli Studi Sudasiatici (ASpeSS). Registrata presso il Tribunale di Firenze con il n. 5726 del 7 maggio 2009.

ISSN 1970-951X (print)

ISSN 1970-9501 (online)

© 2010 Firenze University Press, ASpeSS

## RIVISTA DI STUDI SUDASIATICI

IV • 2009

Firenze University Press

## Sommario

### Articoli

The Scope of Free Inquiry According to the *Vīmaṃsaka - sūtra* and its *Madhyama - āgama* Parallel, 7-20

*Anālayo*

Marxism and Classical Sanskrit Literature: D.D. Kosambi's Approach and Assessment, 21-38

*Ramkrishna Bhattacharya*

The King's Elder Brother: Forest King and "Political Imagination" in Southern Orissa, 39-62

*Raphael Rousseleau*

Knowledge, Cosmic Generation and the World in Madhva's Interpretation of *Chāndogyaopaniṣad* 6, 63-74

*Michael Williams*

Sulle antiche teorie indiane della musica. Un problema a confronto con altre culture, 75-108

*Giacomo Benedetti, Tito M. Tonietti*

Urdu in India, Urdu in Kashmir. La politica linguistica al centro e alla periferia, 109-130

*Daniela Bredi*

Once again on *vyakti - vacane* in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* I.2.51: *śravaṇaḥ / śrava ṇā*, 131-160

*Tiziana Pontillo*

### Recensioni

A Different approach to Vedic texts: researches on "mytho-politics", 163-168

*Elena Mucciarelli*

The Art of beginning, 169-172

*Cristina Pecchia*

Garland to God: A Multimedia Format, 173-178

*Nikolai Gordiychuk*

ONCE AGAIN ON VYAKTI-  
VACANE IN AṢṬĀDHYĀYĪ 1.2.51:  
ŚRAVAṆAḤ / ŚRAVAṆĀ\*

TIZIANA PONTILLO

*This paper aims at adding fresh evidence to Scharfe's proposal (1965) on the interpretation of A 1.2.51. The starting point is a question which has already been tackled in the Mahābhāṣya and in the Kāśikāvṛtti ad A 1v.2.5; more precisely, the reason for the feminine gender of the taddhita śravaṇā-, which is derived as a name of a particular night in which the moon is in conjunction with the constellation śravaṇaḥ. In fact, the mentioned rule prescribes the replacement of the taddhita-affix aṆ with the technical term LUP. Thus, according to the traditional interpretation of the general rule governing LUP-replacements (A 1.2.51), the gender of the derived word should conform to that of the original one, i.e., the masculine name śravaṇaḥ. If the feminine śravaṇā were the first member of the compound śravaṇāśvatthābhyām in A 1v.2.5 instead of śravaṇaḥ, the current application of the LUP-rule would be guaranteed, but Vedic and Kalpa-Literature occurrences discourage this supposition. Nevertheless in A 1v.2.5 there would be no point in considering the gender of the original word śravaṇaḥ.*

INTRODUCTION

AS IS WELL-KNOWN, there are not many LUP-rules. They are eleven in all, each teaching the zero-replacement of a specific *taddhita*-affix by the technical term LUP. This deals with four categories of derivatives, which

\* This article is based on a paper I presented in the *Vyākaraṇa* Section at the 13<sup>th</sup> World Sanskrit Conference, Edinburgh, Scotland, 10<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> July, 2006. My thanks are due to Anna Radicchi and to Malhar Arvind Kulkarni for their comments on my presentation. I am grateful to Dagmar Wujastyk for her comments and suggestions on the written version of this paper. Of course, I myself remain solely responsible for all mistakes.

can basically be considered proper names. They are indications of time (A IV.2.4–5), toponyms (A IV.2.81–83; v.2.105), names of fruits (A IV.3.166–167), nick-names (A v.3.98) and names of holy, artistic or symbolic images (A v.3.99–100). By contrast, there are at least 46 rules involving a *LUK*-zero-replacement of *taddhita*-affixes.

Both *LUK*- and *LUP*-replacements share the feature taught as *na lumatāngasya* (A I.1.63) together with *ŚLU*: the zero-replaced affix does not condition operations on the *aṅga* ‘pre-affixal base’, otherwise applied in the presence of the replaced affix.<sup>1</sup> What does differ depends on the rule *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane* (A I.2.51), and thus at least according to the traditional interpretation on how the gender *vyakti*- and number *vacana*- of the derivative behave.

Let us remember how *LUK* and *LUP* respectively work, using a classical example. Three different *taddhita*-derivatives denoting the ‘black plum fruit’ can be formed from the same *prakriyā* formula *jambvāḥ phalam* ‘the fruit of the black plum tree’. It deals with three options for deriving the name of a specific *vikārah* ‘modification’ or *avayavaḥ* ‘part’ of a plant (A IV.3.134–135) which is precisely the name of its fruit.

1. *jāmbavam* n.sg. = *jambū* + *aṅ* (IV.3.165 + VI.4.146 *av/o* = *guṇa*-replacement of the final *-ū*);
2. *jambu* n.sg. = *jambū* + *LUK* of *aṅ* (IV.3.139 + IV.3.163 + I.2.48 for short vowel);
3. *jambū* f.sg. = *jambū* + *LUP* of *aṅ* (IV.3.139 + IV.3.166).

1. *Jāmbavam* is a *taddhita*-derivative without zero-replacement according to A IV.3.165. Its gender and number (n.sg.) agree with the denotatum *phalam*: *aṅ* is the default *taddhita*-affix taught by A IV.1.83.

2. *Jambu* is a *LUK*-derivative according to A IV.3.163 *phale luk*, which teaches a *LUK*-zero-replacement of the expected *taddhita*-affix *aṅ* (A IV.3.139 or *aṅ*) for deriving the name of a fruit from the name of its tree. The gender and number (n.sg.) of *jambu* agree with the denotatum *phalam*, exactly like *jāmbavam*.

3. *Jambū* is the corresponding *LUP*-derivative which is perfectly homophonous with the ‘black plum tree’, where the meaning as a fruit is a sort of metonymic usage,<sup>2</sup> as considered for instance by Debrunner (1954: II.2,

1. For the M discussion of the condition *aṅgasya* see Benson (1990: 169ff).

2. For a short comparison between the rhetorical and the linguistic point of view see

§15). Therefore, this same term (f.sg.) denotes both the tree *jambū* and the fruit *jambū*. In fact, A IV.3.166 *lup ca* teaches a *LUP*-zero-replacement of the expected *taddhita*-affix *aÑ* for specifically deriving the name of the black plum fruit (*jambū* f.sg.) from the name of its tree (*jambū*- f.sg. ‘the black plum tree’).

A IV.2.5 SAṂJÑĀYĀM ŚRAVAṆĀŚVATTHĀBHYĀM

In the specific *LUP*-category taught by A IV.2.4-5, the name of the *nakṣatra* ‘constellation’ with which the moon is *yukta*- ‘in conjunction’ coincides with the name of the time when this conjunction takes place.

The pertinent *taddhita*-rule given in A IV.2.3 is *nakṣatreṇa yuktaḥ kālaḥ* and the following *sūtra* introduces the zero-replacement by *LUP*, provided the time of conjunction is not qualified by specific terms (A IV.2.4: *lub aviśeṣe*). M and KV examples are: *adya puṣyaḥ* vs. *pauṣī rātriḥ / pauṣam ahaḥ* — the latter adds *adya kṛttikā* as an example of clear *LUP*-replacement. This deals with the opposition between a general span of time (*adya* ‘today’) and a particular span of time (*rātri*- ‘night’ or *ahar*- ‘day’) within the general span of a day. In fact, twenty-four hours are the total extent of time during which the moon can be defined as *nakṣatreṇa yuktaḥ kālaḥ* ‘being in conjunction with a constellation’ and therefore the term *viśeṣa*- refers to each part of this whole time-span.<sup>3</sup>

Pontillo (2004) and the bibliography quoted there; for a preliminary inquiry on the poetical effects of the specific *LUP*-rules A IV.3.166–167, see Pontillo (2006): the gender and number of derivatives are basically irrelevant, because the names of fruits or flowers occur quite exclusively as members of compounds or as indirect cases.

3. This was underlined by the P ad A IV.2.4: *tad etad evaṃ yāvān kālo nakṣatreṇa yuyjate tasya sarvasya pratyayāntenābhidhānam aviśeṣaḥ | tadekadeśasyābhidhānam viśeṣaḥ* and had already been hinted at in an interesting discussion by Patañjali about the term *viśeṣa*. Effectively, the latter could also be the proper way for classifying *adya*- as a specific term which excludes yesterday or tomorrow (M II.272.21–22 ad A IV.2.4: *adya puṣya iti | atrāpi hi viśeṣo gamyate | adyety ukte na hyo na śva iti*). At the same time it can be considered as a general term which does not distinguish which specific part of the day it deals with, in particular whether it is night or day (M II.272.22–23 ad A IV.2.4: *yady apy atra viśeṣo gamyate ’viśeṣo ’pi gamyate | adyety ukte na jñāyate rātrau vā divā veti | yato ’viśeṣas tadāśrayo lub bhaviṣyati*). Moreover, there is a risk in referring to the term *aviśeṣa*- and to *rātri*- as a general term within which we can distinguish several specific parts (M II.272.23–273.1 ad A IV.2.4: *ihāpi tarhi yady api viśeṣo gamyate ’viśeṣo ’pi tu gamyate | rātrir ity ukte na jñāyate kadeti | yato ’viśeṣas tadāśrayo lup prāpnoti*). But the

The following rule A IV.2.5 *saṃjñāyām śravaṇāśvatthābhyām* concerns two constellation-names coinciding with derivative *saṃjñās*. It teaches a zero-replacement of the *taddhita*-affix by *LUP*, which is to be expected after the stems of the mentioned constellation-names. The denotation of the derivative still seems to depend on A IV.2.3: therefore the *saṃjñās* are names of the time when the moon is in conjunction with the two constellations mentioned in the rule, without excluding specific terms qualifying that time.

The only example in the M (II.273.4 ad A IV.2.5) is *śravaṇā* as a *rātriḥ*, to which the KV (ad A IV.2.5) adds *śvatthaḥ* as a *muhūrtaḥ*. These are introduced respectively as the name of a specific night and the name of a specific short space of time (the 30<sup>th</sup> part of a day) within the time (a day) when the moon is in conjunction with the pertaining constellation. What is questioned by M II.273.4–5 ad A IV.2.5 (*iha kasmān na yuktavadbhāvo bhavati | śravaṇā rātriḥ | nīpātanād etat siddham | kiṃ nīpātanam | phālguniśravaṇā-kārttikicaitribhyaḥ iti*) and then also by KV ad A IV.2.5 in the same words is the f. gender of the *taddhita*-derivative *śravaṇā*, because according to the traditional interpretation of the general rule governing the *LUP*-replacements (A I.2.51), the gender of the derived word should conform to that of the original one, i.e., the m. name *śravaṇaḥ* (explicitly quoted as *śravaṇaśabda-* by the KV). Both commentaries conclude that the gender of the *taddhita*- is determined by the *nīpātana* word *śravaṇā* contained in A IV.2.23.

Nevertheless, apart from the commentaries, we cannot be sure about the gender of the first member in the compound *śravaṇāśvatthābhyām*, because the *sandhi* between the final vowel of the first member of the compound and the vowel *a* with which the second member *śvattha-* begins renders it unintelligible. Is it a m.sg. stem *śravaṇa-* or a f.sg. *śravaṇā-*? Only Böhtlingk (1887: 170), in his translation of A IV.2.5, and Debrunner (1954: 2, 56–57), in a paragraph devoted to the derivation without suffixes (*Suffixlose Ableitung*) interpreted the first member as the f.sg. stem *śravaṇā-*, so that the current application of the *LUP*-rule is guaranteed.

#### OCCURRENCES OF ŚRAVAṆAḤ, ŚRAVAṆĀ, ŚRĀVAṆĪ

We may well ask what the occurrences of this last constellation-name are, which corresponds to the *nakṣatra* classified as the 20<sup>th</sup>, 21<sup>st</sup> or 23<sup>rd</sup> *nakṣatra*

time-span reference on which the *viśeṣa-* vs. *aviśeṣa-* classification depends is the *ahorātra-* ‘a day and night’ (M II.273.1–2 ad A IV.2.4: *evaṃ tarhi nakṣatreṇa yuktaḥ kālah ity anuvartate | nakṣatreṇa yuktasya kālasya viśeṣe | kaḥ punaḥ kālo nakṣatreṇa yujyate | ahorātraḥ*).

out of the currently listed 27 or 28. It occurs as a f. form *śronā*,<sup>4</sup> with the typical *o* diphthong instead of *ava* as often found in Middle Indian words, in TaittS IV.4.10.2–3 (*śronā nakṣatraṃ viṣṇur devatā śraviṣṭhā nakṣatraṃ vasavo devatā*), in TaittB 1.5.2.9 (*tac chronā | yad aśṛnot*), in TaittB III.1.2.5–6 (*śṛṇvanti śronām amṛtasya gopām*) and in MaitrS II.13.20 (*śronā nakṣatraṃ viṣṇur devatā śraviṣṭhā nakṣatraṃ vasavo devatā*).<sup>5</sup> The name might have been changed into *śravaṇa*- aiming to connect it more closely with the verbal base *śru*- ‘to hear’, which was supposed to be its etymon, according to Weber (1862: 322, n. 3). The *upākaraṇa*, i.e., the commencement of reading the *Veda* (in particular the *Śruti*), was fixed precisely on the day of the full-moon under this *nakṣatra* (or on the fifth day of the same month or under the *nakṣatra Hasta*), as we can learn from ŚGṛS IV.5.2, ĀśvGṛS III.5.2. The above-quoted etymological passage of the TaittB also seems to corroborate the hypothesis.

Nevertheless, we have to pay attention above all to the works judged closest to Pāṇini’s language. For instance, the ĀśvGṛS, the PārGṛS and the HirGṛS, which were probably *Kalpasūtra*-works more ancient than Pāṇini’s *sūtras*, on the basis of Liebich’s (1891: 36–7)<sup>6</sup> and Brucker’s (1980: 50–69) enquiries, contain both the m. noun *śravaṇaḥ* and the f. *śravaṇā*. However, this latter form occurs as a first member of a compound denoting a rite which has to be performed on the night of the full-moon when the moon is in conjunction with the questioned *nakṣatra*. On the other hand the m. noun seems to only once mean the name of the *nakṣatra*, while it twice is used to denote the time when the moon is in conjunction with this *nakṣatra*, which is taught by the more general rule A IV.2.4, on condition that the time of conjunction is *aviśeṣe* ‘not qualified with a specific term’. Moreover, in the two latter cases we find an instrumental case-form *śravaṇena* according to the syntactic rule A II.3.45 *nakṣatre ca lupi*, which teaches the instrumental case termination (as an option besides the locative) after a nominal stem denoting a constellation ending in *LUP*.

4. Cf. Monier-Williams (1899: 1102); Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: VII, 395); Scherer (1953: 158). For the phonic correspondence between the *o* diphthong and *ava*, cf. Wackernagel (1896: I, 54); Debrunner (1954: II.2, 735–6); Mayrhofer (1956–1980: III, 395).

5. *Śronā* in *Rgveda* I.161.10 is an adjective for the noun *go*:- it deals with a crippled cow.

6. Cf. Cardona (1976: 238, 345, n. 325) and Scharfe (1977: 88) who consider the results of Liebich’s research unsurpassed until now. By contrast, Bronkhorst (1982: 275ff and 1991: 102ff) judges Liebich’s arguments circular and Gonda (1977: 477) puts the importance of the conformity of the *Kalpasūtra*-language with the rules of Pāṇini back into perspective.

ĀśvGrS II.1.1: *Om śrāvanyāṃ paurṇamāsyāṃ śravaṇākarma* ‘Om! On the full-moon night when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*, he should perform the *Śravaṇā*-rite’.

ĀśvGrS III.5.2-3: *Oṣadhīnām prādurbhāve śravaṇena śrāvāṇasya | pañcābhyāṃ hastena vā* ‘At the appearance of herbs when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa* in the *Śrāvāṇa* month or on the fifth (of the *Śrāvāṇa* month) when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Hasta*’.<sup>7</sup>

PārGrS II.14.1–2; 6: *Athātaḥ śravaṇākarma | śrāvanyāṃ paurṇamāsyāṃ || sthālīpākasya juhōti viṣṇave śravaṇāya śrāvanyai paurṇamāsyai va-rṣābhyaś ceti* ‘Then the *Śravaṇā*-rite. On the full-moon night when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*. [...] He offers as an oblation a dish of barley (or rice) boiled in milk, saying: “To Viṣṇu, to (the *nakṣatra*) *Śravaṇa*, to the full-moon-night when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa* and to the rainy season”’.

HirGrS II.6.16.1–2: *Athātaḥ śravaṇākarma | tad yā paurṇamāsī śravaṇena yuñjyāt tasyām upariṣṭāt sāyam agnihotrasya dakṣiṇāgnim* ‘Now the *Śravaṇā* rite. On the day of that full moon when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*, after the evening *Agnihotra* he should establish the *Dakṣiṇāgni*’.

We also have a considerable number of occurrences of the m. noun *śravaṇa*- in other works handed down by the various Vedic Schools, where once again the *nakṣatra*-denotation does not prevail. In the following list of occurrences we can check the attempt to distinguish the two above mentioned interpretations of the *prātipādika śravaṇa*-, which have here been respectively labelled as A (constellation-name) and B (time-name).

(A) AV XIX.7.4: [...] *śravaṇaḥ śraviṣṭhāḥ kurvatām supuṣṭim* ‘Let *Śravaṇaḥ* and the *Śraviṣṭhāḥ* make good prosperity!’<sup>8</sup>

7. We have to consider what Oldenberg (1892: 221) remarks about this expression of time: “If we count the month beginning with the bright fortnight, and assume that the full moon day of *Śrāvāṇa* falls, as the name of the month implies, on *Śravaṇa*, the fifth *Tithi* of that month will fall indeed on *Hasta*”.

8. Whitney (1962: II, 908) notices that the fourth *pada* “would be better if we had *śronas* for *śravaṇas*; but the *Anukramaṇī* acknowledges the redundancy of the verse.”

(B) SāmB II.5.2: *Śravaṇena vratam upetya* ‘After having performed the vow when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*’.

(B) SāmB III.5.1: *Rājānam abhiṣecayet | tiṣyeṇa śravaṇena vā* ‘He should anoint the king when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Tiṣya* or *Śravaṇa*’.

(A) MŚrS x.1.1.3: *Antareṇa citrāsvātī śravaṇapratiśravaṇau kṛttikāpratikṛttike tiṣyapunarvasū ca prāgdeśo ’yaṃ yugamātroditayoḥ pāsāṅca* ‘The eastern quarter should be in line with the cord stretched between *Citrā* and *Svātī*, or between *Śravaṇa* and *Pratiśravaṇa*, or between *Kṛttikā* and *Pratikṛttikā* or between *Tiṣya* and *Punarvasu*, when a pair of these *nakṣatras* has risen the measure of a *yuga* (above the horizon)’.

(A) MŚrS x.3.1.11: *Śravaṇābhijitor bahulātiṣyayor vā citrāsvātyor antare ’psv agninā vā* ‘Between *Śravaṇa* and *Abhijit*, between *Bahulā* and *Tiṣya*, between *Citrā* and *Svātī* (the eastern quarter is found) by water and fire’.

(A) ĀpŚrS v.3.14: *Viśākhayoḥ prajākāmo ’nurādheṣvṛddhikāmaḥ śravaṇe puṣṭikāma uttareṣu proṣṭhapadeṣu pratiṣṭhākāmaḥ* ‘One who is desirous of progeny (should establish fires) under the *nakṣatra Viśākhās*, one who is desirous of prosperity, under *Śravaṇa*, one who is desirous of firm establishment, under *Uttara Proṣṭhapadaś*’.

(B) ŚGrS I.20.1–2: *Ṛṛṭiye māsi pumsavanaṃ | puṣyeṇa śravaṇena vā* ‘In the third month the male-production rite when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Puṣya* or *Śravaṇa*’.

(A) ŚGrS I.26.21: *Viṣṇave śravaṇāya* ‘To Viṣṇu! To the (*nakṣatra*) *Śravaṇa*!’.

(B) ŚGrS IV.5.2: *Oṣadhīnāṃ prādurbhāve hastena śravaṇena vā* ‘At the appearance of herbs, when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Hasta* or *Śravaṇa*’.

(A) ŚGrS IV.15.1–2: *Śravaṇaṃ śraviṣṭhīyāyāṃ paurṇamāsyām akṣatasaktūnāṃ sthālīpākasya vā juhoti | viṣṇave svāhā śravaṇāya svāhā śrāvānyai paurṇamāsyai svāhā varṣābhyaḥ svāhe ’ti* ‘He offers the *Śravaṇa* (oblation) of the flour of fried barley or of cooked food on the full moon day relating to (the *nakṣatra*) *Śraviṣṭhās*, saying “To Viṣṇu *svāhā*! To the (*nakṣatra*) *Śravaṇa svāhā*! To the night of the full moon when the moon is in conjunction with (the *nakṣatra*) *Śravaṇa svāhā*! To the rainy season *svāhā*!”.

(B) MGrS I.4.1: *Varṣāsu śravaṇena svādhyāyān upākurute* ‘He begins to recite the *Veda* to himself in the rainy season when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*’.

(?B) MGrS I.7.3–5: *Bhāryāṃ vindate | kṛttikāsvātīpūrvair iti varayet | rohiṇīmṛgaśiraḥśravaṇaśraviṣṭhottarāṇīty upayame tathodvāhe yadvā puṇyoktam* ‘He takes a wife: he should make his choice on the occasion of the former part of the time when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Kṛttikā* and *Svāti*. For marriage or also for the leading home of the bride, the latter part of the time when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatras Rohiṇī* and *Mṛgaśiras*, *Śravaṇa* and *Śraviṣṭhā* is said to be auspicious’.

(B) KGrS I.12.7–8: *Tr̥tīye māsi puṃsavanam | puṣyeṇa śravaṇena vā* ‘In the third month the male-production rite when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Puṣya* or *Śravaṇa*’.

(B) KGrS III.7.2–4: *Oṣadhīnāṃ prādurbhāve | śrāvanyām paurṇamāsyām | hastena śravaṇena vā* ‘At the appearance of herbs, on the night of full-moon when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*, when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Hasta* or *Śravaṇa*’.

(B) KGrS IV.2.1: *śrāvanyām paurṇamāsyām | hastena śravaṇena vā* ‘On the night of full-moon when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*, when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Hasta* or *Śravaṇa*’.

(A) JGrS I.19: *Śravaṇe snāyād viṣṇor vā etan nakṣatram yajño vai viṣṇur yajño mopanamed iti* ‘He should take the bath under the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*; this *nakṣatra* belongs to Viṣṇu and Viṣṇu is the sacrifice, if he wishes a sacrifice to fall to his share’.

(A) GGrS III.7.19: *Tasya juhuyāt śravaṇāya viṣṇave ḡgnaye prajāpataye viśvebhya devebhyaḥ svāheti* ‘Of that (milk-rice) he should make oblations, saying “To *Śravaṇa*, to Viṣṇu, to Agni, to Prajāpati, to the Viśve Devāḥ, *svāhā!*”’.

(B) PārGrS II.10.2: *Oṣadhīnāṃ prādurbhāve śravaṇena śrāvanyām paurṇamāsyām śrāvanyasya pañcamīm hastena vā* ‘At the appearance of herbs when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*, on the night

of full-moon when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*, or on the fifth day of the *Śravaṇa* month when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Hasta*.<sup>9</sup>

(A) VṣṇDhS 11.78.26–32: *Sarvān kāmān vaiśvadeve | śraiṣṭhyam abhijiti | sarvān kāmān śravaṇe | lavaṇaṃ vāsave | ārogyaṃ vāruṇe | kupyadravyam āje | gr̥ham āhir budhnye* ‘All the wishes under the *nakṣatra* presided over by the Viśve Devāḥ (*Uttarāśādhā*); preminence under the *nakṣatra Abhijit*; all the wishes under the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*; grace under the *nakṣatra* presided over by Vāsava (*Dhaniṣṭhā*); health under the *nakṣatra* presided over by Varuṇa (*Śatabhiṣaj*); metal objects under the *nakṣatra* presided over by Āja (*Pūrvabhādrapadā*); a house under the *nakṣatra* presided over by Āhir Budhnya (*Uttarabhādrapadā*)’.

(A) VDhS 111.9: *Nārāyaṇabalim [...] sapinḍikaraṇasthāne mṛtakārtham aparapakṣe dvādaśyāṃ śravaṇe vā karoti* ‘He performs the funerary oblation to *Nārāyaṇa* in the place where the relationship of a *Sapinḍa* is invested, on account of the impurity contracted through the death of a relation in the second half-month or on the twelfth day under the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*’.

As regards the derivative f. *śravaṇā-*, we have at least ten occurrences denoting the night of the *paurṇamāsī* ‘full-moon’ in the *Kalpasūtras*. We have already seen three *Gṛhya-sūtra*-occurrences (ĀśvGṛS 11.1.1; PārGṛS 11.14.1; HirGṛS 11.6.16.1) as a first member of the compound *śravaṇā-karman*, to which we can add two others:

GGṛS 111.7.1–2: *Athātaḥ śravaṇākarma || paurṇamāsyāṃ kṛtyam*<sup>10</sup> ‘Now the *Śravaṇā* rite which has to be performed on the night of the full-moon’.

GGṛS 114.8.1: *Śravaṇāgrahāyaṇīkarmanor akṣatāñ chiṣṭvā* ‘Having left unhusked barley-corns of the *śravaṇā-* and *āgrahāyaṇī-*rite’.

9. Cf. ĀśvGṛS 111.5.2–3, quoted above, and the pertaining remark.

10. Cf. the regular n. *taddhita* denoting the same ceremony (*śravaṇam*) in GGṛS 111.9.1–2: *Āgrahāyaṇyāṃ baliharaṇam | tat śrāvaṇenaiva vyākhyātam* ‘On the *Āgrahāyaṇī* day *Bali*-offerings (are made). They have been explained by the *Śravaṇa* sacrifice’.

Another compound including *śravaṇā-* as the first member of a compound occurs in BhGrS III.8.1:

*Athāta upākaraṇavisarjane vyākhyāsyāmaḥ śravaṇāpakṣa oṣadhīṣu jātāsu* ‘Then at the end of the initiation rite, we shall explain in detail in the fortnight after the night of the full moon in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*, when the herbs have been born’.

Four further occurrences of the f. *śravaṇā-* as a simple name denote the night of *paurṇamāsī* ‘full-moon’:

ŚŚrS III.14.2: *Caitrīprayogasya yajamānasya śravāṇāyām* ‘If he has commenced the performance of the *Caitrī*-ceremony on the full-moon night when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*’.

ĀpŚrS VIII.5.1: *Tataś caturṣu māseṣv āṣāḍhyām śravaṇāyām vodavasāya varuṇapraghāsair yajate* ‘Then after four months, on the full-moon night when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Aṣāḍhā* or *Śravaṇa*, the sacrificer, having gone out (of his residence) performs the *Varuṇapraghāsa*’.

ĀpŚrS VIII.6.10: *Yady u vai śravaṇāyām saṃsṛjya grhṇīyāt* ‘If however (the *Varuṇapraghāsa*-rite is performed) on the full-moon night when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa*, he should mix (the ghee with curds) and scoop it’.

GGrS III.3.13: *Śravaṇām eka upākṛtyaitam ā sāvitṛt kālām kāṅkṣante* ‘Some perform the *upākaraṇa* on the full-moon night when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra Śravaṇa* and await the time till the day sacred to *Savitṛ* (= under the *nakṣatra Hasta*)’.

Moreover, we have the so-called *nipātana śravaṇā* in the A, which is listed exactly as *paurṇamāsī* ‘night of the full-moon’ together with three other *paurṇamāsī*-names — i.e., *phālgunī*, *kārttikī*, and *citrī*, full-moon-nights in conjunction with the *nakṣatra- phalgunī-* (f.sg.), *kṛttikā-* (f.pl.), and *citrā-* (f.sg.) respectively, in A IV.2.23, according to the scheme introduced by A IV.2.21: *sāsmīn paurṇamāsīti* ‘The *taddhita*-affix *aN* after a nominal stem ending in nominative case termination and denoting a night of the full-moon to denote the period in which (this night of the full-moon occurs)’.

Furthermore, it also seems correct to suppose that the names quoted in the rule *āgrahāyaṇyaśvatthāṭ ṭhak* (A IV.2.22) are two *paurṇamāsī*-names

combined as a *samāhāra-dvandva*, thus *āgrahāyaṇī-* and *aśvatthā-*,<sup>11</sup> which leads us to take the f. *aśvatthā-* as a second attested *saṃjñā* governed by the rule A IV.2.5 *saṃjñāyām śravaṇāśvatthābhyām* instead of *aśvattho muhūrtaḥ*, of which, by contrast, I was unable to find any occurrences apart from the commentaries pertaining to this Pāṇini rule, even excluding the M. Therefore the rule A IV.2.5 could refer precisely to the formation of these two proper names *aśvatthā* and *śravaṇā* as exceptions among the *paurṇamāsī*-names, which otherwise should be regularly derived through the affix *aṆ* (A IV.2.3) and the f. affix *ÑiP* (A IV.1.15), as we can deduce from the comparison with the other *paurṇamāsī*-names in rule A IV.2.23, i.e., *phālgunī-* (< *phalguna-*), *kārttikī-* (< *kṛttikā*), *caitrī-* (< *citrā-*).

On the other hand, the second name mentioned in the rule A IV.2.5, *aśvatthā-* has been interpreted (1) either as another name of the 27<sup>th</sup> *nakṣatra aśvinī-* or *aśvayuj-* (both f.du.) e.g., by Sharma (1999: IV, 156–7; 169)<sup>12</sup> and by Apte (1890: s.v.), but *aśvayuj-* as an independent name of a constellation occurs elsewhere in the A (IV.3.36); (2) or even as another name of the *nakṣatra śravaṇa-*, as is found in the KāṭhS e.g., by Weber (1862: 324); Monier-Williams (1899; s.v.); Keith & Macdonell (1958: I, 413); Scherer (1953: 55; 153; 158).<sup>13</sup> In fact, we find *aśvatthā-* e.g., in KāṭhS xxxix.13 (*viṣṇur devatāśvattho nakṣatram vasavo devatā śraviṣṭhā nakṣatram*) as a name denoting the *nakṣatra śravaṇa-* or *śroṇā-* in a passage closely comparable with those above mentioned from TaittS IV.4.10.2-3 (*śroṇā nakṣatram viṣṇur devatā śraviṣṭhā nakṣatram vasavo devatā*) and MaitrS II.13.20 (*śroṇā*

11. This latter f. name is registered with this denotation in Monier-Williams (1899: s.v.), Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: s.v.), Apte (1890: s.v.), Raja Radhakantadeva (1967: s.v. *aśvatthā, strī, pūrṇamā tithiḥ*).

12. See in particular Sharma's remark on p. 169 about A IV.2.22: "The word *aśvatthā* refers to the constellation *Aśvinī*. The affix itself is an exception to *aṆ*". Neither Böhtlingk (1887), Vasu (1891), Renou (1947–1954) or Katre (1987) explicitly show which *nakṣatra* the mentioned Pāṇinian rules might have dealt with, because the first three authors quote *aśvatthā* only as a *śabda* while the last one chooses an abbreviated form ("the constellation *Aśv.*").

13. See in particular Scherer (1953: 158), who remarks on the *nakṣatra- śravaṇa-* m.: "auch *śroṇā* f [...]. Ein anderer Name ist *aśvatthā-* m 'heiliger Feigenbaum' Pāṇ. 4,2,5; 22 [...]" and Weber (1862: 325, n. 3): "Es mag wohl das Zusammentreffen dieser Fruchtzeit mit dem Gestirn *śravaṇa*, resp. mit dessen Conjunction mit dem Vollmonde, den Namen *aśvatthā* für dasselbe veranlaßt haben". About the close link that exists between the language described by Pāṇini and that of the KāṭhS, see Thieme (1935: 16f; 67) and Bronkhorst (1991: 90; 1996: 59; 64).

*nakṣatram viṣṇur devatā śraviṣṭhā nakṣatram vasavo devatā*). Consequently the rule A IV.2.5, according to the latter interpretation, might have taught the LUP-zero-replacement for two synonyms, *āsvattha-* and *śravaṇa-*.

Finally, we have to verify what the occurrences of the counterexamples *śrāvaṇī*, *āsvatthī rātriḥ* are, proposed as non-*saṃjñās* in KV ad IV.2.5. Effectively, we also met *śrāvaṇī* as a locative and dative case agreeing with *paurṇamāsī* six times in the above listed *Kalpasūtra*-occurrences, even alongside the compound *śravaṇākarmaṇ*, in ĀśvGrS II.1.1 and in PārGrS (II.14.1–2; 6). We find at least three other occurrences of the locative case *śrāvanyāṃ paurṇamāsyām* and one of the nominative case, as the first in a series of four qualifiers for the f.pl. noun *saṃsthāḥ*.

ĀpGrS VII.18.5: *Śrāvanyāṃ paurṇamāsyām astam ite sthālīpākaḥ* ‘The *sthālīpāka*-rite (should be performed) on the full-moon night when the moon is in conjunction with the constellation *Śravaṇa* after the sunset’.

HirGrS II.16.2: *Tac ca śrāvanyāṃ paurṇamāsyām kartavyam* ‘And that has to be performed on the full-moon night when the moon is in conjunction with the constellation *Śravaṇa*’.

GDhS I.8.18: *Aṣṭakā pārvaṇaḥ śrāddham śrāvany āgrahāyaṇī caitryāśvayujīti sapta pākayajñasamsthāḥ* ‘The seven forms of sacrifices using cooked food, i.e. *Aṣṭakā* (offering on the eighth day of the dark fortnight in the winter months), *Pārvaṇa* (offering on full-moon days), the ceremony in honour of the dead relatives, the *Śrāvaṇī*, the *Āgrahāyaṇī*, the *Caitrī*, the *Āśvayujī* (the oblation on the full moon day respectively when the moon is in conjunction with the constellation *Śravaṇa*, *Āgrahāyaṇa*, *Citrā* and *Āśvayuj*)’.

ĀpDhS I.9.27.1: *Śrāvanyāṃ paurṇamāsyām tilabhakṣa upoṣya vā śvobhūte mahānadam udakam upasprśya sāvitrīyā samitsahasram ādadhyājaped vā* ‘On the full-moon night, when the moon is in conjunction with the constellation *Śravaṇa*, after eating food mixed with sesame or after fasting, on the following day, he should set a thousand fires, or mutter the *Sāvitrī*, after touching the water in a large river’.

We could deduce that the f. LUP-*taddhita*-derivative of *śravaṇa-* (*śravaṇā-* < *śravaṇa-* +  $\emptyset$  aN A IV.2.5 + *TāP* A IV.1.4) denotes the *paurṇamāsī* by itself as a *saṃjñā*, as we can see in the *nīpātana* (A IV.2.23), while the derivative with the *taddhita* aN (affix *-a* + *vṛddhi* of the vowel in the initial syllable of the stem) is the regular derivative of *śravaṇa-* according to A IV.2.3, which can also be em-

ployed as a qualifier for the full-moon night with the f. mark *ÑiP* (A IV.1.15), i.e., *śrāvaṇī paurṇamāsī*. The regular *taddhita*-derivative from *śrāvaṇā* according to A IV.2.21 *sāsmīn paurṇamāsīti* (*śrāvaṇā-* + *aN*) occurs twice in the above listed occurrences, in *ĀśvGrS* III.5.2–3 and in *PārGrS* II.10.2.<sup>14</sup>

There are still three occurrences to classify as dependent on either one of these four *sūtras* (A IV.2.3–5; 21). The first is the n. noun *śrāvaṇam* in the above-quoted *ŚGrS* IV.15.1: *śrāvaṇam śraviṣṭhīyāyām paurṇamāsyām akṣatasaktūnām sthālīpākasya vā juhōti*. This n. noun is registered as a synonym for *śrāvaṇā-karman* by the dictionaries. I wonder if it can be included among the *saṃjñās* governed by A IV.2.5, as a *LUP-taddhita*-derivative of *śrāvaṇa-*, although it is not a time-name or rather interpreted as a day when the moon is in conjunction with the constellation *Śrāvaṇa* (according to A

14. The quoted wording of the *sūtra* A IV.2.21 follows M II.275.6, but would include *saṃjñāyām* as a condition of the denotation for the derivative, according to the KV ad A IV.2.21, which in its turn follows a suggestion of Vt 1 ad A IV.2.21 (M II.275.7), then refuted by Vt 2 (M II.275.9) as a *gariyān upasamyogaḥ* ‘too heavy alteration’. In fact, M II.275.10–12 ad Vt 2 in its comment to these two Vts restricts this *taddhita* derivation to the denotation of a period of more than fifteen days, by contrast excluding the intercalary month. KV ad IV.2.21 also subscribes to this restriction. Both commentaries seem to interpret the *saṃjñāyām* condition in the sense of the propounded examples *māsa*, *ardhamāsa* and *saṃvatsara*. Both commentaries employ the well-known phrase *Itikaraṇaḥ kriyate | tataś ced vivakṣā* ‘The expression *iti* is employed, therefore if that is so, there is *vivakṣā*’ in their discussion about the *sūtra*. Nevertheless KV quotes this sort of *paribhāṣā* before explaining the meaning of the condition *saṃjñāyām*, which it in fact accepts in the *sūtra*. By contrast, M II.275.13 ad Vt 2 ad A IV.2.21 concludes the whole discussion of the two Vts by resorting to the *vivakṣā* device and finally rejects the addition of *saṃjñāyām*. It seems to follow that at least M considers the condition *saṃjñāyām* comparable with *iti*. The KV’s interpretation is consistent with that of the M. It explains the redundancy of *iti* and *saṃjñā* in the same *sūtra* as a *jñāpaka* ‘indirect teaching’ that *iti* is synonymous with *saṃjñā*. Cf. Sharma (1999: 168); Radicchi (2000: 101). What is relevant is how we should interpret the *vivakṣā*-device about this *sūtra*. Van Nooten (1983: 50) paraphrases Patañjali’s specific usage of *vivakṣā* for this *sūtra* A IV.2.21 as “the intention to express (the correct form)”, propounded as “apparently sufficient ground for dismissing further restrictive rules”. What Radicchi (1994: 57) states about Patañjali’s quoted phrase *itikaraṇaḥ* etc. seems particularly suitable to this passage too: “*Iti* già espresso da Pāṇini rende inutili aggiunte o riformulazioni del testo dei *sūtra* come ne erano state proposte prima di Patañjali. *Iti* dice che la regola deve essere convalidata dall’uso e vale entro limiti convalidati dall’uso. Quest’uso dipende dagli utenti della lingua che lo scelgono: la scelta è appunto la *vivakṣā*”.

iv.2.4), merely identified with the sacrifice performed on that occasion. An analogous occurrence seems to suggest this latter interpretation:

PārGṛS III.2.2: *Mārgaśīrṣyāṃ paurṇamāsyāṃ āgrahāyaṇīkarma | sthā-lipākaṃ śrapayitvā śravaṇavad ājyāhuti hutvā 'parā juhoti*, 'On the full-moon day of *Mārgaśīrṣa* the *Āgrahāyaṇī* ceremony (is performed). After having cooked a dish of sacrificial food, he offers two *Ājya*-oblations as at the *Śravaṇa*-sacrifice / day and other oblations'.

The second unexplained occurrence is *śrāvaṇī* as an isolated locative noun:

MGṛS II.16.1: *Sarpebhyo bibhyac chrāvanyāṃ tūṣṇīm bhaumam ekakapā-lam śrapayitvā 'kṣatasaktūn piṣṭvā svakṛta iriṇe darbhān āstīryācyutāya dhruvāya bhaumāya svāheti juhoti* 'Being afraid of snakes, *śrāvanyāṃ*, having cooked silently a *Puroḍāśa* sacred to the Earth in a dish, having pounded unhusked fried barley grains and having spread *Darbha* grass on a prepared ground of sterile soil, he offers oblations saying: "Svāhā to *Acyuta Dhruva Bhauma!*"

*Śrāvaṇī* should not be a *saṃjñā*. Is it a common *rātri*- when the moon is in conjunction with the *nakṣatra śravaṇa* (A IV.2.3), i.e., a counterexample for A IV.2.5? Or is it rather a night of the month *śrāvaṇa*, which is a *taddhita*-derivative of *śravaṇā*- (instead of *śravaṇa*-) according to A IV.2.21 *sāsmīn paurṇamāsīti (śravaṇā- + aṅ + NīP)*? It is noteworthy that this passage is interpreted by Gopal (1983: 404) as a description of the *Śravaṇā-karman* and *śrāvanyāṃ* is translated here as "on the day of the full moon of *Śrāvaṇa*".

#### SCHARFE'S PROPOSAL ON A I.2.51 APPLIED TO A IV.2.5

As we have seen, the occurrences of the *nakṣatra śravaṇa*- in the surveyed works are always m., just as in the M and in the KV. Therefore we can raise Patañjali's question once again: what can we do to reconcile the traditional *LUP*-interpretation with this changing of gender from the base *śravaṇa*- to the derivative *śravaṇā*?

As is well-known, Scharfe (1965) proposed a new interpretation of the expression *vyaktivacane* included in the general *LUP*-rule (A I.2.51), not as a *dvandva*-compound meaning 'gender and number' but as a locative case of the *tatpuruṣa*-compound *vyakti-vacana*- 'on condition that an individual is denoted'. In fact, if Scharfe's proposal was right, there would be no point in considering the gender of the original word of the derivative *śravaṇā*. Since

1965 we have at least two distinctive authoritative translations of the quoted *sūtra*: on the one hand for instance Cardona (1976: 196; 334, n. 203 and 1997: 594); Kiparsky (1979: 215 n. 9); Joshi & Roodbergen (1982: 88); Scharf (1996: 74, n. 78) who agree with the traditional interpretation, on the other hand, Wezler (1976: 367) and Thieme (1982: 9, n. 7).

To come back to the main arguments regards the discussed interpretation of A 1.2.51, what is especially remarkable above all is the terminology employed. The rule *lupi yuktavat* (A 1.2.51) as has been pointed out by Joshi & Roodbergen (1982: 69, n. 16) “contains three peculiar terms”, which seem to be employed in a sense that is alien to Pāṇini’s usage, i.e., *vacana-*, *vyakti-* and *yukta-*.

*Vacana-* is a base employed many times in the A, but only twice is it interpreted by commentaries as ‘grammatical number’ — ad A 1.2.51 and 11.3.46. It is only once paraphrased explicitly as *saṃkhyā*, in the M in an explanation of a *kārikā* concerning A 1.2.51 and once in KV ad A 1.2.51.

M 1.227.5–6 ad A 1.2.51: *Prāg api vṛtter yuktaṃ vṛttaṃ cāpiha yāvatā yuktaṃ | vaktuś ca kāmacāraḥ*<sup>15</sup> *prāg vṛtter liṅgasamkhye ye.*

M 1.227.7–10; 22 ad Vt 3 ad A 1.2.51: *Prāg api vṛtter yuktaṃ vanaspatibhir nagaraṃ vṛttaṃ cāpi yuktaṃ vanaspatibhir nagaram | vṛtte ca yuktavadbhāvo vidhīyate | kāmacāraś ca prayoktuḥ prāg vṛtter ye liṅgasamkhye te atideṣṭum vṛttasya vā ye liṅgasamkhye te | yāvatā kāmacāro vṛttasya ye liṅgasamkhye te atideṣyete na prāg vṛtter ye [...] adarśanasya liṅgasamkhye aśakye atideṣṭum iti kṛtvādarśanasahacarito yo ’rthas tasya gatir bhaviṣyati sāhacaryāt.*

KV ad A 1.2.51: *Vyaktivacane iti ca liṅgasamkhyayoḥ pūrvacāryanirdeśaḥ, tadīyam evedaṃ sūtraṃ.*

By contrast, it had been already used as a term for *saṃkhyā* in the Vts, as we can see at least in M 1.422.10 Vt 7 ad A 11.2.24. This was probably a consequence of the wrong segmentation of *ekavacana-*, *dvivacana-*, *bahuvacana-*. The KV attributes this outstanding terminology (i.e., both *vacana-* for *saṃkhyā-* and *vyakti-* for *liṅga-* otherwise occurring in Pāṇini’s work)<sup>16</sup> to

15. With regard to the expression *vaktuś kāmacāraḥ*, see Pontillo (2009).

16. *Liṅga* occurs in A 11.3.46; 4.7; 26 as ‘grammatical gender’. *Saṃkhyā* never occurs there as ‘grammatical number’. Nevertheless it occurs frequently as a name of number words or

the *pūrvacārya*, but apart from in the *Pāṇinīya* literature,<sup>17</sup> there is no ancient occurrence of *vacana-* as ‘grammatical number’. Even its occurrence in the *Bṛhaddevatā* I.43, according to the edition by Macdonell (1904), is not included in the text by Tokunaga (1997):<sup>18</sup>

*Aṣṭau yatra prayujante nānārtheṣu vibhaktayaḥ | tan nāma kavayaḥ prāhur bhede vacanaliṅgayoḥ* ‘That in which eight inflections are employed in various senses, sages call a noun, when there is a distinction of number and gender’.

Moreover, the term seems to be questioned in M I.227.1–2 ad A I.2.51, where *vacana* in the rule is not mentioned as a *pāribhāṣika* ‘technical term’, but according to its sense, in particular according to its etymological sense, as what ‘is expressed’, even though in the specific context of a discussion about the risk of transferring the genitive ending from *kaṭubadaryāḥ* (which is part of the *prakriyā* formula *kaṭubadaryāḥ adūrabhāvo grāmaḥ*) as a plant-name, to the derivative *kaṭubadarī* as a name of the village not far from this plant:

*Nedaṃ pāribhāṣikasya vacanasya grahaṇam | kiṃ tarhi | anvarthagrahaṇam | ucyate vacanam iti.*

Furthermore, *vacana-* occurs in the A at least 35 times in this latter sense of ‘word for denoting *x*’, ‘expression of *x*’, out of which 19 times as the second member of a locative-inflected sg. or more rarely a pl. compound as a condition of the denotation.<sup>19</sup> And, more relevantly, on ten occasions *vacana-*

numerals. 29 occurrences are listed in Bohtlingk (1887: 284\* s.v.). It occurs as a grammatical number in the M, for instance in M I.227.5–10 ad A I.2.51, where *vacana* is paraphrased by *saṃkhyā* and already in the Vts, at least in M I.422.10 Vt 7 ad A II.2.24.

17. According to Thieme (1956: 2–4) the usage of *vacana-* as ‘grammatical number’ only occurs in works more recent than Kātyāyana’s, but this is not so according to Cardona (1974: 287–288, n. 42), and already according to Scharfe (1965: 245), who judge Kātyāyana as sharing the interpretation of later *Pāṇinīyas*.

18. For reconstructing the discussion about the dubious usage of *vacana-* in A II.3.46, since Speijer (1886: 26, n. 1), see Cardona (1976: 229) and the bibliography quoted there. Cf. also Joshi & Roodbergen (1981: 9ff); Joshi & Roodbergen (1993: 88ff).

19. A I.4.89; II.1.33; III.2.112; 3.133–134; 136; 155; 4.66; IV.2.13; V.1.114; 3.23; 69; 4.3; 5; 21; 54; VI.2.24; VIII.1.15; 74.

is a compound with a *padārtha*-name as a first member, comparable with our *vyakti-* in the compound *vyakti-vacana* (*guṇa-vacana-* 6 times: A II.1.30; IV.1.44; V.1.124; V.3.38; VI.2.24; VIII.1.12; *sāmānya-vacana-* twice: A II.1.55; III.4.5; *bhāva-karma-vacana-* once: A VI.2.24; *viśeṣa-vacana-* once: A VIII.1.74).

As regards *vyakti-*, this is never used in the A apart from in our *sūtra* A 1.2.51, even though the KV attributes the term to some predecessors of Pāṇini.<sup>20</sup> It occurs in this sense exclusively as an *ad hoc* interpretation of this *sūtra* in the commentaries. As is well-known, it otherwise occurs as a common term for the ‘individual category’ opposed to *sāmānya*, for instance in the M, or as a term opposed to *jāti* and / or *ākṛti*, in *Mīmāṃsā*- and *Nyāya*-literature.<sup>21</sup> Therefore it seems interesting — as already suggested by Scharfe (1965) — to note the occurrence of the term *jāti* in the following *sūtra* (A 1.2.52).

Also *yuktavat-* is only used in the A in the general LUP-rule.

KV ad 1.2.51 preliminarily excludes the interpretation of *yuktavad-vyaktivacane* as only one word — although it would be grammatically correct — that is as a *tatpuruṣa*-compound in which *yuktavat* is a past active participle of the verb *yuj-* in the sense of ‘that which has connected itself with the meaning of the *taddhita*-affix’:

*Tatra lupi yuktavadvyaktivacane bhavataḥ | yuktavat iti niṣṭhāpratyayena  
ktavatunā prakṛtyartha ucyate | sa hi pratyayārtham ātmanā yunakti | ta-  
sya yuktavato vyaktivacane lubarthe vidhīyete.*

Immediately afterwards, the KV proposes the current interpretation of the rule where the *vidheya* is only *yuktavat-* as *yukta-* with the affix *-vat* according to A v.1.115, a formation which seems to recall *sthānivat-* of A 1.1.56:

*Atha vā yuktaḥ prakṛtyarthaḥ pratyayārthena sambaddhaḥ, tasminn iva  
vyaktivacane lubarthe bhavataḥ.*

*Yukta-* has also been variously interpreted by modern translators as “Wort zu dem es (= das abgeleitete Wort) in Beziehung steht” by Böhtlingk (1887: 18); “the original word” by Vasu (1891: 100); “mot de base” by Renou (1947–1954: 35); “an original base” by Cardona (1976: 332, n. 192); “the original

20. Chatterji (1964: 145) confirms this attribution.

21. Cf. Renou (1942: 101); Abhyankar (1961: 373); D’Sa (1980: 84ff); Kumar (1981: 163); Scharf (1996: 153; 289); Pandurangī (2006: 120; 134ff); Ganeri (2006: 20ff).

word” by Katre (1987: 44); “the original noun-base” by Joshi and Roodbergen (1993: 88); “the object denoted by the pre-affixal base” by Scharf (1996: 74, n. 78), but it is noteworthy that the term preferably employed by Pāṇini for the pre-affixal base is *aṅga-* (cf. A 1.4.13).

By contrast, there are fourteen other occurrences of *yukta-*, apart from A 1v.2.3, where *yukta-* means ‘conjoined’, referring to the astronomical conjunction of the moon with the constellations, and A 1v.2.66, where *yukta-* means ‘who is appointed to’. In nine cases, the term *yukta-* is used in a syntactic conditioning of the rule, more precisely three times in a compound whose first member is the name of a nominal triplet or a name of a grammatical category:

A 1.3.54 *tṛtīya-yukta-* ‘whatever lexeme co-occurring with a nominal stem ending in the instrumental case’;

A 1.4.9 *ṣaṣṭhī-yukta-* ‘whatever lexeme co-occurring with a nominal stem ending in the genitive case’;

A 11.3.8 *karmapravacanīya-yukta-* ‘whatever lexeme co-occurring with a *karmapravacanīya*’,

and six times in a compound whose first member is constituted by one or more lexemes (always indeclinables) and where the compound (except in one case) refers to a name of some grammatical category (11.3.4 *kāraka*; 11.3.19; 29 *prātipādika*; VIII.1.30; 2.96 *pada*):

A 11.3.4 *antarāntareṇa-yukta-* ‘whatever *kāraka-* co-occurring with a lexeme (indeclinable)’;

A 11.3.19 *sahayukta-* ‘whatever *prātipādika* co-occurring with a lexeme (indeclinable)’;

A 11.3.29 *some lexemes-yukta-* ‘whatever *prātipādika* co-occurring with some lexemes (indeclinables)’;

A VIII.1.24 *some lexemes-yukta-* ‘whatever pronoun co-occurring with some lexemes (indeclinables)’;

A VIII.1.30 *some lexemes-yukta-* ‘whatever *pada* co-occurring with some lexemes (indeclinables)’;

A VIII.2.96 some lexeme-*yukta*- ‘whatever pada co-occurring with a certain lexeme (indeclinable)’.

Moreover, we have three compounds whose first member is a demonstrative pronoun or adverb of the Pāṇinian technical type that always deals with a semantical / syntactical connection:

A I.4.50 *tathāyukta*- ‘so (semantically and syntactically) connected to’, expression employed for describing the semantic-syntactical relationship between a *karman* and the agent’s action;

A v.3.77 *tadyukta*- (nominal stem or verb ‘associated with it’ = “compassion” quoted in the precedent *sūtra* as denotation of nominal stems or verbs);

A v.4.36 *tadyukta*- (whatever nominal stem ‘associated with it’ = “conveyance of a verbal message” quoted in the precedent *sūtra* as denotation of a certain derivative).

From this we mainly derive a syntagm which combines an indeclinable with an inflected word and only twice obtain a morphological derivative — that is with reference to the *prakriyā*-level instead of the effective *bhāṣā*-level.

If we also check the usages of the term *yoga*- in the A, the latter occurs at least seven times clearly as a term for the co-occurrence of various words, for the syntactical connection:

A I.4.59 *kriyā-yoga*-; A II.3.16 *namas-svasti-svāhā-svadhā-alaṃ-vaṣaṭ-yoga*-; A v.4.44 *prati-yoga*-; A v.4.47 *hīyamāna-pāpa-yoga*-; A v.4.50 *kr-bhū-asti-yoga*-; A VI.4.74 *māñ-yoga*-; A VIII.1.59 *ca-vā-yoga*-

and six times as a term for a semantic (only rarely syntactical) connection with reference to the *prakriyā*:

A I.1.36 *bahiryoga*- ‘denotation of the connection with the exterior’; I.1.49 *sthāneyoga*- ‘denotation of the relation “in place of”’; A II.2.28 *tulyayoga*- ‘the same relation to the action’; A III.4.20 *parāvarayoga*- ‘denotation of what is situated on that side or this side’; A IV.1.48 *pumyoga*- ‘relationship with the male as a wife’; A v.4.126 *lubdhayoga*- ‘denotation of a connection with a hunter’.

Also, as regards the term *yoga-*, once again there is no trace of a morphological connection in the sense of the ‘affixation’. Both *yukta-* and *yoga-* exclude the morphophonetic perspective of the verb *yuj-*, rather they reflect the semantic field of *yuj-* as ‘sense-association’, ‘etymological connection’.

Thus, the *yuktavadbhāva* might have taught the behaviour of the derivative as if it were the *pada* with which it is connected both semantically and syntactically in the *prakriyā*.

According to Scharfe’s proposal (1965: 243), the rule as a whole could mean: “When a *taddhita*-affix is replaced by the technical term *LUP*, it (the derivative) behaves as if it were the semantically connected word when an individual is to be expressed”. In other words the *LUP*-replacement could be a mere sense-derivation of the same word without any morphological mark, technically blocking the otherwise compulsory *LUK*-replacement of the *sUP*-ending to get a *prātipādika*, before the derivative affixation (A II.4.71: *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ* ‘*LUK*-zero-replacement in place of a nominal ending of a *pada* constituting a verbal stem or a nominal base’). In fact the *uddeśya lupi vyaktivacane* of A I.2.51 cancels the precedent (A I.2.49) *taddhitaluki* and seems to institute a sort of comparison between the *taddhita-LUK* and *taddhita-LUP* (obviously the repetition of the term *taddhita-* is not compulsory because there are other kinds of *LUK*-replacements but exclusively *taddhita-LUP*-replacements). On the other hand, the commentaries also underline this contrast between the two kinds of *taddhita*-replacements, although interpreting it in a different way.

In fact, a *taddhita*-affix is commonly introduced (optionally) after the first *samartha-pada* stated in the specific *taddhita*-rule according to A IV.1.82,<sup>22</sup> but the latter is substituted by the corresponding *prātipādika* through the mentioned *LUK*-rule, because each *taddhita*-affix applies to a *prātipādika* according to A IV.1.76 (cf. A IV.1.1 *prātipādikāt*). The *artha* of the ending zero-replaced by *LUK* is guaranteed by the *sthānivadbhāva*-principle according to A I.1.56.

In the cases governed by the *LUP-vidhi-sūtra* (A I.2.51) the sense of the zero-replaced *taddhita*-affix applies at first to the *yukta*-*pada*, and the rule A II.4.71 only works after the so-called *vṛtti*, in order to get a *prātipādika* to which the nominal ending, gender and number marks included, is added. As a consequence, the first *samartha*-*pada* morphologically coincides with

22. For the only apparent contradiction between the two *adhikāra*-rules see Bhate (1989, 2-3; 6; 8), who furthermore interprets the word *samartha-* as “having the same meaning”, although traditionally it is interpreted differently.

the derived *pada*, that is, it changes its sense without any mark of the derivation either in the stem or in the affix. Through the *LUK*-zero-replacement (A II.4.71), one can derive from this *pada* the *prātipādika* to which finally gender and number have to be associated after the *vṛtti* has taken place.

Therefore, the *yukta*-noun would only be inflected according to the specific syntax of the sentence and would not need any derivative operation, although it acquires the new derivative sense as ‘an individual’.

This last perspective of *LUP*-rules would as a consequence render the KV remarks (KV ad A IV.3.167) about the pl. form of derivative, such as *harītakyaḥ*, useless:

*Atra ca vyaktir yuktavadbhāveṣyate vacanaṃ tv abhidheyavad eva bhavati harītakyaḥ phalāni harītakyaḥ | harītakī | kośātakī | nakharajānī | śaṣkaṇḍī | dāḍī | doḍī | dīḍī | śvetapāki | arjunapāki | kālā | drākṣā | dhvāṅkṣā | gargarikā | kaṅṭakārikā | śephālikā.*

In the same way, it would not be surprising to find the pl. form of the examples pertaining in the first Vt to the *LUP*-rule A IV.3.166 *lup ca*, i.e., the names of fruits of plants which dry out when their fruits ripen are pl. although the terms for plants are mentioned as sg.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, in this way perhaps the *kārikā* quoted by M I.227,5–6 ad A I.2.51 could be better understood:

*Prāg api vṛtter yuktam vṛttam cāpiha yāvatā yuktam | vaktuś ca kāmācārah prāg vṛtter liṅgasaṃkhye ye* ‘It is *yukta* before the *vṛtti* and it is also *yukta* here, inasmuch as it is the object of the *vṛtti*, its (of the *yukta*) gender and number before the *vṛtti* are also a free choice of the speaker’.

Patañjali concludes that insofar as this free choice exists, the gender and number of what is the object of the *vṛtti* will be transferred, rather than the gender and number of the *yukta* before the *vṛtti*, and consequently, he also solves the problem of the dubious transference of the genitive ending of the *yukta*.

If the *kārikā* could be read independently from the current interpretation of the *sūtra*, we would merely find there just one remark about the *yuktavadbhāva* taught by Pāṇini, a sort of a consequence of this specific

23. Vt 1 ad A IV.3.166: *lupprakarāṇe phalapākaśuśām upasaṃkhyānam*. E.g.: *vrihayaḥ* ‘rice’; *yavāḥ* ‘barley’; *māsāḥ* ‘beans (*Phaseolus Radiatus*)’; *mudgāḥ* ‘beans (*Phaseolus Mungo*)’; *tilāḥ* ‘sesame’ (M II.327.21–22 ad Vt 1 ad A IV.3.166; KV ad A IV.3.166).

feature of the *LUP*-derivatives, perhaps the point of departure for the more recent interpretation of *vyaktivacane* as a *dvandva*.

The focus of the controversy between Scharfe (1965) and Cardona (1976: 196; 334, n. 203) would be therefore surpassed: the zero-replacement affix is introduced after a *pada* according to each *taddhita* derivation rule, but A 1.2.51 blocks the otherwise compulsory replacement of the *pada* with the corresponding *prātipādika* (A 11.4.71). Patañjali's so-called *logische Delikatesse*, which teaches the extension of the gender and number of the *vr̥tta* instead of the *prāg vr̥tter* (*yāvatā kāmacāro vr̥ttasya ye liṅgasamkhye te atidekṣyete na prāg vr̥tter ye*) conceals the, in my opinion, veritably peculiar consequence of the *yuktavadbhāva* principle, the blocking of A 11.4.71 before the *LUP*-derivations.

#### CONCLUSION

Let us confer on some examples of the *LUP*-replacements proposed by the M and the KV (all the eleven *LUP*-rules are represented in the table on p. 154).

We have already stated how *puṣyaḥ* descends from *puṣyeṇa yuktaḥ kālaḥ* (A 1V.2.4) and *jambū* from *jambvāḥ* (*vikāraḥ / avayavaḥ* =) *phalam* (A 1V.3.166). With regard to the other *LUP*-rules, to A 1V.2.81 for instance, we can see how at first a substitution takes place, i.e., the denotation of *pañcāla* (i.e., of the first *samartha-pada* in the sentence, *pañcālānām nivāso janapadaḥ*) is derived as an individual country-name instead of as an inhabitant's name and only afterwards the *taddhita-prātipādika* is derived as a *pada*, i.e., it is inflected in the current way by affixing the requested triplet and the proper mark of gender.

There are only two derivatives whose gender and number are respectively different from those of the words from which they are derived, and in both cases these words appear to be less morphologically marked lexemes than the derivatives. On the other hand, if the gender and the number are attributed after the *vr̥tti* has taken place, no difficulties are caused by the adding of another mark to the derivative, which is always a proper name.

Therefore, in the case of *śravaṇā*, we would first derive the sense of the 'night of the full-moon in conjunction with *śravaṇa*-' by the *prakriyā* formula *śravaṇena yuktaḥ kālaḥ*. Then, apart from the ending required by the syntax, the f.sg. affix *ṬāP* would apply to the form obtained after the *vr̥tti* has taken place, that is to the *prātipādika śravaṇa-* as a time-name. The gender of this noun does not concern grammatical rules, but only as — we might say — a lexical feature of the current language or better a linguistic convention, a sort of consequence of *laukikī vivakṣā* in the sense of M 11.342.26–343.3 ad A 1V.1.16.

This is, however, different in the case of a *taddhita*-derivation by a *LUK*-zero-replacement, where at first we get a *prātipādika* from the first *samartha-pada* to which the zero-replaced affix applies with its proper derivative sense. For instance, the n. noun *jambu* is derived from the *samartha-pada jambū* in the genitive case through the intermediate stage of the *prātipādika jambu-*: this *prātipādika* is inflected according to the syntax of the sentence, and its gender and number agree with the denotatum that is *phala-*. From *jambvāḥ* (f.sg. genitive) we get the *prātipādika jambu-* denoting the plant-name, to which the ending with its n. mark applies according to the n. gender of the denotatum, that is *phalam*.

Furthermore, A 1.2.52 *viśeṣāṇām cājāteḥ* might have governed examples such as *śravaṇā-karman* and excluded *śrāvaṇī paurṇamāsī*. Both examples are found in the *Kalpasūtras*. In fact, *śravaṇā-* is not a *karman* but a night. It does not pertain to the *karman* as a species, but rather works as a qualifying word for *karman*. By contrast, in *śrāvaṇī paurṇamāsī* the *taddhita*-derivative is a qualifying word of the *jāti*-word *paurṇamāsī-* in the sense that *śrāvaṇī* and *paurṇamāsī* denote the same species (*jāti*) and the whole expression indicates a night of full-moon in the month *śrāvaṇaḥ*. Therefore this rule merely taken word by word — according to Scharfe's interpretation (1965) of *vyaktivacane* in A 1.2.51 — might extend the *yuktavadbhāva* to the *LUP*-derivatives, which function as qualifying words of other words, provided that the latter don't denote their species.<sup>24</sup>

24. Perhaps the well-known and amazing refusal in A 1.2.53 *tad aśīṣyam saṃjñāpramāṇatvāt*, might have stated the predominance of the *saṃjñā*-feature of this kind of derivatives, in particular referring to *saṃjñās* governed by A 1v.2.5 which work as *viśeṣaṇa*, where a specific mark of gender applies to the *vṛtti* according to a *laukikī vivakṣā*. For the relationship between the *vivakṣā*-device and the gender-regulation, see Van Nooten (1983).

A-rule	<i>samarthah padāḥ = prakriyā</i>	<i>prāḡ vrtter yuktaṁ (M 1.2275-6 ad A 1.2.51)</i>	KV-M-examples = <i>bhāṣā</i>
IV.2.4	<i>puṣyeṇa yuktaḥ kālāḥ</i> 'the time when the moon is in conjunction with the constellation <i>Puṣya</i> '	<i>puṣyaḥ</i> m.sg. constellation-name	<i>adya puṣyaḥ</i> m.sg. time-name
IV.2.5	<i>śravaṇeṇa yuktaḥ kālāḥ</i> 'the time when the moon is in conjunction with the constellation <i>Śravaṇa</i> '	<i>śravaṇaḥ</i> m.sg. constellation-name	<i>śravaṇā</i> f.sg. time-name
IV.2.5	<i>asvatthena yuktaḥ kālāḥ</i> 'the time when the moon is in conjunction with the constellation <i>Asvattha</i> '	<i>asvatthaḥ</i> m.sg. constellation-name	<i>asvattho muhūrtaḥ</i> m.sg. time-name
IV.2.81	<i>pañcālānāṁ nivāso janapadaḥ</i> 'the country which is the place of residence of <i>Pañcālas</i> '	<i>pañcālāḥ</i> m.pl. name of inhabitants	<i>pañcālāḥ</i> m.pl. place-name
IV.2.82	<i>kaṭukabādaryā adārbhavo grāmaḥ</i> 'the village which is not distant from the <i>Kaṭukabādari</i> tree'	<i>kaṭukabādari</i> f.sg. plant-name	<i>kaṭukabādari</i> f.sg. place-name
IV.2.83	<i>śarkarāḥ asmin astīti deśe tannāṁni</i> 'there are pebbles in this place bearing their name'	<i>śarkarāḥ</i> f.pl.	<i>śarkarāḥ</i> f.pl. place-name
V.2.105	<i>sikatāḥ asmin saritīti deśe tannāṁni</i> 'there are sands in this place bearing their name'	<i>sikatāḥ</i> f.pl.	<i>sikatāḥ</i> f.pl. place-name
IV.3.166	<i>jambvāḥ phalam</i> 'the fruit of the black plum tree'	<i>jambū</i> f.sg. plant-name	<i>jambū</i> f.sg. fruit-name
IV.3.167	<i>haritūkyāḥ phalam</i> 'the fruit of the Myrobalan tree'	<i>haritaki</i> f.sg. plant-name	<i>haritaki</i> f.sg. / <i>haritūkyāḥ</i> f.pl. fruit-name
V.3.98	<i>cañceva manuṣyaḥ</i> 'a person similar to a scarecrow'	<i>cañcā</i> f.sg.	<i>Cañcā</i> f.sg. nick-name
V.3.99	<i>śiveva jīvikārthaṁ apanyam</i> '[an image] similar to Śiva, when it is intended for earning a living, though not through its sale'	<i>śivaḥ</i> m.sg. theonym	<i>śivaḥ</i> m.sg. name of an image
V.3.100	<i>devapatheva</i> '[a place] similar to the path of gods'	<i>devapathaḥ</i> m.sg.	<i>devapathaḥ</i> m.sg. place-name

## REFERENCES

*Abbreviations*

A	<i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i>	MGṛS	<i>Mānava-Gṛhya-Sūtra</i>
ĀpŚrS	<i>Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra</i>	MŚrS	<i>Mānava-Śrauta-Sūtra</i>
ĀśvGṛS	<i>Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra</i>	MaitrS	<i>Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā</i>
AV	<i>Atharvaveda (Saunaka)</i>	P	<i>Padamañjarī</i>
BhGṛS	<i>Bhāradvāja-Gṛhya-Sūtra</i>	PārGṛS	<i>Pāraskara-Gṛhya-Sūtra</i>
GDhS	<i>Gautamīya-Dharma-Sūtra</i>	ŚGṛS	<i>Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra</i>
GGṛS	<i>Gobhila-Gṛhya-Sūtra</i>	ŚŚrS	<i>Śāṅkhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra</i>
HirGṛS	<i>Hiraṇyakeśi-Gṛhya-Sūtra</i>	SāmB	<i>Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa</i>
JGṛS	<i>Jaimini-Gṛhya-Sūtra</i>	TaittB	<i>Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa</i>
KāṭhS	<i>Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā</i>	TaittS	<i>Taittirīya-Saṃhitā</i>
KGṛS	<i>Kauṣītaki-Gṛhya-Sūtra</i>	VDhS	<i>Vaikhānasa-Dharma-Sūtra</i>
KV	<i>Kāśikā-Vṛtti</i>	VṣṇDhS	<i>Vaiṣṇava-Dharma-Sūtra</i>
M	<i>Mahābhāṣya</i>	Vt	<i>Vārttika</i>

*Primary Sources*

- Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra*. Text with English Translation and Notes by G. U. Thite. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book, 2004.
- Aṣṭādhyāyī. Pāṇini's Grammatik*. Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von O. Böhtlingk. Leipzig 1887. [= Böhtlingk 1887].
- Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtram with Sanskrit Commentary of Nārāyaṇa*. English Translation, Introduction and Index by Dr. Narendra Nath Sharma, with a Foreword by Dr. Satya Vrat Shastri. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers, 1976.
- Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Padapāṭha and Sāyaṇācārya's Commentary*. IV.4. *Kāṇḍas XIX–XX*. Ed. by Vishva Bandhu. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, 1962.
- Bhāradvāja-Gṛhya-Sūtra*. On the basis of the edition *Bhāradvājagṛhyasūtram. The domestic ritual according to the School of Bhāradvāja*, by H. J. W. Salomons. New Delhi, 1992 [First ed. Leiden, 1913]. [<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/ind/a/ind/ved/yvs/bhargs/bharg.htm>]
- Bṛhad-devatā attributed to Śaunaka. A Summary of the Deities and Myths of the ṚgVeda*. Ed. by Arthur A. Macdonell. Cambridge (Mass): Harvard University Press, 1904. [Reprinted ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994].
- Bṛhaddevatā*. Text reconstructed from the Manuscripts of the Shorter Recension with Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and Indices by Muneo Tokunaga. Kyoto: Rinsen, 1997.

- Gautamiya-Dharma-Sūtra*. On the basis of the edition *Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series* 61, 1966 with variant readings in square brackets taken from the edition by A. F. Stenzler. London: The Institutes of Gautama, 1876. [<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/ind/aind/ved/sv/dhs/gautdhs/gautd.htm>]
- Gobhila-Gṛhya-Sūtram*. With *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa's Commentary crit. ed. from original manuscripts with notes and indices* by Chintamani Bhattacharya. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1982 [First ed. Calcutta, 1936].
- Hiranyakeśi-Gṛhya-Sūtra*. On the basis of the edition *The Gṛhyasūtra of Hiranyakeśin with extracts from the commentary of Māṭṛidatta*, by J. Kirste. Vienna, 1889. [<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/ind/aind/ved/yvs/hirgs/hirgs.htm>]
- Hiranyakeśi-Gṛhya-Sūtra Commentary*. Ed. by Gopīnātha Bhaṭṭa. Poona: Anandasramanamudralaya, 1899.
- Jaimini-Gṛhya-Sūtra*. *The Jaiminigrhyasūtra belonging to the Sāmaveda*. Ed. and transl. by W. Caland. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984. [First ed. Lahore 1922].
- Kāthakaṃ*. *Die Saṃhitā der Kaṭha-Śākhā*. Hrsg. von L. von Schroeder. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1900–1910.
- Kauṣītaki-Gṛhya-Sūtra*. On the basis of the edition *The Kauṣītaka Gṛhyasūtras with the Commentary of Bhavavrata*, by T. R. Chintamani. Madras, 1944. [<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/ind/aind/ved/rv/kausgs/kausg.htm>]
- Kāśikā, a Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar by Vāmana and Jayāditya*. Ed. by A. Sharma, Kh. Deshpande and D. G. Padhye. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University, 1969–1970.
- Mahābhāṣya*. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Ed. by F. Kielhorn. Osnabrück: Zeller, 1970. [First ed. Bombay, 1880–1885].
- Mānava-Gṛhya-Sūtra*. On the basis of the edition *Maitrāyaṇīya Mānava Gṛhya Sūtram with the commentary of Aṣṭavakra*, by R. H. Sastri. New Delhi, 1982. [<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/ind/aind/ved/yvs/mangs/mangs.htm>]
- Mānava-Śrauta-Sūtra*. *The Mānava Śrautasūtra belonging to Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. Transl. by J. M. van Gelder, with new Appendix Containing Corrections and Emendations to the Text by C. G. Kashikar. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1985. [First ed. New Delhi, 1961–1963].
- Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā*. Hrsg. von L. von Schroeder. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1881–1886.
- Nyāsa or Pañcikā Commentary of Ācārya Jinendrabuddhipāda and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra on the Kāśikāvṛtti of Vāmana-Jayāditya*. Ed. by S. D. D. Śastri and K. P. Shukla. Varanasi: Sudhi Prakashan, 1983–1985.
- Pāṇini's Grammatik*. Hrsg., übers., erl. und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von O. Böhtlingk. Leipzig: Haessel, 1887.
- Pāraskara-Gṛhya-Sūtra*. *Grihya-Sūtra by Paraskar with five commentaries of Karka Upādhyāya, Jayarām, Harihar, Gadādhara and Vishvanāth*. Ed. by

- Mahādev Gangādhara Bākṛe. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1982. [First ed. Bombay, 1917].
- Śāṅkhāyanagr̥hyam. Ed. and transl. by H. O. Oldenberg. Berlin: Dümmler, 1878.
- Śāṅkhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra together with the commentary of Varadattasuta Ānartīya and Govinda. Ed. by A. Hillebrandt. New Delhi: Meharchand Lachmandas Publications, 2002. [First ed. Calcutta, 1885–99].
- Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa with Vedārthaprakāśa of Sāyaṇa and Padārthamātravivṛti of Bharatasvāmin. Crit. ed. by B. R. Sharma. Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 1964.
- Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa of the Black Yajur Veda with the Commentary of Sāyanācharya. Ed. by R. Mitra. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1859–1862.
- Taittirīya-Saṃhitā. Kṛṣṇayajurvedīya-taittirīya-saṃhitā. Vedārtha-Prakāśa by Sāyaṇa. Poona: Ānandāśram, 1900–1905.
- Vaikhānasa-Dharma-Sūtra. On the basis of the edition Vaikhānasasmārtasūtram, The domestic rules of the Vaikhānasa school, belonging to the Black Yajurveda, by W. Caland. Calcutta, 1927. [<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/ind/aind/ved/yvs/dhs/vaikhds/vaikh.htm>]
- Vaiṣṇava-Dharma-Sūtra. On the basis of the edition Viṣṇusmṛti, by V. Krishnamacharya. Madras, 1964. Ed. by I. Shima, collated by T. Hayashi under the guidance of Y. Ikari. Kyōtō: Institute for Research in Humanities, 1991. [<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/ind/aind/ved/yvs/dhs/visnudhs/visnu.htm>]

### Secondary Sources

- Abhyankar, K. V. 1961. *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Apte, D. 1890. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Containing Appendices on Sanskrit Prosody and Important Literary and Geographical Names of Ancient India*. Poona. [Reprinted in Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965].
- Benson, James W. 1990. *Patañjali's remarks on aṅga*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bhate, Saroja. 1989. *Pāṇini's Taddhita Rules*. Poona: University of Poona.
- Böhtlingk, Otto. 1887. *Pāṇini's Grammatik*. Leipzig: Haessel.
- Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth. 1855–1875. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1982. The Variationist Pāṇini and Vedic: a Review Article. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 24: 273–82.
- . 1991. Pāṇini and the Veda reconsidered. In *Pāṇinian Studies. Professor S. D. Joshi Felicitation Volume*, eds. M. M. Deshpande and. S. Bhate, 75–121. Ann Arbor: Centre for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan.
- . 1996. Pāṇini and the Kāthas. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20: 59–65.

- Brucker, Egon. 1980. *Die spätvedische Kulturepoche nach den Quellen der Śrauta-, Ṛghya-, und Dharmasūtras*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Bühler, Georg. 1879–1882. *The Sacred Laws of the Āryas as taught in the Schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vāsiṣṭha, Baudhāyana*. [Reprinted in Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965–1969].
- Cardona, George. 1974. Pāṇini's Kāraṅkas: agency, animation and identity. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2: 231–306.
- . 1976. *Pāṇini. A Survey of Research*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- . 1997. *Pāṇini. His Work and Its Traditions*. 1. *Background and Introduction*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . 1999. *Recent Research in Pāṇinian Studies*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Chatterji, K. C. 1964. *Technical Terms and Technique of Sanskrit Grammar*. 1. Calcutta: Calcutta University Press.
- Dandekar, R. N. 1958–1973. *Śrautakośa*. Poona: Vaidika Samsodana Mandala.
- Debrunner, Albert. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik*. II.2. *Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- D'Sa, Francis X. 1980. *Śabdaprāmāṇyam in Śabara and Kumārila. Towards a Study of the Mīmāṃsā Experience of Language*. Vienna: De Nobili.
- Ganeri, Jonardon. 2006. *Artha. Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gonda, Jan. 1977. The Ritual Sūtras. In *A History of Indian Literature* ed. J. Gonda, 1.2, 465–684. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gopal, Ram. 1983. *India of Vedic Kalpasutras*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [First ed. Delhi, 1959].
- Joshi, S. D. and J. A. F. Roodbergen. 1981. *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Prātipadikārthaseṣāhnikā (P 2.3.46–2.3.71). Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes*. Poona: University of Poona.
- . 1982. The Structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī in historical perspective. In *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, held in July 1981*, eds. S. D. Joshi and S. D. Laddu, 59–95. Poona: University of Poona.
- . 1993. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini with Translation and Explanatory Notes*. II (1.2.1–1.2.73). New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Katre, Sumitra M. 1987. *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Keith, Arthur B. 1967. *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Saṁhita*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [First ed. Cambridge (Mass), 1914].
- Keith, Arthur B. and Arthur A. Macdonell. 1958. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*. Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass. [First ed. London, 1912].
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956–1980. *Kurzgefasstes Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1979. *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. Poona: MIT Press and Poona University Press.

- Konow, Sten. 1893. *Das Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa. Ein altindisches Handbuch der Zauberei*. Halle a S.: Niemeyer.
- Kumar, Avanindra. 1981. *Archaic Words in Pāṇini's Aṣṭadhyāyī*. Delhi: Niemeyer.
- Liebich, Bruno. 1891. *Panini. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Indischen Literatur und Grammatik*. Leipzig: Hansel.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1967. *The Grihya-Sūtras. Rules of Vedic Domestic Ceremonies*. II. *Gobhila-Hiraṇyakeśin, Āpastamba*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [First ed. Oxford 1892].
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2000. *Dharmasūtras. The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha, Annotated Text and Translation*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [First ed. Oxford 1999].
- Pandurangi, K. T. 2006. Philosophy of Purvamīmāṃsā. In *Pūrvamīmāṃsā from an Interdisciplinary Point of View*, ed. K. T. Pandurangi, 53–174. Delhi: Center for Studies in Civilizations.
- Pontillo, Tiziana. 2000 [2004]. Derivazione denominale metonimica con zeromorfi di tipo LUP in Pāṇini. *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* XI: 105–149.
- . 2006. The names of fruits, roots and flowers included in Kālidāsa's works and the Aṣṭadhyāyī rules IV,3,163–167 with their Commentaries. In *Pandanus '06. Nature in Literature and Rituals*, ed. J. Vacek, 161–176. Prague: Charles University, Faculty of Arts and Triton.
- . 2007 [2009]. La “Libertà del parlante” nell'orizzonte dei commentari pāṇiniani: dal Mahābhāṣya alla Kāśikāvṛtti. *Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* III.2 n.s.: 51–62.
- Radicchi, Anna. 1994. Vāc e Vivakṣā: creatività e comunicazione. In *La Parola Creatrice in India e nel Medio Oriente. Atti del Seminario della Facoltà di Lettere dell'Università di Pisa, 29-31 maggio 1991*, ed. C. Conio, 53–63. Pisa: Giardini.
- . 2000. Vivakṣā in Kāśikāvṛtti: Jayāditya and Vāmana. In *Makaranda. Madhukar Anant Mehendale Festschrift*, eds. M. A. Dhaky and J. B. Shah, 89–114. Ahmedabad: Sharadaben Chimanbhai Educational Research Centre.
- Renou, Louis. 1942. *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit*. Paris: Champion.
- . 1947–1954. *La grammaire de Pāṇini. Traduite du Sanskrit avec des extraits des commentaires indigènes*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Raja Radhakantadeva. 1967. *Śabdakalpadrumaḥ or An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit Words*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Scharf, Peter M. 1996. *The Denotation of Generic Terms in Ancient Indian Philosophy: Grammar, Nyāya, and Mīmāṃsā*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

- Scharfe, Hartmut. 1965. *vacana* "Numerus" bei Pāṇini? *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 79: 239–46.
- . 1977. Grammatical Literature. In *A History of Indian Literature* ed. J. Gonda, v.2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Scherer, Anton. 1953. *Gestirnnamen bei den indogermanischen Völkern*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Sharma, Ram Nath. 1999. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. iv. *English Translation of Adhyāya Four and Five with Sanskrit Text, Transliteration, Word-Boundary, Anuvṛtti, Vṛtti, Explanatory Notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Speijer, J. S. 1886. *Sanskrit Syntax*. Leiden: Brill.
- Staal, Frits. 1982. *The Science of Ritual*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Stenzler, Adolf F. 1886. *Wortverzeichniss zu den Hausregeln von Āśvalāyana, Pāraskara, Śāṅkhāyana und Gobhila*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Thieme, Paul. 1935. *Pāṇini and the Veda. Studies in the Early History of Linguistic Science in India*. Allahabad: Globe Press.
- . 1956. Pāṇini and the Pāṇinīyas. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76: 1–23.
- . 1982. Meaning and Form of the Grammar of Pāṇini. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 8/9: 3–34.
- Van Nooten, Barend A. 1983. *Vivakṣā-*, or Intention to speak, as a linguistic Principle. In *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini (Held in July 1981)*, eds. S. D. Joshi and S. D. Laddu, 43–52. Pune: University of Poona.
- Vasu, S. C. ed. 1988. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [First ed. Allahabad 1891].
- Wackernagel, Jakob. 1896. *Altindische Grammatik*. 1. *Lautlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Weber, Albrecht Friedrich. 1862. *Die Vedischen Nachrichten von den naxatra (Mondstationen)*. Berlin: F. Dümmler.
- . 1888. Über alt-irānische Sternnamen. *Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1: 3–14.
- Wezler, Albrecht. 1976. Some Observations on the Grammatical Terminology of Pāṇini (Marginalia zu Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* II). In *German Scholars on India. Contributions to Indian Studies*. Vol II, ed. by the Cultural Department of the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, 361–79. New Delhi, Bombay: Nachiketa Publications.
- Whitney, W. D. 1962. *Atharva-Veda Saṃhitā. Translation with a critical and exegetical commentary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.