

## Pāṇini's sibilant-insertion rules and the problem of reconstruction of the AIA root \*skr-

Boris A. Zakharyin  
Moscow State University

It is demonstrated that in rules *A 6.1.135–157*, dedicated to problems of sibilant (= *suṭ*) insertion, Pāṇini follows an *ad hoc* principle, as the heterogeneous phenomena differing in origin and function are brought together exclusively on formal grounds. The results of Pāṇini's analysis might be shortly formulated like this:

(1) In order to explain the appearance of the incremented *-s-* (= *suṭ*) between a determined number of *prefixes* and a set of verbal *roots* with initial /*k*/, Pāṇini formulates a special morphological rule *A 6.1.135* for treating a few exclusive cases only. Intended to be a *governing rule*, *A 6.1.135* is in reality not governing all the subsequent sūtras.

(2) The applicability of = *suṭ* insertion rules is in many cases determined by a considerable number of lexico-semantic restrictions (see, e.g., *A 4.2.16, 6.1.135, 6.1.137–138*).

(3) Understanding that in Imperfect forms of the type *samāskurvata* “(they) prepared (ritually)”, used in ‘*Taittirīyasamhitā*’, or in Perfect forms like *samcaskāra* “(he) has prepared”, noted in Yāska's ‘*Nirukta*’, it is not possible to treat *-s-* as a *prefix*, Pāṇini is forced to introduce rule *A 6.1.136*, intended exclusively for explaining those strictly limited occurrences, but, being formal and a completely prescriptive, rule *A 6.1.136* is not at all an explanatory one.

(4) Besides its non-standard structural properties, *base* of the type “a certain *prefix* + a *root* with initial *k*” usually also implies a too wide dispersion of meanings.

The paper shows that the only possible way for getting rid of the internal inconsistencies in treatment of the presumably ‘inserted’ *-s-* is an assumption that the two initially different verbal *roots*, namely *kar-* (from PIE \**k<sup>o</sup>ar* and \**skar-* (from PIE \**sk<sup>o</sup>ar*), due to similarities of form probably have got merged in already Late Indo-European (LIE), leaving in Ancient Indo-Aryan (AIA) traces of their former separate existence. —See the corresponding hypotheses in works by W. Whitney, M. Mayrhofer, V. Ivanov & T. Gamkrelidze and others.

As G. Cardona's thorough analysis of the primary meanings of the word ‘*samcaskāra-*’ demonstrates, the starting point for merging might have been the sphere of consuming ritual edibles in course of different rites. Later the idea of “purification” also spread onto cooking of everyday meals, and still later it became associated with different spiritual and cultural phenomena (including, for example, speech and its elements).

The fact that the historical mergence of *roots* was the real cause of some structural inconsistencies remained unobserved by Sanskrit grammarians, but at the same time, having noticed the unusual phenomena, Pāṇini and his followers drew scholars' attention to them and suggested a treatment appropriate to their system of grammatical views.