

pūrvatrāsiddham and *āśrayāt siddham*

George Cardona
University of Pennsylvania

As is well known, rules of the final three pādas of Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī, the tripādī, headed by (1) A 8.2.1: *pūrvatrāsiddham*, are suspended with respect to rules of the preceding seven and three-quarter pādas, so that theoretically the results of applying a sūtra within the tripādī cannot be subject to operations provided by prior rules. This suspension applies unless non-suspension is otherwise provided for. Pāṇini explicitly recognizes instances where rule suspension is overruled. Thus, according to (2) A 8.2.80: *adaso'ser dād u do maḥ* a vowel following the *-d-* of *adas* after the *-s* of this base has been dropped is replaced by an *u*-vowel and, simultaneously, the *-d-* of the base is also replaced by *-m-*. In addition, (3) A 8.2.8: *na mu ne* negates the suspended status of (2) with respect to the substitution of the ending *ā* by *nā* (A 7.3.120: *āno nāstriyām*), thus allowing for *amunā* (instr. sg. masc-nt.). Pāṇini also denies the suspended status of tripādī sūtras by implication. This has been recognized not only by at least once modern scholar (see H. E. Buiskool, *The Tripādī* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1939], pp. 98–99) but, much earlier, also by Pāṇinīyas, from Kātyāyana onwards. For example, (4) A 8.2.66: *sasajuṣo ruḥ* lets the *-s* of a pada be replaced by *R* (*ru*). In addition, according (5) A 6.1.113: *ato ror aplutād aplute*, *R* preceded and followed by *a* not subject to contextual pluta replacement is replaced by *u*. (5) could not possibly apply without the presence of *R*. Hence, although (4) is stated under the heading of (1), it is not considered suspended with respect to (5). Kātyāyana (1.1.12 vt. 4: *āśrayāt siddhatvam ca yathā ror uttve*) speaks of (4) being siddha with respect to (5) because it supplies the operand on which the application of the latter depends (*āśrayāt*).

I shall consider this and other instances of the same procedure to support the conclusion that Pāṇinīyas are justified in their interpretation of how (5) is related to rules of the tripādī. As a corollary, I shall argue that, contrary to a recent claim, with respect to the sandhi *-o a-/o-* (< *-as a-*), the text of the *Ṛgveda* known to Pāṇini did not differ from the text which is established in the Śākala recension and accounted for in the *Ṛkprātiśākhya*.