

Total Replacement of the Affix *Jas* by the Substitute *Śī* The *kaumudīs* Interpretation of A 1.1.55 *anekāśīt sarvasya*

Valentina Ferrero

Università degli Studi di Cagliari, Italia

Abstract The present article focuses on the replacement of the whole affix *Jas* by the substitute *Śī*, when it occurs after a *sarvanāman* (pronominal stem) ending in the short vowel *-a*, as taught by Pāṇini in A 7.1.17 *jasah śī*. Most commentators attribute the evocation of A 1.1.55 *anekāśīt sarvasya* to the fact that *Śī* is marked with Ś, while Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, on the other hand, attributes this evocation to the *anekāl* nature of *śī*. This paper analyses the commentaries previous to the *Siddhāntakaumudī* (SK) to understand when *śī* started being understood as *anekāl*, concluding that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita did not abandon the tradition since this appears to be a fresh reinterpretation of Kātyāyana's *vārttikas*.

Keywords Pāṇini. Sarvanāman. Pronominal inflection. Nominative plural. Commentaries.

Summary 1 Introduction. – 2 The Commentarial History of A 7.1.17 *jasah śī*. – 3 *Paribhāṣā* and Traditional Examples on (*an*)*ekāltvam*. – 4 Coming Back to Kātyāyana and Patañjali. – 5 Conclusion.



Edizioni
Ca' Foscari

Peer review

Submitted 2023-08-02
Accepted 2023-09-25
Published 2023-11-03

Open access

© 2023 Ferrero | 4.0



Citation Ferrero, V. (2023). "Total Replacement of the Affix *jas* by the Substitute *śī*". *Bhasha. Journal of South Asian Linguistics, Philology and Grammatical Traditions*, 2(2), [1-20] 259-278.

DOI 10.30687/bhasha/2785-5953/2023/02/001

259

1 Introduction

The topic of the present research is the analysis of the substitute *Śī*, which replaces the affix *Jas* (that is, the affix of the nominative plural) based on the indigenous grammatical explanations, in particular, according to *sūtra* A 7.1.17 *jaṣaḥ śī [aṅgasya #6.4.1 ataḥ #9 sarvanāmanāḥ #14]*: “*Śī* replaces *Jas*, when it occurs after the pre-affixal base consisting of a pronominal stem ending in the short vowel *-a*”; moreover, several commentaries are taken into account in order to understand the change in the interpretation of *Śī*, in accordance with aphorism A 1.1.55 *anekāśīt¹ sarvasya* “a substitute consisting of more than one phoneme (*anekāl*) or marked with *Ś* (*Śit*) replaces the whole”. In conclusion, a step back in the *Mahābhāṣya* (M) and in Kātyāyana’s *vārttikas* (vt.) will be taken to demonstrate that, even though the *Siddhāntakaumudī* (SK) often shows innovative reasonings, its author mostly limits himself to take position for one of the interpretative hypotheses developed within the grammatical tradition, from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A) of Pāṇini onwards.

The main context of the article is determined by Sanskrit pronouns that need to be defined first: they are introduced by Pāṇini in rule A 1.1.27 *sarvādīni sarvanāmāni*, that is, “the word-forms beginning with *sarva* ‘all’ are designated as *sarvanāman* ‘pronouns’”. This *sarvādī* introduces a list of thirty-five pronominal stems, the first member of which is *sarva* ‘all’.²

In *navya vyākaraṇa* works,³ it is generally taught that the inflection of Sanskrit pronouns is *rāmavat* (i.e. ‘like that of Rāma’) for most of the *vibhaktis*. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the pronominal declension is partially different from the nominal one. For

All the translations are by the Author, unless specifically stated. The Author is deeply grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their insightful suggestions.

1 According to Vāsudevadikṣita’s interpretation of *anekāśīt* as *na eka aneka, aneka al yasya sa anekāl, śākāra it yasya sa śīt, anekāl ca śīt ceti samāhāradvandvaḥ* [sic] (*Bālamānoramā* on SK ad A 1.1.55).

2 (1) *sarva* ‘all’, (2) *viśva* ‘all’, (3) *ubha* ‘two’, (4) *ubhaya* ‘both’, (5) word-forms ending with the affix *Ḍatara*, (6) word-forms ending with the affix *Ḍatama*, (7) *itara* ‘other’, (8) *anya* ‘other’, (9) *anyatara* ‘either’, (10) *tvat* ‘other’, (11) *tva* ‘other’, (12) *nema* ‘half’, (13) *sama* ‘all’, (14) *sima* ‘whole’, (15) *pūrva* ‘east or prior’, (16) *para* ‘subsequent’, (17) *avara* ‘west or posterior’, (18) *dakṣiṇa* ‘south or right’, (19) *uttara* ‘north or inferior, subsequent’, (20) *apara* ‘other or inferior’, (21) *adhara* ‘west or inferior’, (22) *sva* ‘own’, (23) *antara* ‘outer or an under or lower garment’, (24) *tyad* ‘he, she, it’, (25) *tad* ‘he, she, it’, (26) *yad* ‘who’, (27) *etad* ‘this’, (28) *idam* ‘it’, (29) *adas* ‘that’, (30) *eka* ‘one’, (31) *dvi* ‘two’, (32) *yusmad* ‘you’, (33) *asmad* ‘we’, (34) *bhavat* ‘you’, (35) *kim* ‘what’ (see KV ad A 1.1.27).

3 Some works of *navya vyākaraṇa* have been taken into consideration here, mainly the *Siddhāntakaumudī* by Bhaṭṭhoji Dikṣita (sixteenth-seventeenth century), the three *kaumudī* by Varadarāja (seventeenth century), namely the *Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī*, the *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī* and the *Sārasiddhāntakaumudī*, and finally a modern Hindi commentary called *Bālasiddhāntakaumudī* by Jyoti Svarūpa Miśra (1991).

instance, Pāṇini introduces some substitutes for the nominative plural (A 7.1.17 *jasah śī*), the dative singular (A 7.1.14 *sarvanāmaḥ smai*),⁴ the ablative singular and the locative singular (A 7.1.15 *naśiṅyoḥ smātsminau*),⁵ and the genitive plural (A 7.1.52 *āmi sarvanāmaḥ suḥ*).⁶

The rule A 7.1.17 *jasah śī* prescribes the replacement of the affix *Jas* with the substitute *Śī* (nom. pl.). This is a complete replacement because of aphorism A 1.1.55 *anekāśīt sarvasya* that teaches the total replacement of the substituendum by an *anekāl* or a *Śīt* substitute. For this reason, *sarva-* + *Jas* becomes *sarva-* + *Śī*. After replacing the marker *Ś* with *lopa* (i.e. ‘zero-replacement’),⁷ the final vowel of *sarva-* and the remaining *ī* of the affix *Śī* are joined in a *guṇa-sandhi*⁸ and hence the result is the form *sarve* for the nominative plural.

The M does not analyse specifically rule A 7.1.17. The *Kāśikāvṛttī* (KV), instead, paraphrases the *sūtra* and gives some examples of its application, such as *sarve* (*sarva-* + *Śī*), *viśve* (*viśva-* + *Śī*), *ye* (*yad-* + *Śī*), *ke* (*kim-* + *Śī*), *te* (*tad-* + *Śī*). Following the authoritative exposition provided by the main commentaries, the other works explain *Śī* in two different ways, according to their interpretation of rule A 1.1.55 *anekāśīt sarvasya*. The *Rūpāvatāra* (R) and the *Prakriyākaumudī* (PK) focus on the fact that *Śī* is marked with *Ś*, while all the other *kaumudīs* beginning with the SK highlight that it is an item consisting of more than one phoneme, as shown in section 2. Nevertheless, it is worthy to note that both these hypotheses have already been put forward by the M *ad* A 1.1.55.

Since the commentaries to the PK tend to follow what was previously written in the root text (see below footnote 13), an in-depth analysis of the SK commentary *ad* A 7.1.17 will lead the research towards new horizons; in fact, after qualifying *śī* as *anekāl* “(an item) consisting of more than one phoneme”, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita explains why this substitute is different from other substitutes and therefore he quotes the *paribhāṣā* “*nānubandhakṛtam anekāltvam*”. The translation

4 A 7.1.14 *sarvanāmaḥ smai* [aṅgasya #6.4.1 atah #9 neḥ #14]: “*smai* replaces *Ñe*, when it occurs after the pre-affixal base consisting of a pronominal stem ending in the short vowel -a”.

5 A 7.1.15 *naśiṅyoḥ smātsminau* [aṅgasya #6.4.1 atah #9 sarvanāmaḥ #14]: “*smāt* and *smin* replace *NasI* and *Ñi*, when they occur after the pre-affixal base consisting of a pronominal stem ending in the short vowel -a”.

6 A 7.1.52 *āmi sarvanāmaḥ suḥ* [aṅgasya #6.4.1 #āt 50]: “*suḥ* is inserted at the head of *ām*, when it occurs after the pre-affixal base consisting of a pronominal stem ending in the phoneme *a*”.

7 Rule A 1.3.8 *laśakv ataddhite* designates the initial *L*, *Ś* and *KU* of affixes other than *taddhita* as *it* when in *upadeśa*, followed by the rule A 1.3.9 *tasya lopa* that prescribes the zero-replacement (*lopa*) of that (*it*), i.e. of the marker(s).

8 Rule A 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* prescribes a *guṇa*-replacement of both, a vowel which follows *a* and the *a* which precedes that vowel, in continuous utterance (*saṃhitā*). In this specific case, the final -a of *sarva-* and the following *ī* of *Śī* are replaced by the *guṇa*-vowel *e*.

and comment to this *paribhāṣā* are worth noting because there is a list of substitutes (i.e. *Dādi* list) that work in the same way as *Śī*. After an analysis of these affixes in section 3, the research will move back to the M in section 4 to demonstrate that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita did not abandon the tradition of Pāṇini's grammar.

All the previous sections will lead to general conclusions on the SK and its main sources as it is important to demonstrate that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita merely re-interprets the tradition in a fresh manner, whether it comes from the M of Patañjali or from the vt. of Kātyāyana. In particular, the present proposal is to outline the main feature of the problem here tackled with the aim of understanding if someone adopted this specific substitution scheme before the SK.

2 The Commentarial History of A 7.1.17 *jaśaḥ śī*

As already anticipated, the M does not analyse A 7.1.17, while the KV paraphrases this *sūtra* and gives some examples of its application. However, KV *ad* A 1.1.55 provides an example for *Śit*, namely A 7.1.20 *jaśśasoḥ śiḥ*, that is relevant to understand the position of the work on the substitute *Śī*. In fact, since *Śī* is considered as *Śit* by the KV, it is possible to understand *Śī* in the same manner.⁹ It is important to consider that other commentaries such as the R and the PK agree with the KV and teach that the substitute *Śī* replaces the whole affix *Jas* because the phoneme *Ś* of *Śī* is a marker (*it*).

R *ad* A 7.1.17: *śakāras sarvādeśārthaḥ anekāltvāt* ¹⁰ *guṇaḥ; sarve |*

The phoneme *Ś* [of *Śī*] has the aim of a total replacement [of *Jas*], because it (i.e. *Śī*) does not consist of more than one phoneme. [According to aphorism A 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*],¹¹ there is a *guṇa-*

⁹ In fact, the KV *ad* A 1.1.55 reads *śit khalv api – jaśśasoḥ śiḥ* (A 7.1.20). *kuṇḍāni tiṣṭhanti, kuṇḍāni paśya*.

¹⁰ This passage seems to be an extension of *Nyāsa* on KV *ad* A 7.1.17: *śakāras sarvādeśārthaḥ. asati tasmin ādeḥ parasya iti vacanād akāramātrasya syāt*, where Jinen-drabuddhi already anticipated that “the phoneme *Ś* [of *Śī*] has the aim of a total replacement [of *Jas*]. If [*Ś*] did not occur there, in accordance with rule A 1.1.54 *ādeḥ parasya*, [*ī*] will only replace the phoneme *a* of *Jas* (i.e. the initial phoneme of the substituendum)”. Nevertheless, *Nyāsa* on KV *ad* A 1.1.55 remarks that *Śī* indeed cannot be considered as *anekāl*: *śitaḥ śakārānubandhenānekaltve'pi śīd iti pṛthakkaraṇam nānubandhakṛtam anekaltvam iti jñāpanārtham*, that is, “even though an item marked with *Ś* consists of more than one phoneme because of the marker *Ś*, *śit* (in rule A 1.1.55) serves as a clue for the *paribhāṣā – nānubandhakṛtam anekāltvam*” (see section 3 below). Many thanks are due to an anonymous reviewer, who drew my attention on this source.

¹¹ A 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* [*saṃhitāyām* #72 *aci* #77 *ekaḥ pūrvaparayoḥ* #84]: “there is a *guṇa*-replacement of both, a vowel which follows *a* and the *a* which precedes that vowel, in continuous utterance (*saṃhitā*)”.

replacement [of the remaining *ī* of *Śī* and the final *-a* of *sarva-* in continuous utterance]; [therefore, the final form is] *sarve* (nom. pl.).

The R defines the phoneme *Ś* of *Śī* as having the aim of a total replacement of the affix *Jas*: it is evident that the R considers *Śī* as “(an item) having the marker *Ś* (*Śit*)”, and this would be sufficient to state that the replacement concerns the whole affix *Jas*; however, the author specifies that the substitute “does not consist of more than one phoneme” (*an-ane-kāltvāt*), clearly referring to *paribhāṣā* “*nānubandhakṛtam anekāltvam*”. In fact, the *paribhāṣā* just mentioned teaches “the status of consisting of more than one phoneme is not determined by the *anubandhas*”.

Once the substitute *Śī* is interpreted as “(an item) having the marker *Ś* (*Śit*)”, the derivation of *sarve* (nom. pl.) occurs as follows: the phoneme *Ś* is zero-replaced (according to A 1.3.9 *tasya lopaḥ* “*lopa* replaces it”); subsequently, there is the *guṇa*-replacement of the remaining *ī* of *Śī* and the final *-a* of *sarva-* (A 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ* prescribing a *guṇa*-replacement of both, a vowel which follows *a* and the *a* which precedes that vowel in continuous utterance). Even more schematically than the R, the PK, which is the first commentary to be entitled as *kaumudī*,¹² defines the phoneme *Ś* as a marker (*it*) and, without considering the process of zero-replacement (*lopa*) and the *guṇa*-sandhi in *-e*, shows the final form of the nom. pl. *sarve*.

PK *ad* A 7.1.17: *śa it | sarve |*

Ś is a marker (*it*). [Therefore, the final form is] *sarve* (nom. pl.).¹³

On the other hand, all the *kaumudī*s beginning with the SK believe that *śī* is a substitute with more than one phoneme (*an-ekāl*) and, for

¹² The PK is basically the source of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita for what concerns the order of Pāṇini’s rules presented in this section and the typology of the commentary chosen, i.e. ‘an elucidation’. The word *kaumudī* is metaphorically used like other words of similar import (cf. *candrikā*) in the title of grammatical commentaries and other explanatory works to imply that the book so designated throws much light on the subject of which it treats, e.g. *padārtha-k^o*, *prakriyā-k^o*, *laghu-k^o*, *vaiśamya-k^o*, *siddhānta-k^o*.

¹³ In order to understand if the PK (fourteenth-fifteenth century) played a role in suggesting the SK change of perspective (sixteenth-seventeenth century), some of the most important commentaries to the PK have been here examined. In particular, the *Prakāśa* by Śeṣakṛṣṇa and the *Prasāda* by Viṭṭhala (sixteenth century) are the only two commentaries that the Author of the present research has been able to analyse, since all the other works are generally unavailable. However, the *Prakāśa* and the *Prasāda* on PK *ad* A 7.1.17 quote the exact same words as the PK: *śa it. sarve*. “*Ś* is a marker (*it*). [Therefore, the final form is] *sarve* (nom. pl.)”. This is the reason why, in this specific situation, the PK cannot be considered as the source of SK reasoning. Note that the mentioned dates follow Coward, Kunjuni Raja 1990, 215.

this reason, it replaces the entire *Jas*. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita provides an explanation of why *śī* should be understood in a different way; however, since the SK is often quite cryptic, it is necessary to wait for modern commentaries to grasp the point.

SK *ad* A 7.1.17: *anekālvāt sarvādeśaḥ* |¹⁴ *na cārvaṇas tṛ ityādav iva nānubandhakṛtam anekālvam iti vācyam* | *sarvādeśatvāt prāg itsamjñāyā evābhāvāt* | *sarve* |

There is a total replacement [of *Jas*], because [the substitute *śī*] consists of more than one phoneme. And it is not like the substitute *tṚ* which replaces [the final -*n*] of *arvan* (see A 6.4.127)¹⁵ etc. – it must be taught that the characteristic of having more than one phoneme is not determined by the *anubhandas* (see *paribhāṣā* in section 3 below) – since the designation as a marker (*it*) does not become applicable [to the *ś* in *śī*] before the total replacement.¹⁶ [Therefore, the final form is] *sarve* (nom. pl.).

As is well known, Varadāraja (seventeenth century) composed three different *kaumudīs* in order to further simplify the main work of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita (sixteenth-seventeenth century). These commentaries abridge the SK by selecting only the most useful aphorisms of Pāṇini's grammar, and the outcome is the composition of three works of different lengths: the *Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī* (MSK), which is considered a medium version, the *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī* (LSK), a brief version, and the *Sārasiddhāntakaumudī* (SSK), a supershort version.

MSK and LSK *ad* A 7.1.17: *anekālvāt sarvādeśaḥ* | *sarve* |

14 It is evident that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita presents this new way of operating among different *sūtras* as something established. In fact, both the *Praṣṭhamānoraṃā* by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita himself and the *Tattvabodhinī* by Jñānendra Sarasvatī (contemporary of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita) comment *anekālvāt* as *na tu śitvād iti bhāvaḥ* “the idea is [that *śī* is *anekāl*] ‘because [the substitute *śī*] is not indeed endowed with the marker *Ś* (*Sit*)’”; moreover, all the following *kaumudīs* endorse the SK approach and just mention *anekālvāt sarvādeśaḥ* as the reason why the substitute *śī* should replace the entire affix *Jas*. The BSK is the only *kaumudī* that goes deeper in explaining all the different steps required to obtain the qualification of the substitute *śī* as *anekāl* “(an item) consisting of more than one phoneme”.

15 Rule A 6.4.127 prescribes the substitution of the final sound of *arvan* with *tṚ*, except in the nominative singular (*sU*) or when the word is joined with the negative particle (*nañ*). According to *sūtra* A 1.1.52, which is here the general rule, a substitute replaces the final phoneme of the substituendum. On the other hand, *Śī* replaces the whole *sthānin* in accordance with the aphorism A 1.1.55, which prescribes the total replacement of the substituendum by an *anekāl* or by a *Śit* substitute.

16 As regard the stage in the derivation in which *Ś* is designated as a marker (*it*), see in particular section 4.

There is a total replacement [of *Jas*], because [the substitute *śī*] consists of more than one phoneme. [Therefore, the final form is] *sarve* (nom. pl.).

SSK *ad* A 7.1.17: *sarve* |

[The final form is] *sarve* (nom. pl.).

It is evident that after several centuries, the perspective concerning this affixation has changed and this is now quite the opposite. The turning point plausibly depends on the *prakriyā* perspective, as *navya vyākaraṇa* commentaries give great importance to the derivation of single words step by step. The SK explains its interpretation of *śī* as *anekāl* by stating that, prior to the total replacement of *Jas* by the substitute *śī*, the *ś* of *śī* cannot be defined as *it*.¹⁷

All the other *kaumudī*s adopt the SK reading by simply quoting *anekāltvāt sarvādeśaḥ*. Instead, Jyoti Svarūpa Mīśra, the author of a contemporary Hindī commentary (1991) entitled *Bālasiddhāntakaumudī* (BSK), explains this choice by dividing the substitution at stake into different passages:

BSK *ad* A 7.1.17:

1) [*anekāla hone se śī ādeśa sampūrṇā jas ke sthāna meṃ hotā hai sarva śī* |

As the substitute *śī* consists of more than one phoneme, it takes the place of the whole *Jas*. Thus, *sarva-* + *śī* (nom. pl.).

According to the BSK, the problem is that the substitute *śī* is present-ed by rule A 7.1.17 *jasāḥ śī*; nevertheless, the designation of *pratyaya*

¹⁷ A comparable reasoning already occurs in the *Padamañjarī ad* A 1.1.55: *śidgrahaṇam kim artham? "jasaḥ śī" sarvasya yathā syāt, anekāl ity eva bhaviṣyati, śakāre lupte nānekāl, ānupūrvyāt siddham. yadāyaṃ sarvādeśas tadā pratyayaḥ, yadā pratyayas tadetsamjñā, yadetsamjñā tadā lopāḥ, yadā lopas tadaikāl tad iha sarvādeśatvam antareṇa naikāltvam upapadyate*, that is, "which is the purpose of the mention of *Śit* (an item) having the marker *Ś*? In order to obtain the total replacement (*sarvasya*) in the rule '*jasāḥ śī*' (A 7.1.17), [*śī*] will be indeed *anekāl* (an item) consisting of more than one phoneme', and after the zero-replacement of the phoneme *ś*, it will consist of no more than one phoneme (*nānekāl*), this is obtained according to the order of application [of grammatical operations]. When there is a complete substitution, then [*Śī* can be designated] as an affix (*pratyaya*); when it is an affix, then [its initial phoneme *Ś*] can be designated as a marker (*it*); when it is designated as a marker, then its zero-replacement (*lopa*) occurs; when the zero-replacement occurs, then [*Śī*] consists of a single phoneme (*ekāl*); therefore, here the characteristic of consisting of a single phoneme (*ekāltvam*) does not take place without the total replacement (*sarvādeśatvam*)". Many thanks are due to an anonymous reviewer, who drew my attention on this source.

‘affix’ is given by A 3.1.1 *pratyayaḥ* and it extends up to the end of the fifth *adhyāya* (till A 5.4.160 *niṣpravāṇīś ca*). This is why, in the beginning, *śī* cannot be qualified as *pratyaya*. However, if *śī* is not a *pratyaya*, its initial phoneme *ś* cannot be considered as *anubandha* (i.e. it is not qualified as *it*); if *ś* does not receive the qualification of *it*, there is not its zero-replacement. In conclusion, the substitute *śī* should be understood as *anekāl* and thus substituted to the whole affix *Jas*.

2) *sthānivadbhāva se śī meṃ pratyaya dharma mānakara laśakvataddhite se śakāra kī itsamjñā* |

In agreement with A 1.1.56 *sthānivādādeśo ‘nalvidhau*,¹⁸ *Śī* has the property of being a *pratyaya*; while, as stated by A 1.3.8 *laśakv ataddhite*,¹⁹ the technical term *it* denotes *Ś*.

Since the substitute *śī* is here considered as “(an item) consisting of more than one phoneme” (*anekāl*), it can now take the place of the whole affix *Jas*; in fact, *sūtra* A 1.1.55 *anekālśit sarvasya* teaches the replacement of the whole substituendum by an *anekāl* or a *Śit* substitute. Moreover, A 1.1.56 *sthānivādādeśo ‘nalvidhau* states that a substitute should be treated like the original and, hence, *Śī* takes the property of being a *pratyaya*. The phoneme *Ś* is termed *it*, the moment it acquires the qualification of *pratyaya* and, consequently, there is the *lopa*-replacement of *Ś*, according to A 1.3.9 *tasya lopaḥ* “*lopa* replaces it”:

3) *tasya lopaḥ se usakā lopa] sarva ī* |

In accordance with *tasya lopaḥ* (A 1.3.9),²⁰ *lopa* replaces that (i.e. the phoneme *Ś*). Thus, *sarva-* + *ī*.

In conclusion, *Ś* is zero-replaced; furthermore, there is the *guṇa*-replacement of the remaining *ī* of *Śī* and the final *-a* of *sarva-* to obtain the final form of the nominative plural *sarve*.

4) *guṇaḥ | sarve* |

18 A 1.1.56 *sthānivādādeśo ‘nalvidhau*: “the substitute (*ādeśa*) is treated like the substituendum (*sthānin*) except with regard to an operation that is relative to an original phoneme (*aL*)”.

19 A 1.3.8 *laśakv ataddhite* [*pratyayasya* #6, *ādih* #5, *upadeśe*, *it* #2]: “the initial *L*, *Ś* and *KU* of affixes other than *taddhita* (i.e. original enunciation) are designated as *it* in *upadeśa*”.

20 For a detailed analysis of rules A 1.3.8 *laśakv ataddhite* and A 1.3.9 *tasya lopaḥ*, see footnote 7.

[According to A 6.1.87 *ād guṇah*,]²¹ there is a *guṇa*-replacement [of the remaining *ī* of *Śī* and the final *-a* of *sarva-* in continuous utterance]. [Therefore, the final form is] *sarve*.²²

According to the *kaumudīs*, *Śī* can receive the definition of *pratyaya* only through *stānivadbhāva*, that is, on account of its being the substitute of the affix *Jas*. Assignment of the term *pratyaya* facilitates assignment of the term *it* to *Ś* by means of rule A 1.3.8 *lašakv ataddhite*. This, in turn, facilitates deletion of *Ś* by *sūtra* A 1.3.9 *tasya lopah*. For this reason, a total replacement of *Jas* by *Śī* is not accomplished because of *Ś* as an *it*. It is, instead, accomplished because it consists of more than one phoneme (*anekāl*).

3 Paribhāṣā and Traditional Examples on (an)ekāltvam

It is important to note that the SK provides another example concerning a final replacement which is completely different from A 7.1.17 *jaśaḥ śī*. In particular, it deals with the substitute *tṚ* taught by Pāṇini in rule A 6.4.127 *arvaṇas tr asāv anañah*, which prescribes the replacement of the final phoneme of the nominal stem *arvan-* with the substitute *tṚ*, except in the nominative singular (*sU*) or when it is joined with the negative particle (*nañ*). In accordance with A 1.1.52 *alo 'ntyasya [śaṣṭhī #49]*, “a substitute replaces the final phoneme (*aL*) of the substituendum prescribed with a genitive form”. For instance, the final phoneme *-n* of *arvan-* is replaced by the substitute *tṚ* before *au* (nom./acc. du.); thus, *arvatṚ + au*. The marker *Ṛ* is zero-replaced; afterwards, the increment *ṇuM* is inserted after the last vowel of *arvan-* (A 7.1.70 *ugidacām sarvanāmasthāne 'dhātoḥ*),²³ to obtain the final form *arvantau*. The derivation of the nominative dual (and the accusative dual) of *arvan-* can be summarised as follow:

arvan + au (A 4.1.2 *svaujas...ṇyossup*)²⁴

21 See footnote 8.

22 It is important to note that this *prakriyā* approach was in part anticipated by the *Bālamānoramā* on SK *ad* A 7.1.17 (including, for instance, the rule A 1.3.8 *lašakv ataddhite*). However, it is evident that the BSK results much more detailed in explaining Bhaṭṭoji's choice once for all.

23 A 7.1.70 *ugidacām sarvanāmasthāne 'dhātoḥ [aṅgasya #6.4.1 num #58]*: “the increment *ṇuM* is inserted after the last vowel (see A 1.1.47) of a pre-affixal base with *uK* (= *u, r, l*) as a marker (*it*), excluding verbal stems (*adhātoḥ*), but including the verbal stem *ac-* before a strong ending (*sarvanāmasthāne*). In fact, according to aphorism A 1.1.47 *midaco 'ntyātparaḥ*, an increment marked with *M* (such as *ṇuM*) is inserted after the last vowel of the stem to which it is added.

24 A 4.1.2 *svaujasamautḥaṣṭābhyāmbhisṇebhyāmbhyasṇasibhyāmbhyasṇasosāmṇyoss up* introduces the nominal affixes in the following way: *prathamā vibhakti: sU* (singular),

arvan > *arvatṚ* (A 6.4.127 *arvaṇas tr asāv anañah*)

arvatṚ + *au* (A 1.1.52 *alo 'ntyasya*)

arvat + *au* (A 1.3.9 *tasya lopah*)

arvantau (A 7.1.70 *ugidacām sarvanāmasthāne 'dhātoḥ: arva- + nuM + t̄ + au*).

On the other hand, the substitute *Śī* replaces the whole *sthānin* in accordance with aphorism A 1.1.55 *anekāśīt sarvasya*, which prescribes the total replacement of the substituendum by an *anekāl* or by a *Śīt* substitute.²⁵ Therefore, the derivation of the nominative plural of *sarva-* is as follows:

sarva + *Jas* (A 4.1.2 *svaujas...riyossup*)

Jas > *Śī* (A 7.1.17 *jasah śī*)

sarva + *Śī* (A 1.1.55 *anekāśīt sarvasya*)

sarve (A 6.1.87 *ād guṇah: guṇa a + ī > e*).

It is worthy to note that the example of the derivation of *arvantau* is included in the traditional explanation of the above-mentioned *paribhāṣā*.²⁶ This is the proof that the substitute *tṚ* cannot be *anekāl* because the phoneme *Ṛ* is a common marker, since only the final phoneme of *arvan* has to be replaced by *t* (to obtain *arvatṚ* + *nuM* > *arvant-*). In other words, the *sarvādeśā* is excluded.

By contrast, there are peculiar cases in which *sarvādeśā* applies (according to rule A 1.1.55), despite the *paribhāṣā*. For instance, in *paribhāṣā* VI of Śiradeva, the substitute *ṆaL* replacing *miP* and *tiP* in the perfect is mentioned. In fact, according to this *paribhāṣā*, the substitute *ṆaL* should consist of only one phoneme because, it being an affix, its initial phoneme *Ṇ* and its final phoneme *L* are designated as *anubhandas* and zero-replaced. Consequently, *ṆaL* should replace only the final *i* of *miP* and *tiP*. Nevertheless, *ṆaL* is substituted for the whole *miP* and *tiP* because its phoneme *a* is considered to

au (dual), *Jas* (plural); *dvitīyā: am, auṬ, Śas; tr̥tīyā: Ṭā, bhyām, bhis; caturthī: Ṇe, bhyām, bhyas; pañcamī: NaS, bhyām, bhyas; ṣaṣṭhī: Nās, os, ām; saptamī: Nī, os, suP.*

25 The phoneme *ś* of *śī* cannot be designated as *it* before replacing *Jas*, as explained above.

26 See *paribhāṣā* VI in Śiradeva (*Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*) and in Nāgeśa (*Paribhāṣenduśekhara*) and *paribhāṣā* IX in Vyādi (Wujastyk 1993).

be a contraction from *a + a*, thus consisting of more than one phoneme (*anekāl*):²⁷

bhū + tiP (A 3.4.78 *tiptasjhi...iḍvahimahiṅ*)²⁸

tiP > NaL (A 3.4.82 *parasmaipadānām ṅalatususthalathusaṅalvamāḥ*)

bhū + NaL (A 1.1.55 *anekālsīt sarvasya: a is anekāl* due to *a + a*)

bhū + a (A 1.3.9 *tasya lopah*)

babhūva (because of the increment *vūK* and the reduplication prescribed for the perfect).²⁹

In *paribhāṣā* VI of Nāgeśa, the *Ḍādi* substitutes (i.e. *Ḍā* etc.)³⁰ are also mentioned as an instance of *sarvādeśa* based on the order in which the grammatical operations take place, namely, the substitution occurs when the *ḍ* of the substitute *ḍā* is not yet designated as a

²⁷ The substitute *NaL* is introduced for the first time by rule A 3.4.82 *parasmaipadānām ṅalatususthalathusaṅalvamāḥ* [liṭaḥ #81]: “the substitutes *NaL*, *atus*, *us*, *thaL*, *athus*, *a*, *NaL*, *va* and *ma* respectively replace (the nine) *parasmaipada* endings (*tiP*, *tas*, *jhi*, *siP*, *thas*, *tha*, *miP*, *vas* and *mas*) of *IIT* (i.e. perfect tense)”. The endings of *IIT* are introduced after a verbal root, when its action belongs to the past, excluding the current day, and is unperceived (A 3.2.115 *parokṣe liṭ*).

²⁸ A 3.4.78 *tiptasjhisipthasthambivasmastātāmjhathāsāthāmdhvamiḍvahimahiṅ* introduces the verbal endings, as follows:

- *parasmaipada* - 3rd person: *tiP* (singular), *tas* (dual), *jhi* (plural); 2nd person: *siP*, *thas*, *tha*; 1st person: *miP*, *vas*, *mas*.
- *ātmanepada* - 3rd person: *ta*, *ātām*, *jha*, 2nd person: *thās*, *āthām*, *dhvam*, 1st person: *iṭ*, *vahi*, *mahiṅ*.

²⁹ The 3rd person singular of the perfect tense of *bhū-* ‘to be’ can be derived as follows: starting with the form *bhū- + tiP* (A 3.4.78), *tiP* is substituted by *NaL* (A 3.4.82) and this is a complete replacement (A 1.1.55); after the zero-replacement of the initial phoneme *ṅ* and the final phoneme *L* (A 1.3.9), we obtain the form *bhū + a*. The augment *vūK* is inserted after the verbal stem *bhū-*, when a *IIT* affix beginning with a vowel follows (A 6.4.88 *bhuvo vugluṅliṭoḥ*): thus, *bhūv + a*; moreover, the verbal root is reduplicated by means of A 6.1.8 *liṭi dhātor anabhyāsasya*: hence, *bhūv + bhūv + a*. However, a long list of rules concerning the reduplication regulates the changes in the form seen immediately above: the first *bhūv* is designated as *abhyāsa* (A 6.1.4 *pūrvō ’bhyāsah*), and only its first consonant remains (i.e. *bh*), all the other are dropped (A 7.4.60 *halādih śeśah*): thus, *bhū + bhūv + a*. In addition, the vowel of the *abhyāsa* is shortened (A 7.4.59 *hrasvah*) and the resulting *u* of the *abhyāsa* is then changed in *a* when a *IIT* affix follows (A 7.4.73 *bhavater ah*): thus, *bha + bhūv + a*. Finally, the voiced consonant of the *abhyāsa* (i.e. *bh*) is changed into a voiced unaspirated consonant (i.e. *b*) by means of A 8.4.54 *abhyāse car ca*: thus, *babhūva*.

³⁰ Note that “the *ādi* of *Ḍādi* is intended to include *Śī* in P. VII.1.17, *Śe* in P. VII.1.39 etc.” (Kielhorn 1960, 34 fn. 1)

marker.³¹ The substitute *ḍā* is taught in the place of the affix *tiP* in the periphrastic future.³² *ḍā* is not interpreted as an affix at first, therefore its initial phonemes *ḍ* cannot be zero-replaced as every other *anubandha* can. Only considering *ḍā* as “an (item) consisting of more than one phoneme” (*anekāl*), it is possible to replace the whole original affix; in this way, the substitute *Ḍā* can be understood as an affix and its initial phoneme *Ḍ*, being *anubandha*, can be zero-replaced:

bhū + tiP (A 3.4.78 *tiptasjhi...iḍvahimahiṅ*)

tiP > Ḍā (A 2.4.85 *luṭaḥ prathamasya ḍāraurasah*)

bhū + Ḍā (A 1.1.55 *anekālsit sarvasya: ā is anekāl* because *ḍā* is not an affix)

bhavitās + Ḍā (because of the insertion of affix *tās* before *IUN* and the augment *iṬ*)

bhavitās + ā (A 1.3.9 *tasya lopaḥ*)

bhavitā (because of the zero-replacement of the final *-ās* of *bhavās*).³³

31 Nāgeśa’s *paribhāṣā* VI reads *ḍādiviśaye tu sarvādeśatvaṃ vinānubandhatvasyaiv-ābhāvenānupūrvyāt siddham*, that is, “but in the domain of the *Ḍādi* [substitutes] (i.e. *Ḍā* etc.), the complete replacement is well established without the absence of the *anubandhas* (i.e. without the application of the *paribhāṣā* and, therefore, because of the *anekāltva* of *ḍā*) on the basis of the order [of the rules’ application]”. It is notable that Vyāḍi does not show any of these examples.

32 A 2.4.85 *luṭaḥ prathamasya ḍāraurasah*: “*Ḍā*, *rau* and *ras* respectively replace the third person endings (*tiP*, *tas*, *jhi*) of *IUT* (i.e. periphrastic future)”. The endings of *IUT* are introduced after a verbal root, when its action is to be denoted in the future, which does not belong to the current day (A 3.3.15 *anadyatane luṭ*).

33 The 3rd person singular of the periphrastic future of *bhū*- ‘to be’ is derived in the following way: starting with the form *bhū + tiP* (A 3.4.78), *tiP* is substituted by *Ḍā* (A 2.4.85); after the complete replacement (A 1.1.55), the affix *tāsI* is introduced after a verbal stem, when a *IUT* affix follows (A 3.1.33 *syatāsi ṛluṭoḥ*): thus, *bhū + tās + Ḍā*. Subsequently, the affix *tās* is designated as *ārdhadhātuka* (A 3.4.114 *ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ*) and, for this reason, the augment *iṬ* is inserted before it (A 7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*): thus, *bhū + iṬ + tās + Ḍā*. Moreover, the final *ū* of *bhū* is replaced by the *guṇa* vowel *o* by means of A 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* and, because of the sandhi-phenomenon, the *guṇa* vowel *o* is substituted by *av* in accordance with A 6.1.78 *eco ’yavāyāvah*: thus, *bhavitās + Ḍā*. The *Ḍ* of *Ḍā* is zero-replaced (A 1.3.9): thus, *bhavitās + ā*. Finally, the syllable beginning with the last vowel (*ṬI*) of *bhavitās* is zero-replaced, when an affix having the marker *Ḍ* follows (A 6.4.143 *ṭeḥ*): thus, *bhavitā*.

4 Coming Back to Kātyāyana and Patañjali

This explanation of the behaviour of the substitute *Ḍā* stems indeed from the first commentaries on rule A 2.4.85 *luṭaḥ prathamasya ḍāraurasah* “*Ḍā*, *rau* and *ras* are substituted for the third person endings of *IUT*”. It is evident that this is a classic example of an aphorism that prescribes a substitution: the substitutes *Ḍā* (sing.), *rau* (du.), and *ras* (pl.) are the elements that replace the affixes of the 3rd person singular (i.e. *tiP*, *tas*, *jhi*) of the periphrastic future (*IUT*). According to the general pattern of substitution, the substitutes are linked together in a *dvandva* compound which is inflected in the nominative plural; they replace the affixes that are generically described as *prathama-* “3rd person endings” and, since this term represents the substituendum, it is inflected in the genitive singular; moreover, this happens when the action is presented in *IUT*, that is, in the periphrastic future.

The replacement of the whole *tiP* by the substitute *Ḍā* was already a problem for Kātyāyana; in fact, he wrote several vt.s to rule A 2.4.85, trying to explain the reasons behind this substitution:

MI.501 l. 1 vt. 4 ad A 2.4.85: *ḍāvikārasya śitkaraṇaṃ sarvādeśārtham*

There is need of the marker *Ś* for the *ādeśa* *Ḍā* (i.e. it will become *ḌāŚ*) in order to obtain the replacement of the whole substituendum.

The first hypothesis given by Kātyāyana is to add the phoneme *ś* to *Ḍā* to transform it in *ḌāŚ*, therefore considered as *Śit* “(an item) having the marker *Ś*”. As seen from the beginning of this article, the total replacement is justified for substitutes *anekāl* “(items) consisting of more than one phoneme” or *Śit* “(items) having the marker *Ś*” (according to rule A 1.1.55 *anekāśit sarvasya*). Therefore, since the interpretation of the substitute *Ḍā* as *anekāl* is not possible because, once the marker *Ḍ* is zero-replaced, the substitute *ā* consists of one phoneme, the idea is to transform it into a *Śit* substitute.³⁴ The risk is that, if the total replacement is not achieved, *Ḍā* replaces only the final phoneme of the substituendum by means of A 1.1.52 *alo ’ntyasya*.

MI.501 l. 9 vt. 6 ad A 2.4.85: *siddham alo ’ntyavikārāt*

The object is achieved because of the substitution of the final phoneme.

³⁴ Nevertheless, vt. 5 ad A 2.4.85 *nighātaprasaṅgas tu* reveals that adding the phoneme *ś* to the substitute *Ḍā* is useless, because there is the risk of losing the accent.

The second hypothesis is that the object can be achieved even if the *ādeśa* replaces the final phoneme of the substituendum (*tiP*), in accordance with the risk presented at the end of the first hypothesis. According to vt. 6, the substitution is achieved through the zero-replacement (*lopa*) of the syllable beginning with the last vowel (*ṬI*) of the stem before a substitute having the marker *Ḍ* (*Ḍit*), in accordance with rule A 6.4.143 *ṭeḥ*: thus, *bhavitās + t + ā > bhavitØ + ā > bhavitā*.³⁵ It is important to underline that this rule is involved in any case in the process of derivation of the 3rd person singular of the periphrastic future, in particular in the last passage: *bhavitās + ā > bhavitØ + ā > bhavitā* described in footnote 33.

M I.501 l. 15 vt. 8 *ad* A 2.4.85: *anitvād vā*

Or on account of its not acquiring the qualification of *it*.

The third hypothesis is the most interesting because, on the basis of the explanation given by Patañjali to vt. 8 *ad* A 2.4.85, Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita comments rule A 7.1.17 *jasaḥ śī*, defining substitute *śī* as *anekāl*. In fact, while discussing the risk of the second hypothesis, it becomes evident that the substitute replacing the final phoneme of an affix cannot itself be designated as an affix. This conclusion of Patañjali triggers a series of chain reactions which are schematically illustrated as follows:

1. that which replaces the final phoneme of an affix cannot itself be an affix;
 2. if *ḍā* is not an affix, its initial phoneme *ḍ* cannot be qualified as *anubandha*;
 3. if the phoneme *ḍ* is not qualified as *anubandha*, it cannot be zero-replaced;
 4. if the phoneme *ḍ* is not zero-replaced, *ḍā* should be considered *anekāl*
- > there is the replacement of the whole substituendum based on its being *anekāl*;
5. if there is a complete substitution, *Ḍā* can be considered an affix;
 6. if *Ḍā* is an affix, its initial phoneme *Ḍ* can be qualified as *anubandha*;

35 The derivation of the final form *bhavitā* (3rd pers. sing. of the periphrastic future) by only replacing the final phoneme of the substituendum (*tiP*) with the substitute *Ḍā* can be thus demonstrated. In fact, Kātyāyana accepts this hypothesis prescribing the *lopa* of the remaining *t* of *tiP* (i.e. *bhavitās + t + ā*) in vt. 7 *ad* A 2.4.85 *ḍiti ṭer lopāl lopaḥ*. However, even if this solution is accepted by the author of the vt.s, he proposes two other vt.s to explain the complete substitution; in particular, vt. 8 *ad* A 2.4.85 *anitvād vā* is the most interesting for the scope of this research and is analysed below.

7. if the phoneme *Ḍ* is qualified as *anubandha*, it can be zero-replaced.³⁶

For the sake of completeness, one last vt. explaining the total replacement of *tiP* with *Ḍā* is illustrated:

M I.501 l. 20 vt. 9 *ad* A 2.4.85: *praśliṣṭānirdeśād vā*

Or by obtaining it on the basis of a *praśliṣṭa-nirdeśa*.

In this specific case, the phoneme *Ḍ* of the substitute *Ḍā* can be zero-replaced, but the remaining *ā* is still considered as *anekāl* “(an item) consisting of more than one phoneme”, as it stands for *ā + ā*.³⁷ The total replacement is thus justified by means of A 1.1.55 *anekāśīt sarvasya*. What is remarkable is that this is the same process accepted for the replacement of the affix *tiP* with the substitute *ÑāL* in the perfect tense, as seen in the previous section.

This explanation of the substitution of *Ḍā* is also valuable to explain the substitute *Śī* (A 7.1.17 – see section 1 above). As already seen for the previous rule A 2.4.85, there is a general pattern of substitution that prescribes the substitute *Śī* (in the nominative singular) in the place of the affix *Jas* (in the genitive singular). However, in M III.246 *ad* A 7.1.17, Patañjali does not mention the way in which this replacement should take place. There is only one hint to such a replacement in M I.131-132 *ad* A 1.1.55, in which Patañjali states that, if vt. 8 *ad* A 2.4.85 (i.e. *anitvād vā*) is accepted, there is no scope for ...*śīt sarvasya* in rule A 1.1.55. The following scheme represents this reasoning:

1. that which replaces the final phoneme of an affix cannot itself be an affix;
 2. if *śī* is not an affix, its initial phoneme *ś* cannot be qualified as *anubandha*;
 3. if the phoneme *ś* is not qualified as *anubandha*, it cannot be zero-replaced;
 4. if the phoneme *ś* is not zero-replaced, *śī* should be considered *anekāl*
- > there is the replacement of the whole substituendum based on its being *anekāl*;
5. if there is a complete substitution, *Śī* can be considered an affix;

³⁶ See M I.501 ll. 16-19 on vt. 8 *ad* A 2.4.85.

³⁷ This hypothesis is clearly rejected by Kielhorn (1960), who defines it as being superfluous, since he clearly approves the former (i.e. vt. 8 *anitvād vā*).

6. if *Śī* is an affix, its initial phoneme *Ś* can be qualified as *anubandha*;
7. if the phoneme *Ś* is qualified as *anubandha*, it can be zero-replaced.

Patañjali *ad A* 1.1.55 concludes that ...*śit sarvasya* has a scope in this rule only if the *paribhāṣā* “*nānubandhakṛtam anekāltvam*” is taken into account. However, this explanation based on vt. 8 *ad A* 2.4.85 (i.e. *anitvād vā*) and on the relevant commentary of Patañjali is evidently the earliest source of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita’s interpretation of the substitute *śī* as *anekāl*.

5 Conclusion

This research on the replacement of the whole affix *Jas* by the substitute *Śī* (A 7.1.17) shows a double historical interpretation of rule A 1.1.55: according to the M, the KV, the R and the PK, the substitute *Śī* is endowed with the *anubandha Ś* and, for this reason, it replaces the whole affix *Jas* after a pronominal stem ending in the short vowel *-a*; all the *kaumudīs* beginning with the SK believe that the substitute *śī* is to be considered as *anekāl* “(an item) consisting of more than one phoneme” and that this is the only way to obtain the replacement of the entire affix *Jas*. Since the designation of *pratyaya* is given by A 3.1.1 *pratyayaḥ* up to the end of the fifth *adhyāya* (till A 5.4.160 *niṣpravāṇis ca*), the substitute *śī* cannot initially be qualified as a *pratyaya*. However, if *śī* is not a *pratyaya*, its initial phoneme *ś* cannot be considered as an *anubandha* (that is, it cannot be designated as *it*); but if *ś* does not receive the qualification of *anubandha*, there is not its zero-replacement. Thus, *śī* should be understood as *anekāl* and substituted to the whole affix *Jas*.

The substitutes *Ḍā* etc. (taking the place of *tiP* in the periphrastic future) work in the same manner. It is evident from vt.s on A 2.4.85 that this solution was presented for the first time by Kātyāyana, who devotes several vt.s to demonstrate that the substitute *ḍā* is *anekāl*, giving rise to the total replacement of the affix *tiP*. First of all, he suggests adding the phoneme *Ś* to the substitute *Ḍā* to transform it in *ḌāŚ*, thus considered as a *Śit* “(an item) having the marker *Ś*” (vt. 4); he later shows that the object can be achieved even if the substitute *Ḍā* replaces only the final phoneme of the substituendum *tiP* (vt. 6); finally, he states that the substitute which replaces the final phoneme of an affix cannot itself be designated as affix (vt. 8). This conclusion triggers a series of chain reactions which are schematically illustrated by Patañjali as follows: that which replaces the final phoneme of an affix cannot itself be an affix; therefore, if *ḍā* is not an affix, its initial phoneme *ḍ* cannot be qualified as *anubandha*; if the phoneme *ḍ*

is not qualified as *anubandha*, it cannot be zero-replaced; if the phoneme *ḍ* is not zero-replaced, *ḍā* should be considered as *anekāl*; as a consequence, there is the replacement of the whole affix *tiP* by the substitute *ḍā* on its being *anekāl*; if there is a complete substitution, *Ḍā* can be considered an affix; if *Ḍā* is an affix, its initial phoneme *Ḍ* can be qualified as *anubandha*; if the phoneme *Ḍ* is qualified as *anubandha*, it can be zero-replaced.

While presenting its commentary to A 7.1.17 *jasah śī*, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita re-introduces this perspective according to which the substitute *śī* is to be considered as *anekāl* “(an item) consisting of more than one phoneme”, and not as *Śit* “(an item) having the marker *Ś*”. It is immediately evident, after going through the several steps of the present research, that the idea of interpreting the substitute *śī* as *anekāl* comes to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita from the vt.s. The SK re-interprets the tradition, taking position against the M and the following commentaries, and re-introducing this qualification of the substitute *Śī*. It is worth noting that this change of perspective is necessary for the SK in order to clearly explain the *prakriyā* of the final form *sarve* (nom. pl.). Moreover, since all the other *kaumudīs* are completely based on the SK, it is not difficult to understand why Varadarāja treats the substitute *śī* as *anekāl* in his three *kaumudīs*, or why a modern work such as the BSK (in the 1969) still continues to understand the total replacement of the affix *Jas* by the substitute *śī* as based on its being “(an item) consisting of more than one phoneme”. All in all, it is extremely interesting that the *kaumudīs*’ tradition adopts such reading of rule A 7.1.17, even though Patañjali concludes his long discussion on Kātyāyana’s vt.s in favour of the root text, thus considering *Śit* as a compulsory part of the wording of A 1.1.55.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

A = [Aṣṭādhyāyī] Pāṇini’s *Grammatik. Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von O. Böthlingk*. Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel, 1887.

Bālamānoramā [Bālamānoramā] Śrīmadabhaṭṭojidīṣitaviracitā vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī śrīmadvāsudevadīkṣitapraṇīṭayā bālamānoramākhyavyākhyayā śrī imajjñānendrasarasvatīviracitayā tattvabodhinyākhyavyākhyayā ca sanāthitā. 4 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2006.

BSK = [Bālasiddhāntakaumudī] Bālasiddhāntakaumudī by Jyoti Svarūpa Mīśra. Vārāṇasi: Viśvavidyālaya Prakāśana, [1969] 1991.

KV = [Kāśīkāvṛttī] Kāśīkā. A commentary on Pāṇini’s Grammar by Vāmana & Jayāditya. 2 vols. Ed. by A. Sharma, K. Deshpande, and D.G. Padhye. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University, 1969-70.

- LSK = [*Laghusiddhāntakaumudī Śrīmadvaradarājabaṭṭhācāryaviracitā laghusiddhāntakaumudī (sūtrāṇaṃ vārtikāṇaṃ paribhāṣāṇaṃ dhātūnāñca akārādikramasūcikayā pāṇinīyaśikṣā - gaṇapāṭha - sārthaprayogaṇukramaṇikā - prayogalekhanaprakāraīśca sahitā)*], in *Haridāsa Saṃskṛta Granthamālā*, vol. 119. Ed. by S.Ś. Joshi. Vārāṇasī: Caukhambā Saṃskṛt Śirij Āphis, 2001
- M = [*Mahābhāṣya The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali*]. 3 vols. Ed. by F. Kielhorn. Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt, 1880-85. Third edition, revised and furnished with additional readings, references, and selected critical notes by K.V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandakar Oriental Research Institute, 1962.
- MSK = [*Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī Śrīvaradarājācāryaviracitā madhyasiddhāntakaumudī sudhā indumatī saṃskṛtahindividyākhyopetā*]. Ed. by S.Ś. Joshi and R.C. Jhā. Varanasi: Chowkhamba, 1960.
- Nyāsa = [*Nyāsa Kāśikavṛtti of Jayāditya-Vāmana (Along with Commentaries Vivaraṇapañcikā—Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra)*]. 6 vols. Ed. by S. Misra. Varanasi: Ratna Publications, 1985.
- Padamañjarī [Padamañjarī] Kāśikavṛtti of Jayāditya-Vāmana (Along with Commentaries Vivaraṇapañcikā—Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra)*. 6 vols. Ed. by S. Misra. Varanasi: Ratna Publications, 1985.
- Paribhāṣasaṃgraha [Paribhāṣasaṃgraha] Paribhāṣasaṃgraha (A collection of original works on Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās). Edited critically with an introduction and an index of Paribhāṣās by K.V. Abhyankar*. Poona: Bhandakar Oriental Research Institute, 1967.
- Paribhāṣenduśekhara [Paribhāṣenduśekhara] The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojībhatta. Edited critically with the commentary Tattvadarśa of Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar by K.V. Abhyankar*, pt. I. Poona: Bhandakar Oriental Research Institute, 1962.
- PK = [*Prakriyākaumudī The Prakriyākaumudī of Rāmachandra (in two parts) with the commentary Prasāda of Viṭṭhala and with a critical notice of manuscripts and an exhaustive and critical introduction by K.P. Trivedi*]. Poona: Bhandakar Oriental Research Institute, 1925-31. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series LXXVIII-LXXXII.
- Prakāśa [Prakāśa] Prakriyākaumudī by Rāmacandrācārya with Prakāśa by Śrīkriṣṇa. Edited with his 'Raśmi' by M. Miśra*. 3 vols. of *Sarasvatībhavangaṇthamālā*, vols. 111-13. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1977-80.
- Prasāda = [Prasāda] The Prakriyākaumudī of Rāmachandra (in two parts) with the Commentary Prasāda of Viṭṭhala and with a Critical Notice of Manuscripts and an Exhaustive and Critical Introduction by K.P. Trivedi*. Poona: Bhandakar Oriental Research Institute, 1925-31. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series LXXVIII-LXXXII.
- Prauḍhamanoramā [Prauḍhamanoramā] The Prauḍhamanoramā by M.M. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkshita. (Avyayībhāvānta). A Commentary upon his Siddhāntakaumudī. With its Gloss called Laghuśabdaratna by Sri Hari Dīkshita, and Śabdaratna Bhairavi Commentary by M.M. Pandit Śri Bhairava Miśra, Prabha-Notes by M.M. Śri Mādhava Sāstrī Bhandārī. Śabdaratna Pradiṭṭa Notes on Avyayībhāvānta Portion by Pandit Jagannātha Sāstrī Paṇde. Edited with Vibha-Notes and Introduction, by Pandit Sāda Śiva Śarma Sāstrī*, pt. I. Benares: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1935. Kashi Sanskrit Series 58.

- R = [Rūpavatāra] *The Rūpavatāra of Dharmakīrti. With additions and emendations for the use of college students by M. Rangacharya.* 2 vols. Vol. 1: Madras: Natesan, 1916; vol. 2: The Bangalore Press, Bangalore, 1927.
- SK = [Siddhāntakaumudī] *Śrībhaṭṭojidīkṣitaviracitā vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī, paṇḍitaśrīsbhāpatīśarmopādhyāyaviracitayā lakṣmī vyākhyayopetā, śrībālakṛṣṇa-pañcolinā sampādītā.* 2 vols. Ed. by B.K. Pancholi. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1966.
- SSK = [Sārasiddhāntakaumudī] *Sārasiddhāntakaumudī of Varadarāja. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Critical & Exegetical Notes by G.V. Devasthali.* Poona: University of Poona, 1968. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Cl. C, 4.
- Tattvabodhinī* [Tattvabodhinī] *Śrīmadabhaṭṭojidīkṣitaviracitā vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī Śrīmadvāsudevādīkṣitapraṇīṭayā bālamānoramākhyavyākhyayā Śrīmajjñānendrasarasvatīviracitayā tattvabodhinīvyākhyayā ca sanāthitā.* 4 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2006.

Secondary Sources

- Böthlingk, O. (1887). *Pāṇini's Grammatik. Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen.* Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel.
- Coward, H.G.; Kunjunni Raja, K. (1990). *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: The Philosophy of the Grammarians*, vol. V. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Filliozat, P.S. (1975-86). *Le Mahābhāṣya de Patañjali. Avec le Pradīpa de Kaiyaṭa et l'Uddyota de Nāgeśa. Traduction par Pierre Filliozat.* 5 vols. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie.
- Joshi, S.D.; Roodbergen, J.A.F. (1991-2011). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini. With Translations and Explanatory Notes.* 14 vols. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Kanshi, R. (2010-12). *The Laghusiddhāntakaumudī of Varadarāja. A Primer of Pāṇini's Grammar.* Translated and elucidated by Kanshi Ram. Edited by Mithilesh Chaturvedi. 3 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Katre, S.M. (1987). *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini. In Roman Transliteration by Sumitra M. Katre.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kielhorn, F. (1960). *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgajībhaṭṭa.* Edited and explained by F. Kielhorn. Part II, *Translation and Notes.* Second edition by K.V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Monier-Williams, M. (1899). *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages by Sir Monier Monier-Williams. New Edition, Greatly Enlarged and Improved with the Collaboration of Professor E. Leumann, Professor C. Cappeller and Other Scholars.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sharma, R.N. [1987] (1999-2002). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Second revised and enlarged edition with Index of Sūtras (translated and explained). 6 vols. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.
- Vasu, S.C. (1891-98). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Translated into English by Śrīśa Chandra Vasu. 8 vols. Allahabad: Indian Press.
- Vasu, S.C. (1905-07). *The Siddhānta Kaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.* Edited and translated into English by Late Śrīśa Chandra Vasu. 3 vols. Allahabad: Pāṇini Office.
- Wujastyk, D. (1993). *Metarules of Pāṇinian Grammar. The Vyāḍīyaparibhāṣāvṛtti.* Critically edited with translation and commentary. 2 vols. Groningen: E. Forsten.

