



# Proceedings of the 17th World Sanskrit Conference, July 9-13, 2018

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, CANADA

## What Is the Purpose of Restating *dā* in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.3.19: *tado dā ca?* Yūto Kawamura

*Proceedings of the 17th World Sanskrit Conference, Vancouver, Canada, July 9-13, 2018, Section 3: Vyākaraṇa.*

Section Convenors: Malhar Kulkarni and Peter Scharf  
General Editor: Adheesh Sathaye

Published by the Department of Asian Studies, University of British Columbia, on behalf of the International Association for Sanskrit Studies.

DOI: 10.14288/1.0379846.

URI: <http://hdl.handle.net/2429/71001>.

*Suggested Citation Format:*

### MLA:

Kawamura, Yūto. "What Is the Purpose of Restating *dā* in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.3.19: *tado dā ca?*" *Proceedings of the 17th World Sanskrit Conference, Vancouver, Canada, July 9-13, 2018, Section 3: Vyākaraṇa*. Edited by Malhar Kulkarni and Peter Scharf, 2019. DOI: 10.14288/1.0379846.

### APA:

Kawamura, Y. (2019). What is the purpose of restating *dā* in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.3.19: *tado dā ca?* In M. Kulkarni and P. Scharf (eds.) *Proceedings of the 17th World Sanskrit Conference, Vancouver, Canada, July 9-13, 2018, Section 3: Vyākaraṇa*. DOI: 10.14288/1.0379846.

### Chicago:

Kawamura, Yūto. 2019. "What Is the Purpose of Restating *dā* in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.3.19: *tado dā ca?*" In *Proceedings of the 17th World Sanskrit Conference, Vancouver, Canada, July 9-13, 2018, Section 3: Vyākaraṇa*, edited by Malhar Kulkarni and Peter Scharf. DOI: 10.14288/1.0379846.

Copyright © 2019 by the author. Content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International license (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>



वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्  
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SANSKRIT STUDIES  
अन्ताराष्ट्रियसंस्कृताध्ययनसमवायः



# What Is the Purpose of Restating *dā* in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.3.19: *tado dā ca*?

Yūto Kawamura

Department of Indian Philosophy, Hiroshima University,  
Hiroshima, Japan.

## Abstract

A 5.3.15: *sarvaikānyakimiyattadaḥ kāle dā* introduces the affix *dā* after *tad* terminating in seventh-triplet endings on condition that reference is made to a time. By this rule obtains the derivate *tadā* corresponding to the string *tasmin kāle*. Despite this, A 5.3.19: *tado dā ca* also provides that *tad* in seventh-triplet endings takes *dā* under the same condition, thus resulting in the same derivate. Whereas Kātyāyana and Patañjali consider it meaningless to restate *dā* in A 5.3.19, four solutions to this problem are offered by some other grammarians. Three of the four solutions are unacceptable from the viewpoint of Pāṇinian grammar. What one must pay careful attention to is the remaining explanation mentioned by Kaiyaṭa: There is a difference between the two *tadās* derived by A 5.3.15 and A 5.3.19; the former serves to derive *tadā* (*tad* + *Ñi* + *dā*) with high pitch on its last vowel and the latter to derive *tādā* (*tad* + *Ñi* + *ādā*) with high pitch on its first vowel. That is, A 5.3.19 is to be read as *tado 'dā ca*. Although *tadā* is a regular formation, *tādā* also could be secondarily formed due to various linguistic factors. It is therefore possible that *tādā* did exist in the language Pāṇini describes and he accounted for it by A 5.3.19. In this context, it is compelling that this form is actually found in *R̥gveda* Khila 1.8.1.

**Keywords:** Pāṇini; Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.3.15; Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.3.19; *tadā*; *tadānīm*.

## Introduction

A 5.3.15: *sarvaikānyakimiyattadaḥ kāle dā* introduces the taddhita affix *dā* after the pronominal *tad* “that” terminating in seventh-triplet endings (*saptamī*) on condition that reference is made to a time (*kāla*).<sup>1</sup> By this rule obtains the derivate *tadā*

---

<sup>1</sup> PK on A 5.3.15 (I.905.2-3): *ebhyaḥ saptamyantebhyo dāpratyayaḥ syāt kāle 'rthe | tralāder apavādaḥ ||*

“then, at that time” corresponding to the alternative string *tasmin kāle* (A 4.1.82: *samarthānām prathamād vā*). However, consider the following rule:

A 5.3.19: *tado dā ca* ||

This rule teaches that the pronominal *tad* in seventh-triplet endings takes *dā* or *dānīm* (← *ca*) under the same condition as A 5.3.15, thus resulting in two derivatives: *tadā* and *tadānīm* “then, at that time,” which alternate with the equivalent string *tasmin kāle*.<sup>2</sup> A question naturally arises: why did Pāṇini state *dā* again in A 5.3.19 when A 5.3.15 already accounts for the form *tadā*?

Kātyāyana, Patañjali, the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita declare that it is meaningless (*anarthaka*) to restate *dā* in A 5.3.19 since the introduction of *dā* after *tad* is already provided for by A 5.3.15 (*vihitatvāt*),<sup>3</sup> thereby indicating that A 5.3.19: *tado dā ca* can be reduced to \*A 5.3.19: *tadaś ca* (*tadaś cety eva sūtram paṭhanīyam*).<sup>4</sup>

A 5.3.15: *sarvaikānyakiṃyattadaḥ kāle dā* || (→ *tadā*)

...

A 5.3.18: *dānīm ca* || (→ *idānīm*)

\*A 5.3.19: *tadaś ca* || (→ *tadānīm*)

The present paper attempts to find a valid reason for this seemingly redundant statement of *dā* in A 5.3.19, considering four solutions offered to this problem by some indigenous grammarians.

<sup>2</sup> The item *ca* in A 5.3.19 is to cause *dānīm* to recur therein from A 5.3.18: *dānīm ca*. In Joshi and Bhate (1983: 64), this type of *ca* is categorized as “giving rise to abbreviative interpretation.”

<sup>3</sup> vt. 1 on A 5.3.19: *tado dāvācanam anarthakaṃ vihitatvāt* || MBh on vt. 1 to A 5.3.19 (II. 406.13-14): *tado dāvācanam anarthakaṃ | kiṃ kāraṇam | vihitatvāt | vihito 'tra pratyayaḥ sarvaikānyakiṃyattadaḥ kāle deti* || KV on A 5.3.19 (II.535.5): *tado dāvācanam anarthakaṃ vihitatvāt* || SK 1968 (II.595.3): *tado dāvācanam anarthakaṃ vihitatvāt* |

Note that according to Ben-Dor (2016: 76), the authors of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* “always try to mention a purpose for a term in the sūtra or for a sūtra as a whole and nowhere do they argue that it would be useless” and “one of the aims of the authors of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* is to provide a purpose to every part of Pāṇini’s sūtras.” Their comment *tado dāvācanam anarthakaṃ vihitatvāt* on A 5.3.19 is one of the three exceptions to this general attitude (Ben-Dor 2016: 76, note 59).

<sup>4</sup> TB on SK 1968 (II.595.29-30): *tadaś cety eva sūtram paṭhanīyam iti bhāvaḥ* |

## First Solution: *vaicitryārtham*

Jinendrabuddhi (ca. 700, CE) opines that Pāṇini's restatement of *dā* in A 5.3.19 is to add variety/ attractiveness to the Aṣṭādhyāyī (*vaicitryārtham*), that is, it is simply for the sake of variety/attractiveness of style without any other specific purpose in view.<sup>5</sup> This solution is also said to be indicated by Rāmacandra (ca. 14th-15th c. CE) in his *Prakriyākaumudī*.<sup>6</sup> It is known that grammarians resort to the concept of *vaicitrya* in order to justify Pāṇini's otherwise inexplicable phraseology. This type of solution might sometimes make sense, but clearly not in our case. Would Pāṇini have wanted to make his grammar more attractive in terms of its wording, by adding *dā* to A 5.3.19? The solution presented by Jinendrabuddhi sounds too contrived and hence too far-fetched to be acceptable.

## Second Solution: *sakṛdbaddham anityaṃ dvirbaddham ca subaddham*

In the course of the discussion on the vocative singular form *subhru*, “O fair-browed [lady]” used by Kālidāsa, Haradatta (c. 1000-1100 CE) refers in his *Padamañjarī* to some grammarians' view that the repetition of *dā* in A 5.3.19 is to be assumed as an implication (*jñāpakam*) for the following metarule because otherwise Pāṇini's wording would become pointless:

*sakṛdbaddham anityaṃ dvirbaddham ca subaddham ||*

<sup>5</sup> Nyāsa on KV to A 5.3.19 (VI.249.31-32): *anarthakam iti | vaicitryārtham | anyasyābhāvād anarthakaṃ vaicitryeṇa sārthakam eva |*

<sup>6</sup> According to the *Prasāda*, a commentary on the *Prakriyākaumudī*, Rāmacandra indicates this when he says *punardāvidheḥ phalaṃ cintyam* – “the purpose of providing for *dā* again [in A 5.3.19] is questionable” – otherwise he would not have used the term *cintyam*. PK on A 5.3.19 (I.906.9-10): *tadaḥ saptamyantāt dā syād dānīm ca kāle || tadā | tadānīm | punardāvidheḥ phalaṃ cintyam |*. *Prasāda* on PK to A 5.3.19 (I.906.14-17): *nanu sarvaikānyakimṃyattadaḥ kāle dety anenaiva dāvidheḥ siddhatvāt punardāvidhir vyartha ity āsaṅkyāha punardāvidher iti | phalaṃ cintyam ity anena vaicitryārthavyatiriktaṃ phalaṃ nāstīti sūcitam | yadi sarvathā phalābhāva evābhipretaḥ syāt tarhi cintyam iti nāvakṣyat |*

[A provision] made [only] once is not obligatory, but if made twice, it becomes well-made.<sup>7</sup>

Needless to say, “it becomes well-made” (*subaddham*) in this metarule is intended as “it becomes obligatory” (*nityam*).<sup>8</sup>

The point is this. As described above, in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* the introduction of the affix *dā* to *tad* is provided for twice: by A 5.3.15 and A 5.3.19. This is, according to some grammarians, to imply that the introduction at issue is to be deemed obligatory. This means that one is not permitted to employ the expression *tasmin kāle* as an alternative for the derivate *tadā*.<sup>9</sup> To teach us this, Pāṇini mentioned *dā* in A 5.3.19 as well as A 5.3.15.

This metarule is made use of to justify Kālidāsa’s use of the ungrammatical form *subhru*.<sup>10</sup> The deduction of such a metarule is, however, untenable. It is quite

---

<sup>7</sup> PM on KV to A 1.4.4 (I.506.13-15): *anye tv āhuḥ – anityo ‘yaṃ pratiśedhaḥ sakṛdbaddhatvāt | tathā ca paribhāṣā – sakṛdbaddham anityaṃ dvirbaddham ca subaddham iti | atra ca jñāpakam tado dāvacanam ity āhuḥ ||*

Others, on the other hand, say: this prohibition [of applying the class name *naḍī* to items such as *bhrū*] is not obligatory since [the prohibition] is made [only] once. Such being the case, a metarule applies [here]: *sakṛdbaddham anityaṃ dvirbaddham ca subaddham*. And they say that the statement of *dā* with respect to *tad* is an implication for this [metarule].

<sup>8</sup> The literal translation of the metarule would be “what is bound with [grammatical rules only] once is not obligatory, but if bound twice, it becomes well-bound.” To the best of my knowledge, no Paribhāṣā works list this metarule. I consider that this is because the metarule in question is quite unreasonable, as shown below.

The latter part of this metarule, *dvirbaddham subaddham*, “if bound twice, [it] becomes well-bound,” is given by Patañjali as a kind of maxim to furnish a reason for the redundancy of words. MBh on vt. 2 to A 6.1.223 (III.119.19-21): *athavā halsvaraprāptau vyañjanam avidyamānavad bhavatīty eṣā paribhāṣā kartavyā | kimartham idam ubhayam ucyate na halsvaraprāptāv avidyamānavad ity evocyeta svaraprāptau vyañjanam avidyamānavad iti vā | dvirbaddham subaddham bhavatīti ||*. Here a discussant argues that the words *hal* and *vyañjana* denote the same meaning, “consonant,” and one of them would therefore be unnecessary. Patañjali invokes the maxim as an answer to this objection. As Kaiyaṭa explains, what Patañjali means to say is that stating the two words serves a purpose in that it affords a better understanding of the meaning. *Pradīpa* on MBh to vt. 2 ad A 6.1.223 (IV.532.15): *dvirbaddham iti | ubhayopādāne spaṣṭāvagatir bhavatīty arthaḥ |*

<sup>9</sup> Still, one can use this expression as an alternative for the derivate *tadānīm*.

<sup>10</sup> See Kawamura 2018 for details.

obvious that Pāṇini's system of grammar would collapse if we accepted this metarule as valid, since most provisions are made only once in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Pāṇini could not have intended to imply such a metarule when formulating A 5.3.19.

### Third Solution: *sakṛddvandvam anityam*

According to Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita (ca. 16th-17th c. CE), some grammarians view Pāṇini's restatement of *dā* in A 5.3.19 as a sign that the introduction of *dā* after *tad* is to be considered not obligatory (*anitya*), deducing another metarule:

*sakṛddvandvam anityam* ||

[The application of the rule in question to] an item which has once formed a dvandva compound [with an other related item] is not obligatory.<sup>11</sup>

In the expression *sarvaikānyakīṃyattadaḥ* of A 5.3.15, the item *tad* is once combined with the other items to form a dvandva, before A 5.3.19. As such, *tad* as given in A 5.3.19: *tado dā ca* falls under the domain of this metarule: the introduction of *dā* or *dānīm* by A 5.3.19 to *tad* is regarded as optional, which sanctions one to use *tasmin kāle* as the utterance equivalent in meaning to *tadā* or *tadānīm*. It is to hint at this metarule that Pāṇini repeated *dā* in A 5.3.19.

Again, this metarule is introduced to explain the vocative singular form *subhru*; but the deduction of this metarule too is without support. First and foremost, the introduction of taddhita affixes is basically optional (*vā*), in accordance with the heading A 4.1.82: *samarthānām prathamād vā* that governs taddhita affixation rules. A 5.3.15 and A 5.3.19 are no exceptions. There is thus no need of indicating the metarule at hand by adding *dā* to A 5.3.19. Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita denies this metarule as well.<sup>12</sup>

### Fourth Solution: *tadā* and *tādā*

Kaiyaṭa (ca. 11th c. CE), while commenting on Patañjali's discussion of the item *dā* in A 5.3.19, brings forward some grammarians' argument:

<sup>11</sup> Again, as far as I know, this metarule is not found in any paribhāṣā work. The reason seems to be the same as the unsound metarule *sakṛdbaddham anityam dvirbaddham ca subaddham*. See note 8.

<sup>12</sup> ŚK (103.33-104.3): *ke cit tu tado dāvacanena sakṛddvandvam anityam iti paribhāṣājñāpanam āśrityānityo 'yaṃ pratiṣedha iti samādadhuḥ | kintv etat sakalapramādeṣu suvacam | tado dāvacanapratyākhyānaparabhāṣyādiviruddham ca |*

*Pradīpa* on MBh to A 5.3.19 (IV.184.18-19): *sūtrakāreṇa tv adāpratyayaḥ kṛta ity āhur | svare ca viśeṣaḥ | adāpratyaye tadāśabda ādyudātto bhavati | dāpratyaye tv antodāttaḥ |*

On the other hand, some say that the affix *adā* has been uttered by the author of sūtras (Pāṇini). There is a difference in accent: when the affix *adā* follows, the word *tadā* has high pitch on its first syllable; when the affix *dā* follows, the word *tadā* has high pitch on its last syllable.

Here some grammarians argue that there is a difference between the two *tadās* derived by A 5.3.15 and A 5.3.19: the former serves to derive *tadā́* (*tad* + *dā́*) with high pitch on its last vowel (*antodātta*) and the latter to derive *tádā* (*tad* + *ádā*) with high pitch on its first vowel (*ādyudātta*) in conformity with A 3.1.3: *ādyudāt-taś ca*. That is to say, A 5.3.19 is to be read as *tado 'dā ca*, not *tado dā ca* (*praśliṣṭanird-eśa*, *akārapraśleṣa*).<sup>13</sup> The derivation of *tadā́* and *tádā* can be shown as follows:

*tasmin kāle*

(1) *tasmin* + *dā́* (A 5.3.15: *sarvaikānyakimyattadaḥ kāle dā*)

(*tad-Ñi* + *dā́*)

(2) *tad*-ϕ + *dā́* (A 2.4.71: *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ*)

(3) *taa* + *dā́* (A 7.2.102: *tyadādīnām aḥ*)

(4) *ta* + *dā́* (A 6.1.97: *ato guṇe*)

*tadā́*

*tasmin kāle*

(1) *tasmin* + *ádā* (A 5.3.19: *tado 'dā ca*)

(*tad-Ñi* + *ádā*)

(2) *tad*-ϕ + *ádā* (A 2.4.71: *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ*)

(3) *taa* + *ádā* (A 7.2.102: *tyadādīnām aḥ*)

(4) *ta* + *ádā* (A 6.1.97: *ato guṇe*)

(5) *tádā* (A 6.1.97: *ato guṇe*; A 8.2.5: *ekādeśa udāttēnodāttaḥ*)

*tádā*

<sup>13</sup> This view is also introduced in the *Padamañjarī*, which is dated later than Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa*. PM on KV to A 5.3.19 (VI.249.20-21): *apara āha—adāpratyayo 'yaṃ na dāpratyaya iti | tatrādyudāttatvaṃ pakṣe bhavati |*. Nāgeśa denies this way of thinking for the simple reason that it goes against the *Bhāṣya*. Uddyota on *Pradīpa* to MBh ad A 5.3.19 (IV.184.22): *ity āhur iti | atrārucibījaṃ bhāṣyavirodhaḥ ||*.

It is highly significant in this connection that although the oxytone *tadā* is a regular formation, attested from the *Atharvaveda* (both recensions) onwards, the barytone *tādā* is also found in RVKh 1.8.1:

*yadā yuñjāthe maghāvānam āśum puruspṛham pṛtanājyām suvīram |*  
*suvāśvam dasrā rātham ā havēsu **tādā** yutīr yāti<sup>14</sup> rāsas<sup>15</sup> tanūnām ||*

When you two (Aśvins), at our calls, harness the chariot which is bounteous, swift, much-desired, driving to battle, carrying great heroes, drawn by good horses, o wondrous ones, then the essence of our bodies gets united.

This verse is the only example in which the word *tadā* is employed in the *Ṛgveda* Khila.<sup>16</sup> The accentual shift in *tādā* might be explainable as a device to emphasize the function of this temporal adverb: “It is *exactly/only* when you two harness the chariot that the essence of our bodies gets united.” Moreover, accent is known to be subject to analogical changes (Lubotsky 1988: 15); analogy with other adverbs derived from *tād* could also result in this barytone *tādā*.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Scheftelowitz (1906: 64) proposed that the reading *yeti* be corrected to *yāti*. This emendation is accepted in the text presented in Bhise (1995: 43). Bhise (1995: 93) notes Scheftelowitz’s proposal.

<sup>15</sup> Sontakke and Kashikar (1946) and Bhise (1995) read *rasam*, and Scheftelowitz (1906) reads *rasan*. *Rasam* cannot be a nominative of the noun *rasa* since it is a masculine noun, although the translation of the fourth line given in Bhise (1995: 93) presupposes that *rasam* is a nominative: “then the essence of our popersons (sic) gets united (with the body).” *Yutīr* in the verse is an accusative form of the stem *yuti*, so that *rasam* as an accusative does not work in this situation. Nor does *rasan* (“roaring”) as a present participle fit in with the context; the word *tanūnām* (“of bodies”) is clearly construed with the noun *rasa*, as in RV VII.104.10. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that the readings are to be corrected to *rasas*, a nominative singular of the masculine noun *rasa*. It is noteworthy in this connection that the characters *s* and *m* are frequently confused in Śāradā manuscripts, as Scheftelowitz (1906: 47) noted.

<sup>16</sup> See Sontakke and Kashikar (1946: 901-907) and Bhise (1995: 8-16) on the date of Khila verses and their relation to the *Ṛgveda*. Bhise (1995: 16) summarizes: “The Khilasūktas, thus, contain some parts which are of high antiquity like Ṛgvedic hymns and others which are either contemporaneous (sic) with the *Brāhmaṇas*, *Upaniṣads* or the *Gṛhyasūtras*.”

<sup>17</sup> Notice also that the barytone *kādā* is also attested in the *Ṛgveda* (RV I.84.20; I.105.3; I.139.5; VI.54.9; X.48.5; X.152.1).



*táthā* (RV +)

*tátas* (RV +)

*tátra* (RV +)

*tárhi* (RV X.129.2, AV +)

*tāti* (AV)<sup>18</sup>

All of these adverbs have high pitch on the first syllable, like *tádā*.<sup>19</sup>

All this leaves open the possibility that the form *tádā* did exist in the language Pāṇini knew and that, as some grammarians referred to by Kaiyaṭa assume, Pāṇini actually accounted for the form in his grammar by A 5.3.19.<sup>20</sup>

A 5.3.15: *sarvaikānyakimṃyattadaḥ kāle dā* || (→ *tadā*)

A 5.3.19: *tado 'dā ca* || (→ *tádā*, *tadānīm*)

## Conclusion

The two metarules deduced to justify Pāṇini's repetitive use of *dā* are scarcely acceptable from the viewpoint of Pāṇini's grammatical system. On the other hand, given that the barytone *tádā*, as a result of natural linguistic behavior, could have existed in the language Pāṇini was familiar with, the fourth solution

<sup>18</sup> See Mayrhofer (1992–2001) for further details of these forms.

<sup>19</sup> The suffixes *thāL* (A 5.3.23: *prakāravacane thāl* → *táthā*), *tasIL* (A 5.3.7: *pañcamyās tasil* → *tátas*), *tral* (A 5.3.10: *saptamyās tral* → *tátra*), and *rhiL* (A 5.3.20: *tayor dārhilau ca chandasi* → *tárhi*) are marked with *L* to show that the first vowel which precedes these elements in a derivate is high-pitched (A 6.1.193: *liti*). Pāṇini does not account for *tāti*.

The fact that Pāṇini did not mark the suffix *dā* with *L* might be considered as a handicap against the fourth solution under discussion. But the point of this solution is that A 5.3.15 explains the oxytone *tadā* as derived with the suffix *dā* and A 5.3.19 explains the barytone *tádā* as derived with the suffix *ádā* – there is no need of marking the latter suffix with *L* since its initial vowel is supposed to be high-pitched by A 3.1.3: *ādyudāttaś ca*, and as such this suffix automatically derives the barytone *tádā*, as shown in the derivational procedure presented above.

<sup>20</sup> Scheftelowitz (1906: 64) is suspicious of the reading *tádā* and proposes that (1) *tádā* be modified as the regular form *tadā* or (2) be read as *tád ā* (*ā* construed with *yāti*). Another possibility (3) is to read *tádā yutír* as *tád ā yutír* (the word *\*āyuti* is not attested in any Sanskrit literature, though). However, in view of the fact that *tádā* could be in fact formed due to some linguistic factors, as described above, (1)–(3) are not necessarily called for.

submitted in Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa* cannot be completely rejected and may indeed capture the real intention of Pāṇini. Otherwise, one would have to turn to Jinen-drabuddhi's solution: *vaicitryārtham*. We are still caught in the intricate maze of Pāṇini's elaborate diction.

*vicitrā sūtrasya kṛtiḥ pāṇininā |*

Wondrous is Pāṇini's composition of sūtras.<sup>21</sup>

## Epilogue

Whereas grammarians devote considerable efforts to the justification of Pāṇini's wording in A 5.3.19, there is a possible, simple solution to the problem which is not discussed by any indigenous grammarian. Suppose that Pāṇini formulated A 5.3.19 as *tadaś ca*.

A 5.3.15: *sarvaikānyakiṃyattadaḥ kāle dā ||*

\*A 5.3.19: *tadaś ca ||*

\*A 5.3.19 lets the affix *dānīm* occur after the same item *tad* under the same condition as A 5.3.15. Such being the case, this reformulated rule should be an exception (*apavāda*) to A 5.3.15. For, the domain of application of \*A 5.3.19 is wholly included within the domain of application of A 5.3.15, which applies to the items *sarva*, *eka*, *anya*, *kim*, *yad*, and *tad*. Consequently, the application of A 5.3.15 to *tad* is always blocked by A 5.3.19;<sup>22</sup> and therefore Pāṇini's grammar becomes unable to account for the form *tadā*, which is supposed to be derived by A 5.3.15. To avoid this, Pāṇini stated *dā* again in A 5.3.19.

A 5.3.15: *sarvaikānyakiṃyattadaḥ kāle dā ||* (→ *sarvadā*, *ekadā*, *anyadā*, *kadā*, *yadā*, *tadā*)

A 5.3.19: *tado dā ca ||* (→ *tadā*, *tadānīm*)

We will now face the following question: why did Pāṇini then include *tad* in A 5.3.15 when A 5.3.19 is expected to derive both *tadā* and *tadānīm*: Pāṇini could have formulated A 5.3.15 as *sarvaikānyakiṃyadaḥ kāle dā* without *-tad*.

\*A 5.3.15: *sarvaikānyakiṃyadaḥ kāle dā ||* (→ *sarvadā*, *ekadā*, *anyadā*, *kadā*, *yadā*)

<sup>21</sup> KV on A 2.2.15 (I.122.11). See also KV on A 4.1.166 (I.359.11) and on A 7.2.78 (II.820.8).

<sup>22</sup> For this kind of "simple blocking," see Scharf 2012: 319–320.

A 5.3.19: *tado dā ca ||* (→ *tadā, tadānīm*)

An immediate answer to this would be that in A 5.3.15 Pāṇini just listed all the common stems from which forms ending in *dā* (*sarvadā, ekadā*, etc..) are derived, without any other intention.

Now, the remaining question to be asked is why any grammarian does not touch upon the fact that \*A 5.3.19 (and A 5.3.19) behaves as an exception to A 5.3.15, a question which I cannot answer at the moment. Nevertheless, it is my hope that this paper would serve as a stimulant to further investigation into the Indian grammatical thoughts.

## Acknowledgments

I gratefully acknowledge helpful discussions with George Cardona, Werner Knobl, Eizirō Dōyama, Adam Catt, and Junichi Ozono on several points in this paper.

## Bibliography

### *Abbreviations/Primary Sources*

A: *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. See Appendix III (*Aṣṭādhyāyīsūtrapāṭha*) in Cardona 1997.

KV: *Kāśikāvṛtti*. See A. Sharma, K. Deshpande, and D. G. Padhye 1969-1970.

MBh: *Mahābhāṣya*. See Abhyankar 1962-1972.

Nyāsa: See Miśra 1985.

PK: *Prakriyākaumudī*. See Trivedi 1925-1931.

PM: *Padamañjarī*. See Miśra 1985.

*Pradīpa*: See Vedavrata 1962-1963.

*Prasāda*: See Trivedi 1925-1931.

RV: *Ṛgveda*. See Aufrecht 1877.

RVKh: *Ṛgveda Khila*. See Scheftelowitz 1906, Sontakke and Kashikar 1946, and Bhise 1995.

ŚK: *Śabdakaustubha*. See Nene 1929.

SK: *Siddhāntakaumudī*. See Caturveda and Bhāskara 1958-1961.

TB: *Tattvabodhinī*. See Caturveda and Bhāskara 1958-1961.

*Uddyota*: See Vedavrata 1962-1963.

vt.: *vārttika*. See Abhyankar 1962-1972.

### Secondary Sources

A. Sharma, K. Deshpande, and D. G. Padhye. 1969-1970. *Kāśikā: A Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar by Vāmana & Jayāditya*. 2 vols. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy.

Abhyankar, K. V. 1962-1972. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali: Edited by F. Kielhorn*. 3 vols. Bombay: Government Central Press, 1880-1885. Third edition, revised and furnished with additional readings, references and select critical notes by K. V. Abhyankar. 3 vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962-1972.

Aufrecht, T. 1877. *Die Hymnen des Ṛigveda*. 2 bde. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.

Ben-dor, S. 2016. "On the Relation of the Kāśikāvṛtti to the Mahābhāṣya." In *Vyākaraṇapariṣṭhā: Proceedings of the Vyākaraṇa Section of the 16th World Sanskrit Conference*, edited by George Cardona and Hideyo Ogawa. New Delhi: DK Publishers Distributors, 53-97.

Bhise, U. 1995. *The Khila-sūktas of the Ṛgveda: A Study*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Cardona, G. 1997. *Pāṇini: His Work and Its Traditions. Volume One. Background and Introduction*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988. Second edition, revised and enlarged, 1997.

Caturveda, G. Ś. and P. Ś. Bhāskara. 1958-1961. *Śrīmadbhaṭṭojidīkṣitaviracitā vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī śrīmadvāsudevadīkṣitapraṇītayā bālamānoramākhyavyākhyayā śrīmājñānendrasarasvatīviracitayā tattvabodhinīyākhyavyākhyayā ca sanāthitā*. 4 vols. Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Joshi, S. D. and S. Bhate. 1983. *The Role of the Particle ca in the Interpretation of the Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Pune: University of Poona.

Kawamura, Y. 2018. "Sakṛdbaddham anityaṃ dvirbaddham ca subaddham." *Journal of South Asian Languages and Cultures* 9: 77-93.

Lubotsky, A. 1988. *The System of Nominal Accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

- Mayrhofer, M. 1992-2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 3 bde. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Miśra, Ś. 1985. *Kāśikāvṛtti of Jayāditya-Vāmana (along with Commentaries Vivaraṇa-pañcikā-Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra)*. 6 vols. Varanasi: Ratna Publications.
- Nene, P. G. Ś. 1929. *The Śabda Kaustubha by Pandit Bhattojīdīkshit*. Vol. II, Fas. 5 to 10. From the *Second Pāda of 1st Adhyāya to Second Pāda of 3rd Adhyāya* and *Sphoṭa Candrikā* by Pandit Srikrisna mauni. Benares: Vidya Vilas Press.
- Scharf, P. M. 2012. "Rule Selection in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, or Is Pāṇini's Grammar Mechanistic?" In *Studies in Sanskrit Grammars: Proceedings of Vyākaraṇa Section of the 14th World Sanskrit Conference*, edited by George Cardona, Ashok Aklujkar, and Hideyo Ogawa. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld, 319-350.
- Scheftelowitz, I. 1906. *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*. Breslau: Verlag von M & H Marcus. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966.
- Sontakke, N. S. and C. G. Kashikar. 1946. *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā with the Commentary of Sāyaṇācārya*. Vol. IV, Maṇḍalas IX-X. Poona: Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala.
- Trivedi, K. P. 1925-1931. *The Prakriyākaumudī of Rāmachandra with the Commentary Prasāda of Viṭṭhala and with a Critical Notice of Manuscripts and an Exhaustive and Critical Introduction*. 2 vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Vedavrata. 1962-1963. *Śrībhagavat-patañjali-viracitam Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣyam (Śrī-kaiyaṭakṛta-pradīpena nāgojībhāṭṭa-kṛtena-bhāṣyapradīpodyotena ca vibhūṣitam)*. 5 vols. Gurukul Jhajjar (Rohtak): Hairyaṇā Sāhitya Saṁsthāna.