

UNION ACADÉMIQUE
INTERNATIONALE

UNIONE ACCADEMICA
NAZIONALE

CORPUS IURIS SANSCRITICUM
ET FONTES IURIS ASIAE MERIDIANAE ET CENTRALIS
Project n. 43

A Series on Social and Religious Law of India, South-East and Central Asia
founded by Oscar Botto

Vol. XI



EDIZIONI AIT – EDIZIONI ETS

**CORPUS IURIS SANSCRITICUM
ET FONTES IURIS ASIAE MERIDIANAE ET CENTRALIS**
Project n. 43

Scientific Committee: Nalini Balbir (Paris), Domenico Francavilla (Torino), Axel Michaels (Heidelberg), Patrick Olivelle (Austin, Texas), Irma Piovano (Torino)

The project is directed by the Comitato AIT (Asia Institute Torino)

AIT Editorial Board: Irma Piovano, Gabriella Olivero, Stefano Turina

Publisher:
Comitato AIT
Corso Trento 13
10129 Torino (Italy)
www.asiainstitutetorino.it
Printer: Edizioni ETS, Pisa (Italy)
Electronic version: www.asiainstitutetorino.it/corpusiuris.html
Sole Agents: Comitato AIT

Copyright © 2025 Comitato AIT per la promozione degli Studi sull'India e sul Sud-Est Asiatico
Irma Piovano (President) – Saverio Sani (Vice President) – Franco Omegna (Treasurer)
Corso Trento 13 – 10129 Torino (Italy)
C.F. 97651370013 – R.E.A. Torino, n. 1048465 – R.O.C., n. 14802

Pubblicazione realizzata con il contributo dell'Università degli Studi di Cagliari, Dipartimento di Lettere, Lingue e Beni Culturali

ISBN 978-884677494-1

MEDHĀTITHI'S
GRAMMATICAL NOTES ON
THE *MĀNAVADHARMAŚĀSTRA*
HOW TECHNICALITIES CAN SHED LIGHT
ON ANCIENT INDIAN LAW

Alessandro Giudice and Tiziana Pontillo

EDIZIONI AIT – EDIZIONI ETS

2025

Acknowledgements

This volume, the eleventh in the series, is the final publication by the AIT-Asia Institute Torino. The series and the associated project *Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum et Fontes Iuris Asiae Meridianae et Centralis* were founded in 1987 by the distinguished Indologist Professor Oscar Botto and have been directed by the AIT-Asia Institute Torino until 12 September 2025. On this date, the series and project were entrusted to the University of Cagliari, and specifically, they now fall under the Department of Literature, Languages and Cultural Heritage, which also generously contributed to the printing of this volume. From the twelfth volume onwards, the series will continue to be published by UNICApres, under the direction of Tiziana Pontillo and Alessandro Giudice, who are also the authors of this volume.

This work examines the grammatically focused commentarial passages of Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* on the *Mānavadharmasāstra* to determine the criteria guiding the selection of words interpreted in such a highly technical manner and the grammatical rules underlying these explanations. Among the commentators on Dharmaśāstra texts, Medhātithi stands out for the number and sharpness of his grammatical discussions. Building on his perspective, the authors explore how closely the language of the *Mānavadharmasāstra* follows Pāṇini's rules and how the grammatical tradition shapes the argumentative structure of the *Manubhāṣya*. My heartfelt thanks go to the Union Académique Internationale and to the Unione Accademica Nazionale for their patronage and support of Project No. 43 (*Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum et Fontes Iuris Asiae Meridianae et Centralis*). I am grateful to the members of the Scientific Committee of the CIS, Nalini Balbir, Domenico Francavilla, Axel Michaels, and Patrick Olivelle, for their competent and valuable advice. I must remember with particular gratitude Satya Vrat Shastri and Pierre Sylvain Filliozat, recently deceased. I extend my deepest gratitude to the Vice President of the AIT, Saverio Sani, to the treasurer, Franco Omegna, and the collaborators, Victor Agostini, Gabriella Olivero and Stefano Turina, for their skilled and generous collaboration.

Irma Piovano
President of the Committee AIT-Asia Institute Torino

Preface

The idea for this study emerged four years ago during one of the editions of the Summer Schools on Pāṇini's Sanskrit Grammar organised by the University of Cagliari and the University of Pisa in September 2021, when the teachers were Maria Piera Candotti, Malhar Kulkarni and Tiziana Pontillo. More specifically, its origins lie in a lecture by Tiziana Pontillo on the use of Vyākaraṇa in Sanskrit commentaries, devoted particularly to the Kāvya genre, which became a source of inspiration for Alessandro Giudice. He noted a related, frequent use of Vyākaraṇa annotations by the Dharmaśāstra author Medhātithi in his *Manubhāṣya*, which prompted him to gather all the relevant Vyākaraṇa-oriented passages. From the end of the following year, after Alessandro Giudice had commenced his doctoral studies at the University of Cagliari, he and Tiziana Pontillo began sharing the project of translating and studying all the collected passages, which gradually developed what is now Chapter 2. Three years later, with the addition of an introduction, an analysis of the selected passages, and several other sections, this has now evolved into the present volume.

The book is the result of a joint work entirely discussed and shared by both authors. However, for academic requirements, Alessandro Giudice is responsible for Sections 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 3.2.2, 3.2.4.1, 3.2.4.2, 3.2.4.3.1, 3.2.7, 3.3, 3.4, the *Preliminary note* and Nos. 1-56, 113-168 of Chapter 2, and Chapters 5-8, while Tiziana Pontillo is responsible for Sections 1.2.2, 3.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.3, 3.2.4.3, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, Nos. 57-112, 169-223 of Chapter 2, Chapter 4, and *General index*. Unless explicitly stated, all English translations of Vedic and Sanskrit texts are by the authors. Translations by other scholars have been included here solely for the purpose of comparison. In all cases, the reproduced excerpts of Vedic and Sanskrit texts have been adjusted to align with the orthographic conventions of this work, including the application of *sandhi* rules.

We should like to express our heartfelt thanks to Maria Piera Candotti, Elisa Freschi, Davide Mocci and Malhar Kulkarni for their valuable input in discussions on several points of this volume or its preliminary steps. We would like to acknowledge our debt to David Brick, Victor D'Avella and Monika Nowakowska for their thorough peer-review of the draft of this volume: their insightful comments and corrections have significantly enhanced the quality of the final product. We are immensely grateful to Irma Piovano, President of the

Asia Institute of Turin, for granting us the privilege of publishing this volume in the prestigious *Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum et Fontes Iuris Asiae Meridianae et Centralis* series. Special thanks are due to Sally Davies for astutely and patiently revising the English of the entire volume. Despite the number of people who helped us to revise the text and discussed some parts of it, we are of course solely responsible for any errors that may remain.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	5
Preface	7
Table of contents	9
1. Introduction	11
1.1. Purpose of the research	11
1.2. Historical overview	12
1.2.1. Dharmaśāstra commentaries	12
1.2.2. Grammatical sources available in Medhātithi's age	13
1.3. Medhātithi's <i>Manubhāṣya</i> : A philological account	16
2. Textual analysis: Text, translation and comments on Medhātithi's grammatical passages	21
Preliminary note	21
First <i>adhyāya</i> (20 passages)	24
Second <i>adhyāya</i> (65 quotations)	57
Third <i>adhyāya</i> (27 passages)	154
Fourth <i>adhyāya</i> (21 passages)	186
Fifth <i>adhyāya</i> (9 passages)	207
Sixth <i>adhyāya</i> (3 passages)	218
Seventh <i>adhyāya</i> (4 passages)	221
Eighth <i>adhyāya</i> (48 passages)	225
Ninth <i>adhyāya</i> (10 passages)	282
Tenth <i>adhyāya</i> (3 passages)	291
Eleventh <i>adhyāya</i> (12 passages)	295
Twelfth <i>adhyāya</i> (1 passage)	308
3. Study: An examination of the selected Medhātithi's grammatical passages..	311
On the structure of the study	311
3.1. Grammatical passages with linguistic purposes (TL)	311
3.2. Grammatical passages with exegetical purposes (TE)	315
3.2.1. Phonetic issues	316
3.2.2. Verbal inflection	317
3.2.3. Nominal inflection	318
3.2.4. Derivative stems	320
3.2.4.1. Derivative verbal bases	320

3.2.4.2. Deverbal derivative nominal stems (<i>kr̥t</i>).....	321
3.2.4.3. Denominal derivative nominal stems (<i>taddhita</i>).....	323
3.2.4.3.1. Denominal derivative nominal stems ending compounds (<i>samāsānta</i>)	326
3.2.5. Compounds (<i>samāsa</i>)	327
3.2.6. Zero phenomena	330
3.2.7. <i>Chandas</i>	332
3.3. Grammatical passages with juridical purposes (J).....	336
3.4. Grammatical passages with encyclopaedic purposes (E)	343
4. Conclusion	351
5. Abbreviations and bibliography.....	357
6. <i>Index locorum</i>	373
7. Glossary of technical terms.....	385
8. Table of quotations in comparison with Jha's and Olivelle's editions of the <i>Manubhāṣya</i>	387
General index	403

1. Introduction

1.1. *Purpose of the research*

The research presented in this volume aims to understand when, how, and why Medhātithi quotes grammatical sources in his *Manubhāṣya* on the *Mānavadharmasāstra*, as well as the exegetical benefits it provides in terms of ancient Indian law.

When comparing Medhātithi's commentary with other Sanskrit works belonging to the commentarial genre on Dharmaśāstra and non-Dharmaśāstra root texts, we realised that Medhātithi frequently relied on Vyākaraṇa sources (Pāṇini's rules, Kātyāyana's glosses, etc.) to explain some peculiar linguistic usages of the *Mānavadharmasāstra* and, most importantly, used them as hermeneutical tools to resolve subtle interpretative issues in a work that demands the highest possible degree of clarity as a juridical text.

It is noteworthy that the previous editors of the *Manubhāṣya*, even though they recognised some quotations or references to grammatical passages (particularly *sūtras* from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*) in both the edition and the translation, did not conduct a thorough examination of Medhātithi's text with this purpose in mind, that is to identify as many Vyākaraṇa passages as possible, and then translate and explicate them from a grammatical perspective.

The purpose of this volume is to examine all the passages in Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* that contain direct quotations or references to the teachings of Vyākaraṇa works, namely Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Kātyāyana's *vārttikas*, Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, and, occasionally, the *Paribhāṣās* and the *Gaṇasūtras*. Based on this analysis, this work aims to understand why Medhātithi makes such prominent and significant use of grammatical sources in his commentary on the *Mānavadharmasāstra*, especially in relation to other commentaries on the same tradition, the Dharmaśāstra, or on other traditions such as Kāvya.

The work consists of three main sections: a historical and philological premise, the analysis of the entire corpus composed of 223 passages selected from the *Manubhāṣya*, and an overview study of the gathered material organised into several categories, which we established to distinguish contents, purposes, and

linguistic items involved in Medhātithi's commentary. The focus on linguistic details and possible Vyākaraṇa sources within each *Manubhāṣya* passage aims to provide a practical tool for Dharmaśāstra readers who wish to gain a thorough understanding of Medhātithi's argument and interpretation, which can be grasped even through the grammatical technicalities Medhātithi employs.

Our guiding principle was not so much to detect all the sources that may have inspired the technical-linguistic sections identified in the *Manubhāṣya*, but rather to account for the authoritative grammatical knowledge that its author seems to assume is already acquired and readily available to his intended readers.

1.2. *Historical overview*

1.2.1. *Dharmaśāstra commentaries*

The primary texts in the Dharmaśāstra tradition are the *Dharmaśāstras* or *Smṛtis*, written in *śloka*s and composed from the early Common Era onwards. Compared to earlier *Dharmasūtras*, these works feature several innovations, starting with the first and most groundbreaking text which is the *Manusmṛti* or *Mānavadharmasāstra* (dated to the mid-second century; see Olivelle 2018: 24). Besides Manu's treatise, only four other prominent works have been preserved through manuscripts: the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* or *Yājñavalkyadharmasāstra* (dated to the early 5th century CE; see Olivelle 2019: viii-xv; 2020: 40-44), the *Nāradaśmṛti* (dated to between the 5th and 6th centuries CE; see Olivelle 2018: 28), the *Viṣṇusmṛti* or *Vaiṣṇavadharmasāstra* (dated to between the 6th and 8th centuries CE; Olivelle 2018: 27), and the *Parāśarasmṛti* (dated to the 8th century CE; see Olivelle 2018: 27). However, based on the quotations attributed to other Smṛtikāras in later Dharmaśāstra texts, Kane (1962-1975: I, 304) hypothesised that there were probably around one hundred *Smṛtis*. Some of these, notably those by Brhaspati and Kātyāyana, were particularly significant for the development of Indian law in post-Gupta jurisprudence (see Kane 1962-1975: I, 213; Patkar 1978: 8-9; Olivelle 2006: 187-188).

From around the 7th century CE onwards, Dharmaśāstra authors began to compose a type of text that was different from the one in use centuries before. Rather than producing independent normative texts, experts in *dharma* turned to writing commentaries on foundational texts, variously named *Bhāṣyas*, *Ṭīkā*s, and the like. The aim of these commentaries was to explain both the content and linguistic elements of the root texts. Before the composition of such

commentaries, oral and informal scholarly discussions on these texts probably took place in educational settings such as the preceptor's house (*gurukula*) (see Davis 2018: 371-372). As Tubb and Boose illustrated (2007: 3-5), a typical Sanskrit commentary analyses the root text in detail, elucidating both its linguistic and conceptual components, categorised according to the functions traditionally attributed to a commentary. The first four concern the language of the root texts: word division (*padaccheda*), paraphrasing (*padārthokti*), analysis of grammatical complexes like compounds and derivatives (*vigraha*), and explanation of sentence construction (*vākyayojanā*). The fifth addresses the content, explicitly providing answers to any objections to what is expressed in the text (*ākṣepasamādhāna*). The emergence of new social, legal, and religious practices, along with modifications to existing ones, prompted Dharmaśāstra authors to codify such changes in the dominant literary form of the period that was the commentary (see Lingat 1973: 108-109). Occasionally, these new norms conflicted with the original *Smṛtis*, but rather than dismissing these sources, scholars reinterpreted them to align with evolving socio-cultural realities (see Davis and Brick 2018: 30-32). Examples of such commentaries include Viśvarūpa's *Bālakrīḍā* on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* (dated to the early 9th century CE; see Olivelle 2020: 37) and the text to which this monograph is devoted: Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* (discussed further below in Section 1.3).

1.2.2. Grammatical sources available in Medhātithi's age

The grammarians behind the passages cited by the *Manubhāṣya* were essentially: Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, whose grammatical works together constitute the so-called Trimuni Vyākaraṇa ('the grammar of the three wise men'), and also Jayāditya and Vāmana.

The *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, namely the grammar in eight 'lectures' by Pāṇini, which dates back to the 4th century BCE,¹ is the *mūla* text, i.e. the root text for the work of all the other grammarians mentioned here, which consists of four parts. The most important of these is the Sūtrapāṭha, which is the actual body of 3,996 aphorisms divided into eight chapters (*adhyāyas*), each divided into four sections (*pādas*).

¹ Some scholars maintain that he might be backdated to 500 BCE since his language is close to the Vedic usage (see Thieme 1955: 429; Renou 1969: 483; Scharfe 2009: 28). However, he was a subject of the Achaemenid Empire, since the northwestern area of India, where he is believed to have lived, was a tributary of the Persian Empire until Alexander's expedition.

After an interesting group of metarules and other capital rules included in the first chapter, the second is mainly devoted to nominal inflection and compounds; the third to the deverbal affixes, both those used for verbal inflection and *kṛts*, i.e. the affixes forming the deverbal derivative stems while the fourth and fifth chapters deal with the denominal derivative affixes (i.e. the *taddhitas*) and the relevant derivative stems. From the sixth chapter onwards, we find an explanation of the mechanisms that govern the surface form of words and sentences, with special attention being paid to pitch accents, sandhi rules and phonic replacements in general. The Sūtrapāṭha has 2 appendices, the Dhātupāṭha and the Gaṇapāṭha: the former provides a collection (literally a ‘recitation’, i.e. the outcome of the action of reading something aloud) of all verbal bases, ordered according to ten conjugation classes, with subgroups arranged according to the verbal diathesis or the accent etc.,² while the latter is a collection of several lists mainly of nominal bases, each of which represents the object or the target of a specific Sūtrapāṭha rule. In other words, each list included in the Gaṇapāṭha comes under a particular rule of the Sūtrapāṭha, or better it pertains to a specific rule. As a consequence, we have to consider that a crucial difference does exist between the Dhātupāṭha and the Gaṇapāṭha. In fact, while the list of verbal bases in the Dhātupāṭha is closed and complete, encompassing all the verbal bases recorded in the Vedic and Sanskrit languages in the age when this corpus was compiled, the Gaṇapāṭha does not contain the whole Vedic and Sanskrit nominal lexicon, but merely an appendix to the specific rules taught by Pāṇini in order to describe the nominal system (see Radicchi 1991). The authorship of the Gaṇapāṭha is uncertain. Furthermore, these nominal lists are often *ākṛtis*, i.e. purely exemplificative (thus open) lists that could be integrated by the readers. In actual fact, at times they do not even exclusively contain nominal bases because the Gaṇapāṭha simply gathers an extensive collection of examples referring to specific rules without any limitation in terms of grammatical categories. Usually, the lists in both the Dhātupāṭha and the Gaṇapāṭha are labelled with a name formed from the first verbal or nominal base listed, followed by the word *ādi* or *prabhṛti*. For instance, the *adādi* list is the list of verbal bases whose present tense is inflected according to the second class, i.e. the list whose beginning (*-ādi*) is the verb *ad-* ‘to eat.’ Instead, the *akṣarasamāmnāya*, i.e. ‘the catalogue of sounds’ that is the enumeration (*samāmnāya*) of *akṣaras* (i.e. syllables) by tradition or from memory

² Although we cannot be sure whether the Dhātupāṭha appended to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is the actual list Pāṇini himself produced, we are certain that the main body of rules must have had some version of this list as an appendix. In the list handed down to us, the verbal bases are provided with a short meaning-explanatory gloss.

is the basis for the Sūtrapāṭha. It is true to say that without this catalogue, nobody would be able to read and understand Pāṇini's grammar. Speech sounds are not listed casually but ordered according to grammatical requirements and organised into 14 sets of sounds (singled out from the actual language), each closed by a consonantal marker (which is only part of the metalanguage and not of the language itself). These markers, called *its* by Pāṇini and *anubandhas* later by the commentators, play several roles in the grammar. These sets of sounds are called *Śivasūtras* or *Maheśvarasūtras* or even *Pratyāhārasūtras*, a term that helps us to understand their purpose. Indeed, *pratyāhāra-* means 'withdrawal', 're-absorption', and they are *de facto* 'abbreviative designations' (literally 'reabsorbing names') which are used to give a very brief indication of the specific group of speech sounds to which a given rule can apply.

Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, dated with some degree of reliability to the 2nd century BCE, is a commentary on the rules of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. More precisely, the work proceeds to discuss, defend, correct, and supplement 1,701 out of the total of 3,996 aphorisms attributed to that grammar. For the most part, Patañjali relies on Kātyāyana's *vārttikas*, a commentary that comments in a compendious style on 1,245 Pāṇini rules, which would otherwise be lost to us. The *vārttikas* probably date back to the 3rd century BCE. Apart from the rules commented on by Patañjali, another essential work that allows us to understand Pāṇini's grammar is the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, a late commentary probably dating back to the 7th century CE and attributed to Jayāditya and Vāmana.³ The merit of the latter is that it contains a generally easy explanation of all the rules in Pāṇini's grammar. When the explanation of the same rule is also available in the *Mahābhāṣya*, it is evident that the *Kāśikāvṛtti* often simply repeats the conclusions established by Patañjali, even employing the same examples and aiming to simplify the contents.

Instead, the 5th century CE grammarian and philosopher Bhartṛhari, who probably preceded Jayāditya and Vāmana, certainly makes an original contribution to the Pāṇinian linguistic tradition. He was the author of both a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*, i.e. the *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* (of which only the commentary on the first 55 rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* has been handed down to us), and a treatise in verse entitled *Vākyapadīya* or *Trikāṇḍī*, which presents a more general reflection on language, without directly commenting on individual grammatical rules. Its 2000 stanzas or *kārikās* are divided into three chapters: the *Brahmakāṇḍa*, i.e. the 'Section on Brahman', meant to summarise and explain traditional teachings; the *Vākyakāṇḍa*, i.e. the 'Section on the Sentence', and the *Padakāṇḍa*, i.e. the

³ See Haag and Vergiani (2011: 15, fn. 1) and D'Avella (2018: 41, fn. 139).

‘Section on Word-forms’, also called *Prakīrṇakāṇḍa*, i.e. the ‘Miscellaneous Section.’ We have found no traces of any direct citations of these two works in the *Manubhāṣya*, nor have we found any connection with the *Cāndravṛtti*, a work from which the *Kāśikāvṛtti* frequently borrows,⁴ and which was written by the Buddhist grammarian Candragomin, who was strongly influenced by Patañjali. Nonetheless, Candragomin dates back to the 5th century CE, and it is thus obvious that he predates the commentary we have dealt with in the present volume. The upper limit of another Buddhist grammarian, Jinendrabuddhi, who authored a commentary on the *Kāśikāvṛtti* called *Nyāsa* or *Kāśikāvivarāṇapañjikā*, is the 8th to 9th century CE.⁵ It is thus most likely that he preceded the *Manubhāṣya*. In a few passages (see e.g. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71), we have assumed that an option may be that Medhātithi was influenced by the grammatical knowledge of this age, of which Jinendrabuddhi is an authoritative witness.

1.3. *Medhātithi's Manubhāṣya: A philological account*

During the so-called “commentarial age” of Dharmaśāstra (see Section 1.2.1), Medhātithi composed one of the most authoritative commentaries on the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*, titled *Manubhāṣya* (‘Commentary on Manu[’s root text]’) or, as it was called by later medieval Dharmaśāstra scholars (e.g. Devaṇabhaṭṭa, the thirteenth-century author of the *Smṛticandrikā*), simply *Bhāṣya* (‘Commentary’), given its undisputed prominence in the field. According to Kane (1962-1975: I, 575), Medhātithi, son of Vīrasvāmin, probably lived in Kashmir in the second half of the 9th century CE. Olivelle (2016a: 121) underlines the fact that, notwithstanding his Kashmiri origin, Medhātithi was “conversant with legal practices in other parts of the [S]ubcontinent”, as evidenced by the references to non-Kashmiri institutes, such as the inheritance of sonless widows, which was typical of South India (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.3).⁶ However, it is worth noting that knowledge of non-Kashmiri legal practices might be more closely linked to a wide range of texts known by Medhātithi rather than to his direct familiarity with them, which would depend on extensive travel or cosmopolitanism per se. In this regard, Brick (2023: 116) shows that his knowledge of the South Indian practice of widows’ inheritance probably relied on Yāska’s *Nirukta* (especially Nir 3.5).

⁴ See Scharfe (1977: 114) and the bibliography quoted there.

⁵ See D’Avella (2018: 41, fn. 79) and the bibliography quoted there.

⁶ A translation of Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.3 is available in Olivelle (2016a: 235-240).

Medhātithi was neither the first nor the only commentator to deal with the *Mānavadharmasāstra*. The manuscript tradition, in fact, hands down eight other commentaries, of which only one precedes Medhātithi's. Here follows a summary list (for a detailed account, see Olivelle 2005: 367-369):

1. Bhāruci's *Rjumiṭākṣarā*, variously placed between the 6th century (see Derrett 1975: I, 10) and the 9th century (see Kane 1962-1975: I, 569).
2. Govindarāja's *Manuṭikā*, placed in the 11th century CE (see Kane 1962-1975: ibid.).
3. Nārāyaṇa's (or Sarvajñanārāyaṇa's) *Manvarthavivṛtti*, placed before the 15th century CE (see Kane 1962-1975: I, 1190).
4. Kullūka's *Manvarthamuktāvalī*, variously placed between the 13th century CE (see Kane 1962-1975: I, 759) and the 15th century CE (see Bühler 1886: cxxxī).
5. Rāghavānanda's *Manvarthacandrikā*, placed after the mid-fourteenth century CE (see Kane 1962-1975: I, 1210).
6. Nandana's *Nandinī*, of uncertain date.
7. Rāmacandra's commentary, of uncertain date.
8. Maṇirāma's commentary, placed in the 17th century (see Dave 1972-1984: I, xii).

Despite its importance in the field of Dharmaśāstra, the transmission of the *Manubhāṣya* was certainly not problem-free. A crucial event in its philological history was the so-called *jīrṇoddhāra* (lit. 'restoration of what is decayed'), carried out by order of King Madana (identified with Madanapāla, a prince of Digh) in the 14th century. However, this restoration was actually only a completion of the damaged manuscript in Madana's possession: using manuscripts from other parts of India, a sort of new edition was created at Madana's court which modern scholarship considers as inaccurate or resulting from a lack of expertise (see Colebrooke 1801: xiv; Bühler 1886: cxxiv-cxxv; Jha 1999: I, ix-xii; Olivelle 2021). The following colophon added at the end of the third, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth *ādhyāyas* of the *Manubhāṣya* bears witness to the *jīrṇoddhāra*:

*mānyā kāpi manusmṛtis taducitā vyākhyāpi medhātithēḥ
sā luptaiva vidher vaśāt kvacid api prāpyaṃ na tat pustakam |
kṣoṇīndro madanaḥ sahāraṇasuto deśāntarād āhṛtair
jīrṇoddhāram acīkarat tata itas tatpustakair lekhitaiḥ ||*

Since it is devoted to the *Manusmṛti* which is worthy of honour,
Medhātithi's explanation devoted to it (i.e. to the *Manusmṛti*) [is

worthy of honour] as well. This was lost because of the power of fate. This manuscript is by no means attainable. King Madana, Sahāraṇa's son, accomplished a restoration [of what was decayed] through its manuscripts, which were therefore made to be written here, brought from another region.

In philological terms, this restoration which results from contamination between manuscripts from different philological traditions (of which all trace has been lost) could be defined as the archetype from which all the extant manuscripts of the *Manubhāṣya* (from Northern India) derive.

There are five printed editions of Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya*:

1. Mandlik's edition of 1886 in two volumes (Mandlik 1886).
2. Gharpure's first edition of 1920 (Gharpure 1920): this edition appears to follow that of Mandlik (1886), despite offering some variant readings in the footnotes.
3. Jha's English translation of 1920-1926 in five volumes (Jha 1920-1926), followed by his edition of 1932-1939 in three volumes (Jha 1932-1939), reprinted in 1999 in ten volumes together with the English translation, accompanied by a foreword by Wezler (Jha 1999). In this case, the Mandlik (1886) and Gharpure (1920) editions were consulted together with other manuscripts not used by the latter critical editors (as evident from a long passage commenting on MDh^M 3.108, which is missing in the first two editions of the *Manubhāṣya*). However, no variant readings are provided in the footnotes, nor is there any indication of the damaged passages emended by Jha.
4. Gharpure's second edition of 1958, accomplished with the help of Swami Kevalananda of the Prājña Maṭha of Wai (Gharpure 1958): this edition appears to mainly follow Jha's (1932-1939).
5. Dave's edition of 1972-1984 in six volumes (Dave 1972-1984): this edition integrally follows that of Jha (1932-1939).

The finest printed edition of Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* available to us is Jha's edition (1932-1939; reprinted in 1999). This edition served as the basis for all subsequent editions, whose editors did not revise the text with new manuscript evidence (and this remains true today). Due to the lamentably poor transmission of the text, Jha did not attempt to produce a critical edition; we are unaware of all the variant readings he had access to, nor do we know when he made emendations or conjectures. However, he did provide us, before his own edition was published, with selected (meaningful) variants in Part I of his Notes to the

Mānavadharmaśāstra (Jha 1924), based on the editions of Gharpure (*adhyāyas* 1-7) and Mandlik (from *adhyāyas* 8-12). In these notes, Jha corrected parts of the printed text of the *Manubhāṣya*, primarily relying on manuscripts A and, in particular, S; in other cases, he proposed what appear to be his own emendations. The scholar usually recorded what he thought were genuine variants, while dismissing most textual differences as meaningless syllables.

Jha also produced a complete translation of the *Manubhāṣya*, which enables us to understand how he interpreted the text and, at times, aids in various text-critical decisions. Some interpretive notes, which are admittedly not very comprehensive, appeared in Part II of his Notes (Jha 1924). Scholars generally recognised the value of Jha's translation, as summarised by Wezler in his foreword to the reprint of Jha's edition (Jha 1999: v-vi): "Like any other translation of a Sanskrit text, Jha's ought to be used not without some critical reservation, but it should, no doubt, be used—and when it is not, as obviously e.g. by J.H. Dave in preparing his own edition of the *Manusmṛti* with nine commentaries, it is much to one's disadvantage."

This was the state of affairs until some years ago, when Olivelle (2021) released an electronic edition of the *Manubhāṣya* in fifteen parts, accompanied by a brief introduction. This edition is based on all the previous ones (except for Dave 1972-1984); however, Jha's edition (1932-1939) actually served as the reference in many cases. In addition, Olivelle used another source for editing Medhātithi's text: Laxmanshastri Joshi's *Dharmakośa*, particularly the first volume, the *Vyavahārakāṇḍa* (Joshi 1937-1941), and the fifth volume, the *Varṇāśramadharmakāṇḍa* (Joshi 1988-2003). This huge academic work is a sort of modern digest, collecting almost all the Dharmaśāstra texts (root texts and sections from commentaries and digests) divided into topics. Joshi's version of Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* sometimes differs slightly from its version in printed editions, and Olivelle adopted the *Dharmakośa*'s reading in some cases.

Olivelle's electronic edition is the outcome of a significant effort: besides transcribing the text using Roman transliteration, Olivelle also included variant readings from printed editions (not directly from manuscripts) in footnotes and occasionally noted his preference for one reading over others. While an e-text may contain typos and some choices could be questionable, the result is probably the best available version of Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya*. Nevertheless, we still need a superior edition of this important Dharmaśāstra text, which can only be achieved through a major critical edition project involving the search for new manuscripts.

Considering all these elements, we have chosen to use Olivelle's electronic edition (2021) alongside all the other editions, especially Jha's (1932-1939). We

have included all of Olivelle's critical notes in our text, explaining when we have decided to follow his text and when we have chosen to adopt other variant readings from other editions. However, in several cases, we needed to make minor corrections to the Sanskrit text because its poor condition rendered it impossible to understand Medhātithi's grammatical references (e.g. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.241). We also initially used Jha's translation (Jha 1999) as the basis for highlighting citations and references to grammatical rules and passages within the *Manubhāṣya*, as well as for understanding some of its complex passages. However, although we recognise its undeniable value, we wish to note that we have occasionally diverged from Jha's translation, opting to translate as closely as possible the original Sanskrit text by Medhātithi, while proposing our own interpretation. It was probably this independent approach to translating the *Manubhāṣya* that enabled us to identify many grammatical annotations of Medhātithi which had gone unnoticed in all editions and translations, especially those by Jha and Olivelle (see, in this regard, Chapter 8).

2. Textual analysis: Text, translation and comments on Medhātithi's grammatical passages

Preliminary note

In this section, we present the complete overview of the *Manubhāṣya* sections in which Medhātithi cites or refers to grammatical sources, particularly Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Kātyāyana's *vārttikas*, Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, and the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.⁷ We focus our attention especially on these foundational Vyākaraṇa texts, since our aim is to understand the relationship between Medhātithi's commentary and the Vyākaraṇa tradition as a whole, rather than to single out the specific source of each grammatically oriented excerpt.

Each passage is marked with an acronym regarding Medhātithi's use of the Vyākaraṇa sources. The list of acronyms is as follows:

- Encyclopaedic [E]: When a grammatical rule (Pāṇini's) or passage (Kātyāyana's, Patañjali's, etc.) is referenced as an authoritative reference to elucidate content that is not strictly part of the text being commented on but intended to expand the discussion by incorporating additional elements. In this category of passages, we consider that Medhātithi resorts to Pāṇini as an authority per se rather than as a grammarian.
- Juridical [J]: When a grammatical rule (Pāṇini's) or passage (Kātyāyana's, Patañjali's, etc.) is referenced to explain or digress on normative elements, features of *dharma* and very often the Mīmāṃsā-based discourse on the role of the injunction in the Dharmaśāstra.
- Textual-exegetical [TE]: When a lexeme of the *Mānavadharmasāstra* text or one of its variant readings is semantically explained or interpreted through a grammatical rule (Pāṇini's) or commentarial passage (Kātyāyana's, Patañjali's, etc.). The purpose of this category of grammatical notes is not to explain a linguistic form but rather to reflect on its meaning.
- Textual-linguistic [TL]: When a word-form of the *Mānavadharmasāstra* text or one of its variant readings is grammatically explained or

⁷ We occasionally included a few references to Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*, Nāgeśa's *Paribhāṣās*, Gaṇasūtras and Unaḍisūtras.

interpreted through a grammatical rule (Pāṇini's) or commentarial passage (Kātyāyana's, Patañjali's, etc.). In this case instead, the arguments of Medhātithi's excerpts are built around inflection, derivation, compounding, syntax, etc., therefore on peculiar linguistic forms found in Manu's text.

For clarification of each category, we refer to our study, in which we provide further explanations for why we classified the selected passages from the *Manubhāṣya* under such labels (see Sections 3.1-4). In addition, we acknowledge that the distinction between E, J, TE, and TL cases is not always clear-cut or straightforward. Of course, we invented these broad categorisations of how Medhātithi used Vyākaraṇa in his commentary simply to provide a valuable and immediate way of distinguishing the different approaches to the Vyākaraṇa tradition adopted by Medhātithi in his text.

Alongside the acronym in square brackets, we use the following sigla in round brackets to indicate whether Medhātithi mentions the name of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana or Patañjali (= P, Kāt, Pat). We also indicate if the scholar has cited a rule or a segment from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (= A), a *vārttika* (= Vt), a passage from the *Mahābhāṣya* (= M), the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (= KV), or more rarely the *Nyāsa* (= N), a *Gaṇasūtra* (= GS) or an *Uṇādisūtra* (= US). In the case of a mere hint at these sources, we put a star (*) next to the siglum.

When we reproduced the Sanskrit text of the *Manubhāṣya*, we bolded the direct quotations of the grammatical passages and the names of the Vyākaraṇa authorities (e.g. that of Pāṇini), while we chose to leave the references to grammatical sources in standard type. Each grammatical passage that Medhātithi employs has been indicated in round brackets: when it is a direct quotation, there is only an indication of the grammatical passage; when it is a reference, there is an indication of the grammatical passage in conjunction with 'see' or 'cf.' based on whether Medhātithi [Medh] follows or does not follow the line of that given passage. Ultimately, the relevant portion of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* verse [MDh^M],⁸ to which Medhātithi devotes a commentary involving Vyākaraṇa quotations or references, is placed in a box.

As already stated in the *Preface and acknowledgements*, unless stated otherwise, all translations in this section are by the authors, including those of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* verses. We decided to retranslate the verses into English

⁸ We have chosen the abbreviation MDh^M for Medhātithi's version of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* in the *Manubhāṣya*, in order to distinguish it from Olivelle's critical edition of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* (Olivelle 2005), which is referred to by the abbreviation MDh.

merely to mirror the interpretation given by Medhātithi, to whom this volume is dedicated. This principle applies both when the commentator's interpretation is in line with that shared by the rest of tradition and modern scholarship and when it departs from it by giving other meanings that are even distant from the words of the text (see e.g. MDh^M 1.93).

*First adhyāya (20 passages)***1. Medh ad MDh^M 1.1 [E/TE] (P³, A^{*3}, M, KV*)**

*manum ekāgram āsīnam abhigamya maharṣayaḥ |
pratipūjya yathānyāyam idam vacanam abruvan || 1.1 ||*

After approaching Manu, who was seated focusing on a single point and reverencing [him] in due manner, the great seers addressed this speech [to him].

[...] *tathā hi | bhagavān **pāṇinir** anukṭvaiva prayojanam **atha śabdānuśāsanam***
(M 1.1 l. 1) *iti sūtrasaṃdarbham ārabhate || [...]*

For instance, the Venerable Pāṇini begins [his] collection of *sūtras*, indeed having not declared the purpose, namely: “Here onwards is the teaching of the words” (M 1.1 l. 1).

[...] *bhagavataḥ punaḥ **pāṇiner** atisaṃkṣiptāni sūtrāṇi |
naivārthāntarābhīdhānaparatvāśāṅkā | tatra ākumāraṃ ca yaśaḥ **pāṇineḥ*** (see KV ad A 1.4.89 = KV ad A 2.1.13) *prakhyātam iti suprasiddhaprayojanatvād
anupanyāsaḥ | ayaṃ tu vitato grantho 'nekārthavādabahuḥ
sarvapuruṣārthopayogī | tatra sukhāvabodhārthe prayojanābhīdhāne na kiṃcit
parihīṇam || [...]*

Besides, the *sūtras* of the Venerable Pāṇini are excessively concise. There is no doubt, indeed, that [the *sūtras*] do not express a meaning beyond the internal one (i.e. they do not mean anything other than what they are expressing). Then, Pāṇini's fame is known even to a child (see KV ad A 1.4.89 = KV ad A 2.1.13). Since [his work's] purpose is very well known, it is not mentioned. Conversely, this extended treatise (i.e. the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*), which is full of various explanatory passages (*arthavāda*) on the meaning [of any precept], leads [to the fulfilment] of all human purposes. Here nothing is omitted with regard to expressing the purpose which is for the sake of easy comprehension.

idam vacanam abruvan | ucyate 'neneti vacanam (see A 3.3.117) *| vakṣyamāṇam
dviṭīyaślokapraśnavākyam iti tad eva pratyāsannatvād idam iti pratinirdiśati |
yeṣāṃ api pratyakṣavastupratinirdeśaka idamśabdā teṣāṃ api buddhisthatvāt
praśnasya pratyakṣatā | atha vocyata iti vacanam prcchyamāṇam vastv abruvan
vākyapakṣa idam vākyam uccāritavantaḥ | karmasādhane tu vacanaśabda idam
aprcchan* (see A 3.3.113) *| dvikarmakaś ca tadā brūṇ akathitakarmanā manunā*
(see A 1.4.51) *| tiṣṭhāṃ kriyāṇāṃ manuḥ karma ||*

‘[The great seers] addressed this speech [to him]’: [the word-form] *vacana-* is ‘that through which it is spoken’ (see A 3.3.117). This points out the question posed in the second verse (i.e. MDh 1.2): because of its being close by, it is referred to with [the pronoun] *idam*. Even for those who [take] the word-form *idam-* as pointing out an object directly perceived (*pratyakṣa*), the direct perception of the question is due to its being present in [their] mind. Or rather, they said a *vacana*, which is ‘[that which] is said’, i.e. a thing requested; in the hypothesis that [it means] ‘sentence’ (and not ‘the thing requested’), they are [people] who have uttered this sentence. However, when the word-form *vacana* is productive of a patient (see A 3.3.113),⁹ they asked the following (*idam*). And, in this case, the verbal base *brūñ* takes two objects with Manu as the patient provided that [another *kāraka* name]¹⁰ has not been assigned (see A 1.4.51). Manu is the patient of the three actions [of this verse, i.e. *abhigamya*, *pratipūjya*, *abruvan*].

Rules and passages cited or referred to:

- A 1.4.51: *akathitaṃ ca [kārake 23 karma 49]*
[In the domain of *kāraka*], what is not assigned (with another *kāraka* name) [is] also [designated as *karman*].
- A 3.3.113: *kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam [dhātoḥ 3.1.91]*
The *kṛtya* affixes and *Lyuṭ* occur [after a verbal base] under various conditions.
- A 3.3.117: *karaṇādhikaraṇayoś ca [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 kṛt 3.1.93 lyuṭ 113]*
[The *kṛt* affix *Lyuṭ*] also [occurs after a verbal base] to denote an instrument and substratum.
- M 1.1.1.1: *atha śabdānuśāsanam*
Here is the teaching of the words.
- KV *ad* A 1.4.89 = KV *ad* A 2.1.13: *ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ*
Pāṇini’s fame is known to a child.

Comment:

Medhātithi refers to Pāṇini from the beginning of the *Manubhāṣya*. In his comment on MDh^M 1.1, he asserts that the function of the initial four verses is to

⁹ The term *karmasādhana* is frequently attested in the *Mahābhāṣya* with the meaning of ‘productive of patient.’ Cf. also the meaning ‘bringing about [a derivation] in the sense of *karman*/in the passive sense’ recorded by Roodbergen (2008: 136).

¹⁰ As far Pāṇini’s category of *kāraka*, see especially Kiparsky and Staal (1969), Joshi (1971), Cardona (1974), Candotti and Pontillo (2025).

delineate Manu's text as being the creation of a skilled composer. This opening section declares the scope of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*, i.e. to furnish directives to men's pursuits which with other means would otherwise remain unknown.

As is well known, commentaries usually have more or less extensive sections in which actual or fictitious objections to the *mūla* text are presented, and it is then up to the commentator to respond by 'defending' the root text (commonly known as *ākṣepasamādhāna* 'answering the objections'; see Tubb and Boose 2007: 5). In the first objection raised against Manu's text, it is argued that, even without being explicitly declared, the scope of the work is still understandable; thus, any indication of the work's purpose in MDh^M 1.1-4 would be quite useless. In this context, it is related to the fact that Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* begins *in medias res*, without declaring its purpose, i.e. the teaching of words. What is quoted is the beginning of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.1 l. 1) and not the actual beginning of Pāṇini's work (A 1.1.1).¹¹ Medhātithi addresses this initial objection by asserting that the purpose of the treatise must be immediately stated so that readers thoroughly understand its intention from the outset.

Later on in the same commentarial passage, always within the *ākṣepasamādhāna* service, Medhātithi compares the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* and *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The latter work is said to be remarkably succinct, particularly if we take its *sūtra* structure into consideration. Although its purpose is not explicitly stated, Pāṇini's widespread acclaim ensures that the reason for studying the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is easy to understand. This is expressed in a frequently used sentence that extends this awareness even to children (*ākumāraṃ ca yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ*) and which first appeared in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 1.4.89; KV *ad* A 2.1.13). Instead, the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* is anything but concise and laconic (also considering the fact that it is composed in *ślokas*): the text elaborates on the explanation of each precept, and, to ensure easy comprehensibility, nothing is omitted.

We note that these two encyclopaedic references to Pāṇini's text at the beginning of the *Manubhāṣya* (Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1) clearly show the significance that the Vyākaraṇa tradition holds for Medhātithi in commenting on Manu's *mūla* text: as highlighted in the first part of this monograph, this distinction actually sets Medhātithi apart from any other Dharmaśāstra commentator.

The third excerpt focuses on the word-form *vacana-* for which two different meanings are provided. First, Medhātithi assigns the meaning of the instrument through which it is spoken (*ucyate 'nena*), hinting at rule A 3.3.117. This rule teaches that the *kṛt* affix *LyuT*, which is replaced by *-ana-* in accordance with A

¹¹ A 1.1.1: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.21.

7.1.1,¹² occurs to denote an instrument (*karana*). Second, he suggests the meaning of patient, likely hinting at A 3.3.113, which teaches to apply the same affix *LyuT* under various conditions (*bahulam*). By using the phrase *akathitakarmanā* ('patient to which no other *kāraka* names are assigned'), the commentator refers to the specific case of A 1.4.51.

2. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.2 [TE] (A*)

bhagavan sarvavarṇānām yathāvat anupūrvaśaḥ |
antaraprabhavānām ca dharmān no vaktum arhasi || 1.2 ||

May you, o Venerable One, tell us duly and in regular order the
dharmas of all the social classes and [those] of mixed origin.

[...] *yathāvat | arhaty arthe vatiḥ* (see A 5.1.117) *yena prakāreṇānuṣṭhānam arhati | idam nityam idam kāmiam idam aṅgam idam pradhānam dravyadeśakālakartrādīniyamaś ca prakāro 'rhatē viśayaḥ | [...]*

[The word-form] *yathāvat* [is thus analysed]: [the *taddhita* affix] *vatI* occurs in the meaning of 'X deserves' (see A 5.1.117), i.e. 'in the way in which the performance deserves [to be accomplished].' The domain of the specific sphere of [the verb] *arhati* is the way [in which the performance deserves to be accomplished]: 'this is obligatory', 'this is optional', 'this is secondary', 'this is primary', and the restriction concerning substance, place, time, agent and the like.

Rule referred to:

- A 5.1.117: *tad arham [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 vatiḥ 115]*
 [The *taddhita* affix *vatI* occurs after a nominal stem] to denote 'deserving X.'

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the *taddhita* derivation of the adverb *yathāvat* by resorting to A 5.1.117, which teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *vatI* to a nominal stem to denote 'deserving X.' It is self-evident that *yathā* is not a common nominal stem but an indeclinable (*avyaya*) as A 2.1.6¹³ shows.

¹² A 7.1.1: *yuvor anākau* "ana and aka occur in the place of *yu* and *vu*."

¹³ A 2.1.6: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.7.

Nonetheless, Medhātithi plausibly aims at excluding the other meanings of *vatI* explained in A 5.1.115¹⁴-5.1.116¹⁵ and A 5.1.118.¹⁶

3. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.4 [TL] (A*)

*sa taiḥ prṣtas tathā samyag amitaujā mahātmabhiḥ |
pratyuvāc[ārcya] tān sarvān maharṣīñ chrūyatām iti || 1.4 ||*

Thus, that Almighty one, duly questioned by those Magnanimous ones, after honouring all those great seers, replied: “Listen!”

[...] *ata evārcya tān sarvān ity arcanam aviruddham | anyathā śiṣyasyopādhyāyāt kīdṛśy arceti | arcayater āñpūrvasya lyabantasya* (see A 7.1.37) *rūpam ārcyati | pāṭhāntaram arcayitvā tān iti | [...]*

Therefore, when it is said “after honouring all of them” (*ārcya tān sarvān*), the act of honouring is proper (i.e. consistent with the context). Otherwise, what kind of honouring [is paid] by a teacher to a pupil? The form *ārcya-* [must be explained as formed from] the verbal base *arc-* (lit. ‘the verb *arcayati*’), preceded by [the prefix] *āñ-* and [ending with the affix] *LyaP* (see A 7.1.37); another reading is *arcayitvā tān* (“after honouring them”).

Rule referred to:

- A 7.1.37: *samāse 'nañpūrve ktvo lyap [aṅgasya 6.4.1]*
The affix *LyaP* replaces *Ktvā* [of an *aṅga*] co-occurring (as the final constituent) in a compound with a particle as its initial constituent with the exclusion of *nañ*.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the verbal form *ārcya*, which is a gerund from the verbal base *arc-* (‘to honour’). The scholar focuses on the point that, instead of the gerund being formed with the regular *kṛt* affix (i.e. *Ktvā*, taught by A 3.4.21),¹⁷ the verbal form *ārcya-* is derived by applying the substitute affix

¹⁴ A 5.1.115: *tena tulyaṃ kriya ced vatiḥ [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76]* “[The *taddhita* affix] *vatI* occurs [after a nominal stem] to denote an action similar to X.”

¹⁵ A 5.1.116: *tatra tasyeva [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 vatiḥ 115]* “[The *taddhita* affix] *vatI* occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘like in X’ and ‘like X’s.’”

¹⁶ A 5.1.118: *upasargāc chandasi dhātvarthe [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 vatiḥ 115]* “In the domain of Vedic literature, [the *taddhita* affix] *vatI* occurs after a nominal stem] which is a preverb to denote the sense of verbal base.”

¹⁷ A 3.4.21: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.4.

*LyaP*¹⁸ (treated as a *kṛt*) taught by A 7.1.37 (which is hinted at in the text). The latter rule teaches to replace the *kṛt* affix *Ktvā* with the substitute *LyaP* when the verbal *āṅga* is prefixed with any particle except *nāñ* (= *a-*). In this case, as Medhātithi correctly explains, the substitution by A 7.1.37 regularly occurs since the verbal base *arc-* is prefixed by *āñ* (= *ā-*), which is attested—we add—in the *prādi* list (*pra-* and the like'), appended to A 1.4.58¹⁹ and itemising all the prefixes (*pūrva*). In the end, Medhātithi reports that another variant reading is available, i.e. *arcayitvā*. Nonetheless, we note that although, grammatically-speaking, the latter is undoubtedly more easily segmentable, it is only found in one manuscript, i.e. mTr6 (see Olivelle 2005: 384).

Ultimately, as regards *arcayati* (here declined in the genitive singular), we observe that Medhātithi often quotes verbs using what corresponds to the Sanskrit first-person singular form (which is equivalent to the English third-person singular) rather than the corresponding verbal base. This is a long-standing practice adopted by many Vyākaraṇa authors which dates back at least to Yāska's *Nirukta*. See e.g. Nir 1.8: *gāyatraṃ gāyateḥ stutikarmaṇaḥ* “[The word-form] *gāyatra-* derives from [the verbal base] *gai-* to denote the action of praising.” The third-person singular verbal ending *-ti* is dealt with as if it were an affix *-ti* (here *gāyati-*) to form a noun (inflected in the genitive singular) instead of a verbal form in Yāska's paretymologies. An analogous morphological explanation is given by means of the affix *-i* applying to the verbal base, which constitutes the etymon, to form a noun (again inflected in the genitive singular). See e.g. Nir 2.5: *kṣīraṃ kṣarater | ghaser vero nāmakaraṇaḥ |* “[The word-form] *kṣīra-* ('milk') derives from [the verbal base] *kṣar-* ('to stream') or rather *īra-* is a noun-maker from [the verbal base] *ghas-* ('to eat').” This pattern of explanation aims at simply establishing a relation between the examined noun and its verbal etymon and not with what is signified by it, exactly as happens in the Vyākaraṇa tradition (see Kahrs 1998: 160). As for Yāska's technical use of a genitive form of a noun formed from the third-person singular (here *gāyati-*), as well as the genitive form of a noun formed from the verbal base plus the affix *-i* (*ghasi-*), see Kahrs (1984; 1998: 158-168).

In the Vyākaraṇa tradition, only from Kātyāyana onwards, what appears as a third-person singular verbal form inflected as a noun as well as a verbal base plus the affix *-i* began to be explicitly taught as a *kṛt* derivative stem created by adding

¹⁸ For a fresh perspective on the descriptive method of substitution, see Candotti and Pontillo (2004; 2022a).

¹⁹ A 1.4.58: *prādayaḥ [nipātāḥ 56 asattva 57]* “The items on the *prādi* list (*pra-* and the like') are termed as ‘particles’ (*nipāta*) when not denoting a *sattva-* ('being').”

the *kṛt* affix *ŚtiP* to the verbal base, as explained in Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.108 (M 2.154 l. 18): *ikṣtipau dhātunirdeśe* “[The *kṛt* affixes] *iK* and *ŚtiP* [should be taught] for the purpose of explicitly indicating the verbal bases.”

However, we point out that, before Kātyāyana's establishment of this *vārttika*, this mechanism of mentioning the verbal base by transforming an inflected third-person singular verbal form into a noun is also attested in Pāṇini's grammar. See e.g. A 6.4.36: *hanter jah* [*aṅasya* 1 *hau* 35] “*ja-* occurs in place of [the *aṅa* of] the verbal base *han-* (‘to strike’) [before *hi-*].” As a rule, Pāṇini's metalanguage boils down to easily inflecting verbal bases as if they were nouns ending in a consonant. See e.g. A 3.2.82: *manaḥ* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *supi* 4 *ṆinI* 78] “[The *kṛt* affix] *ṆinI* occurs [after the verbal base] *man-* (‘to think’) [co-occurring with a nominal *pada*].”

4. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.7 [TE] (A*²)

yo 'sāv *atīndriyagrāhyaḥ* *sūkṣmo 'vyaktaḥ sanātanaḥ |*
sarvabhūtamayo 'cintyaḥ sa eṣa svayam udbabhau || 1.7 ||

That One, who can be understood as being beyond the faculties of perception, thin, non-manifest, perpetual, consisting of all the beings, inconceivable, this One appeared on his own.

[...] *indriyāṇām atyayo*²⁰ *'tīndriyam | avyayībhāvaḥ* (see A 2.1.6) | *atīndriyagrāhyaḥ supsupeti samāsaḥ* (see A 2.1.4) | *indriyāṇy atikramya grhyate na kadācid indriyasya gocaraḥ | [...]*

[The compound] *atīndriya-* [means] ‘the one who is beyond the faculties of perception.’ [This is] an *avyayībhāva* (see A 2.1.6). [The compound *atīndriyagrāhya-*] is a compound made up of two *padas* (see A 2.1.4), [meaning that] it is understood after overpassing the faculties of perception, namely it is never the field of action of faculties of perception.

Rules referred to:

- A 2.1.4: *saha supā* [*sup* 2 *samāsaḥ* 3] “[An inflected noun combines] with another inflected noun [to form a compound].”
- A 2.1.6: *avyayaṃ vibhaktisamīpasamṛddhivyrddhyarthābhāvātyayāsampratiśabdaprādurbhāvapaścādyathānupūrvyayaug*

²⁰ Unlike the other editions, which bear the variant reading *atyayaḥ*, Jha and Dave read *atītaḥ*. Although it is a distinct formation from the morphological point of view, the word-form *atīta-* is attested as conveying the same meaning as *atyaya-*.

apadyasādrśyasampattisākalyāntavacaneṣu [samāsaḥ 3 saha supā 4 avyayībhāva 5]

An indeclinable in the meanings of a case-ending (*vibhakti*), *samīpa-* ('contiguous'), *samṛddhi-* ('prosperity'), *vyṛddhi-* ('bad luck'), *arthābhāva-* ('absence of object'), *atyaya-* ('going beyond'), *asamprati-* ('not according to the present circumstances'), *śabdaprādurbhāva-* ('manifestation of speech'), *paścāt-* ('posteriority'), *yathā-* ('as', 'like'), *ānupūrvya-* ('one after another'), *yaugapadya-* ('simultaneousness'), *sādrśya-* ('likeness'), *sampatti-* ('fulfilment'), *sākalya-* ('completeness'), and *anta-* ('meaning') [combines with an inflected noun] to form an *avyayībhāva*.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi first explains the left-hand constituent of the *tatpuruṣa* compound *atīndriyagrāhya-*, namely *atīndriya-*. This is an *avyayībhāva* compound formed by the indeclinable *ati* and the nominal stem *indriya* ('faculty of perception') according to A 2.1.6. Then, he also resorts to the general rule of compounding, i.e. A 2.1.4. for the analysis of the compound as a whole.

5. Medh ad MDh^M 1.10²¹ [TL] (A, A*, KV*)

āpo nārā iti proktā āpo vai narasūnavah |
tā yad asyāyanam pūrvaṁ tena nārāyaṇaḥ smṛtaḥ || 1.10 ||

The waters (*ap*) are called *nāras*: the waters are, indeed, the offspring of Nara (*narasūnu*). Since his first refuge was in them, he is called *nārāyaṇa* for this [reason].

[...] *narā ayanam asyeti narāyaṇa iti prāpte 'nyeṣām api drśyate* (A 6.3.137) *iti dīrghaḥ | pūruṣa iti yathā* (see KV ad A 6.3.137) *| atha vā sāmūhiko 'ṇ* (see A 4.2.37) ||

[The word-form *nārāyaṇa-* is explained as such]: after obtaining [the *bahuvrīhi* compound] *narāyaṇa-* [meaning] 'the one whose refuge is waters', the long [syllable is explained according to] *anyeṣām api drśyate* (A 6.3.137), such as *pūruṣa-* (instead of *puruṣa-*; see KV ad A 6.3.137); or rather, [it is explained by the application of] the [*taddhita*] affix *aṇ* denoting 'collection' (see A 4.2.37).

²¹ We note that, according to Olivelle (2005: 238), both this and the next verse (MDh 1.10-11) seem to be either an interpolation or a parenthetical remark devoted to *Nārāyaṇa*, since the beginning of MDh 1.12 is connected to the end of MDh 1.9.

Rules and passage cited or referred to:

- A 4.2.37: *tasya samūhaḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[A *taddhita* affix, i.e. *aN*, occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘the collection of X-s.’
- A 6.3.137: *anyeṣām api dṛśyate* [*dīrgho* 111 *saṃhitāyām* 114]²²
[A long vowel] is seen to replace [a short vowel] of other [*pādas* in a continuous utterance].
- KV *ad* A 6.3.137: [...] *nāraḥ pūruṣaḥ* [...] [An example for the application of rule A 6.3.137 is] ‘a sinful man’ (where *pūruṣa-* is used instead of *puruṣa-*).

Comment:

The verse commented on deals with the paronymy²³ of *nārāyaṇa-*, here used as the name of Manu’s son. In Manu’s text, first of all, the plural masculine form

²² According to Katre (1987: 800), the *anuvṛtti* of *ataḥ* from A 6.3.135 is also included while according to Sharma (1987-2003: V, 414), it includes the *anuvṛtti* of *aṇaḥ* from A 6.3.111. Nonetheless, we consider both these two genitive forms as blocked by the genitive form *nipātasya* followed by *ca* of A 6.3.136. Medhātithi does not give evidence of any kind of *anuvṛtti* as far as the supposed genitive is concerned, while he mentions *dīrgha*, included in this rule by *anuvṛtti* (from A 6.3.111). This is the same reading of A 6.3.137 given the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, which illustrates the rule by several examples of vowel lengthening, namely *keśākeśi*, *kacākaci* (‘a contest in which one pulls the hair of another’), *jalāṣaṭ* (‘one who endures rain’), *nāraḥ* (‘hell’) and *pūruṣaḥ* (‘man’).

²³ In this volume (see Nos. 5, 11, 214), we have chosen the term ‘paronymy’ over ‘folk etymology’ to describe the psycholinguistic mechanism that, based on analogy, causes the mistaken association of one lexical unit with another. Although the term ‘folk etymology’ is common in Sanskrit studies, it is misleading (see Yelle 2013: 66): the process involved is not genuinely etymological of a word-form but rather the assertion of a semantic link between two different word-forms, independently from their actual historical relation. Furthermore, in most cases—including those from Medhātithi’s *Manubhāṣya* examined in this chapter, as well as examples outside Sanskrit literature (see e.g. Béguelin 2002)—the phenomenon is not “popularly generated.” Instead, it results from the work of highly educated, poetically crafted formations, making the qualifier ‘folk’ particularly unsuitable. For these reasons, to describe this phenomenon, we have preferred the more neutral term ‘paronymy’ (composed of the two Ancient Greek elements *παρά*, *pará*, meaning ‘near’, and *ἐτυμολογία*, *etymología*, meaning ‘etymology’), coined by Pisani (1967) to replace the earlier German term *Volksetymologie* (‘folk etymology’), considered inadequate because of the “learned” origin of some of these etymologies.

nārāḥ ('waters') is explained as *narasūnu-* ('Nara's offspring'), and then *nārāyaṇa-* as a *bahuvrīhi* compound as 'the one whose refuge was the waters.' Nevertheless, Medhātithi's explanation starts from the plural masculine form derived from *nṛ-*, i.e. *narāḥ* (with *a* as the first vowel), and focuses on its lengthening. Medhātithi provides two alternatives. In the first account, the long vowel of *nārāyaṇa-* is obtained according to A 6.3.137 such as in the case of *pūruṣa-* (which is included among the traditional examples of this rule: see KV ad A 6.3.137). Based on the second account, the long vowel is obtained by the application of the *taddhita* affix *aṇ* in accordance with rule A 4.2.37.

6. Medh ad MDh^M 1.20 [TL] (A², A*)

ādyādyasya guṇaṃ tv eṣāṃ avāpnoti paraḥ paraḥ |
yo yo yāvatithaḥ caiṣāṃ sa sa tāvadguṇaḥ smṛtaḥ || 1.20 ||

Among these, each following [element] attains the quality of each preceding one, and any element among these is taught as possessing the same number of qualities as the position it holds in the series.

[...] *yo ya ākāśādilaṅkaṇo 'rtho yāvatithaḥ yāvatāṃ pūraṇaḥ | vator ithuk* (A 5.2.53) | [...]

Whatever object is characterised by ether and the like is [called] *yāvatitha* (lit. 'the how-manyeth'), [which is] the ordinal number of the corresponding cardinal numbers, [according to the rule] *vator ithuk* (A 5.2.53).

[...] *ādyādyasyeti katham | ādyasyādyasyeha bhavitavyam | nityavīpsayor* (A 8.1.4) *iti dvirvacanena*²⁴ | *yathā paraḥ para iti | chandobhir aviśeṣāt smṛtīnām* *lug* (see A 7.1.39) *vṛttānurodhāc caivaṃ paṭhitam* ||

How [is] *ādyādyasya* ('each preceding') [explained]? For, [the regular form] should be *ādyasyādyasya* just as [in the phrase] *paraḥ paraḥ* ('each following') through the repetition [of the word] in accordance with [rule] *nityavīpsayoḥ* (A 8.1.4). Because the *smṛti* texts are not distinct from *chandas* texts, there is a LUK zero-replacement²⁵ [of the genitive case ending *sya*] (see A 7.1.39) and, because of conforming to the meter, [the word] is recited this way.

²⁴ Mandlik and Gharpure, as well as Olivelle, feature the variant reading *dvivacanena*. Instead, Jha and Dave present the variant reading *dvirvacanena*, which we have decided to adopt as it fits better in the context.

²⁵ For an introduction to the various zero-phenomena taught by Pāṇini, see Pontillo (2003a) and Candotti and Pontillo (2022).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 5.2.53: *vator ithuk* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *saṃkhyāyāḥ* 47 *tasya pūraṇe ḍaṭ* 48]
[The increment] *ithUK* [occurs at the head of the *taddhita* affix *ḍaṭ* introduced after a nominal stem consisting of a *saṃkhyā*] and ending in *-vat* [to denote an ordinal number].
- A 7.1.39: *supām sulukpūrvasavarṇāccheyādādyāyājālah* [*aṅasya* 6.4.1 *chandasi* 38]
[In the domain of Vedic literature], in the place of nominal endings [of a nominal *aṅa*], *sU*, a *LUK* zero-replacement, a long vowel corresponding to the preceding one, *ā*, *āt*, *Śe*, *Ḍā*, *Ḍyā*, *yāC* or *āl* occur.
- A 8.1.4: *nityavīpsayoḥ* [*sarvasya dve* 1]
[Two expressions occur in place of a single whole] to denote continuity or distributiveness.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi first comments on the word-form *yāvatitha-* (lit. ‘the last of the many which’), which is explained as a *taddhita* derivative stem denoting an ordinal number by means of the increment *ithUK* (taught by A 5.2.53), applied before the *taddhita* affix *ḍaṭ* (introduced by A 5.2.48).²⁶ Second, he focuses on the sequence *ādādyāyasya*, which is based on A 8.1.4, teaching to double a phrase (rather than forming a compound)²⁷ to express repetition or desire of being pervasive. Instead of the expected *ādādyāyasya*, there is a *LUK* zero-replacement of the genitive case ending *-sya*. A *LUK* zero-replacement is indeed included in a rule specifically taught with the constraint *chandasi*, namely A 7.1.39, but the traditional examples are adesinential locative forms such as *vyòman* for the expected *vyòmani* (‘in the heaven’). Thus, it is not sure that here Medhātithi hints at this rule, but it is likely. What is more noteworthy here is that a *chandasi* rule can actually apply because, following Medhātithi’s view, there is no distinction between a *smṛti* source (such as the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*) and a *chandas* text (intended, as for the application of this rule, as those falling into the *chandasi* constraint). Of course, A 8.1.4 could have

²⁶ A 5.2.48: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38.

²⁷ In fact, the reduplication of a whole linguistic expression as a compound, as taught in A 8.1.1 (*sarvasya dve*) is quite commonly considered as wrong. Even the technical term *āmṛedita* used for this assumed compound is incorrect. Indeed, *āmṛedita* is only the second element (which repeats the first one) according to A 8.1.2 (*tasya param āmṛeditam*). See, in this regard, Ditrich (2011) and Grieco (2023).

been used to form *ādyasyādyasya* without any problems if there had been no metrical requirements (*vṛttānurodha*, as indicated by Medhātithi). Indeed, the *śloka* here requires one fewer syllable, so a *LUK* zero-replacement occurs on the basis of A 7.1.39 to produce *ādyādyasya*.

7. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.21 [E] (A)

sarveṣāṃ tu sa nāmāṇi karmāṇi ca pṛthak pṛthak |
vedaśabdebhya evādaṃ pṛthak saṃsthāś ca nirmame || 1.21 ||
 At first, just by means of Vedic word-forms, he (i.e. Prajāpati)
 created one by one names, acts, and single forms for all of them.

sa prajāpatiḥ sarveṣāṃ arthānāṃ nāmāṇi cakre | yathā kaścit putrāṇāṃ jātānāṃ
anyeṣāṃ vā saṃvyavahārārthaṃ karoti vṛddhir ādaic (A 1.1.1) dhī śrī strī m
(PiñS 1.1.1) iti | śabdārthasaṃbandhaṃ kṛtavān gaur aśvaḥ puruṣaḥ (Nir 1.1)
iti | [...]

He, i.e. Prajāpati, assigned proper names to all the objects, as someone assigns [names] to sons who are born [to him] or others for the sake of common use, [as it happens when] *vṛddhir ādaic* (A 1.1.1) and *dhī śrī strī m* (PiñS 1.1.1) [are taught]. He constituted the relation between word-forms and objects as *gaur aśvaḥ puruṣaḥ* (Nir 1.1: ‘Cow, horse, man’).

Rule cited:

- A 1.1.1: *vṛddhir ādaic*
 [The long vowel] *ā* [and the diphthongs] *ai* and *au* [constitute] the *vṛddhi*.

Comment:

While commenting on this cosmogonic passage from Manu’s text that deals with the creation of the world by Prajāpati, Medhātithi reflects upon the mechanism of designating the objects (*artha*) by assigning them word-forms (*śabda*) invented by the creator himself. To form a comparative bridge, he cites the beginning of Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A 1.1.1), the *Piṅgalasūtra* (PiñS 1.1.1), and Yāska’s *Nirukta* (Nir 1.1): all three passages are indeed *saṃjñāsūtras*, i.e. *sūtras* respectively introducing the designation of grammatical, prosodical, and hermeneutical categories in the three works mentioned above.

The joint reference to Pāṇini and Piṅgala is precisely taken from the Mīmāṃsā discussion on the existence of an author (of the Veda), specifically from one of the arguments against the so-called *nityātā* (‘permanence’) of the language found in Śabara’s *Śabarabhāṣya* and Kumāṛila’s *Tantravārttika ad PMS 1.3.4* (see Śab

ad PMS 1.3.4; Kum *ad* PMS 1.3.4). Let us ultimately note that, in this context, one might have expected him to expand on this matter by quoting one of the most famous Ṛgvedic cosmogonic passages in which creation is envisioned as an act of naming (e.g. RV 10.129) or a *śabdabodha* passage illustrating the *nityātā* (e.g. M 1.136 l.5 – 1.138 l. 10 *ad* Vtt. 9-17 *ad* A 1.1.56).

8. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.23 [TE] (A*², Pat, M*)

agnivāyuravibhyas tu trayam brahma sanātanam |

[dudohā] yajñasiddhyartham rgyajuḥsāmalaḥṣaṇam || 1.23 ||

From fire, wind, and sun, he (i.e. Prajāpati) milked the permanent threefold Veda, the features of which are stanzas (*rc*), formulas (*yajus*), and chants (*sāman*) for the sake of accomplishing the sacrifice.

[...] *nākhyātārtho vikalpayitum yuktaḥ | pañcamī tarhi kimartham*²⁸ | *duhiyācīti dvitīyayā bhavitavyam* (see A 1.4.51) | *kiṃ ca dṛṣṭapramāṇavirodhī prāgvṛtto 'rtha ucyamāno na*²⁹ *manahparitoṣam*³⁰ *ādhatte prāmāṇikānām | parihṛto virodhaḥ svarūpaparatvāśrayaṇenaiśām āgamānām ṛgveda evāgner ajāyata yajurvedo vāyoh sāmaveda ādityāt* (AitB 25.7) *iti | agnyādayo 'pi devatā aiśvaryabhājo niratīśayaśaktiś ca prajāpatiḥ tatra kā nāmānupapattiḥ | asmin darśane pañcamy api vivakṣyā | ataḥ kārakāṇi kathitāni* (see A 1.4.24) *atrāpādanasamjñety*³¹ *apādānavivakṣāyām bhāṣye samarthitāni* (see M 1.334 ll. 1-3 *ad* A 1.4.51) | [...]

It is incorrect to (fancifully) modify the meaning of the verb (*duh-* ‘to milk’).³² Then, why is there the ablative ending? The accusative case ending should be used in the case of *duh-* (‘to milk’) and *yāc-* (‘to ask’) (as an *akathitakāraka*

²⁸ Mandlik, Gharpure and Jha feature the variant reading *kimartham*, which we decided to adopt. Olivelle, as well as Dave, present the variant reading *kimarthā* (agreeing with *pañcamī*) following *Dharmakośa* 5.88.

²⁹ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) omit *na*.

³⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *manasaḥ paritoṣam*, while the others present the variant reading *manahparitoṣam*, which we decided to adopt.

³¹ Mandlik, Gharpure, and Jha feature the variant reading *kathitāny atrāpādānasamjñeti*, which we decided to adopt. Olivelle, as well as Dave, present the variant reading *kathitāni yatrāpādānasamjñeti* following *Dharmakośa* 5.88.

³² Here the term used to denote a verb is the ancient technical term *ākhyāta*, already occurring in the *Nirukta*, instead of the Pāṇinian technical term *tiṇanta* (lit. ‘an item ending with a verbal ending’).

according to A 1.4.51). Furthermore, the mind of the men who have founded their knowledge on the right means of knowledge is not satisfied when the object described as having happened previously is contradictory with the means of perception.³³ The contradiction is avoided by relying on the fact that [Manu] has the very form of these Vedic texts as [his] primary focus: “the *Ṛgveda* was born from Agni, the *Yajurveda* from Vāyu, the *Sāmaveda* from Āditya” (AitB 25.7). [The group of] deities beginning with Agni also participates in sovereignty and Prajāpati is endowed with unsurpassed power. In this case, what is impossible for them? In this perspective, the ablative case also depends on the intention of the speaker.³⁴ Therefore, the *kāraṅkas* (i.e. the ablative taught in A 1.4.24) that, in this context, are [commonly] mentioned in accordance with the designation of the ablative (see M 1.334 ll. 1-3 *ad* A 1.4.51), are taken into consideration in the [*Mahā-*]*bhāṣya* in the case of the speaker’s intention of conveying the sense of an ablative.

Rule and passage referred to:

- A 1.4.24: *dhruvam apāye ’pādānam [kārake 23]*
[A *kāraka*] denoting a stable reference point when a movement away is signified is called *apādāna* (i.e. ablative).
- M 1.334 ll. 1-3 *ad* A 1.4.51:³⁵
duhiyācirudhiprachibhikṣiciñām upayoganimitam apūrvavidhau |
bruvīśāsiguṇena ca yatsacate tat akīrtitam ācaritam kavinā ||
duhi gām dogdhi payah | naitad asti | kathitātra pūrvāpādanasaṃjñā (see A 1.4.24) |
The reason for the application when it is not taught in a previous rule, with reference to the verbal bases *duh-* (‘to milk’), *yāc-* (‘to ask’), *rudh-* (‘to obstruct’), *prach-* (‘to ask’), *bhikṣ-* (‘to desire’) and *ci-* (‘to pile up’)³⁶ and that which is associated with a quality of *bruv-* and

³³ Since the text employs the technical term *pramāṇa*, we could expect the use of *pratyakṣa* as a hypernym conveying the sense of perception. Therefore, we wonder whether *drṣṭapramāṇa* conveys visual perception as opposed to perception in general.

³⁴ The notion of *vivakṣā-* etymologically interpreted as “desire to say or speak” and commonly interpreted as “intention of the speaker” occurs in the history of the Vyākaraṇa tradition from Kātyāyana onwards (see e.g. M 1.324 l. 1 Vt. 5 *ad* A 1.4.23). See Radicchi (1993; 1994; 2000), Vergiani (2022), Candotti and Pontillo (2024a).

³⁵ We note that the same passage is also found in KV *ad* A 1.4.51.

³⁶ As regards the *akathitakāraka*, we note that the list of verbal bases is mentioned previously in M 1.329 l. 19 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 1.4.29.

śās-, is applied by the seer (i.e. by Pāṇini) as “not mentioned.” Regarding *duh-*, [an example is]: *gām dogdhi payaḥ* (‘he milks milk from the cow’). This is not [a good example]. The designation of the ablative has already been mentioned in this case in a previous rule.

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi focuses on the syntax of the perfect form *dudoha* (‘milked’; see also Olivelle’s translation: ‘squeezed out’), associated with the accusative *trayaṁ brahma sanātanam* (‘the permanent threefold Veda’) and the ablative *agnivāyuravibhyaḥ* (‘from fire, wind and sun’). First of all, he comments on this image, but then maintains that everything is possible for the gods, and it is sufficient to rely on the Vedas (i.e. on *śabda*) and not on other authoritative means of knowledge (*pramāṇas*), including direct perception (*pratyakṣa*). Within a more grammatically oriented reflection, he explains that the ablative case for *agnivāyuravibhyaḥ* (‘from fire, wind, and sun’) is used in the place of the accusative expected in accordance with A 1.4.24, as the *śloka-vārttika* quoted in M 1.334 ll. 1-2 *ad* A 1.4.51 enjoins. A second patient (*karman*) is indeed only admitted for a *kāraka*, which signifies something that was not taught in a previous rule, but in this case, ‘fire, wind and sun’ are regarded in the Vedic text as a stable point (*dhruva*), i.e. the origin, when separation (*apāya*), i.e. the milking of the Vedas, is signified.

Medhātithi resorts to the category of *vivakṣā* (‘speaker’s intention’) even though the quoted passage from Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* does not contain any reference to it. However, although it is true that the later grammatical tradition incorporates the *vivakṣā* notion (e.g. the nominal stem *vivakṣita-* occurs four times in the *Nyāsa* commentary referring to the sentence *gām dogdhi payaḥ*: see N *ad* A 1.4.51),³⁷ but, indeed, in our opinion, Medhātithi is here merely referring to the optionality involved as a rule in the usage of *kārakas* according to Kātyāyana and Patañjali, as explained in the *Mahābhāṣya* on Vt. 4³⁸ and Vt. 5³⁹ *ad* A 1.4.23 (M 1.323 ll.

³⁷ We thank Victor D’Avella for providing us with this useful reference.

³⁸ M 1.323 l. 22 Vt. 4 *ad* A 1.4.23: *apādānaṁ ca vṛkṣasya paṇam patatīti* “And there is the sense of ablative [when it is said] *vṛkṣasya paṇam patati* ‘the leaf of the tree is falling.’”

³⁹ M 1.324 l. 1 Vt. 5 *ad* A 1.4.23: *na vā apāyasyāvivakṣitatvāt* “Otherwise not, because there is no speaker’s intention of expressing separation.”

23-24 *ad* Vt. 4 *ad* A 1.4.23;⁴⁰ M 1.324 ll. 2-5 *ad* Vt. 5 *ad* A 1.4.23).⁴¹ As clearly explained by Deshpande (1990: 39) “The ‘roles’ in these *kāraka* rules are not necessarily a part of the real world as it is out there, but a part of a culture-specific and a language-specific interpretation of the world as it is perceived by an individual. In simple terms, it depends upon the intention of the speaker (*vivakṣātaḥ kārakāṇi bhavanti*) in a conventionalized form. There is freedom within the limits of cultural and linguistic conventions.”

9. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.31 [TL] (A*)

lokānāṃ tu vivṛddhyartham mukhabāhūrupādataḥ |

brāhmaṇaṃ kṣatriyaṃ vaiśyaṃ śūdraṃ ca niravartayat || 1.31 ||

For the sake of expanding the worlds, he (i.e. Prajāpati) then developed Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras⁴² from his mouth, arms, thighs, and feet.

[...] *mukhabāhūrupādataḥ* | *yathākramaṃ mukhād brāhmaṇaṃ*⁴³ *bāhubhyāṃ rājanyam ūrubhyāṃ vaiśyam śūdraṃ pādata iti* | *tasiḥ apādāne* (see A 5.4.45) | *kāraṇāt kāryaṃ niṣkṛṣyata iveti bhavati*⁴⁴ | *apāye sati apādānatvam* | [...]

⁴⁰ M 1.323 ll. 23-24 *ad* Vt. 4 *ad* A 1.4.23: *apādānasaṃjñā ca prāpnoti* | *kva* | *vrkṣasya parṇam patati* | *kuḍyasya piṇḍaḥ patatīti* | “[When it is said] *vrkṣasya parṇam patati* (lit. ‘the leaf is falling from the tree’) or *kuḍyasya piṇḍaḥ patati* (lit. ‘a round piece of the wall is falling’), the designation of ablative also obtains (in the sense of “the leaf is falling from the tree” and “a round piece is falling from the wall”).”

⁴¹ M 1.324 ll. 2-5 *ad* Vt. 5 *ad* A 1.4.23: *na vaiśaḥ doṣaḥ* | *kim kāraṇam* | *apāyasya avivakṣitatvāt* | *nātra apāyo vivakṣitaḥ* | *kim tarhi* | *sambandhaḥ* | *yadā cāpāyo vivakṣito bhavati bhavati tadāpādānasaṃjñā* | *tad yathā* | *vrkṣāt parṇam patatīti* | *sambandhas tu tadā na vivakṣito bhavati* | *na jñāyate kaṅkasya vā kurarasya veti* || “There is no shortcoming. Why? Because there is no speaker’s intention of expressing separation. Here separation is not the object of the speaker’s intention, but rather a (non-*kāraka*) relation. And when separation is the object of the speaker’s intention, then the designation of the ablative notion occurs. For instance [when it is said] *vrkṣāt parṇam patati iti* “the leaf is falling from the tree”, then the (non-*kāraka*) relation is not the object of the speaker’s intention. Or it is not known if *parṇa* (as a leaf) belongs to a mango tree (*kaṅka*) or (as a feather) belongs to an osprey (*kurara*).”

⁴² We decided to translate the accusative singular forms *brāhmaṇaṃ kṣatriyaṃ vaiśyaṃ* and *śūdraṃ* with matching plural forms according to A 1.2.58 (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.137).

⁴³ Mandlik does not include the portion that follows *brāhmaṇaṃ*.

⁴⁴ In his electronic edition, Olivelle notes that *Dharmakośa* 5.1153 features the variant reading *bhāti*.

mukhabāhūrupādātāḥ ('from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet') respectively [means] 'from the mouth, [he creates] Brāhmaṇas', 'from the arms, [he creates] Kṣatriyas', 'from the thighs, [he creates] Vaiśyas', 'from the feet, [he creates] Śūdras.' [The *taddhita* affix] *tasI* occurs to denote the sense of ablative (see A 5.4.45). [Such a *taddhita* affix] occurs [to denote that] the effect is as if it were drawn from the cause. Since [this derivative stem] implies separation, the sense of ablative [is explained].

Rule referred to:

- A 5.4.45: *apādāne ca ahīyaruhoḥ* [prātipadikāt 4.1.1. *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *anyatarasyām* 42 *pañcamyās tasiḥ* 44]
[The *taddhita* affix *tasI*] also [optionally occurs after a nominal stem] to denote the sense of ablative except for *hīya-* ('to be abandoned') and *ruh-* ('to ascend').

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the word-form *mukhabāhūrupādātāḥ* ('from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet'), which is explained as a *taddhita* derivative stem formed from the *dvandva* compound *mukhabāhūrupāda-* ('mouth, arms, thighs, and feet') by applying rule A 5.4.45. This rule teaches to form a derivative stem by using the *taddhita* affix *tasI* to denote the sense of ablative. In this case, according to Medhātithi, such a sense of ablative is justified since the verse deals with the separation (*apāya*), relating to the creation of the members of the four *varṇas* (Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras) brought about by the separation of the limbs of the original Puruṣa (whose reference is undoubtedly to RV 10.90).

10. Medh ad MDh^M 1.40 [TE] (A)

krmikīṭapataṅgāṁś ca *yūkāmākṣikamatkuṇam* |
sarvaṁ ca *daṁśamaśakam* *sthāvaraṁ ca* *prthagvidham* || 1.40 ||
Worms, beetles, moths, lice, flies, bugs, and all gadflies and gnats
and the immovable creatures of different kinds.

[...] *kṣudrajantavaḥ* (A 2.4.8) *ity ekavadbhāvaḥ* ||

[The compounds *yūkāmākṣikamatkuṇa-* ('lice, flies, bugs') and *daṁśamaśaka-* ('gadflies and gnats') are treated] as a singular form according to *kṣudrajantavaḥ* (A 2.4.8)

Rule cited:

- A 2.4.8: *kṣudrajantavaḥ* [*ekavacanam* 1 *dvandvaḥ* 2]
[A *dvandva* compound] denoting small creatures [is singular in number].

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the singular number of the two *dvandva* compounds *yūkāmakṣikamatkuṇa-* (‘lice, flies, and bugs’) and *daṁśamaśaka-* (‘gad-flies and gnats’) by quoting A 2.4.8, which teaches the *dvandva* compound traditionally called *samāhāradvandvas* if denoting small creatures.⁴⁵

11. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 [TL] (A*², GS)

udbhijjāḥ *sthāvarāḥ sarve bījakāṇḍapraroḥiṇaḥ* |

oṣadhyāḥ *phalapākāntā bahupuspaphalopagāḥ* || 1.46 ||

All vegetables, born from sprouting, shoot up from seeds and stalks.

[The vegetables] bearing many flowers and fruits and dying after the maturity of their fruits are [called] ‘annual plants’ (*oṣadhi*).⁴⁶

udbhedanam udbhit | *bhāve kvip* (cf. A 3.2.61; M 2.155 l. 9 Vt. 9 *ad* A 3.3.108)⁴⁷
| *tato jāyanta iti udbhijjāḥ* | [...]

[The word-form] *udbhid-* [means] ‘sprouting’ (*udbhedana*). [The *kṛt* affix] *KviP* occurs in the sense of action (cf. A 3.2.61; M 2.155 l. 9 Vt. 9 *ad* A 3.3.108). Since

⁴⁵ Regarding this rule, see Borghero (2023: 73-74).

⁴⁶ It should be noted that the word-form *oṣadhi-* denotes herbs or plants in its Vedic occurrences, but, in the *Mānavadharmasāstra*, it refers to annual plants, as evident from the verse itself and a subsequent passage of Medhātithi’s commentary on the verse, quoted as follows (Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46): *idaṁ tāsāṁ svābhāvikam karma | pākāntāḥ phalapākaḥ anto nāśa āsām iti | pakve phale vrīhyādayo naśyanti, bahunā ca puspaphalenopagatāḥ yuktā bhavanti* | “This is the action belonging to the nature of these (i.e. annual plants): ‘whose death is maturity’ (*pākāntāḥ*) [means that] the maturity of the fruits is their end, i.e. their death. When the fruit is mature, the rice grain plant (*vrīhi*) and the like die, and they are abundantly laden, i.e. endowed with flowers and fruits.” It is useful to note that the definition of *oṣadhi* plants as dying when their fruit matures (*phalapākānta*) is found both in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (see KV *ad* A 8.4.7) and the *Amarakośa* (see AK 2.4.110).

⁴⁷ Our thanks to Victor D’Avella for this reference.

they spring up from that (i.e. *udbhid-*),⁴⁸ [they are called] ‘born from sprouting’ (*udbhijja*).

tathauṣadhyah | oṣadhaya iti yuktam | ikārah kṛdikārād iti (*bahvādi* list, GS 3 in KV *ad* A 4.1.45) *chāndaso vā* (cf. A 6.3.132) | [...]

Then, *oṣadhyah* ‘annual plants’ (i.e. nominative plural of the feminine nominal stem *oṣadhi-*); *oṣadhaya* is the right form (i.e. nominative plural of the feminine nominal stem *oṣadhi-*), the sound *ī* occurs after the final sound *i* of a *kṛt* nominal stem (*bahvādi* list, GS 3 in KV *ad* A 4.1.45), or it is a *chandas* feature (cf. A 6.3.132).

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 3.2.61: *satsūdviṣadruhaduhayujavidabhidacchidajinīrājām upasarge 'pi kvip* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *supi* 4]
[The *kṛt* affix] *KviP* occurs [after the verbal bases] *sad-* (‘to sit down’), *sū-* (‘to generate’), *dviṣ-* (‘to hate’), *druh-* (‘to harm’), *duh-* (‘to milk’), *yuj-* (‘to join’), *vid-* (‘to know’), *bhid-* (‘to split’), *chid-* (‘to divide’), *ji-* (‘to win’), *nī-* (‘to lead’), and *rāj-* (‘to shine’), even co-occurring with a preverb [and with a nominal *pada*].
- A 6.3.132: *oṣadheś ca vibhaktāv aprathamāyām* [*mantra* 131 *dīrghah* 111 *saṃhitāyām* 114]
[In the domain of *mantras*, a long vowel occurs] in the place of a final sound of *oṣadhi-* before a nominal ending which is not a nominative case ending [in continuous utterance].
- M 2.155 l. 9 Vt. 9 *ad* A 3.3.108: *sampadādibhyah kvip*
[The *kṛt* affix] *KviP* occurs after the list beginning with *sampad-* (‘success’) [in the sense of action].
- *bahvādi* list, GS 3 (in KV *ad* A 4.1.45): *kṛdikārād aktinaḥ*
[The feminine affix *ÑiṢ* preferably occurs] after the short vowel *i* of [a *kṛt* derivative stem formed by means of] a *kṛt* affix excluding the affix *KtiN* (taught by A 3.3.94).⁴⁹

⁴⁸ This *iti* clause represents the *vigraha* of the *upapadasamāsa* *udbhijja-*. We decided to render the latter compound with a causal clause beginning with ‘since’ because *udbhijja-* is declined in the plural number.

⁴⁹ A 3.3.94: *striyām ktin* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *bhāve* 18 *akartari ca kārake* 19] “[The *kṛt* affix] *KtiN* occurs after a verbal base to denote an action or a *kāraka* other than the agent in the feminine gender.”

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi first comments on the word-form *udbhid-* (‘sprouting’), which is the left-hand constituent of the synthetical compound *udbhij-ja-* (‘born from sprouting’). As he explains, *udbhid-* is a *kṛt* derivative stem formed from the homophonous verbal base *udbhid-* (lit. ‘to break out’, ‘to rise up’) by applying the *kṛt* affix *KviP*. As for the specific rule regulating its derivation, we have chosen to indicate rule A 3.2.61 because of the presence of the verbal base *bhid-* among the left modifiers of the rule. At first glance, the indication of *bhāve* instead of *kartari* as the syntactical category of the *kṛt* affix *KviP* is unexpected, since, in rule A 3.2.61, the locative *kartari* is to be inferred by *anuvṛtti*⁵⁰ from rule A 3.1.57. We assume that, in this specific case, Medhātithi uses *bhāve* instead of *kartari* as the semantic constraint because he wants to interpret the compound *udbhij-ja-* as ‘born from *udbhid-*’, where *udbhid-* is a *kṛt* derivative stem conveying the sense of action (*bhāve*) and not that of agent (*kartari*), as rule A 3.2.61 foresees. Such an extension is probably inspired by Vt. 9 *ad* A 3.3.108 (M 2.155), which teaches to apply the *kṛt* affix *KviP* after the *sampadādi* list in the sense of action. According to Patañjali (M 2.155 l. 10 *ad* Vt. 9 *ad* A 3.3.108), the list just includes *sampad-*, *vipad-*, *pratipad-*, *āpad-* and *pariṣad-*. This *vārttika* is also mentioned in a passage from the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 3.3.94) and the examples are only *sampad-*, *vipad-*, and *pratipad-*. Therefore, given that it does not seem to be an *ākṛtigāṇa*, the extension to *udbhid-* is the result of Medhātithi’s interpretive reasoning.

Second, the scholar reflects upon the use of the word-form *oṣadhyaḥ* (i.e. the nominative plural of the feminine nominal stem *oṣadhī-*), employed in place of the word-form *oṣadhayaḥ* (i.e. the nominative plural of the feminine nominal stem *oṣadhi-*), which, from a grammatical perspective, would have been the expected “regular” form. The commentary is devoted to the long *ī* at the end of the nominal stem *oṣadhī-*, which is said to be applied after the final *i* of a *kṛt* affix. Jha (1999: III, 86-87) explains the lengthening of *oṣadhi-* with a *vārttika ad* A 4.1.45, which is, however, not found in Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya*. Sharma (1987-2003: IV, 47) also mentions some *vārttikas* that teach to introduce *Ñṛṣ* after the *kṛt KtiN* (taught by A 3.3.94) and reports that “[s]ome even claim that *Ñṛṣ* could be introduced after any stem ending in *i*, provided it did not have the signification of a *KtiN*.” Indeed, Medhātithi hints at a *gaṇasūtra*, i.e. a rule inserted in the

⁵⁰ The term *anuvṛtti* refers to the mechanism that carries the course or influence of a preceding aphorism forward into subsequent ones, in accordance with specific rules. See Joshi and Bhate (1984).

bahvādi list (which is an *ākṛtiḡaṇa*) appended to A 4.1.45,⁵¹ found, e.g., in KV ad A 4.1.45, as indicated above. In our view, Medhātithi plausibly does not go to great pains to complete his sentence with this exception, simply because the *nomen actionis* affix *KtiN* (= *-ti-*) is not involved in the derivation of *oṣadhi-*. It is clear that he interpreted *dhi-* in *oṣadhi-* as a *kṛd-anta* stem, derived from the verbal base *dhā-/dhi-* with the *kṛt* affix *Ki* (see A 3.3.93).⁵² This is in line with the traditional paronymology of the noun *oṣadhi-*, given e.g. by ŚBM 2.2.4.5, which reads as follows:

oṣaṃ dhayēti tāt oṣadhayāḥ |
[Since] they were told to ‘absorb the burning heat’, they
consequently became the *oṣadhayāḥ*, ‘the healing plants.’⁵³

Thus, after the root nominal stem *dhi-*, Medhātithi applies the feminine affix *ÑiṢ* according to the aforesaid *gaṇasūtra*, but inaccurately labels the affix as *īkāraḥ*, as if it were a sound rather than a morpheme, i.e. *ÑiṢ*, which from a phonic point of view boils down to *-ī*.

As an alternative account, Medhātithi asserts that the nominative plural *oṣadhyāḥ* could also be explained as a *chandas* feature (*chāṇḍasa*). However, interpreting this *chāṇḍasa* as a ‘Vedic feature’ is probably unwarranted. Corpus research on the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit* shows that the form *oṣadhyāḥ* is only attested starting from Early Classical and Epic Sanskrit works, such as the

⁵¹ A 4.1.45: *bahvādiḡbhyāś ca [prātipadikāt 1 striyām 3 anupasarjanāt 14 ÑiṢ 40 vā 44]* “[The feminine affix *ÑiṢ*] preferably also occurs after the nominal stems listed in the [exemplificative list] *bahvādi*, [provided that they are not non-head constituents].” The term *upasarjana* is used by Pāṇini to denote the “non-head” of compounds. In particular, it is defined as the member that, in the constituent analysis of the compound, always maintains a single ending (*ekavibhakti*), independently of the case ending, which applies to the compound when it is used in a sentence; this case ending matches that of its head in the constituent analysis. The *upasarjana* constituent is fixed once and for all with a frozen case ending. See Pontillo (2003b), and Candotti and Pontillo (2019). In this verse by Manu, the compound is not a *bahuvrīhi* (cf. A 2.2.24). Therefore, the stem after which the feminine affix occurs is not an *upasarjana*, so A 4.1.45 regularly applies.

⁵² A 3.3.93: *karmany adhikarāṇe ca [ghoḥ kiḡ 92]* “[The *kṛt* affix *Ki*] also [occurs] after the verbal bases designated as *GHU* (= *dā-/dhā-*: see A 1.1.20) when co-occurring with a *pada* denoting patient and in the sense of substratum.”

⁵³ Our translation is in line with Deeg’s (1995: 220), “Sauge das Brennen [aus]!”, but not with Eggeling’s (1882: 323), “Drink, while burning!”

Mānavadharmasāstra and the *Mahābhārata*.⁵⁴ Instead, the nominative plural form of the nominal stem *oṣadhī-* usually found in Vedic texts is *oṣadhīḥ*. In this case, Medhātithi's indication of *chāndasa* likely refers to a metrical feature, perhaps because the nominal form *oṣadhyaḥ* has a syllable less than its alternative *oṣadhayaḥ*. For the sake of completeness, let us point out that the long vowel *-ī* in the stem matching the nominative plural *oṣadhyaḥ* instead of *oṣadhayaḥ* (from a nominal stem ending with *-i*) is prohibited in the domain of *mantras* by rule A 6.3.132, precisely devoted to the nominal stem *oṣadhi-*, according to which a long vowel cannot occur as a nominative case ending for such a nominal stem.

12. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.58 [TL] (A*)

idaṃ śāstram tu kṛtvāsau mām eva svayam āditaḥ |

[vidhivad] grāhayām āsa marīcyādīms tv ahaṃ munīn || 1.58 ||

After composing this treatise, he himself made me alone regularly acquire it at first, and I in turn [made] the seers starting from Marīci onward [acquire it].

[...] *vidhivac chiṣyopādhyāyayor ananyamanaskatādiguṇo 'vāhitacittatā vidhiḥ | arhe vatiḥ* (see A 5.1.117) | [...]

vidhivat (lit. 'according to the rule', here 'the way the rule provides'): [the word-form] *vidhi* [means] 'quality of not having one's thought on anything different' belonging to the teacher and pupil, i.e. the status of a concentrated mind. [The *taddhita* affix] *vatI* [occurs after the nominal stem *vidhi-*] in the meaning of 'deserving' (see A 5.1.117).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.1.117: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.2.

Comment:

After explaining the meaning of the etymon *vidhi-* (lit. 'rule') within the context in which it is used in Manu's text, Medhātithi comments on the *taddhita* derivative stem *vidhivat-*, which is explained as being formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *vatI* in the sense of 'worth' (*arha*) to the nominal stem *vidhi-*. Thus, the rule he recalls is correctly A 5.1.117, which teaches to form *taddhita* derivative stems by applying the affix *vatI* to denote 'deserving X' (*tad arham*).

⁵⁴ See the relevant web page of the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit*: <http://www.sanskrit-linguistics.org/dcs/index.php?contents=fundstellen&IDWord=40135> (accessed 03/12/2025).

13. Medh ad MDh^M 1.59 [TL] (A*)

etad vo 'yaṃ bhrguḥ śāstraṃ śrāvayiṣyaty aśeṣataḥ |
etad dhi matto 'dhijage sarvam eṣo 'khilaṃ muniḥ || 1.59 ||

The well-known Bhrgu will have this treatise heard by you without omissions because the seer mentioned has learnt the whole treatise from me without leaving any gaps.

[...] *gurumukhād vidyā niṣkrāmatīva śiṣyaḥ pratigrhṇātīvety atah apādāne tasir matta iti yuktaḥ* (see A 5.4.45) | [...]

The wisdom is as if it went out from the teacher's mouth, the pupil is as if he received [it]: hence, [the *taddhita* affix] *tasI* is applied to convey the sense of ablative [to form the *taddhita* derivative stem] *mattaḥ* ('from me') (see A 5.4.45).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.4.45: see Medh ad MDh^M 1.31.

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi comments on the derivation of the *taddhita* derivative stem *mattas*, which is formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *tasI* to the pronominal base of the first person singular *mad-*, according to rule A 5.4.45.

14. Medh ad MDh^M 1.61-62 [J] (KV)

svāyambhuvasyāsya manoḥ ṣaḍvaṃśyā manavo 'pare |
sṛṣṭavantaḥ prajāḥ svāḥ svā mahātmāno mahaujasaḥ || 1.61 ||
svārociṣaś cottamaś ca tāmaso raivatas tathā |
cākṣuṣaś ca mahātejā vivasvatsuta eva ca || 1.62 ||

There are another six Manus, [who are] lineal descendants of Manu, the son of the Svāyambhuva, who, being endowed with great nobility and great power, have each generated their own offspring: Svārociṣa, Uttama, Tāmasa, Raivata, Cākṣusa, endowed with great bright energy, and the son of Vivasvat.

[...] *asmadupādhyāyasya svāyambhuva iti khyātasya ṣaḍ anye 'pare manavo vaṃśyā ekasmin vaṃśe kule jātāḥ sarve vaṃśyāḥ | sarve hi sākṣād brahmaṇā sṛṣṭā ity ekakulasambhavād vaṃśyā ucyante | atha vā ekasmin kārye 'dhikṛtā vaṃśyā ekakarmānvayena prāṇinām vaṃśavyavahāro bhavati | dvau muntī vyākaraṇasya vaṃśyau* (KV ad A 2.1.19) | [...]

To the one who is called *svāyambhuva*-, i.e. to our teacher, another six of Manu's lineal descendants, all born to a single lineage, i.e. family, [are called] *vaṁśyāḥ* [of the *svāyambhuva*]. They are called *vaṁśya* due to their birth to a single family since it is indeed said that they are all evidently generated by Brahmān. Or rather, *vaṁśyas* are those entitled to a single task: the daily linguistic usage of *vaṁśa*- is proper to living beings due to their association with a single activity: [for example], *dvau munī vyākaraṇasya vaṁśyau* (see KV *ad* A 2.1.19).

Passage cited:

- KV *ad* A 2.1.19: *dvau munī vyākaraṇasya vaṁśyau dvimuni vyākaraṇasya* [...]
Two seers belonging to the grammatical tradition are the *dvimuni* *vyākaraṇasya*.

Comment:

While commenting on Manu's six lineal descendants (*ṣaḍvaṁśa*), Medhātithi cites one traditional example presented by the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 2.1.19) commenting on A 2.1.19.⁵⁵ The latter rule teaches to form an indeclinable compound by combining a numeral with a nominal *pada* meaning 'lineal descendant.' In actual fact, this is not the full quotation from the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, since only the section containing the *vigraha* of the compound *dvimuni*- is quoted. The main aim of the quotation is not grammatical but juridical since its purpose is to explain what a *vaṁśya* is. In this regard, it is interesting that Medhātithi decided not to quote the *Kāśikāvṛtti*'s definition of *vaṁśa*- found at the beginning of the passage from which he cites the example (KV *ad* A 2.1.19): *vidyayā janmanā vā prāṇinām ekalakṣaṇasantāno vaṁśaḥ ity abhidhīyate* "A continued succession sharing a single characteristic among living beings through knowledge or birth is called 'lineage' (*vaṁśa*)." Once Medhātithi has explained that a *vaṁśya* can also be made up of people who are engaged in the same activity, he can explain, based on the *Kāśikāvṛtti* passage, that *dvimuni vyākaraṇam* comes to signify a grammatical lineage made up of two seers. He probably hints at the possibility that the *ṣaḍvaṁśyāḥ* mentioned here in MDh^M 1.61 might have denoted a group of six people who were engaged in the same activity, namely the transmission of the *Mānavadharmasāstra*. Finally, we note that Medhātithi here uses the term *vyavahāra* in the sense of 'daily linguistic usage' (see Roodbergen 2008: 403)

⁵⁵ A 2.1.19: *saṅkhyā vaṁśyena* [*samāsaḥ 3 saha supā 4 avyayībhāvaḥ 5 sup 9 vā 18*] "A number [preferably combines with a nominal *pada*] denoting 'lineal descendant' [to form an indeclinable compound]."

rather than one of its juridical meanings (see Olivelle, Brick, and McClish 2015: 371).

15. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.69-70 [TL] (A⁶)

catvāry āhuḥ sahasrāṇi varṣāṇām tat kṛtaṃ yugam |
tasya [tāvacchatī] samdhyā samdhyāmśaś ca tathāvidhaḥ || 1.69 ||
[...] ⁵⁶ itareṣu sasamdhyeṣu sasamdhyāmśeṣu ca triṣu |
ekāpāyena vartante sahasrāṇi śatāni ca || 1.70 ||

[Sages] maintain that the Kṛta Yuga lasts for four thousand years. Its [preceding] twilight encompasses a group of so many hundreds of years and the following twilight is as such. The thousands and the hundreds decrease by one in all the other three [Yugas], [preceding] twilights and following twilights.

[...] *tāvacchatī iti ikāraḥ smartavyaḥ | iha smṛtiḥ | tāvatām śatānām samāhāraḥ | tāvac chabdasya bahugaṇavatudati (A 1.1.23) iti vatvantatvāt samkhyāsamjñāyām satyām samkhyāpūrvo dviguḥ (A 2.1.52) iti dvigusamjñāyām satyām t̥āpo 'pavādo (cf. A 4.1.4) dvigoḥ (A 4.1.21) iti n̄p | śataṃ ⁵⁷ parimāṇam asya iti | yattadetebyaḥ (A 5.2.39) iti vatup | ā sarvanāmnah (A 6.3.91) ity ākāraḥ | anyathā bahuvrīhau tāvanti śatāni yasyāḥ śataśabdasyākārāntatvāt ajādyataṣṭāp (A 4.1.4) iti t̥āpā bhavitavyam | tasmin kṛte tāvacchatā iti syād ity abhiprāyaḥ ||*

As for [the word-form] *tāvacchatī* ('a group of so many hundreds'), the sound *ī* should be explained. Here follows the explanation. [This word-form denotes] a

⁵⁶ Interesting to note the peculiar structure of this commentary passage: the word-form *tāvacchatī*, which is found in MDh^M 1.69, is commented on at the end of the section concerning the next verse, i.e. MDh^M 1.70.

⁵⁷ Mandlik and Gharpure, as well Olivelle, feature the variant reading *śataṃ*. Jha and Dave present the variant reading *tat*. According to a note in Jha (1924: I, 13), this reading appears to be based on manuscript S. However, we have decided to adopt *śataṃ* based on the following principle. Jha's and Dave's reading *tat* is based on a gloss on rule A 5.2.39 to explain the output meaning of the relevant *taddhita* stem "the measure is X." Instead, of Mandlik's, Gharpure's and Olivelle's reading *śataṃ* is actually the application of the output meaning to the case at stake in this passage, namely relating to *tāvacchatī*, for which *tad-* (one of the bases listed in A 5.2.39, applied to form the left-hand constituent *tāvat-*) occurs in the sense of *śataṃ*, which is the measure denoted by the compound *tāvacchatī* - as explained some lines above (*tāvatām śatānām samāhāraḥ*). In our opinion, the latter is probably Medhātithi's original reading and, at the same time, the *lectio difficilior*.

group of so many hundreds. According to *dvigoḥ* (A 4.1.21) [that is] an exception to [the application of the feminine affix] *ṬāP* (cf. A 4.1.4), [the feminine affix] *ÑīP* [occurs after a nominal stem] designated as *dvigu* according to *saṅkhyāpūrvo dviguḥ* (A 2.1.52), since the word-form *tāvat* is designated as a *saṅkhyā*⁵⁸ because it ends in *vatUP* by means of *bahugaṇavatuḍati saṅkhyā* (A 1.1.23). “Its measure is one hundred” (*śataṃ parimāṇam asya*): [the *taddhita* affix] *vatUP* occurs based on *yattadetebhyaḥ parimāṇe vatup* (A 5.2.39). The sound *ā* replaces [the final sound of the pronominal stem *tat-*, which is the etymon of *tāvat-*] based on *ā sarvanāmnah* (A 6.3.91). Otherwise, if it were a *bahuvrīhi* [in the sense of] ‘whose hundreds are so many’, [the feminine affix] *ṬāP* would occur according to *ajādyataḥ ṭāp* (A 4.1.4) due to the sound *a* of the word-form *śata-*. If it were analysed in such a way, [the word-form would be] *tāvacchatā*: this is the implied meaning.

Rules cited:

- A 1.1.23: *bahugaṇavatuḍati saṅkhyā*
[The nominal stems] *bahu-* (‘many’) and *gaṇa-* (‘group’) and [the derivative stems] ending in [the *taddhita* affixes] *vatUP* and *Ḍati* are *saṅkhyās*.
- A 2.1.52: *saṅkhyāpūrvo dviguḥ*
[A compound] whose first constituent is a *saṅkhyā* [is called] *dvigu*.
- A 4.1.4: *ajādyataḥ ṭāp* [*prātipadikāt* 1 *striyām* 3]
The [feminine] affix *ṬāP* occurs [after a nominal stem] of the *ajādi* list and those ending in the sound *a*.
- A 4.1.21: *dvigoḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 1 *striyām* 3 *ataḥ* 4 *nīp* 5 *anupasarjanāt* 14]
[The *taddhita* affix *ÑīP* occurs after a nominal stem ending in *-a* provided that it is not a non-head constituent] consisting of a *dvigu* compound [to form a feminine nominal stem].
- A 5.2.39: *yattadetebhyaḥ parimāṇe vatup* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tad asya* 36]
[The *taddhita* affix] *vatUP* occurs [after the nominal stems] *yad-* (‘which’), *tad-* (‘that’), *etad-* (‘this’) to denote ‘this is the measure of X.’
- A 6.3.91: *ā sarvanāmnah* [*uttarapade* 1 *ḍṛgḍṛśvatuḥ* 89]

⁵⁸ We have decided to leave *saṅkhyā* untranslated as, according to A 1.1.23, it encompasses not only numerals but also the nominal stems *bahu-*, *gaṇa-* and those ending in *vatUP* (= *-vat*) and *ḌatI* (= *-at*).

The sound *ā* replaces the final sound of a pronominal stem before [the second compound constituent consisting of *-dṛś* ('looking'), *-dṛśa* (id.), and *-vatUP*].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi provides a long commentary on the compound *tāvacchatī-* ('a group of so many hundreds'), formed by *tāvat-* ('so much') and *śata-* ('hundred'), of which a series of grammatical features are detailed. In the first part of the comment, Medhātithi focuses on how this compound should be analysed. It is parsed not as a *bahuvrīhi*, but as a *dvigu* since its first constituent is a *saṅkhyā*: while introducing this element, he supplies the general rules defining both *saṅkhyā* (A 1.1.23) and *dvigu* (A 2.1.52). Why does such a compound have to be analysed as just a *dvigu*? Because the feminine affix *ṆīP* (taught by rule A 4.1.21) is applied instead of the affix *ṬāP* (taught by A 4.1.4): the latter constitutes the *utsarga*, while the former, as Medhātithi underlines, is its *apavāda*. If the general rule A 4.1.4 were applied, the compound form would be *tāvacchatā-* since the affix *ṬāP* (= *-ā*) would be attached. In the second part of the commentary, Medhātithi focuses on the derivation of the left-hand constituent *tāvat-*, whose formation is explained in accordance with A 5.2.39 that teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *vatUP* to the pronominal base *tad-* (together with *yad-* and *etad-*) to denote 'this is the measure of X' (*tad parimāṇam asya*). Finally, Medhātithi correctly cites the substitution rule A 6.3.91, according to which the final sound in the pronominal stem *tad-* (the etymon of the *taddhita* derivative stem *tāvat-*) is replaced by *ā* before the *taddhita* affix *vatUP* (*tat-vat* > *ta-ā-vat* > *tāvat-*).

16. Medh ad MDh^M 1.71 [TL] (A*², KV*, N*)

*yad etat parisaṁkhyātam ādāv eva caturyugam |
etad dvādaśa[sāhasraṁ] devānāṁ yugam ucyate || 1.71 ||*

The well-known group of four Yugas which, at the very beginning, was calculated as lasting twelve thousand years, is defined as the Yuga of the Gods.

[...] *sahasraśabdāt svārthe 'ṇ* (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38) | *dvādaśacaturyugasahasrāṇi parimāṇam*⁵⁹ *yasminn iti vighrahaḥ* (see A 5.1.57) ||

⁵⁹ Mandlik and Gharpure, as well as Olivelle, feature the variant reading *dvādaśacaturyugasahasrāṇi parimāṇam*. Instead, Jha and Dave feature the reading

After the word-form *sahasra-*, [the *taddhita* affix] *aN* occurs [while retaining] the own meaning [of the base]⁶⁰ (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38) [to derive the *taddhita* derivative stem *sāhasra-* ‘a thousand’ (i.e. the same meaning as the etymon), constituting the right-hand constituent in the compound *dvādaśasāhasra-* ‘twelve thousand’]. ‘In which the measure is twelve thousand [years] equal to four *yugas*’ (*dvādaśacaturyugasahasrāṇi parimāṇam*): [this is] the constituent analysis [of the compound *dvādaśasāhasra-*] (see A 5.1.57).

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 5.1.57: *tad asya parimāṇam* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[A *taddhita* affix among those taught by rules A 5.1.18-115 occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘this is the measure of X.’
- A 5.4.38: *prajñādibhyaś ca* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *aṇ* 36]
[The *taddhita* affix *aN*] also [occurs after a nominal stem] part of the *prajñādi* list (‘knowledge and the like’).
- KV *ad* A 5.4.38: *prajña ity evam ādibhyaḥ prātipadikebhyaḥ svārthe aṇpratyayo bhavati*
After the nominal stems beginning in this way, i.e. *prajñā-*, affix *aN* occurs [while retaining] the own meaning [of the base].
- N *ad* A 5.4.38: *prajñādir ayam ākṛtigaṇaḥ*
This list beginning with *prajñā-* is an exemplificative list.

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi comments on the *taddhita* derivation of *dvādaśasāhasra-* (‘consisting of twelve thousand’). First of all, he obtains *sāhasra-* from *sahasra-* (‘thousand’) by applying a *taddhita* affix which retains the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*). There is an entire section of Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, i.e. between A 5.3.1 and 5.4.160, which teaches *taddhitas* which retain the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*). This technical term is used by later Vyākaraṇa authors (see e.g.

dvādaśacaturyugasahasrāṇi parimāṇe. According to a note in Jha (1924: I, 13), this appears to be the reading of one manuscript, while another reading that ends in °*parimāṇam*, is also suggested: “*dvādaśa.....vighrahaḥ*—Better reading *dvādaśa sahasrāṇi parimāṇam yasminn iti vighrahaḥ* as in S; better still.....*parimāṇe yasminn iti vighrahaḥ* as in A.” However, we have decided to stick to the variant reading *dvādaśacaturyugasahasrāṇi parimāṇam* which, unlike Jha and Dave, we do not consider to be problematic.

⁶⁰ A *svārtha* affix is a “semantically neutral” affix according to D’Avella (2018: 128). On this category, see also Dvivedi (1975).

KV *ad* A 5.3.1),⁶¹ but it does not occur in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The relevant rule we think that is applied here is A 5.4.38, which is explicitly referred to by Medhātithi in a similar passage (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.38). This rule teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *aN* which retains the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*: see also KV *ad* A 5.4.38) to a nominal stem part of the *prajñādi* list. The latter is not considered as an exemplificative list (*ākṛtiḡaṇa*) by the *Kāśikāvr̥tti*. However, the *Nyāsa* later considers it as an *ākṛtiḡaṇa* (see N *ad* A 5.4.38), thus making it possible to apply this affix *aN* here and in the other passages.

The second stage in the derivation is that Medhātithi forms the derivative stem *dvādaśasāhasra-* by adding another *taddhita* affix *aN*, taught by A 5.1.57, to denote ‘this is the measure of X.’ Since the first syllable of this compound’s nominal stem is already long, the *ablaut* effect of the affix is not visible.

17. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93 [TL] (Vt*)

*uttamāṅgodbhavāj jyaiṣṭhyād brahmaṇas caiva dhāraṇāt |
sarvasyaivāsya sargasya dharmato brāhmaṇaḥ prabhuḥ || 1.93 ||*

The Brāhmaṇa is indeed the Lord of the whole world as far as the Dharma is concerned because of his origin from the head, his seniority, and his preservation of the Veda.

[...] *dharmataḥ prabhur dharme prabhur ity arthaḥ | ādyāditvāt tasiḥ* (see M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44) ||

dharmataḥ prabhuḥ means *dharme prabhuḥ* (‘lord in the field of *dharmā*’): this is the meaning. [The *taddhita* affix] *tasI* occurs due to its being part of the group *ādyādi* (see M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44).

Passage referred to:

- M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44: *tasiprakaraṇe ādyādibhyaḥ upasaṅkhyānam*

In the topic of [the *taddhita* affix] *tasI*, there is the additional statement that [the *taddhita* affix *tasI* occurs] after the group *ādyādi*.

⁶¹ KV *ad* A 5.3.1: *ataḥ param svārthikāḥ pratyayās teṣu samarthādhikāraḥ prathamagrahaṇam ca pratiyogyapekṣatvān na upayujyate iti nivṛttam* ‘Thereupon, affixes occur in their own meaning; in them (between A 5.3.1 and A 5.4.160), the heading rule beginning with *samartha* (A 4.1.82) and the word *prathama-* (‘first’), because of the speaker’s expectancy of association, are not employed—so, it ceased to be valid.’

Comment:

While commenting on the word-form *dharmatas* ('from the *dharma*'), formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *tasI* (taught by A 5.4.44),⁶² Medhātithi refers to the *ādyādi* list ('*ādi*- and the like') mentioned by Kātyāyana in M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44. Rule A 5.4.44 teaches to optionally apply affix *tasI* co-occurring with the particle *prati*- and is extended by the aforementioned *vārttika* to this word list. The *ādyādi* list includes word-forms such as *āditaḥ* ('at the beginning'), *madhyataḥ* ('in the middle'), *antataḥ* ('at the end') (see M 2.436 l. 12 *ad* A 5.4.44).⁶³ Since this group is indeed an *ākṛtigāṇa* (see KV *ad* A 5.4.44),⁶⁴ Medhātithi is allowed to postulate the inclusion of the word-form *dharma*- in this list. It is tempting to assume that he also plays with the word-form *ādi*- creating a pun by synonymically reconnecting the word *dharma* (envisioned as the beginning of all) to *ādi*-.

18. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.94 [TE] (A*)

taṃ hi svayāmbhūḥ svād āsyāt tapas taptvādito 'sṛjat |
havyakavyābhivāhyāya sarvasyāśya ca guptaye || 1.94 ||

After first blazing with ascetic blaze, the Svayambhū indeed emitted him from his mouth for the conveyance of the oblations for gods and ancestors and the protection of the universe.

[...] *yad devān uddiśya kriyate tad dhavyaṃ pitṛṇ uddiśya tat kavyam | tayor abhivahanāya devān pitṛṃś ca prati prāpanāya | abhivāhyāyeti bhāve kṛtyaḥ* (see A 3.1.124) *kathaṃcid draṣṭavyaḥ sakarmatvād vahateḥ |* [...]

What is performed by indicating the gods [is called] *havya*-, [what is performed] by indicating the ancestors [is called] *kavya*-. [The word-form] *havya-kavyābhivāhyāya* (lit. 'for the conveyance of *havya* and *kavya*', i.e. the dative singular from the nominal stem *havyakavyābhivāhya*-) [means] 'for leading [*havya* and *kavya*] towards gods and ancestors.' [In the dative inflected form]

⁶² A 5.4.44: *pratiyoge pañcamyās tasiḥ [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 anyatarasyām 42]* "[The *taddhita* affix] *tasI* [optionally occurs after a nominal stem] ending in the ablative case co-occurring with [the particle] *prati*-."

⁶³ M 2.436 l. 12 *ad* A 5.4.44: *tasiprakarāṇe ādyādibhyaḥ upasaṅkhyānam kartavyam | āditaḥ | madhyataḥ | antataḥ ||* "In the topic of [the *taddhita* affix] *tasI*, there is the additional statement that [the *taddhita* affix *tasI* occurs] after the group *ādyādi*: [for instance], *āditaḥ* ('at the beginning'), *madhyataḥ* ('in the middle'), *antataḥ* ('at the end')."

⁶⁴ KV *ad* A 5.4.44: [...] *ākṛtigāṇaś ca ayam* "And this is an exemplificative list."

abhivāhyāya ('for the conveyance'), the *kṛtya* affix [*ṆyaT*] (see A 3.1.124) should be somehow examined in the sense of action due to the transitiveness of [the verbal base] *vah-* ('to convey').

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.124: *ṛhalor nyat* [*dhātoḥ* 91]
The *kṛtya* affix *ṆyaT* occurs [after a verbal base] ending in *-ṛ* or a consonant.

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi comments on the *kṛt* derivation of the future passive participle *abhivāhya-* (lit. 'to be conveyed', here 'conveyance') from the verbal base *abhivah-* ('to convey'). He hints that this form may be derived from one of the *kṛtya* affixes, among which the affix *ṆyaT* is undoubtedly inferred (see A 3.1.124). After indicating the more common *abhivahanāya* as a synonym, he attributes the unexpected (given that it is a transitive verb) meaning of *bhāva* (instead of the *karman* meaning) to *abhivāhya-*. Indeed, the classical examples of the *bhāva* meaning attributed to a *kṛtya* affix (regulated by the general rule A 3.4.70)⁶⁵ are in fact intransitive verbs, as seen in the relevant section from the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 3.4.70), where the *kṛtya* forms *āśitavya-* and *śayitavya-* derived from the intransitive verbal bases *āś-* ('to reach', 'to obtain') and *śī-* ('to lie', 'to sleep') are listed.⁶⁶

19. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.103 [J] (A*²)

viduṣā brāhmaṇenedam *adhyetavyam* *prayatnataḥ* |
śiṣyebhyaś ca *pravaktavyam* *samyañ nānyena kenacit* || 1.103 ||

This (i.e. Manu's treatise) should be studied zealously and taught to the pupils by a learned Brāhmaṇa and no one else.

adhyetavyam pravaktavyam ity arhe kṛtyaḥ (see A 3.1.96; 3.3.169) *na vidhau* |
dviṭīyād adhyāyāt prabhṛti śāstraṃ pravartisyate | *ayaṃ hy adhyāyo 'rthavāda*
eva | *nātra kaścid vidhir asti* | [...]

⁶⁵ A 3.4.70: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.228.

⁶⁶ However, as pointed out by Victor D'Avella (whom we thank), there are rules which teach the denotation of *bhāva* even for *kṛtya* derivatives from transitive verbs such as A 3.1.108.

adhyetavyam ('to be studied') [and] *pravaktavyam* ('to be taught'): [in such word-forms], the *kr̥tya* [affix] (*tavya* or *tavyaT*: see A 3.1.96)⁶⁷ occurs in the meaning of 'deserving' (see A 3.3.169) and not in the meaning of 'injunction.' The teaching (i.e. the injunction) will proceed from the second *adhyāya* onwards. For the present *adhyāya* this is only an explanation: there is no injunction here.

Rules referred to:

- A 3.1.96: *tavyattavyānīyarah* [*dhātoḥ* 91 *kr̥tyāḥ* 95]
[The *kr̥tya* affixes] *tavya*, *tavyaT*, *anīyaR* occur [after a verbal base].
- A 3.3.169: *arhe kr̥tyatr̥caś ca* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kr̥t* 3.1.93 *liṅ* 168]
The *kr̥tya* [affixes], [the *kr̥t* affix] *tr̥C*, [and the substitutes of the *lakāra* *liṅ*] occur after a verbal base] to express the fact of deserving (a given action).

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi provides a short note on the future passive participles *adhyetavya*- ('to be studied') and *pravaktavya*- ('to be taught'), formed by means of the *kr̥tya* affix *tavya* or *tavyaT* (taught by A 3.1.96). To form the two verbal forms, the scholar explains that the *kr̥tya* affix at stake occurs in the sense of 'deserving' (according to A 3.3.169) instead of 'injunction.' The purpose of this note is more juridical than grammatical, due to the position of this verse commented on in the first *adhyāya*. Since Manu only starts to provide injunctions (i.e. after declaring the sources of *dharma* in MDh 2.6-11) from the second *adhyāya* onwards, these two future passive participles are said to be without any injunctive force. This commentarial section anticipates numerous passages devoted to reflecting upon the injunction within the *Manubhāṣya* (starting from Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6).

20. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.108 [TE] (A*²)

*ācārah paramo dharmah śrutyuktaḥ smārta eva ca |
tasmād asmin sadāyukto nityam syād [ātmavān] dvijaḥ || 1.108 ||*

The supreme *dharma* that is declared in the Vedic scriptures (*śruti*), as well as that which is handed down in the post-Vedic scriptures

⁶⁷ The crucial difference between these two future passive participle affixes is the pitch, i.e. *tavyā-* and *tāvya-*. The *anubandha T* determines the *svarita* accent of the former (*tavyaT*), according to A 6.1.185. Since it is generally impossible to predict the accent of verb forms formed with this affix, any subsequent references to the rule will be indicated as referring only to *tavya* for simplicity's sake.

(*smṛti*), is proper conduct. Therefore, a twice-born who is constantly absorbed in this (i.e. treatise) should always be longing for what is good for himself.

[...] *tasmād ācāradharme nityaṃ yuktaḥ syān nityaṃ anuṣṭhēd ātmavān ātmano hitam icchan | sarvasyātmāsty ato matupā taddhitaparatvam ucyate* (cf. A 5.1.5; 5.2.94) ||

Therefore, he should always be engaged in the *dharma* that is known as proper conduct, i.e. he should always perform [the *ācāradharma*], being *ātmavān* (lit. ‘having a soul’, i.e. nominative singular from the nominal stem *ātmavat-*), i.e. ‘longing for what is good for himself.’ There is a soul belonging to everyone (cf. 5.2.94); hence, the importance of a *taddhita* [as ‘what is good for him’ (cf. A 5.1.5)] is expressed by means of the *matUP* [affix].

Rules referred to:

- A 5.1.5: *tasmai hitam* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[A *taddhita* affix occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘beneficial for X.’
- A 5.2.94: *tad asya asty asminn iti matup* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[The *taddhita* affix] *matUP* [occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘X belongs to Y’, ‘X exists in Y.’

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the nominal stem *ātmavat-*, which is explained as being formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *matUP* (taught by A 5.2.94). However, unlike the meanings conveyed by the affix *matUP*, i.e. ‘X belongs to Y’ (*tad asya*) or ‘X exists in Y’ (*asty asmin*), the scholar attributes a particular meaning to the *taddhita* derivative stem *ātmavat-* which finds no matching rule in the grammatical tradition: this is explained as *ātmano hitam icchan* (‘the one who longs for what is good for himself’). This seems to be a reference to the output meaning of rule A 5.1.5 (*tasmai hitam*), peculiarly recalled by means of the compound *taddhita-*, which is the technical term for the *matUP* affix itself. As a result, this grammatical note serves to demonstrate that a *dvija* who is engaged in the *ācāradharma* is self-controlled.

Second adhyāya (65 quotations)

21. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.1 [J] (A*)

*vidvadbhiḥ sevītaḥ sadbhir nityam adveṣarāgibhiḥ |
hrdayenābhyanujñāto yo dharmas taṃ nibodhata || 2.1 ||*

Learn that which is the Dharma blessed by the heart and permanently served by the men who are learned, venerable and exempt from love and hatred.

[...] *sevā anuṣṭhānaśīlatā | bhūtapratyayenānādikālapravṛttatām* (see A 3.2.102) *āha | nāyam aṣṭakādidharma 'dyatve kenacit pravartita itaradharmavat | etad eva nityaśabdena darśayati | [...]*

The act of serving (*sevā*) is the habit of religious performance. By means of an affix conveying the sense of the past (i.e. of the past passive participle *Kta*; see A 3.2.102), he (i.e. Manu) expresses the fact that it (i.e. *dharma*) has existed since a time with no beginning. This *dharma* [consisting of] *aṣṭakās* (i.e. the oblations offered on the eighth day of the full moon), and the rest is not made current by somebody in the present time as if it were an ordinary *dharma*. He shows it indeed by means of the word-form *nitya*- ('always').

Rule referred to:

- A 3.2.102: *niṣṭhā [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 bhūte 84]*
A *niṣṭhā* affix (i.e. *Kta* and *KtavatU*: see A 1.1.26)⁶⁸ occurs [after a verbal base to denote past tense].

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi comments on the use of the past passive participle *sevita*- (from the verbal base *sev*- 'to serve'), which is formed by means of the *Kta* affix (one of the two *niṣṭhā* affixes) in its own original sense of the past, according to the semantic constraint *bhūte* in A 3.2.102 (continued by *anuvṛtti* from A 3.2.84). He employs this reference to demonstrate that the *dharma* belongs to the past as well as to the present, i.e. it is constant over time.

22. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.5 [TE] (A, A*)

*teṣu samyag vartamāno gacchaty amaralokatām |
yathāsaṃkalpitāṃś ceha sarvān kāmān samaśnute || 2.5 ||*

⁶⁸ A 1.1.26: *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā* "[Affixes] *Kta* and *KtavatU* are denoted as *niṣṭhā*."

One reaches the condition of immortals (lit. ‘condition proper to immortal worlds’) by behaving towards them properly and, in this world, fulfils the desires just as they have been conceived.

[...] *evam kurvan gacchati prāpnoty amaralokatām | amarāḥ devās teṣāṃ lokaḥ svargaḥ | tannivāsād amareṣu lokaśabdaḥ sthānasthāninor abhedād mañcāḥ krośantīvat | tenāyaṃ samāso 'marāś ca te lokāś cāmaralokās tadbhāvo 'maralokatā* (see A 5.1.119) | *devajanatvaṃ prāpnoti devatvaṃ prāpnotīty arthaḥ | vṛttānurodhād evaṃ uktam | atha vā amarāṃ lokayati paśyaty amaralokaḥ | **karmany aṇ***⁶⁹ (A 3.2.1) | *tadantād bhāvapratyayaḥ* (see A 5.1.119) | *devadarśī saṃpadyate | anenāpi prakāreṇa svargaḥ prāptir evoktā bhavati | atha vā amara iva lokyate loka* (see A 3.2.1) | [...]

By doing so, one reaches, i.e. obtains the *amaralokatā*. The gods are immortals; their world is heaven. Because of residing in this (i.e. heaven), among the immortals, there is the word-form *loka-* due to the identity between the place and the one occupying the place, as when it is said ‘the stands (i.e. people sitting on the stands) are crying out.’ By means of this, such a compound [is formed]: worlds that are immortal are *amaralokas*, *amaralokatā* is their condition (see A 5.1.119). The meaning is that one obtains the nature of the gods, i.e. one obtains divine status. It is said in such a way because of conforming to the meter. Or rather, *amaraloka* is the one who *lokayati*, i.e. sees the immortals, according to *karmany aṇ* (A 3.2.1). [The *taddhita*] affix [*taL*] conveying the sense of condition is applied after the end of this (see A 5.1.119). One turns into one who sees the gods: also in this manner, the achievement of heaven is indeed expressed. Or rather, one is seen as if he were an immortal in this world (see A 3.2.1).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 3.2.1: *karmany aṇ* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93]
[The *kṛt* affix] *aṇ* [is applied after a verbal base] when co-occurring with a *pada* conveying the sense of the patient.
- A 5.1.119: *tasya bhāva tvatalau* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[The *taddhita* affixes] *tva* and *taL* [occur after a nominal stem] to denote ‘condition of X.’

⁶⁹ Mandlik and Gharpure, as well Olivelle, feature the variant reading *karmany aṇ*, corresponding to the quotation of A 3.2.1. Instead, Jha and Dave feature the variant reading *karmanyam*, which does not make any sense.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the formation of the *taddhita* derivative stem *amaralokatā-*, which is formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *taL* to the etymon *amaraloka-* according to A 5.1.119 (together with the *taddhita* affix *ṭāP* taught by A 4.1.4).⁷⁰ The latter rule teaches the formation of derivative stems by means of the *taddhita* affixes *tva* and *taL* to convey the meaning of ‘condition of X.’ In particular, the scholar proposes three different interpretations of the etymon at the basis of this derivation process, i.e. *amaraloka-*. According to the first explanation, the inflected noun *loka-* (‘world’) combines with the other *pada* *amara-* (‘immortal’) to form the *karmadhāraya* compound *amaraloka-* (‘immortal world’). According to the second and third explanations, the second constituent of the compound *amaraloka-* is interpreted as a *kṛt* derivative stem from the tenth-class verbal base *lok-* (‘to see’), respectively used in the Parasmaipada diathesis (in the sense of ‘one who sees’) or in the passive diathesis (in the sense of ‘seen’). Based on these explanations, the locative *karmaṇi* in the quoted rule A 3.2.1 specifies in a metalinguistic way that *amara-* plays the role of the patient of the *kṛt* derivative stem *loka-* in what would be defined as an *upapadasamāsa* according to A 3.1.92.⁷¹ Perhaps, Medhātithi provides such an in-depth linguistic explanation of the derivative *taddhita* stem *amaralokatā-* even for the sake of gaining a deeper understanding of what condition a man can actually attain by behaving properly. A man can either become a god among other gods (which does not sound really orthodox) or simply one who can see gods in heaven or is seen as a god in the world.

23. Medh ad MDh^M 2.6 [TE/J] (P, A^{*3}, Vt^{*}, M^{*2})

vedo 'khilo dharmamūlaṃ smṛtiśīle ca tadvidām |
 ācāraś caiva sādḥūnām ātmanas tuṣṭir eva ca || 2.6 ||

The root of *dharma* is the whole Veda, the tradition and the custom of those knowing it, the conduct of the learned and what satisfies one's own self.⁷²

⁷⁰ A 4.1.4: see Medh ad MDh^M 1.69-70.

⁷¹ A 3.1.92: *tatropapadaṃ saptamīstham* [dhātoḥ 91] “In this section (i.e. that governed by the *adhikāra dhātoḥ* starting from A 3.1.91), a co-occurring word (*upapada*) occurs in the locative case.”

⁷² Regarding the interpretation of the fourth root of *dharma*, namely the *ātmatuṣṭi*, see Section 3.3.

[...] *vyutpādyate ca vedaśabdaḥ | vidanty ananyapramāṇavedyaṁ dharmalakṣaṇam artham* (see PMS 1.1.2) *asmād iti vedaḥ* (see A 3.3.19; M 2.246 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19) | [...]

And the word-form *veda-* is derived [as follows]: since they know (*vidanti*) the object that is worthy for them (see PMS 1.1.2),⁷³ whose essential mark is the *dharma*, which cannot be known from any other authoritative source of knowledge, from this it is called the Veda' (see A 3.3.19; M 2.246 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19).

[...] *mantrārthavādapramāṇabhāvo 'py aviruddhaḥ | yady apy arthavādā vidhyuddeśastutiparā na svārthasya vidhāyakās tathāpi keśāñcid anyaparataiva nopapadyate yāvat svārthaviśayo vidhir nāvagamitaḥ | yathā steno hiraṇyasya surām pibamś ca* (ChUp 5.10.9) *ityādeḥ pañcāgnividhiśeṣataivam etāvataiva nopapadyate yāvad dhirānyasteyādeḥ pratiśedho nāvagamitaḥ | ya etām vidyām adhīte sa hiraṇyasteyādy apy ācaramś taiś ca samvasan na pataty anyathā tu patatīty avagatir aviruddhā | atha vidhyuddeśo vidheḥ pratipādako nārthavāda iti kenaiśā paribhāṣā kṛtā | ete patanti catvāraḥ* (ChUp 5.10.9) *ity atrāpy ākhyātaśravaṇam asti | liṅādayo*⁷⁴ *na santīti cet* (cf. A 3.3.161) *pratitiṣṭhanti* (see PB 23.2.4) *iti rātriṣv api naiva liṅśrutir*⁷⁵ *asti* (cf. Śab *ad* PMS 4.3.17-18) | *atha tatrādhikārākāṅkṣyām ekavākyatāyām satyām pañcamalakārādikalpanayā vidhyavasāyāḥ* (cf. A 3.4.7) *evam atrāpi bhaviṣyati* | [...]

The authoritativeness of *mantras* and explanations⁷⁶ is also consistent. Although the explanations are focused on the praise of what is pointed out by the injunction,

⁷³ Given the general Mīmāṃsā-related content of this commentarial passage (see below), we have interpreted the phrase *dharmalakṣaṇam artham* as a paraphrase of PMS 1.1.2 (*codanālakṣaṇo 'rtho dharmah* "The *dharma* is that worthy thing which is characterised by a Vedic injunction"). Therefore, *artha* might be an aim, but it also might be what is of worth (e.g. *svarga*), as we are inclined to interpreting it. We are indebted to Monika Nowakowska for this suggestion.

⁷⁴ All editions of the *Manubhāṣya* feature *liṅādayaḥ* except for the first edition of Gharpure, which presents *liṅgādayaḥ*. Jha (1924: I, 23) discussed this variant reading in a note: "for *liṅgā* read *liṅā* as in M."

⁷⁵ All editions of the *Manubhāṣya* feature *liṅgaśrutih* except for the first edition of Gharpure, which presents *liṅgaśrutih*. Jha (1924: I, 23) discussed this variant reading in a note: "for *liṅga* read *liṅa* as in M."

⁷⁶ Throughout the entire volume, we have consistently rendered the Mīmāṃsā-related term *arthavāda* as 'explanation' or 'explanatory passage' in our translation of the excerpts from Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya*. We note that, within Mīmāṃsā, the Veda is divided into *vidhi/codanā*, *arthavāda*, *mantra*, and *nāmadheya* portions. They are all *pramāṇas* by

they do not enjoin their own object; nevertheless, it is not suitable that any of them (i.e. the explanations) are focused on something else unless the injunction is explained as having the object [of the explanations] as its scope. For instance, [the sentence] beginning with *steno hiraṇyasya surāṃ pibamś ca* (ChUp 5.10.9: ‘The one who steals gold and the one who drinks the Surā’) is not suitable to be a supplement to the injunction of the five fires (*pañcāgnividhi*) unless a prohibition against theft of gold and the like is explained. The one who studies this science, even if his behaviour includes the theft of gold and the like and his association with people [who commit such sins], does not lapse [from his own social condition], whereas otherwise (i.e. if he does not study this science), he will lapse. The understanding [of this] is consistent. Then, ‘what is pointed out by the injunction is that which teaches the injunction, not the explanations’: who made this explanatory rule⁷⁷? Even in [the sentence] *ete patanti catvāraḥ* (ChUp 5.10.9: ‘these four lapse [from their own social condition]’), there is the perception of a finite verbal form. If there are no substitutes of the *lakāra*⁷⁸ *līṅ* (= optative; cf. A 3.3.161) and the like, when it is said *pratitiṣṭhanti* (‘they are well grounded’; see PB 23.2.4), there is not really a *līṅ* verbal form in the Vedic text in [the explanatory passages (*arthavāda*) of] the *rātri(sattra)* (cf. Śab *ad* PMS 4.3.17-18).⁷⁹ Therefore, as there is a single sentence which has the expectancy of

which *dharma* is attained, since they are parts of the Veda, but only *vidhis* give direct access to *dharma* as they enjoin one to undertake ritual actions. As seen in this passage, *arthavādas* bring a *stuti* or *nindā* aspect into play. So, Medhātithi’s purpose here is to demonstrate that they do not enjoin anything by themselves; their objective is to praise what is taught or enunciated (*uddeśa*) by *vidhis*. Problems arise when the absence of any *vidhi* does not clarify its object.

⁷⁷ We have avoided using the term *paribhāṣā* (and chosen to translate it as an ‘explanatory rule’) because, as noted later in the comment, to the best of our knowledge, this is not an authoritatively handed-down *Paribhāṣā* but a principle that seems to have been invented by Medhātithi or one that was informally circulating in his milieu.

⁷⁸ Regarding the assignment of the correct substitute for *la*, see Mocci and Pontillo (2023) and the bibliography cited therein.

⁷⁹ This is one of the points in which the connection between the Mīmāṃsā school and Medhātithi is most evident. Śabara is presumably the first Mīmāṃsā author to introduce the example of the *rātrisattra* (lit. ‘sacrificial session at night’) while commenting on PMS 4.3.17-18. Relying on TS 5.1-10, Śabara uses the *rātrisattra* argument to explain that something which is only mentioned in an explanatory passage (*arthavāda*) can be considered as a result of the sacrifice enjoined in a given rule. This generated the so-called “*rātrisattra* theorem” (*rātrisattranyāya*) in later Mīmāṃsā literature. See Yoshimizu (2012: 663).

specifying who is entitled to obtain the mentioned condition (*pratitiṣṭhanti*), the injunction is argued by means of assuming [the occurrence of one substitute of] the fifth *lakāra* (i.e. *IEṬ* = subjunctive: cf. A 3.4.7)⁸⁰ [in the verbal forms *patanti* in ChUp 5.10.9 and *pratitiṣṭhanti* in PB 23.2.4]; thus, even in this case, there will be [the understanding of an injunction, i.e. the meaning of *IIN*].

[...] *tad etal leśato 'smābhir uktam | vistaras tu smṛtivivekā jñātavyaḥ |*
 [...] *linādigamyam*⁸¹ *bhagavān vidhiṃ smarati pāṇiniḥ |*
na śaktāḥ te vidhiṃ vaktum siddhavastvabhīdhāyinaḥ ||
 [...] *ratrīṣu pratitiṣṭhantīty* (see PB 23.2.4) *asatsv eva linādiṣu ||*
pañcamena lakāreṇa tadarthagatir iṣyate |
patanti (see ChUp 5.10.19) *na mlecchitavā* (see M 1.2 ll. 7-9) *ityādiṣu*
tathā bhavet || [...]

We have explained this [subject] very briefly, but a detailed description should be understood on the basis of the *Smṛtiviveka*:

[...] “The Venerable Pāṇini records the injunction as attainable with the [affix] *IIN* and the like. They cannot express an injunction, as they express accomplished objects. [...] Although there are no *IIN* (= optative) and the like [affixes] in passages such as *pratitiṣṭhanti* (see PB 23.2.4), the understanding of such a meaning (namely, that of *IIN*, i.e. an injunction) is signified by the fifth *lakāra* (i.e. *IEṬ* = subjunctive). Likewise, there should be [the same understanding of *IIN*, i.e. an injunction] in passages such as *patanti* (see ChUp 5.10.9), *na mlecchitavai* (see M 1.2 ll. 8 *ad* A 1.1.1), and the like.”

[...] *dvandvaś cāyam itaretarayoge* (see M 1.434 ll. 10-12 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29)
 | *tena parasparasāpekṣayoḥ smṛtiśīlayoḥ dharmam prati prāmāṇyam*
evābhipretaṃ na pūrvavan nirvartakatvam [...]

And this [compound *smṛtiśīla-*] is a *dvandva* [whose constituents are] in mutual connection (see M 1.434 ll. 10-12 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29). Therefore, since *smṛti* and *śīla* are characterised by mutual expectancy, it is meant that they are authorities with regard to *dharma* but they do not create [*dharma*] as mentioned above.

⁸⁰ The substitutes of the *lakāra* *IEṬ* are numbered as the fifth in alphabetical order. Regarding the Pāṇinian treatment of the subjunctive, see Scharf (2008).

⁸¹ All editions of the *Manubhāṣya* feature *linādigamyam* except for Gharpure's, in which *liṅgādigamyam* is found. Jha (1924: I, 23) discussed this variant reading in a note: “for *liṅgā* read *linā* as in S and A.”

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 3.3.19: *akartari ca kārake samjñāyām* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *ghaṇ* 16]
[The *kṛt* affix *GHaṇ* occurs after a verbal base] to denote a *kāraka* other than the agent in the case of a proper name.
- A 3.3.161: *vidhinimantraṇāmantraṇādhīṣṭasampraśnaprārthāneṣu liṇ* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91]
[After a verbal base] the substitutes of the *lakāra liṇ* (= optative) occur to denote an injunction, summons, invitation, solicited instruction, deliberation, or request.
- A 3.4.7: *liṇarthe leṭ* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *chandasi* 6]
[After a verbal base, in the domain of Vedic literature],⁸² the substitutes of the *lakāra leṭ* (= subjunctive) occur to denote the meaning of *liṇ* (= optative).
- M 2.246 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19: *samjñāgrahaṇānarthakyam ca sarvatra ghaṇaḥ darśanāt*
And the mention of *samjñā* is useless because there is perception of *GHaṇ* everywhere.
- M 1.2 ll. 7-9: *te 'surāḥ | te 'surā helayo helaya iti kurvantaḥ parābabhūvus | tasmāt brāhmaṇena na mlecchitavai nāpabhāṣitavai | mleccho ha vā eṣa yad apaśabdaḥ | mlecchā mā bhūma ity adhyeyam vyākaraṇam | te 'surāḥ ||*
te 'surāḥ ('these Asuras'): they perished after saying *he 'layo he 'layaḥ* ('O foes, o foes').⁸³ Therefore, a Brāhmaṇa must not babble like a *mleccha* nor vulgarise his speech. Indeed, what is non-Indo-Aryan speech is *mleccha*. Grammar should be studied so that we do not become *mlecchas*. *te 'surāḥ*.
- M 1.434 ll. 10-12 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29: *itaretarayogaḥ | plakṣaś ca nyagrodhaś cety ukte gamyata etat plakṣo 'pi nyagrodhasahāyo nyagrodho 'pi plakṣasahāya iti |*

⁸² The problematic interpretation of the *chandasi* semantic constraint in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* has been extensively discussed by scholars. We address the issue in our study (see Section 3.2.7), providing evidence supporting our translation of *chandasi* mainly as 'in the domain of Vedic literature.'

⁸³ To note that the phrase *he 'layo he 'layaḥ* is found in another version in ŚBM 3.2.1.23 (*he 'layo he 'lavaḥ*), which, according to Thieme (1938: 4), stands for Skt. *he 'rayo he 'rayaḥ*.

[The term] *itaretarayoga* [is here explained]. When it is said *plakṣaś ca nyagrodhaś ca* ('both the Plakṣa and Nyagrodha trees'), this is understood: the Nyagrodha tree has the Plakṣa tree as a companion, just as the Plakṣa tree has the Nyagrodha tree as a companion.

Comment:

In the first excerpt, Medhātithi comments on the word-form *veda-*, which is derived from the verbal base *vid-* ('to know') followed by the *kṛt* affix *GHañ*. The relevant rule is A 3.3.19, which teaches to form a *kṛt* derivative stem by applying *GHañ* to denote a *kāraka* other than the agent in the case of *saṃjñā*. In this case, based on Medhātithi's explanation, the *kāraka* at stake is *apadāna*. Indeed, *veda-* may be considered a proper name when it denotes the sacred text. Nonetheless, this passage might also refer to the relevant Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19 (M 2.246 l. 1), which extends the use of *GHañ* beyond the restriction of *saṃjñāyām*. On the other hand, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* includes *veda-* among the examples of the application of *GHañ* according to A 3.3.121⁸⁴ (see KV *ad* A 3.3.121). However, Medhātithi cannot be referring to this rule here, because it only teaches the denotation of instrument or substratum.

In the second and third excerpts, Medhātithi fully develops his argument on the injunction (*vidhi*) for the first time, except for the "preview" found in the first *adhyāya* (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.103). While commenting on the phrase *smṛtiśīle ca tadvidām* ('the tradition and the conduct of those knowing it, i.e. the Veda'), the scholar refers to the condition of authoritativeness held by formulas (*mantra*) and explanations (*arthavāda*). These are not injunctive per se, but only if accompanied by another section containing the injunction; as an example he recalls the beginning of ChUp 5.10.9, which is said to not be injunctive if it is not completed by the verb *patanti* found at its end:

*steno hiraṇyasya surām pibamś ca guros talpam āvasan
brahmahā ca | ete patanti catvāraḥ pañcamaś cācaramś tair
iti ||*

The one who steals gold, the one who drinks the Surā, the one who violates the teacher's marital bed, and the one who kills a Brāhmaṇa: these four lapse [from their own social

⁸⁴ A 3.3.121: *halaś ca [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 kṛt 3.1.93 karaṇādhikaraṇayoḥ 117 puṃsi saṃjñāyām prāyeṇa 118 ghañ 120]* "[The *kṛt* affix *GHañ* occurs after a verbal base] which also ends in a consonant [to form a masculine derivative stem denoting an instrument or a substratum]."

condition] and the fifth [who lapses] is the one who associates with them.

To further develop this topic, Medhātithi resorts to an explanatory rule that he calls a Paribhāṣā (*vidhyudddeśo vidheḥ pratipādako nārthavādaḥ*, ‘what is pointed out by the injunction is that which teaches the injunction, not the explanations’). To the best of our knowledge, this rule is not found in any other text and has only reached us through Medhātithi’s text. He then goes on to expand his speech upon this explanatory rule by recalling other grammatical elements, stating that the injunction should be understood when it is expected, even if the substitutes of the *lakāra* *līṅ* (= optative) are missing (in accordance with A 3.3.161): this is possible by assuming the application of the substitutes of the *lakāra* *lEṭ* (= subjunctive) regulated by A 3.4.7, which teaches that, in Vedic literature, subjunctive verbal forms (formed by means of the substitutes of the *lakāra* *lEṭ*) could assume the meaning of an injunction in place of the optative ones (formed by means of the substitutes of the *lakāra* *līṅ*). In this regard, he cites just the first words of another Vedic passage, i.e. PB 23.2.4:

*etā vai pratiṣṭhitās trayodaśa rātrayaḥ pratitiṣṭhanti ya
etā upayanti ||*

Indeed, these [rites of] the thirteen nights are well grounded:
the ones who perform these [rites] are well grounded.

In this case, the injunction is understood through the presence of the verbal form *pratiṣṭhanti*, which completes the sentence. In both the case of *patanti* (ChUp 5.10.9) and of *pratiṣṭhanti* (PB 23.2.4), the scholar assumes that the substitutes of the *lakāra* *lEṭ* occur instead of *lAṭ* (A 3.2.123),⁸⁵ namely that these are subjunctive forms and not the present indicative, and the sense of *līṅ* (i.e. of the optative) is then inferred according to A 3.4.7.

In the second excerpt, Medhātithi quotes a section in verse of a lost work named *Smṛtīviveka* (whose title is only known thanks to the *Manubhāṣya*) in which his argument about an injunction involving Vyākaraṇa elements is taken up again with further reference to a passage from Patañjali (M 1.2 ll. 7-9). Even in this case, if we follow Medhātithi’s argument, the injunctive sense is provided by (i) the use of the verbal forms with the meaning of purpose *mlecchitavai* (‘he must

⁸⁵ A 3.2.123: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.28.

[not] babble like a *mleccha*'), and *apabhāṣitavai* ('he must [not] vulgarise his speech'), and (ii) the fact that the latter verbal form accompanies the former. In the last excerpt, Medhātithi explains the compound *smṛtiśīla* as a *dvandva* compound of the *itaretarayoga* type in accordance with the non-Pāṇinian label given for the first time by Patañjali (see M 1.434 ll. 10-12 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29). Even this grammatical portion is useful for his argument about the hierarchy of *dharma* sources.

24. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.7 [J] (A, A*²)

yaḥ kaścit kasyacid dharmo manunā parikīrtitaḥ |
sa sarvo 'bhihito vede [sarvajñānamayo] hi saḥ || 2.7 ||

Whatever *dharma* relating to anybody is declared by Manu: all that [*dharma*] is declared in the Veda since it contains all knowledge.

[...] *sarvajñānamayo hi saḥ | sarveṣāṃ jñānānām adṛṣṭaviṣayānām hetur nimittam vedaḥ | sarvair jñānair nirmita iveti jñāne*⁸⁶ *tadvikāratvam adhyāropya mayāḥ kṛtaḥ | yo hi yadvikāraḥ sa tanmayas tatsvabhāva ity ucyate | vedaś ca jñānahetutvāt tanmaya iti* (see A 4.3.143) *| satkāryadarśane*⁸⁷ *kāraṇam kāryasvabhāvam iti | atha vā sarvajñānād dhetor āgataḥ hetumanuṣyebhyaḥ* (A 4.3.81) *iti mayāḥ kriyate* (see A 4.3.82) ||

sarvajñānamayo hi saḥ: the Veda is the cause, i.e. the ground for all cognitions whose sphere is inaccessible to perception (i.e. the sphere of *dharma*). After superimposing the notion that [the Veda] is its transformation (*vikāra*) on the awareness that [the Veda] has been created by all objects of knowledge, [the *taddhita* affix] *mayāḥ* is applied (see A 4.3.143).⁸⁸ Anything is X-*maya*, i.e. of the same nature as X, provided that it is indeed a modification of X. And the Veda might [also] be said to be X-*maya* due to the fact that it has knowledge as its cause. In the Satkārya(vāda) *darśana*,⁸⁹ the cause has the effect as its own nature.

⁸⁶ In his electronic edition, Olivelle notes that *Dharmakośa* 5.110 suggests the variant reading *vede*.

⁸⁷ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *yatkāryadarśane*. Instead, the text of Jha, Dave and Olivelle contains *satkāryadarśane*. We have decided to adopt this reading since it makes better sense here.

⁸⁸ We thank Victor D'Avella for providing us with this reference.

⁸⁹ This passage obviously hints at the crucial philosophical doctrine teaching the pre-existence of the effect in the cause and thus the permanence of the effect, which exists independently of everything else, due to its own intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*). This position is contrasted by the so-called *a-satkāryavāda* according to which the effect does not pre-

Or rather, [the *taddhita* affix] *mayāṭ* occurs after [the nominal stem *sarvajñāna-*] to express [the Veda is] ‘coming from a cause’, i.e. all-comprehensive knowledge (see A 4.3.82): [the latter semantic constraint, i.e. ‘from a cause’ descends from] *hetumanuṣyebhyaḥ* (A 4.3.81).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 4.3.81: *hetumanuṣyebhyo 'nyatarasyām rūpyaḥ* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tata āgataḥ* 74]
[The *taddhita* affix] *rūpya* optionally occurs after a nominal stem conveying the sense of a cause or a human being [to denote ‘coming from X’].
- A 4.3.82: *mayā ca* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tata āgataḥ* 74 *hetumanuṣyebhyo 'nyatarasyām* 81]
[The *taddhita* affix] *mayāṭ* also [optionally] occurs [after a nominal stem conveying the sense of a cause or a human being to denote ‘who has come from X’].
- A 4.3.143: *mayāḍ vaitayor bhāṣāyām abhakṣyācchādanayoḥ* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
In the domain of spoken language,⁹⁰ [the *taddhita* affix] *mayāṭ* preferably occurs [after a nominal stem] to denote these two meanings (i.e., ‘transformation of X’ and ‘part of a whole of X’: A 4.3.134-135), excluding food or clothing.

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi explains the derivation of the *taddhita* derivative stem *sarvajñānamaya-* (referring to the noun *veda-*) by proposing two hypotheses. The first is the optional rule A 4.3.143, which teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *mayāṭ* in the meaning of ‘transformation of X.’ Medhātithi clearly refers to this rule by means of *tadvikāra*^o (a reference to the meaning constraint that descends

exist in the cause and is therefore non-permanent or better, it cannot arise except in dependence on something else (*parabhāva*). According to the first doctrine there is a risk that nothing can arise because everything already exists, whereas the second teaching suggests that something could even arise out of nothing. The earliest Indian school of philosophy promoted the *satkāryavāda* and thus almost all the following schools felt obliged to take sides for or against such a theory.

⁹⁰ As for a survey of the scholarly debate on the meaning of the term *bhāṣā* in Pāṇini, see Cardona (1976: 238).

from A 4.3.134).⁹¹ This is actually a *bhāṣāyaṃ* rule that is peculiarly applied to Manu's text unless this constraint is meant to exclude the Vedic *Samhitās*. The second hypothesis is to resort to A 4.3.82 by applying the same *taddhita* affix with the meaning of 'coming from X' (descending from A 4.3.74).⁹² Furthermore, he also refers to the Satkārya *darśana* to conclude that the Veda as an effect (*kārya*) pre-exists in its cause (*kāraṇa*), i.e. *sarvajñāna*-. In our view, the ultimate aim of this commentarial portion is to support the primary role of the Veda as a *dharmamūla* as the root of all knowledge by resorting to a Mīmāṃsā argument. Indeed, in the light of the Mīmāṃsā there are two domains: one accessible to perception (i.e. to the five senses) and one inaccessible to perception (access to which is via the Veda), i.e. *dharma*.

25. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.12 [E] (Pat)

vedaḥ smṛtiḥ sadācāraḥ svasya ca priyam ātmanah |
etac caturvidham prāhuḥ sāṅsād dharmasya lakṣaṇam || 2.12 ||

The Veda, the tradition (i.e. post-Vedic scriptures), the conduct of virtuous men, and what is dear to one's own self: they say this is the fourfold manifest characteristic of *dharma*.

[...] *yathā naiyāyikā anityaḥ śabdaḥ* (see e.g. NBh 1.1.35) *iti pratijñāya sādhanopanyāsaṃ kṛtvā nigamayanti tasmād anityaḥ śabda iti | prāyeṇa caiṣā granthakārāṇām rītiḥ | tathā mahābhāṣyakāro 'pi kvacit sūtram vārtikaṃ vā paṭhitvā vyākhyāya punaḥ paṭhati ||*

After postulating, just as the Naiyāyikas do, that language is non-permanent, after mentioning the evidence, they conclude: "Therefore, language is non-permanent" (see e.g. NBh 1.1.35). And as a rule, this is the common opinion of all the authors. Likewise, the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*, having explained a *sūtra* or a *vārttika* after reciting it, recites it again.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi deals with repetitions. He begins with a report that others explain this verse as serving the purpose of a summary (*upasaṃārārtham*) and that the repeated recitation indicates that the topic on the definition of *dharma* is concluded. Examples are then given from other genres. The Naiyāyikas, or logicians, postulate that speech is impermanent (see e.g. NBh 1.1.35). To state

⁹¹ A 4.3.134: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.42.

⁹² A 4.3.74: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.46.

this, Medhātithi uses the Nyāya technical term *pratijñā*- ('to postulate'). Then, they bring forth their evidence and close off their argument by concluding that speech is impermanent. Again, Medhātithi uses the Nyāya technical term *nigam*- ('to conclude'); by the way, the *nigamana* is the fifth part of a syllogism. In this argument, Medhātithi mentions Patañjali as another example of a Sāstrin who states something to explain one of Pāṇini's *sūtras* or one of Kātyāyana's *vārttikas* and then repeats it at the conclusion of the discussion.

26. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.13 [TE] (A*)

arthakāmeṣv asaktānām dharmajñānaṁ vidhīyate |
dharmam jñāsamānānām pramāṇam paramam śrutiḥ || 2.13 ||

The knowledge of *dharma* is prescribed for those who are not attached to riches and pleasures. For those who want to know the *dharma*, the Veda is the supreme authoritative means of knowledge.

[...] *dharmajñānaṁ dharmānuṣṭhānaṁ* [...] *jñāyate 'sminn iti jñānam anuṣṭhānam ity ucyate* (see A 3.3.117) | [...]

[The compound] *dharmajñāna*- [means] 'undertaking the *dharma*.' [...] [The compound constituent] *jñāna*- is called in this way because it is that in which the action of knowing is realised' (see A 3.3.117).

Rule referred to:

- A 3.3.117: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the *kṛt* derivative stem *jñāna*- (right-hand constituent of the compound *dharmajñāna*-), explaining that it is formed with the *kṛt* affix *Lyuṭ*, here denoting the substratum where the action of knowledge is carried out; the inferred rule is A 3.3.117.

27. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.16 [J] (A*)

niṣekādiśmaśānānto mantrair yasyodito vidhiḥ |
tasya śāstre 'dhikāro 'smiñ jñeyo nānyasya kasyacit || 2.16 ||

The prerogative of [studying] this treatise should be recognised to the one for whom the injunction beginning with the ritual for impregnation (*niṣeka*) and ending with that in the crematorium (*śmaśāna*) is taught by *mantras* and [it should] not [be recognised] to anyone else.

viduṣā brāhmaṇenedam adhyetavyam (MDh^M 1.103) *iti paṭhanti* | *sa cārthavādaḥ* | *tatra tavyapratyayadarśanāt* (see A 3.1.96) *kasyacid vidhibhrāntiḥ syāt* | *tathā ca sati kṣatriyavaiśyayor adhyayanam nivartata*⁹³ *ity etadāśaṅkānivṛttyartho*⁹⁴ *'yaṃ ślokaḥ kṣatriyavaiśyayor prāptiṃ darśayati* | *tathā yathākāmī śūdro 'py apratiśedhād adhyetum pravarteta tannivṛttyartham apīty evaṃ imaṃ*⁹⁵ *ślokaṃ pūrve vyācacaḥsire* | *śāstraśabdo 'yaṃ mānavagranthavacanah* | [...]

They read *viduṣā brāhmaṇenedam adhyetavyam* ('This has to be studied by a well-educated Brāhmaṇa') (MDh^M 1.103), and this is an explanation (i.e. it is not an injunction). Here, somebody could be given a false impression of an injunction due to the perception of the affix *tavya* (in the future passive participle *adhyetavya*- found in MDh^M 1.103) (see A 3.1.96), and, that being the case, this verse whose purpose is to exclude any doubt that Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas are excluded from studying [it] (i.e. Manu's treatise), shows that Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas are capable of pursuing it (i.e. that they can study Manu's treatise). Similarly, older [commentators] explained this verse as follows, i.e. as having the purpose of excluding that even a Śūdra, if he so wishes, may begin to study [it] (i.e. Manu's treatise) because of the absence of an [explicit] prohibition (i.e. the prohibition that prevents Śūdras from studying Manu's treatise). This word-form *śāstra*- [here] indicates the composition belonging to Manu.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.96: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.103.

Comment:

In this section, before starting to comment on the verse itself, Medhātithi recalls his previous explanation of future passive participles found in MDh^M 1.103 to once again maintain that even though it seems to be an injunction (*vidhi*), it is actually only an explanation (*arthavāda*). He prevents the reader from inferring a restriction from the future passive participle *adhyetavyam* (i.e. that only Brāhmaṇas can study Manu's treatise) by explaining that, in fact, Kṣatriyas and

⁹³ Mandlik, Gharpure and Olivelle feature the variant reading *nivartate*. Jha and Dave present the variant reading *nivarteta*, which is the reading in manuscripts J and S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 26).

⁹⁴ Gharpure and Jha feature the variant reading *ity edāśaṅkānivṛttyarthah*, which however makes no sense. The other editions contain the current variant reading *ity etadāśaṅkānivṛttyarthah*.

⁹⁵ The reading given by the editions of the *Manubhāṣya* is *imaṃ*. The variant *idaṃ* in Olivelle's electronic edition is likely a typo.

Vaiśyas can also study it because the nature of the verse is explanatory and not prescriptive.

The link between the previous comment on MDh^M 1.103 and that on MDh^M 2.16 may be both grammatical and thematic in nature. As regards the grammatical side, it can be found in the *kr̥tya* affixes applied to *adhyetavya-* (used in MDh^M 1.103) and *jñeya-* (used in MDh^M 2.16), respectively *tavya* for the former (taught in A 3.1.96) and *yaT* for the latter (taught in A 3.1.97).⁹⁶ As for the thematic aspect, it may lie in what Medhātithi says about older commentators' interpretations of MDh^M 1.103, i.e. that Manu's text did however exclude Śūdras from studying Manu's treatise even though there is no explicit prohibition for this. The first part of the rest of the commentary on this verse focuses on the term *adhikāra* ('prerogative') and develops around which social classes have the prerogative to study Manu's treatise. Contrary to what the older commentators stated, Medhātithi believes that even though Śūdras may pragmatically study Manu's treatise, they will not be able to understand its contents; thus, they would never be able to perform any rites since this lack of understanding keeps them unlearned.

28. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.23 [E/J] (A*²)

kṛṣṇasāras tu carati mṛgo yatra svabhāvataḥ |
sa jñeyo yajñiyo deśo mlecchadeśas tv atah paraḥ || 2.23 ||

Where the spotted antelope (*Antilope cervicapra*) lives naturally, that place should be known as fit for sacrifices, but beyond it, there is the foreigners' land.

[...] *nanu ca nābhivyāpaka evādheyo yena*
kṛtsnādhārābhivyāptyaivādhikaraṇārthanirvṛttiḥ syāt tileṣu tailam (ŚveUp 1.15)
itivat | kiṃ tarhy ekadeśasaṃbandhināpy ādheyena bhavati
kṛtsnasyādhārābhāvah (see A 1.4.45) *prāsāda āste ratham adhitiṣṭhatīti | evam*
iha⁹⁷ grāmanagarasamudāyasya nadīparvatāntādyavadhikasya deśasya
prakṛtatvād ekadeśe 'pi parvatāranyādaucaran sarvam ādhārīkaroti | tenāyam
adoṣaḥ mūrtayor naikadeśaḥ saṃbhavati | [...]

And one may object that [the deer] must not be strictly placed in the [whole] extension (*abhivyāpaka*), with respect to the principle according to which there should be the fulfilment of the meaning of [the *kāraka* called] *adhikarāṇa* just by

⁹⁶ A 3.1.97: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.23.

⁹⁷ The reading in the editions of the *Manubhāṣya* is *iha*. The variant *hi* in Olivelle's electronic edition is likely a typo.

means of the extension of the whole substratum (*ādhāra*), as in the case of *tileṣu tailam* ('sesame oil in the sesame seeds', ŚveUp 1.15). But rather the condition of being a substratum (*ādhāra*) belonging to a whole is also realised by means of anything to be placed when it is only partly connected to a portion [of it] (i.e. the substratum) (see A 1.4.45), [such as] when it is said *prāsāda āste* ('he is sitting in the house') and *ratham adhitiṣṭhati* ('he is standing on the chariot'). Thus, due to the subject of [our] discussion about the place which is a group of villages and towns and whose boundaries are rivers, foothills and the like, [the deer] who is moving even in a part of the mountains, in the forests and so on makes the whole [place its] substratum (*ādhāra*).

[...] *kṛtyo* (see A 3.1.97) '*pi jñeya ity adhyāropitavidhyartho jartilayavāgvā juhuyād itivā vidhivā nīgadārthavāda eva* | [...]

When it is said *jñeya*, a *kṛtya* affix (namely *yaT*: see A 3.1.97) is also applied with the meaning of a superimposed injunction, as when it is said "he should present an oblation of wild sesamum and rice gruel" (*jartilayavāgvā juhuyāt*) as if it were an injunction, but it is only an explanation (*arthavāda*) of the sacrificial formula.

Rules referred to:

- A 1.4.45: *ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam* [*kārake* 23]
[In the domain of *kāraṇas*], the one denoting the substratum is termed *adhirakaṇa*.
- A 3.1.97: *aco yat* [*dhātoḥ* 91 *kṛtyāḥ* 95]
[The *kṛtya* affix] *yaT* occurs [after a verbal base] ending in *aC* (= in a vowel sound).

Comment:

In the first excerpt of this commentary, Medhātithi employs the grammatical terminology used in A 1.4.45 (in the context of attributions of the names of the *kāraṇas*) when the designation of *adhikaraṇa* is given to the substratum (*ādhāra*). The scholar specifies that the notion of substratum can refer to both a whole entity and a part of it. For instance, when it is said *prāsāda āste* ('he is sitting in the house'), it is clear that he is sitting in a single part of the house even though the whole house is mentioned, and, when it is said *ratham adhitiṣṭhati* ('he is standing on the chariot'), it is clear that the action only regards a single part of the chariot. It is noteworthy that the accusative case used in the second example is considered

as an *adhikaraṇa* in accordance with A 1.4.46⁹⁸, while the first example regularly has a *saptamī vibhākti* (i.e. the ending of the locative case) according to A 2.3.36.⁹⁹

The second excerpt comments on the future passive participle *jñeya-* (formed by adding the affix *yaT* to the verbal base *jñā-* following A 3.1.97), with constant reference to the topic of the presence of an injunction or simply an explanation. By recalling the formula *jartilayavāgvā juhuyāt* (“he should present an oblation of wild sesamum and rice gruel”), Medhātithi shows that what seems to be a *vidhi* is indeed just an *arthavāda*. As Olivelle notes in his *Manubhāṣya* transcription, a paper by Muroya (2009-2010) is helpful in providing a better understanding of this passage. The latter scholar reconstructed the lost text of the *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* where we find a similar discussion about the formula *jartilayavāgvā juhuyāt*. which, despite being a Vedic injunction, is never found in Vedic sources. Just as happens in Medhātithi’s argument, the Nyāya text in question ultimately classifies this formula as an explanatory statement that only resembles an injunction and is not an injunction in itself.

29. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26 [TE] (A*, Vt*)

vaidikāḥ karmabhiḥ punyair niṣekādir dvijanmanām |
kāryaḥ śarīrasaṃskāraḥ pāvanaḥ pretya ceha ca || 2.26 ||

As far as the twice-borns are concerned, the purifying cleansing of the body, beginning with the ritual of impregnation, should be performed by means of auspicious Vedic ritual actions after death and in this world.

mantraprayogā vaidikakarmāṇi | vedā mantrā ihābhipretāḥ | teṣāṃ yāny uccāraṇāni tāni tatra bhavāni (see A 4.3.53) | *ato ’dhyātmāditvāt ṭhañ*¹⁰⁰ (see M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60) | *vedamūlatvād vopacarito vaidikaśabdaḥ | karmaśabdena cetikartavyatārūpaṃ karma grhyate* | [...]

The Vedic rites are recitations of *mantras*. Here, *vedāḥ* (i.e. the plural form of *veda-*, as the etymon of *vaidika-*) are intended as *mantrāḥ*. [Why are the *karmāṇi* called *vaidikāṇi*?] Those which are utterances of X [here *vedāḥ* = *mantrāḥ*] are

⁹⁸ A 1.4.46: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.75.

⁹⁹ A 2.3.36: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.192.

¹⁰⁰ The reading in all the editions of the *Manubhāṣya* is *ato ’dhyātmāditvāt ṭhak*. However, following Jha’s translation (1999: III, 245), we have emended the text to *ato ’dhyātmāditvāt ṭhañ*. Cf. also Medhātithi’s *usus scribendi* in Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44: *ātmāditvāt ṭhañ kartavyaḥ*.

in the place X (see A 4.3.53). Hence, the affix *ṭhañ* occurs because of the existence of the list beginning with *adhyātma-* ('soul') (see M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60). Otherwise, the word-form *vaidika-* is figuratively undertaken because of its being rooted in the Veda and, by means of the word-form *karman-*, an action whose characteristic is an obligation (lit. 'the fact that it must be carried out in this way') is intended.

Rule and passage referred to:

- A 4.3.53: *tatra bhavaḥ* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[A *taddhita* affix among those taught from A 4.1.83 onwards occurs after a nominal stem] to denote 'being in the place X.'
- M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60: *samānasya tadādeś ca adhyātmādiṣu ceṣyate*
And [the *taddhita* affix] *ṭhañ* should be applied to the nominal stem *samāna-* ('same'), a nominal stem beginning with it, and [the word-forms] of the list beginning with *adhyātma-* ('soul').

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the *taddhita* derivative stem *vaidika-*. In accordance with the *vigraha* which the scholar proposes in his commentary (*tatra bhavāni*), we assume that he derives such a nominal stem based on A 4.3.53 for the output meaning and Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60 (M 2.310) for the *taddhita* affix applied. Rule A 4.3.53 teaches to apply one of the affixes taught from A 4.1.83 onwards to denote 'being in the place X' (*tatra bhavaḥ*). Following Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60 (M 2.310), the affix at stake is *ṭhañ* (according to the emended text of this *Manubhāṣya* passage, for which see below). This *vārttika*, appended to A 4.3.60,¹⁰¹ teaches to apply such an affix to the nominal stem *sāmana-*, one beginning with it, or one included in the *adhyātmādi* list ('soul and the like'), which is an exemplificative list, as asserted in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (see KV *ad* A 4.3.60: *adhyātmādir ākṛtigaṇaḥ*). In this regard, Patañjali proposes the following examples: *sāmānika-* ('of equal rank'), *sāmānadeśika-* ('coming from the same place'), *ādhyātmika-* ('relating to the soul'), *ādhydaivika-* ('spiritual'), *ādhibhautika-* ('relating to created beings'). This *vārttika* supplies an extension of the application of the affix *ṭhañ* to nominal bases other than the *avyayībhāva*

¹⁰¹ A 4.3.60: *antaḥpūrvapadāt ṭhañ* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *prāg dīvyato 'n* 4.1.83 *tatra bhavaḥ* 53 *avyayībhāvāt* 59] "[The *taddhita* affix] *ṭhañ* [occurs after a nominal stem consisting of an *avyayībhāva* compound] whose left-hand constituent is *antar-* ('within') [to denote 'being in the place X']]"

compounds taught by A 4.3.60. The stem *vaidika-* can also be considered formed by adding the *taddhita* affix *ṭhañ* due to the exemplificative nature of the *adhyātmādi* list.

Now, we must explain why we decided to emend this portion of Medhātithi's text to *ato 'dhyātmāditvāṭ ṭhañ*. All the editions agree with the reading *ato 'dhyātmāditvāṭ ṭhak*. The latter affix (introduced by A 4.2.60¹⁰²) might be applied with the meaning *tatra bhavaḥ* ('being in the place X') taught by A 4.3.53. However, the *ukthādi* list mentioned in A 4.2.60 is not exemplificative, so that it is far from certain that the etymon *veda-* is included. By contrast, the citation of the *adhyātmādi* list in this portion of the *Manubhāṣya* clearly shows that there is a precise reference to Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60 (M 2.310 l. 9).¹⁰³ This emendation is strengthened by Medhātithi's *usus scribendi*, as there is almost an exact parallel in another *Manubhāṣya* passage (Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44: *ātmāditvāṭ ṭhañ kartavyaḥ*) in the section relating to the word-form *āvikasūtrika-*. Given that a corruption of *ṭhañ* in *ṭhaK* is a plausible hypothesis, we proceeded with the emendation of the text.

30. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.28 [J] (A*)

svādhyāyena vratair homais traividyenejyayā sutaiḥ |
mahāyajñaiś ca yajñaiś ca brāhmīyaṃ kriyate tanuḥ || 2.28 ||

A body is made *brāhmīya* by means of his own recitation [of the Veda], religious observances, fire oblations, the threefold knowledge, making offerings, offspring, the great sacrifices and [common] sacrifices.

[...] *stutiḥ kriyata iti ca vartamānāpadeśaḥ | na vidhivibhaktiḥ | tatra kuto brahmaprāpteḥ phalatvāvagamaḥ | na cātra karmāṇi vidhīyante yenādhikārākāṅkṣāyām*¹⁰⁴ *saty api vartamānanirdeśe* (cf. A 3.2.123)

¹⁰² A 4.2.60: *kratūkthādisūtrāntāṭ ṭhak* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tad adhīye tad veda* 59] "[The *taddhita* affix] *ṭhaK* occurs after the nominal stem *kratu-* ('sacrificial rite'), one listed in the group beginning with *uktha-* (a particular kind of recitation), or one ending with *sūtra-* [to denote 'one studies or knows X']."

¹⁰³ Indeed, while the text he edited bears the abovementioned reading with *ṭhak*, Jha's translation (1999: III, 245) was the first to identify the reference to the *taddhita* affix *ṭhañ* and the relevant *vārttika* by Kātyāyana.

¹⁰⁴ The reading in the editions of the *Manubhāṣya* is *yenādhikārākāṅkṣāyām*. The reading *yenādhikārākāṅkṣyāyām* in Olivelle's electronic edition is likely a typo.

*rātrisattre*¹⁰⁵ *pratiṣṭhāvat* (cf. PB 23.2.4) *phalanirdeśaḥ syāt* (cf. Śab *ad* PMS 4.3.17-18) | [...]

And, when it is said *kriyate* (lit. ‘he is done’), praise is what assigns the present tense: there is no ending conveying an injunction. Whence, in this context, is it understood that there is an effect [coming from] attaining Brahman? In this context, no actions are enjoined, so that, since there is expectancy of specifying what is entitled to obtain [the effect], despite in the case of the indication of the present tense (cf. A 3.2.123), there should be an indication of an effect as in the case of [the verbal base] *pratiṣṭhā-* (cf. PB 23.2.4) [in the performance of] a *rātrisattra* (cf. Śab *ad* PMS 4.3.17-18).

Rule referred to:

- A 3.2.123: *vartamāne laṭ* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91]
The substitutes of the *lakāra* *laṭ* occur [after a verbal base] to denote the present tense.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi questions the passive present form *kriyate* (from the verbal base *kr-* ‘to do’) to check whether it is used as an injunction or whether it is out of line with the previous passages regarding injunctions, specifically Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6: this actually explains the references to the *rātrisattra* example (elaborated within the Mīmāṃsā school: cf. Śab *ad* PMS 4.3.17-18) in the *Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa* (PB 23.2.4) where the verbal form *pratiṣṭhanti* is analysed as having an injunctive sense. In the case under scrutiny, the commentator concludes that there is an extra-indication of the effect even though the present tense (formed by means of the substitutes of the *lakāra* *laṭ*, introduced by A 3.2.123) is used.

31. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.30 [TE] (A*)

nāmadheyaṃ daśamyām tu dvādaśyām vāsyā *kārayet* |
punye tithau muhūrte vā nakṣatre vā guṇānvite || 2.30 ||

One should perform the ceremony of giving a name on his tenth or twelfth day, on an auspicious lunar day or time slot, or under a propitious constellation.

¹⁰⁵ We have decided to standardise the spelling of *rātrisattra-* to the more common *rātrisattra-*.

daśamyām tithau dvādaśyām vāsyā dārakasya nāmadheyam kurvīta | nijartho (cf. A 3.1.26) *na vivakṣitaḥ | tathā ca grhyam daśamyām utthāpya pitā nāma karoti* (PārGS 1.17.1) *iti* | [...]

One should perform the ceremony of giving a name to him, i.e. a child, on the tenth or twelfth lunar day. The [causative] sense of the affix *ṆiC* (cf. A 3.1.26) is not intended to be signified. And, likewise, a *Grhyasūtra* says: “The father assigns the name on the tenth [day], after causing him (i.e. his son) to stand up” (PārGS 1.17.1).

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.26: *hetumati ca [dhātoḥ 22 ṇic 25]*
[The affix] *ṆiC* also occurs [after a verbal base] to denote the causal agent.

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi comments on the causative optative verbal form *kārayet* (formed from the verbal base *kr-* ‘to do’), maintaining that, even though it is morphologically a causative form according to A 3.1.26, it does not have a causative meaning. To support this, Medhātithi compares the verse with a prose section from a *Grhyasūtra* (PārGS 1.17.1), where a simple present tense (*karoti*) is used instead of a causative one.

32. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.31 [TE] (A*⁴)

maṅgalyam *brāhmaṇasya syāt kṣatriyasya balānvitam |*
vaiśyasya dhanasaṃyuktam sūdrasya tu jugupsitam || 2.31 ||

[The name] of a Brāhmaṇa should be one conferring happiness, of a Kṣatriya, one endowed with power, of a Vaiśya, one relating to wealth, and for a Sūdra, one abhorred.

[...] *maṅgalāya hitam* (see A 5.1.5) *tatra vā sādhu* (see A 4.4.98) *māṅgalyam iti vyutpattiḥ | abhimatasyārthasya cirajīvitvabahudhanāder dr̥ṣṭādr̥ṣṭasukhaphalasya siddhir maṅgalam | tadabhidhānam eva śabdasya hitatvam sādhutvam ceti taddhitasiddhiḥ | sādhutvam nābhipretārthasiddhipratipādanam eva vivakṣitam | kiṃ tarhi ya āśāsyate tadvacanenaiva siddhiḥ | samāsād āyusiddhiḥ dhanasiddhiḥ putralābha ityādeḥ pratīyate | taddhitād vā hitanimittaprayojanārthīyāt* (cf. A 5.1.5, A 5.1.38, A 5.1.109) *| tatra grhye taddhitāntam pratiśiddham kṛtam kuryān na taddhitam* (PārGS 1.17.2) *iti* | [...]

The [*taddhita*] derivation of [the word-form] *māṅgalyam* is in the sense of ‘beneficial for well-being (see A 5.1.5) or ‘good at [ensuring] well-being’ (see A 4.4.98). Well-being [means] the accomplishment of a desired object, which is longevity, abundant wealth and the like, and which has perceptible and imperceptible pleasure as its effect. The realisation of the *taddhita* affixation consists of the characteristic of being suitable (*sādhutva*) as well as that of being beneficial (*hitatva*) proper to the word-form [*maṅgalya-*], precisely as its denotation. Accomplishing the realisation of the intended meaning, i.e. the characteristic of being beneficial, is not the object of the intention of the speaker. But rather there is realisation of that (i.e. the intended meaning) which is desired just by means of [a word] that expresses it. It is recognised on the basis of a compound such as *āyusiddhi-* (‘realisation of long life’), *dhanasiddhi-* (‘realisation of wealth’), *putralābha-* (‘obtaining children’) or on the basis of a *taddhita* standing for ‘suitableness’ (cf. A 5.1.5), ‘reason’ (cf. A 5.1.38) or ‘purpose’ (cf. A 5.1.109). But in the *Gr̥hyasūtra* corpus, [a name] ending in a *taddhita* affix is prohibited: “One should apply a *kṛt* and not a *taddhita*” (PārGS 1.17.2).

Rules referred to:

- A 4.4.98: *tatra sādhuḥ* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *yat* 47]
[The *taddhita* affix *yaT* occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘good at X.’
- A 5.1.5: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.108.
- A 5.1.38: *tasya nimittaṃ saṃyogotpātau* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[A *taddhita* affix occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘reason of X’ provided that a ‘connection’ (*saṃyoga*) or a ‘calamity’ (*utpāta*) is denoted.
- A 5.1.109: *prayojanam* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1. *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *ṭhañ* 108]
[The *taddhita* affix *ṭhañ* occurs after a nominal stem] to denote “X is his/her/its purpose.”

Comment:

In this passage dealing with the proper names of Brāhmaṇas, Medhātithi explains the *taddhita* formation of the word-form *māṅgalya-* as being derived from the nominal stem *maṅgala-* (‘well-being’) with the addition of the *taddhita* affix *yaT*

according to A 4.4.98 or A 5.1.5.¹⁰⁶ The former rule teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *yaT* to denote the meaning of ‘good at X’, while the latter rule teaches to apply it to denote that of ‘beneficial for X.’ In conclusion, he makes a parallel between compounds and *taddhitas* that convey the same intended meaning. The aim is to make known that the usage of a *taddhita* in *maṅgalya-* suggests a preferred linguistic morphology in assigning Brāhmaṇas’ names. As evidence of this, Medhātithi quotes a passage from the *Pāraskaragṛhyasūtra* (1.17.2), which prohibits the use of names ending in *taddhita* affixes instead of *kṛt* affixes. This statement is also found in the grammatical tradition, namely in the *Paspaśā* of Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.4.1.24).

For the sake of completeness, Medhātithi’s comment on MDh^M 2.31 continues the discussion of the auspicious names of Brāhmaṇas, which can be summarised as follows. He argues that a name such as Devadatta must be either *maṅgale sādhu* (based on A 4.4.98) or *maṅgalāya hitam* (based on A 5.1.5). For this to be the case, the word-form *devadatta-* must somehow convey something auspicious. This can be understood from compounds such as *dhanasiddhi-*, or from *taddhita* derivatives such as *gavya-* (‘something good for cows’) and *śaraṇya-* (‘someone good at providing protection’). In these examples, the intended object is mentioned (*dhana-*, *go-*), but this is not the case with Devadatta. We could create names such as *gavya-* or *śaraṇya-*, which would be auspicious, but the prohibition against using *taddhita* suffixes in legal treatises rules out this option. Therefore, Medhātithi concludes that we should use names that explicitly express the intended meaning (*abhipretārtha*), such as Gośarman and Dhanaśarman.

33. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 [TL/E] (P, A, A^{*3}, KV*, N*)

garbhāṣṭame ’bde kurvīta brāhmaṇasya upanāyanam |
garbhād ekādaśe rājño garbhāt tu dvādaśe viśaḥ || 2.36 ||

One should perform the ceremony of the sacred thread of a Brāhmaṇa in the eighth year after conception; [that] of a Kṣatriya [should be performed] in the eleventh [year after conception], and [that] of a Vaiśya [should be performed] in the twelfth [year after conception].

[...] *upanayanam evaupanāyanam svārthiko ’n* (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38) | *anyeṣām api dṛśyate* (A 6.3.137) *ity uttarapadasya dīrghaḥ* | *chāndasatvād vobhayapadavṛddhiḥ* | [...]

¹⁰⁶ The *taddhita* affix *yaT* extends from A 4.4.75 to A 5.1.5 according to Bhate (1989: 10).

[The word-form] *aupanāyana-* stands for *upanayana-* after which [the *taddhita* affix] *añ* occurs in the stem's own meaning (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38). The long vowel of the second *pada* occurs according to *anyeṣām api dṛśyate* (A 6.3.137). Otherwise, the *vrddhi* of both *padas* depends on its being a *chandas* feature.

*bhagavāṃś ca pāṇinir evam eva pratipanno rājñāḥ karma rājyam iti rājyaśabdasya rājaśabdam prati prakṛtitvaṃ*¹⁰⁷ (see A 5.1.124) *bruvann eva janapadaisvaryeṇa rājaśabdārthaprasiddhim āha* (cf. A 4.1.168) | [...]

And the Venerable Pāṇini, after obtaining in this way *rājyam* as *rājñāḥ karma* ('the chief's action') by speaking in favour of the word-form *rājan-* ('chief') as being the etymon of the word-form *rājya-* ('chiefdom') (see A 5.1.124), says that the common meaning of the word *rājan-* is that of 'chief of a country' (cf. A 4.1.168).

Rules and passages cited or referred to:

- A 4.1.168: *janapadaśabdāt kṣatriyād añ* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[The *taddhita* affix] *añ* [occurs after a nominal stem], which is a word-form meaning a territory (*janapada*) and, at the same time, a warrior clan (*kṣatriya*), to denote 'descendant of X.'
- A 5.1.124: *guṇavacanabrāhmaṇādibhyaḥ karmaṇi ca* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tasya bhāvaḥ* 119 *ṣyañ* 123]
[The *taddhita* affix] *ṣyañ* [occurs after a nominal stem] consisting in a word denoting a quality or belonging to the list beginning with *brāhmaṇa-* to denote ['state of X'] and 'action [of X].'
- A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- A 6.3.137: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.10.
- KV *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- N *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.

¹⁰⁷ Mandlik and Gharpure present the variant reading *prati prakṛtitvaṃ*, which is then found in Olivelle. Instead, Jha has the variant reading *rājaśabdam prakṛtiṃ*, which was then also used by Dave. In his textual notes, Jha (1924: I, 33) accounts for the following readings: "for *rājaśabdam prati prakṛtitvaṃ* M and F. N. read *rājyaśabdam*; N and S read *rājaśabdam prakṛtiṃ*, which is right." In our view, the latter is, however, a *lectio faciliior*, which we decided to discard in favour of *prati prakṛtitvaṃ*.

Comment:

In the first excerpt of the commentary, Medhātithi explains the formation of *aupanāyana-* as a *taddhita* derivative stem from *upanayana-* with the addition of the *taddhita* affix *aN*. The scholar designates the derivative stem as *svārthika* with respect to its etymon *upanayana-* (‘Vedic initiation’). Indeed, as noted above (see our comment on Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71), this technical term—not occurring in Pāṇini—is traditionally associated with the *taddhita* rules that are included between A 5.3.1 and 5.4.160 (see e.g. KV *ad* A 5.3.1). The relevant rule we think that is applied here is A 5.4.38, which is explicitly referred to by Medhātithi in a similar passage (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.38). This rule teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *aN* which retains the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*: see also KV *ad* A 5.4.38) to a nominal stem part of the *prajñādi* list. The latter is not considered as an exemplificative list (*ākṛtigāṇa*) by the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. However, the *Nyāsa* later considers it an *ākṛtigāṇa* (see N *ad* A 5.4.38), thus making it possible to apply this affix *aN* here and in the other passages.

The second rule (A 6.3.137), quoted in full in the text, deals with the replacement of the short vowel *a* with the matching long vowel *ā*. It should be noted that the etymon of the *taddhita* derivative stem *aupanāyana-*, i.e. the nominal stem *upanāyana-*, is read as a compound combining the *upasarga* *upa-* with the *kṛt* nominal stem *naṇana-* (formed from the verbal base *nī-* ‘to lead’). For the sake of completeness, we report that all the traditional examples relating to A 6.3.137 present the long vowel replacement in the first constituent. Alternatively, Medhātithi asserts that the *vṛddhi* of both *padas* in the *taddhita* derivative stem (*aupa-* < *upa-*; *nāyana-* < *naṇana-*) depends on it being a *chandas* feature. The latter has to be considered “metrical” because such a word-form does not occur in the Vedic corpus, at least as far as our research on the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit* has shown.¹⁰⁸ Medhātithi plausibly assumes that the two vowels under analysis underwent *vṛddhi* to fit into the sequence $\cup - \cup X$ (here forming a diiamb: $\cup - \cup -$), which is typical of *pāda* b in the *pathyā* form of the *śloka* metre.

Further on in this commentary, Medhātithi raises another issue, i.e. what is the specific meaning of the word-form *rājan-* (‘chief’). As discussed in a section we have excluded because of its length, Medhātithi understands this word to be synonymous with *kṣatriya-* for three reasons: a) it is preferably used as *kṣatriyajāti* in the books (*grantheshu*); b) two other *varṇa* names are employed in

¹⁰⁸ See the relevant page on the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit*: http://www.sanskrit-linguistics.org/dcs/index.php?contents=abfrage&word=aupanāyana&query_type=1&sort_by=alpha (accessed 03/12/2025).

this very *śloka*; c) the term *kṣatriya* is used instead of *rājan* in MDh 2.42ff. where some details of the same *upanayana* ceremony are explained. Next, Medhātithi remarks that the word-form *rājan-* also conveys the sense of ‘chief of a country’ (*janapadeśvara*) even if the relevant chief is not a warrior (*kṣatriya*). Nevertheless, it is classified as a secondary sense (*gauṇa*), which can only be applied when the primary meaning (*mukhya*) is not appropriate. In the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*, the word-form *rājan-* stands for *kṣatriya-* as it is involved in ĀśGS 1.17.1-4,¹⁰⁹ cited in the commentary.¹¹⁰

Moving to the second excerpt, Medhātithi advances a further piece of evidence about the assumed meaning of *rājan-* that depends on Pāṇini’s teachings relating to this word-form. In this case, the grammarian is cited by name. Medhātithi accredits Pāṇini with the derivation of the *taddhita* derivative stem *rājya-* from the nominal base (*prakṛti*) *rājan*, based on, in our view, A 5.1.124. This rule teaches to form *taddhita* derivative stems by applying the *taddhita* affix *Ṣyaṅ* to a nominal stem meaning a quality or included in the *brāhmaṇādi* list to denote ‘status of X’ or ‘action of X.’ We have chosen to indicate this Pāṇinian rule since the word-form *rājan-* is included in such a list. Furthermore, from a morphological point of view, another rule is also implied, i.e. A 6.4.168,¹¹¹ where the formation of the *taddhita* derivative stems such as *rājya-* with the zero-replacement of *-an-* in its etymon (*rājan*) constitutes an exception to this rule. The latter teaches to retain the original form with *an* before an affix beginning with the semivowel *y*, provided that the derivative nominal stem does not convey the sense of status or action. Ultimately, when Medhātithi comes to the conclusion that Pāṇini himself had recognised the common meaning of *janapadeśvara* for *rājan*, we believe that he might have had rule A 4.1.168 in

¹⁰⁹ ĀśGS 1.17.1-4: *aṣṭame varṣe brāhmaṇam upanayed ekādaśe kṣatriyaṃ dvādaśe vaiśyaṃ* “One should initiate a Brāhmaṇa in the eighth year [after birth]; a Kṣatriya, at the eleventh; a Vaiśya, at the twelfth.”

¹¹⁰ We note that the arguments found in this section dealing with the semantic range of the term *rājan-* take up a Mīmāṃsā discussion (see PMS 2.3.3), to which Kumārila, likely Medhātithi’s principal source for the Mīmāṃsā-based discussions, also dedicated much attention (see Kum *ad* PMS 2.3.3). In this regard, see Yoshimizu (2020; 2024). Thanks to Monika Nowakowska for this indication.

¹¹¹ A 6.4.168: *ye ca abhāvakarmaṇoḥ [aṅgasya 1 bhāṣya 129 prakṛtyā 163 an 167]* “[The *aṅga* final sound of a *BHA* nominal stem ending in *-an* also retains its original form before an affix] beginning with the semivowel *-y-*, provided that it does not express a state or an action.”

mind, in which the name of a *janapada* and the name of a warrior clan (*kṣatriya*) are put on the same level.

34. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38 [TE] (A, A*²)

ā śōḍaśād brāhmaṇasya sāvitṛī nātivartate |
ā dvāviṃśāt kṣatrabandhoḥ | ā caturviṃśater viśaḥ || 2.38 ||

As far as a Brāhmaṇa is concerned, the Sāvitṛī formula does not elapse until the sixteenth year; as far as one born as a Kṣatriya is concerned, [it does not elapse] until the twenty-second [year]; as far as a Vaiśya is concerned, [it does not elapse] until the twenty-fourth [year].

[...] *evam ā dvāviṃśāt kṣatrabandhoḥ kṣatriyajātīyasyety arthaḥ | bandhuśabdo*
'yaṃ kvacit kutsāyāṃ pravartate | yat svaṃ katham vetsyi¹¹² brahmabandhav iti¹¹³
| jñātivacano yathā

grāmatā janatā caiva bandhutā ca sahāyatā | (see A 4.2.43)

mahendrasyāpy agamyā asau bhūmibhāgabhujaṃ kutaḥ ||

dravyavacano jātyantāc cha bandhunīti (A 5.4.9) | *tatra pūrvayor arthayor*
asaṃbhavāt tṛtīyo 'rtho grhyate | dvāviṃśateḥ pūraṇo dvāviṃśo 'bdaḥ
taddhitārthaḥ (see A 5.2.48) | [...]

In such a manner, *ā dvāviṃśāt kṣatrabandhoḥ* (lit. 'up to the twenty-second year for one whose *bandhu* is the warrior class'), i.e. the meaning is 'for one who belongs to a warrior caste.' In some cases, this word-form *bandhu-* occurs in the

¹¹² Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *ceccha* (so, conjunction *ca* + *iccha*, an imperative form conjugated in the second person singular in the Parasmaipada diathesis from the verbal base *iṣ-*). In contrast, Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *vetsya*. This appears to be based on manuscript S, according to a note by Jha (1924: I, 34). However, this cannot be accepted as it stands since it is not grammatically correct: the correct form is *vetsyi* (present indicative form conjugated in the second person singular in the Parasmaipada diathesis from the verbal base *vid-*). We opted for the emended reading *vetsyi* as it fits better in the context than *ceccha*.

¹¹³ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *bandhāv iti*. Instead, Jha and Dave present the variant reading *bandhav iti*. This appears to be based on manuscript S, according to a note by Jha (1924: I, 34). Ultimately, Olivelle has the variant *brahmabandha iti*. These two readings are both based on the vocative form *brahmabandho*, which has two regular *sandhi* solutions *brahmabandhav iti* (Jha and Dave) and *brahmabandha iti* (Olivelle). The former is rarer but still admitted, while the latter is the most common form. However, we have decided to stick with the former to avoid emending the text.

sense of contempt, such as for instance: “O Brāhmaṇa by birth only, how do you know what is your own?” [It also occurs] as an expression denoting a kinsman (*jñāti*), as for instance:

“The group of villages, the group of people, the group of kinsmen, and the group of allies (see A 4.2.43) are inaccessible even for the Great Indra: what about one among the possessors of portions of the earth?”

[It also occurs] as an expression denoting an individual substance (*dravya*), as in the case of rule *jātyantāc cha bandhuni* (A 5.4.9). In this context, due to the inapplicability of the first two meanings, the third meaning is selected. The ordinal of twenty-two [is called] *dvāvimśa-*: the denotation of the *taddhita*¹¹⁴ derivative stem [formed with the affix *Ḍaṭ* (see A 5.2.48)] is a year (*abda*).

ā caturvimśater viśaḥ | prāpto 'py atra pūraṇapratyayo (see A 5.2.48) *vṛttānurodhān na kṛtaḥ pratīyate tu tadarthaḥ | [...]*

“Until the twenty-fourth year” (*ā caturvimśater viśaḥ*): although, even in this case, [the *taddhita*] affix conveying ‘completing’ (i.e. *Ḍaṭ*, see A 5.2.48) could be applied, it is not realised due to metrical constraints, but recognised as denoting this meaning.

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 4.2.43: *grāmajanabandhusahāyebhyas tal* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tasya samūhaḥ* 36]
[The *taddhita* affix] *taL* [occurs after the nominal stems] *grāma-* (‘village’), *jana-* (‘people’), *bandhu-* (‘kinsman’), *sahāya-* (‘ally’) to denote ‘collection of X.’
- A 5.2.48: *tasya pūraṇe ḍaṭ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *saṁkhyāyāḥ* 47]
[The *taddhita* affix] *Ḍaṭ* [occurs after a nominal stem consisting of a *saṁkhyā*] to denote an ordinal number.
- A 5.4.9: *jātyantāc cha bandhuni* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[The *taddhita* affix] *cha* occurs [after a nominal stem] ending with *jāti-* to denote ‘individual kinsman.’

¹¹⁴ We remark that Medhātithi uses the term *taddhita* both in the meaning of secondary affix and in that of derivative nominal stems formed by applying that secondary affix (= *taddhitānta*) just as Pāṇini does.

Comment:

In the first excerpt from the commentary, the first two of Pāṇini's rules are merely involved in explaining the meaning of the word-form *bandhu-*, whereas the third is actually included in the grammatical interpretation of a segment of Manu's text. At the beginning, the word-form *bandhu-* is presented as a polysemous word. The first meaning is the pejorative one, i.e. that of contempt (*kutsā*), and it is introduced without any grammatical reference but with a short sentence cited as an example (*yat svaṃ kathaṃ vetsi brahmabandhav iti*).¹¹⁵ The second meaning is that of 'kinsman' (*jñāti*), documented through the instances of the application of rule A 4.2.43 (i.e. *grāmatā-*, *janatā-*, *bandhutā-*, and *sahāyatā-*): according to this rule, the *taddhita* affix *taL* is applied after the nominal stem *bandhu-* to form *bandhutā-*, which denotes a group of kinsmen. The third meaning is that of 'individual substance' (*dravya*), which is introduced by citing A 5.4.9, according to which a *taddhita* derivative such as *brāhmaṇajātīya-* ('an individual belonging to the *brāhmaṇa* class')¹¹⁶ is formed. The interpretation of *bandhu-* as an expression of *dravya-* may be inspired by the following sentence included in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* comment on this rule (KV *ad* A 5.4.9): *yena brāhmaṇatvādiḥ vyajyate tadbandhu dravyam* "The *bandhu* by means of which the class of Brāhmaṇahood and the like is distinguished is an individual substance (*dravya*).” In our opinion, Medhātithi employed Pāṇini's rules in this context as encyclopaedic references to single out different meanings of the word-form *bandhu-*. However, even in the other three rules involving *bandhu-* in the

¹¹⁵ Compounds whose right-hand member is *bandhu-* employed as a pejorative qualifier are broadly used in Classical Sanskrit. For instance, in the *Mahābhārata*, *brahmabandhu-* occurs as "an insult addressed to wayward Brahmins" (Brodbeck 2009: 140). The same compound also occurs with the same meaning in Vedic sources: see e.g. KS 10.6 and ChUp 6.1.1.

¹¹⁶ This translation is in line with Sharma's interpretation (1987-2003: IV, 668-669) of this Pāṇinian rule. Cf. Katre (1987: 616), who translated the constraint *bandhuni* to denote connection or appropriateness and the example *brahmaṇajātīya* as "proper or associated with a [B]rahmin, belonging to a [B]rahmin." Cf. Renou (1966: II, 85), who translated the same constraint as "pour désigner une substance qui adhère à (la notion d'espèce, c'est à dire qui la caractérise ou s'y approprie)" and the same example as "qui convient au type de gens appelés brāhmanes."

Aṣṭādhyāyī (i.e. A 6.1.14,¹¹⁷ 6.2.109,¹¹⁸ 6.3.85),¹¹⁹ there is no reason to assign a different meaning. Finally, let us note that the verse he cites as an example to illustrate the second meaning is undoubtedly a *śloka*, but its source is unknown. In the last part of this first passage, Medhātithi comments on the word-form *dvāviṃśa-*, of which a *vigraha* is supplied, i.e. *dvāviṃśateḥ pūraṇaḥ* (lit. ‘completing twenty-two’). This *taddhita* derivative stem is formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *Daṭ* to a nominal stem consisting of a numeral according to rule A 5.2.48 to denote its ordinal counterpart. In the second excerpt, Medhātithi eventually explains the reason why the numeral stem *caturviṃśati-* (‘twenty-four’) and not the *taddhita* derivative stem *caturviṃśa-* (formed following rule A 5.2.48) is found in Manu’s text, i.e. due to the metrics.

35. Medh ad MDh^M 2.41 [TE/E] (P, A, A*², M*, KV*)

kārṣṇarauravabāstāni | *carmāṇi brahmacārīṇaḥ* |
vasīraṇaṁ ānupūrvyeṇa | *śāṇakṣaumāvīkāni* | *ca* || 2.41 ||

The Vedic students should wear the skins of a black antelope, Ruru antelope or he-goat and [garments] of hemp, linen and wool following the order (of *varṇas*).

kṛṣṇaśabdo yady api kṛṣṇagunayuktavastumātre vartate kṛṣṇā gauḥ kṛṣṇaḥ kambala iti tathāpīḥa smṛtyantarāt (see YSm 1.2) *rauravasāhacaryāc ca mṛga eva pratīyate* | *rurur mṛgajātivīśeṣaḥ* | *bastāḥ chāgaḥ* | *sarvatra vikāre* ‘*vayave vā taddhitaḥ*’ (see A 4.3.154; see also KV ad A 6.2.1) | [...]

Although the word-form *kṛṣṇa-* (‘black’) [constituting the etymon of the *taddhita* derivative stem *kārṣṇa-*] is just used in the mere sense of ‘an object endowed with the quality of blackness’, as when it is said ‘black cow’, ‘black blanket’,

¹¹⁷ A 6.1.14: *bandhuni bahuvrīḥau* [*śyaṇaḥ samprasāraṇam* 13] “[A *samprasāraṇa* replacement of the affix *Śyaṇ* occurs] in a *bahuvrīḥi* compound ending, provided that *bandhu-* (‘relative’) constitutes its final constituent.”

¹¹⁸ A 6.2.109: *nadī bandhuni* [*pūrvapadam* 1 *udāttaḥ* 64 *antaḥ* 92 *bahuvrīḥau* 106] “[The left-hand constituent of a *bahuvrīḥi* compound] denoting a river [is high-pitched in the last syllable] when *bandhu-* (‘relative’) combines [as the right-hand constituent].”

¹¹⁹ A 6.3.85: *jyotirjanapadarātrinābhināmagoṭrarūpasthānavarṇavaryovacanabandhuṣu* [*uttarapade* 31 *saḥ* 78 *samānasya* 84] “[The word-form *samāna-* ‘same’ is replaced with *sa-* when compounded with the nominal stems *jyoti-* (‘kinsman’), *janapada-* (‘people’), *rātri-* (‘night’), *nābhi-* (‘navel’), *nāman-* (‘name’), *gotra-* (‘family’), *rūpa-* (‘form’), *sthāna-* (‘place of standing’), *varṇa-* (‘colour’), *varyo-* (‘age’), *vacana-* (‘speech’), and *bandhu-* (‘relative’).

nevertheless, in this case, it is only understood as ‘deer’ (in particular, the black antelope) due to [its occurrence in] another *Smṛti* (see YSm 1.2) and the association with *raurava-*. [The word-form] *ruru-* [constituting the etymon of the *taddhita* derivative stem *raurava-* denotes] a species of deer (i.e. the species labelled as *picta*). [The word-form] *basta-* [constituting the etymon of the *taddhita* derivative stem *bāsta-* denotes] the he-goat. In all these cases, the *taddhita* [affix *añ* occurs] in the sense of ‘modification’ or ‘part’ (see A 4.3.154; see also KV *ad* A 6.2.1).

[...] *caśabdaḥ samuccaye* (see M 1.434 ll. 9-10 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29) | [...]

The word-form *ca* occurs to denote collection.

ucyate | bhaved etad evaṃ yadi bhedenā nirdeśaḥ syāt samasaṃkhyātvam ca | iha tu brahmacāriṇa ity ekaśabdopādānān na kramo 'vagamyate | trayaś ca brahmacāriṇaḥ | śaḍ anudeśīnas trīṇi carmāṇi trīṇi vastrāṇi¹²⁰ | ānupūrvyagrahaṇe¹²¹ tu sati vākyaṅtaropāttaḥ krama āśrīyate | tathā ca carmabhiḥ sambadhyā punar brahmacāripadam āvartya vāsobhiḥ sambadhyate | tataḥ saṃkhyāśāmyasiddhiḥ | īdṛśa eva viśaye bhagavatā pāṇininī yatnaḥ kṛtaḥ yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām iti (A 1.3.10) ||

It is said [in reply]: it could be thus if there were a separate explicit mention and [if there were] equality in number. But, in this case, when it is said *brahmacāriṇaḥ* (i.e. a plural form), the order [of the *brahmacārins*] is not understood based on the usage of a single word-form. And there are three Vedic students referring to six items, i.e. three skins and three pieces of clothing. However, since there is the mention of *ānupūrvya* (‘order’), the order is mentioned on the basis of another sentence. In this manner, after connecting [them, i.e. the Vedic students] with the [word-forms for] ‘skins’, after repeating

¹²⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *trīṇi carmāṇi vastrāṇi* (the second *trīṇi* is omitted). The others present the variant reading *trīṇi carmāṇi trīṇi vastrāṇi*. This appears to have originally been Jha’s conjecture, which was then taken up by the other editors. Jha (1924: I, 35) notes: “*trīṇi carmāṇi vastrāṇi*—defective reading; S and N read *trīṇi vastrāṇi*; neither of these readings is in keeping with the preceding phrase *śaḍ anudeśīnaḥ*, which requires the reading *trīṇi carmāṇi trīṇi vastrāṇi*.” The proposed reading provides a clearer interpretation of Medhātithi’s text, so we have decided to maintain it.

¹²¹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *ānupūrvyagrahaṇe*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle contain the variant reading *ānupūrvyagrahane*, which appears to be the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 35). We have decided to use the latter variant reading as it actually fits better in the verse.

the word-form *brahmacārin-* again, it is connected with [the word-form for] ‘clothes.’ Therefore, equality in number is obtained. In such a context, an effort is made by the Venerable Pāṇini when he teaches *yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām* (A 1.3.10).

Rules and passages cited or referred to:

- A 1.3.10: *yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām*
Among sequences of the equal number (of items), there is (the criterion of) referring to the previous one in (a one-to-one) order.
- A 4.3.154: *prāṇirajatādibhyo 'ñ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tasya vikāraḥ* 134 *avayave* 135]
[The *taddhita* affix *añ* occurs after a nominal stem] meaning a living being (*prāṇin*) and included on the list beginning with *rajata-* (‘silver’) [to denote ‘transformation of X’ and ‘part of a whole of X’].
- M 1.434 ll. 9-10 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29: *samuccayaḥ | plakṣaś ceti ukte gamyata etad nyagrodhaś ceti* |
[The term] *samuccaya* [is here explained]. When it is said *plakṣaś ca* (‘and the Plakṣa tree’), this is understood: there is this and the Nyagrodha tree.
- KV *ad* A 6.2.1: *kārṣṇottarāsaṅgāḥ | kṛṣṇo mṛgaḥ tasya vikāraḥ kārṣṇaḥ prāṇirajatādibhyo 'ñ* (A 4.3.154) *iti añpratyayānto* [...] ‘Upper garments made of [the skin of] black antelope’ (*kārṣṇottarāsaṅga*, declined in the nominative masculine plural): [the *taddhita* derivative stem] *kārṣṇa-* is formed by applying the [*taddhita*] affix *añ* to *kṛṣṇa-* (‘black antelope’), i.e. [a species of] deer [to denote] ‘transformation of X’ according to *prāṇirajatādibhyo 'ñ* (A 4.3.154).

Comment:

In the first excerpt, Medhātithi focuses on three *taddhita* derivative stems, i.e. *kārṣṇa-* (‘made of/coming from the black antelope’), *raurava* (‘made of/coming from the *picta* deer’), and *bāsta* (‘made of/coming from the he-goat’), alluding to two of Pāṇini’s rules. According to A 4.3.154, these are formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *añ* in the sense of ‘transformation of X’ or ‘part of a whole of X’: these output meanings respectively descend from A 4.3.134¹²² and A 4.3.135.¹²³

¹²² A 4.3.134: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.42.

¹²³ A 4.3.135: *avayave ca prāṇyośadhivrkṣebhyaḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *prāg dīvyato 'ñ* 4.1.83 *tasya vikāraḥ* 134] “[A *taddhita* affix taught from 4.1.83 onwards

The use of this rule to form such *taddhita* derivative stems, particularly *kārṣṇa-*, is confirmed by a passage from the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 6.2.1), which Medhātithi may have had in mind.¹²⁴

In the second excerpt, Medhātithi reflects on the use of the conjunction *ca* in the meaning of collection (*samuccaya*). This is one of the four functions attributed to the particle *ca* together with *anvācaya* (‘subordination’), *itaretarayoga* (‘mutual connection’) and *samāhāra* (‘aggregation’) identified starting from Patañjali (see M 1.434 ll. 9-10 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29).¹²⁵

In the third excerpt, Medhātithi answers a possible objection regarding the need for using *ānupūrvyeṇa* (indicated through *yathākramaṃ* in the objection itself). He maintains that the language itself could be of help in matching the items to their possessors (i.e. the three Vedic students) by resorting to the syntactical principle taught by Pāṇini (who is just cited by name) in rule A 1.3.10. The latter teaches that what follows relates to what precedes in a one-to-one order when there is the same number of items expressed in the rule. In the case under analysis, it is clear that the match between the three Vedic students and the six items mentioned depends on a double match, namely, a first one with the three skins and a second one with the three pieces of clothing.

36. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.42 [TE] (A*, KV*)

mauñjī trivṛt samā śalkṣṇā kāryā viprasya mekhalā |
kṣatriyasya tu maurvī jyā vaiśyasya śaṇatāntavī || 2.42 ||

The belt of a Brāhmaṇa should be made as a smooth and soft triple cord of Muñja grass (i.e. *Saccharum Sara* Roxb.); [that of] a Kṣatriya [should be made] as a bowstring of Mūrvā hemp (i.e. *Sansevieria Roxburghiana* Schult.); [that of] a Vaiśya [should be made] of threads of Śaṇa hemp (i.e. *Cannabis Sativa* L.).

muñjas trṇajātis tadvikāro mauñjī (see A 4.3.134) | [...]

The Muñja is a species of grass (i.e. *Saccharum Sara* Roxb.): [the *taddhita* derivative stem] *mauñjī-* [means] its transformation (i.e. that the cord is made of Muñja grass) (see A 4.3.134).

occurs after a nominal stem] meaning a living being (*prāṇin*), a plant (*oṣadhi*), or a tree (*vṛkṣa*) to denote [‘transformation of X’] and ‘part of a whole of X.’”

¹²⁴ Our thanks to Victor D’Avella for this reference.

¹²⁵ Regarding the *samuccaya* meaning of *ca*, see Borghero (2023: 60-62).

śaṇatantuvikāraḥ śaṇatāntavī (see A 4.3.134) | *chāndasatvād uttarapadaṇṛddhiḥ* | *atha vā kevalāt tantuśabdāt taddhite kṛte tadantasya śaṇaiḥ saṃbandhaḥ śaṇānām tāntavīti* | *prakṛter*¹²⁶ *vikāraḥ* (see KV ad A 4.3.134) *śaṇatāntavī*¹²⁷ *prakṛtisambandhitayā vyapadiśyate* | *gavyam ghṛtam devadattasya pautraḥ iti* | [The *taddhita* derivative stem] *śaṇatāntavī-* [is formed to denote] the modification of a *śaṇatantu* ('thread of Śaṇa hemp', i.e. of *Cannabis Sativa* L.) (see A 4.3.134). The *ṛddhi* in the right-hand constituent (i.e. *tāntavī-*) depends on its being a *chandas* feature. Or rather, once the *taddhita* affix is applied to the sole word-form *tantu-* ('thread'), there is a combination of what ends in it (i.e., the *taddhita* affix) with *śaṇaiḥ* ('the fibres of hemp'), i.e. *śaṇānām tāntavīti* 'what (f.) is made of threads of hemp fibres.' *śaṇatāntavī-* is intended as a modification of [its] nature (i.e. of *śaṇatantu*, a thread of Śaṇa hemp) (see KV ad A 4.3.134) because of its being connected with its nature, as when it is said 'the cow's clarified butter' (*gavyam ghṛtam*) [and] 'Devadatta's grandson' (*devadattasya pautraḥ*).

Rule and passage referred to:

- A 4.3.134: *tasya vikāraḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *prāḡ dīvyato* 'ṇ 4.1.83]
[A *taddhita* affix taught from A 4.1.83 onwards¹²⁸ occurs after a nominal stem] to denote 'the transformation of X.'
- KV ad A 4.3.134: *prakṛter avasthāntaram vikāraḥ*
The modification is another state of nature.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the *taddhita* derivative stems *mauñjī-* and *śaṇatantavī-*, formed by adding the *taddhita* affix *aṇ* to denote 'transformation of X' according to A 4.3.134. In particular, Medhātithi introduces two alternative derivations for the stem *śaṇatantavī-*, either as a *taddhita* derivation from the

¹²⁶ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) present the variant reading *vikṛteḥ*, while the others read *prakṛteḥ*. This appears to be based on manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 36).

¹²⁷ Jha and Dave omit *śaṇatāntavī*, while Mandlik, Gharpure and Olivelle include it. This appears to be based on manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 36).

¹²⁸ According to Bhate (1989: 59), "nearly one hundred words" are grouped under the *arthādhikāra tasya vikāraḥ* (A 4.3.134) "which comprises 35 rules" up to the end of the chapter. The previous *arthādhikāra* runs from A 4.2.92 to A 4.3.133, i.e. traditionally, it does not go any further, even though A 4.3.134 belongs to the *aṇpratyayādhikāra* taught in A 4.1.83 which runs up to A 4.4.2 (see Bhate 1989: 62, fn. 7).

compound *śaṇatantu-* or as the combination of the word-form *śaṇa-* with the *taddhita* derivative stem *tāntavī-* (which is in turn derived from the etymon *tantu* ‘thread’). In this case, the scholar hints at A 4.3.134 even by emphasising the relationship between the nature of the hemp and the girdle made of hemp threads. It is possible that he felt obliged to provide this double explanation of the word-form *śaṇatāntavī-* because he expected the use of a *bahuvrīhi* feminine form of *śaṇatantu-*. The notion of *prakṛti* (*prakṛter vikārah*) is not involved either by Pāṇini or Patañjali but it is used in the passage from the *Kāśikāvṛtti* commenting on A 4.1.134, where *vikāra* is explained as *prakṛter avasthāntaram*. In our opinion, the aim of the two examples *gavyaṃ ghṛtam* and *devadattasya pautrah*, which are not included in the aforesaid *Kāśikāvṛtti* passage, is to highlight what is the original nature of the items denoted by the *taddhita* derivatives, namely a cow (*go*) and Devadatta’s son (*putra*). It is noteworthy that this original nature is conveyed by the *prakṛtis*, respectively *go* and *putra*, which are the etymons, i.e. the nominal bases from which the derivative stems at stake derive.

Alternatively, Medhātithi considers the *ṛddhi* vowel *ā* in *°tāntavī-* as a *chandas* feature, likely hinting at its occurrence in the Vedic corpus (as detailed by research on the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit*: see e.g. GB 1.2.4.14-16).¹²⁹

37. Medh ad MDh^M 2.44 [TL] (A*², Vt*)

kārpāsam upavītam | syād viprasayordhvavṛtam trivṛt |
śaṇasūtramayaṃ rājño vaiśyasyāvikasautrikam |¹³⁰ || 2.44 ||

The sacred thread of a Brāhmaṇa should be a triple cord made of cotton; [that of] a Kṣatriya [should be] made of threads of Śaṇa hemp; [that of] a Vaiśya [should be] made of wool shag.

upavītaśabdena vāsovināśaviśeṣa ucyate | vakṣyaty uddhṛte dakṣiṇe pāṇau
 (MDh^M 2.63) *iti | tac ca dharmamātram | tasya na kārpāsātā sambhavaty ato*

¹²⁹ See the relevant page on the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit*: <http://www.sanskrit-linguistics.org/dcs/index.php?contents=lemma&IDWord=97083> (accessed 03/12/2025).

¹³⁰ The variant reading *°sautrikam* is found in 13 manuscripts, a few works of the indirect tradition and most printed editions of the *Mānavadharmasāstra* including all the editions containing the *Manubhāṣya* (for the critical apparatus, see Olivelle 2005: 410-411). However, we note that it is not well-tuned to Medhātithi’s commentarial section, where the compound at stake is read as *āvikasūtrikam* or *avikasūtrikam* without discussing the right-hand constituent *sūtrika-* (and not *sautrika-*); the latter variant reading is the one chosen by Olivelle (2005: 410).

dharmeṇa dharmī lakṣyate yasyāsau vinyāsaḥ tat kārṇāsam ucyate | arśāāditvād vā matvarthīyo 'kāraḥ kartavyaḥ (see A 5.2.127) *upavītavad upavītam iti* | [...] By means of the word-form *upavīta-* (lit. 'worn', here 'invested with the sacred cord'), the peculiarity in the way it is worn (lit. 'placed') as a garment¹³¹ is expressed. He will wear [it] "when the right hand is raised" (*uddhṛte dakṣiṇe pāṇau*: MDh^M 2.63), and it is merely the feature [of how it is worn]. Its feature of being made of cotton is not realised; therefore, the bearer of the feature is characterised by the feature (because the qualifier *kārṇāsa-* cannot qualify a way of dressing). What is said to be *kārṇāsa-* is that which is worn in this way. Or rather, since [the word-form *upavīta* can be part] of the list beginning with *arśas-* ('haemorrhoids'), the sound *a* (indeed, the *taddhita* affix *aC*)¹³² in the [possessive] meaning of *matUP* should be applied (see A 5.2.127): [following this derivation process], *upavītam* is 'that to which the *upavīta* belongs.'

*avir*¹³³ *meṣas tasya sūtram tena kṛtam āvikasūtrikam | adhyātmāditvāt ṭhañ*¹³⁴ *kartavyaḥ* (see M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60) | *āvikasūtrikam iti vā paṭhitavyam | tatra ca matvarthīyena ṭhanā rūpasiddhiḥ* (see A 5.2.115) ||

[The word-form] *avi-* [means] 'sheep': its thread [is *āvikasūtra-*]; that which is made by it is *āvikasūtrika-*. [The *taddhita* affix] *ṭhañ* should be applied since [the etymon can be part] of the list beginning with *adhyātma-* ('soul') (see M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60). Or rather, it should be read as *āvikasūtrika* (i.e. with an initial short *a-*), and, in this case, the accomplishment of the form is by means of [the *taddhita* affix] *ṭhaN* in the sense of *matUP* (see A 5.2.115).

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 5.2.115: *ata inīṭhanau* [pratiṭṭhikāt 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tasyāsty asmin iti* 94 *anyatarasyām* 96]

¹³¹ While all the editions print *vāsa-* separately, we take it as being part of the compound *vāsovinīyāsaviśeṣa-*, because we interpret it as a modifier of *vinīyāsa-*.

¹³² As for the use of a compound ending with *kāra-* conveying a sound in the place of a technical term for an affix, see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46.

¹³³ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *avikaḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *aviḥ*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 36).

¹³⁴ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *adhyātmāditvāt ṭhañ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *adhyātmāditvāt ṭhañ*.

[The *taddhita* affixes] *inI* and *ṭhaN* [optionally] occur [after a nominal stem] ending with a short vowel *-a* [to denote ‘X belongs to Y’ or ‘X exists in Y’].

- A 5.2.127: *arśaādibhyo 'c* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tad asyāsti asmin* 5.2.94]
[The *taddhita* affix] *aC* [occurs after a nominal stem] of the list beginning with *arśas-* (‘haemorrhoids’) [to denote ‘X belongs to Y’ or ‘X exists in Y’].
- M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.

Comment:

In the first commentarial excerpt, Medhātithi gives two alternative explanations of the word-form *upavīta-* (literally meaning ‘worn’, as a past passive participle of the verbal base *upavye-* ‘to put on the sacred thread’ or ‘invest oneself with the sacred thread’). For the first explanation, he analyses it as a metonymy in which the feature of being worn replaces the garment’s name. He demonstrates this by reflecting on the qualifier *kārpāsa-* (‘made of cotton’) which cannot refer to the way something is worn but rather to the item itself. For the second explanation, he resorts to rule A 5.2.127 that teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *aC* (indicated by means of the compound *akāra-* conveying the sound *a* instead of the relevant morpheme) to a nominal stem of the *arśaādi* list (‘haemorrhoids and the like’), which is an *ākṛtigāṇa* (see KV *ad* A 5.2.127), to denote ‘X belongs to Y’ or ‘X exists in Y.’

In the second excerpt, the scholar focuses on the word-form *āvikasūtrika-*, which is explained as a *taddhita* derivative stem. To explain its formation, he refers to the application of the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaÑ*, taught by A 4.3.60,¹³⁵ according to Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60 M 2.310 l. 9. In this way, the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaÑ* should be applied to the compound *avikasūtra-* (‘woollen shag’) to form *āvikasūtrika-* (lit. ‘being in woollen shag’; here meaning ‘made of woollen shag’). Later, Medhātithi proposes another reading, i.e. *avikasūtrika-*, where the initial vowel is not subject to *vṛddhi* replacement because the alternative *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN* is assumed instead of *ṭhaÑ* according to A 5.2.115. The latter rule teaches to apply the *taddhita* affixes *inI* and *ṭhaN* to nominal stems ending in the short vowel *-a* in order to form derivative stems meaning ‘X belongs to Y’ or ‘X exists in Y.’ In the case at stake, the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN* would be applied to the compounded nominal stem *avikasūtra-* (‘woollen thread’), which is a nominal base ending in

¹³⁵ A 4.3.60: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.

a short *-a*. In the latter case, the *vṛddhi* replacement of the initial vowel (requested by the *anubandha* *Ñ* in the case discussed above) does not take place since it is not provided for by the *anubandha* *N*.

38. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.46 [TE] (A*)

keśāntiko *brāhmaṇasya daṇḍaḥ kāryaḥ pramāṇataḥ |*
lalāṭasaṃmito rājñaḥ syāt tu nāsāntiko viśaḥ || 2.46 ||

As far as the height of the staff of a Brāhmaṇa is concerned, it should be from the ground to the hairline; [the height of the staff] of a Kṣatriya should reach that of the forehead, and [the height of the staff] of a Vaiśya from the ground [should be] up to the nose.

ākāraviśeṣavacanā daṇḍasabdāḥ | dīrghaṃ kāṣṭhaṃ saṃmitāyāmam¹³⁶ daṇḍa ity ucyate | kiyat tasya dairghyam ity apekṣāyām āha | keśāntaṃ gacchati prāpnoti keśāntago mūrddhapramāṇaḥ¹³⁷ | pādāgrād ārabhya mūrddhāvadhiḥ keśāntagaḥ | keśā vānto 'syeti keśāntakaḥ | samāsāntaḥ kakāraḥ (see A 5.4.154) | [...]

The word-form *daṇḍa-* (lit. ‘staff’) expresses a specific shape: a *daṇḍa* is said to be a long stick whose extension has a given measurement. In expectation of a question like this, [Manu] answers what its length is. What goes up to, i.e. reaches, the hairline is *keśāntaga-*, which has the measurement of the head; that whose limit is the head starting from the tip of the feet is *keśāntaga-*. Otherwise, since it is said that it ends at the hairline, it is called *keśāntaka-*: the syllable *ka* is a *samāsānta* (see A 5.4.154).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.4.154: *śeṣāt vibhāṣā [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 bahuvrīhau 113 samāsāntāḥ 68 kaP 151]* [The *taddhita samāsānta* affix *kaP*] marginally [occurs after a nominal stem at the end (A 1.1.72) of a *bahuvrīhi* compound] to denote a residual meaning other than those previously taught.

¹³⁶ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *kāṇḍasaṃmitāyāmam*. Jha, Olivelle and Dave present the variant reading *kāṣṭhaṃ saṃmitāyāmam*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 37). We opted for the latter reading as it makes better sense.

¹³⁷ Mandlik features the variant reading *mūrddhāpramāṇaḥ*. All the others present the variant reading *mūrddhapramāṇaḥ*, which we decided to maintain.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the staff (*daṇḍa*) whose length depends on the social class of the owner. As regards a Brāhmaṇa's staff, Medhātithi proposes two variant readings for the qualifier word: a) *keśāntaga-* ('which goes up to the hair'); b) *keśāntaka-* ('whose end is the hair'). As Medhātithi himself explains, the latter is formed by applying the *taddhita samāsānta* affix *kaP*, which, in our view, is the rule taught by A 5.4.154. This rule teaches to apply this affix to a *bahuvrīhi* compound that has a different meaning to those covered by the preceding rules. We report that there is a difference in the *Manubhāṣya* between the text of the verse (where we find *keśāntika-*) and the commentary (which instead presents *keśāntaka-*). Neither of the two proposed variants was selected by Olivelle (2005: 411), who preferred the variant reading *keśāntiko*, which appears in most of the witnesses. The variant readings cited by Medhātithi, namely *keśāntago* and *keśāntako*, are found respectively in two (i.e. Lo⁵ and Ox³) and three manuscripts (i.e. Lo¹, Lo⁴, and Pu¹⁰). Ultimately, we consider it significant that Medhātithi does not suggest an alternative reading.

39. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.52 [TE/J] (A*⁴)

āyusyaṃ prāṇmukho bhuṅkte yaśasyaṃ dakṣiṇāmukhaḥ |
śrīyaṃ *pratyāṇmukho bhuṅkte ṛtaṃ bhuṅkte hy udaṇmukhaḥ* || 2.52 ||
 One facing eastward [while eating] enjoys longevity; one facing southward, glory; one facing westward, prosperity; one facing northward, truth.

[...] *ime kāmīyā eva vidhayaḥ | śrīyam icchan śrīyaṃ kyajantāc*¹³⁸ *chatā kṛtaḥ* (see A 3.1.8; 3.2.124) | *śrīyai hitaṃ vā śrīyam iti makārāntaḥ pāṭha āyusyādivat* (see A 5.1.5) | *prāṇyaṅgatvāt svārthe bhujir vartate | tathā ṛtaṃ*¹³⁹ *bhuṅkte iti | śrīyaṃ bhojanāt prāpnotīti | tathā ca dvitīyāntaḥ pāṭhaḥ śrīyam iti | tādārthye vā caturthī śrīyai pratyag iti | [...] antareṇāpi vidhipratyayam aprāptatvād vidhyarthāvagatiḥ pañcamalakārādikalpanayā* (see A 3.4.7) | *evam etad digvibhāgena bhojanaṃ phalaviśeṣārtham* | [...]

These rules are just optional (i.e. they depend on the desire of the rule observers).

¹³⁸ Mandlik contains the variant reading *śrīyam icchan śrīyaṃ na kyajantāt*. The others feature the variant reading *śrīyam icchan śrīyaṃ kyajantāt*, which fits better in the context.

¹³⁹ Mandlik has the variant reading *yathā ṛtaṃ*. Gharpure (1st) features the variant reading *tathā kṛtaṃ*. The others present the variant reading *tathā ṛtaṃ*. This is the reading in manuscripts M and S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 39).

[The word-form] *śriyan*, [which means] ‘desiring prosperity’ (*śriyam icchan*), is formed by adding [the present participle affix] *ŚatR* (see A 3.2.124) [to the nominal stem] ending in [the denominative affix] *KyaC* (see A 3.1.8). Or rather, the reading [should be] *śriyam* ending with the letter *-m* [in the meaning of] ‘beneficial for prosperity’, such as [in the word-form] *āyusya-* (‘giving long life’) and the like (see A 5.1.5). The verbal base *bhuj-* (lit. ‘to eat’, here ‘to enjoy’) is used in its own meaning (i.e. ‘to eat’) because [the face] is considered as a limb of a living being. Likewise, “one enjoys truth” (*ṛtaṃ bhuñkte*); “one reaches prosperity by eating [facing the west]” (*śriyaṃ bhojanāt prāpnoti*). And therefore, the reading is the second ending (i.e. the accusative) *śriyam*. Or rather, [another reading is] the fourth case (i.e. the dative *śriyai*) in the sense of ‘for the sake of that’ as when it is said ‘facing the west for the sake of prosperity.’ [...] Even without the affix conveying the injunction, because it is not obtained, the meaning of injunction is understood by assuming [the occurrence of the substitutes of] the fifth *lakāra* (*LET* = subjunctive) (see A 3.4.7). Thus, the action of eating by means of the distinction of the cardinal points aims at a specific outcome.

Rules referred to:

- A 3.1.8: *supa ātmanaḥ kyac* [*karmaṇaḥ icchāyām vā* 7]
[The affix] *KyaC* [optionally] occurs after an inflected noun [expressing the object of the formed verbal base] denoting ‘one’s own [wish]’ (i.e. of the agent).
- A 3.2.124: *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv aprathamāsamānādhikaraṇe* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *vartamāne* 123]
[The *kṛt* affixes] *ŚatR* and *ŚānaC* [occur after a verbal base] in place of *LAṬ* (= present), [provided that the action is in the present tense] and when *LAṬ* is not co-referential with an inflected noun ending in the nominative case.
- A 3.4.7: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6.
- A 5.1.5: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.31.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi first comments on the word-form *śriyan*, explaining that it is a present participle formed by adding the *kṛt* affix *ŚatR* taught by A 3.2.124 to the denominative verbal base *śriya-*, which is in turn formed by applying the affix *KyaC* according to A 3.1.8 to the nominal base *śrī-* (‘prosperity’).

One may wonder why the final vowel of the nominal stem (i.e. *śri-*) from which the supposed denominative *śriyati* is derived is short and not long as in the case of the relevant nominative (i.e. *śrī-*). Indeed, Pāṇini forms this denominative verbal stem according to A 3.1.8 starting from the following input sentence: *ātmanah + śriyam* (i.e. the accusative form of the nominal etymon: see A 6.4.77)¹⁴⁰ + *icchati* = “he desires prosperity for himself.” In order to obtain the nominal stem used for the derivative verbal stem at stake, a replacement of the nominal ending *-am* with zero (of *LUK* type) is required according to A 2.4.71.¹⁴¹ Thus, a zero-replacement of *-am* results in *śriy-* to which the *KyaC* affix applies. The final *y* of *śriy-* is then zero-replaced in accordance with A 6.4.155,¹⁴² interpreted after Patañjali’s reading, which extends this rule beyond the series of three affixes mentioned by Pāṇini (M 3.230 ll. 7-8 *ad* A 6.4.155).¹⁴³ After the first proposal, he introduces the variant reading *śriyam*, which is explained in two ways:

- a) the accusative form of the *taddhita* derivative stem obtained by applying the *taddhita* affix *yaT* to the feminine nominal stem *śrī-* in the sense taught by A 5.1.5, i.e. ‘beneficial for X’ (to which the abovementioned rule A 6.4.155 also applies);¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁰ A 6.4.77: *aci śnudhātubhruvām yvor iyaṇuvāṇau [aṅgasya 1]* “*iyaN* and *uvaN* replace the vowel *i* and *u* final [of an *aṅga*] which ends in the *Śnu* affix or consists of a verbal base or consists of the nominal stem *bhru-* (‘eyebrow’).” We assume that, in the case under scrutiny, the starting point is the verbal base *śrī-* (‘to shine’).

¹⁴¹ A 2.4.71: *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ [luk 58]* “[*LUK* zero-replacement] of a nominal case ending which occurs as a part of a verbal base or of a nominal stem.”

¹⁴² A 6.4.155: *teḥ [aṅgasya 1 bhasya_129 lopah 147 iṣthemeyassu 154]* “[There is zero-replacement] of the *TI* syllable (i.e. that which begins with the final vowel of a linguistic item: see A 1.1.64) [of an *aṅga* of a *BHA* nominal stem before the *iṣthaN*, *imanIC*, and *īyasUN* affixes].”

¹⁴³ M 3.230 ll. 7-8 *ad* A 6.4.155: *kiṃ punar idaṃ parigaṇanam āhosvid udāharaṇamātram | udāharaṇamātram ity āha [...]* “But is this an exhaustive list or merely an example? He (i.e. Pāṇini) answers that it is merely an example.” One instance that Patañjali offers is the verbal form *prāpayati* obtained from *priyam ācaṣṭe* (‘he calls [someone] dear’), by applying the causative affix *ṆiC*. In this form, there is a zero-replacement of the ending *-am* and a zero-replacement of *-y-* occurs according to A 6.4.155. For the complete derivation, see Sharma (1987-2003: 5, 550).

¹⁴⁴ In this case, the input for the derivation of the *taddhita* is *śriyai hitam*, from which we obtain the *aṅga* (referring to the *taddhita* affix *yaT*) *śriy-* by applying the zero-replacement of the dative ending through A 2.4.71; at this point, it is necessary to apply again A 6.4.155.

b) the accusative form of the feminine nominal stem *śrī-*, i.e. *śriyam*, as an alternative form of *śrīm* (see also Kiparsky 2012: 3).

He ultimately proposes another variant reading *śriyai*, i.e. the relevant dative form, instead of *śriyam*, used to signify the aim of the action of ‘eating with one’s face turned to the west.’

Moreover, in the last section of this excerpt, the scholar again concentrates on the injunctive sense of this verse, which is realised by assuming that the verbal form *bhuñkte* (from the verbal base *bhuj-*, lit. ‘to eat’, here ‘to procure’) is conjugated in the subjunctive mood, i.e. formed by means of the substitutes of the *lakāra* *lEṭ* (i.e. subjunctive): in the latter case, thanks to rule A 3.4.7, it is possible to infer the injunctive force (generally provided by the substitutes of the *lakāra* *lIN*, i.e. optative) in the subjunctive verbal forms.

40. Medh ad MDh^M 2.53 [E] (A)

upa^{sprśya} dvijo nityam annam adyāt samāhitah |
bhuktvā copas^{sprśet} samyag adbhiḥ khāni ca sam^{sprśet} || 2.53 ||

A twice-born should always eat food after sipping water while being intent on (the food itself), and after eating, he should properly sip water and he should wash his orifices with water.

ācamanopasprśatisābdau samānārthau śuddhyarthasamśkāraviśeṣavacanau śiṣṭavyavahārād avagamyete | [...] sprśeh sāmānyaviśayatve 'pi prayogo niyāmakah | [...] puṣyasiddhyau (A 3.1.116) *nakṣatramātre paṭhyete viśeṣe ca vartete | [...]*

[The *nomen actionis*] *ācamana-* (‘sipping water from the palm of the hand’) and the verb *sprśati* (‘he sips water’) are understood as two word-forms endowed with the same meaning expressing the specific ritual action of purification (namely the action of sipping water from the palm of the hand) as is expected by the daily linguistic usage of well-educated people. [...] Despite the broad general semantic dominion of the [verbal base] *sprś-*, its usage is subject to a restriction. [...] [For instance], according to *puṣyasiddhyau* (A 3.1.116), [the *nipātana* verbal derivatives *puṣya-* and *siddhya-*] are only listed in the sense of (specific) asterisms and are used in this specific sense.

Rule cited:

- A 3.1.116: *puṣyasiddhyau nakṣatre* [*dhātoḥ* 91 *kṛt* 93 *kyap* 106]
[The *kṛt* affix *KyaP* occurs after verbal bases] to derive the future passive participle *puṣya-* and *siddhya-* as *nipātanas* in the sense of ‘asterism.’

Comment:

In this case, in order to explain the restricted use of the similarly polysemic verbal base *sprś-* ('to touch'), used here in the specific ritual sense of sipping water, Medhātithi uses the example of the two ready-made forms (*nipātana*) *puṣya-* and *siddhya-* taught by A 3.1.116 with the restricted sense of specific asterisms even though their etymons are the polysemic verbal bases *puṣ-* ('to flourish') or *sidh-* ('to succeed').

41. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.54 [TL] (A)

*pūjayed aśanam nityam adyāc caitad akutsayan |
drṣtvā hr̥ṣyet prasīdec ca pratinandec ca sarvaśaḥ || 2.54 ||*

[A twice-born] should always respect food and should eat it without despising it. After seeing [it], he should be pleased and satisfied and should accept [it] willingly at all times.

[...] *sarvaśaḥ sarvadā | anyatarasyām* (A 5.4.42) *iti vyavasthitavibhāṣā vijñānāt saptamyarthe śas*¹⁴⁵ *kartavyaḥ | sarvadeti vā paṭhitavyam || sarvaśaḥ* ('completely') [means] 'at all times.' The affix *śas* should be applied in the sense of a locative due to the understanding of a limited option (*vyavasthitavibhāṣā*) according to *anyatarasyām* (A 5.4.42). Or rather, [the variant reading] *sarvadā* should be read.

Rule cited:

- A 5.4.42: *bahvalpārthāc chas kārakād anyatarasyām* [pratipādikāt 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[The *taddhita* affix] *śas* optionally occurs [after a nominal stem] meaning *bahu-* ('many') and *alpa-* ('a few') as a *kāraka*.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the locative sense of the *taddhita* derivative stem *sarvaśas*, formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *śas* to the pronominal stem *sarva-* ('all') in accordance with the optional rule A 5.4.42. This rule teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *śas* to a synonym for *bahu-* ('many') and *alpa-* ('a few') provided that they express a *kāraka*.

¹⁴⁵ The reading in the *Manubhāṣya* editions is *śas*. The reading *śam* in Olivelle's electronic edition is likely a typo.

42. Medh ad MDh^M 2.56 [TE/J] (A*²)

nocchiṣṭam *kasyacid* *dadyān nādyād etat tathāntarā* |
na caivātyaśanam kuryān na cocchiṣṭaḥ kvacid vrajet || 2.56 ||
 [The Vedic student] should not give the leftovers to anyone, he
 should not eat between [meals], he should not eat immoderately, he
 should not wander about when he still has leftovers on him.

pātrīstham annam āsyasparśadūṣitam ucchiṣṭam ucyate | *tan na kasyacid dadyād*
 [...] | *caturthyām prāptāyām ṣaṣṭhī sambandhamātranīṣedhārthā* (see A 2.3.50)
 | *ye 'pi dattam idam asmabhyam iti na vidus teṣām api bhojanāya na*
*prakalpyam*¹⁴⁶ *śvabidaḥlādīnām* | *na hy atra dadātyarthaḥ paripūrṇaḥ*¹⁴⁷
*svatvanivṛttimātram dātuh parasya svatvāpattir*¹⁴⁸ *nāsti* (cf. A 1.4.32; A 2.3.13)
 | [...]

Food remaining in a dish that has been contaminated by contact with the mouth is called ‘leftovers’ (*ucchiṣṭa*). One should not give this to anyone [...]. Even though the dative case ending is expected, the genitive case ending occurs with a meaning that rejects the mere sense of relation (see A 2.3.50). It (i.e. the leftovers) should not be assigned to eat even to those who do not know “this has been given to us”, i.e. dogs, cats and the like. Indeed, in this context, the meaning of the verbal base *dā-* is not fully expressed. There is merely the cessation of ownership on the part of the giver, [but] there is no appropriation on the part of another one (i.e. the receiver) (cf. A 1.4.32; A 2.3.13).

Rules referred to:

- A 1.4.32: *karmaṇā yam abhipraiti sa sampradānam* [*kārake* 23]
sampradāna is the designation on which the agent targets as recipient [of the action] through the patient.
- A 2.3.13: *caturthī sampradāne* [*kārake* 1.4.23]

¹⁴⁶ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *prakalpaṃ*. The others present the variant reading *na prakalpyam*, which is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 40).

¹⁴⁷ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *paripūrṇa*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *paripūrṇaḥ*.

¹⁴⁸ All the *Manubhāṣya* editions but Olivelle’s feature the reading *satvāpattiḥ*. Olivelle conjectures *svatvāpattiḥ*, also based on Jha’s translation of this portion (1999: III, 304): “[I]t does not involve the producing of the proprietary right in the recipient.” We have decided to adopt the latter, as it makes more sense in the context.

[In the domain of *kāraḥas*], the dative ending occurs to denote the recipient.

- A 2.3.50: *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*

The genitive case ending occurs to denote the residual meaning.

Comment:

Medhātithi reflects on the use of the genitive case of *kasyacit* instead of the expected dative (cf. A 2.3.13). He explains that, in this case, the prototypical sense of *sampradāna* as the one who appropriates something of which the giver has transferred ownership (almost in line with A 1.4.32) does not occur. In view of this, the genitive is used in its place to denote this type of relation, which may be considered as being allowed by A 2.3.50. However, another possibility to which Medhātithi might have thought is resorting to A 2.3.62,¹⁴⁹ which is a specific rule teaching the use of the genitive in the sense of dative in *chandas*. However, this implies that, however, Medhātithi reads this verse as part of a *chandas* text.

43. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.58 [TE/TL] (A*⁴)

brāhmeṇa vipras tīrthena nityakālam upaspr̥śet |
kāyaḥtraidaśikābhyām vā na pitryeṇa kadācana || 2.58 ||

A Brāhmaṇa should sip water at all times by means of the lines of the hand dedicated to Brahmā or Prajāpati or the deities (lit. ‘thrice-ten deities’) but never to the ancestors.

[...] *brāhmeṇety etad api stutyartham eva | brahmā devatāsyeti* (see A 4.2.24) | *na hi tīrthasya devatā bhavaty ayāgarūpatvād amantratvāc ca | yāgarūpatām ca kenacid dharmeṇa śuddhihetutvādīnādhyāropya devatātaddhitaḥ | [...]*

When it is said *brāhmeṇa* (‘by means of [the lines of the hand] dedicated to Brahmā’), this also has only the purpose of praising. [This *taddhita* derivative stem means] ‘Brahmā is its deity’ (see A 4.2.24), because the deity [in the *vigraha*] is not ‘of the lines of the hand’ (*tīrthasya*) due to [its] not having the appearance of a sacrifice and [its] not being a *mantra*. The *taddhita* stem derived from [the name of] the deity (*devatātaddhita*) [is obtained] having superimposed the appearance of a sacrifice with some property, i.e. [its] being the cause of purification and the like, [onto the lines of the hand (*tīrtha*)].

¹⁴⁹ A 2.3.62: *caturthyarthe bahulam chandasi [ṣaṣṭhī 50]* “In the domain of Vedic literature, [the genitive case ending] occurs under various conditions in the sense of the dative case ending.”

evam tridaśā devatā asyeti traidaśikam | tridaśaśabdād devatāṇi kṛte svārthe kaḥ (cf. A 5.4.154; see A 2.2.25, 5.4.73) | *devatātvam ca pūrvavat* (see A 4.2.24) | [...]

Thus, [the *taddhita* derivative stem] *traidaśika-* ('dedicated to deities'; lit. 'dedicated to the thrice-ten deities') [means] 'its deities are thrice-ten.' [The *taddhita samāsānta* affix] *ka[P]* occurs [while retaining] the own meaning [of the base] (cf. A 5.4.154) after the word-form *tridaśa* (see A 2.2.25), after applying [the *taddhita* affix] *aN* in the sense of deity (see A 4.2.24), and the characteristics of being a deity are the same as the aforesaid ones (i.e. in the case of *brāhma-*).

Rules referred to:

- A 2.2.25: *saṅkhyayāvyayāsannādūrādhikasamkhyāḥ saṅkhyeye [samāsaḥ 2.1.3 bahuvrīhiḥ 23]*¹⁵⁰
An indeclinable, [the nominal stems] *āsanna-* ('near'), *adūra-* ('not distant'), *adhika-* ('surplus') and the *saṅkhyās* combine with another *saṅkhyā* in the sense of enumeration [to form a *bahuvrīhi* compound].
- A 4.2.24: *sā 'sya devatā [pratipādikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76]*
[A *taddhita* affix, i.e. *aN*, occurs after a nominal stem] to denote 'X is his/her/its deity.'
- A 5.4.73: *bahuvrīhau saṅkhyeye ḍaj abahugaṇāt [pratipādikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 samāsāntāḥ 68]*
[The *taddhita samāsānta* affix] *ḍaC* occurs after a nominal stem [at the end of a] *bahuvrīhi* [compound] formed in the sense of enumeration, provided that it does not end in *bahu-* ('many') and *gaṇa-* ('troop').
- A 5.4.154: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.46.

Comment:

In the first commentarial excerpt, Medhātithi remarks on the *taddhita* derivative stem *brāhma-*, which is formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *aN* to the nominal stem *brahman-* according to A 4.2.24. The latter rule teaches to apply such a *taddhita* affix to form derivatives conveying the sense of 'X is his/her/its deity.' The second excerpt provides a longer grammatical note on the *taddhita* derivative stem *traidaśika-* (lit. 'dedicated to the thrice-ten deities', which, in Classical Sanskrit, simply means 'dedicated to the deities'). Its derivation process is explained as follows:

¹⁵⁰ The optionality conveyed by *vā* operates in A 2.1.18-2.2.9.

1. The basis of the etymon is the *bahuvrīhi* compound *tridaśa-* ('thrice-ten'), which is formed according to A 2.2.25. We add that, under rule A 5.4.73, the *taddhita* affix *ḌaC* is applied to *tridaśa-*, and the relevant output is *tridaśá-* ('whose number is thrice-ten').
2. Then, according to A 4.2.24, the *taddhita* affix *aṇ* is applied to *tridaśá-*, and the relevant output is *traidaśá-* ('dedicated to thrice-ten deities').
3. In the end, Medhātithi presumably hints at rule A 5.4.154, according to which the *taddhita samāsānta* affix *kaP* (indicated as *kaḥ* by the scholar) is applied to *traidaśa-*. However, if the rule Medhātithi is hinting at here is actually A 5.4.154, the latter passage seems to be wrong. The output would be *traidaśaka* (< *traidaśa* + *-kaP*) instead of the handed-down *traidaśika-*. The latter derivative stem can be obtained instead by applying the *taddhita* affix *ṭhañ* following A 5.1.18.¹⁵¹ The latter rule teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *ṭhañ* (that equals *ika-* according to A 7.3.50)¹⁵² to derive stems conveying one of the meanings taught up to rule A 5.1.115. The output derivative stem would be *traidaśiká-*, which is finally obtained by zero-replacing the final *-a* of the etymon under rule A 6.4.48.¹⁵³ If the pattern of derivation we are proposing here is correct, the third step indicated by Medhātithi would actually be useless, because the *taddhita* affix *ṭhañ* taught in A 5.1.18 would directly ensure the *ṛddhi* of the nominal stem. Ultimately, it is noteworthy that more than ten manuscripts hand down the variant reading *°traidaśakābhyām* (see Olivelle 2005: 413). Even though all the editions of the *Manubhāṣya* have the reading *traidaśika-* in this commentarial passage, one could also argue that Medhātithi had this alternative reading in mind, thereby resolving the issue.¹⁵⁴

44. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.61 [TE] (A*)

anuṣṇābhīr aphenābhīr adbhīs tīrthena dharmavit
śaucepsuḥ sarvadācāmed ekānte *prāgudaṇmukhaḥ* || 2.61 ||

¹⁵¹ A 5.1.18: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.298.

¹⁵² A 7.3.50: *ṭhasya ikaḥ* [*aṅasya* 6.4.1 *pratyayasthāt* 44] “*ik* occurs in place of *ṭh* [of an affix of an *aṅga*].”

¹⁵³ A 6.4.48: *ato lopah* [*aṅasya* 1 *ārdhadhātuke* 46] “Zero replacement of the short vowel *a* final [of an *aṅga*] occurs [before an *ārdhadhātuka* affix].”

¹⁵⁴ We would like to thank Victor D’Avella for this suggestion.

The one who knows the *dharma*, when he desires purification, should always sip water which is neither hot nor frothy in a secret place with his face turned towards the east or north.

[...] *prāgudaṇmukhaḥ | mukhaśabdaḥ pratyekam abhisambadhyate | [...]* *vigrahaś caivaṃ kartavyaḥ prāgudaṇmukham asyeti | nāyaṃ dvandvagarbho bahuvrīhir api tu bahuvrīhir eva | dvandvagarbhatāyāṃ samāhāre samāsāntenākāreṇa bhavitavyam* (cf. A 5.4.106) | *itaratarayogo 'pi naiva | na hi yugapad ubhayadiṇmukhatā sambhavati | [...]*

[In the compound] *pragudaṇmukha-*, the word-form *mukha-* ('face') must be construed with each [of the two other compound constituents, i.e. *prāc-* ('towards the east') and *udac-* ('towards the north')]. [...] And the constituent analysis [of the compound *pragudaṇmukha-*] should be made as such: "Whose face is turned towards the east or north." This is not a *bahuvrīhi* encapsulating a *dvandva*, but simply a *bahuvrīhi*. If it encapsulated a *dvandva* used in the case of a *samāhāra*, it should end with the syllable *a* (= *ṬaC*) as a *samāsānta* (cf. A 5.4.106). It is not an *itaratarayoga*. Indeed, it is not possible that a face is simultaneously turned in both directions.

Rule referred to:

- A 5.4.106: *dvandvāc cudaṣahāntāt samāhāre [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 samāsāntaḥ 68 ṭac 91]*
[The *taddhita samāsānta* affix *ṬaC* occurs after a nominal stem] consisting of a *dvandva* compound ending in a palatal sound, in *d*, *ṣ*, or *h* when it conveys the sense of 'collection.'

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the *bahuvrīhi* compound *prāgudaṇmukha-* with the aim of excluding the interpretation of the first two nominal stems of the etymon as a *dvandva*, be it *samāhāra* or *itaratarayoga* (note that Pāṇini never used either of these terms). The latter analysis is excluded because of its meaning. The former is excluded, as the scholar explains, because of the non-application of the *samāsānta ṬaC* according to A 5.4.106. Indeed, the interpretation of *prāgudaṇmukha-* given by Medhātithi is that of a simple *bahuvrīhi* with the meaning of 'whose face is turned towards the east or north.'

45. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.62 [TL] (A², Vt*, M*)

hrdgābhiḥ *pūyate vipraḥ kaṇthagābhis tu bhūmipah |*

vaiśyo 'dbhiḥ prāśitābhis tu śūdraḥ spr̥ṣṭābhir antataḥ || 2.62 ||

A Brāhmaṇa is purified by waters up to the heart; a Kṣatriya (lit. ‘protector of the earth’) [is purified by waters] up to the throat; a Vaiśya [is purified by waters] that are swallowed; a Śūdra [is purified by waters] lapping the top of his head (lit. ‘touched by the top of his head’).

hṛdayaṃ gacchanti prāpnvanti hṛdgāḥ | anyeṣv api dṛśyate (A 3.2.101; see M 2.112 l. 20 *ad* A 3.2.101) *iti gamer ḍaḥ | hṛdayasya hṛd* (A 6.3.50) *iti yogavibhāgād dhṛdādeśaḥ* | [...]

[The word-form] *hṛdgāḥ* [means] ‘[they which] go to, i.e. reach the heart.’ [The *kṛt* affix] *ḍa* [occurs after the verbal base] *gam-* according to *anyeṣv api dṛśyate* (A 3.2.101; see M 2.112 l. 20 *ad* A 3.2.101). The substitution [of *hṛdaya-*] with *hṛd-* is due to a *yogavibhāga* under *hṛdayasya hṛd* (A 6.3.50).

śūdraḥ spr̥ṣṭābhir antata anteneti | ādyāditvāt tṛtīyārthe tasiḥ (see M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44) | [...]

śūdraḥ spr̥ṣṭābhir antata (‘a Śūdra [is purified] by [waters] lapping the top of his head’): [the word-form *antata* means] *antena* (‘by the top of his head’). [The *taddhita* affix] *tasI* [is applied] in the sense of the instrumental case due to its being part of the *ādyādi* group (see M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44).

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 3.2.101: *anyeṣv api dṛśyate* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *bhūte* 84 *janer ḍaḥ* 97]
[The *kṛt* affix *ḍa*] is also seen [after the verbal base *jan-*] co-occurring with other [nominal stems, provided that the action denoted is in the past].
- A 6.3.50: *hṛdayasya hṛd lekḥayadanlāsesu* [*uttarapade* 1]
hṛd- occurs in the place of *hṛdaya-* when [the nominal stem] *lekha-* (‘line’), [the *taddhita* affixes] *yaT* and *aN*, or [the *kṛt* derivative stem] *lāsa-* ‘jumping’ follows [as the right-hand constituent].
- M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93.
- M 2.112 l. 20 *ad* A 3.2.101: *anyebhyo 'pi dṛśyata iti vaktavyam*
It should be taught: “After other [verbal bases], [the *kṛt* affix *ḍa*] is also seen.”

Comment:

In the first excerpt, Medhātithi focuses on the *upapādasamāsa hr̥dga-*, which he considers as being formed by applying the *kṛt* affix *Ḍa* to the verbal base *gam-* according to A 3.2.101, which he quotes in full. The latter rule teaches to apply such an affix to the verbal base *jan-* ('to know') when it co-occurs with other nominal stems. In fact, the verbal base *gam-* is not actually taught by this rule, which is only devoted to the *upapādasamāsas* formed with the *kṛdanta ja-* (< *jan-*). Nonetheless, as first explained in the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 2.112 l. 20 *ad* A 3.2.101), the same *kṛt* affix *Ḍa* taught by this rule is also applied to other verbal bases. Let us note that this sentence seems to be a *vārttika*, even though Kielhorn did not classify it as such. Finally, we report that this extension is also confirmed in other grammatical works, such as in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (see KV *ad* A 3.2.101).¹⁵⁵ In the second excerpt, Medhātithi explains that *hr̥d-* is obtained by means of the substitution taught in A 6.3.50, which teaches to substitute *hr̥daya-* with *hr̥d-* when a specific right-hand constituent follows, i.e. the nominal stem *lekha-* ('line'), the *taddhita* affix *yaT* or *aN*, or the *kṛt* derivative stem *lāsa-* ('jumping'). To the best of our knowledge, the *yogavibhāga* Medhātithi proposes here for the application of this substitution, even if none of the *uttarapadas* listed in the rule in question occurs, is not documented either in the *Mahābhāṣya* or in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. On the other hand, as noticed by Sharma (1987-2003: V, 364) while commenting on A 6.3.51, this replacement of *hr̥daya-* with *hr̥d-* is not actually mandatory since both these nominal bases are recorded as such.

Finally, Medhātithi focuses on the derivation of *antatas* ('by the top of his head') by means of the *taddhita* affix *tasI* according to Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44 (M 2.436 l. 11), which is also referred to on other occasions in the *Manubhāṣya* (see e.g. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93). This is fundamental for the discussion in the next part (which we have not included for the sake of brevity) of the meaning of the word-form *anta-* in this verse by Manu: *anta-* (lit. 'end') could express 'nearness' (*samīpa*) or 'part' (*avayava*), with the analysis here clearly leaning toward the second meaning, as proximity alone would not suffice for the ritual act of sipping water.

46. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.66 [TL] (A)

amantrikā tu karyeyaṃ strīṇāṃ āvṛd aśeṣataḥ |
saṃskārārthaṃ śarīrasya *yathākālaṃ* *yathākramam* || 2.66 ||

¹⁵⁵ KV *ad* A 3.2.101: *tena dhātvantarād api bhavati* "[The *kṛt* affix *Ḍa*] also occurs after other verbal bases by this [rule]."

As far as women are concerned, this whole series (of rites) should be performed without any formula, without exceptions, for the sake of consecrating their body, in due time and in due order.

[...] *yathākālam* | *yasmin kāle yaḥ saṃskāra uktas taṃ kālam anatikramya* | *padārthānativṛttau yathāsādrśye* (A 2.1.7) '*vyayībhāvaḥ* | *evaṃ krame* '*pi draṣṭavyam* | [...]

[The word-form] *yathākālam* ('in due time') [means] not having passed beyond that time in which a sacred ceremony (*saṃskāra*) is prescribed. The indeclinable compound [*yathākālam* is formed by applying] *yathāsādrśye* (A 2.1.7) in congruity with the meaning of the word. In this way, [an indeclinable compound] should also be seen in the case of *krama* ('order') [as the right-hand constituent] (i.e. *yathākramam*: 'in due order').

Rule cited to:

- A 2.1.7: *yathāsādrśye* [*saṃsaḥ* 3 *saha supā* 4 *avyayībhāvaḥ* 5 *avyayam* 6]
The indeclinable *yathā* combines [with an inflected noun to form an indeclinable compound] provided that it does not denote resemblance.

Comment:

In this short grammatical note, Medhātithi focuses on the formation of the *avyayībhāva* compounds *yathākāla*- ('in due time') and *yathākrama*- ('in due order') following A 2.1.7, which teaches to form indeclinable compounds with *yathā* as a constituent provided that the output meaning is not "resemblance to X."

47. Medh ad MDh^M 2.70 [TE] (A*³)

adhyeṣyamāṇas | *tv ācānto yathāśāstram udaṇmukhaḥ* |
brahmāñjalikṛto | *'dhyāpyo laghuvāsā jitendriyaḥ* || 2.70 ||

When [the pupil] is about to study, after sipping water according to the rule, facing the north, joining his palms in the *brahmāñjali*, wearing clean clothes,¹⁵⁶ [and] with his faculties of perception under control, he should then be instructed.

¹⁵⁶ We translated *laghuvāsa*- according to Medhātithi's interpretation, which paraphrases it with *dhautavāsa*-. For the interpretation in other commentaries, see Olivelle (2005: 248).

pratyāsanne bhaviṣyati lṛḍ ayaṃ draṣṭavyaḥ (see A 3.3.14; cf. A 3.3.13) | *adhyayane pravartamāno 'dhyayanam ārabhamāṇo 'dhyetum icchann iti yāvat* | [...]

[As regards the verbal form *adhyeṣyamāṇa-*], this [substitute of the *lakāra*] *lṛṭ* (cf. A 3.3.13) should be considered in the sense of proximate future (see A 3.3.14), as far as [it means] ‘he is engaged in studying’, ‘he begins the study’, ‘he desires to study.’

[...] *brahmāñjaliḥ kṛto yeneti* | *āhitāgnyāder ākṛtiganatvān niṣṭhāntasya paranipātaḥ* (see A 2.2.37) | *brahmāñjalikṛd iti vā pāṭhaḥ* | [...]

[The compound *brahmāñjalikṛta-* must be analysed as] ‘by whom the *brahmāñjali* has been made.’ The right-hand position of the past participle (i.e. *kṛta-*) is due to the exemplificative nature of the *āhitāgni* list (see A 2.2.37). Otherwise, a variant reading is *brahmāñjalikṛt* ‘making the *brahmāñjali*.’

Rules referred to:

- A 2.2.37: *vāhitāgnyādiṣu* [pūrvam 30 niṣṭhā 36]
In compounds belonging to the group beginning with *āhitāgni-* (lit. ‘one who has placed the sacred fire [upon the altar]’), [the constituent which is a participle ending in a *niṣṭhā* affix (i.e. *Kta* and *KtavatU*: see A 1.1.26) is] preferably [the left-hand member].
- A 3.3.13: *lṛṭ śeṣe ca* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *bhaviṣyati* 3 *kriyāyām kriyārthāyām* 10]
[The substitutes of the *lakāra*] *lṛṭ* occur [after a verbal base to denote future, when it co-occurs with an action whose purpose is (another) action],¹⁵⁷ and in the residual meaning (i.e. in future tense meanings other than those taught in the relevant section beginning with A 3.3.3).
- A 3.3.14: *lṛṭaḥ sad vā* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *bhaviṣyati* 3 *kriyāyām kriyārthāyām* 10 *śeṣe ca* 13]
In the place of [the substitutes of the *lakāra*] *lṛṭ*, the *kṛt* affixes termed *sat*¹⁵⁸ preferably occur [after a verbal base to denote future when it co-occurs with an action whose purpose is (another) action and in the residual meaning].

¹⁵⁷ This locative is interpreted as expressing the *upapada* according to A 3.1.92.

¹⁵⁸ The term *sat* is explained in A 3.2.127: *tau sat* [*śatṛśanacau* 124] “The two [*kṛt* affixes] *ŚatR* and *ŚānaC* are termed *sat*.”

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi first analyses the future Ātmanepada participle *adhyeṣyamāṇa-* (from the verbal base *adhī-* ‘to study’) in accordance with A 3.3.14, which teaches to form the Parasmaipada and Ātmanepada future participles. According to the scholar, the future participle under analysis is used in the sense of imminence, which is one of the three meanings identified together with those of engagement and desire.

Then, Medhātithi focuses on the *bahuvrīhi* compound *brahmāñjalikṛta-*, in which the right-hand slot is occupied by a past participle according to A 2.2.37. This is an exception to the most common word order taught by A 2.2.36,¹⁵⁹ which assigns it to the left-hand slot.

48. Medh ad MDh^M 2.74 [TE] (A*³)

brahmaṇaḥ praṇavaṃ kuryād ādāv ante ca sarvadā |
sravaty anomaṅkṛtaṃ pūrvaṃ parastāc ca viśīryati || 2.74 ||

One should always utter the sacred syllable *om* at the beginning and at the end of the Veda: if it is recited without [the sacred syllable] *om* at the beginning, it gushes forth and, [if it is recited without the sacred syllable *om*] at the end, it is shattered.

[...] *pūrvaṃ prārambhe 'nomṅkṛtaṃ brahma sravati | omā kṛtaṃ*¹⁶⁰ *omśabdena saṃskṛtaṃ | sādhanam kṛteti samāsaḥ* (see A 2.1.32) | *atha vā omṅkṛta uccārito*¹⁶¹ *yasmin brahmaṇi tad omṅkṛtaṃ* (see A 2.2.37) *sukhāditvāt paranipātaḥ* (cf. A 6.2.170) | [...]

At the beginning, i.e. at the commencement, the Veda recited without [the sacred syllable] *om* gushes forth. ‘Made with *om*’ [means] ‘completed by means of the word-form *om*.’ The compound [is formed according to the rule which teaches to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound by combining a nominal *pada* denoting] a *sādhana* (i.e. an instrument or an agent) with a *kṛt* derivative stem (see A 2.1.32). Or rather, *omṅkṛta-* is the Veda in which [the recitation] *omṅkṛta-* (‘made with *om*’) is uttered’ (see A 2.2.37). The right-hand position [of the past passive participle *kṛta-*] is

¹⁵⁹ A 2.2.36: see Medh ad MDh^M 3.19.

¹⁶⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *om iti kṛtaṃ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *omā kṛtaṃ*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 45).

¹⁶¹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *omṅkṛtaṃ ity uccāritaḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *omṅkṛta uccārito*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 45).

because of its being [linked with the rule mentioning] the *sukhādi* list (cf. A 6.2.170).

Rules referred to:

- A 2.1.32: *kartṛkaraṇe kṛtā bahulaṃ* [*samāsaḥ* 3 *saha supā* 4 *sup* 9 *vā* 18 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 22 *trīyā* 30]
[An inflected noun] denoting an agent or instrument [preferably] variously combines with [an inflected noun inflected in the instrumental case] ending in a *kṛt* affix [to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound].
- A 2.2.37: see *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.70.
- A 6.2.170: *jātikālasukhādibhyo 'nācchādanāt kto 'kṛtamitapratipannāḥ* [*udāttāḥ* 64 *uttarapadasya* 111 *antaḥ* 143 *bahuvrīḥ* 162]
[The *kṛt* affix] *Kta*—except [when it is part of] *kṛta-* ('done'), *mita-* ('measured') and *pratipanna-* ('promised')—[occurring as the last syllable of the right-hand constituent in a *bahuvrīḥ* is high-pitched] after [nominal stems] meaning *jāti-* ('class')—provided that it does not mean *ācchādana-* ('cover')¹⁶²—*kāla-* ('time') and belonging to the *sukhādi* list ('happiness and the like').

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi comments on the compound *anomkṛta-*. At first, he reads it as a *tatpuruṣa* compound with the *upasarjana* inflected in the instrumental case according to A 2.1.32. Then, he proposes a different reading as a *bahuvrīḥ* with a past participle as the right-hand constituent in accordance with A 2.2.37. However, Medhātithi also hints at rule A 6.2.170 by mentioning the *sukhādi* list (mentioned in this rule as well as in A 3.1.18 and 5.2.131), where the accentuation of a *bahuvrīḥ* is explained with a past participle as the right-hand constituent with some exceptions including *kṛta-*. This proves that Pāṇini considered the compounds ending with *kṛta-* as *bahuvrīḥ*s.

49. Medh ad MDh^M 2.75 [TE] (A)

prāk[kūlān] paryupāsīnaḥ pavitraś caiva pāvitaḥ |
prāṇāyāmais tribhiḥ pūtas tata omkāram arhati || 2.75 ||

When [the Vedic student] is seated on the tufts of Kuśa grass with the tips turned eastward, he is cleansed by the strainers and purified

¹⁶² This translation of *anācchādanāt* follows the *Kāśikāvṛtti* interpretation of the rule: see KV ad A 6.2.170.

by three breathing exercises: then, he is allowed [to utter] the syllable *om*.

kūlaśabdo darbhāgravacanaḥ | tān paryupāsīnas teṣu prāgagreṣu darbhēṣūpaviṣṭa ity arthaḥ | adhiśīnsthāsām (A 1.4.46) *iti*¹⁶³ *sthā ā āsām ity ānā praśleṣāt karmatvam | pari upa ā āsīna iti ihāpy ānā śliṣṭanirdiṣṭo draṣṭavyaḥ | paryupaśabdāv anarthakau | [...]*

The word-form *kūla-* denotes the tip of the tuft of Kuśa grass. ‘Sitting on them’ [means] ‘squatted on them, i.e. on the tufts of Kuśa grass having the tips turned eastward’: this is the meaning. The condition of being a [*kāraka*] *karman* [of the word-form *kulān*], [triggered by the prefix] *ā-* (= *aṅ*) in accordance with *adhiśīnsthāsām* (A 1.4.46), is due to the *praśleṣa* (i.e. the coalescence and consequently the double reading of the same vowel *ā*, in this case between the verbal bases *sthā-* and *ās-*) [so that the rule is read as if it were] “*sthā, ā* and *ās.*” Here, [the word-form *paryupāsīnaḥ*] must also be seen as [subject to] the indication of the coalescence with [the prefix] *a-* (= *aṅ*) [between *upa-* and *āsīna-*]: [the verbal form *paryupāsīna-* (here ‘sitting’) is formed by the prefixes] *pari-*, *upa-*, [and] *ā-*, and *āsīna-* (i.e. the past passive participle from the verbal base *ās-* ‘to sit’); the two word-forms *pari* and *upa* are meaningless.

Rule cited:

- A 1.4.46: *adhiśīnsthāsām karma* [*kārake* 23 *ādhāraḥ* 45]
[In the domain of *kāraḥ*], the *karman* denotes [the substratum] when the verbal bases *śī-* (‘to lie’), *sthā-* (‘to stand’), and *ās-* (‘to sit’) co-occur with the prefix *adhi-*.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi explains the use of the accusative *prākkūlān* as the surface realisation of the *kāraka karman*, which is, in fact, taught in A 1.4.46 for the verbal base *ās-* (involved in the past passive participle *paryupāsīna-* from the verbal base *paryupās-*) when it co-occurs with the prefix *adhi-*. This is why he applies the *praśliṣṭanirdeśa* procedure to both the rule and the participle *paryupāsīna-*. In the first case, he reads the long vowel *ā* twice as if it were the outcome of a *sandhi* between the final vowel of *sthā-* and the initial vowel of *ās-*.

¹⁶³ Mandlik, Gharpure and Dave feature the variant reading *adhiśīnsthāsām iti* (which we decided to maintain). Jha presents the variant reading *śīnsthāsām iti*, but the missing *adhi-* is likely a misprint. Indeed, a note in Jha (1924: I, 46) correctly cites the reference to A 1.4.46. Finally, Olivelle has the variant reading *adhiśīnsthāsām* (without *iti*).

According to this reading, the rule would also include the prefix *ā-* (= *āN*). In the second case, an analogous double reading of *ā* is realised on *paryupāsīna* as a *sandhi* between the final vowel of *upa-* and the initial vowel of *ās-*. In this way, the prefix *ā-* (= *āN*) triggers the accusative case ending of *prakkulān*. As a final note, no meaning is attributed to the two prefixes *pari-* and *upa-*, while the only meaningful prefix is this assumed *ā-*. Nonetheless, in our opinion, the two prefixes could be bearers of some meaning if we imagine that the *guru* and his pupils were sitting in a way that resembled a group of people sitting next to each other (*upa-*) in a circle (*pari-*).

50. Medh ad MDh^M 2.79 [TE] (A*)

sahasrakṛtvas tv abhyasya bahir etat trikaṃ dvijaḥ |
mahato 'py enaso māsāt tvacevāhir vimucyate || 2.79 ||

After repeating this threefold [sound] one thousand times outside [the village], the twice-born even frees himself from a great sin in a month like a snake [frees itself] from its skin.

[...] *sahasravārān abhyasyāvartya | nanu*¹⁶⁴ *kṛtvasuco* (see A 5.4.17) *'py āvṛttiḥ pratipādyate 'bhyasyety anenāpi | tatra paunaruktyam | sāmānyaviśeṣabhāvād adoṣaḥ | abhyasyety anena sāmānyato 'bhyāsa uktas tatra viśeṣāpekṣāyām sahasrakṛtveti | na ca kṛtvasujantād evobhayāvagatis tasya kriyāviśeṣāpekṣatvāt | na hi devadattaḥ pañcakṛtvo 'hna*¹⁶⁵ *ity ukte yāvad bhūṅkta iti nocyate*¹⁶⁶ *tāvād vākyārthaḥ samāpyate | [...]*

‘After repeating’ (*abhyasya*), i.e. reciting repeatedly, a thousand times. However, due to [the *taddhita* affix] *kṛtvasUC* (see A 5.4.17), the repetition is also understood; [then, it is] also [understood] through this, i.e. *abhyasya*. In this case, there is a tautology. There is no shortcoming because both the general and particular exist [as categories to be signified]. With this [expression] *abhyasya*, the repetition is mentioned from the general point of view. In this case, when there is expectancy of the particular, *sahasrakṛtvas* is said, and there is no understanding of both [these meanings] due to the word ending with the *kṛtvasUC* [affix], because it (i.e. the word ending in the *kṛtvasUC* affix) is expected [to express] a particular detail of the action. For, if it is said ‘Devadatta five times a

¹⁶⁴ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *na tu*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *nanu*, which we decided to adopt.

¹⁶⁵ Mandlik presents the variant reading *anha*, which is likely a misprint.

¹⁶⁶ Mandlik features the variant reading *te nocyate*. Gharpure, Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *nocyate*, which we decided to adopt.

day' (*devadattaḥ pañcakṛtvo 'hne*), the meaning of the sentence is not obtained until when it is said 'he eats' (*bhunkte*).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.4.17: *saṃkhyāyāḥ kriyābhyāṇṛttigaṇanane kṛtvāsu* [pratiṇṇādikāt 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[The *taddhita* affix] *kṛtvāsu* occurs [after a nominal stem] which is a *saṃkhyā* to denote the counting of the repetitions of an action.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi wonders whether *abhyasya* is a case of tautology with respect to the distributive numeral *sahasrakṛtvāsu* (formed by adding the *taddhita* affix *kṛtvāsu*, taught by rule A 5.4.17) since both the gerund form of the verb *abhyas-* ('to repeat') and the numeral convey the sense of repetition. He solves the problem by attributing a general sense to *abhyasya* and a particular one to the numeral. The final example given by Medhātithi shows how the mere use of the numeral in a sentence—such as *devadattaḥ pañcakṛtvo 'hne*—is unintelligible without using a verbal form—in this case, *bhunkte*.

51. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.84 [J] (A*)

kṣaranti sarvā vaidikyo juhōtiyajatikriyāḥ |
akṣaram tv [akṣaram jñeyam] brahma caiva prajāpatiḥ || 2.84 ||
All the Vedic¹⁶⁷ actions denoted by the verbs *hu-* ('to offer oblation') and *yaj-* ('to sacrifice') perish, but the (sacred) syllable should be recognised as imperishable, and [this] is indeed Brahman, [this] is Prajāpati.

[...] *iha tv akṣaram jñeyam iti na pūrvāpekṣā nāpi sāvitryādīnāṃ punaḥ parāmarśo 'sti | ataḥ svapadārthair eva vākyaṛthaparisaṃmāpter nānyaśeṣatā | jñeyam ity atra kṛtyo vidhāyakaḥ* (see A 3.1.97) | *brahmapadena ca saṃbandhād brahmarūpatayā jñeyam upāśyaṃ bhāvanīyam | bhāvyamāne ca tasmin mānasajapa ukto bhavati ||*

However, in this case, when it is said "[this] should be recognised as imperishable", there is neither expectancy for anything [said] before nor any inference for the Sāvitrī (i.e. the prayer addressed to Savitṛ used by the twice-born people at their Vedic initiation) and the like. As a consequence, [the phrase

¹⁶⁷ The reading *vaidikyo* ('Vedic') chosen by Olivelle (2005: 418) in his critical edition is attested in most manuscripts even though it is not recorded in the lexicons.

akṣaram jñeyam is meaningful] just by means of the meanings of its own words: there is no [need for] anything else to complete the meaning of the sentence. Here, when *jñeyam* is said, the *kr̥tya* affix contains an injunction (see A 3.1.97). And because of the connection with the word *brahman-*, this should be recognised, conceived, and worshipped by means of its having form of the Brahman. And when this is conceived, the mental repetition (of the syllable) is pronounced.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.97: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.23.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the phrase *akṣaram jñeyam* (“[this] should be recognised as imperishable”), whose words in themselves are meaningful and do not call for anything more to be said; in this regard, he underlines the fact that the injunction is contained in the future passive participle *jñeya-* (from the verbal base *jñā-* ‘to know’), specifically within the *kr̥tya* affix *yaT* (taught by A 3.1.97).

52. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.86 [TL] (A*)

*ye pākayajñāś catvāro vidhiyajñasamanvitāḥ |
sarve te japayajñasya kalām nār̥hanti | ṣoḍaśīm || 2.86 ||*

All these that are the four cooked sacrifices provided with the [other] sacrifices prescribed do not deserve the sixteenth part of the sacrifice consisting of muttering prayers.

[...] *kalām aṁśam ṣoḍaśīm nār̥hanti | ṣoḍaśena bhāgena na samā bhavanti | atha vār̥hatiḥ prāptyaṅge mūlyapaṇane vartate | arhaśabdāt tipam* (cf. A 3.4.78) *kr̥tvā arhanti rūpam ||*

They do not deserve the sixteenth part, i.e. share. They are not equal to the sixteenth part. Or rather, the verbal base *arh-* is used in the sense of the price given as payment to obtain a portion. After applying the verbal ending *tiP* (cf. A 3.4.78) to the word-form *arha-*, the form *arhanti* [is obtained].

Rule referred to:

- A 3.4.78: *tipasjhisipthasthamibvasmastātāmjhathāsāthāmdhvamiḍ-vahimahiṇ* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *lasya* 77]
[Affixes] *tiP*, *tas*, *jhi*, *siP*, *thas*, *tha*, *miP*, *vas*, *mas*, *ta*, *ātām*, *jha*, *thās*, *āthām*, *dhvam*, *iṭ*, *vahi* and *mahiṇ* occur [after a verbal base in place of *l*-members].

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the formation of *arhanti*, the third-person plural of the present indicative of the verbal base *arh-* ('to deserve'), which is mentioned here as the verbal stem *arha-* including the thematic vowel. It is interesting to note that instead of mentioning *jhi* (corresponding to the third-person plural verbal ending) or *tiñ* (the *pratyāhāra* of the verbal endings: cf. A 3.4.78), he uses the term *tiP* (corresponding to the third-person singular verbal ending), which is rather strange seeing that when grammarians explain a verbal form, they normally use the plural form. However, we cannot exclude a scribal error of *tip* from *tiñ*.

53. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.90 [TL] (A*)

śrotraṃ tvak cakṣuṣī jihvā nāsikā caiva pañcamī |

pāyūpastham | hastapādām | vāk caiva daśamī smṛtā || 2.90 ||

The organ of hearing, the skin, the two eyes, the tongue, the nose as the fifth; the anus and generative organs, hands and feet, the voice is recalled as the tenth.

dvandvanirdiṣṭayoḥ prāṇyaṅgatvād ekavadbhāvaḥ (see A 2.4.2) | [...]

The singular number of the two *dvandva* compounds mentioned above (i.e. *pāyūpastha-* 'anus and generative organs' and *hastapāda-* 'hands and feet') is due to [the constituents'] being the limbs of a living being (see A 2.4.2).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.4.2: *dvandvaś ca prāṇitūryasenāṅgānām [ekavacanaṃ 1]*
A *dvandva* compound made up of members denoting parts of a living being, a musical group or an army [is] also [singular in number].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the two *dvandva* compounds present in Manu's text, i.e. *pāyūpastha-* ('anus and generative organs') and *hastapāda-* ('hands and feet') by resorting to rule A 2.4.2. The latter rule teaches to form the so-called *samāhāradvandva* compounds,¹⁶⁸ i.e. a *dvandva* inflected in the

¹⁶⁸ We remark that the term *samāhāradvandva* is later than Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Indeed, the commonly used Sanskrit term *samāhāra* ('Zusammenfassung, Menge' according to Wackernagel 1957: 163) is not exactly a class of *dvandvas* in Pāṇini's grammar but, at the very least, constitutes a constraint actually used in A 5.4.106. The other traditional category of *dvandva* compounds, i.e. *itaretarayoga*, is first found in KV *ad* A 5.4.106.

singular number (and neuter gender—we add—in accordance with A 2.4.17),¹⁶⁹ when the compound members are the limbs of a living being (*prāṇin*), a musical group (*tūrya*) or an army (*senā*).

54. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.96 [TL] (A, A*)

na tathaitāni śakyante samniyantum asevaṃ |
*viśayeṣu pradurjāni*¹⁷⁰ *yathā jñānena nityaśaḥ* || 2.96 ||

Likewise, these [organs] cannot be restrained without taking care, just as sins [cannot be] permanently [restrained] by knowledge in the several domains.

[...] *āyaṃ śas*¹⁷¹ *tatra tatra nityaśo 'anupūrvaśaḥ sarvaśaḥ pūrvaśa iti vyāsamanuprabhṛtibhir mahāmuniḥ prapūjyate | tasya sādhitve yatnaḥ kartavyaḥ | tatra śasvidhav ekavacanāc ca vīpsāyām* (A 5.4.43) *iti paṭhyate | tatra vīpsārthaḥ kathamcit dyotayitavyaḥ | anye tu śasas tiṣṭhatyarthasya kvipi rūpaṃ varṇayanti* (cf. A 3.2.77) *| kriyāviśeṣaṇaṃ caitat napuṃsakam | nityasthitena jñānenety arthaḥ* ||

This [*taddhita* affix] *śas* is used here and there [in expressions like] *nityaśaḥ* ('permanently'), *anupūrvaśaḥ* ('in regular order'), *sarvaśaḥ* ('entirely'), [and] *pūrvaśaḥ* ('previously') by the great sages Vyāsa, Manu *et cetera*. An effort should be made regarding the correctness of this (i.e. the correct application of the *taddhita* affix *śas*). In this case, since, in the rule for *śas*, *ekavacanāc ca vīpsāyām* (A 5.4.43) is read, the meaning of distributiveness must somehow be made to appear. But other people explain the form of *śas* as having the meaning of the verb *sthā-* ('to stay') before [the *kṛt* affix] *KviP* (cf. A 3.2.77), and this [would be] a qualifier for an action (i.e. an adverb) [inflected] in the neuter gender; the meaning [would be] 'by means of the knowledge which permanently exists.'

¹⁶⁹ A 2.4.17: *sa napuṃsakam [ekavacanam 1]* "That (i.e. a *dvigu* compound A 2.4.1 and a *dvandva* compound A 2.4.2-16) [treated as singular in number] is neuter in gender."

¹⁷⁰ *pradurjāni* is Olivelle's conjecture; the other editions (Mandlik, Gharpure, and Jha) have *prajurjāni*.

¹⁷¹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *āyaṃ aśas*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *āyaṃ śas*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 53). We decided to use the latter reading, as it rightly includes the reference to the *taddhita* affix *śas*.

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 3.2.77: *sthaḥ ka ca* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *KviP* 76 *supi* 4 *upasarge* 'pi 61]
[The *kṛt* affix *KviP*] and *Ka* [occur after the verbal base] *sthā-* [co-occurring¹⁷² with a nominal *pada* or a preverb].
- A 5.4.43: *saṅkhyāikavacanāc ca vīpsāyām* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *śas* 42 *anyatarasyām* 42]
[The *taddhita* affix *śas* optionally occurs after a nominal stem] which is a *saṅkhyā* or an expression of a singular number to signify the distributive sense.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the last word of the verse, i.e. *nityaśaḥ*, proposing two different readings. The first of these relies on the *taddhita* rule A 5.4.43, which teaches to optionally form an indeclinable *taddhita* derivative stem by applying the affix *śas* to nominal stems that are numerals or expressions of a singular number in order to signify a distributive sense. The second is built on the hypothesis that *nityaśas* must be analysed as an *upapādasamāsa* made up of the nominal stem *nitya-* ('perpetual') and the *kṛt* derivative stem *śas-*, formed by means of the zero-replaced *kṛt* affix *KviP*, used in the sense of *sthā-* ('to stay'), probably in order to extend the application of a *KviP* rule to a verbal base which is not covered by Pāṇini's *KviP* rules. In our opinion, he may be hinting at rule A 3.2.77, which teaches to apply the *kṛt* affix *KviP* to a specifically indicated word-form, namely the verbal base *sthā-*, which is subject to zero-replacement (*lopa*) according to A 6.1.67.¹⁷³ The extension of the application of this rule to another verbal base would be thoroughly unexpected from a strictly grammatical point of view, even if it has the same meaning as *sthā-* (as Medhātithi maintains). In addition to this, we underline that the verbal base *śas-* (more commonly spelt as *sas-*) could at most be assimilated to *sthā-* (framed in the sense of 'to stay' instead of the etymological sense 'to stand') only in the meaning of 'to sleep', documented for the second verbal class. It is noteworthy that the verbal base *śas-* is mainly used as belonging to the first verbal class in the sense of 'to kill.'

¹⁷² As for the metalinguistic use of the locative case in the *upapādasamāsa* section, see A 3.1.92, translated in a footnote under Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.5.

¹⁷³ A 6.1.67: *ver aprktasya* [*lopaḥ* 66] "A single sound [affix] *vi* [is (unconditionally) zero-replaced]."

55. Medh ad MDh^M 2.100 [TE] (A*)

*vaśe kṛtvendriyagrāmam saṃyamyā ca manas tathā |
sarvān saṃsādhayed arthān akṣiṇvan [yogatas] tanum || 2.100 ||*

After taking the group of organs into his own power and restraining his mind, one should properly attain all [his] aims without injuring his body.

[...] *yogato yuktyā | sahasā kasyacit kaṭhināsanakṛṣṇājīnādiprāvaraṇāt pīḍā*¹⁷⁴ *bhavati sukumāraprakṛteḥ*¹⁷⁵ | *tadartham idam ucyate | yeṣāṃ suśīlitaṃ saṃskṛtaṃ bhojanaṃ mṛduśayyādi na taiḥ sahasā tat tyaktavyam api tu krameṇa sātmyatām ānetavyaṃ tadviparītam | yogaḥ krameṇa pravṛttir ucyate | tatra ca yogato vaśe kṛtveti*¹⁷⁶ *saṃbandhaḥ | yathāsthānam eva vā yogata iti yojanīyam | yuktyā aucityataḥ*¹⁷⁷ *śārīraṃ nāpanayet | yad ucitaṃ śārīrasya na taj jhaṭiti nivartayet | tātparyam vā yogaḥ*¹⁷⁸ | *trṭīyarthe tasiḥ* (see A 5.4.46) | *tātparyeṇa śārīraṃ rakṣet ||*

[The word-form] *yogataḥ* [means] ‘properly.’ For anybody whose nature is delicate great pain is derived from a hard posture and from wearing deerskins, etc. This is said in this sense. Those who are accustomed to food that is well-prepared, well-cooked, and to soft couches, should not abandon this [behaviour] suddenly, but rather they should gradually adopt [a behaviour] which is opposite to theirs. This gradually [realised] progress is called *yoga*, and, in this context, there [should be] a syntactical relation [between] *yogatas* and *vaśe kṛtvā* (‘after taking power of [the ensemble of sense organs]’). Otherwise, *yogatas* should be employed according to [its] position (i.e. without linking it with another phrase), [and the meaning would be] ‘one should not damage the body properly, i.e. in a

¹⁷⁴ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading °*prāvaraṇapīḍā*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading °*prāvaraṇāt pīḍā*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 54).

¹⁷⁵ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *sukumāratvāt prakṛteḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *sukumāraprakṛteḥ*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 54).

¹⁷⁶ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *vaśīkṛtveti*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *vaśe kṛtveti*.

¹⁷⁷ Mandlik features the variant reading *kuciṃtātaḥ*, which is evidently incorrect. Gharpure, Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *aucityataḥ*, which is the correct one.

¹⁷⁸ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) add the phrase *trṭīyāyogaḥ*. The others omit it. The omission is recorded in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 54).

suitable way.’ He should not immediately abandon what is suitable for the body. Or rather, [the word-form] *yoga-* [means] ‘purpose.’ [The *taddhita* affix] *tasI* [is used] in the sense of the instrumental case (see A 5.4.46) [and the meaning is] ‘he should protect the body with this purpose.’

Rule referred to:

- A 5.4.46: *atigrahāvyathanakṣepesv akartari tṛtīyāyāḥ* [pratipādikāt 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tasi* 44 *anyatarasyām* 42]
[The *taddhita* affix *tasI* optionally occurs after a nominal stem] whose meaning is that signified by an instrumental case to denote exceeding, non-yielding or blaming, provided that the instrumental case does not convey an agent.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the ablative form *yogatas*, advancing a couple of hypotheses on its meaning, namely ‘gradual application’ and ‘purpose.’ Within the first hypothesis, he goes to some lengths to explain how the exertion called *yoga* has to be gradual, and he also proposes that *yogatas* should be connected with the first phrase in the wording of the verse. To illustrate the second proposal, he hints at Pāṇini’s explanation of using the *taddhita* affix *tasI* with a sense that is different from that commonly conveyed by an ablative case ending taught in A 5.4.44.¹⁷⁹ Indeed, we assume that he adopts the simple clause *tṛtīyarthē tasi* to propose the interpretation of *yogatas* as if it were *yogena*. This is a sort of extension of the general rule Pāṇini devoted to the instrumental sense of the *taddhita* affix *tasI*, namely A 5.4.46, where the meaning of the *taddhita* affix at stake is precisely that of an instrumental case ending.¹⁸⁰ We think that the Medhātithi probably assimilated the meaning ‘to waste’ assigned to the verbal form derived by *kṣi-* (used with the negative prefix *a-*) to the meanings listed in

¹⁷⁹ A 5.4.44: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93.

¹⁸⁰ In actual fact, there is also an optional rule teaching to apply the *taddhita* affix *tasI* with the meaning of the instrumental case, i.e. A 5.4.47. However, the latter only relates to the nominal stem syntactically connected with a passive verbal form of *hā-* (‘to lack’), i.e. the participle *hīyamāna-*, and the nominal stem *pāpa-* (‘vice’). The rule reads as follows: *hīyamānapāpayogāc ca* [pratipādikāt 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tasi* 44 *anyatarasyām* 42 *akartari tṛtīyāyāḥ* 46] “[The *taddhita* affix *tasI*] also [optionally occurs] after [a nominal stem] syntactically connected with a passive verbal form of *hā-* (‘to lack’), and [the nominal stem] *pāpa-* (‘vice’), [whose meaning is that signified by an instrumental case, provided that it does not convey an agent].”

rule A 5.4.46 for the verbs which co-occur with a *taddhita* formation with the affix *tasI* in the sense of an instrumental case which analogously conveys a hostile sense.

56. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.101 [TE] (A², Kāt, Vt)

*pūrvām [saṁdhyām] japaṁ tiṣṭhet sāvitṛm ārkadarśanāt |
paścimām tu sadāsīnaḥ samyag ṛkṣavibhāvanāt || 2.101 ||*

During the morning twilight, one should stand whispering the Sāvitrī until sunrise, but, during the evening twilight, one should be sitting in the due way until the manifestation of the Pleiades (forming the Plough, i.e. *Ursa Maior*).

[...] *ādityodaye ca sarvatas tamo nivartate | ubhayadharmānivrtau ca saṁdhyā rātridharme 'hardharme ca | atyantasaṁyoge caiṣā dvitīyā saṁdhyām iti | tena yāvat saṁdhyākālaṁ tiṣṭhet ity uktam bhavati | tataḥ paraṁ svātantryam sthitam eva | kecid āhur naiveyam atyantasaṁyoge dvitīyā | kiṁ tarhi kālāś cākarmakāṇām karmasaṁjño bhavati* (≈ M 1.336 Vt. 12 *ad* A 1.4.51) *iti vārtikakāras tatra karmaṇi dvitīyā* (A 2.3.2) *ity eva dvitīyā | yat tu kālādhvanor atyantasaṁyoge* (A 2.3.5) *iti tad yatra kriyāvācī śabdo na prayujyate | krośaṁ kuṭilā nadī sarvarātraṁ kalyāṇī | yatra¹⁸¹ ca sakarmako dhātur māsam adhīyata iti sa¹⁸² tasya viśayaḥ | iha punaḥ saṁdhyām tiṣṭhet iti tiṣṭhatir akarmakaḥ | ato vidhinirdeśaḥ kṛtsnasaṁdhyāprāptyarthaṁ sthānāsanayoḥ kartum¹⁸³ | [...]*

And darkness completely disappears at sunrise, and there is twilight (*saṁdhyā*) in the case of the disappearance of the properties of both [times of the day], i.e. in the case of the property of night and that of the day. And this accusative [ending] in *saṁdhyām* is used in the sense of total connection. The meaning is that he should be standing as long as the time of twilight [lasts]. After that, [his] independence is indeed established. Some sustain that this (i.e. *saṁdhyām*) is not

¹⁸¹ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *ubhayatra*. The others present the variant reading *yatra*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 54).

¹⁸² Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *satyam*. The others but Olivelle present the variant reading *sa*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 54). Ultimately, Olivelle's edition omits it. We have decided to maintain the reading *sa* as it makes better sense.

¹⁸³ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *kartavyaḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *kartum*, which actually makes better sense. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 55).

an accusative [used] in the sense of total connection. But rather the Vārtikakāra (i.e. Kātyāyana) says: “And time is designated as the *karman* of the intransitive verbs” (≈ M 1.336 Vt. 12 *ad* A 1.4.51). In this case, the accusative [is explained] just by *karmaṇi dvitīyā* (A 2.3.2). What is [taught by] *kālādhvanor atyantasamyoge* (A 2.3.5) [applies] where the word-form expressing an action is not employed, i.e. “the river is twisty for a *krośa*” (*krośaṃ kuṭilā nadī*), “fortunate all night” (*sarvarātram kalyāṇī*). And [it is also used] where the verbal base is transitive, i.e. “[it] is studied all month long.” This is its limited sphere [of application]. In this case, however, when it is said “one should stand all twilight long”, the verbal base *sthā-* (‘to stand’) is intransitive; therefore, there is a special indication in the rule (M 1.336 Vt. 12 *ad* A 1.4.51) [according to which] the actions of [e.g.] standing and sitting are meant to be performed in order to carry out [such actions] throughout the whole twilight.¹⁸⁴

Rules and passage cited or referred to:

- A 2.3.2: *karmaṇi dvitīyā* [*anabhihite* 1]
The accusative is used in the sense of patient [unless otherwise signified].
- A 2.3.5: *kālādhvanor atyantasamyoge* [*dvitīyā* 2]
[The accusative] is used after words denoting time and distance in the sense of total connection.
- M 1.336 Vt. 12 *ad* A 1.4.51: *kālabhāvādhvavantavyāḥ karmasamjñā hy akarmaṇām*
Time, state and distance should be understood as the designation of the *karman* of the intransitive verbs.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on *saṃdhyām*, i.e. the accusative feminine form of the nominal stem *saṃdhyā-* (‘twilight’), which is interpreted as meaning *atisamyoga* (‘total connection’). The latter expression is used by Pāṇini in rule A 2.3.5 to denote duration and motion through a place signified by the case accusative case ending. In this case, the accusative case ending does not denote just the patient (as prescribed by A 2.3.2), but it indicates time (as taught by A 2.3.5) since the accusative *saṃdhyām* means ‘during twilight.’ In this regard, Medhātithi quotes a *vārttika* (directly attributed to the Vārttikakāra, i.e. Kātyāyana), which teaches that the accusative case ending means time, when the verb is intransitive. It should be noted that the citation of the *vārttika* is not literal

¹⁸⁴ We note that the verbal bases *sthā-* and *ās-* together with *śī-* are the object of rule A 1.4.46, which is dealt with in Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.75.

or, at least, it does not coincide with any of the *vārttikas* quoted in the *Mahābhāṣya*. We agree with Olivelle, whose transcription singles out Vt. 12 *ad* A 1.4.51 (M 1.336) as most probably being a *vārttika*, at which Medhātithi was hinting. This *vārttika* could also apply here since, as the scholar explains, the verbal base *sthā-* ('to stand') is intransitive.

57. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106 [TE] (A, A*)

naityake nāsty anadhyāyo brahmasatram hi tat smṛtam |
[brahmāhutihutam] punyam anadhyāyavaṣaṭkṛtam || 2.106 ||

In the regular [Vedic recitation], there is no interruption: indeed, this is handed down as a sacrificial session made up of the Veda. [The study of] the Veda, which is offered as if it were an offering, is a meritorious act, whose *Vaṣaṭ* formula determines its interruption.

[...] *satratvam idānīm rūpakabhaṅgyā yojayati | brahma adhyayanam āhutihutam anyat satram somāhutyā hūyate | juhutir anivṛttau¹⁸⁵ vartate 'nekārthātvād dhātūnām | brahmaśabdena tadviṣayādhyayanakriyā lakṣyate | brahmādhyanam āhutir ivopamitam vyāghrādibhiḥ* (A 2.1.56) *iti samāsaḥ | anadhyāye yad adhyayanam tena vaṣaṭkṛtam | [...] vaṣaṭśabdena vauṣaṭśabdo lakṣyate | tena kṛtam yuktaṁ saṃskṛtam | sādhanam kṛteti samāsaḥ* (see A 2.1.32) ||

In this case, [Manu] uses a metaphor to express the state of being a *sattra*. [The compound *brahmāhutihuta-* should be analysed as] *brahman*, i.e. the study [of the Veda], is *āhutihutam*, i.e. offered as if it were an offering. Any other *sattra* is offered by means of a Soma offering. The verbal base *hu-* is used in the sense of 'non-cessation' [of the action of offering] due to the polysemy of the verbal bases. The act of studying the Veda as its special sphere is conveyed by the word-form *brahman-*. The study of the Veda is like an offering; the compound [is explained] by *upamitam vyāghrādibhiḥ* (A 2.1.56). The study which [is performed] at a time when there is the intermission of study is made by means of *vaṣaṭ*. [...] The word-form *vauṣaṭ-* is conveyed by the word-form *vaṣat-*. The sacrifice (*saṃskṛta*) is made, i.e. performed, by this (*tena kṛtam*). The compound [is formed according to the rule which teaches to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound by combining a nominal

¹⁸⁵ Mandlik, Gharpure and Olivelle feature the variant reading *anivṛttau*. Jha and Dave present the variant reading *nivṛttau*. We have decided to maintain the variant reading *anivṛttau*, as this makes more sense of the content of Manu's verse.

pada denoting] a *sādhana* (i.e. an instrument or an agent) with a *kṛt* derivative stem (see A 2.1.32).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 2.1.32: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.74.
- A 2.1.56: *upamitaṃ vyāghrādibhiḥ sāmānyāprayoge [samāsaḥ 3 saha supā 4 sup 9 vā 18 tatpuruṣaḥ 22 samānādhikareṇa 49]*
[An inflected noun] denoting the measured object combines with [an inflected noun] of the list beginning with *vyāghra-* ('tiger') [to derive a *tatpuruṣa karmadhāraya* compound, provided that no inflected noun denoting a general property is used].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi first explains the compound *brahmāhutihuta-* as a *rūpakasamāsa* (formed according to A 2.1.56, understood in the post-Pāṇini sense), in which *brahman-* (intended as 'study of the Veda') is the subject of comparison (*upamita*) and *āhutihuta-* (in the sense of 'offered by means of an offering') is the standard of comparison (*upamāna*). Therefore, the study of the Veda is compared to an offering. The scholar then explains the compound *vaṣaṭkṛta-* as a *tatpuruṣa* compound formed according to rule A 2.1.32. In this regard, he compares the role played by the word-form *vaṣat-* (uttered at the end of the hymns) with the study of the Veda (accomplished at the end of the days in which its study is not interdicted). Finally, we would like to emphasise that, reading Pāṇini *ex Pāṇini ipso*, A 2.1.56 and A 2.1.55¹⁸⁶ originally teach to form a *tatpuruṣa karmadhāraya* compound with the sense of a *rūpakasamāsa* (namely a compound that consists of a metaphorical identification) and not an *upamāsamāsa* (namely a compound that consists of a simile), as instead it was interpreted by the post-Pāṇinian theoreticians, among which Medhātithi is clearly found.¹⁸⁷

58. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.107 [J] (A*)

yaḥ svādhyāyam adhīte 'bdaṃ vidhinā niyataḥ śuciḥ |
tasya nityaṃ kṣaraty eṣa payo dadhi ghṛtaṃ madhu || 2.107 ||

This (i.e. the recitation) of the one who recites his recitation for one year according to the rule, self-controlled and purified, constantly gives forth a stream of milk, curd, ghee and honey.

¹⁸⁶ See Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.147.

¹⁸⁷ For more information on this issue, see Candotti and Pontillo (2017).

prakṛtavidhiśeṣo 'yam | sa ca nityaḥ samadhigataḥ | nitye ca phalaśravaṇam arthavādaḥ | na ca vidhivibhaktir vidyate (cf., e.g., A 3.1.95) | *yenaikasya tūbhayatve saṃyogaḥ prthaktvam* (PMS 4.3.5) *ity anena nyāyenādhikārāntarahetuḥ payaḥprabhṛtiḥ*¹⁸⁸ *syāt | labdhe ca nitye 'dhikāre rātrisattranyāyo*¹⁸⁹ *'pi nāsti* (cf. Śab ad PMS 4.3.17-18) *yena payaādīni niṣphalatvena kalperan | tasmād arthavāda evāyam adhīyānasya lokapaktyā pratigrahādīnā golābhāt payaḥprabhṛteḥ prakṣaraṇānūvādasyālabhanam* | [...]

This is supplied to the mentioned injunction. And this is obtained as mandatory. And the act of learning the outcome in the case of something that is mandatory is a [pure] explanatory passage [of the injunction]. And there is no ending conveying the injunction (e.g. a *kṛtya* affix: cf., e.g., A 3.1.95). According to the statement “But when one [substance] is used in both ways (i.e. for *nitya* ‘mandatory’ and *nimittaka* ‘contingent’ actions) there is a connection, but there is [also] separateness” (PMS 4.3.5), milk and the like (mentioned as part of a *nitya* as well as of a *nimittaka* action) should be another cause for being entitled [to place milk and the like in the sacrificial arena]. However, when the fact of being entitled has also been taken as mandatory, the rule of the *rātrisattra* (cf. Śab ad PMS 4.3.17-18)¹⁹⁰ is not valid, and, due to this reason, milk and the like would be prepared unfruitfully. Therefore, this is just an explanatory passage: his abundance (*prakṣaraṇa*) in milk and the like is obtained because of the obtaining of cattle as a reward on the part of the people for the one who studies the Veda and through his accepting gifts and the like.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.95: *kṛtyāḥ* [*dhātoḥ* 91]
[The affixes occurring after a verbal base] introduced hereafter are called *kṛtya*.

Comment:

In this case, there is no direct citation or reference to a grammatical rule or passage. Medhātithi wonders whether the verse should be interpreted as an injunction or not. In this regard, he states that there is actually no ending that means injunction (*vidhivibhakti*); thus, by means of this general reference, he

¹⁸⁸ Mandlik presents the variant reading *prayapabhṛtiḥ*, which is likely a misprint. The others feature the correct variant reading *payaḥprabhṛtiḥ*.

¹⁸⁹ As in a previous instance (No. 28), we have standardised the spelling of *rātrisatra-* to the more common *rātrisattra-*.

¹⁹⁰ Regarding the *rātrisattra*, see Medh ad MDh^M 2.6.

could be hinting at a *kṛtya* affix (taught in the section A 3.1.95-132), a *līṅ* verbal form (cf. A 3.3.161),¹⁹¹ etc. Later on in the comment, the scholar resorts to a direct quotation of PMS 4.3.5 and an indirect reference to PMS 4.3.17-18 to discuss the possibility of deducing an injunction from an explanatory passage. He ultimately concludes that the present verbal form *kṣarati* used to signify the constant raining of milk and the like on him merely conveys the sense of an action which happens automatically because of the study of the Veda and not as an enjoined action. The general meaning of this Mīmāṃsā-based excerpt is that, if rituals are mandatory (*nitya*), only one outcome (*phala*) is assumed; there is no need to point out *phala*, as it is already known, so if there is any mention of *phala*, this mention is just a commendatory statement, that is additional encouragement to undertake a given act.

59. Medh ad MDh^M 2.108 [TE] (A*)

agnīndhanaṃ bhaikṣacaryām adhaśayyām guror hitam |
ā samāvartanāt kuryāt kṛtopanayano dvijaḥ || 2.108 ||

A twice-born who has carried out [his] initiation should perform the feeding of fire, begging for alms, sleeping on the ground and what is salutary for his teacher up to the time of [his] return home.

[...] *gurave hitam iti hitayoge caturthī* (see A 2.1.36) *nyāyyā*¹⁹² ||

[As for *guror hitam* ('salutary for the teacher', lit. 'of the teacher'), the correct form [should be] *gurave hitam* [in which] the dative ending is syntactically combined with [the word-form] *hita-* (see A 2.1.36).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.1.36: *caturthī tadarthāṛthabalihitasukharakṣitaiḥ* [*sup* 2 *saha supā* 4 *vā* 18 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 22]
 [An inflected noun] ending in the dative case [preferably] combines with [an inflected noun] denoting what is intended for it (i.e. for what is expressed by the constituent in the dative case) or with the following inflected nouns, i.e. *artha-* ('purpose'), *bali-* ('sacrificial offering'), *hita-* ('benefit'), *sukha-* ('pleasure'), and *rakṣita-* ('what is reserved') [to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound].

¹⁹¹ A 3.3.161: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.6.

¹⁹² Mandlik adds *taddhakṣyati* after *nyāyyā*, while the others do not.

Comment:

Medhātithi reflects on the phrase *guror hitam* used in the sense of ‘doing what is beneficial to the teacher’, made up of the neuter form of the past participle of *dhā-* (conveying the sense of ‘what is destined for’, lexicalised as denoting ‘anything useful for’, i.e. ‘benefit’ or ‘well-being’, etc.) and the genitive of the nominal stem *guru-*. A literal translation of the phrase could be ‘his teacher’s well-being.’ Nonetheless, the role the word-form *guru-* plays in the phrase is that of ‘the one who benefits’ from *hitam*. This role must be expressed in the dative case as it is presupposed by the wording of A 2.1.36 (paraphrased by the scholar), which is a compounding rule teaching to form the equivalent *tatpuruṣa* compound *guruhita-*.

60. Medh ad MDh^M 2.116 [TE] (A, A*)

brahma yas tv ananujñātam adhīyānād avāpnuyāt |
sa brahmasteyasaṃyukto narakam pratipadyate || 2.116 ||

The one who would obtain [the knowledge of] the Veda without authorisation from [another one] who is reciting [it] falls to hell as he is accused of (lit. ‘connected to’) the theft of the Veda.

[...] *adhīyānād iti pañcamy ākhyātopayoge* (A 1.4.29) *iti | apāyasya vā gamyamānatvād brahma hy adhyetur* (see A 1.4.24) *niṣkrāmatīva | lyablope* (see A 7.1.37) *vā karmaṇi | adhīyānam śrutvāpnoti śikṣate ||*

The ablative case in *adhīyānād* [is assigned] according to *ākhyātopayoge* (A 1.4.29). Otherwise, it derives from the comprehension of a movement away (see A 1.4.24) since it is as if the Veda came from the one who studies [the Veda]. Or rather, in the case of a zero-replacement of [a *kṛt* derivative stem ending with the substitutive affix] *LyaP* (see A 7.1.37) (i.e. *śrutvā*), [the ablative is used] in the sense of the patient: he obtains, i.e. he learns, after listening to the one who studies.

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 1.4.24: see Medh ad MDh^M 1.23.
- A 1.4.29: *ākhyātopayoge* [*kārake* 23 *apādāna* 24]
 [A *kāraka*] denoting the one who tells (*ākhyātr-*) when instruction is signified [is called *apādāna* (i.e. ablative)].
- A 7.1.37: see Medh ad MDh^M 1.4.

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi advances two alternatives to explain the syntactical value of the ablative form of the nominal stem *adhīyāna-* ('the one who is studying'). First, he resorts to A 1.4.29 by directly citing the rule that teaches to use the ablative in the sense of the one who tells (*ākhyātr*), provided that instruction is signified. In this case, the *adhīyāna* should in fact be considered 'the instructor' (even though his instruction must be understood as not being destined for the listener mentioned in MDh^M 2.116). Second, he simply refers to the general rule A 1.4.24 teaching to use the ablative in the sense of a stable reference point, provided that a movement away is signified. He then continues to develop this hypothesis assuming that a gerund form from the verbal base *śru-* ('to listen to'), formed by means of the substitute affix *LyaP* (taught by A 7.1.37), is zero-replaced and combined with the ablative form at stake (which thus denotes the starting point of the instruction).

61. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.119 [TL] (A)

śayyāsane 'dhyācarite śreyasā na samāviśet |

śayyāsanasthaś caivainam pratyutthāyābhivādayet || 2.119 ||

[The Vedic student] should not occupy a bed or a seat used by a superior, and, only when he is resting on a bed or a seat, should he address him after standing up.

śayyā cāsanam ceti jātir aprāṇinām (A 2.4.6) *iti dvandvaikavadbhāvaḥ* | [...]

[The compound *śayyāsana-* must be analysed as] 'bed and seat': the status as if it denoted a single thing of [this] *dvandva* compound is according to *jātir aprāṇinām* (A 2.4.6).

Rule cited:

- A 2.4.6: *jātir aprāṇinām* [*ekavacanam* 1 *dvandvaḥ* 2]
[A *dvandva*] combining class names excluding living beings [is singular in number].

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the compound *śayyāsana-* which is inflected in the locative case and occurs as the left-hand constituent of the *upapadasamāsa* *śayyāsanastha-*. This is a *dvandva* compound analysed as being formed by

combining two inflected nouns in a copulative sense according to A 2.2.29,¹⁹³ which is the general rule defining the *dvandva* compound, i.e. in the sense of the copulative conjunction *ca*. As directly quoted by Medhātithi, the singular number complies with rule A 2.4.6; therefore, this copulative compound falls into the category of *samāhāradvandva* (as such, it is also neuter in gender following A 2.4.17).¹⁹⁴

62. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.122 [E] (P, A)

abhivādāt param vipro jyāyāmsam abhivādayan |

asau nāmāham asmīti svaṃ nāma parikīrtayet || 2.122 ||

A Brāhmaṇa, when addressing another older [Brāhmaṇa], should proclaim his name after greeting him, saying: “I salute you—I whose name is so-and-so.”¹⁹⁵

[...] *asāv ity etasya padasyānarthakyād arthānavasāyaḥ | smṛtyantaratanrenāpi vyavaharanti ca sūtrakārāḥ | yathā pāṇiniḥ karmaṇi dvitīyā* (A 2.3.2) *iti dvitīyādiśabdaiḥ*¹⁹⁶ | *ihāpy asāv iti | svaṃ nāmātidīśata iti yajñasūtre 'pi paribhāṣitam | yady evaṃ svaṃ nāmety anenaiva siddhe 'sau nāmety anarthakam | nāmaśabdaprayogārtham | katham | svaṃ nāma kīrtayed idam nāmāham iti | anena svarūpeṇāham asmīti | samānārthatvād vikalpaṃ manyante | atra ślokadvaye*¹⁹⁷ *etāvad abhivādanavākyasya rūpaṃ siddham abhivādaye devadattanāmāham bhoḥ | uttareṇa ślokena bhor ity etad vidhāsyate | [...]*

There is no scope for the meaning of this inflected word *asau* because of its uselessness. The authors of Sūtras also make use of the model of other *smṛti* sources. For instance, they use word-forms such as *dvitīya-* which Pāṇini uses in *karmaṇi dvitīyā* (A 2.3.2), [and] here also when it is said *asau* (‘so-and-so’), it is the object of a metarule in a rule on the sacrifices (*yajñasūtra*), which reads: “He indicates his own name” (*svaṃ nāmātidīśate*). If it has been established precisely by this [rule] that one’s own name [must be indicated, then to say] “My name is

¹⁹³ A 2.2.29: *cārthe dvandvaḥ* [*sup* 2.1.2 *saha supā* 2.1.4] “[An inflected noun] combines with [an inflected noun] in the meaning of ‘and’ to form a *dvandva* compound.”

¹⁹⁴ A 2.4.17: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.90.

¹⁹⁵ We remark that *asau* literally means ‘that.’

¹⁹⁶ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *ādiśabdaiḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle show the variant reading *iti dvitīyādiśabdaiḥ*, which we decided to adopt.

¹⁹⁷ Mandlik and the Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *ślokaḥ*. The others present the variant reading *ślokadvaye*. This appears to be the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 60).

so-and-so” is useless. The purpose of this use is [mentioning] the word-form *nāma-* (‘name’). How? One should declare [one’s] own name [by saying]: “This is my name,” “I am named by this (word-)form.” Because of the equivalence of denotation, [some] consider [this] (i.e. either to use the pronoun or the proper name) an option. Here, in a couple of *śloka*s, the well-established form of the utterance used for greetings is “I am greeting you, your honour—I whose name is Devadatta” (*abhivādaye devadattanāmāhaṃ bhoḥ*). [The use of] this “*bhoḥ*” will be enjoined in a subsequent verse (i.e. MDh 2.124).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.3.2: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.101.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the word-form *asau* (‘so-and-so’), which is explained as redundant in the greetings formula taught by Manu. He maintains that the authors of Sūtras usually employ word-forms borrowed from the *smṛti* sources: for instance, they use the term *dviṭīya-* to express the accusative case ending, which is borrowed from Pāṇini’s rule A 2.3.2: this citation is clearly of an encyclopaedic nature. Then, he resorts to a Paribhāṣā from a certain *yajñasūtra*, interpreted by Jha (1999: III, 392) as an unknown work named *Yajñasūtra* of which we were unable to find any trace. Instead, we think that Medhātithi uses the expression *yajñasūtra-* (‘rule on the sacrifices’) to hint at a prototypical sentence employed in the sacrificial arena when the name of the patron of the sacrifice is enunciated. We did not find any specific rule in the *Śrautasūtras*, but the following passage selected from the *Baudhāyanaśrautasūtra* seems to refer to this ritual context (BŚS 3.19): *atha yatra hotur abhijānāty āśāste ’yaṃ yajamāno ’sau tad yajamānaṃ yajñāsyā dohaṃ vācayati* [...] “When [the Adhvaryu] listens to the Hotṛ [who says]: ‘this patron so-and-so desires [X]’, he makes the patron utter ‘the milking of the sacrifice.’” In this passage also, the pronoun *asau* is mentioned to indicate the name of the patron.

63. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.123 [TE/E] (A, Pat, M)

nāmadheyasya ye kecid abhivādaṃ na jānate |

tān prājño ’ham iti brūyāt striyaḥ sarvās tathaiva ca || 2.123 ||

A wise man should say “I” [with] those who do not know the way of addressing [people by] their proper name as well as [with] all women.

[...] *anye tu pratyabhivādaṃ na jānata iti varṇayanti* | ***pratyabhivāde 'śūdre*** (A 8.2.83) *iti nāmānte pluto vihitah* | *taṃ ye na vidus teṣv aham ity eva vācyam* | *vyākaraṇaprayojanopanyāsaprasaṅgena caitan mahābhāṣyakāreṇa pradarśitam* |

avidvāṃsaḥ pratyabhivāde nāmno ye na plutim viduḥ |

kāmaṃ teṣu tu viproṣya strīṣv ivāyam ahaṃ vadet || (M 1.3 ll. 7-8)

[...]

Other people explain that they do not know the proper way to reply to greetings. An extra-long vowel is taught at the end of the name by *pratyabhivāde 'śūdre* (A 8.2.83). In the case of those who do not know this [extra-long vowel], only *aham* should be uttered, and this has been demonstrated by the author of the *Mahābhāṣya* on the occasion of the statement of the usages of the grammar:

“But in the case of people who are unaware, i.e. they do not know the phenomenon of the extra-long vowel of the name in the case of the reply to greetings, as is the case with women, one should only say ‘I’ at one’s own will when returning after a journey” (M 1.3 ll. 7-8).

Rule and passage cited:

- A 8.2.83: *pratyabhivāde 'śūdre* [vākyasya teḥ pluta udāttaḥ 82]
[An extra-long high-pitched vowel is used in place of the syllable beginning with the last vowel of an utterance] in the case of the greeting response if the person being greeted is not a Śūdra.
- M 1.3 ll. 7-8: *avidvāṃsaḥ* [...] *vadet*, see the translation.

Comment:

After another two explanations of the first hemistich of this rule, Medhātithi advances the hypothesis that it hints at rule A 8.2.83 which teaches to use an extra-long high-pitched vowel at the end of the name when greeting a man who is not a Śūdra. Moreover, he quotes a verse included in the *Paspaśā*, i.e. the introduction to the *Mahābhāṣya*, to authorise the mere use of “I” without the extra-long substitution of the final vowel of the name when the man who is being greeted does not know this rule, in exactly the same way as happens when one is greeting a woman. In the *Paspaśā*, this verse is quoted to explain that anyone who wishes to stop being ignorant of how greetings are properly made must study grammar.

64. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.125 [TE/E] (P², A, A*)

*āyusmān bhava saumyeti vācyo vipro 'bhivādane |
akāraś cāsya nāmno 'nte vācyah pūrvākṣarah plutaḥ || 2.125 ||*
When a Brāhmaṇa is addressed, one should utter [towards him]: “O
good Sir, be you provided with [long] life.” At the end of his name,
the sound *a* having a consonant as its previous sound should be
uttered as prolated.

[...] *pūrvākṣara eva plutabhāvino 'kārasya viśeṣaṇam etat | akṣaram atra
vyañjanam | tatra pūrvaśliṣṭaḥ*¹⁹⁸ *sa evam ucyate | etad uktaṁ bhavati | pūrva eva
nāgantur*¹⁹⁹ *akāraḥ plutaḥ kartavyaḥ | kiṁ tarhi ya eva nāmni vidyate sa eva
plāvayatavyaḥ | sarvaṁ caitad evaṁ vyākhyānaṁ bhagavataḥ pāṇineḥ
smṛtisāmarthyena*²⁰⁰ *| śabdārthaprayoge ca manvādibhyo 'dhikatarah prāmāṇye
bhagavān pāṇiniḥ | sa ca pratyabhivāde 'śūdre (A 8.2.83) teḥ plutiṁ smarati |
ṭīṣabdena yo 'ntyo 'c tadādiśabdarūpam ucyate (see A 1.1.64) | [...]*

[The word-form] *pūrvākṣara-* (‘previous syllable’) is a qualifier of the vowel *a*, which has to be uttered as an extra-long vowel. Here, [the right-hand constituent] *akṣara-* means ‘consonant.’ In this case, this (i.e. the sound *a*) is defined in this way, i.e. that which is connected to the previous [sound] (i.e. a consonant). This is the meaning of what has been said: precisely the vowel *a*, which was there previously and not another adventitious one, must be realised as prolated. What, then? Just that (i.e. the vowel *a*), which is found in the name, must be prolonged. All this explanation is by the force of the tradition of the venerable Pāṇini. The venerable Pāṇini is superior to Manu and the others as far as the authority of the usage of linguistic meanings is concerned, and according to *pratyabhivāde 'śūdre* (A 8.2.83), he establishes the extra-long substitution of the vowel of the *ṬI* syllable. The word-form beginning with the last vowel is denoted by the term *ṬI* (see A 1.1.64).

¹⁹⁸ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *pūrvasmin yasmin śliṣṭaḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *pūrvaśliṣṭaḥ*. The origin of this reading is unknown. Jha (1924: I, 61) records the variant reading *pūrvamin* (perhaps a misprint for *pūrvasmin*) *śliṣṭaḥ* of manuscript A.

¹⁹⁹ Mandlik contains the variant reading *nāngantuḥ*, which is likely a misprint. The others present the variant reading *nāgantuh*.

²⁰⁰ Mandlik and the Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *sprśati sāmartyena*. The others present the variant reading *smṛtisāmarthyena*. This is the reading in manuscript A, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 61).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 1.1.64: *aco 'ntyādi ti*
That which begins with the final vowel (of a linguistic item) is designated as *ṬI*.
- A 8.2.83: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.123.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the compound *pūrvākṣara-* ('having a consonant as its previous sound'), which is read as a *bahuvrīhi* compound (in which the constituent *akṣara-* means 'consonant' and not 'syllable'). Pāṇini's name is cited twice as the most authoritative voice when the usage of the meaning of words is to be established: in this field, he is defined as more authoritative than Manu himself; an argument that is taken up again on several other occasions (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.51). Furthermore, as regards the purely grammatical aspect, Medhātithi again cites A 8.2.83 to justify the substitution of the *ṬI* syllable with its extra-long counterpart. Finally, the scholar recalls the metarule teaching what is termed *ṬI* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, i.e. A 1.1.64.

65. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.129 [TL] (A*²)

parapatnī tu yā strī syād asaṃbaddhā ca yonitaḥ |
tām brūyād bhavatīty evaṃ subhage bhaginīti ca || 2.129 ||

[When addressing] the one (f.) who is the wife of another man and unrelated by kinship, one should say "madam", "dear lady" and "sister."

yā tāvat parasya patnī sā bhavati subhage 'tha vā bhavati bhagini |
bhavacchabdo 'yaṃ strīpratyayāntaḥ saṃbuddhau kṛtahrasvaḥ (see A 7.3.107) |
bhavatīty atretikaraṇaṃ padārthaviparyāsakṛtasvarūpaṃ param²⁰¹ bodhayati
subhage bhaginīty atra prakāre (see A 1.1.68) | [...]

The one (f.) who is the wife of another man is [to be addressed] as "madam" (*bhavati*, voc. fem. sing. from *bhavat-*), "dear lady" (*subhage*, voc. fem. sing. from *subhaga-*) and "sister" (*bhagini*, voc. fem. sing. from *bhaginī-*). The word-form *bhavat-* ending with the feminine affix obtains a final short vowel in the sense of a vocative (see A 7.3.107). The expression *iti*, by which the own form is realised because of the exchange with the meaning of the word and which comes

²⁰¹ Jha omits *param*, just as manuscript S does (see Jha 1924: I, 62), while the others do not. We decided to maintain *param* as it is still possible to make sense of it in this section.

after [*bhavati*] makes known that it is used in the [same] manner in which *subhāge* and *bhagini* are used here (i.e. all the three words can be used indistinctively as vocatives) (see A 1.1.68).

Rules referred to:

- A 1.1.68: *svaṃ rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā*
The own form of a linguistic unit occurs except for the designations of linguistic forms.
- A 7.3.107: *ambārthanadyor hrasvaḥ [aṅgasya 6.4.1 sambuddhau 106]*
A substitute short vowel replaces [the final sound of an *aṅga*] meaning *ambā-* ('mother') or termed as *nadī* (i.e. see A 1.4.3ff.) [before the vocative case ending].

Comment:

Medhātithi here explains the form *bhavati*, i.e. a vocative feminine singular from the nominal stem *bhavat-* (lit. 'your honour'; in the feminine gender: 'madam'). As for the morphological formation at its basis, A 4.1.6²⁰² is applied, which teaches to apply the feminine affix *ŌP* after a nominal stem taught with markers *U*, *R*, and *L*. The rule works since the nominal stem *bhavat-* is included as *bhavatU* in the *sarvādi* list ('all and the like'). The form deriving from this rule is *bhavatī* (< *bhavat-* + *ŌP*). A general rule (A 2.3.47)²⁰³ provides that the nominative case ending is taught to also occur in the sense of a vocative (*sambodhana*). However, the vocative form *bhavati* with a final short vowel is explained by A 7.3.107, which Medhātithi refers to precisely with the term *sambuddhi*.²⁰⁴ According to this rule, a short vowel replaces its long counterpart before the vocative case ending (corresponding to the nominative formed due to the previously cited rule) of nominal stems meaning *ambā-* ('mother') or termed

²⁰² A 4.1.6: *ugitaś ca [prātipadipadikāt 1 striyām 3 ŋp 5]* "[The feminine affix *ŌP*] also [occurs after a nominal stem] ending in an *it* denoted by the term *uK* (i.e. ending in *U*, *R*, *L*)."

²⁰³ A 2.3.47: *sambodhane ca [prathamā 46]* "[The nominative case ending] also occurs (after a nominal stem) in the sense of vocative."

²⁰⁴ Even though the vocative is generally labelled as *sambodhana* by Pāṇini, we remark that the term *sambuddhi* is also a term used in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, occurring in A 1.1.16 and 1.2.33.

as *nadī* by Pāṇini (cf. A 1.4.3-6).²⁰⁵ The feminine nominal stem *bhavatī-* may fall into the second category (since its stem ends in *-ī*). The final sentence about the use of *iti* indirectly hints at rule A 1.1.68 which teaches that in Pāṇini's grammar every word form stands for its own form instead of for its meaning. By contrast, in a common text, the use of *iti* after a word form is mandatory in order to shift from the meaning conveyed by the latter to its own form.

66. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.137 [TE] (A*)

pañcānām triṣu varṇeṣu bhūyāṃsi guṇavanti ca |

yatra syuḥ so 'tra mārhaḥ sūdro 'pi daśamīm gataḥ || 2.137 ||

Among the three [upper] classes, the one who has more and in a qualified manner of [these] five [titles to respect] is worthy of honour, and so is a Śūdra who has reached [his] tenth stage of life (i.e. 'nineties').

[...] *bhūyāṃsīty ādhikyamātram vivakṣitam na bahutvasamkhyāiva | tena dviviṣayatāpi siddhā bhavati | na hy ayaṃ samkhyāvācyeva bahuśabda ity atra pramāṇam asti | bhūyaḥśabdaś cāyaṃ na bahuśabda ādhikye ca tatra tatra dṛṣṭaḥ prayogaḥ | bhūyāṃś cātra parihāro bhūyasābhyudayena yokṣya iti pratyayārthabahutvam api na vivakṣitam | jātyākhyāyam (A 1.2.58) hy etad bahuvacanam | vivakṣāyam hy ekasya guṇavato mānahetutvam na syāt | tataś ca pūrvo 'vagatir bādhyate*²⁰⁶ | [...]

[The plural accusative form] *bhūyāṃsi* [from the nominal stem *bhūyas-* 'more'] is used with the intention of the speaker to merely signify excess, certainly not the plural number. A double feature is also well established by this [word-form]. Here, there is no evidence that this word-form *bahu-* ('many') must express number. And there is the word-form *bhūyas-* and not the word-form *bahu-*; here, the use is perceived in the sense of excess/superiority. It is said, for instance, "there is much to be answered here" (*bhūyāṃś cātra parihāraḥ*) or "I will be endowed with much success" (*bhūyasā'bhyudayena yokṣye*). There is no intention on the part of the speaker to signify the plurality of the meaning of the affix [in the form *bhūyāṃsi*]. Indeed, this plural number is taught by

²⁰⁵ Broadly speaking, the general rule A 1.4.3 teaches that the terms marked as *nadī* are uniquely feminine nominal stems ending with the vowels *-ī* and *-ū* such as *nadī-* ('river') or *vadhū-* ('daughter-in-law'). Some specific rules are provided in A 1.4.4-6.

²⁰⁶ Mandlik, Gharpure and Olivelle feature the variant reading *bādhyate*. Jha and Dave present the variant reading *bādhyeta*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 64).

jātyākhyāyām (A 1.2.58). Verily, in the intention of the speaker, there should be no reason not to attribute respect to a single man endowed with qualities, and, therefore, the previous understanding [of this meaning] is set aside.

Rule cited:

- A 1.2.58: *jātyākhyāyām ekasmin bahuvacanam anyatarasyām*
The plural number optionally occurs when a singularity has to be denoted, provided that a class is signified.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi cites rule A 1.2.58, which teaches that the plural number is optionally used instead of the singular when singularity is meant when a class (*jāti*) is being denoted. This rule is recalled by interpreting Manu's text in a particular way. According to Medhātithi's interpretation, the verse expresses that a man is entitled to more respect than another one even if he only exceeds the latter by a single quality, i.e. even if he is endowed with two qualities, while his competitor is only endowed with a single quality. Of course, Pāṇini's provision aims at the admitted use of the singular grammatical number to signify the plurality of members of a class: the rule provides that, e.g., the singular form *brāhmaṇaḥ* (from the nominal stem *brāhmaṇa-*) can mean the same as the plural *brāhmaṇāḥ*, when the speaker wishes to signify the class of Brāhmaṇas. In an original way, Medhātithi considers the plural ending as not necessarily conveying the sense of plurality by forcing the application of this Pāṇinian rule.

67. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.139 [TE] (A*)

teṣāṃ tu samavetānāṃ mānyau snātakapārthivau |
rājasnātakayoś caiva snātako *nṛpamānabhāk* || 2.139 ||

When they²⁰⁷ meet, the bath graduate and the lord of the earth should be honoured and [when] just the king and the bath graduate [meet], the bath graduate enjoys honour [from the presence] of the sovereign.

[...] *nṛpamānabhāk nṛpasya sakāśān mānaṃ bhajate labhate | śaṣṭhī nirdhāraṇe* (see A 2.3.41) | [...]

²⁰⁷ The people who are meeting are listed in the previous verse (MDh 2.138), i.e. people in vehicles or in their nineties, the sick, people carrying a load, women, bath graduates, kings, and bridegrooms.

The man who is said to be *nṛpamānabhāj-* enjoys, i.e. obtains, honour from the presence of the sovereign. The genitive [is used] in the partitive sense (see A 2.3.41).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.3.41: *yataś ca nirdhāraṇam* [*saptamī* 36 *ṣaṣṭhī* ca 38]
[A locative or genitive case ending occurs] (after a nominal stem)
denoting something from which something else is set apart (i.e. the partitive sense).

Comment:

Medhātithi's mention of the phrase *ṣaṣṭhī nirdhāraṇe* is really puzzling. Indeed, the use of the genitive or locative as signifying something from which something else is singled out is taught in rule A 2.3.41. The spontaneous interpretation of this special case of the *tatpuruṣa* compound at stake, i.e. *nṛpamānabhāj-* (which is namely an *upapadasamāsa*), might rather be 'obtaining honour on the part of the king.' Nonetheless, the unique genitive *nṛpasya* that is employed within Medhātithi's analysis of the compound depends on the ablative form *sakāśāt* (from the nominal stem *sakāśa-* 'presence'). The sense conveyed by the latter syntagm is 'from the presence of the king', which is extraneous to the mentioned *nirdhāraṇa* sense. The king, in fact, is not the person from whom the bath graduate is distinguished, but he is the man whose honour is received by the bath graduate (who is entitled to receive this), as taught in MDh 2.139. On the other hand, a syntactic structure involving a partitive adnominal genitive as an *upasarjana* in a *tatpuruṣa* compound is explicitly prohibited by A 2.2.10.²⁰⁸ Therefore, if Medhātithi was hinting at analysing the compound as *nṛpa-* + *mānabhāj-* meaning 'enjoying honour unlike the king', i.e. 'distinguished from the king by the fact that he receives honour', this analysis should be considered as non-Pāṇinian. A third hypothesis could be that Medhātithi's quotation hinted at such a prohibition and thus interpreted the compound in a different way.

68. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.140 [E] (P²)

upanīya tu yaḥ śiṣyaṃ vedam adhyāpayed dvijaḥ |
sakalpaṃ sarahasyaṃ ca tam ācāryaṃ pracakṣate || 2.140 ||

²⁰⁸ A 2.2.10: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.292.

They call ‘Preceptor’ the twice-born who, after initiating a pupil, makes him study the Veda together with the ritual literature and the esoteric doctrine.

ācāryādisābdānām evārthanirūpaṇārtham idam ārabhyate | sopacāro hi loka eṣām prayogaḥ | na ca śabdārthasambandhasya smartṛbhir ācāryapāṇiniprabhṛtibhir etan nirūpitam | iyaṁ cācāryapadārthasmṛtir vyavahāramūlā na vedamūlā pāṇinyādismṛtivat | na hy atra kiṃcit kartavyam upadiśyate | asya śabdasyāyam artha iti siddharūpo 'yam arthaḥ na sādhyarūpaḥ | [...]

This rule is undertaken just with the aim of stating the meaning of the word-form *ācārya-* and the like. Indeed, the use of these [word-forms] in the everyday language is tuned to rules of conduct. And this is not determined by [the teachers] starting from Preceptor Pāṇini onwards, who teach the relationship between word-forms and their meaning. And what is taught here about the meaning of the word-form *ācārya-* is rooted in the usage but it is not rooted in the Vedas like the teaching of Pāṇini and the others. In fact, it does not teach anything which has to be done. The meaning of this word-form is something well-established, not something which has to be established.

Comment:

In the explanation of the word-form *ācārya-* (‘preceptor’), which is used to define the *dvija* man initiating a pupil and teaching him the Veda as well as the ritual and secret texts, Medhātithi refers to Pāṇini twice. He states that the use of word-forms such as *ācārya-* is not determined by Pāṇini’s teaching and the like (thus, by the Vyākaraṇa authorities) but by everyday language use since this is not rooted in the Veda.

69. Medh ad MDh^M 2.145 [TE] (Vt)

[upādhyāyān daśācāryā] ācāryāṇām śataṁ pitā | sahasraṁ tu pitṛṇ mātā gauraveṇātiricyate || 2.145 ||

The teacher exceeds ten preceptors; the father exceeds one hundred teachers; the mother exceeds one thousand fathers in venerability.

upādhyāyān daśātiricyate | daśabhya upādhyāyebhyo 'dhikaḥ | katham punar atra dvitīyā | atir ayaṁ karmapravacanīyaḥ | upādhyāyān atikramyātikramyātiricyate gauraveṇa sātīśayena yujyate | atha vādhikyam atirekas taddhetuke 'bhibhave dhātur vartate | gauravādhikyenopādhyāyān

abhibhavati | atiricyata iti karmakartari dviṭīyā cāviruddhā duhipacyor bahulaṃ sakarmakayoḥ (M 2.69 l. 10 Vt. 14 *ad* A 3.1.87) *iti bahulagrahaṇāt | [...]*

‘He exceeds ten preceptors’ (*upādhyāyān daśātiricyate*), i.e. he is superior to ten preceptors: here, how does an accusative case ending come about? This *ati* is a preposition. After overpassing the teachers, he exceeds [them]: he is endowed with superior authoritativeness. Or rather, his ‘exceeding’ (*atireka*) [means] ‘surpassing’: the verbal root is used in the sense of an action of prevailing which has this [exceeding] as its cause. He prevails over the teachers with his superior authority. When it is said *atiricyate* with the patient who is the agent at the same time (i.e. as a reflexive verbal form), the accusative case ending is consistent with this according to [the following *vārttika*]: “Under various conditions, in the case of the transitive verbs *duh-* (‘to milk’) and *pac-* (‘to cook’), [the use of the agent as if it were a patient has to be added]” (M 2.69 l. 10 Vt. 14 *ad* A 3.1.87).

Passage cited:

- M 2.69 l. 10 Vt. 14 *ad* A 3.1.87: *duhipacyor bahulaṃ sakarmakayoḥ*, see the translation.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi explains the use of the accusative *upādhyāyān* (from the nominal stem *upādhyāya-* ‘teacher’) in several ways, and, ultimately, resorts to a *vārttika* on the rule regulating reflexive verbal forms (A 3.1.87),²⁰⁹ i.e. Vt. 14 *ad* A 3.1.87 (M 2.69 l. 10). Indeed, neither the verb *duh-* (‘to milk’) nor *pac-* (‘to cook’), which are regulated by the *vārttika* at stake, are involved. Medhātithi simply relies on the fact that Kātyāyana uses the expression *bahulam*, which—to stay with Kiparsky’s (1979: 206) suggestion—indicates that the rule is “subject to further restrictions of various kinds.” Medhātithi is probably suggesting that the phrase *upādhyāyān daśātiricyate* should be interpreted as ‘he left the teachers with a surplus of ten times.’

70. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.146 [TE] (Vt*)

utpādakabrahmadātror garīyān brahmadah pitā |

[brahmanjanma] hi viprasya pretya ceha ca śāśvatam || 2.146 ||

Between a parent and the one who donates the Veda, the one who donates the Veda is the more venerable father; for the Brāhmaṇa’s

²⁰⁹ A 3.1.87: *karmavat karmaṇā tulyakriyāḥ [kartr̥ 68]* “When [the agent] behaves as a patient of the same action it is as if it were a patient.”

birth in the Veda (i.e. whose purpose is to study the Veda) is forever, both in the afterlife and in this world.

[...] *atra heturūpam arthavādam āha | brahmajanma hi brahmagrahaṇārthaṃ janma brahmajanma | śākapārthivādītvāt samāsaḥ* (see M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69) | *asmin samāsa upanayanaṃ brahmajanma | atha vā brahmagrahaṇam eva janma* | [...]

Here, [Manu] uttered an explanatory passage as a logical reason. “For it is *brahmajanman*”: [the compound *brahmajanman*- should be analysed as] ‘a birth whose purpose is that of seizing (i.e. learning) the Veda.’ This is a compound from the group beginning with *śākapārthiva*- (‘king eating vegetables’) (see M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69). In this compound, the ceremony of initiation is considered as *brahmajanma*. Or rather, ‘birth’ is just the seizing (i.e. learning) of the Veda.

Passage referred to:

- M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69: *samānādhikaraṇādhikāre śākapārthivādīnām upasaṅkhyānam uttarapadalopaś ca*
In the section whose heading is the co-referentiality [of the constituents of a compound] (i.e. in the section starting with A 2.1.49 and ending with A 2.1.72, devoted to the *tatpuruṣa karmadhāraya* compounds), there is the additional statement [consisting] of the list beginning with *śākapārthiva*- (‘king eating vegetables’) and the zero-replacement of a further constituent.

Comment:

In this excerpt, Medhātithi interprets the compound *brahmajanman*- in two ways. In the first case, he resorts to the well-known Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69 (M 1.406), which justifies the procedure of *uttarapadalopa*, a rule actually introduced by Kātyāyana and thus not an original rule by Pāṇini. Medhātithi uses this to explain the meaning of some *karmadhāraya* compounds by postulating a zero-replaced third constituent in the *vigraha*. For instance, the constituent analysis of *śākapārthiva*- should be *śākabhojī pārthivaḥ*, i.e. *śākena bhojī pārthivaḥ* (‘a king who eats vegetables’),²¹⁰ where the further constituent *bhojin*- is zeroed. Analogously, the compound *brahmajanman*- is analysed as *brahmagrahaṇārthaṃ janma* (‘birth whose purpose is seizing the Veda’), where

²¹⁰ According to A 2.1.32 (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106), the constituent analysis of the relevant *tatpuruṣa* compound is: *śākena bhojīti sa śākabhojī*.

the further constituent *grahaṇārtha-* is zero-replaced. In the second case, Medhātithi proposes the following constituent analysis: *brahmagrahaṇam janma* ('birth which is the seizing of the Veda'), where a further constituent, namely *grahaṇa-*, is again zero-replaced with the same mechanism.

71. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.155 [TE] (A, Vt*)

viprāṇām jñānato jyaiṣṭhyam kṣatriyāṇām tu vīryataḥ |
vaiśyāṇām dhānyadhanataḥ śūdrāṇām eva janmataḥ || 2.155 ||

The pre-eminence of Brāhmaṇas depends on knowledge; that of Kṣatriyas, on heroism; that of Vaiśyas, on corn and wealth; just that of Śūdras, on [the year of their] birth.

[...] *ādyāditvāt tṛtīyārthe tasiḥ* (see M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44) | **hetau** (A 2.3.23) *tṛtīyā* ||

Due to its being part of the group *ādyādi* (see M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44), [the *taddhita* affix] *tasI* occurs in the sense of the instrumental case: the third ending in the sense of logical cause [is taught] in *hetau* (A 2.3.23).

Rule and passage cited or referred to:

- A 2.3.23: *hetau* [*tṛtīyā* 18]
The third ending (i.e. the instrumental case) occurs (after a nominal stem) when a logical cause is signified.
- M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93.

Comment:

Medhātithi focuses on the use of the ablative affix *tasI* in the forms *jñānataḥ* (from the nominal stem *jñāna-* 'knowledge'), *vīryataḥ* (from the nominal stem *vīrya-* 'strength'), *dhānyadhanataḥ* (from the *dvandva* compound *dhānyadhana-* 'grain and wealth'), and *janmataḥ* (from the nominal stem *janman-* 'birth'). As for the morphological formation behind these forms, Medhātithi resorts to the use of the *taddhita* affix *tasI*: as explained on many other occasions (see e.g. Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93), such an affix is applied since these nominal stems are part of the exemplificative group *ādyādi*, as foreseen by Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44 (M 2.436 l. 11). This affix is said to occur in the meaning of the instrumental case denoting cause (*hetu*), as regulated by A 2.3.23, which Medhātithi quotes in full.

72. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.160 [TE] (Vt, M*)

yasya vāṇmanase śuddhe samyaggupte ca sarvadā |

sa vai sarvaṃ avāpnoti vedāntopagataṃ phalaṃ || 2.160 ||

The one whose speech and mind are pure and always well-preserved indeed reaches the whole fruit attained by the [finally] settled doctrine of the Veda.

[...] *vedāntā vedasiddhāntāḥ | siddhaśabdasyātyantaṃ siddha iti siddhe śabdārthasambandhe* (M 1.6 l. 16) *ity atrātyantaśabdasyeva lopaḥ* (see M 1.6 ll. 24-25) | *vaidikeṣu vākyeṣu yaḥ siddhānto vyavasthitārtho 'sya karmaṇa idaṃ phalaṃ ity upagato 'bhyupagato vedavidbhiḥ tatphalaṃ sarvaṃ prāpnoti* | [...] [The compound] *vedānta-* (here quoted as a plural nominative form) [means] 'settled doctrine of the Veda.' As when it is said *siddhe* in *siddhe śabdārthasambandhe* (M 1.6 l. 16), the word-form *atyanta-* ('final') belongs to the word-form *siddha-*, here also, there is precisely a zero-replacement of the word-form *atyanta-* here (see M 1.6 ll. 24-25). The fruit of the action is the well-defined meaning in the Vedic assertions, i.e. the *siddhānta* (i.e. the conclusion of an argument) that is reached, namely that on which the connoisseurs of the Veda agree: he obtains the whole fruit of this.

Passages cited:

- M 1.6 l. 16: *siddhe śabdārthasambandhe*
The relationship between a word-form and a meaning is well-established.
- M 1.6 ll. 24-25: *atha vā pūrvapadalopo 'tra draṣṭavyaḥ | atyantāsiddhaḥ siddha iti | tad yathā | devadatto dattaḥ satyabhāmā bhāmeti* |
Or rather, a zero-replacement of the first member of the compound must be recognised: *siddha-* ('settled') stands for *atyantasiddha-* ('finally settled'), as, for instance, [the proper names] *datta-* [which] stands for *devadatta-* [and] *bhāmā-* [which] stands for *satyabhāmā-*.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi reflects on the first constituent (and non-head member) of the *tatpuruṣa* compound *vedāntopagata-* (lit. 'reached by means of the end of the Veda'), i.e. *vedānta-* ('ends of the Veda'). He interprets the first member *vedānta-* as *vedasiddhānta-*. Jha (1999: III, 437-438) translates the latter word as 'canons of the Veda', but we have preferred to translate it as 'the settled doctrine of the Veda.' The compound member *vedānta-* is, in turn, a *tatpuruṣa* compound, and, in this case, Medhātithi maintains that *anta-* stands for *siddhānta-*: namely, he assumes the zero-replacement of a member (the so-called mechanism of *padalopa*) and relies on a traditional grammatical example

proposed by Patañjali (see M 1.6 ll. 24-25) while commenting on the very first *vārttika* in the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.6 l. 16), which Medhātithi quotes *verbatim* in his commentary.

73. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.162 [TE] (A*)

saṃmānād brāhmaṇo nityam udvijeta viṣād iva |
amṛtasyeva ākāṅkṣed avamānasya sarvadā || 2.162 ||

May the Brāhmaṇa always fear homage as if it were poison; may he long for contempt as if it were nectar.

[...] *amṛtam ivākāṅkṣed abhilaṣed avamānam avajñāṃ sarvadā | utkaṇṭhāsāmānyād adhīgarthatvam*²¹¹ *ākāṅkṣer āropya ṣaṣṭhī kṛtā* (see A 2.3.52) | [...]

He should always be longing for, i.e. wishing, contempt, i.e. scorn, as if it were ambrosia. Because of the equivalence of the sense of ‘longing for’ (lit. ‘having the neck uplifted [on the point of going to do anything]’) of [the verbal base] *ākāṅkṣ-*, after superimposing the sense of *adhī-* (‘to turn the mind towards’)²¹² on it, the genitive case ending is used (see A 2.3.52).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.3.52: *adhīgarthatdayeśām karmaṇi [ṣaṣṭhī 50]*
 [A genitive case ending occurs] (after a nominal stem) to denote the patient of the verbs conveying the sense of *adhī-i-* (‘to turn the mind towards’) and the verbal bases *day-* (‘to allot’) and *īś-* (‘to rule’).

Comment:

In this excerpt, Medhātithi justifies the use of the genitive depending on the verb *ākāṅkṣ-*, which is generally constructed with the accusative case of the patient, by explaining that it adopts the case which fits *adhī-* and its synonyms according to A 2.3.52. The latter rule actually teaches to use the genitive to express the patient of verbs meaning *adhī-* (‘to turn the mind towards’), together with the verbal bases *day-* (‘to allot’) and *īś-* (‘to rule’). Indeed, Medhātithi additionally resorts to the notion of superimposition (*āropa*) to extend the syntactic construction of the verb *adhī-* to the verb *ākāṅkṣ-*. Nevertheless, Pāṇini himself

²¹¹ This is the variant reading found in Gharpure (2nd) and Olivelle, which we decided to adopt. The variant readings found in the other editions are: *adhīātattvartham* in Mandlik edition and Gharpure (1st), *adhīrārthatvam* in Jha and Dave.

²¹² The verbal base *i-* (‘to go’, ‘to come’) is mentioned in the Dhātupāṭha (3.8) with the anubandha *K*, so that it occurs in *sandhi* as *g* (*iG*).

teaches it for all the verbs which convey its meaning by means of *adhīg-artha-* ‘the sense of *adhī-*.’

74. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.165 [J] (A*)

tapoviśeṣair vividhair vrataiś ca vidhicoditaiḥ |
vedaḥ kṛtsno [‘dhigantavyaḥ] sarahasyo dvijanmanā || 2.165 ||

Together with the various austerities and the observances enjoined by rules, the whole Veda, along with the secret doctrines, should be studied by the twice-born.

[...] *iha kecid veda ity atraikavacanam vivakṣitam manyante | yady api tavyapratyayanirdeśāt* (see A 3.1.96) *vinīyogato vedasya prādhānyam saṁskāryatayā pratīyate tathāpi vidhito vastutaś cārthāvabodhe guṇabhāva eva | [...] ayaṁ hy atra vidhyarthaḥ adhītena vedenārthāvabodham kuryāt | [...]*

Here, some people consider that the singular number is intentionally used here when it is said “Veda.” Even if the main authoritative means of knowledge is recognised as being dependent on the application of the Veda because of the explicit indication of the [*kṛtya*] affix *tavya* (in *adhigantavyaḥ*) (see A 3.1.96) by means of the fact that it is well-prepared, the Veda indeed has a secondary status in the learning of its meaning coming from injunctions and circumstances. [...] Here, the sense of the injunction is that one should achieve the learning of its meaning by means of the Veda studied.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.96: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.103.

Comment:

Medhātithi once again reflects on the injunctive character of this verse, which can be deduced from the affix *tavya* (taught in rule A 3.1.96) used in *adhigantavyaḥ* (‘which should be studied’) and only in agreement with the singular number of the Veda. We understand that the study of the Veda is the only object of the injunction contained in this verse.

75. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.166 [TE] (A*)

vedam eva sadābhyasyet [tapas tapsyan] dvijottamaḥ |
vedābhyāso hi viprasya tapaḥ param ihocyate ||

A supreme twice-born desiring to blaze through the ascetic blaze should always repeat just the Veda; indeed, the repetition of the Veda is here called “supreme austerity” of the Brāhmaṇa.

[...] *tat*²¹³ *tapas tapsyaṃs tapasārjayitum icchann arjanāṅge saṃtāpe dhātur vartate* | *karmakartṛtvasyāvivakṣitatvāt* (cf. A 3.1.88) *parasmaipadam* | [...] Aiming at blazing in this ascetic blaze (*tapas tapsyat-*) stands for ‘desiring to achieve strength through the ascetic blaze’: [the verbal base] works in the sense of penance, i.e. bodily mortification. The Parasmaipada conjugation is due to the intention of the speaker not to express a reflexive verbal action (cf. A 3.1.88).

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.88: *tapas tapaḥkarmakasyaiva* [*karṭṛ* 68²¹⁴ *karmavat* 87]
[The agent] of the verbal base *tap-* [behaves as a *karman* (i.e. is used as a reflexive verbal form)] only when it has *tapas* as its patient.

Comment:

After explaining the meaning of the *figura etymologica tapas tapsyat-* by emphasising the desiderative sense of the future participle through a paraphrasis, Medhātithi hints at A 3.1.88 as a rule that has been contravened because of the Parasmaipada diathesis employed for the verbal base *tap-* constructed with *tapas-* as its patient.

76. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.167 [TE] (A, A*)

ā haiva sa nakhāgrebhyaḥ paramaṃ *tapyate tapaḥ* |
yaḥ sragvy api dvijo 'dhīte svādhyāyaṃ śaktito 'nvaham || 2.167 ||
A twice-born who, even wearing a garland, performs his own Vedic recitation to the best of his possibilities [and] day by day, definitely blazes his supreme ascetic blaze just right down to the tips of his nails.

[...] *tapyate tapa iti* | *tapas tapaḥ karmakasyaiva* (A 3.1.88) *iti yag ātmanepade* (see A 3.1.67) | [...]

²¹³ Mandlik presents the variant reading *tatas*. The others feature the variant reading *tat*, which we have decided to maintain.

²¹⁴ The wording of rule A 3.1.68 does indeed include *kartari*.

‘He is blazing his ascetic blaze’ (*tapyate tapas*): [the *kṛt* affix] *yaK* (see A 3.1.67) occurs in the Ātmanepada diathesis according to *tapas tapaḥ karmakasyaiva* (A 3.1.88).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 3.1.67: *sārvadhātuke yak* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.22 *bhāvakarmaṇoḥ* 3.1.66]
[The affix] *yaK* occurs [after a verbal base] before a *sārvadhātuka* affix
[when the eventuality or the patient is to be signified (by the *sārvadhātuka* suffix itself)].
- A 3.1.88: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.166.

Comment:

In the analysis of the *figura etymologica tapyate tapas*, Medhātithi once again resorts to A 3.1.88, which, in this case, is applied to this phrase (cf. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.166). As explained in the previous excerpt, this rule operates at a syntactic level when the verbal base *tap-* (‘to blaze’) is constructed with *tapas-* as its *karman*, allowing the use of a *karṭṛ* as if it were a *karman*. In other words, the role of agent and patient is simultaneously played by the same verbal ending, creating a so-called “reflexive verbal form.” In this regard, the meaning of patient is expressed by the passive form realised by means of the affix *yaK* taught in A 3.1.67. The latter rule teaches to apply such an affix when the patient (or the eventuality) has to be expressed by the *sārvadhātuka* affix.

77. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.169 [TL] (A)

mātur agre 'dhijananam dvitīyaṃ mauñjibandhane |
trītiyaṃ yajñadīkṣāyāṃ dvijasya śruticodanāt || 2.169 ||

The birth of a twice-born is, at first, from the mother, the second one when the girdle made of Muñja grass (i.e. *Saccharum Sara* Roxb.) is tied, the third one on the occasion of the consecration as a patron of the sacrifice according to the injunction of the Vedic scriptures (*śruti*).

[...] *dvitīyaṃ mauñjibandhana upanayane | nyāpor bahulam* (A 6.3.63) *iti hrasvaḥ* | [...]

The second [birth] takes place at the tying of the Muñja grass girdle (called *mauñjī*), i.e. at the Vedic initiation. The short vowel [of the constituent *mauñji-* in the compound *mauñjibandhana-*] is due to *nyāpor bahulam* (A 6.3.63).

Rule cited:

- A 6.3.63: *nyapoḥ saṃjñāchandasoḥ bahulam* [uttarapade 1 hrasvaḥ 61]
[A short vowel occurs] in the place of *-ī* (= *Ñī*) and *-ā* (= *āP*) [before the right-hand constituent of a compound] in a proper name or in the domain of Vedic literature under various conditions.

Comment:

Medhātithi here accounts for the final short vowel of the left-hand constituent in the compound *mauñjibandhana-* by resorting to rule A 6.3.63. This rule teaches to shorten the feminine affix of a left-hand compound constituent provided that the compound denotes a proper name (*saṃjñā*) or occurs in the domain of Vedic literature (*chandas*). He probably considers *mauñjibandhana-* as a *saṃjñā*. In fact, there are only rare occurrences of this compound in Late Vedic works (i.e. BDh 1.3.6, VDh 2.32 and 2.62).

78. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.172 [TE] (A*)

nābhivyāhārayed brahma *svadhāninayanād ṛte |*
śūdreṇa hi samas tāvad yāvad vede na jāyate || 2.172 ||

Excepting the performance [of the Śraddha rite] with the Svadhā formula, one should not utter any Vedic text, because, before one is born in the Veda (i.e. before the initiation ceremony), one is equated with a Śūdra.

[...] *kecit tv imam eva brahmābhivyāhāraṇīṣedhaṃ prāg upanayād vyākaraṇādyaṅgādhyayane jñāpakam varṇayanti | nījartham* (see A 3.1.26)
vyācakṣate pitrā na vācanīyo bālyāt tu kānicid avyaktāni vedavākyāni svayam paṭhato na doṣaḥ | [...]

Some people explain the prohibition of uttering the Veda before the initiation ceremony as a clue [suggesting that the prohibition is] in the case of the study of the ancillary sciences starting from the grammar onward. They comment upon the meaning of the causative affix *ÑiC* (see A 3.1.26) [by saying] that he should be made to utter [the Veda] by his father, but the one who spontaneously reads some indistinct Veda sentences from childhood is not at fault.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.30.

Comment:

In the segment devoted to explaining the word-form *brahman-* as meaning ‘Veda’, Medhātithi informs us about the proposal advanced by some interpreters to consider the optative causative form *abhivyāhārayet* (from the verbal base *abhivyavāhr-*) as suggesting a restriction. The prohibition against uttering the Veda is restricted to the case in which the father plays a role in making his son study the Veda, but not if the child spontaneously begins babbling a few sentences from Vedic texts. More precisely, he says that the interpreters explained the meaning of the causative affix *ṆiC* in this way (which is introduced by rule A 3.1.26).

79. Medh ad MDh^M 2.189 [TL] (A*)

vratavad devadaivatye pitrye *karmaṇy atharṣivat |*
kāmam abhyarthito ’śnīyād vratam asya na lupyate || 2.189 ||

Then, [one who is engaged in an observance], when he is invited, could eat at will like a seer in a sacrifice addressed to the gods and ancestors as if he [remained] in [his] observance: his observance is not broken.

[...] *yadi na śrāddhe*²¹⁵ *pitro devatāḥ katham tarhi pitryam etat karmeti devatātaddhitāḥ* (see A 5.4.24; cf. A 4.2.24) | [...]

If the ancestors are not the deities in the Śrāddha ceremony, why is there a *taddhita* affix [taught to be applied to a nominal stem] denoting a deity (see A 5.4.24; cf. A 4.2.24) when it is said that this sacrificial action is [denoted by the nominal stem] *pitrya*-?

Rule referred to:

- A 4.2.24: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.58.
- A 5.4.24: *devatāntāt tādarthye yat* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76] [The *taddhita* affix] *yaT* [occurs after a nominal stem] ending with [the inflected noun] *devatā-* (‘deity’) to denote ‘meant for X.’

Comment:

As part of a much longer discussion, Medhātithi resorts to grammar to prove that the name of the *pitrya* rite, i.e. of the Śrāddha ceremony, is the name of a rite

²¹⁵ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *śrāddhena*. The others have the variant reading *śrāddhe*. This appears to be the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 76).

whose deities are the ancestors (*pitṛ*). In another case (see MDh^M 2.58), he employs the indication *devatātaddhita* to resort to rule A 4.2.24, which teaches to form the *taddhita* derivative stem whose etymon is a deity's name on account of the affix *aN*. However, if A 4.2.24 were actually applied to the nominal stem *pitṛ-*, the correct *taddhita* derivative noun should be *paitra-* with a *vrddhi* provided by the *anubandha* *N*. Instead, to explain the *taddhita* derivative stem *pitṛya-* found in Manu's text, we think that Medhātithi resorted to rule A 5.4.24 that teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *yaT* to a (compounded) nominal stem ending with the inflected noun *devatā-* ('deity') to denote 'meant for (= consecrated to) X.' Nonetheless, we believe that Medhātithi's aim was to explain the compound *pitṛdevatya-*, which is the correct output deriving from the application of A 5.4.24. Otherwise, Medhātithi might have read the rule as if it taught to apply the affix after a nominal stem ending in a deity's name and not ending with the nominal stem *devatā-*, thus even including a nominal stem merely 'consisting in a deity's name' and classifying the *pitṛs* among the deities (so, *pitṛ-* + *yaT* > *pitṛya-*). Traditional examples of this rule indeed contradict the latter interpretation: see e.g. the examples provided by KV *ad* A 5.4.24, i.e. *agnidevatya-* ('consecrated to god Agni'), *pitṛdevatya-* ('consecrated to the Pitṛ gods'), *vāyudevatya-* ('consecrated to god Vāyu'), where the *taddhita* affix *yaT* applies to a nominal stem ending in *devatā-* used as the right-hand compound constituent.

80. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.201 [TL] (A)

parīvādāḥ *kharo bhavati śvā vai bhavati nindakah |*
paribhoktā kṛmir bhavati kīṭo bhavati matsarī || 2.201 ||

Because of censuring [one's teacher]²¹⁶, one becomes a donkey; by blaming [him], one becomes indeed a dog; by living at [his] cost, one becomes a worm; when jealous, one becomes an insect.

[...] *parivādaparivādayor ghañy amanuṣye*²¹⁷ *bahulam* (A 6.3.122) *iti dīrghatvādīrghatve ||*

²¹⁶ The reference to the teacher (*guru*) is found in the previous verses (see MDh^M 2.199-200).

²¹⁷ Mandlik, Gharpure and Jha feature the variant reading *ghañāmanuṣye*. Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *ghañy amanuṣye*, which we have decided to adopt because the citation of A 6.3.122 does not work without the locative singular for *ghañ*.

The presence of the long and short vowel in [the nominal stems] *parivāda-* ('blame') and *parīvāda-* ('censure') is in accordance with *ghaṇy amanuṣye bahulam* (A 6.3.122).

Rule cited:

- A 6.3.122: *upasargasya ghaṇy amanuṣye bahulam* [uttarapade 1 dīrghaḥ 111 *saṃhitāyām* 114]
[In continuous utterance, a long vowel] occurs in the place of the final vowel of a prefix [before a right-hand compound constituent] ending in [the *kṛt* affix] *GHañ* under various conditions, provided that a human being is not denoted.

Comment:

Here, Medhātiti reflects on the quantity of the vowel *i* in the nominal stem *parīvāda-* ('censure') by partially citing the *sandhi* rule A 6.3.122, which deals with the final vowel of the left-hand compound constituent when the right-hand constituent ends in the *kṛt* affix *GHañ*. This nominal stem is obtained by applying the *kṛt* affix *GHañ* to the verbal base *vad-* ('to speak') according to A 3.3.18,²¹⁸ which also ensures the right meaning for the verse. The final long vowel instead of the expected short one in *parīvāda-* is thus a Pāṇinian form.

81. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.208 [TE] (A)

bālaḥ samānajanmā vā śiṣyo vā yajñakarmaṇi |
adhyāpayan guruto guruvan mānam arhati || 2.208 ||

In a sacrificial rite, a teacher's son who teaches [someone], either he is a boy of the same age or a pupil, deserves the same honour as a teacher [from the one who is being instructed].

[...] *ye tu vyācakṣate 'dhyāpayann ity anenādhyāpanasāmarthyam lakṣyate 'dhyāpanasamarthaś ced adhyāpayatu mā vādhyāpayed grhītavedaś ced guruvad draṣṭavyas teṣāṃ śābdam etad vyākhyānam satyam bhavati | śatā lakṣaṇārthaḥ sa*²¹⁹ *tu kriyāyā lakṣaṇahetvoḥ kriyāyāḥ* (A 3.2.126) *iti | kriyā cātra śrutā guruvan mānam arhati ||*

Indeed, some people explain that, with [the word-form] *adhyāpayat-* (i.e. the present participle from the verbal base *adhī-* 'to study'), the capacity of imparting

²¹⁸ A 3.3.18: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.64.

²¹⁹ Mandlik features the variant reading *tat*. The others present the variant reading *sa*, which fits better grammatically.

instruction is signified. If he is able to impart instruction, let him impart instruction, or [if he is not able to do it], he should not impart instruction. However, if he has acquired the knowledge of the Veda, he should be considered as if he were a teacher. This verbal explanation is the truth. The present participle affix has the meaning of a characteristic, but [precisely] that of the action according to *lakṣaṇahetvoḥ kriyāyāḥ* (A 3.2.126), and the action is here mentioned: 'he deserves the same respect as his teacher.'

Rule cited:

- A 3.2.126: *lakṣaṇahetvoḥ kriyāyāḥ* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *vartamāne* 123 *laṭaḥ śatṛśanacau* 124]
[The *kṛt* affixes *ŚatR* and *ŚanaC* replace the substitutes of the *lakāra* *LAṬ* after a verbal stem] denoting a characteristic or a logical cause of another action, [provided that the action is in the present tense].

Comment:

By resorting to A 3.2.126, Medhātithi explains that the present participle *adhyāpayat-* (from the verbal base *adhī-* 'to study') is used in the sense of a characteristic of the action expressed by the verbal base to which the participle affix applies. This grammatical explanation serves to further support the fact that the young teacher must be paid due honour, provided that he is able to be a teacher, no matter whether he actually teaches or not.

82. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.220 [TE] (A)

taṃ ced abhyudiyāt sūryaḥ śayānaṃ kāmācārataḥ |
nimloce vāpy avijñānāḥ japann upavased dīnam || 2.220 ||
Should the sun rise or set while [the Vedic student] is sleeping intentionally or without awareness, he should abstain from food for one day by muttering [prayers].

*atredaṃ prāyaścittaṃ caret | brahmacāriṇaṃ śayānaṃ nidrāvaśaṃ gatam*²²⁰
abhyudiyāt svenodayenābhivyāptadoṣaṃ kuryāt | abhir abhāge (A 1.4.91) *iti*

²²⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *nidrāvagatam*. Gharpure (2nd) presents the variant reading *nidrāvaśagatam*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle have the variant reading *nidrāvaśaṃ gatam*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 83).

*karmapravacanīyatvam | tato dvitīyā śayānam iti | itthambhūtaṃ suptam iti lakṣaṇaṃ vā svāpakāle yady udyeta*²²¹ | [...]

Here he should carry out this atonement. Should the sun rise while the Vedic student is still lying down, fallen prey to sleep, this would make [the Vedic student] guilty due to its (i.e. the sun's) rising. The characteristic of a preposition is in accordance with *abhir abhāge* (A 1.4.91). Therefore, there is the accusative case ending when it is said *śayānam*. If the sun rose during the time of his sleeping, his being asleep is a fact or his characteristic.

Rule cited:

- A 1.4.91: *abhir abhāge [nipātaḥ 56 karmapravacanīyāḥ 83 lakṣanetthambhūtākhyānavīpsāsu 90]*
[The *karmapravacanīya* designation is assigned] to the particle *abhi-* ('towards') [when a characteristic, a statement of fact or entirety is denoted], but not a division.

Comment:

In this case, Medhātiti justifies the use of the accusative in the form *śayānam* (from the nominal stem *śayāna-* 'sleeping') on the basis of the designation of *abhi-* as a preposition according to rule A 1.4.91. The latter rule teaches that the accusative occurs to denote a characteristic, a statement of fact or entirety but not a division. From the citation of this rule, we understand that *abhi-* is not intended as a preverb for *udiyāt* (optative form from the verbal base *udi-* 'to rise') but as a particle.

83. Medh ad MDh^M 2.238 [TE] (A²)

*śraddadhānaḥ śubhāṃ vidyām ādadītāvarād api |
antyād api paraṃ dharmaṃ [strīratnam] duṣkulād api || 2.238 ||*

A man who has faith could receive useful learning even from an inferior; the supreme *dharma* even from an undermost person; a gem of a woman even from a low family.

[...] *strī ratnam iva | strī cāsau ratnam ca tad iti vā | upamitaṃ vyāghrādibhiḥ*
(A 2.1.56) *viśeṣaṇaṃ viśeṣyena* (A 2.1.57) *iti vā | yadā yatkiṃcid utkr̥ṣṭaṃ vastu*

²²¹ The section from *abhiḥ* to *udyeta* is absent from the editions of Mandlik and Gharpure. This section is supplied by manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 83), who considered it a "long lacuna" (even though it can also be considered a scribal addition to this manuscript).

tad ratnam ucyate tadā viśeṣaṇam iti | atha tu marakatapadmarāgādīny eva ratnaśabdavācyaṇy utkarṣasāmānyād anyatra prayogas tadopamitam iti | [...]
 [The compound *strīratna-* must be analysed as] ‘a woman like a gem’ or ‘this is a woman, and this is a gem.’ [The compound is formed] according to *upamitam vyāghrādibhiḥ* (A 2.1.56) or *viśeṣaṇam viśeṣyena* (A 2.1.57). When this gem is mentioned as whatever is excellent, then it is a qualifier. However, elsewhere, the use is that of mentioning the word-form for a gem just standing for an emerald, a ruby, and the like, because of the equivalence in excellence: this is a standard of comparison.

Rules cited:

- A 2.1.56: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106.
- A 2.1.57: *viśeṣaṇam viśeṣyena bahulam* [*samāsaḥ 3 saha supā 4 sup 9 tatpuruṣaḥ 22 samānādhikaraṇena 49*]
 [An inflected noun] working as a qualifier combines with a co-referential inflected noun working as a qualifier under various conditions [to derive a *tatpuruṣa karmadhāraya* compound].

Comment:

Medhātithi explains the compound *strīratna-* by providing two different *vigrahas*, i.e. ‘a woman like a gem’ and ‘this is a woman and this is a gem’ (> ‘woman gem’). The former follows the late traditional reading of rule A 2.1.56 (which is read as teaching an *upamā*-compound instead of the *rūpaka*-compound, originally meant by Pāṇini)²²² and the latter is closer to the original Pāṇinian interpretation of the compound in line with the common *vigraha* for a *karmadhāraya*. Medhātithi also resorts to A 2.1.57, by interpreting the constituent *ratna-* as a qualifier (*viśeṣana*) with the sense of ‘gem-like’ relying on the *bahulam* condition, which allows the right-hand position of the non-head constituent *ratna-*.

84. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.245 [TE] (Vt*)

na pūrvam gurave kiṃcid upakurvīta dharmavit |
snāsyams tu guruṇājñaptāḥ śaktyā gurvartham āharet || 2.245 ||
 [The pupil] who knows the *dharma* should pay homage of any kind to the teacher at the beginning, but, when he is about to become a

²²² Regarding this point, see our comment on Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106.

bath graduate and with the permission of the teacher, he should offer a teacher's fee to the best of his possibilities.

[...] *pūrvam snānād gurave kiṃcid upakurvīta dadyād dadātyarthe dhātuḥ sopasargo 'taś ca svasādhyā caturthī* (see M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13) | *atha vā kriyāgrahaṇam api kartavyam iti tataḥ saṃpradānatvam* | [...]

Before the bath graduation, he should pay homage, i.e. give something to the teacher. The verbal base [*kr-*] with the prefix [*upa-*] occurs in the sense of 'to give' and, therefore, the dative case ending has to be formed in its own way (see M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13). Or rather, the mention of [this] action (i.e. 'to give') should also be made; consequently, [there would be] the sense of recipient.

Passage referred to:

- M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13: *caturthīvidhāne tādarthye upasāṅkhyānam*
When the dative ending is taught, the additional statement *tādarthye* ('in the sense of 'for the sake of X') [should be made].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the dative *gurave* from the nominal stem *guru-* ('teacher'), which is not expected after the verbal base *upakṛ-* (lit. 'to bring near') in the regular sense of recipient according to A 2.3.13.²²³ He is probably hinting at Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13 (M 1.449), which teaches the use of the dative ending as conveying the sense of 'for the sake of X.' Furthermore, Medhātithi concentrates on the prefix which suggests the meaning of 'giving' for the compound verb *upakṛ-*.

85. Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.247 [TL] (KV*)

*ācārye tu khalu prete guruput্রে গুণান্বিতে |
[gurudāre] sapinḍe vā guruvad vṛttim ācaret* || 2.247 ||

When the preceptor has indeed died, one should behave towards the teacher's virtuous son, the teacher's wife or one belonging to the same lineage as if he were in the presence of the teacher.

[...] *dāraśabdo bahuvacanānto bhāryāvacano vaiyākaraṇaiḥ smaryate* (see KV *ad* A 1.2.53) | [...]

²²³ A 2.3.13: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.56.

The word-form *dāra-* ('wife') is recorded by grammarians as being used with the plural nominal ending when conveying the sense of 'wife' (see KV *ad* A 1.2.53).

Passage referred to:

- KV *ad* A 1.2.53: *tatra liṅgaṃ vacanaṃ ca svabhāvasaṃsiddham eva na yatnapratipādyam yathāpo dārā grhāḥ sikatā varṣā iti*
In this case, gender and number are just autonomously established and should not be explained with effort, such as *āpaḥ* (f. pl., 'water'), *dārāḥ* (m. pl., 'wife'), *grhāḥ* (m. pl., 'house'), *sikatāḥ* (f. pl., 'sand'), *varṣāḥ* (f. pl., 'rain').

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the right-hand constituent of the compound *gurudāra-* ('teacher's wife'), probably resorting to a late grammatical list of nominal stems used with gender and number other than those actually expected, such as the list found in KV *ad* A 1.2.53.

Third adhyāya (27 passages)

86. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.1 [J/TL/TE] (A, A*³)

ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikam caryam gurau traivedikam vrataṃ |
tadardhikam pādikam vā grahaṇāntikam eva vā || 3.1 ||

The observance referring to the three Vedas that should be performed at the teacher's [house] lasts thirty-six years, or one-half, or one-quarter, or even up to the close of study.

[...] *traivedikam vrataṃ caryam* | [...] *caryam caritavyam* | *kṛtyo vidhau* (see A 3.1.100) | [...]

The observance relating to the Three Vedas should be performed. [...] *caryam* [is equivalent to] *caritavyam* (cf. A 3.1.100): the *kṛtya* [affix occurs] in the sense of injunction.

[...] *kaḥ punar adhikārī | upanītas traivarṇiko māṇavaka iti brūmaḥ | brahmacāridharmeṣu hy etad āmnāyate | liṅḍaḍayo* (cf. A 3.3.161) *hy avinābhūtaniyojyārthavidhyarthapratipādakāḥ | tatra viśeṣākāṅkṣāyāṃ kvacit chabdasamarpito viśeṣo bhavati svargakāmo yāvajjīvam agnihotraṃ juhōti | kvacid āsruto 'py anvitābhidhānasāmarthyabalena kalpyo viśvajidādiṣu | kvacit*

prakaraṇād vastusāmarthyād vidhyantaraparyālocanayāpi ca pratīyate | tad etad iha sarvam asti | prakṛto brahmacārī | vastusāmarthyena cārthāvbodha upajāyate | sa ca sarvavidhiṣūpayujyate viduṣo 'dhikārāt | tad idam apare na mṛṣyanti | saṁskāraavidhitvenaivāsya pratīyamānādhikāratā | yataḥ saṁskārakarmāṇi saṁskāryārthatayānuṣṭhīyante | yadi ca saṁskārye na dṛśyeta viśeṣas tataḥ saktuvat saṁskārarūpatā hīyeta | asti cātra phalavat karmāvbodhalakṣaṇo viśeṣaḥ | yat tu sviṣṭakṛdādivad iti tat prakṛtipratyayavijñānāgamyatvarūpahānitayā yuktobhaya rūpatā | [...]

And again, who is entitled to [the fruits of the actions to which the Vedic study leads]? We answer that it is the boy belonging to the three upper classes who has been initiated. Indeed, this is handed down among the duties of the Vedic student. For the substitutes of the *lakāra* *līṅ* (= optative; cf. A 3.3.161) and the like are effective in conveying the meaning of injunction, which cannot exist without the object being enjoined. Here, when a specification is desired, the specification is sometimes supplied by the words: “The one who desires to reach heaven offers the Agnihotra during his whole life.” Sometimes, for instance, in the Viśvajit sacrifice and the like, [the specification] should be established by means of the effectiveness of the expression of what is joined to it, even though it is not orally transmitted. Sometimes, it is also understood because of the context and the effectiveness of the things themselves by means of the reflection on other injunctions. And all which has been said is here present. The Vedic student is under discussion. And by means of the effectiveness of the things themselves, he becomes aware of the comprehension of the meaning. And he follows all the injunctions because the one who has learnt [the Veda] is entitled to [do so].

Other people do not like this. [They maintain that] it is the authority of what follows that is precisely realised by means of the character of the injunction of the sanctifying ceremony. Since the sanctifying ritual actions are carried out with the aim of the objects which have to be sanctified, and if no specificity is perceived in the object to be sanctified, then the form of the sanctifying rite itself gets lost, such as in the case of the barley meal (*saktu*). And, in this case, the specificity is indeed characterised by the comprehension of the action provided with fruits. But when it is said “as in the case of the Sviṣṭakṛt and the like”, there is the form of both [the action and its fruit] connected [with it] with the disappearance in the form of a recognition of the distinction between base and affix.

[...] *anye tu brāhmaṇena niṣkāraṇo dharmah ṣaḍaṅgo vedo 'dhyeyaḥ* (M 1.1 ll. 18-19) *iti niṣkāraṇa ity etasyādhikārapadatām manyante | niṣkāraṇaḥ*

*kāraṇaṃ prayojanaṃ anuddiśya nityakarmavat kartavyam | na hy
asyādhikārasamarpakatvaṃ antareṇa viśayadvāreṇa
kriyākāratadvīṣeṣaṇatvādinānvayaḥ sambhavati | tasmāt saty api
saṃskāraavidhitve gamyamānādhikāratvaṃ śrūyamānādhikāratvaṃ
vāviruddham | [...]*

But other people consider that, when it is said that “the Veda has to be studied with its six limbs by the Brāhmaṇa without any [special] reason” (M 1.1 ll. 18-19), [the word-form] *niṣkāraṇa-* (‘without any [special] reason’) is the word expressing the authority for this. [The word-form] *niṣkāraṇa-* [means that], after pointing out no reason, i.e. no purpose, it has to be carried out as if it were a constant (i.e. obligatory) activity. Indeed, it does not yield its authority without the medium of the specific domain: there is no association with the action, the *kāraka*, the qualification of them, etc. Therefore, even though there is the nature of the injunction of the sanctifying rites, the authority of what is understood or what is heard is unobstructed.

[...] *ṣaṭtriṃśadabdāḥ samāhṛtāḥ ṣaṭtriṃśadabdam tatra bhavaṃ
ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikam* (see A 4.3.53) | *evaṃ traivedikam | tadardhaparimāṇam
tadardhikam | evaṃ pādikaṃ grahaṇāntikam iti | sarvatra ata iniṭhanau* (A 5.2.115) *iti matvarthīyaḥ | na tu yasya yatparimāṇam tat tasyāstīti* (cf. A 5.1.57) *śakyate 'padeṣṭum* ||

Thirty-six years (*ṣaṭtriṃśadabdāḥ*) are combined in the [*dvigu*] compound *ṣaṭtriṃśadabda-*. [The *taddhita* derivative stem] *ṣaṭtriṃśadābdika-* (‘lasting thirty-six years’) [is formed from the etymon *ṣaṭtriṃśadabda-* in the sense of] ‘being there’ (i.e. ‘relating to X’) (see A 4.3.53). [The *taddhita* derivative stem] *traivedika-* (lit. ‘relating to the three Vedas’) [is analysed] in the same way. [The *taddhita* derivative stem] *tadardhika-* [is formed in the sense of] ‘that whose measure is half of X.’ [The *taddhita* derivative stems] *pādika-* (lit. ‘amounting to’) and *grahaṇāntika-* (lit. ‘being at the close of study’) [are analysed] in the same way. In all these cases, the meaning of *matUP* (i.e. of the possessive *taddhita* affix) [is applied] according to *ata iniṭhanau* (A 5.2.115), but one cannot apply the rule according to which ‘whose measure of which, this is its’ (cf. A 5.1.57).

Rules and passage cited or referred to:

- A 3.1.100: *gadamadacarayamaś ca anupasarge* [*dhātoḥ* 91 *kṛyāḥ* 95 *yat* 97]

[The *kṛtya* affix *yaT*] also applies [after the verbal stems] *gad-* ('to speak'), *mad-* ('to rejoice'), *car-* ('to move') and *yam-* ('to sustain'), provided that they do not co-occur with a preverb.

- A 3.3.161: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6.
- A 4.3.53: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.
- A 5.1.57: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.
- M 1.1 ll. 18-19: *brāhmaṇena niṣkāraṇa dharmah ṣaḍaṅgo vedo 'dhyeyah*, see the translation.

Comment:

In the first excerpt, Medhātithi comments on the future passive participle *carya-* (from the verbal base *car-*, lit. 'to move', here 'to practise'), which, compared to the alternative form *caritavya-* (formed by applying A 3.1.96),²²⁴ can be explained by the specific rule A 3.1.100 teaching to apply the *kṛtya* affix *yaT* after the verbal base *car-* and others, provided that there is no preverb.

The second excerpt is included in a larger section linked to the previous one, which deals with performing Vedic-related duties for thirty-six years (expressed by means of *ṣaṭtriṃśadābdika-* 'lasting thirty-six years'). The specific passage answers the following question: who are the addressees of the results to which the Vedic study leads? According to some, only a boy belonging to the three upper classes is entitled to these results, because the Vedic study is prescribed among the Vedic student's duties by means of the affix *liṅ* (i.e. optative: cf. A 3.3.161) and the like. According to others, the injunction is not connected to the presence of optative verbal forms but by the sanctifying character of the ceremonies themselves. The third excerpt reports a further position in this discussion. Medhātithi cites *verbatim* a passage from the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.1 ll. 18-19) which prescribes that the Veda has to be studied without any special reason, i.e. *niṣkāraṇa*: the Vedic study is merely a constant activity, and there is no inherent purpose in its practice.

In the last excerpt, which is instead both linguistic and exegetical, Medhātithi focuses on all the *taddhita* derivatives found in the verse under analysis, i.e. *ṣaṭtriṃśadābdika-* ('lasting thirty-six years'), *traivedika-* ('relating to the three Vedas'), *tadardhika-* ('half as much'), *pādika-* ('amounting to'), and *grahaṇāntika-* ('being at the close of study'). First, by means of *tatra bhavaṃ*, he resorts to rule A 4.3.53, teaching to form *taddhita* derivatives having the meaning

²²⁴ A 3.1.96: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.103.

of ‘being in the place X’, e.g., *ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikaṃ vratam* is ‘an observance obtaining in thirty-six years.’ Second, he also cites rule A 5.2.115, which teaches to optionally form *taddhita* derivatives with a series of affixes including *thaN* (= *-ika*) in the sense of *matUP* (i.e. ‘belonging to X’ or ‘being in X’). Third, since he paraphrased the compound *tadardhika-* as *tadardhaparimāṇam* with reference to the measure (*parimaṇa*) of thirty-six years (*ṣaṭtriṃśadābda-*), Medhātithi feels obliged to clarify that rule A 5.1.57 (which includes *parimāṇam*) does not apply. His reference to *parimaṇa* is in fact just at a lexical level, i.e. *tadardha-* merely represents the etymon of *tadardhika-*: this is why he specifies that rule A 5.1.57 does not apply.

87. Medh ad MDh^M 3.4 [J] (A*)

*guruṇānumataḥ [snātvā samāvṛtto] yathāvidhi |
udvaheta dvijo bhāryāṃ savarṇāṃ lakṣaṇānvitām || 3.4 ||*

With the permission of the teacher, after performing the ceremony of bath graduation, having turned back according to the rules, the twice-born should take a wife of the same social class and endowed with auspicious marks.

[...] *kecit samāvantanaṃ vivāhāṅgaṃ snānaṃ manyante | ktvāśrutyā* (cf. A 3.4.21) *bhedapratipattir iti ced evaṃ tarhi samāvantanaṃ vivāhāṅgaṃ snānasamskāraṃ vakṣyati | saviśeṣaṃ hi tatra snānaṃ āmnātaṃ eva snātakena ityādi | [...]*

Some consider that the return [signifies that] the bath graduation is part of the marriage rites. If one were to argue that there is the perception of a difference (in terms of the time between the action of returning and bathing) by hearing [the affix] *Ktvā* (cf. A 3.4.21), then [Manu] will explain that the return of the Vedic student from the teacher’s house (*samāvantana*) is the ceremony of bath graduation (*snānasamskāra*), which is part of the marriage rite. For, in this context (i.e. at the marriage rite), a bath graduation with specific features is indeed prescribed by Vedic scriptures by stating ‘by the bath graduate’ and so on.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.4.21: *samānakarṭṛkayoḥ pūrvakāle [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 kṛt 3.1.93 ktvā 18]* [The affix *Ktvā* occurs after a verbal base] to denote a prior action when co-occurring with another action, provided that they both have the same agent.

Comment:

Medhātithi here reflects on the return of the Vedic student from the teacher's house (*samāvartana*) and the bath graduation (*snāna*) as being part of the marriage rite on the basis of the relationship between the action conveyed by the gerund form *snatvā* and the past participle *samāvṛtta-*. He evidently recalls rule A 3.4.21 to argue that the action conveyed by the gerund is prior to that of the main clause.

88. Medh ad MDh^M 3.6 [TE] (A*)

mahānty api samṛddhāni *go'jāvidhanadhānyataḥ* |

strīsaṃbandhe daśaitāni kulāni parivarjayet || 3.6 ||

One should avoid these ten families in [sanctioning] a marriage union, albeit they are noble [and] wealthy due to cows, goats, sheep, money and grain.

[...] *dhanaviśeṣaṇārtham āha go'jāvidhanadhānyataḥ* | *trītyārthe tasiḥ* (see A 5.4.46) | *go'jāvidhanena ca dhānyena ca* | [...]

[Manu] says *go'jāvidhanadhānyataḥ* (lit. 'due to cows, goats, sheep, money, and grain') to distinguish the properties. [The *taddhita* affix] *tasI* occurs in the sense of the instrumental case (see A 5.4.46) [and the meaning is] 'by means of cows, goats, sheep and money' and 'by means of grain.'

Rule referred to:

- A 5.4.46: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.100.

Comment:

In this excerpt, Medhātithi comments on the *taddhita* derivative stem *go'jāvidhanadhānyataḥ*, formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *tasI* in the sense of the instrumental case to the *dvandva* compound stem *go'jāvidhanadhānya-* ('cows, goats, sheep and money') according to rule A 5.4.46.

89. Medh ad MDh^M 3.7 [TE] (A*⁴)

hīnakriyaṃ niṣpuruṣaṃ niśchando *romaśārśasam* |

kṣayyāmayāvyapasmāriśvitrikuṣṭhi *kulāni ca* || 3.7 ||

[One should avoid a family] neglecting ritual actions, deprived of male offspring, disregarding the study of the Veda, or [whose members] are hairy and affected with haemorrhoids, and families of tuberculous, dyspeptic, epileptic, vitiliginous, and leprous people.

[...] *romaśārśasam* | *dvandvaikavadbhāvena* (see A 2.4.6) *kuladvayaṃ nirdiṣṭam* | *bahudīrghair bāhvādiṣu lomabhir yutam* | [...] *sarva ete vyādhiviśeṣavacanāḥ śabdā romaśād ārabhya matvarthīyapratyayāntā nirdiṣṭāḥ* (see A 5.2.100, A 5.2.127, A 5.2.128) | [...]

‘Hairy and affected with haemorrhoids’ (*romaśārśasam*): two kinds of families (i.e. the one hairy and the other suffering with haemorrhoids) are expressly indicated by the composition treated as if it denoted a single thing by means of a *dvandva* (see A 2.4.6). [...] All these word-forms expressing peculiar diseases—beginning with *romaśa-* (‘hairy’) [and comprehending: *arśasa-* (‘affected by haemorrhoids’), *kṣayin-* (‘tuberculous’), *āmayāvin-* (‘dyspeptic’), *apasmārin-* (‘epileptic’), *śvitrin-* (‘vitiliginous’), *kuṣṭhin-* (‘leprous’)]—are expressly indicated as ending with [*taddhita*] affixes meaning *matUP* (see A 5.2.100 for *romaśa-*; A 5.2.127 for *arśasa-*; A 5.2.128 for *kṣayin-*, *āmayāvin-*, *apasmārin-*, *śvitrin-*, and *kuṣṭhin-*).

Rules referred to:

- A 2.4.6: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.119.
- A 5.2.100: *lomādīpāmādicchādibhyaḥ śanelacaḥ* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tad asyāsty asmin* 94]
[The *taddhita* affixes] *śa*, *na*, *ilaC* occur [after the nominal stems] belonging to the lists beginning with *loma-* (‘hair’), *pāman-* (‘cutaneous eruption’), and *piccha-* (‘tail feather’) [to denote ‘belongs to X’ or ‘exists in X’].
- A 5.2.127: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.
- A 5.2.128: *dvandvopatāpagarhyāt prāṇisthād inih* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tad asyāsty asmin* 94]
[The *taddhita* affix] *ini* occurs [after a nominal stem] which is a *dvandva* [compound] or denoting *upatāpa-* (‘disease’) and *garhya-* (‘vile’) standing for an animate being [to denote ‘belongs to X’ or ‘exists in X’].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi hints at four of Pāṇini’s rules to explain: i) the *samāhāradvandva romaśārśasa-* (lit. ‘having hair and haemorrhoids’) by A 2.4.6, which teaches to form a *dvandva* compound in the singular number (and neuter gender, under A 2.4.17)²²⁵ when inanimate beings are denoted; ii-iii) the *taddhita* derivative stems *romaśa-* and *arśasa-* (which are constituents of the *dvandva*

²²⁵ A 2.4.17: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.90.

compound *romaśārśasa-*) taught by A 5.2.100 and A 5.2.127, according to which the *taddhita* affixes *śa* and *aC* apply respectively to denote the possessive sense of *matUP*; iv) the *taddhita* derivative stems *kṣayin-*, *āmayāvin-*, *apasmārin-*, *śvitrin-*, and *kuṣṭhin-* (which are constituents of the *dvandva* compound, which is, in turn, the non-head constituent of the *tatpuruṣa* compound *kṣayyāmayāvyapasmāriśvitrikuṣṭhikula-* ‘family of tuberculous, dyspeptic, epileptic, vitiliginous, and leprous people’) under A 5.2.128 that teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *inI* with the meaning of *matUP*.

90. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.8 [TE] (A*)

nodvahet kapilām kanyām nādhikāṅgīm na rogiṇīm |
nālomikām nātilomām na vācālām na piṅgalām || 3.8 ||

One should not take as a bride a maiden who has red hair or an extra limb, who has many diseases (or ‘who is affected with a disease which is difficult to heal’), who is devoid of or abundant in hair, who is chatty or who is jaundiced.

[...] *rogiṇī bahurogā duṣpratikāravayādhiḡhītā ca | bhūmnīnir²²⁶ matvarthīyo nityayoge vā* (see A 5.2.128) | [...]

‘Having a disease’ (f.) (*rogiṇī*) [means] ‘having many diseases’ and ‘affected with a disease which is difficult to heal’: [the *taddhita* affix] meaning *matUP* (i.e. having a possessive meaning) *inI* occurs in the sense of ‘multitude’ or ‘perpetual property’ (see A 5.2.128).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.2.128: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.7.

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the feminine *taddhita* derivative stem *rogiṇī* by singling out the *taddhita* affix *inI*, which is applied according to rule A 5.2.128 to obtain the output *rogin-* and, as a consequence, its feminine form, i.e. *rogiṇī-*

²²⁶ Mandlik presents the variant reading *bhūmnīṇih*, while Gharpure shows the variant reading *bhūmnīni*, and Jha, Dave and Olivelle feature the variant reading *bhūmnīnih*. We have decided to adopt the latter reading since it correctly contains the locative singular of the word-form *bhūman-* and the nominative singular of the word-form *ini-* (i.e. the *taddhita* affix *inI*).

(formed in accordance with A 4.1.14).²²⁷ It is noteworthy that Medhātithi adds two meaning restriction for the *taddhita* here used, namely *bhūman-* ('multitude') and *nityayoga-* ('perpetual property'). The latter may correspond to what in modern linguistics is called "inalienable possession."

91. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.9 [TE] (Vt*)

naṛkṣavṛkṣanadīnāmnīm | *nāntyaparvatanāmikām* |
na pakṣyahipreṣyanāmnīm na ca bhīṣaṇanāmikām || 3.9 ||

[One should] not [marry a woman] whose name is that of a constellation, tree or river, whose name is that of the lowest [caste] or a mountain, whose name is that of a bird, snake or servant, or whose name is frightening.

ṛkṣaṃ nakṣatram tannāmikārdṛā jyeṣṭhetyādi | *vṛkṣanāmnīm śiṃśapāmalakīti* |
nadī gaṅgā yamunā tannāmnī | *ṛkṣāṇi ca vṛkṣās ca nadyaś ceti dvandvas tāsāṃ*
nāmānīti ṣaṣṭhīsamāsaḥ | *tato dvitīyena nāmasabdenottarapadalopī*
samāsaḥ (see M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69) | [...]

[The word-form] *ṛkṣa-* [means] 'constellation': the one (f.) named as this (i.e. as a constellation), such as *ārdṛā* (i.e. the fourth or sixth lunar mansion) and *jyeṣṭhā* (i.e. the sixteenth or eighteenth lunar mansion), [should not get married]. [One should not marry] the one (f.) whose name is a tree such as *śiṃśapā* (i.e. *Dalbergia sissoo* Roxb.) and *āmalakī* (i.e. *Phyllanthus emblica* L.). A river is [for instance] the *gaṅgā* and *yamunā*: the one (f.) named as this (i.e. as a river) [should not get married]. [The compound *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadī-*, which is a constituent of *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadīnāman-*, should be analysed as] a *dvandva* [meaning] 'constellations, trees and rivers.' [The compound *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadīnāman-* should be analysed as] a *ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa* in the sense of 'the names of these (f.).' Therefore, through the accusative case ending [of] the word-form *nāman-*, [this is] a compound whose final member (i.e. a second mention of *nāman-*) is zero-replaced (see M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69).

Passage referred to:

- M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.146.

²²⁷ 4.1.14: *anupasarjanāt* [*pratipādikāt* 1 *nīp* 5] "[The affix *NīP* occurs after a nominal stem] provided that it is not a non-head constituent of a compound."

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi explains the *bahuvrīhi* compound *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadīnāman-* (‘whose name is a constellation, tree or river’), inflected in the feminine accusative case *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadīnāmnīm* and referring to the maiden (*kānyāṃ* in MDh 3.8) whom a twice-born should not marry. First, the constituent *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadī-* is separately analysed as a *dvandva* compound in the sense of ‘constellations, trees and rivers.’ Then, the scholar states that a *tatpuruṣa* compound with the genitival sense (*ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa*) is formed as *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadīnāman-* in the sense of ‘the name of constellations, trees and rivers.’ Finally, a *bahuvrīhi* compound is derived from this etymon. Medhātithi postulates that a final member of this compound, i.e. a second mention of *nāman-*, is zero-replaced by the so-called *uttarapadalopa*. We remark that this process was not originally Pāṇini’s and was introduced by Kātyāyana (see M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 ad A 2.1.69). According to Medhātithi, the sense of this *bahuvrīhi* compound is ‘whose name is a name of constellations, trees and rivers’, with the second ‘name’ being zero-replaced.

92. Medh ad MDh^M 3.19 [TE] (A, A*⁵, KV*)

vr̥ṣalīphenapītasya *niḥśvāsopahatasya ca* |
tasyāṃ caiva prasūtasya niṣkṛtir na vidhīyate || 3.19 ||

No atonement is enjoined to the one by whom the Śūdra woman’s saliva is drunk, who is infected by [her] breath, who has procreated in her.

arthavādo ’yam | *vr̥ṣalyāḥ pheno vr̥ṣalīpheno vaktrāsavaḥ sa pīto yena* (see A 2.2.23-24) | *palāṇḍubhakṣitādivat paranipātaḥ* (see KV ad A 4.1.53; A 2.2.37) | *pāṭhāntaram*²²⁸ *vr̥ṣalīpītapphenasya* (see A 2.2.36) | *pītaḥ pheno yasyeti vighraho vr̥ṣalyā pītapphenah* | *ṭṛṭīyā* (A 2.1.30) *iti yogavibhāgāt samāsaḥ* | *pītaḥ pheno vāneneti vighrahe vr̥ṣalyā iti ṣaṣṭhīsamāsaḥ* (see A 2.2.8) | *arthas tu sarvavṛttiṣv eka eva* | [...]

This is an explanation of the meaning. ‘The saliva of a *vr̥ṣalī* (i.e. a Śūdra woman), i.e. *vr̥ṣalīphena*, is the juice of [her] mouth; [the *vighraha* of the compound *vr̥ṣalīphenapīta-* is] ‘by whom this has been drunk’ (see A 2.2.23-24). The irregular position [of the past passive participle *pīta-*] within the compound [*vr̥ṣalīphenapīta-*] (≠ A 2.2.36) is the same as *palāṇḍubhakṣita-* etc. (‘having

²²⁸ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *pāṭhāntare*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *pāṭhāntaram*. The latter is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 97).

eaten onions') (see KV *ad* A 4.1.53; as regards the constituent order: see A 2.2.37). There is another variant reading: *vr̥ṣalīpītapphenasya* (see A 2.2.36); [its] *vigraha* 'whose saliva has been drunk' [means] 'the saliva which has been drunk by the *vr̥ṣalī*.' The compound [is formed] according to *tr̥tīya* (A 2.1.30) due to a *yogavibhāga*. Or rather, if there were *vr̥ṣalyāḥ* (genitive feminine singular: 'of a *vr̥ṣalī*') in the *vigraha* 'the saliva has been drunk by X', [this would be] a *ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa* (see A 2.2.8). However, the meaning is just the same in all the cases.

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 2.1.30: *tr̥tīyā tatkr̥tārthena guṇavacanena* [*samāsaḥ* 2.1.3 *saha supā* 2.1.4 *vā* 2.1.18 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 2.1.22]
A word inflected in the instrumental case denoting a quality meaning 'made by X' [preferably combines with another inflected noun to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound].
- A 2.2.8: *ṣaṣṭhī* [*samāsaḥ* 2.1.3 *saha supā* 2.1.4 *vā* 2.1.18 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 2.1.22]
A word inflected in the genitive case [preferably combines with another inflected noun to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound].
- A 2.2.23: *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ*
The remainder is the *bahuvrīhi* [compound].
- A 2.2.24: *anekam anyapadārthe* [*samāsaḥ* 2.1.3 *saha supā* 2.1.4 *sup* 2.1.9 *vā* 2.1.18 *bahuvrīhiḥ* 23]
Two or more inflected nouns [preferably combine] in the meaning of another inflected noun (i.e. the meaning of an inflected noun different from the constituents) [to form a *bahuvrīhi* compound].
- A 2.2.36: *niṣṭhā* [*pūrvam* 30 *bahuvrīhau* 35]
An inflected noun ending in a *niṣṭhā* affix (i.e. *Kta* and *KtavatU*: see A 1.1.26)²²⁹ occurs as the left-hand member [in a *bahuvrīhi* compound].
- A 2.2.37: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.70.
- KV *ad* A 4.1.53: *palāṇḍubhakṣitī palāṇḍubhakṣitā*
'One who has eaten onions' (first feminine form), 'one who has eaten onions' (second feminine form).

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the compound *vr̥ṣalīphenapīta-* by proposing two different interpretations and a variant reading:

²²⁹ A 1.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.1.

- a) First, he reads it as a *bahuvrīhi* compound, proposing the constituent analysis as *sa pīto yena*: ‘By whom this (i.e. the Śūdra woman’s saliva) is drunk.’ Regarding this interpretation, he specifies that the compound is a *paranipāta*, i.e. it irregularly presents as a second member what should be expected as the first. This is allowed by A 2.2.37, as the last member *pīta-* is included in the group *āhitāgnyādi* (‘whose sacrificial fire has been placed’), which is an *ākṛtigaṇa*, because the past passive participle can constitute the first or second member of a *bahuvrīhi* *contra* the previous rule A 2.2.36. As far as this rule is concerned, Medhātithi presents the case of the *palāṇḍubhakṣita-*, which is found in a commentarial excerpt on rule A 4.1.53 (see KV *ad* A 4.1.53) of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.
- b) Second, the commentator presents the variant reading *vr̥ṣalīpītaphena-*, which contains the *bahuvrīhi* *pītaphena-* (analysed as *pītaḥ pheno yasya* ‘whose saliva is drunk’) with the order expected by A 2.2.36. In fact, the *bahuvrīhi* *pītaphena-* is then combined with *vr̥ṣalī-* and analysed as a *tatpuruṣa* according to A 2.1.30 adopted through a *yogavibhāva* (i.e. only *tr̥tīya* is taken into account). The instrumental *vr̥ṣalyā* should qualify as a *guṇavacana* of the *pītaphena-*; the sense would be: ‘the drunk saliva which is produced by the *vr̥ṣalī*.’
- c) Lastly, Medhātithi proposes another *viśraha* for this *tatpuruṣa*, i.e. *pītaḥ pheno anena*, combined with the genitive *vr̥ṣalyāḥ*; the sense would be: ‘the Śūdra woman’s saliva is drunk by X.’ The compound that combines *pītaphena-* with *vr̥ṣalyāḥ* is then a *ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa* according to A 2.2.8.

93. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.27 [J] (P, A*)

ācchādya cārcayitvā ca śrutaśīlavate svayam |

āhūya dānaṃ kanyāyā brāhmo dharmah prakīrtitaḥ || 3.27 ||

After presenting [her] with clothes, honouring [her], the gift of the maiden [given by the father] to a well-educated and righteous [suitor], after spontaneously inviting [him], is the rite (*dharma*) made known as Brāhma.

[...] *ye tu manyante yathaiva gavāder dravyasyādr̥ṣṭārthatayā dīyamānasya mantrapūrvakeṇa pratigraheṇa dānaṃ api nirvartate tenaivedam uktaṃ dadātiṣu caivaṃ dharmeṣu (≈ GDh 5.19) iti | evaṃ ceha pratigrahamantrasthānīyo vivāha iti | tathā copayamanaṃ vivāha ity eko ’rthaḥ | upayamanaṃ ca svakaraṇam |*

evaṃ ha sma bhagavān pāṇinīḥ smaraty upād yamaḥ svakaraṇe (A 1.3.56) *iti | ato vivāhaḥ kanyāsvikārārthaḥ | [...]*

However, some think that, just when the cow and the like are given for the sake of obtaining a transcendental outcome, the action of giving is also brought about by means of the act of acceptance preceded by the *mantra* (i.e. *devāsya tvā savitūḥ prasave 'śvīnor bāhūbhyāṃ pūṣṇó hástābhyāṃ prátigrhṇāmi* ‘At the impulse of the god Savitr, with the arms of the Ásvin, with the hands of Pūṣan I receive you’: see MS 1.9.4.8), and thus, by means of this, it is said as follows: “It is even thus for all *dharma* gifts (*dadāti*)” (≈ GDh 5.19). Hence, even in this regard, marriage is equated with the acceptance [of priestly gifts] according to the sacred texts, and, likewise, ‘taking for one’s self’ (*upayamana*) has the same meaning as ‘marriage’ (*vivāha*). And ‘taking as one’s own’ (*upayamana*) [means] ‘marrying.’ Thus, indeed, the Venerable Pāṇini teaches *upād yamaḥ svakaraṇe* (A 1.3.56). Therefore, marriage has the meaning of ‘making a woman one’s own.’

Rule cited:

- A 1.3.56: *upād yamaḥ svakaraṇe* [ātmanepadam 12]
[Ātmanepada substitutes of the *lakāras* occur after the verbal base] *yam-* (‘to hold’) occurring after [the preverb] *upa-* to denote ‘marrying.’

Comment:

Here, while reporting the opinion of some who consider marriage equivalent to accepting (i.e. as accepting a gift), Medhātithi reflects on one of the words used for ‘marrying’, i.e. *upayamana-*, which literally means ‘taking for one’s self’, as taught by A 1.3.56 (which he quotes). The latter rule teaches that the verbal base *yam-* is conjugated in the Ātmanepada diathesis after the preverb *upa-* when the meaning conveyed is ‘marrying.’ From Medhātithi’s perspective, marriage equals making the wife a husband’s property. In actual fact, this short commentarial passage has no real grammatical value for understanding Manu’s text, as the aim of using Pāṇini’s *sūtra* is to explain the deep sense of marriage.

94. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.34 [TE] (A*)

*suptāṃ mattāṃ pramattāṃ vā raho yatropagacchati |
sa pāpiṣṭho vivāhānāṃ [paiśacaḥ] prathito 'dhamah || 3.34 ||*

When one approaches in secret [a maiden] who is sleeping, intoxicated or mad, this is the most sinful of marriages, the lowest one renowned as Paiśaca.

[...] *brāhmādīnām idam arthe taddhitāḥ* (see A 4.3.120) | *brahmādisaṃbandhitā ca stutyāropyate* | *evaṃ sarveṣu* | *paiśācaḥ piśācānām ayaṃ yukta iti nindā* ||
 As for the meaning [of the *taddhita* derivative stems denoting the eight marriages: *brāhma-*, *daiva-*, etc.], the *taddhita* [affix] occurs in the sense of ‘this belongs to the group *brāhmādi* (‘Brāhma marriage and the like’) (see A 4.3.120), and the connection with the Brahman and the like is superimposed (on the marriage ceremonies) through praise: it is thus in all cases. [The word-form] *paiśāca-* [meaning] ‘this is proper to Piśācas’ is a derogatory expression.

Rule referred to:

- A 4.3.120: *tasyedam* [pratiṭipādikāt 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
 [A *taddhita* affix among those taught from A 4.1.83 onwards occurs after a nominal stem] in the sense of ‘this belongs to X.’

Comment:

Medhātithi firstly focuses on the terms denoting the eight forms of marriage, cumulatively indicated by means of the compound *brāhmādi* (‘Brāhma marriage and the like’). The scholar seems to recall A 4.3.120 to explain the eight forms. Secondly, he comments on the last term of this group, i.e. *paiśāca-* (which refers to the lowest and most condemned marriage among the eight), reporting its *vigraha* and explaining that it is derogatory even from the etymological point of view, as the *taddhita* derivative stem is formed from the etymon *piśāca-* (i.e. a particular class of demons).

95. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.36 [TE] (A*)

yo yasyaiśāṃ vivāhānām manunā kīrtito guṇaḥ |
sarvaṃ śṛṇuta taṃ viprāḥ samyak kīrtayato mama || 3.36 ||

O Brāhmaṇas, listen to all that is the good quality of each of these marriages which Manu mentions, as I duly mention them.

[...] *eṣāṃ vivāhānām iti nirdhāraṇe śaṣṭhī* (see A 2.3.41) | [...]

[In the phrase] *eṣāṃ vivāhānām* (‘of these marriages’), the genitive [is used] in the partitive sense (see A 2.3.41).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.3.41: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.139.

Comment:

Medhātithi is commenting here on the partitive use of the genitive in the phrase *eṣām vivāhānām* ('of these marriages'). He correctly hinted at rule A 2.3.41, which teaches that genitive and locative are used to denote the partitive sense.

96. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.38 [TL] (A, A*)

daivoḍhājāḥ sutaś caiva sapta sapta parāvarān |
ārṣoḍhājāḥ sutas trīṃs trīn ṣaṭ ṣaṭ kāyoḍhājāḥ sutaḥ || 3.38 ||

A son generated from a woman married according to the Daiva rite [liberates] seven generations before and after [him]; a son generated from a woman married according to the Ārṣa rite [liberates] three [generations before and after him]; the son generated from a woman married according to the rite relating to god Ka (= the Prājāpatya rite) [liberates] six [generations before and after him].

[...] *kaḥ prajāpatiḥ | sa devatā yasya vivāhasya sa kāyaḥ* (see A 4.2.25) | [...] *kāyoḍhaja iti hrasvatvaṃ **nyāpoḥ samjñāchandasor bahulam** iti* (A 6.3.63) | [...] [The word-form] *ka-* denotes [God] Prajāpati. The marriage of which he (i.e. God Ka = God Prajāpati) is the deity is Kāya (= Prājāpatya) (see A 4.2.25). [...] The shortening of [the word-form] *kāyoḍhaja-* ('born from a woman married according to the rite relating to god Ka, i.e. the Prājāpatya rite') is due to *nyāpoḥ samjñāchandasor bahulam* (A 6.3.63).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 4.2.25: *kasyet* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *sāsya devatā* 23] [A *taddhita* affix, i.e. *aN*, occurs after the nominal stem] *ka-* ('Ka, i.e. Prajāpati') and the substitute short *i* replacing its final vowel sound (i.e. *a*) [to denote 'X is his/her/its deity'].
- A 6.3.63: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.169.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi reflects on the synthetical compound *kāyoḍhaja-* (lit. 'born from a woman married according to the Prājāpatya rite'). First, he comments on the left-hand compound constituent *kāya-* (lit. 'relating to god Ka, i.e. Prajāpati'), which is formed according to the specific rule A 4.2.25. Then, Medhātithi states that the compound *kāyoḍhaja-* is a variant of *kāyoḍhāja* formed by means of A 6.3.63.

97. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.39 [TE] (A², A^{*3})

*brāhmādiṣu vivāheṣu caturṣv evānupūrvaśaḥ |
brahmavarcasināḥ putrā jāyante śiṣṭasammatāḥ || 3.39 ||*

In the four marriages beginning with the Brāhma, indeed, in regular order, the sons are generated as possessing sacred knowledge (lit. ‘possessing the Brahman’s glory’) and esteemed by cultured men.

[...] *śrutādhyayanavijñānaśampattinimitte ca pūjākhyātī*²³⁰ *brahmavarcasam |
tadvanto brahmavarcasināḥ | innanto ’yam* (see A 5.2.115) *| śiṣṭānām sammatā
anumatā agarhyā adviṣṭāḥ priyā iti yāvat | ataś*²³¹ *cāmatyarthatvān*²³²
matibuddhī (A 3.2.188) *asyāviśayatvena ktena ca pūjāyām* (A 2.2.12) *ity etena
nāsti samāsapratiṣedhaḥ | sambandhasāmānyavivakṣāyām ca ṣaṣṭhī* (see A 2.2.8,
2.3.50) ||

The reverence and fame originating from prosperity, knowledge and studying the Veda are ‘sacred knowledge’ (*brahmavarcasa-*); those who possess it are *brahmavarcasin-*: this [word-form] ends in [the *taddhita* affix] *in[I]* (see A 5.2.115). [The compound *śiṣṭasammatā-*, which should be analysed as] ‘esteemed by well-educated men’ (*śiṣṭānām sammatā*), [means] ‘approved’, ‘not vile’, ‘not hated’, ‘beloved’: such is the explanation. For this reason, due to [its] not having the meaning of ‘wish’ (*matī*), [the rule] *matibuddhi* (A 3.2.188) [does not apply] as it does not fall under [this rule’s] dominion. Thus, there is no preclusion [for the formation] of the compound by means of *ktena ca pūjāyām* (A 2.2.12), and the genitive case [is used] in the intention of the speaker to express a general relation (see A 2.2.8; 2.3.50).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 2.2.8: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19.
- A 2.2.12: *ktena ca pūjāyām* [*samāsaḥ* 2.1.3 *saha supā* 2.1.4 *sup* 2.1.9 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 2.1.22 *ṣaṣṭhī* 8 *na* 10]

²³⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *pūjākhyāti*, while the others present the variant reading *pūjākhyātī*. This is the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 102).

²³¹ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *yataś*, while the others present the variant *ataś*.

²³² Mandlik features the variant reading *cāmānyarthatvāt*, while the others present the variant reading *cāmatyarthatvāt*.

[A word ending in the genitive case does not] also [combine with a word formed with the *kṛt* affix] *Kta* in the sense of ‘homage’ [to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound].

- A 2.3.50: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.56.
- A 3.2.188: *matibuddhipūjārthebhyāś ca [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 kṛt 3.1.93 vartamāne 123 kta 187]*
[The *kṛt* affix *Kta* applies after a verbal stem] denoting ‘wish’ (*mati*), knowledge (*buddhi*), and homage (*pūjā*) [when the action refers to the present time].
- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on some grammatical features of the word-forms *brahmavarcasin-* (‘possessing sacred knowledge’) and *śiṣṭasaṃmata-* (‘esteemed by well-educated men’). Given its possessive meaning, the first compound is explained to be a *taddhita* formed with the affix *inI* according to A 5.2.115, starting from the *tatpuruṣa* compound *brahmavarcasa-*, and we add that it ends with the *samāsānta* affix *aC* applied in accordance with A 5.4.78.²³³ The second compound is analysed as a *ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣa*, i.e. *śiṣṭānām saṃmatā* (by means of A 2.2.8), whose genitival *pada* expresses a general relation. In this case, Medhātithi hints at the non-specified meaning taught by A 2.3.50, which teaches to apply the genitive case ending to a nominal stem to convey whatever meaning has not been taught up to that rule in the section devoted to the assignment of the nominal endings. Finally, he comments on the right-hand constituent *saṃmata-*, which is a *kṛt* derivative stem from the verbal stem *samman-* (lit. ‘to think together’, ‘to agree’). He declares that the latter is not formed with A 3.2.188, as its verbal base does not have the meaning of ‘wish’ (*mati*) but that of ‘approbation’ (thus, ‘esteem’); therefore, rule A 2.2.12, which would preclude the formation of *tatpuruṣa* compounds by combining the past passive participle denoting ‘homage’ (*pūjā*) with *padas* ending in the genitive case, does not apply.

98. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.45 [TE] (A*, KV*)

[rtukālābhigāmī] syāt svadāranirataḥ sadā |
parvavarjaṃ vrajec cainām tadvrato ratikāmyayā || 3.45 ||

²³³ A 5.4.78: *brahmahastibhyām varcasah [pratipādikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 samāsāntāḥ 68 ac 75]* “[The *taddhita samāsānta aC* applies after the nominal stem] *varcas-* (‘lustre’) co-occurring with [the nominal stems] *brahman-* (‘sacred knowledge’) and *hastin-* (‘elephant’).”

One should always be pleased by his wife when having sexual intercourse [with her] during [her] proper season, and, outside of the forbidden days in a month, he, performing all observances towards her (i.e. ‘being loyal to her’), should go to her [even just] for the sake of sexual enjoyment.

[...] *ṛtukāle 'bhigantum vratam asyety ṛtukālābhigāmī | vrata iti niniḥ* (see A 3.2.80) *yathā sthaṇḍilaśāyy aśrāddhabhojīti* (see e.g. KV *ad* A 3.2.80) | [...] [The one respecting] his vow to have sexual intercourse [with his wife] during [her] proper season is the *ṛtukālābhigāmin*; thus, [the *kṛt* affix] *ṆinI* occurs in the meaning of ‘vow’ (see A 3.2.80) such as in the cases of *sthaṇḍilaśāyin*- (‘one sleeping on the bare ground due to a vow’) [and] *aśrāddhabhojin*- (‘one who does not eat during a Śrāddha ceremony due to a vow’) (see KV *ad* A 3.2.80).

Rule and passage referred to:

- A 3.2.80: *vrata [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 kṛt 3.1.93 supi 4 nini 78]*
[The *kṛt* affix] *ṆinI* occurs [after a verbal stem co-occurring with a nominal *pada*] to denote a ‘religious vow.’
- KV *ad* A 3.2.80: *sthaṇḍilaśāyī | aśrāddhabhojī |*
[Examples for the application of rule A 3.2.80 are] *sthaṇḍilaśāyin*- (‘one sleeping on the bare ground due to a vow’) [and] *aśrāddhabhojin*- (‘one who does not eat during a Śrāddha ceremony due to a vow’).

Comment:

Here Medhātithi reflects on the compound *ṛtukālābhigāmin*-, formed by *ṛtukāla*- (‘proper season’) and the *kṛt* derivative stem *abhigāmin*- (‘having sexual intercourse’). In particular, he provides a grammatical explanation for the latter compound constituent, which is formed by adding the *kṛt* affix *ṆinI* to the verbal base *abhiḡam*- (lit. ‘to approach’) in the meaning of ‘religious vow’ (*vrata*), according to rule A 3.2.80.²³⁴ He also cites the two common examples found in the passages dealing with this rule in Vyākaraṇa works, i.e. *sthaṇḍilaśāyin*- and *aśrāddhabhojin*- (see KV *ad* A 3.2.80).

99. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.61 [TE] (A^{*3}, Vt^{*2})

pañcāitān yo mahāyajñān na hāpayati śaktitah |
sa grhe 'pi vasan nityaṃ sūnādoṣair na lipyate || 3.61 ||

²³⁴ We report that Jha (1999: IV, 72)—followed by Olivelle—wrongly indicated the rule inferred here as A 3.2.20.

The one who does not neglect these five great sacrifices compatibly with [his] possibilities is not defiled with the guilt derived from animal slaughter despite constantly remaining at home.

nityatvam atra vidhīyate | anyad anūdyate | viguṇā apy ete yathāśakti kartavyāḥ | etad api nityatvāt prāptam eva | tasmād yathāsaṃbhavaṃ śaktita iti | ādyāditvāt tasiḥ (see M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44) | *hāpayatīti prakṛtyartha eva nījarthasyāvivakṣitatvāt* (cf. A 3.1.26) | *atha vā hananaṃ hā saṃpadāditvāt kvip* (see A 3.2.76) *tām āpayatīti nyat* (see A 3.1.124) *āpnoteḥ kartari kvip* (see A 3.2.76) *tadantāt prātipadikād dhātvārthe ñic* (see M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26) | *na hāpayati na tyajed ity arthaḥ* | [...]

Here, the mandatory nature [of the five great sacrifices] is enjoined, [while] the rest is repeated. These should be performed, even if imperfectly, according to one's possibilities. This is indeed accomplished even due to [its] mandatory nature. Therefore, [it is said] 'compatibly [with one's] possibilities', i.e. *śaktitas*:- [the *taddhita*] affix *tasI* occurs due to its being part of the group *ādyādi* (see M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44). [The verbal form] *hāpayati* (lit. 'he causes someone to leave', here 'he neglects') [is explained as follows]. It just has the meaning of the root as there is no intention on the part of the speaker to express the [causative] meaning of [the *kṛt* affix] *ÑiC* (cf. A 3.1.26). Or rather, [it is formed as follows]: *hā-* (f.) [is used] in the sense of 'omission' (*hanana*) because of its obtaining [the *kṛt* affix] *KviP* (see A 3.2.76); [the meaning of *hāpayati* is explained as] *tām āpayati* (lit. 'he causes to obtain it', here 'he obtains it, i.e. the omission', as *tām* stands for the accusative feminine singular form of *hā-* and *āpayati* stands for *āpnoti* as a way of quoting the verbal base *āp-*). [The *kṛt* affix] *ÑyaT* [occurs after the compounded stem *hāp-*, lit. 'to reach the omission'] (see A 3.1.124). [The *kṛt* affix] *KviP* [is then applied] in the sense of the agent to [the verbal base] *āp-* (see A 3.2.76). [The *kṛt* affix] *ÑiC* [finally occurs] after the nominal stem ending with it (i.e. *āpya-* as the right-hand member of the compound *hāpya-*) in the sense of the verbal base (i.e. without the causative sense) (see M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26): *na hāpayati* means 'he does not omit.'

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 3.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.30.
- A 3.1.124: *ṛhalor nyat* [*dhātoḥ* 91 *kṛt* 93 *kṛtya* 95]: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.94.
- A 3.2.76: *kvip ca* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *supi* 4 *upasarge* 61]

[The *kṛt* affix] *KviP* also occurs [after a verbal base when it co-occurs with a nominal *pada* or a preverb].

- M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26: *tat karoti iti upasaṅkhyānam sūtrayatyādyartham*
There is the additional statement that the sense of ‘he does it’ occurs for the verbal forms such as *sūtrayati* (‘he teaches [it] as a *sūtra*’).
- M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi first deals with the ablative form *śaktitas* (from the nominal stem *śakti-* ‘possibility’), formed by applying the affix *tasI* (taught by A 5.4.44), by resorting to Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44 (M 2.436 l. 11), due to its being part of the *ādyādi* group.

He then goes on to comment on the causative form of the verbal base *hā-*, i.e. *hāpayati*, providing two explanations:

- 1) It might be a causative form from the verbal base *hā-* (‘to abandon’) whose causative sense is not realised due to the speaker’s intention; therefore, according to this supposition, A 3.1.26, teaching that the *kṛt* affix *ṆiC* is applied in the causative sense, does not apply.
- 2) It might be analysed as the denominative form derived from the nominal stem *hāpya-* consisting in an *upapādasamāsa* made up of *hā-* + *āpya-*. The derivational steps are as follows:
 - a) the feminine noun *hā-* in the sense of ‘omission’ (*hanana*) is derived from the verbal base *hā-* affixed with *KviP* (realised as a zero-morpheme by means of A 6.1.67),²³⁵ according to rule A 3.2.76: *hā-* + *KviP* (= Ø) > *hā-*;
 - b) by means of rule A 3.1.124, the *kṛt* affix *ṆyaT* is applied to the compounded stem *hāp-* (formed by the noun *hā-* + the verbal base *āp-*) to obtain *hāpya-*: *hā-* + *āp-* > *hāp-* + *ṆyaT* > *hāpya-*;
 - c) since the meaning conveyed by the affix *ṆyaT* denotes a *karman* (or a *bhāva*) according to rule A 3.4.70,²³⁶ the affix *KviP* is applied to *hāpya-* to denote a *kartr* according to A 3.2.76 (again zero-replaced under A 6.1.67): *hāpya-* + *KviP* (= Ø) > *hāpya-*;
 - d) finally, the causative affix *ṆiC* is applied to the nominal stem *hāpya-* to obtain *hāpayati*, with a denominative sense according to Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26: *hāpya-* + *ṆiC* > *hāpayati*.

²³⁵ A 6.1.67: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.100.

²³⁶ A 3.4.70: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.228.

100. Medh ad MDh^M 3.81 [TE] (Vt*)

prṣṭhavāstūni kurvīta balim sarvānnabhūtaye |
pitṛbhyo baliṣeṣaṃ tu sarvaṃ dakṣiṇato haret || 3.81 ||

On the upper floor of the house, one should make an offering for the sake of obtaining all types of food; one should bring all the remainder of the offering from the south to the Pitṛs.

[...] *sarvānnabhūtaye* | *tādartheye caturthī na sampradāne* (see M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13) | [...]

[In the form] *sarvānnabhūtaye* ('for the sake of obtaining all types of food'), the dative ending occurs in the sense of 'being intended for X', and not in the sense of recipient (see M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13).

Passage referred to:

- M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.245.

Comment:

While commenting on the dative form *sarvānnabhūtaye* ('for the sake of obtaining all types of food'), Medhātithi states that the dative is used in the sense of purpose, according to M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13, and not in the most common sense of recipient, taught in A 2.3.13.²³⁷

101. Medh ad MDh^M 3.88 [TE] (A*)

vidyātapahsamṛddheṣu hutam vipramukhāgniṣu |
nistārayati durgāc ca mahataś caiva kilbiṣāt || 3.88 ||

An oblation [offered] in the mouths of Brāhmaṇas that are fires, abundantly endowed with knowledge and ascetic blaze, saves [a man] from distress and great fault.

[...] *viprāṇām mukhāny agnaya ity atra vyāghrāder ākṛtiganatvāt samāsaḥ* (see A 2.1.56) | [...]

[The compound *vipramukhāgni-* must be analysed as] 'the mouths of Brāhmaṇas are fires': in this case, the compound belongs to the *vyāghrādi* group ('tiger and the like') due to its being part of an exemplificative list (see A 2.1.56).

²³⁷ A 2.3.13: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.56.

Rule referred to:

- A 2.1.56: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106.

Comment:

Medhātithi explains the compound *vipramukhāgni-* as formed according to rule A 2.1.56, analysed as ‘the Brāhmaṇas’ mouths are fires’ (*viprāṇaṃ mukhāny agnayaḥ*).²³⁸ In the *vigraha* he proposes, *vipramukha-* (‘the Brāhmaṇa’ mouth’) is the subject of comparison (*upamita*), *agni-* (‘fire’) is the standard of comparison (*upamāna*), and the *tertium comparationis* is omitted; therefore, the mouths of the Brāhmaṇas are compared to the fires.

102. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.111 [E] (A*)

*sāyaṃ tv annasya siddhasya patny amantraṃ baliṃ haret |
vaiśvadevaṃ hi nāmaitat sāyaṃprātar vidhīyate || 3.111 ||*

In the evening, when the food is prepared, the wife should offer an oblation without formulas. This [rite] named Vaiśvadeva is prescribed for the evening and morning.

[...] *na ca*²³⁹ *yaiḥ śabdair baliharaṇādi kriyate te kutrācit paṭhyante | kevalam agnyādibhyo devebhyo homaṃ kuryād iti śruteḥ svāhākāreṇa vā vaṣaṭkāreṇa vā devebhyo haviḥ sampradīyata iti vākyaṅtareṇa sarvahomeṣu svāhākāro vihito yājyānte vaṣaṭkāro niyamito yājyāyāṃ vaṣaṭkarotīti | svāhākāraśabdayoge caturthī smaryate* (see A 2.3.16) | [...]

The word-forms with which the oblation beginning with the *baliharaṇa* (‘presentation of oblations’) is made are not listed anywhere [in the Vedic scriptures]. From the Vedic scriptures, it is said ‘one should only make an oblation to the gods beginning with Agni.’ The ritual exclamation *svāhā* is taught by another [Vedic] passage in all the other oblations: ‘An oblation is offered to gods either with the ritual exclamation *svāhā* or *vaṣaṭ*.’ [In contrast], the ritual exclamation *vaṣaṭ* is restricted at the end of the *yājyā* according to [the statement] ‘one pronounces *vaṣaṭ* at [the end of] the *yājyā*.’ The dative is taught in connection with the word-form of the ritual exclamation *svāhā* (see A 2.3.16).

²³⁸ As regards Medhātithi’s employment of the *rūpakasamāsa* category, which, in accordance with post-Pāṇini usage, supersedes the original *upamāsamāsa* category of Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, see our comment on Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106.

²³⁹ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) omit *na ca*, while the others contain this segment. This is the reading of F.N., as noted by Jha (1924: I, 116).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.3.16: *namaḥsvastisvāhāsvadhā 'laṃvaṣaḍyogāc ca* [caturthī 13]
[The dative] also occurs (after a nominal stem) co-occurring with *namas-* ('homage'), *svasti-* (an exclamation of well-being), *svāhā-* (an exclamation of blessing), *svadhā-* (the exclamation used to present the oblation to the gods), *alam-* ('enough'), and *vaṣaṭ-* (the exclamation uttered at the end a sacrificial verse).

Comment:

While digressing on the oblations, Medhātithi refers to the use of the dative in co-occurrence—among others—with the exclamation *vaṣaṭ*, which is found in one of the passages cited as belonging to the Vedic scriptures, according to rule A 2.3.16.

103. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.113 [J] (A*)

*pitṛñām māsikaṃ śrāddham anvāhāryaṃ vidur budhāḥ |
tac cāmiṣeṇa kartavyaṃ praśastena prayatnataḥ || 3.113 ||*

The sages recognise the monthly Śrāddha ceremony to the ancestors as Anvāhārya, and this has to be zealously upheld by means of the commended preparation of food.

[...] *kiṃ punaḥ śrāddhe homabrāhmaṇabhojanapiṇḍanirvapaṇādīni karmāṇi sarvāṇy eva samapradhānāni śrāddhaśabdavācyāny uta kiṃcid aṅgam atra kiṃcit pradhānam | ucyate | śrāddham bhojayet (≈ MDh^M 3.151) śrāddham bhuktam anena (≈ A 5.2.85) iti sāmānādhikarāṇyād brāhmaṇabhojanam mukhyaṃ pratīyate ||*

However, are all the actions consisting of oblation, feeding of Brahmanas, offering of riceballs and the like included in the Śrāddha? Are [all] equally primary? Should they be expressed by means of the word-form *śrāddha*? Or rather, is something secondary and something primary? It is answered: since [the two sentences] *śrāddham bhojayet* (≈ MDh^M 3.151: 'one should feed [the Brāhmaṇas] during the Śrāddha ceremony') [or] *śrāddham bhuktam anena* (≈ A 5.2.85; here: 'eaten by X during the Śrāddha ceremony') are co-referential, the feeding of Brāhmaṇas is recognised as principal.

Rule cited:

- A 5.2.85: *śrāddham anena bhuktam iniṭhanau* [pratipādikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76]

[The *taddhita* affixes] *inI* and *ṭhaN* [occur after a nominal stem to denote] ‘the Śrāddha is eaten by X.’

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi cites A 5.2.85 to demonstrate—in answer to a question—that feeding the Brāhmaṇas (*brāhmaṇabhojana*) is the main part of the Śrāddha ceremony: the reference to Pāṇini is, therefore, non-grammatical. Finally, we report that the citation of A 5.2.85 is not *verbatim*: in the latter rule, which teaches to form *taddhita* derivative stems affixed with *inI* and *ṭhaN* to denote ‘the Śrāddha is eaten by X’, *bhuktam* and *anena* are interchanged.

104. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.136 [TL] (A*)

*eṣām anyatamo yasya bhuñjīta śrāddham arcitah |
pitṛñām tasya tṛptiḥ syāc chāśvatī [sāptapauruṣī] || 3.136 ||*

For one of the ancestors whose funeral offering is eaten by one of these²⁴⁰ who is being honoured, there will be permanent satisfaction up to the seventh generation.

[...] *sāptapauruṣī tṛptiḥ | saptapuruṣān vyāpnoti | anuśatikāder* (see A 7.3.20) *ākṛtiganatvād ubhayapadavṛddhiḥ | [...]*

‘Satisfaction up to the seventh generation’ (*sāptapauruṣī tṛptiḥ*) [means] that it pervades [the life of] seven [generations of] men. There is a *vṛddhi* vowel in both constituents due to the fact that the *anuśatikādi* list (see A 7.3.20) is exemplificative.

Rule referred to:

- A 7.3.20: *anuśatikādīnām ca [vṛddhiḥ 7.2.114 aco ṇṇiti 7.2.115 taddhiteṣv acām ādeḥ 7.2.117 kiti 7.2.118 uttarapadasya 10 pūrvapadasya 19]*
[A *vṛddhi* vowel] also [replaces a first vowel of both the former and final member of a pre-affixal stem of a compound] consisting of a member of

²⁴⁰ The reference to ‘these’ (*eṣām*) must be linked to the previous verse (MDh^M 3.135 = MDh 3.145), where the scholars of the three branches of the Veda (*Rgveda*, *Sāmaveda*, *Yajurveda*) are mentioned. As confirmation of this, we quote another portion from Medhātithi’s commentary on MDh^M 3.136: *eṣām trayāṇām traividyānām anyatamo bhojanīyaḥ* ‘Any of these three scholars of the three scholars well-versed in the three Vedas should be fed.’

the list beginning with *anuśatika-* ('accompanied by a hundred') [when a *taddhita* affix with the marker \tilde{N} , \tilde{N} or K follows].

Comment:

Medhātithi here focuses on the *vrddhi* vowel of both constituents of the compound *sāptapauruṣa-* ('lasting to the seventh generation'). He correctly refers to rule A 7.3.20, which teaches that a *vrddhi* replacement occurs at the beginning of both *padas* of a pre-affixal stem of a compound from the *anuśatikādi* list, provided that a *taddhita* affix marked with \tilde{N} , \tilde{N} or K applies to this stem. The compound *sāptapauruṣa-* is indeed not part of this list, which, however, as Medhātithi rightly recalls, is an *ākṛtigaṇa*.

105. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.155 [TE] (A*²)

ācārahīnaḥ klībaś ca nityaṃ yācanakaś tathā |
kṛṣijīvi ślīpadī ca sadbhir nindita eva ca || 3.155 ||

A man deprived of good behaviour, an unmanly one, as well as one who always asks for alms (or 'molests others through begging'), a ploughman, a club-footed man, and one who is blamed by respectable people [should be avoided as guests at the Śrāddha ceremony].²⁴¹

[...] *yācanakaḥ sadaiva yo yācate yaś ca yācñayā parān udvejayati | vastusvabhāvo 'yaṃ yācñayā yācyamānodvejanam | nandyādibhyo yuḥ* (see A 3.1.134) *svārthe kaḥ* (see A 5.3.74) | [...]

[The word-form] *yācanaka* [means] 'the one who always begs' and 'the one who molests others through begging.' This is the natural state of circumstances, i.e. the nuisance caused to the one who is pestered (lit. 'begged') by [constant] begging. [As for the derivation of *yācanaka-*] *-yu-* (= *Lyu*) occurs after [the verbal stems which are part of] the group beginning with *nandi-* (*nand-* + *-i-* < $\tilde{N}iC$) (see A 3.1.134), and [the *taddhita* affix] *ka* occurs in its own meaning (see A 5.3.74).

Rules referred to:

- A 3.1.134: *nandigrahipacādibhyo lyuṇinyacaḥ* [*dhātoḥ* 91 *kṛt* 93]
[The *kṛt* affixes] *Lyu*, $\tilde{N}inI$, and *aC* occur [after the verbal bases] of the groups beginning with *nand-*+ $\tilde{N}iC$ 'to gladden', *grah-*+ $\tilde{N}iC$ 'to seize',

²⁴¹ This integration is due to MDh^M 3.140.

and *pac-* ‘to cook’ (to denote an agent according to the general rule A 3.4.67: *kartari kṛt*).

- A 5.3.74: *kutsite* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *kaḥ* 70 *akac* 71] [The *taddhita* affixes] *ka* and *akaC* occur [after a nominal stem] in a derogatory sense.

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi comments on the derivative stem *yācanaka-*, whose derivation is outlined as follows:

1. First, the *kṛt* affix *Lyu* (which the commentator indicated as *yu*, i.e. without the *anubandha*) is applied to the verbal base *yāc-* (‘to ask’) due to its being part of the *nāndyādi*, *grāhādi*, and *pācādi* lists according to A 3.1.134. Indeed, the verbal base *yāc-* is found on the *grāhādi* list.
2. Second, the *taddhita* affix *ka* is applied to the *kṛt* derivative stem *yācana-* (‘the one who asks’) according to rule A 5.3.74, which teaches to form the *taddhita* derivative stem in the derogatory sense. Medhātithi hints at the affix *ka* to derive *yācaka-* while retaining the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*) by recalling that *ka* is included in a section devoted to the *taddhita* affixes traditionally designated as *svārthika* (i.e. A 5.3.1 – 5.4.160).

106. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.157 [TE] (A*)

etān vīgarhitācārān *apāṅkteyān* *dvijādhamān* |
dvijātipravaro vidvān ubhayatra vivarjayet || 3.157 ||

In both cases (i.e. divine and ancestral oblations), a wise, excellent twice-born should avoid those lowest twice-borns who behave contemptuously [and] do not deserve to eat with others.²⁴²

[...] *apāṅkteyāḥ paṅktiṃ nārhanti* | *bhavārthe dhak kartavyaḥ* (see A 4.3.53) |
anarhatvam eva paṅktāv abhavanena pratīyate | *anyair brāhmaṇaiḥ saha*
bhojanaṃ nārhanti | *ata eva paṅktidūṣakā ucyante* | *taiḥ sahopaviṣṭā anye* 'pi
dūṣitā bhavanti ||

²⁴² The word-form *paṅkti-* (the etymon of the *taddhita* derivative stem *apāṅkteya-*, to which Medhātithi’s excerpt is devoted here) denotes what is referred to in anthropological studies as ‘commensality’, i.e. the act of eating together. This principle underpins the Indian caste system: a twice-born individual must be careful to only eat with others of the same social level and not with those of a lower social level.

[The word-form] *apāṅkteyāḥ* [means] ‘they do not deserve to eat with others.’ [The *taddhita* affix] *ḍhak* should be applied in the meaning of ‘being there’ (see A 4.3.53). The state of being undeserving is indicated by their not eating with other people. They do not deserve to eat with other Brāhmaṇas: for this reason alone, they are regarded as corrupting the act of eating with other people. The others who shared a seat with them have been corrupted as well.

Rule referred to:

- A 4.3.53: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the *taddhita* derivative stem *apāṅkteya* (lit. ‘not being in the same class’), which is said to be formed with the *taddhita* affix *ḍhaK* (introduced by A 4.1.121)²⁴³ in the meaning of ‘being there’, according to rule A 4.3.53 (the substitution of *-i-* with *-e-* is due to A 6.4.148).²⁴⁴

107. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.159 [TE] (A*)

apaṅktyā dāne yo datur bhavaty ūrdhvaṃ phalodayaḥ |
 daive karmaṇi pitrye vā taṃ pravakṣyāmy aśeṣataḥ || 3.159 ||
 Without omitting anything, I will explain what the donor’s reward
 is after his giving to those who are not worthy of company in a
 sacrifice to gods or ancestors.

*asya pratiṣedhavidheḥ phalam āha | paṅktim arhantīti paṅktyāḥ | na paṅktyāḥ
 apaṅktyāḥ | daṇḍyādidarśanād rūpasiddhiḥ* (see A 5.1.66) | [...]

[Manu] expresses the outcome of the prohibitive injunction of it [expressed in the previous verse, i.e. that the sacrificial offering should not be presented to a Brāhmaṇa who does not recite the Veda. Those who are worthy of company are *paṅktyāḥ*; those who are not worthy [of it] are *apaṅktyāḥ*. The accomplishment of the form of [this *taddhita* derivative] depends on how one sees *daṇḍya* and the like (see A 5.1.66).

²⁴³ A 4.1.122: *itaś cāniṇaḥ* [pratiṣādikāt 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tasyāpatyam* 92 *ḍhak* 120] “[The *taddhita* affix] *ḍhaK* occurs [after a nominal stem] ending in short *i* that excludes *iN* [to denote ‘descendant of X’].”

²⁴⁴ A 6.4.148: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.173.

Rule referred to:

- A 5.1.66: *daṇḍādibhyaḥ* [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tad arhati* 63 yat 65]
[The *taddhita* affix *yaT* occurs after a nominal stem] belonging to the group beginning with *daṇḍa-* ('punishment') [to denote 'he deserves X'].

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the formation of the *taddhita* derivative *apaṅktya-* ('not worthy of company'). To explain this form, he resorts to the example *daṇḍya-* 'worthy of punishment (*daṇḍa-*)' to explain the meaning relationship between the etymon *paṅkti-* 'group' and the *taddhita* derivative nominal stem *paṅktya-*. Such an explanation seems to hint at rule A 5.1.66, which explains how to form a *taddhita* derivative by applying *yaT* after a nominal stem of the group *daṇḍādi* ('punishment and the like') denoting 'worthy of X.'

108. Medh ad MDh^M 3.161 [E] (A*)

*dārāgnihoṭrasamyogaṃ kurute yo 'graje sthite |
parivettā sa vijñeyaḥ parivittis tu pūrvajāḥ || 3.161 ||*

The one who undertakes the maintenance of the sacred fire after taking a wife while the older brother remains [in his status (i.e. he does not marry)] should be recognised as Parivettṛ, but the elder, as Parivitti.

[...] *kālaviśeṣo 'dhiko vyapekṣate | tathā ca smṛtir aṣṭau varṣāny udīkṣeta ṣaḍ ity eke* (≈ GDh 18.19) *iti | eṣā ca varṣasamkhyā yadā kanīyān prāptavivāhakālaḥ tataḥ*²⁴⁵ *prabhṛti draṣṭavyaḥ*²⁴⁶ *| vivāhakālaś ca svādhyāyavidhinivṛttiḥ | nanu ca proṣitādhikāre tat paṭhitam | bhartari proṣite yaḥ strīṇāṃ pravāsakālas tam upakramya bhrātārītyādi paṭhitam | satyam | vākyāntare proṣitaśabdasya pratyakṣaḥ saṃbandho 'vagataḥ | vākyāntare tu saṃbandhe* (≈ GDh 18.16) *pramāṇaṃ vaktavyam | na ca tad asti yathā svaritenādhikāra iti* (see A 1.3.11) *| na cātra tacchabdo 'sti | na ca tadapekṣayā vinaiva tasya vākyasyāparipūrnatvam | [...]*

An additional specific period of time is observed, and, in this regard, a *Smṛti* reads: "One should wait for eight years, others say for six [years]" (≈ GDh 18.19).

²⁴⁵ Mandlik features the variant reading *itaḥ*, while the others present the variant reading *tataḥ*.

²⁴⁶ Mandlik and the Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *praṣṭavyaḥ*, while the others present the variant reading *draṣṭavyaḥ*.

And this is the number of years that should be considered from [the time] when the younger brother has reached the age of marriage onwards, and the time of marriage is the cessation of the injunction of the recitation of the Veda.

Nonetheless, [an objection could be that] this is read under the *adhikāra* of *proṣita* ('one who has set out on a journey'): after undertaking that which is the time of [the husband's] dwelling abroad for women when their husband has left on a journey, [this] is also read for the brother and the like.

It is true, [an answer could be that] the distinct connection of the word-form *proṣita* in the one sentence (i.e. GDh 18.19) is understood, but, having connected [this word-form] with another sentence (\approx GDh 18.16: *pravrajite*), the reason should be expressed. But this is not [expressed] according to the *adhikāra* mechanism (see A 1.3.11). Even in this case (i.e. in this rule), this word-form (i.e. *proṣita*-) does not appear. And, without the expectancy of it (i.e. of the word-form *proṣita*-), the sentence is not accomplished.

Rule referred to:

- A 1.3.11: *svaritena adhikārah*
The governing rule [is marked] with a *svarita* accent.

Comment:

While commenting on the compound *agnihotra*- ('oblation to Agni'), Medhātithi focuses on the time that the younger brother is expected to wait before marrying and placing the fire on the sacrificial fireplace after his elder brother has gone abroad. The discussion relies on a verse from the *Gautamadharmasūtra* in a variant version presented by Medhātithi (GDh 18.19), which adds the segment *aṣṭau varṣāny udīkṣeta* to the version handed down in manuscripts, i.e. *ṣaḍ ity eke* (for the critical apparatus, see Olivelle 2000: 558). Medhātithi reflects on the *adhikāra* mechanism involved in Gautama's text when the reading of *sūtra* 18.19 presupposes the continuation of *pravrajite* (present in GDh 18.16). In fact, he uses *proṣita*- in place of *pravrajita*-. It is tempting to assume that the version of the *Gautamadharmasūtra* used by Medhātithi used actually presented the variant *proṣita*-, but perhaps he was merely citing from memory or paraphrasing it. To resort to the *adhikāra* mechanism, Medhātithi cites metarule A 1.3.11, which introduces the technical term *adhikāra* in the grammar.

109. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.165 [TE] (A)

te tu jātāḥ parakṣetre prāṇināḥ pretya ceha ca |
dattāni havyakavyāni nāśayanti pradāyinām || 3.165 ||

But the living being, born in the womb of another's wife, causes the oblations offered to gods and ancestors to disappear for the one who donates both in the afterlife and in this world.²⁴⁷

jātyākhyāyām (A 1.2.58) *iti bahuvacanam prāṇina iti* | [...]

The plural number of *prāṇinaḥ* [is explained] according to *jātyākhyāyām* (A 1.2.58).

Rule cited:

- A 1.2.58: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.137.

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi focuses on the plural form of the nominal stem *prāṇin-* ('living being'), which, according to A 1.2.58, should be interpreted as denoting a singular since it refers to a universal, i.e. to a whole class of elements (*jāti*): the use of this explanation means that the word-form *prāṇinaḥ* is translated as '(a) living being.'

110. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.190 [TE] (A*²)

ya ete tu gaṇā mukhyāḥ pitṛṇām parikīrtitāḥ |
teṣām apīha vijñeyam *putrapautram* *anantakam* || 3.190 ||

The group of sons and grandsons made up of those who are declared as the well-known main series of ancestors should be recognised even here as measureless.

[...] *gavāśvaprabhṛtīvāt putrapautram ity ekavadbhāvaḥ* (see A 2.4.11) | *anantakam aparimitam | svārthe kaḥ* (see A 5.4.154) ||

The singular number [of the *dvandva* compound] *putrapautra-* ('sons and grandsons') is due to its being part of [the list] beginning with *gavāśva-* ('cattle and horses'). [The word-form] *anantaka-* ('endless') [means] 'measureless'; the [affix] *ka* occurs [while retaining] the own meaning [of the base].

Rules referred to:

- A 2.4.11: *gavāśvaprabhṛtīni ca* [*ekavacanam* 1 *dvandvaḥ* 2]

²⁴⁷ We have chosen to translate the nominative masculine plural *jātāḥ* (from the stem *jāta-* 'born') and the genitive masculine plural *pradāyīnām* (from the stem *pradāyin-* 'giving') as singular in line with rule A 1.2.58 applied to *prāṇinaḥ*.

[A *dvandva* compound] which is part of the list beginning with *gavāśva-* ('cattle and horses') [is] also [singular in number].

- A 5.4.154: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.46.

Comment:

In this excerpt, Medhātithi first focuses on the singular number of the *dvandva* compound *putrapautra-* ('sons and grandsons'), which is explained by its being part of the list beginning with *gavāśva-* ('cattle and horses') according to A 2.4.11. He then refers to the morphological formation of the *taddhita* derivative stem *anantaka-* ('endless'), to which the *taddhita samāsānta* affix *kaP* is said to apply while retaining the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*, as belonging to the section of *taddhita* affixes traditionally designated as *svārtika*: A 5.3.1 – 5.4.160) according to A 5.4.154.

111. Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.226 [TE] (A*²)

atyuşṇaṃ sarvaṃ annaṃ syād bhuñjīraṃs te ca vāgyatāḥ |
na ca dvijātayo brūyur dātrā prṣṭā havirguṇān || 3.226 ||

All food should be very hot, and they should eat while being restrained in speech, and the twice-borns, when questioned by the giver, should not state the qualities of the oblation.

[...] *vāgyatāḥ vāk yatā niyamitā yaiḥ | chāndasaḥ paranipātāḥ | vācā vā yatāḥ | sādhanam kṛteti samāsaḥ* (see A 2.1.32) | *karṭṛvacanaś ca tadā yataśabdah* (see A 3.4.71) *vyāpāraṇiṣedho niyamanam vācaś ca vyāpāraḥ śabdoccāraṇam tatpratiṣedhaḥ kriyate | vyaktāvyaktaśabdoccāraṇam na kartavyam* | [...]

[The word-form] *vāgyatāḥ* (declined in the nominative masculine plural) [means] 'the ones who restrain, i.e. take speech under control.' The irregular position [of the past passive participle *yata-*] is a *chandas* feature. Otherwise, [the following analysis is proposed]: 'restrained in speech.' [In this case], the compound [is formed by combining a nominal *pada* denoting] a *sādhana* (i.e. an instrument or an agent) with a *kṛt* derivative stem (see A 2.1.32). And then the word-form *yata-* expresses the agent (see A 3.4.71). The prohibition of an activity is a restriction, and the act of speech is uttering words; the prohibition of this is made. One should not utter words, whether intelligible or unintelligible.

Rules referred to:

- A 2.1.32: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.74.

- A 3.4.71: *adikarmaṇi ktaḥ kartari ca* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *karmaṇi bhāve ca* 69]
[The *kṛt* affix] *Kta* [denoting the patient and the event] also occurs [after a verbal stem] to denote the agent, when referring to an incipient action.

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the compound *vāgyata-* which is analysed in two ways. First, he reads it as a *bahuvrīhi* compound meaning ‘the one by whom the speech is restrained.’ In this case, he underlines the irregular position of the past passive participle *yata-* as a second constituent.²⁴⁸ This can be explained by means of rule A 2.2.37²⁴⁹ by resorting to the exemplificative *ahitāgnyādi* list. Nonetheless, Medhātithi justifies it as a *chandas* exception: if it were meant as a Vedic exception, he may have been hinting at the inclusion of Vedic compounds within this list; if it were meant as a metrical exception, he may have been referring to the sequence – ◡ X at the end of *pāda* b as metrically conforming to the *pathyā* form of the *śloka* metre. As an alternative, Medhātithi analyses the compound as a *tatpuruṣa* formed by A 2.1.32. In addition to this, he reads the past participle *yata-* as active instead of passive, probably hinting at rule A 3.4.71, even though this meaning of the onset of an action is not evident.

112. Medh ad MDh^M 3.259 [TE] (A*)

ṣaṇmāsāṁś chāgamāṁsena pāṛṣatena ca sapta vai |
aṣṭāv aiṇeyamāṁsena rauraveṇa navaiva tu || 3.259 ||

For six months, by means of *chāga*-meat and, indeed, for seven [months], by means of [meat] belonging to a *prṣata*, for eight [months], by means of the meat belonging to an *eṇa*, but, for nine [months], by means of [meat] belonging to a *ruru*.

rurupṛṣataiṇā mṛgajātiviśeṣavacanāḥ | rauraveṇa pāṛṣatena aiṇeyeti vikāre taddhitaḥ (see A 4.3.134) ||

[The nominal stems] *ruru-* (i.e. the species of deer called *picta*), *prṣata-* (i.e. the spotted deer), and *eṇa* (i.e. the species of black deer) specifically express the whole species of deer. When [in the text] it is said *rauraveṇa* (lit. ‘belonging to a *ruru*’ > ‘a *ruru*’s meat’), *pāṛṣatena* (lit. ‘belonging to a *prṣata*’ > ‘a *prṣata*’s

²⁴⁸ As for the constituent order in *bahuvrīhi* compounds, see Candotti and Pontillo (2024b) and the bibliography cited there.

²⁴⁹ A 2.2.37: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.70.

meat'), *aiṇeya* (lit. 'belonging to an *eṇa*' > 'an *eṇa*'s meat'), the *taddhita* [affix occurs] in the sense of 'transformation' (see A 4.3.134).

Rule referred to:

- A 4.3.134: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.42.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the formation of the *taddhita* derivative stems *raurava-* (lit. 'coming from the *ruru*' > 'the *ruru*'s meat'), *pārṣata-* (lit. 'coming from the *parṣat*' > 'the *parṣata*'s meat'), and *aiṇeya* (lit. 'coming from the *eṇa*' > 'the *eṇa*'s meat.' By means of the locative *vikāre*, he refers to rule A 4.3.134, which teaches to form *taddhita* derivatives by adding a *taddhita* affix taught from 4.1.83 onwards to denote 'the transformation of X' (thus, 'coming from X', 'made of X'). In this case, Manu's text refers to the meat which comes from these species of deer, i.e. it is their transformation.

Fourth adhyāya (21 passages)

113. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.5 [TE] (A*)

ṛtam uñchaśilaṃ jñeyam amṛtaṃ syād ayācitam |
mṛtaṃ tu yācitam bhaikṣam pramṛtaṃ karṣaṇam smṛtam || 4.5 ||

The action of gleaning and gathering should be known as *ṛta*²⁵⁰, what is not asked for should be immortal, the almsfood that is asked for is instead mortal, and agriculture is recorded as lethal.

[...] *mṛtam iva yācitam bhaikṣam*²⁵¹ *iti | yācitam ity eva siddhe bhaikṣaśabdena sāmūhikataddhitāntena* (see A 4.2.37) *bahavo yācitavyā ity ucyate naikaḥ kadarthanīyaḥ |* [...]

The almsfood asked for by begging is like death. Having well-established [the formation of the past passive participle] *yācita-*, by means of the word-form *bhaikṣa-* ('alms') ending with a *taddhita* affix that forms collective nouns (see A

²⁵⁰ We have decided to leave the word *ṛta* untranslated because we are persuaded that this may be a hint at the ancient Vedic notion of *ṛta* as the "cosmic order/truth" that emphasises the sacredness of this Brahmanical institution of obtaining food without buying or producing it (i.e. by means of agriculture).

²⁵¹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *bhaikṣitam*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *bhaikṣam*.

4.2.37), it is said that many should be asked [for almsfood]: it is more than one who should be troubled [by begging].

Rule referred to:

- A 4.2.37: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.10.

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi comments on the *taddhita* derivative *bhaikṣa-* (lit. ‘alms’, from the nominal stem *bhikṣā-* ‘begging’) in order to demonstrate that this practice of begging is addressed to many people. He does this by relying on the fact that the word-form *bhaikṣa-* is formed with a *taddhita* affix denoting a collective noun (*sāmūhikataddhitānta*): the scholar is thus referring to rule A 4.2.37, which teaches to form a *taddhita* derivative by applying the *taddhita* affix *aN* to denote ‘the collection of X-s.’ Therefore, in the present case, *bhaikṣa-* literally denotes ‘the collection of the things obtained by begging’ (thus, more simply: ‘alms’).

114. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.7 [TE] (A*²)

[kusūladhānyako] vā syāt kumbhīdhānyaka eva vā |
tryahaihiko vāpi bhaved [aśvastanika] eva vā || 4.7 ||

One should either be one who possesses as much grain as a granary holds or one who possesses the grain [contained] in a small pot, or one who possesses grain for three days, or one who does not possess [as much grain as is needed] for tomorrow.

[...] *kusūle dhānyam asyeti gamakatvād vyadhikaraṇo bahuvrīhiḥ | pāṭhāntaram kuśūladhānyika²⁵² iti | kusūlaparimitaṁ dhānyam kuśūladhānyam tad asyāstīti matvarthīya ikaśabdaḥ* (cf. A 5.2.115) | [...]

Because it conveys the sense of ‘the grain [contained] in a granary belongs to him’, [this] is a *bahuvrīhi* whose constituents are not co-referential. Another reading is *kuśūladhānyikaḥ*. ‘The grain whose measure is a granary’ is *kuśūladhānya-*. The word-form *ika* (= the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN*) conveys the sense of *matuP* to signify ‘this belongs to X’ (cf. A 5.2.115).

²⁵² Mandlik, Gharpure, and Olivelle feature the variant reading *kuśūladhānyakāḥ*. Jha presents the variant reading *kuśūladhānyikaḥ* (which appears to be the variant reading of F.N.: see Jha 1924: I, 148), while Dave has *kuśūladhānyikaḥ*. The latter two readings (differing only in the sibilant) fit with the Pāṇinian explanation provided in the following sentence (where *ika* is mentioned as the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN*), unlike the first reading.

[...] *śvo bhavaṃ śvastanaṃ bhaktaṃ tad asyāstīti pūrvavad matvarthīyaṃ kṛtvā* (see A 5.2.115) *nañsamāsaḥ kartavyaḥ* (see A 2.2.6) | [...]

[The *taddhita* derivative stem] *śvastana-* ('belonging to tomorrow') [means] 'what is assigned for *śvas* ('tomorrow')', i.e. '[time] to come': as before, after applying [the *taddhita* affix *thaN*] conveying the sense of *matuP* (see A 5.2.115), namely 'this belongs to X', a negative compound (i.e. *aśvastanika-* 'not possessing [as much grain as is needed] for tomorrow') should be formed (see A 2.2.6).

Rules referred to:

- A 2.2.6: *nañ* [samāsaḥ 2.1.3 saha supā 2.1.4 tatpuruṣaḥ 2.1.22]
The negative prefix *nañ* [combines with an inflected noun to form a *tatpuruṣa*].
- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.

Comment:

In the first excerpt, Medhātithi comments on the stem *kusūladhānyaka-* ('possessing as much grain as a granary holds'). First, he reads it as a *bahuvrīhi* whose *upasarjana* is *kusūladhānya-* in the sense of 'the grain [contained] in a granary.' Within this explanation, we hypothesise that Medhātithi postulates a *taddhita samāsānta* affix *kaP* according to A 5.4.154.²⁵³ Second, after introducing the variant reading *kuśūladhānyikaḥ*, Medhātithi analyses it as a *tatpuruṣa* compound *kusūladhānya-* (which he reads as 'grain whose measure is a granary')²⁵⁴ to which the *taddhita* affix *thaN* (= *ika*) is applied according to A 5.2.115.

In the second excerpt, Medhātithi explains *aśvastanika-* (lit. 'not possessing [as much grain as is needed] for tomorrow') as a *taddhita* derivative stem formed by means of the affix *thaN* (= *ika*), in this case correctly applied to the etymon *śvastana-* (lit. 'belonging to tomorrow'), to which the negative prefix *nañ* applies to form a negative *tatpuruṣa* compound according to A 2.2.6.

115. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.10 [TE] (A, A*)

varṭayaṃś ca śiloñchābhyām agnihotraparāyaṇaḥ |
iṣṭīḥ pārvāyaṇāntīyāḥ kevalāḥ nirvapet sadā || 4.10 ||

²⁵³ A 5.4.154: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.46.

²⁵⁴ This explanation is equivalent to that proposed in our translation, where the locative sense of *kusūle* is emphasised.

And the one living on gleaning and gathering, who has the Agnihotra as his chief object, should always pour out mere oblations relative [to the group of] days of the four moon changes and [the group of two] solstices.

parva cāyanāntaś ca taylor bhavāḥ pārvāyaṇāntīyāḥ | svārthikam aṇam (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38) *kṛtvā vṛddhāc chaḥ* (A 4.2.114) *kartavyaḥ* | [...]

Those (i.e. the oblations: *iṣṭis*) relative to these two, i.e. [to the group of] days of the four moon changes and [the group of two] solstices, are *pārvāyaṇāntīyāḥ*. After applying [the *taddhita* affix] *aN* [while retaining] the own meaning [of the base] (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38), *vṛddhāc chaḥ* (A 4.2.114) should be applied.

Rules and passages cited or referred to:

- A 4.2.114: *vṛddhāc chaḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *śeṣe* 92] [The *taddhita* affix] *cha* (= *-īya*) occurs [after a nominal stem] containing a *vṛddhi* vowel (in its first syllable, see A 1.1.73) [to denote meanings not taught before].
- A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- KV *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- N *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi comments on the *taddhita* derivative *pārvāyaṇāntīya-* (‘relative to [the group of] days of the four moon changes and [the group of] solstices’), formed from the *dvandva* compound *parvāyaṇānta-* (‘the four days of the new moon and the solstice’). As he correctly explains, the first affix that occurs is *aN* as taught by A 5.4.38, i.e. retaining the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*; see also KV *ad* A 5.4.38). As we explained in our comment on another passage (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71), the application of this affix is made possible thanks to Jinendrabuddhi’s extension of the *prajñādi* list as an *ākṛtigaṇa* (see N *ad* A 5.4.38). The second affix applied is *cha*, taught by A 4.2.114, which teaches to form a *taddhita* derivative by adding *cha* to one of the meanings that has not been mentioned (*śeṣe*) in the previous section (A 4.1.92-4.2.70). Just as happens in the case of one of the classical Vyākaraṇa examples related to this rule (i.e. *śālīya*, ‘belonging to a hall’, analysed as *śālāyām bhavaḥ*), its meaning is explained at the beginning of the section.

116. Medh ad MDh^M 4.18 [TE] (A*)

vayasah karmanō 'rthasya śrutasyābhijānasya ca |
veṣavāgbuddhi[sārūpyam] ācaran vicared iha || 4.18 ||

One should live here by holding the conformity of apparel, speech,
and mind to age, activity, wealth, instruction and family.

[...] *sārūpyam iti svārthe śyañ* (see KV *ad* A 5.1.124) | *tenāyam artho bhavati vayādyucitā*²⁵⁵ *veṣādayaḥ kartavyāḥ* | *sārūpyam aucityam anyasyākṛtyādeḥ sādṛśyāsambhavāt* | [...]

[In the compound constituent] *sārūpya-*, [the *taddhita* affix] *Śyañ* occurs [while retaining] the own meaning [of the base] (see KV *ad* A 5.1.124). By means of it, this becomes the meaning: apparel and the like should be considered fit for [one's] age and the like. *sārūpya-* [means] 'fitness' due to the impossibility of other [kinds of] likeness, such as that of aspect (*ākṛti*) and the like.

Rule referred to:

- KV *ad* A 5.1.124: *caturvarṇyādibhyaḥ svārthe upasaṅkhyānam*
After [nominal stems] such as *caturvarṇya-*, there [should be] an additional statement of the fact that [the *taddhita* affix *Śyañ* occurs] while retaining the own meaning [of the base].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on *sārūpya-*, which is a compound member of *veṣavāgbuddhisārūpya-* (lit. 'conformity of apparel, speech, and mind'). He explains that it is a *taddhita* derivative formed by the affix *Śyañ* (taught by A 5.1.124)²⁵⁶ applied in the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*), i.e. *sarūpa-* ('uniform'), according to the *Kāśikāvṛtti* passage (KV *ad* A 5.1.124), which expands upon Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.1.124 (M 2.370).²⁵⁷

117. Medh ad MDh^M 4.20 [TE] (A)

yathā yathā hi puruṣaḥ śāstraṃ samadhigacchati |
tathā tathā vijānāti vijñānaṃ cāsyā rocate || 4.20 ||

²⁵⁵ Mandlik's edition presents the variant reading *vayaṃ ādyucitā*, which is probably a misprint. The other editions feature the variant reading *vayādyucitā*.

²⁵⁶ A 5.1.124: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36.

²⁵⁷ M 2.370 l. 20 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.1.124: *brāhmaṇādiṣu caturvarṇyādīnām upasaṅkhyānam* "There [should be] an additional statement of [words] such as *caturvarṇya-* ('four castes') among the words of the list beginning with *brāhmaṇa-*."

The more indeed a man studies the *śāstra* in depth, the more he discerns, and the more his discernment shines forth.

tadā vijñānaṃ cāsyā rocate | [...] *rucer anabhilāṣārthatvād rucyarthānām* (A 1.4.33) *iti sampradānatvābhāvaḥ* |

Therefore, ‘and his discernment shines forth’ (*vijñānaṃ cāsyā rocate*). [...] Since [the verbal base] *ruc-* does not mean ‘to desire’ [here], there is no notion of recipient [as would be expected] according to *rucyarthānām* (A 1.4.33).

Rule cited:

- A 1.4.33: *rucyarthānām prīyamāṇaḥ* [*kārake* 23 *sampradānaṃ* 32] [In the domain of *kāra*, the *sampradāna*] denotes ‘one who is pleased’ when verbal bases meaning *ruc-* (in the sense of ‘to please’) are used.²⁵⁸

Comment:

While commenting on the sentence *vijñānaṃ cāsyā rocate* (‘and his discernment shines forth’), Medhātithi underlines the non-application of rule A 1.4.33 to the verbal base *ruc-* (‘to shine’ or ‘to please’; here ‘to shine’), because, in this verse, the latter means ‘to shine’ and not ‘to please’, as required by the rule.

118. Medh ad MDh^M 4.27 [TE] (A*, M*)

nāniṣṭvā navasasyeṣṭyā paśunā cāgnimān dvijah |
navānnam adyān māmsam vā *dirgham āyur jijīviṣuḥ* || 4.27 ||

A twice-born who maintains the sacred fire and who desires to live a long life should eat neither new harvest nor meat without offering the sacrifice of new grain or an animal victim.

[...] *niyamānupālāne phalam āha* | *dirgham āyur jijīviṣuḥ* | *āyuhśabdena prabandhavatyah prāṇāpānavṛttaya ucyante* | *dvitīyā ca saty api jīvater akarmakatve* *’pi* *iṣikriyāpekṣayā* | *sannanto* *’pi* *dhātur icchāyām vartate* | *atrāpi*²⁵⁹ *darśane iṣeḥ karma prakṛtyartha na bāhyam icchā vekṣyamāṇam prati guṇabhūtā prakṛtipratyayau pratyayārthaṃ saha bruvata* (see M 2.58 ll. 11-13 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.1.67) *iti sannantād anyatrāpi* | *asminn api darśane āyuhśabdena*

²⁵⁸ Our interpretation of the rule is based on KV *ad* A 1.4.33.

²⁵⁹ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *yady api*. The others present the variant reading *atrāpi*. This appears to be the reading in manuscript A, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 151).

*kālo lakṣayīṣyate dīrghakālaṃ jīvanam icchan | tatra kālatā vāvagantavyā*²⁶⁰
karmasamjñā hy akarmanām iti karmatvam (see A 2.3.5) | [...]

[Manu] states [what] the outcome is when the restriction is respected. “The one who wants to live a long life” (*dīrgham āyur jīviṣuḥ*): by means of the word-form *āyus-*, the functions of breathing in and out are said to be characterised by an uninterrupted activity. Despite the objectlessness of the [verb] *jīvati* (‘he lives’), there is the accusative case ending due to the expectancy of the action of desiring. The verbal base ending in the affix *-san* is employed in the sense of desire. Even here, from this perspective, the patient of [the verb] *iṣ-* is included in the meaning of the base [itself], it is not external; the desire has become a quality with regard to what is desired; in a formation other than that ending in *-san*, “base and affix are both said to express the meaning of the affix” (see M 2.58 ll. 11-13 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.1.67). Even in this perspective, time will be indicated by the word-form *āyus-*, i.e. ‘desiring a long-lasting life.’ In this context, its function of being a patient is according to “the time span should instead be understood as having the designation of patient/object, in the case of objectless [verbs]” (see A 2.3.5).

Rule and passage referred to:

- A 2.3.5: *kālādhvanor atyantasaṃyoge [dvitīyā 2.3.2]*
 [The accusative case ending occurs] (after nominal stems) meaning time and distance to denote total connection.
- M 2.58 ll. 11-13 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.1.67: *idam asya yadi eva svābhāvikam athāpi vācanikaṃ prakṛtipratyayau pratyayārthaṃ saha brūta iti na cāsti sambhavo yad ekasyāḥ prakṛter dvayor nānārthayor yugapad anusahāyībhāvaḥ syāt | evaṃ ca kṛtvaikapakṣībhūtam evedaṃ bhavati sārvaadhātukārthā eveti ||*

Even though this is intrinsic and moreover taught by the rules, base and affix are both said to express the meaning of the affix, and there should be no possibility for a single basis to be in the condition of simultaneously accompanying two [affixes] endowed with more than one meaning. And, after making this consideration, only this position emerges, namely that they (i.e. agent, patient, and eventuality) are the meanings of the *sārvaadhātukas*.

²⁶⁰ Mandlik features the variant reading *kālabhāvāvagantavyā*. The others present the variant reading *kālatā vāvagantavyā*.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the section *dīrgham āyur jītvīṣuḥ* (‘the one who wants to live a long life’), by focusing on the accusative case ending of *dīrgha-* and *āyus-*. According to Medhātithi, the transitive meaning of the verb *iṣ-* (‘to desire’) is incorporated in the desiderative *kṛt* stem *jītvīṣu-* (formed by applying A 3.2.168).²⁶¹ While discussing the hypothesis of an accusative case ending governed by the verbal base rather than the affix, he cites almost *verbatim* a passage from Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* (M 2.58 ll. 11-13 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.1.67), which restricts the meaning of agent, patient and eventuality to the *sārvadhātukas* alone. In this regard, Medhātithi also refers to the durative sense of the accusative, which can be used with objectless verbs, plausibly hinting at rule A 2.3.5. The latter rule teaches the use of the accusative case with nominal stems meaning time and distance to denote total connection.

119. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.28 [TE] (A*)

navenānarcitā hy asya paśuhavyena cāgnayah |
prāṇān evāttum icchanti navānnāmiṣaḥ gardhinaḥ || 4.28 ||

Indeed, his fires, desirous of new harvest and meat, when they are not honoured by the new [harvest] and an animal victim sacrifice, long to only eat breaths of life.

[...] *gardhinaḥ gardham abhilāṣātīśayas tad asyāstīti matvarthīya inih* (see A 5.2.115) ||

gardhinaḥ (‘of the desirous one’) [must be analysed as follows]: ‘desire’ (*gardha*) [stands for] ‘pre-eminent covetousness’, [and the *taddhita* affix] *inI* meaning *matUP* [denoting] ‘this belongs to X’ [occurs] (see A 5.2.115).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi comments on the formation of the *taddhita* derivative *gardhin-* (‘desirous’) from the nominal stem *gardha-* (‘desire’) by applying the *taddhita* affix *inI* in the sense of *matUP* in accordance with A 5.2.115.

²⁶¹ A 3.2.168: *sanāśamsabhikṣa uḥ* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *vartamāne* 123 *tacchīlataddharmatatsādhukāriṣu* 134] “[The affix] *u* [occurs after a verbal base] ending in the affix *saN* or after *āśams-* (‘to desire’) and *bhikṣ-* (‘to beg’) [to denote the agent’s natural inclination, duty, and skill].”

120. Medh ad MDh^M 4.32 [TE] (Vt*)

*śaktito 'pacamānebhyo dātavyam grhamedhinā |
samvibhāgaś ca bhūtebhyaḥ kartavyo 'nuparodhataḥ || 4.32 ||*

To the best of his possibilities, it should be given by the householder performing the domestic rites to those who do not cook by themselves, and a portion should be made for the sake of all the living beings without trouble (for the householder).

[...] *bhūtebhya iti tādarthye caturthī* (see M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13) | [...] In [the word-form] *bhūtebhyaḥ*, the dative ending is used in the sense of 'for the sake of X.'

Passage referred to:

- M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.245.

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the dative ending of *bhūtebhyaḥ* by hinting at Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13 (M 1.449), which introduces the additional sense of 'for the sake of X' instead of the common sense of recipient (*sampradāna*).

121. Medh ad MDh^M 4.33 [TE] (A*)

*rājato dhanam avicchet samśīdan snātakaḥ kṣudhā |
yājyāntevāsinor vāpi na tv anyata iti sthitiḥ || 4.33 ||*

A bath graduate, who is distressed by hunger, should seek wealth from the king or from a sacrificer or resident pupil, but from no one else: this is the fixed rule.

[...] *yājyāntevāsinor | dhanāpekṣā śaṣṭhī | tasanto* (see A 5.4.45) *vā paṭhitavyaḥ | kriyānimittatvād etayoḥ śabdayor yājanādhyāpanābhyām jīved ity uktaḥ bhavati* | [...]

yājyāntevāsinor ('of the sacrificer and resident pupil') [must be analysed as follows]: the genitive [is used] with regard to 'wealth' (expressed in the verse), or it could be read as ending in the affix *tas[I]* (i.e. *yājyāntevāsitaḥ*; therefore, one could read it as an ablative) (see A 5.4.45). Due to the instrumentality of the acts [denoted by] the two word-forms, what is said is "one should live by sacrificing and instructing."

Rule referred to:

- A 5.4.45: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.31.

Comment:

To explain the meaning of the *dvandva* compound *yājyāntevāsin-* (declined in the dual ablative/genitive), Medhātithi states that it is a genitive referring to *dhanam* ('wealth', present in Manu's text). However, he hypothesises that it is also possible to read it as an ablative ending in *tas* (taught by A 5.4.45), i.e. 'from the sacrificer and resident pupil.'

122. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.49 [TE] (A*²)

pratyagniṃ pratisūryaṃ ca pratisomodakadvijam |
pratigu prativātaṃ ca prajñā naśyati mehataḥ || 4.49 ||

The wisdom of the one who voids urine (or 'due to the act of voiding urine') towards a fire, the sun, the moon, water, a twice-born one, a cow or the wind disappears.

[...] *mehataḥ | śatramtas* (see A 3.2.124) *tasanto* (see A 5.4.45) *vā | mehataḥ puruṣasya mehanād vā ||*

[The word-form] *mehataḥ* [must be analysed as follows]: the *ŚatR* affix (see A 3.2.124) or the *tas/I* affix (see A 5.4.45) occurs; [the meaning is] 'a man voiding urine' (gen.) (if the *ŚatR* affix occurs) or 'due to the act of voiding urine' (abl.) (if the *tasI* affix occurs).

Rules referred to:

- A 3.2.124: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.52.
- A 5.4.45: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.31.

Comment:

Medhātithi reflects on the interpretation of the ablative singular form *mehataḥ* from the nominal stem *meha-* ('urine'). This word-form can be a genitive of the present active participle formed by adding the *kṛt* affix *ŚatR* (taught by A 3.2.124) from the verbal base *mih* ('to pass urine'), or an ablative formed by adding the *taddhita* affix *tasI* (taught by A 5.4.45) from the nominal stem *meha-* ('urine'). Olivelle (2005: 127) interpreted it as a present participle (i.e. formed by the *kṛt* affix *ŚatR*).

123. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.64 [TE] (A*)

na nṛtyen naiva gāyec ca na vāditrāṇi vādayet |
nāṣphoṭayen na ca kṣveḍen na ca rakto virodhayet || 4.64 ||

When one is enamoured [of someone], one should not dance, sing,
 play musical instruments, shake, whistle, or create hostility.

[...] *rāgī parituṣṭe*²⁶² *na virodhayet virodham na kuryāt | pīḍite na niṣedhaḥ |*
ghañantān (see A 3.3.18) *ñic kartavyaḥ* (see M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26) ||

The one who is enamoured of [another one] who is completely satisfied should not contend with [the latter], i.e. he should not create hostility. If [this man] is troubled [by another one], there is no prohibition. After [a verbal base] ending in *GHañ* (see A 3.3.18), [the *kṛt* affix] *ñic* should be applied (see M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26).

Rule and passage referred to:

- A 3.3.18: *bhāve* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *ghañ* 16]
 [The *kṛt* affix *GHañ* occurs after a verbal base] to denote an action.
- M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.61.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the verbal form *virodhayet* as a denominative from the nominal stem *virodha-* ('hostility') according to Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26 (M 2.34 l. 8), which is, in turn, derived from the verbal base *virudh-* ('to contend') by applying the *kṛt* affix *GHañ* according to A 3.3.18. The latter rule teaches to form a *nomen actionis* by means of the *kṛt* affix *GHañ* that occurs after a verbal base.

124. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.71 [TE] (A*)

[loṣṭhamardī] tṛṇacchedī nakhakādī ca yo naraḥ |
sa vināśaṃ vrajaty āśu sūcako 'śucir eva ca || 4.71 ||

The man who breaks clods [of earth], cuts grass, or bites [his] nails,
 quickly goes to destruction just as the denouncer and the impure.

²⁶² Mandlik features the variant reading *parituṣṭaḥ*; Gharpure (1st) presents the variant reading *parituṣṭya*. The others present the variant reading *parituṣṭe*. This appears to be the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 158).

asmād eva kevalāl loṣṭhagrahaṇāt pūrvoktamṛlloṣṭham iti śaṣṭhīsamāso (see A 2.2.8) *vijñāyate | ubhayaprādhānye hi mṛdgrahaṇam loṣṭha iva atrākariṣyata*²⁶³ | [...]

Due to this mention of *loṣṭha-* ('clod') just alone, a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound (see A 2.2.8) is understood in the sense of 'clod of earth', previously uttered (see MDh 4.70: *mṛlloṣṭham*). If both (i.e. *mṛd-* and *loṣṭha-*) were main constituents of the compound (as a *dvandva*), the mention of *mṛd-* like *loṣṭha-* would be made.

Rule referred to:

- A 2.2.8: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19.

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the left-hand constituent of the compound *loṣṭhamardin-* (lit. 'breaking clods') by interpreting it as a *śaṣṭhīsamāsa* (according to general rule A 2.2.8) formed with an understood *mṛd-* inferred from the previous verse (MDh 4.70). He underlines the analysis of *mṛdloṣṭha-* ('clod of earth') as a *tatpuruṣa* with a member (*loṣṭha-*) depending on the other member that is understood (*mṛd-*), because, if it were interpreted as a *dvandva* compound, both would be mentioned. In fact, it is clear that the head of a compound can replace the whole compound in two contiguous sentences. As a final note, we emphasise that, in accordance with post-Pāṇini usage, Medhātithi here employs the *prādhānya*, the post-Pāṇinian term for the head of the compound, as guidance in his analysis and not the *upasarjana*, i.e. the subordinate member, as Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* provides.²⁶⁴

125. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.80 [E]

*na śūdrāya matim dadyān nocchiṣṭam na haviṣkṛtam |
na cāsyopadiśed dharmam na cāsyā vratam ādiśet || 4.80 ||*

One should not give a suggestion to a Śūdra, nor leftovers, nor oblation, and one should not teach the *dharma* to him, nor indicate a religious observance to him.

²⁶³ Mandlik and Gharpure (1st) feature the variant reading *atrākariṣyatā*. Gharpure (2nd) present the variant reading *atrākariṣyat*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle have the variant reading *atrākariṣyata*.

²⁶⁴ On this point, see Candotti and Pontillo (2019).

[...] *iha vadanti*²⁶⁵ | *vyākaraṇādau dharmāvabodhārthaśāstre dharmāśabdaḥ | tad dhi na dharmāśāstram atīndriyārtham iti pratiśedhānupadeśāt | bhavati tu dharmāśāstrāvabodhārtham | śaknoti hi vaiyākaraṇaḥ padārthānusaraṇena*²⁶⁶ *gahanaṃ vākyārtham unnetum | dharmāśāstratvāc ca tasya śāstra ity anena gatatvāt*²⁶⁷ *prthag ucyate* | [...]

Here they say: The word-form *dharmā* occurs in the sense of treatise concerning the object that ensures the knowledge of *dharmā* such as [a treatise on] grammar and the like. Indeed, it (i.e. the grammatical treatise and the like) is not a Dharmaśāstra, which has a suprasensory meaning: [this is why] its prohibition is not taught. But it has the purpose of understanding the Dharmaśāstra. Indeed, a grammarian is able to find out the meaning of a sentence that is difficult to understand in conformity with the meaning of inflected nouns. And since it is a Dharmaśāstra, this is stated separately, as it is already implied by saying *śāstra*.

Comment:

This small excerpt from Medhātithi's commentary highlights how he separates the Dharmaśāstra and the Vyākaraṇa. In this case too, it is used as an example to distinguish the Dharmaśāstra from other subsidiary sciences. Here, it is said that grammar, and in particular a grammarian (*vaiyākaraṇa*), can discern the meaning of difficult sentences through the analysis of the meaning of inflected nouns.

126. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.83 [TE] (A*²)

keśagrahān prahārāṃś ca śirasy etān vivarjayet |

śiraḥsnātaś *ca tailena nāṅgaṃ kiṃcid api spr̥ṣet || 4.83 ||*

One should avoid these two [actions], i.e. pulling hair or striking the head, and, after washing the head, one should not even touch any limb with sesamum oil.

²⁶⁵ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *idaṃ tu bahuyuktam*. The others present the variant reading *iha vadanti*.

²⁶⁶ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading °*anusāreṇa na*. The others present the variant reading °*anusāreṇa*. This appears to be the reading in manuscript A, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 161).

²⁶⁷ Mandlik, Jha and Dave feature the variant reading *anenāgatatvāt*. Gharpure and Olivelle present the variant reading *anena gatatvāt*.

[...] *śiraḥ snātam*²⁶⁸ *kṣālitam aneneti rājadantāder ākṛtiḡaṇatvāt paranipātaḥ* (see A 2.2.31) | *śiraḥsnāta iti bāhulakena samāsaḥ* (see A 2.2.37) | [...]

[The compound *śiraḥsnāta*- should be analysed as] ‘by whom the head is bathed, i.e. washed’; the irregular position [of the past passive participle *snāta*- within the compound] is due to the *rājadantādi* list (‘front tooth and the like’) being exemplificative (*ākṛtiḡaṇa*) (see A 2.2.31). The compound *śiraḥsnāta* [is explained] by the principle of *bāhulam* (*bāhulaka*) (see A 2.2.37).

Rules referred to:

- A 2.2.31: *rājadantādiṣu param* [samāsaḥ 2.1.3 upasarjanam 30]
In the group [of compounds] beginning with *rājadanta*- (‘front tooth’), [the subordinate member] occurs as the second member.
- A 2.2.37: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.70.

Comment:

Here Medhātithi is commenting on the compound *śiraḥsnāta*- (lit. ‘having the head bathed’, here ‘by whom the head is bathed’), focusing on the irregular position of the right-hand constituent *snāta*- (‘washed’), which is explained by recalling the *rājadantādi* list, taught by rule A 2.2.31. This list is referred to as *ākṛtiḡaṇa*, even though the *Kāśikāvṛtti* does not define it as such. Instead of the general rule A 2.2.31, one might have expected the citation of rule A 2.2.37, which is specifically taught for *bahuvrīhi* compounds that have a past passive participle as one of their constituents. By means of the term *bāhulaka*, Medhātithi may in fact be referring to rule A 2.2.37 by generally hinting at the optionality this rule involves.

127. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.102 [TE] (A*)

kārṇaśrave 'nile rātrau divā pāmsusamūhane |
etau varṣāsv anadhyāyāv adhyāyajñāḥ pracakṣate || 4.102 ||

When the wind is heard by the ears at night or heaps the sand in the daytime, the experts in recitation define these two as situations for interrupting the recitation during the rainy season.

anilo vāyuh | *vegena vāti vāyau vāyvantarasamgharṣād dhvaniḥ śrūyate yatra sa kārṇaśravo vāyuh* | *kārṇābhyām śrūyate yaḥ sa kārṇaśravaḥ* | *sādhanaṃ kṛteti*

²⁶⁸ Mandlik, Gharpure and Olivelle feature the variant reading *śiraḥsnānaṃ*. Jha and Dave present the variant reading *śiraḥ snātaṃ*.

samāsaḥ (see A 2.1.32) | *avasthāviśeṣopalakṣaṇārthaṃ karṇagrahaṇam* | *śrūyate karṇābhyām eva* | *tena yadaivam vāyuśabdaḥ śrūyate tadā nādhyetavyam* | [...] [The word-form] *anila* [means] ‘wind.’ When the wind blows violently, a noise is heard since another wind rubs against [it], this wind is ‘perceptible to the ears’; what is heard by the two ears is *karṇaśrava*. The compound [is analysed according to the rule teaching to form a compound by combining] a *sādhana* (i.e. an instrument or an agent) [with another inflected *pāda* meaning] ‘made [by X]’ (see A 2.1.32). The mention of *karṇa-* [takes place] for the sake of implying a specific condition, i.e. [the wind blows so violently that] it is heard just by the ears. Thus, when the sound of wind is heard, then one should not study.

Rule referred to:

- A 2.1.32: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the compound *karṇaśrava-* (‘heard by the ears’): after providing an explanation for this compound by mentioning the etymon of *śravas-* (i.e. *karṇābhyām śrūyate yaḥ sa karṇaśravaḥ*), he hints at rule A 2.1.32 by means of the expression *sādhanaṃ kṛtā*: the *kṛt* derivative stem is in this case *śrava*.

128. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.108 [TE] (A^{*2})

antargataśave grāme vṛṣalasya ca samnidhau |
anadhyāyo rudyamāne samavāye janasya ca || 4.108 ||

There is an interruption of Vedic recitation in a village where a corpse is found, in the presence of a low man, at the sound of crying and in the middle of a crowd of people (or ‘when a crowd of people is crying’).

[...] *rudyamāne rudanaśabde sati* | *bhāvamātre rudyamānaśabdaḥ* | *samavāyo janasya* | *yatra bahavo janāḥ kāryārtham ekatra samghaṭitā bhavanti tādrśe deśe nādhyeyam* | *atha vā janasya samavāye rudyamāne rudatīty arthaḥ* | *bahuṣu rudatsu pratiṣedhaḥ* | *chāndasaṃ kartāry ātmanepadam* (≠ A 1.3.13; 1.3.78) ||
 [The locative form] *rudyamāne* [means] ‘when there is the sound of crying.’ The word-form *rudyamāna* merely conveys the sense of an eventuality (see A 1.3.13). [The phrase] ‘crowd of people’ (*samavāyo janasya*) [must be commented on as follows]: where many people are collected in a single place for the sake of their duties, in such a place one should not study. Or rather, ‘since a crowd of people

is heard crying’, i.e. ‘it cries’: this is the meaning. The prohibition occurs when many are crying. The *ātmanepada* to denote an agent is a *chandas* feature (\neq A 1.3.13; 1.3.78).

Rules referred to:

- A 1.3.13: *bhāvakarmanoh* [*ātmanepadam* 12]
[*Ātmanepada* substitutes of the *lakāras* occur (after a verbal base)] to denote an eventuality and a patient.
- A 1.3.78: *śeṣāt kartari parasmaipadam*
After the remainder (of verbal bases, i.e. after a verbal base which is not mentioned in the previous rules from the same section), the *Parasmaipada* [substitutes of the *lakāra*] occur (after a verbal base) to denote an agent.

Comment:

Here Medhātithi comments on the *Ātmanepada* participle *rudyamāna-* ‘crying’ (from the verbal base *rud-* ‘to cry’) in two ways. According to the first, the participle is explained as denoting an eventuality based on the general rule A 1.3.13, which teaches that the *Ātmanepada* substitutes of the *lakāras* convey the sense of an eventuality (*bhāva*) or a patient (*karman*). In the second explanation, the participle *rudyamāna-* is used to denote an agent (*kartṛ*), i.e. as if it were a *Parasmaipada* form. In fact, the *kṛt* affix *-āna* is designated as an *Ātmanepada* substitute of the *lakāras* according to A 1.4.100²⁶⁹ (in the case of *rudyamāna-*, the affix *-māna-* depends on the increment *-m-* taught in A 7.2.82).²⁷⁰ Since this case is not included among the exceptions to rule A 1.3.13, we would expect the participle to be formed according to the *śeṣa* rule A 1.3.78, which teaches the use of *Parasmaipada* to signify an agent for all the cases not explained in the reference section. However, Medhātithi presents the *Parasmaipada* meaning attributed to this *Ātmanepada* form as a Vedic feature.

129. Medh ad MDh^M 4.147 [TE] (A)

vedam evābhyasen nityam yathākālam atandritaḥ |
taṁ hy asyāhuḥ paraṁ dharmam upadharmo ’nya ucyate || 4.147 ||

²⁶⁹ 1.4.100: *tañānāv ātmanepadam* [*saṁjñā* 1 la 99] “[The designation] *Ātmanepada* denotes the substitutes of the *lakāras* indicated by the siglum *tañ* and [the affix] *āna*.”

²⁷⁰ A 7.2.82: *āne muk* [*aṅgasya* 6.4.1 *sārvadhatuke* 76 *ataḥ* 80] “[The final increment] *muK* occurs [after an *aṅga*] ending in the short vowel *a* [before the *sārvadhatuka* affix *āna*].”

One should indefatigably and constantly repeat the Veda in due time; for, they say this is the supreme *dharma*; the rest is called subordinate *dharma*.

[...] *upadharmah* | *dharmasya samīpe upadharmah* | *samīpapradhānas tatpuruṣo nāvyaṣṭibhavaḥ* | ***upamānāni sāmānyavacanaiḥ*** (A 2.1.55) *iti yathā* | [...] *upadharmah* ('subordinate *dharma*'): [what is] in the proximity of *dharma* is *upadharmah*, i.e. it refers to a subordinate [*dharma*]; [this compound] is a *tatpuruṣa* and not an *avyayībhāva* according to *upamānāni sāmānyavacanaiḥ* (A 2.1.55).

Rule cited:

- A 2.1.55: *upamānāni sāmānyavacanaiḥ* [*samāsaḥ* 3 *saha supā* 4 *vā* 18 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 22 *samānādhikareṇa* 49]
[An inflected noun] denoting an object of comparison [preferably combines with another inflected noun] denoting a general category [to form a *tatpuruṣa karmadhāraya* compound].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the grammar of the compound *upadharmah*- ('subordinate *dharma*'), which is said to be a *tatpuruṣa karmadhāraya* compound and not an *avyayībhāva* compound (taught in A 2.1.5-21). This is because the subordinate member *upa*- is used in the sense of *samīpa*- ('near') constructed with the noun *dharma*- inflected in the genitive case, and thus its outcome is not an indeclinable as requested by the *avyayībhāva* rules. Furthermore, the scholar quotes rule A 2.1.55, even though this quotation is puzzling because no constituent of this compound complies with such a rule: for instance, there is no *sāmānya* involved, and *upa*- cannot be an *upamāna*. We might assume that the rule is cited just to give an example of a comparable compound authored by Pāṇini, namely an *upamāna*, probably analysed as equivalent to *mānasya samīpe* ('in the proximity of a measure'). We assume that the compound *upadharmah*- might have been formed in accordance with A 2.2.18²⁷¹ since *upa*- is included on the *prādi* list and combines with the inflected noun in the sense of *dharmasya samīpe* ('in the proximity of *dharma*').

²⁷¹ A 2.2.18: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.153.

130. Medh ad MDh^M 4.177 [TE] (A)

na pāṇipādacapalo na netracapalo 'nrjuḥ |

na syād vākcapalaś caiva na paradrohakarmadhīḥ || 4.177 ||

One should not be wavering with hands and feet, nor wavering with eyes, nor crooked, nor wavering with the language, nor should his actions and thoughts be injurious to others.

pāṇipādābhyāṃ capalaḥ | tṛtīyā (A 2.1.30) *iti yogavibhāgāt samāsaḥ* | [...]

[The compound *pāṇipādacapala-* should be analysed as] ‘wavering with [his] hands and feet’: this compound [is formed] according to *tṛtīyā* (A 2.1.30) due to the splitting of the rule.

Rule cited:

- A 2.1.30: see Medh ad MDh^M 3.19.

Comment:

Here Medhātithi is commenting on the compound *pāṇipādacapala-* (‘wavering with [his] hands and feet’), which is analysed as a *tatpuruṣa* according to A 2.1.30, a rule adopted by means of a *yogavibhāga* (i.e. only *tṛtīyā* is considered as a rule taken apart from *tatkṛtārthena guṇavacanena*), plausibly because *capala-* (‘wavering’) is not considered as something *tatkṛtārtha-*, that is “whose meaning is ‘done by X’”, in our case ‘hands and feet.’

131. Medh ad MDh^M 4.192 [TE] (A*²)

na vāry api prayacchet tu baiḍālavratike dvije |

na bakavratike pāpe nāvedavidī dharmavit || 4.192 ||

The one who knows the law should not offer even water in the case of a twice-born behaving like a cat, nor [in the case] of a wicked one behaving like a heron, nor [in the case] of the one who ignores the Veda.

[...] *adhikaraṇāvivakṣāyāṃ saptamī*²⁷² (see A 2.3.36) | *saṃpradānavivakṣāyāṃ caturthī yuktā* (cf. A 2.3.13) ||

²⁷² Mandlik, Gharpure and Olivelle feature the variant reading *saptamī*. Jha and Dave present the variant reading *baiḍālavratike*. As Olivelle notes, although Jha’s text has *baiḍālavratike* as its reading, it presupposes *saptamī* in reference to the locative forms found throughout the verse, rather than to *baiḍālavratike* alone.

[In this verse], the locative is used in the intention of expressing a substratum. If there were the intention of expressing a recipient, the dative [would have been] appropriate.

Rules referred to:

- A 2.3.13: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.56.
- A 2.3.36: *saptamy adhikarane ca* [anabhihite 1 dūrāntikārthebhyaḥ 35] The locative case ending occurs (after a nominal stem) to denote *adhikaraṇa* ('substratum') and also [(after the nominal stems) whose meaning is *dūra-* ('distance') and *antika-* ('vicinity'), provided that *adhikaraṇa* is not otherwise expressed].

Comment:

Here Medhātithi is commenting on the use of the locative case in this verse (*baīḍālavratike, dvije, bakavratike, pāpe, nāvedavidī*) by recalling the general rule A 2.3.36, teaching to use it as expressing the substratum (*adhikaraṇa*), instead of the expected expression of the recipient (*saṃpradāna*), which is typical of the dative as taught by A 2.3.13.

132. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.194 [TL] (A*², Vt*)

yathā plavenaupalena nimajjaty udake taran |
tathā nimajjato 'dhastād ajñau dātrpratīcchakau || 4.194 ||

As the one who is crossing with a boat made of stone sinks into the water, so the donor and receiver, if unconscious, sink.

[...] *evam ajñau dātrpratīcchakau | pratīcchakah pratīcchām karotīti ṇicam kṛtvā* (see M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26) *ṇvul kartavyaḥ* (see A 3.1.133) | *pratīpsaka iti pāṭhāntaram | tatra sannantāt* (see A 3.1.7) *āpnoter ṇvul* (see A 3.1.133) | *arthas tūbhayor eka eva ||*

Thus, the donor and receiver are ignorant. [The word-form] *pratīcchaka-* [means] 'he accepts (lit. he makes an act of acceptance)' (*pratīcchām karotī*): after applying [the *kṛt* affix *ṆiC*] (see M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26), [the *kṛt* affix] *ṆvuL* should be applied (see A 3.1.133). [The word-form] *pratīpsaka-* ('desiring to obtain') is another reading. In this case, after [the verbal base] *āp-* ('to obtain') ending in [the desiderative *kṛt* affix] *saN* (see A 3.1.7), [the *kṛt* affix] *ṆvuL* [should be applied] (see A 3.1.133). However, the meaning of both is just the same.

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 3.1.7: *dhātoḥ karmaṇaḥ samānakartṛkāḍ icchāyām vā* [san 5]
[The affix *saN*] optionally occurs to denote ‘wish’ after a verbal base expressing the object and having the same agent.
- A 3.1.133: *nvulṛcau* [dhātoḥ 91 kṛt 93]
[The *kṛt* affixes] *NvuL* and *tṛC* occur [after a verbal base to denote the agent (*kartari kṛt* A 3.4.67)].
- M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.61.

Comment:

Medhātithi is commenting on the right-hand constituent of the *dvandva* compound *dātṛpratīcchaka-* (‘the giver and receiver’), i.e. *pratīcchaka-* (lit. ‘receiver’): the latter is explained as being a *kṛt* derivative stem, formed by means of the affix *NvuL* (taught by A 3.1.133), from the denominative *pratīcchā-* (‘acceptance’), in turn derived from the verbal base *pratīṣ-* according to Vt. 5 *ad* 3.1.26. Therefore, Medhātithi again resorts to the denominative to explain some word-forms found in Manu’s text. Finally, he also provides a variant reading, i.e. *pratīpsaka-* (lit. ‘desiring to obtain’), which is also explained from a grammatical point of view, i.e. as a *kṛt* derivative stem formed by adding the affix *NvuL* (A 3.1.133) to the desiderative form of the verbal base *āp-* (‘to obtain’), formed by means of the *kṛt* affix *saN* (taught by A 3.1.7). Medhātithi concludes that the two variant readings have the same meaning, but this is not actually true: if we stick to the grammatical interpretation, the *pratīcchaka* is a person who actually accepts something, while the *pratīpsaka* is a person who desires to obtain something (but no receiving or accepting is implied). Furthermore, we report that the word-form *pratīpsaka-* is never attested in Sanskrit literature, as corpus research on the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit* has shown.²⁷³

133. Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.195 [TE] (A, A*³, Vt)

[*dharmadhvajī*] *sadā lubdhaś chādmiko lokadambhakaḥ |*
baidālavratiko jñeyo hiṃsraḥ sarv[ābhisamdhakaḥ] || 4.195 ||

The one who, despite always displaying the banner of *dharma*, is covetous and fraudulent, who deceives people, who is violent, or who is an overwheeler of all should be understood as behaving like a cat.

²⁷³ See the relevant page on the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit*: http://www.sanskrit-linguistics.org/dcs/index.php?contents=abfrage&word=pratīpsaka&query_type=1&sort_by=alpha (accessed 03/12/2025).

[...] *dharmo dhvajam iva* | *vyāghrāder ākṛtigaṇatvāt samāsaḥ* (see A 2.1.56) | ***kadācit karmadhārayaḥ sarvadhanādyartha iti*** (M 1.403 l. 20 Vt. 5 *ad* A 2.1.69) | *tataḥ so 'syāstīti matvarthīyaḥ* (see A 5.2.115) | [...]
 [The etymon of the compound *dharmadvajin-* is *dharmadhvaja-*, namely] 'dharma is like a banner' (*dharmo dhvajam iva*). [Such an etymon is] a compound [formed according to A 2.1.56] due to [its] being part of the exemplificative list *vyāghrādi*. "Sometimes, the *karmadhāraya* [analysis] prevails to signify 'all one's property' and the like" (M 1.403 l. 20 Vt. 5 *ad* A 2.1.69). Consequently, [the *taddhita* affix] meaning *matUP* (i.e. *inI*) occurs [to denote] 'this belongs to X' (see A 5.2.115).

[...] *abhisamdhakaḥ abhisamdhatta iti* | ***ātaś copasargaḥ*** (A 3.1.136) *iti kaḥ* | *tataḥ svārthe kaḥ* | *sarveṣām abhisamdhaka iti śaṣṭhīsamāsaḥ* (see A 2.2.8) | [...]
 [The word-form] *abhisamdhaka-* [means] 'the one who has overwhelmed.' [The *kṛt* affix] *ka* occurs according to *ātaś copasargaḥ* (A 3.1.136). Therefore, [the affix] *ka* occurs [while retaining] the own meaning [of the base]. [Since the compound *sarvābhisamdhaka-* should be analysed as] 'the overcomer of all', it is a *śaṣṭhīsamāsa*.

Rules and passage cited or referred to:

- A 2.1.56: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106.
- A 2.2.8: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19.
- A 3.1.136: *ātaś copasarge* [*dhātoḥ* 91 *kaḥ* 135]
 [The *kṛt* affix *ka*] also [occurs after a verbal base] ending in long *a* (*-ā*), provided that it co-occurs with a preverb [to denote the agent (*kartari kṛt* 3.4.67)].
- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.
- M 1.403 l. 20 Vt. 5 *ad* A 2.1.69: *kadācit karmadhārayaḥ sarvadhanādyarthaḥ*, see the translation.

Comment:

In the first excerpt, Medhātithi focuses on the *taddhita* derivative stem *dharmadvajin-* ('possessing the *dharma* as his banner'), formed by adding the *taddhita* affix *inI* (taught by rule A 5.2.115) from the compound *dharmadhvaja-*. The latter is read in two ways: i) as an *upamāsamāsa* according to A 2.1.56 (which is traditionally read as such), i.e. *dharmo dhvajam iva*; ii) as a pure *karmadhāraya* compound following Vt. 5 *ad* A 2.1.69 (M 1.403 l. 20), i.e. in the meaning of *sarvadhāna* ('all one's property'). In fact, in Patañjali's commentary

on this *vārttika*, there is a list beginning with *sarvadhānin-* which may be the one Medhātithi seems to be hinting at here. We report that Jha (1999: IV, 451) claims that the *taddhita* affix at stake is *NinI* (never taught in the meaning of *matUP*), but we consider that *dharmadhvajin-* perfectly complies with A 5.2.115 teaching the affix *inI*.

In the second excerpt, Medhātithi focuses on the right-hand constituent of the compound *sarvābhisamdhaka-* (lit. ‘the overwheeler of all’), i.e. *abhisamdhaka-* (lit. ‘overwheeler’). The latter is correctly said to be formed by adding the *kṛt* affix *ka* (taught by A 3.1.136) in its own meaning, i.e. to denote an agent (as explained in A 3.4.67), since the verbal base *abhisamdhā-* ends in *-ā* and has a preverb. Finally, the compound *sarvābhisamdhaka-* is defined as a *ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa* (according to A 2.2.8), and its *visarga* is also provided (*sarveṣām abhisamdhaka*).

Fifth adhyāya (9 passages)

134. Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.8 [TE] (A*²)

anirdaśāyā goḥ kṣīram *auṣtram aikaśapham tathā |*
āvikaṃ samdhinīkṣīram vivatsāyāś ca goḥ payah || 5.8 ||

The milk of a cow within the ten days of impurity after birth, camel [milk], single-hoofed animal [milk], sheep [milk], and the milk of a cow in heat or milk of a cow deprived of [her] calf.

yadīhānirdaśāham goḥ kṣīram iti pāṭha uṣṭrādīnām api dāśāhādikaḥ pratiṣedha āśaṅkyate | anirdaśāgrahaṇānūvṛtṭyā tatra samācāra ātyantikapratiṣedhārtha āśrayaṇīyah | anirdaśāyā iti tu strīlīṅgapāṭhe (see A 4.1.4) *āśaṅkaiva nāsti | na hi taddhitāntair* (see A 4.3.134) *anirdaśāyā uṣṭram ityādibhiḥ sambandhopapattiḥ | [...]*

If, in this passage, the reading were ‘the cow’s milk within the ten days after birth’ (*anirdaśāham goḥ kṣīram*), the prohibition ‘ten days (after birth) and the like’ would be doubted even in the case of camels and the like. If the mention of *anirdaśā* is maintained, in this case, the practice (for camels and the like) should be resorted to as it is targeted on a continual prohibition (i.e. without the time span of ten days). But, in the case of a reading with a feminine affix, i.e. *anirdaśāyāḥ* (see A 4.1.4), there is no doubt at all. For, the grammatical connection of *anirdaśā* with ‘camel’ (*uṣṭra*) and the like that ends in *taddhita* affixes (see A 4.3.134) does not take place.

Rules referred to:

- A 4.1.4: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.69-70.
- A 4.3.134: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.42.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi reflects upon the syntax of the *śloka*. He underlines that the word *anirdaśāyāḥ*, declined in the genitive feminine singular, only agrees with *goḥ* (genitive feminine singular from the nominal stem *gaus-* ‘cow’). Medhātithi seems to cite a variant reading, i.e. *anirdaśāhaṃ goḥ kṣīram* (‘the cow’s milk within the ten days after birth’), which may agree with *kṣīram* (‘milk’), *auṣtram* (lit. ‘coming from the camel’), *aikaśaphaṃ* (lit. ‘coming from the single-hoofed animal’), *āvikaṃ* (lit. ‘coming from the sheep’), and *saṃdhinīkṣīram* (‘milk of a cow in heat’). Medhātithi argues that, if the reading were *anirdaśāhaṃ goḥ kṣīram*, the time limit of ten days would be extended to all the animals cited in the verse. Instead, with the current reading *anirdaśā*, formed with a feminine affix (taught by A 4.1.4), there are no hermeneutical problems since there is no grammatical concordance between *anirdaśāyāḥ* and the *taddhita* derivative stems *kṣīram*, *auṣtram*, *aikaśaphaṃ*, *āvikaṃ* and *saṃdhinīkṣīram*, which are all formed by applying *aN* (according to A 4.1.134) and declined in the nominative neuter singular. Consequently, the time restriction of ten days is limited to the cow.

135. Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.9 [TE] (Vt*, Pat, M*)

āraṇyānām ca sarveṣāṃ mṛgāṇām māhiṣaṃ vinā |
strīkṣīraṃ caiva varjyāni sarvaśuktāni caiva hi || 5.9 ||

And [the milk] of all forest-born and wild animals excluding [the milk] of female buffaloes, the milk of women as well as all the kinds of milk that indeed became sour should be avoided.

āraṇyā gohastimarkaṭādayaḥ | pumsāṃ kṣīrābhāvaḥ | sarveṣāṃ mṛgāṇām iti jātīmātravivakṣāyām puṃliṅganirdeśasāmarthyāt strībhiḥ saṃbandhaḥ | mṛgakṣīraṃ kukkuṭāṇḍam itivat (see M 3.157 l. 15 Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42) | *darśitam caitat puṃbhāvavidhau mahābhāṣyakāreṇa* (see M 3.157 ll. 16-17 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42) | [...]

‘Wild animals’ (*āraṇya*) are cows, elephants, monkeys and the like. There is no milk from male [animals]. [With the expression] *sarveṣāṃ mṛgāṇām* (‘of all animals’), when the intention of the speaker is just to express the universal (i.e. the species), there is the connection with female [animals] since the indication of

the masculine gender is [also] fit to signify this. [Saying the compound] *mṛgakṣīra-* (‘deer milk’) is the same [as saying] *kukkuṭāṇḍa-* (‘cock egg’) (see M 3.157 l. 15 Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42), and this is explained by the author of the *Mahābhāṣya* in [the discussion of] the masculine gender rule (M 3.157 ll. 16-17 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42).

Passages referred to:

- M 3.157 l. 15 Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42: *kukkuṭyādīnām aṇḍādiṣu puṁvadvacanam*
The expression as if they were in the masculine gender is proper to [the word-forms] *kukkuṭi-* (‘fowl’) and the like before *aṇḍa-* (‘egg’) and the like.
- M 3.157 ll. 16-17 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42: *kukkuṭyādīnām aṇḍādiṣu puṁvadbhāvaḥ vaktavyaḥ | kukkuṭyāḥ aṇḍam kukkuṭāṇḍam mṛgyāḥ padam mṛgapadam kākyāḥ śāvaḥ kākaśāvaḥ |*
The condition as if they were in the masculine gender should be expressed by [the word-forms] *kukkuṭi-* (‘fowl’) and the like followed by *aṇḍa-* (‘egg’) and the like: the egg of the fowl is *kukkuṭāṇḍa-*, the footprint of the deer is *mṛgapada-*, the young of the crow is *kākaśāva-*.

Comment:

Here Medhātithi reflects upon the genitival phrase *sarveṣāṃ mṛgāṇām* (‘of all animals’), which, despite being grammatically inflected in the masculine gender, also includes females. To explain this, he resorts to Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42²⁷⁴ (M 3.157 l. 15) and Patañjali’s explanation of the latter *vārttika* (M 3.157 ll. 16-17). Nevertheless, in our view, this explanation is not really grammatically-oriented. The understood referent of this genitival phrase is *kṣīra-*, which one can infer from the previous verse and the compound *strīkṣīram* in the second hemistich. The genitival phrase *sarveṣāṃ mṛgāṇām* (to which *āraṇyānām* ‘wild’ should also be added) refers to the latter. Therefore, this is an analytical phrase, while Medhātithi hints at a *vārttika* that is related to compounds. A 6.3.42 teaches to treat feminine nominal stems maintaining the same stem for masculine and feminine as masculine when compounded in a *karmadhāraya* or when affixed by

²⁷⁴ A 6.3.42: *puṁvat karmadhārayajātīyadeśīyeṣu [uttarapade 1 striyāḥ bhāṣitapuṁskādanūn 33]* “[A feminine-denoting nominal stem not ending in *ūN* and sharing an identical stem with the corresponding masculine form] is treated like a masculine in a *karmadhāraya* compound or before [the *taddhita* affixes] *jātīyaR* and *deśīyaR*.”

jātīyaR and *deśīyaR*. In Vt. 2 Kātyāyana extends this procedure to *tatpuruṣa* compounds (specifically, *ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣas*) formed by *kukkuṭi-* ('fowl') and the like as the left-hand constituent and *aṇḍa-* ('egg') and the like as the right-hand constituent. In Manu's text, both the rule and *vārttika* do not apply since there is no compound (nor are there any *taddhita* derivative stems formed with *jātīyaR* and *deśīyaR*). The only very generic piece of information that can be gleaned from this learned quotation is that the Sanskrit language may refer to the feminine gender by means of a masculine nominal stem, as documented by such phenomena. Medhātithi introduces the grammatical references by arguing *mṛgakṣīraṃ kukkuṭāṇḍam itivat* "[The compound] *mṛgakṣīra-* ('deer milk') is like *kukkuṭāṇḍa-* ('fowl egg')." In all likelihood, he was led to cite Patañjali's commentary on Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42 since, among the three examples he cited, the word-form *mṛga-* is included in *mṛgyāḥ padam mṛgapadam*.

136. Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.23 [J] (A*)

babhūvur *hi puroḍāśā bhakṣyāṇām mṛgapakṣiṇām |*
purāṇeṣv ṛṣiyajñeṣu brahmacatrasaveṣu ca || 5.23 ||

Indeed, in ancient sacrifices [performed] by seers and the Soma oblations [performed] by Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas, the sacrificial cakes are made of edible beasts and birds.

[...] *arthavādatvād babhūvur iti bhūtapratyaye* (cf. A 3.2.115) *na vivakṣā | tenādyatve 'pi bhavanti* [...]

Because [this verse] has the nature of an explanatory passage, there is no intention on the part of the speaker [to express the past] in the affix conveying the past (i.e. the substitutes of the *lakāra IIT*: cf. A 3.2.115). Therefore, even in the present time, they are [as such] (i.e. *bhavanti* and not *babhūvuh*).

Rule referred to:

- A 3.2.115: *parokṣe liṭ [pratyayaḥ 3.1.1 paraś ca 3.1.2 dhātoḥ 3.1.91 bhūte 84 anadyatane 111]*
 [The substitutes of the *lakāra*] *IIT* (= perfect) occur [after a verbal base to denote a past action excluding the present day] and beyond the speaker's perception.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the perfect form *babhūvuh* maintaining that it does not convey the sense of the past as taught in A 3.2.115 for the perfect (*IIT*), due to the

anuvṛtti of *bhūte* from A 3.2.84. He considers that the sacrificial cakes in this verse are still made of edible beasts and birds in the present time. Thus, he considers *babhūvuḥ* as being equivalent to the present form *bhavanti*.

137. Medh ad MDh^M 5.38 [TL] (A*, Vt*)

yāvanti paśuromāṇi tāvatkṛtvo ha mārāṇam |

vrthā[paśughnaḥ]prāpnoti pretya janmani janmani || 5.38 ||

The one slaughtering cattle without motivation obtains, after passing away, to die, birth after birth, as many times as the hair of the animal.

[...] *paśughna iti kapratyaye chāndasaṃ rūpam* (see A 3.2.4; M 2.98 l. 5 Vt. 2 ad A 3.2.4) ||

[The word-form] *paśughna-* (‘slaughtering cattle’) is a Vedic form ending with the affix *Ka* (see A 3.2.4; M 2.98 l. 5 Vt. 2 ad A 3.2.4).

Rule and passage referred to:

- A 3.2.4: *supi sthaḥ [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 kṛt 3.1.93 ka 3]*
[The *kṛt* affix *Ka*] occurs [after the verbal base] *sthā-* when it co-occurs with a nominal *pada*.
- M 2.98 l. 5 Vt. 2 ad A 3.2.4: *yogavibhāgāt siddham*
It is well-established on the basis of a *yogavibhāga*.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the right-hand constituent *paśughna-* (‘killing cattle’), which is part of the compound *vrthāpaśughna-* (‘killing cattle in vain’). According to the scholar, this is a Vedic form (*chāndasa*) ending with the *kṛt* affix *Ka*. In our opinion, he is hinting at rule A 3.2.4 read by splitting (*yogavibhāga*) the only segment *supi* from the whole phrase as suggested in Vt. 2 ad A 3.2.4. The outcome of such a *vārttika* is in fact the teaching of the formation of *upapādas* whose *vigraha* is made up of whatever inflected noun combined with whatever *kṛt* derivative stem obtained by means of the affix *Ka*. As for its being a *chandas* feature, we report that the nominal stem *paśughna-* actually occurs nine times declined in the feminine form (*paśughnī-*) in Vedic literature,²⁷⁵ as the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit* shows.

²⁷⁵ It is plausible that, in Medhātithi’s age and place of origin (i.e. Kashmir), the sense conveyed by this compound was no longer recognised due to cultural reasons, namely the widespread inclination toward *ahiṃsā*.

138. Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.51 [E/J] (P, A, A*)

*anumantā viśasitā nihantā krayavikrayī |
saṃskartā copahartā ca khādakaś ceti ghātakāḥ || 5.51 ||*

The one who gives permission, the one who dissects, the one who kills, the one who buys and sells, the one who cooks, the one who serves and the one who eats—[these] are killers.

[...] *svatantraḥ karteti* (A 1.4.54) *viśeṣaśāstrādinā yaḥ prāṇaviyojanam prāṇinām karoti sa hantocyate | krayavikrayādyāś ca kriyās tato 'nyā eva |*

By means of the specific rule *svatantraḥ kartā* (A 1.4.54) and the like, the one who realises the separation of life from living beings is called the killer, and the actions consisting of buying and selling and the like are different from that.

nanu ceyam api smṛtir evaite anumantṛprabhrtayo ghātakā iti | nedam śabdārthasambandhe pramāṇam kiṃ tarhi dharmādharmayoḥ | abhiyuktataro hi tatra bhavān pāṇiniḥ | manvādayaś ca lokaprasiddhaiḥ padārthair vyavaharanti na śabdārthasambandhavidhiṃ smaranti | prayoktāro hy ete na smartāraḥ | [...]

However, there is just this [teaching prescribed by] the *smṛti*, according to which the one gives permission and the rest (i.e. the one who dissects, etc., mentioned in Manu's verse) are murderers. This (i.e. the *smṛti*) is not an authority in the connection between meanings and word-forms, but [only] in what is *dharmā* and what is *adharma*. For, in this context, the Venerable Pāṇini is more authoritative. Manu and the other [Smṛtikāras] deal with word meanings which are established in the common language, they do not teach a rule concerning the connection between meanings and word-forms. For, they are users, not teachers [in this field].

[...] *yad api*²⁷⁶ *prayojakatvena kartṛtvam uktam tad api naivāsti | idam hi tasya lakṣaṇam*

preṣaṇādhyeṣaṇābhyām tu yaḥ svatantrasya codakaḥ |

sa kartā caiva hetuś ca (see A 1.4.55) *mukhyo nopakaran paraḥ || iti |*

vadhako hi jīvanaprayuktyā pravartate māṃsavikrayeṇa jīviṣyāmīti na tu khādakena viniyujyate | [...]

What has been established as the nature of the agent by means of the nature of the prompter is also not true. Indeed, its characteristic is this: “The one who is the

²⁷⁶ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *yadi*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *yad api*, which fits better in the context.

impeller of the independent [*kāraka*] by means of the action of sending and soliciting is the agent (*karṭṛ*) and the prompter (*hetu*: A 1.4.55) is not the main one, but another similar [to it].” Indeed, the slayer acts [in such a way] for the sake of making a living by saying “I will live by selling meat”, but he is not committed [to do so] by the eater.

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 1.4.54: *svatantraḥ kartā* [*kārake* 23]
[In the domain of *kārakas*], the independent one is called *karṭṛ* (‘agent’).
- A 1.4.55: *tatprayojako hetuś ca* [*kārake* 23 *kartā*]
[In the domain of *kārakas*], his prompter, the *hetu*, is also called [*karṭṛ*].

Comment:

The first excerpt, in which Medhātithi reflects on the actual scope of the agent of the action of killing, resorts to A 1.4.54 to explain that the action conveyed by the verbal base *han-* (‘to kill’) is just that of killing, while the actions of buying and selling meat are different to the action of killing denoted by *han-*. In other words, he seems to say that buyers and sellers are not killers.

In the second excerpt, while reflecting on the one who can be considered a murderer (*ghātaka*), Medhātithi states that Manu and the other Smṛtikāras are not authorities in grammar or, more precisely, in establishing connections between meanings and word forms. In this field, as the scholar argues, the authority is Pāṇini, and the Smṛtikāras limit themselves to being just users (*prayokṭṛ*), not teachers (*smarṭṛ*).

In the third excerpt, returning to the reflection on the agent’s scope of the action of killing, Medhātithi considers the notion of prompter (*hetu*), hinting at A 1.4.55, particularly as regards the buyer and seller of meat. He concludes that neither the buyer nor the seller is the *hetu* of the action of killing the animals because the killer kills the animal in order to gain his subsistence and not because he has been prompted to do this by anybody else. As a consequence, the agent of the action of killing remains the one who materially kills the animal.

139. Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.53 [TE] (A*²)

varṣe varṣe ’śvamedhena yo yajeta śataṃ samāḥ |
māṃsāni ca na khāded yas tayoh *punyaphalam* *samam || 5.53 ||*

For the one who, year by year, sacrifices by the horse-sacrifice for one hundred years and for the one who does not eat meat, for both, the meritorious act and the fruit are the same.

[...] *puṇyaṃ ca phalaṃ ca puṇyaphalam* | *samāhāradvandvaḥ* (cf. A 2.4.6) | *śaṣṭhīsamāse hy asāmarthyam* (cf. A 2.2.8) ||
 [The compound] *puṇyaphala-* [must be analysed] as ‘meritorious act and fruit’: [this is] a *samāhāradvandva* (cf. A 2.4.6). Indeed, there is weakness in [constructing] a *śaṣṭhīsamāsa* (cf. A 2.2.8).

Rules referred to:

- A 2.2.8: see *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.19.
- A 2.4.6: see *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.119.

Comment:

Medhātithi interprets the compound *puṇyaphala* as a *dvandva* compound by employing the post-Pāṇinian term *samāhāradvandva* to denote a *dvandva* in the singular number and neuter gender (according to A 2.4.2 and 2.4.17). The specific rule that allows the formation of this assumed *dvandva* compound may be A 2.4.6, thus considering *puṇya* and *phala* as class names (*jāti*) of inanimate beings (*aprāṇin*). He excludes the analysis of this compound as a *śaṣṭhīsamāsa*, perhaps due to the presence of another genitive, namely *tayoḥ* (‘of these two’).

140. Medh ad MDh^M 5.66 [TE] (A)

nṛṇām akṛtamunḍānām viśuddhir naiśikī smṛtā |
nirvṛttamunḍakānām tu trirātrāc chuddhir iṣyate || 5.66 ||

The complete purification of men who have not accomplished the shaving of their head is recorded as lasting one night, but the purification of the dead with their head shaved is acknowledged after a set of three days.

imāḥ śaṣṭhīḥ kartṛkarmanḥ kṛti (A 2.3.65) *iti kartṛlakṣaṇāḥ kecid vyācakṣate* | *akṛtacūḍa ekāhena śuddhyati* | *tathā vayo*²⁷⁷ *’vasthāpekṣo ’pi vikalpa ity ekīyamataṃ uktam* | *tasyaiva ślokasya vyavasthāvākya ime* | *anye tv adhyāhāreṇa sambandhalakṣaṇā āhuḥ* | *akṛtamunḍānām mṛtānām ye sapinḍāḥ* | *tatrottarapakṣaḥ samācārābhipretaḥ* | [...]

Some explain that these genitive case endings (i.e. *nṛṇām* < *nṛ-* ‘man’, *akṛtamunḍānām* < *akṛtamunḍa-* ‘having not accomplished the shaving of their head, and *nirvṛttamunḍakānām* < *nirvṛttamunḍaka-* ‘dead with their head

²⁷⁷ Mandlik presents the variant reading *tathā ca yaḥ*, while the others feature the variant reading *tathā vayah*.

shaved’) express the agent (*karṭṛ*) according to *karṭṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti* (A 2.3.65). [The meaning would be]: “The untensured [man] is purified in a single day.” Likewise, the opinion about the single-day [impurity] according to which the option is also based on age and condition has [already] been explained (e.g. MDh^M 5.58). These people (*ime*) [stick to] what is settled by just the statement of this *śloka* (i.e. without supplying anything). Other people (*anye*) say, instead, that [the genitive case endings] express ‘relationship’ by means of supplying [some word-forms]. [The meaning would be]: “The kinsmen of men who have not accomplished the shaving of their head.” In this case, the second position is approved by custom.

Rule cited:

- A 2.3.65: *karṭṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti* [*anabhihite* 1 *śaṣṭhī śeṣe* 50]
A genitive case ending occurs to denote the agent or the patient [of the action conveyed by a verbal base] ending in a *kṛt* affix.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the use of the genitive case ending of the nominal forms *nṛṇām* (< *nṛ-* ‘man’), *akṛtamuṇḍānām* (< *akṛtamuṇḍa-* ‘having not accomplished the shaving of their head’), and *nirvṛttamuṇḍakānām* (< *nirvṛttamuṇḍaka-* ‘dead with the head shaved’). Two different opinions are reported. According to the first, the genitive is employed according to A 2.3.65, i.e. it is used to express the agent (therefore, as it were a nominative) in the case of co-occurrence of a *kṛt* derivative stem (in this case, the derivative stem *viśuddhi-* ‘complete purification’ from the verbal base *viśudh-* ‘to purify completely’); according to the second, the genitive expresses a relationship (in particular, kinship).

141. Medh ad MDh^M 5.110 [E] (P³)

taijasānām mañinām ca sarvasyāśmamayasya ca |
bhasmanādbhir mṛdā caiva śuddhir uktā mañisibhiḥ || 5.110 ||

The sages maintain that the purification of metallic objects, gems and every item made of stone [must be accomplished] by means of ash, water and clay.

[...] *katham punaḥ śāstrāt padārthaviśeṣāvasāyo yāvatā kartavyatāparatvena śāstram pramāṇam na padārthaprasiddhau pāṇinivad vedamūlatvābhyupagamān manvādismr̥tīnām |* [...]

However, how can there be the determination of a particular meaning from the (Dharma-)śāstra as far as the (Dharma-)śāstra is the authority in the distinction of what should be done and not in bringing about the meaning of words as Pāṇini does: [this is] due to the agreement with the Veda, which is the root of the *Smṛtis* [composed] by Manu and the other [Smṛtikāras].

vaidikamantrasādhyāyāṃ ca śuddhau kā vyavahāramūlatā śakyā | vidhīś cānarthakaḥ syāt | nanu ca pāṇiner api vidhir asti sādhubhir bhāṣitavyaṃ nāsādhubhir iti | naiśā pāṇineḥ smṛtiḥ | sā hy etāvati paryavasitā sādhur ayam ayaṃ neti | etat tu dharmasūtrakāriṇāṃ smaraṇaṃ yady apy asti | abhidhānasārāc caitan nipuṇato 'vagantavyam |

[...] And, since the purification should be accomplished on the basis of Vedic formulas, how could it be rooted in customary use? And the injunction should be in vain. And no doubt there is also a rule [attributed] to Pāṇini according to which “it should be spoken by good men and not by bad men.” This teaching (*smṛti*) is not Pāṇini's. For this is [his teaching] established in such [an issue]: “This is a good person, this is not.” In any case, if it should also be true, this is a traditional teaching of the composers of *Dharmasūtras*, and this should be wholly known from a lexical compendium (*abhidhānasāra*).

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi points out the different domains over which Dharmaśāstra and Vyākaraṇa scholars have authority. He accredits Pāṇini with the role of deriving the meaning of words more than the role of establishing meaning. Moreover, he seems to consider grammar a tool for distinguishing between right and wrong word formations, while he recognises that the Dharmasūtra- and Smṛtikāras preside over the relationship between linguistic usages and human categories. This can be assumed from the different usage of *sādhu-* in *sādhubhir bhāṣitavyaṃ nāsādhubhir* and *sādhur ayam ayaṃ na*, where it respectively denotes virtuous men and correct words. Medhātithi recognises the Dharmasūtra- and Smṛtikāras as the authority on determining correct conduct based on the Veda and in some cases, custom (which he refers to here as *vyavahāra*). As a final note, to the best of our knowledge, *abhidhānasāra* is not the title of a handed-down Sanskrit work; we thus consider it to be a category of texts.

142. Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.157 [E] (M*, KV*)

anekāni sahasrāṇi kumārabrahmacāriṇām |

divaṃ gatāni viprāṇām akṛtvā kulasaṃtatim || 5.157 ||

Many thousands of Brāhmaṇas, being celibate Vedic students, have gone to heaven without carrying on the continuity of their family.

[...] *evaṃ kila śrūyate nāputrasya loko 'sti* (AitB 33.1) *iti | liṅgaṃ ca tatrāvivaṅśitam ataḥ putrārthe prasaṅga idam ucyate* (see M 2.144 ll. 13-15 *ad* Vt. 1 *ad* A 3.3.18; KV *ad* A 3.3.18) | [...]

Indeed, it is heard (i.e. it is found in Vedic scriptures) thus: “There is no heaven for the one who has no children (lit. ‘sons’)” (AitB 33.1). And, in this case, the gender is not the object of the intention of the speaker; therefore, this [masculine gender] in the meaning of ‘son’ is said to be a [mere] automatic involvement (see M 2.144 ll. 13-15 *ad* Vt. 1 *ad* A 3.3.18; KV *ad* A 3.3.18).

Passages referred to:

- M 2.144 ll. 13-15 *ad* Vt. 1 *ad* A 3.3.18: [...] *nāntarīyakatvād atra puṃllīṅgena nirdeśaḥ kriyata ekavacanena ca | avaśyam kayācid vibhaktiā kenacic ca liṅgena nirdeśaḥ kartavyaḥ* [...] Here, the mention [of the word-form] is made by means of masculine gender and singular number because they are not intrinsically present [in the same word *bhāve*]. The mention has to be made by means of some ending and some gender.
- KV *ad* A 3.3.18: *puṃliṅgaikavacanam ca atra na tantraṃ* The masculine gender and singular number here are not intrinsically part of the rule.

Comment:

At the beginning of his commentary on this verse, Medhātithi quotes a passage from the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* (AitB 33.1) where the word-form *aputra* (‘man without children’, lit. ‘man without sons’). As regards the latter *Brāhmaṇa* passage, he reflects on the absence of any intention on the part of the speaker to express the gender when employing the word-form *aputra* and that the meaning ‘son’ for *putra* is just an automatic involvement (*prasaṅga*). This kind of discussion is proper to the grammatical tradition, especially that of the *Mahābhāṣya* (see M 2.144 ll. 13-15 *ad* Vt. 1 *ad* A 3.3.18), and then taken up by the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (see KV *ad* A 3.3.18).²⁷⁸

²⁷⁸ For an in-depth discussion on the *prasaṅga* principles in *Śrautasūtras*, *Mīmāṃsā* and *Vyākaraṇa*, see Freschi and Pontillo (2013: 65-129).

*Sixth adhyāya (3 passages)***143. Medh ad MDh^M 6.1 [TE] (A*)**

*evaṃ grhāśrame [sthitvā] vidhivat snātako dvijaḥ |
vane vaset tu niyato yathāvad vijitendriyaḥ || 6.1 ||*

After staying in the householder stage of life in accordance with due rules, a twice-born bath graduate should duly live in the forest, self-restrained, with his faculties of perception subdued.

[...] *tatra sthitvā tam anuṣṭhāya vane vased iti vidhiḥ | sthitveti ktvāpratyayena* (see A 3.4.21) *paurvakālyam gārhashtyasya vanavāsād darśayati | krameṇāśramaḥ kartavyaḥ | kṛtagārhashtyo vanavāse 'dhikriyate | [...]*

In this context, [the gerund] *sthitvā* [means] ‘having carried it (i.e. *grhāśrama* – ‘the householder stage of life’) out’; ‘he should dwell in the forest’: this is the rule. By means of the affix *Ktvā* (see A 3.4.21), [the word-form] *sthitvā* shows the priority of time of the householder stage of life (lit. ‘estate’) compared to [that of] the forest dweller. The stage of life (*āśrama*) should be undertaken in the regular order. The one who has completed the householder stage of life is entitled to that of the forest dweller.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.4.21: see Medh ad MDh^M 3.4.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the gerund *sthitvā*, formed by adding the *kṛt* affix *Ktvā* to the verbal base *sthā-*, taught by A 3.4.21. According to the latter rule, the affix *Ktvā* is applied to a verbal base to denote an action preceding another: the scholar focuses just on the priority of time (*paurvakālyā*), relating to the stages of life of the householder and forest dweller.

144. Medh ad MDh^M 6.18 [TL] (A*²)

*sadyaḥ prakṣālako vā syān [māsasaṃcayiko] 'pi vā |
[saṃmāsanicayo] vā syāt [samānicaya] eva vā || 6.18 ||*

He could wash on the same day [after eating] or [could] even keep a supply [of food] lasting a month, or six months, or a year.

[...] *māsopayogī vā saṃcayo māsaparyāptaḥ saṃcayo māsasaṃcayaḥ | so 'syāstīti than kartavyaḥ* (see A 5.2.115) *| yadi vā māsasaṃcayaka iti*

bahuvrīhisamāso 'tra kartavyaḥ (see A 5.4.154) *māsaparyāptaḥ samcayo 'syeti*
| *evam uttarayor api* ||

‘The [food] supply sufficient for a month’ or ‘the [food] supply lasting a month’ is the *māsasaṃcaya* (‘monthly supply’). [The affix] *thaN* should be applied [to denote] ‘this belongs to X’ (see A 5.2.115). Or, if [the reading] were *māsasaṃcayaka*, it should then be explained as a *bahuvrīhi* compound (with the addition of the *samāsānta* affix *kaP*; see A 5.4.154), i.e. ‘the one whose supply lasts for a month.’ [The interpretation] is thus also for the other two [*taddhita* derivative stems, i.e. *ṣaṇmāsanīcaya*- ‘a supply lasting sixth months or ‘having a food supply lasting six months’ and *samānīcaya*- ‘a supply lasting one year’ or ‘having a food supply lasting one year’].

Rules referred to:

- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.
- A 5.4.154: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.46.

Comment:

Medhātithi here focuses on the *taddhita* derivative stem *māsasaṃcaya*-, which, based on his *vigraha*, means ‘a [food] supply convenient for a month’ or ‘a [food] supply lasting a month.’ This *taddhita* derivative stem is explained as being formed by adding the affix *thaN* (taught by A 5.2.115) in the sense of ‘belonging to X’, as alluded to by the scholar (by means of the periphrasis *so 'syāsti*). Medhātithi also provides another reading, i.e. *māsasaṃcayaka*-, which is read as a *bahuvrīhi* compound, ending—we add—with the *taddhita samāsānta* affix *kaP* (according to A 5.4.154). The same explanation is then extended to the other two *taddhita* derivative stems found in Manu’s verse, namely *ṣaṇmāsanīcaya*- (‘a supply lasting sixth months or ‘having a food supply lasting six months’) and *samānīcaya*- (‘a supply lasting one year’ or ‘having a food supply lasting one year’).

145. Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.38 [TE] (A*², KV*, N*)

prājāpatyāṃ nirūpyeṣṭīm *ṣarvavedasadaḥṣiṇām* |

ātmany agnīm samāropya brāhmaṇaḥ pravrajed grhāt || 6.38 ||

After performing an oblation sacred to Prajāpati, whose priestly gift consists of all his properties, and making the fires rise within himself (i.e. interiorising them), a Brāhmaṇa should leave home and wander [as a mendicant].

[...] *sārvavedasaṃ dakṣiṇāsyāstīty anyapadārthaḥ* | *vedo dhanam tat sarvaṃ deyaṃ* (cf. A 4.3.47) | *idam arthe vihitāḥ svārthiko vā prajñāder ākṛtigaṇatvāt* (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38) | [...]

[The compound *sārvavedasadakṣiṇā-* should be explained as] ‘whose priestly gift is all one’s property’, i.e. as a *bahuvrīhi* compound (lit. ‘having the sense of another word’). [The compound constituent] *vedas-* [means] ‘wealth’; the whole of this should be given (cf. A 4.3.47). Or rather, this (i.e. the *taddhita* derivative stem *sārvavedasa-*) is formed [by means of the *taddhita* affix *aN* that occurs] in the own meaning [of the base] due to [its] being part of the *prajñādi* exemplificative list (‘knowledge and the like’) (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38).

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 4.3.47: *deyaṃ ṛṇe* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *prāg divyāto 'n* 4.1.83 *tatra* 25]
[After a nominal stem, a *taddhita* affix taught from A 4.1.83 to 4.4.2 applies] to denote ‘to be given as a debt [at that time].’
- A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- KV *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- N *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.

Comment:

Medhātithi first explains the feminine compound *sārvavedasadakṣiṇā-* that agrees with *iṣṭi-* (‘oblation’) analysed as a *bahuvrīhi* (‘whose priestly gift is all one’s property’). Second, he focuses on the derivation of its first constituent, i.e. *sārvavedasa-*, formed by the *taddhita* affix *aN* (taught by the general rule A 4.1.83) from the compound *sarva-vedas-*. In our opinion, Medhātithi may have used *tat sarvaṃ deyaṃ* to recall the *deyaṃ* of rule A 4.3.47, whose output meaning does not fit in this case. In the end, as an alternative, he suggests applying the affix *aN* in the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*), as set out in rule A 5.4.38, interpreted after KV *ad* A 5.4.38 and N *ad* A 5.4.38 (for more information, see our comment on Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71). Notably, Jinenandrabuddhi’s commentarial section classifies the *prajñādi* list (which Medhātithi explicitly references in this passage) as an *ākṛtigaṇa*, thereby incorporating the stem *sārvavedas-* here commented on.

Seventh adhyāya (4 passages)

146. Medh *ad* MDh^M 7.95 [TE] (A*)

*yac cāsyā sukṛtaṃ kiṃcid amutrārtham upārjitam |
bhartā tat sarvaṃ ādatte parāvṛttahatasya tu || 7.95 ||*

And the chieftain receives whatever good deed procured for the sake of there above (i.e. the other world) of the one who has been killed when he turned his back [to the enemy].

[...] *amutrārtham upārjitam | artho 'syāstīty arthaḥ | arśaāditvāc ac* (see A 5.2.127) | *amutrāmuṣmīṃ loka yat prayojanaṃ tad arjitaṃ tad asya niṣphalaṃ bhavati | amutrārtho 'syeti vā amutrārtham | vyadhikaraṇo bahuvrīhir gamakatvāt prayojakatvāc²⁷⁹ ca ||*

amutrārtham upārjitam ('procured for the sake of there above, i.e. for the other world'): 'the purpose belongs to X', this is the meaning [of the *taddhita* derivative stem *artha-*]. [The *taddhita* affix] *aC* [is applied to the nominal stem *artha-*] due to [its] being part of *arśaādi* ('haemorrhoids and the like') (see A 5.2.127). What is earned as the aim *amutra*, i.e. in that world, becomes fruitless for him. Or rather, *amutrārtha-* [should be analysed as] 'whose purpose belongs to the other world': [this would be] a *bahuvrīhi* compound relating to another subject due to [its] being immediately understandable and effective.

Rule referred to:

- A 5.2.127: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.

Comment:

Here Medhātithi is commenting on the compound *amutrārtha-*, which is analysed both as a *tatpuruṣa* and a *bahuvrīhi*. According to the first interpretation, Medhātithi explains that the right-hand constituent of the *tatpuruṣa* compound (i.e. *artha-*) is formed according to A 5.2.127 (by alluding to the *arśaādi* list), i.e. by adding the affix *aC* to denote 'X belongs to Y' (the application of this rule is correct since the *arśaādi* list is an *ākṛtigāṇa*). Following this interpretation, the meaning of the *tatpuruṣa* would be 'purposeful for the other world.' According to the second interpretation, the scholar explains it as a *bahuvrīhi* compound ('whose purpose belongs to the other world'), which fits better than the explanation as a *tatpuruṣa*, both in this context and from a grammatical

²⁷⁹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *prayojakāc ca*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *prayojakatvāc ca*.

perspective. In the latter case, another man is entitled to gain the merits of the dead man.

We remark that Jha (1999: V, 344) interprets the first hypothesis of Medhātithi differently since he assumes that the affix *aC* is applied to the compound *amutrārtha-*. However, we consider that it is most significant that Medhātithi employs the phrase *artho 'sya* to develop the first hypothesis and *amutrārtho 'sa* to develop the second one.

147. Medh *ad* MDh^M 7.127 [TL] (A*)

*krayavikrayam adhvānaṃ bhaktaṃ ca saparivyayam |
yogakṣemaṃ ca saṃprekṣya [vaṇijo dāpayet karān] || 7.127 ||*

After examining the purchase and sale, the journey, food with condiments and peace after war, [the king] should have the merchants pay the taxes.

[...] *etad apekṣya vaṇigbhyaḥ karā ādātavyāḥ | vaṇigbhir dāpayet karān iti pāṭho yukto gatyādiniyamena karmasamjñāyā abhāvāt* (see A 1.4.52) | *daṇḍavacano vā dhātus tadā daṇḍivad dvikarmakatvam ||*

Having respected this, the taxes should be paid by the merchants. ‘He (i.e. the king) should make the merchants (*vaṇij*, declined in the instrumental masculine plural) pay the taxes’ (*vaṇigbhir dāpayet karān*): this is the appropriate reading (\neq the handed down one, i.e. *vaṇijo dāpayet karān*),²⁸⁰ due to the absence of the designation as a patient/object (*karman*) according to the restriction [taught in rule] *gatyādi* (see A 1.4.52). Or rather, the verbal base [*dāpaya-*] denotes a fine (*daṇḍa*); then, like [the verbal base] *daṇḍi-* (on which the denominative stem *daṇḍaya-* is formed), there will be two objects.

Rule referred to:

- A 1.4.52: *gatibuddhipratyavasānārthaśabdakarmākarmakāṇām aṇi kartā sa nau [kārake 23 karman 49]*
[In the domain of *kāra*], whatever is a *karṭṛ* in the case of a non-*ṆiC* verbal base denoting movement, perception or eating, or a verbal base whose object is ‘sound’ and an intransitive verbal base is designated as *karman* in the case of a *ṆiC* verbal base.

²⁸⁰ The reading *vaṇigbhir dāpayet karān* is not reported in Olivelle’s critical apparatus (cf. Olivelle 2005: 634).

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi is commenting on the phrase *vaṇijo dāpayet karān* ('he should have the merchants pay the taxes') arguing that the correct reading should be *vaṇigbhir dāpayet karān* (i.e. with the instrumental *vaṇigbhiḥ* in place of the accusative *vaṇijaḥ*) since rule A 1.4.52 does not apply because the verbal base *dāpaya-* (< *dā-* + *ṆiC*: 'to cause to give') does not meet any constraint provided by the rule.

148. Medh ad MDh^M 7.130 [TE/TL] (A, A*)

pañcāśadbhāga ādeyo rājñā paśuhiraṇyayoḥ |

dhānyānām aṣṭamo bhāgaḥ śaṣṭho dvādaśa eva vā || 7.130 ||

One-fiftieth share (lit. 'a share consisting of fifty') of cattle and gold should be received by the king, [as well as] one-eighth, one-sixth or even one-twelfth share of grains.

mūlyādhikayoḥ paśuhiraṇyayoḥ pañcāśadbhāgo grāhyaḥ | [...] *pañcāśatpūraṇaḥ pañcāśaḥ* (see A 5.2.48) | *viṃśatyādibhyaḥ* (A 5.2.56) *iti pakṣe tamaḥ* | *pañcāśadbhāga* *iti pāṭhe dvibhāgādivat saṃkhyāntaram* ||

'Of cattle and gold', i.e. having an excellent worth, 'a share consisting of fifty' (*pañcāśadbhāga*) should be taken. [...] [The *taddhita* derivative stem] *pañcāśa-* (lit. 'fiftieth'; ≠ *pañcāśat°*, i.e. the left-hand constituent of *pañcāśadbhāga-*) [means] the ordinal number of fifty (lit. 'filling fifty'; see A 5.2.48); in the alternative form of *viṃśatyādibhyaḥ* (A 5.2.56), [the increment] *tamaḥ* [could optionally be applied]. [Instead], in the reading *pañcāśadbhāga-* ('a share consisting of fifty'), there is another reckoning (i.e. the compound *pañcāśadbhāga-* means 'a share consisting of fifty' and not 'a fiftieth part') such as in the case of *dvibhāga-* ('a share consisting of two') and the like.

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 5.2.48: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.38.
- A 5.2.56: *viṃśatyādibhyas tamaḥ anyatarasyām* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *saṃkhyāyāḥ* 47 *tasya pūraṇe daṭ* 48]
[The increment] *tamaḥ* optionally [occurs at the head of the *taddhita* affix *Ḍaṭ* introduced after a nominal stem consisting of a *saṃkhyā*] being part of the list beginning with *viṃśati-* ('twenty') [to denote an ordinal number].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the compound *pañcāśadbhāga-*, which seems to be interpreted as a *karmadhāraya*, i.e. ‘a share consisting of fifty’ (unlike the interpretation registered by the MW and accepted by Olivelle, i.e. ‘one-fiftieth share’). It is self-evident that Medhātithi considers this phrase as meaning ‘one-fiftieth’ because he probably considers the word-forms *aṣṭama-*, *ṣaṣṭha-*, and *dvādaśa-* in the second hemistich. Nonetheless, he seems to suggest that, from a morphological point of view, the expected form should be the *taddhita* derivative stem *pañcāśa-* (‘fiftieth’), formed by adding *ḌaT* (taught by A 5.2.48), or *pañcāśattama-*, formed by the increment *tamaT* (taught by A 5.2.56).

149. Medh ad MDh^M 7.193 [TL] (A*²)

[kaurakṣetrāmś] ca [matsyāmś] ca [pañcālān] [śūrasenajān] |

dīrghāṃl laghūṃś caiva narān agrānīkeṣu yojayet || 7.193 ||

One should equip [with weapons] tall and indeed quick men coming from the lands of the Kurus, Matyas, Pañcālas and Śūrasenas in the vanguard.

kurukṣetraṃ prasiddham | matsyasaṃjño virātadeśo nāgapure pañcālāḥ | ubhaye kānyakubjā āhicchatrāś ca | śūrasenajā māthurāḥ | kvacic cātra bhāvārthe pratyayo (see A 4.2.69) *luptanirdiṣṭaḥ* (see A 4.2.81) | [...]

[The word-form] *kurukṣetra-* (name of a city) is well-known. The country of Virāṭa is designated as Matsya. In Nāgapura, there are the Pañcālas: they are both those [who dwell] in Kanyakubja and those [who dwell in] Ahicchatra. Those [who dwell] in Mathurā are born in Śūrasena. And, in some cases (here *matsya-*, and *pañcāla-*), the [*taddhita*] affix denoting their being there (namely, their residing there, i.e. the *taddhita* affix *aṇ* taught by A 4.2.69) is expressly indicated as zero-replaced by *LUP* (see A 4.2.81).

Rules referred to:

- A 4.2.69: *tasya nivāsaḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *deśe tannāṃni* 67]
[The *taddhita* affix *aṇ* occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘[the place of] residence of X’ [whose placename depends on such an X].
- A 4.2.81: *janapade lup* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tad asmin asti...* 67-70]

[The *taddhita* affix that occurs after a nominal stem to denote ‘place of residence of X’ etc.] is zero-replaced by *LUP* to denote ‘inhabited country.’

Comment:

Manu’s verse contains four word-forms denoting ‘inhabited countries’ (*janapada*), i.e. *kurukṣetra-* (‘country of the Kurus’), *matsya-* (‘country of the Matsyas’), *pañcāla-* (‘country of the Pañcalas), and *śūrasenaja-* (‘country of the Śūrasenas’) in order to explain that some of these names, namely *matsya-* and *pañcāla-* are also used as the name of the peoples who live in the homonymous countries. In his commentary, Medhātithi refers to the *taddhita* derivation by *LUP* zero-replacement (of the *taddhita* affix *aN* taught by A 4.2.69) by means of A 4.2.81 in order to explain that some of these names, namely *matsya-* and *pañcāla-* are also used as the name of the country where they live (*janapada*).²⁸¹ Of course, the variant reading *kaurakṣetra-* (interpreted as denoting the inhabitants of the city *kurukṣetra-*), which is found in MDh^M 7.193 in Jha’s edition (and, therefore, probably the textual variant that Medhātithi had to deal with), is regularly obtained by applying the affix *aN* (according to A 4.3.25²⁸² in the sense of ‘born there’ or A 4.3.53²⁸³ in the sense of ‘being there’). Nonetheless, we add that the alternative variant reading *kurukṣetra-* is found in thirteen manuscripts (as well as in some printed editions) (see Olivelle 2005: 647); the latter variant reading, if interpreted as denoting the inhabitants of the city *kurukṣetra-*, would also be obtained by means of the *LUP* zero-replacement taught by A 4.2.81. Finally, we note that the last name denoting ‘inhabited country’, i.e. *śūrasenaja-* (m.), is a compound whose left-hand constituent is the masculine name for country *śūrasena-*.

Eighth adhyāya (48 passages)

150. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.4-7 [TE] (A², A*, Vt*)

teṣāṃ ādyam ṛṇādānaṃ nikṣepo ’svāmivikrayaḥ |
saṃbhūya ca samutthānaṃ dattasyānapakarma ca || 8.4 ||
vetanasyaiva cādānaṃ saṃvidas ca vyatikramaḥ |

²⁸¹ For a fuller discussion of ethnonyms formed with A 4.2.81 on the basis of the relevant choronyms as their etymons, see Pontillo (2021).

²⁸² A 4.3.25: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.46.

²⁸³ A 4.3.53: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.

krayavikrayānuśayo vivādaḥ svāmipālayoḥ || 8.5 ||

simāvivādadharmaś ca pārūṣye daṇḍavācike |

steyam ca sāhasam caiva strīsaṃgrahaṇam eva ca || 8.6 ||

strīpūṃdharmo vibhāgaś ca dyūtam āhvaya eva ca |

padāny aṣṭādaśaitāni vyavahārasthitān iha || 8.7 ||

The first of these is the non-payment of debts; [the second is] the deposit; [the third is] the sale of a property by one who is not the [legal] owner; [the fourth is] engaging in business after entering into partnership; [the fifth is] the resumption of a gift, [the sixth is] the non-payment of wages, [the seventh is] the breach of a contract, [the eighth is] the cancellation of a purchase or sale, [the ninth is] the dispute between landlord and herdsman, [the tenth is] the law on the disputes about boundaries, [the eleventh and the twelfth are] the physical and verbal attacks, [the thirteenth is] theft, [the fourteenth is] violence, [the fifteenth is] sexual crime against women, [the sixteenth is] the law regarding husband and wife, [the seventeenth is] the division of inheritance, [the eighteenth is] gambling and betting. These eighteen are the grounds for the institution of lawsuits in this world.

[...] *pārūṣye daṇḍavācika iti | daṇḍaś ca vāk ca daṇḍavācam dvandvāc cudaśahāntāt (A 5.4.106) iti samāsāntas tad asyāstīti ata ini ṭhanau (A 5.2.115) iti ṭhan | strīpūṃdharmo iti | strīsaṃgrahaṇam pumān iti śākapārthivādivat samāsaḥ (see M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 ad A 2.1.69) | strī ca pumāmś ceti vighrahe strīpūṃsadharma iti syāt (see A 5.4.77) ||*

pārūṣye daṇḍavācike ('verbal and physical attacks'): [the etymon of the *taddhita* derivative stem *daṇḍavācika-*, i.e. the compound] *daṇḍavāca-* [must be analysed as] *daṇḍa-* (lit. 'stick') and *vāc-* (lit. 'speech') according to rule *dvandvāc cudaśahāntāt* (A 5.4.106); [the *taddhita* affix] *ṭhaN* occurs [after the latter compound] in the sense of 'X belongs to Y' according to *ata ini ṭhanau* (A 5.2.115). *strīpūṃdharmo* ('*dharma* concerning a husband and wife'): [this] compound, which has to be read as a 'man associated with a woman', is like *śākapārthiva* and the like (see M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 ad A 2.1.69); if the constituent analysis were 'man and woman' (i.e. if it were a *dvandva* compound), [the correct form of this] compound would be *strīpūṃsadharma-* (see A 5.4.77).

Rules and passage cited or referred to:

- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.

- A 5.4.77: *acaturavicaturasucaturastrīpumsadhenvanaḍuharkṣāma-vānmanasākṣibhruvadāragavorvaṣṭhīvapadaṣṭhīvanaktaṃdivarātrīṃdivāhardivasarajasaniḥśreyasapuruṣāyusadvyāyusātryāyusargyajuṣajātokaṣamahokṣavṛddhokṣopasunagoṣṭhaśvāḥ* [prātipadikāt 4.1.1. *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *samāsāntāḥ* 68 ac 75]
[The *taddhita samāsānta* affix *aC* occurs after a nominal stem] as in the following *nipātana* forms: *acatura-* (‘not having four’), *vicatura-* (‘having lost four’ or ‘containing various quarters’), *sucatura-* (‘whose quarters are beautiful’), *strīpumsa-* (‘female and man’, i.e. ‘wife and husband’), *dhenvanaḍuha-* (‘cow and bull’), *rkṣāma-* (‘Rgvedic and Sāmavedic hymns’), *vānmanasa-* (‘speech and mind’), *akṣibhruva-* (‘eye and eye-brow’), *dāragava-* (‘wife and cow’), *ūrvaṣṭhīva-* (‘thigh and knee’), *padaṣṭhīva-* (‘foot and knee’), *naktaṃdiva-* (‘night and day’), *rātrīṃdiva-* (‘id.’), *aharḍiva-* (‘day by day’), *sarajasa-* (‘entirely’), *niḥśreyasa-* (‘having no better’, ‘most excellent’), *puruṣāyusa-* (‘human life’), *dvyāyusa-* (‘two lives’), *tryāyusa-* (‘three lives’), *rgyajuṣa-* (‘Rgveda and Yajurveda’), *jātokaṣa-* (‘young bullock’), *mahokṣa-* (‘great bull’), *vṛddhokṣa-* (‘old bull’), *upaśuna-* (‘near the dog’), and *goṣṭhaśva-* (‘dog in a cow-pen’).
- A 5.4.106: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.61.
- M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.146.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on two word-forms that are included in MDh^M 8.6 and 8.7 respectively. The first is *daṇḍavācika-*, which is a *taddhita samāsānta* derivative stem obtained by applying the affix *thaN* (taught in A 5.2.115) to the *dvandva* compound (combining *daṇḍa-* and *vāc-*) endowed with a *taddhita samāsānta* affix *ṭaC* taught in A 5.4.106 in the sense of ‘collection’ (*samāhāra*), thus neuter and singular. The second word analysed is *strīpumḍharma-* which is assimilated to the compound *śākapārthiva-* (‘king eating vegetables’), which is the example given in the heading for the category of *karmadhāraya* compounds with *uttarapadalopa* introduced by Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69 (M 1.406 l. 5). As in the case of *śākapārthiva-* (in which a zero-replacement of a further constituent *bhojin-* (‘eating’) is postulated to account for the precise meaning of the compound), the constituent *sahita-* (‘associated’) is postulated as being zero-replaced in the case of *strīpumḍharma-* in order to avoid the analysis of the compound as a *dvandva* because, according to rule A 5.4.77, the *nipātana* form should instead be *strīpumsadharma-*.

151. Medh ad MDh^M 8.9 [TL] (Kāt, M)

yadā svayam na kuryāt tu nṛpatiḥ kāryadarśanam |
tadā [niyuñjyād] vidvāmsaṁ brāhmaṇaṁ kāryadarśane || 8.9 ||
 When the king himself does not preside over a lawsuit, he should
 then appoint a well-educated Brāhmaṇa in the role of presiding over
 a lawsuit.

[...] *niyojyo vidvān syād iti paṭhitavyam | niyuñjyād iti niyuñjīta*²⁸⁴
*svarādyantopasrṣṭāt*²⁸⁵ (M 1.290 ll. 8-9 ad A 1.3.64) *iti hi kātīyā ātmanepadaṁ*
smaranti ||

[The phrase *niyuñjyāt vidvāmsaṁ brāhmaṇaṁ* ‘he (i.e. the king) should appoint a learned Brāhmaṇa’] should [instead] be read as ‘a learned [Brāhmaṇa] has to be appointed’ (*niyojyo vidvān [brāhmaṇaḥ] syāt*). Indeed, [the verbal form] *niyuñjyāt* should be *niyuñjīta* according to [the teaching] *svarādyantopasrṣṭāt* (‘after a preverb beginning or ending with a vowel’; see M 1.290 ll. 8-9 ad A 1.3.64) because [the *vārttikas*] composed by Kātya[’s descendant] (i.e. Kātyāyana) recommend the *ātmanepada* form.

Passage cited:

- M 1.290 ll. 8-9 ad A 1.3.64: *svarādyantopasrṣṭāt vaktavyam | udyuñkte anuyuñkte. apara āha | svarādyantopasrṣṭād iti vaktavyam | prayuñkte niyuñkte viniyuñkte |*
 After a preverb beginning with a vowel, [the *Ātmanepada* endings] should be taught [after the verbal base *yuj-* (‘to yoke’)]. [Examples are] *udyuñkte* (‘he is in contact with’), *anuyuñkte* (‘he joins again’). Somebody else maintains that, after a preverb beginning or ending with a vowel, [the *Ātmanepada* endings] should be taught [after the verbal base *yuj-*]. [Examples are] *prayuñkte* (‘he harnesses to’), *niyuñkte* (‘he binds to’), *viniyuñkte* (‘he disengages himself from’).

²⁸⁴ Mandlik features the variant reading *niyuñjīta*, which is incorrect from a grammatical point of view. The others present the correct variant reading *niyuñjīta*.

²⁸⁵ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *svarājyantopasrṣṭāt*, which does not correspond to the *Mahābhāṣya* passage quoted. The other editions include the variant reading *svarādyantopasrṣṭāt*, which exactly corresponds to the relevant *Mahābhāṣya* passage.

Comment:

The word-form examined by Medhātithi is *niyuñjyāt*, an optative form from the verbal base *niyuj-* ('to bind to'). Before actually commenting on its grammar, he proposes that it should be read as the future passive particle from the same verbal base followed by the copula inflected in the third person form of the optative; in this paraphrasis, the Brāhmaṇa should be inferred as its subject, and both the gerundive and the qualifier should agree with this nominative: *niyojyo vidvān [brāhmaṇaḥ] syāt*. This is how he explains why the Parasmaipada form is not acceptable, namely because the Ātmanepada form of the optative (i.e. *niyuñjīta*) is recommended by grammatical tradition and not by the Parasmaipada form *niyuñjyāt*. He thus quotes a passage we find in the *Mahābhāṣya* regarding A 1.3.64,²⁸⁶ which was not classified as a *vārttika* in Kielhorn's edition, even though it is very similar to one (M 1.290 ll. 8-9 *ad* A 1.3.64).

On the other hand, we probably cannot guess who or what exactly the mentioned *kātyāḥ* was. In line with Jha (1999: VI, 22) we have interpreted this plural form as the name of texts composed by Kātya in the sense of Kātya's descendant, i.e. Kātyāyana. If this interpretation were correct, Medhātithi's passage could constitute a piece of evidence in favour of singling out these two short passages in the *Mahābhāṣya* as two *vārttikas* that escaped Kielhorn's notice.

All in all, the doubt arises that in addition to the grammatical reason, a deliberate choice is made to avoid emphasising any sort of imperious attitude on the part of the king but rather to stress his need to avail himself of the expertise of an educated Brāhmaṇa to carry out the important task that had arisen.

152. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.23 [TE] (A*, M)

dharmāsanam adhiṣṭhāya saṃvītāṅgaḥ samāhitaḥ |
pranāmya lokapālebhyaḥ *kāryadarśanam ārabhet || 8.23 ||*

After ascending the *dharma* seat with his limbs covered and [his mind] concentrated, he should initiate the lawsuit after bowing down before (i.e. 'paying homage to') the world guardians.

[...] *lokapālebhya iti caturthī saṃpradāne | katham | kriyāgrahaṇam saṃpradānasūtre* (see A 1.4.32) *coditam śrāddhāya nigrhṇate patye śete* (M 1.330 ll. 18-19 *ad* A 1.4.32) *ityādyartham | na ca kriyāgrahaṇam grhṇātyādiviṣayam eva bhāṣye 'nuktatvāt ||*

²⁸⁶ A 1.3.64: *propābhyām yujer ayajñapātreṣu [ātmanepadam 12]* "[The Ātmanepada endings occur] after the verbal base *yuj-* ('to yoke') after [the preverbs] *pra-* and *upa-* provided that it does not co-occur with words meaning 'sacrificial vessels.'

The dative ending of *lokapālebhyaḥ* ('to the world guardians') [must be interpreted] in the sense of the recipient. How? As regards the *sūtra* that teaches the meaning of 'recipient', the [additional] mention of the action [beyond the patient of the action] (*kriyāgrahaṇa*) has also been enjoined (see A 1.4.32) [such as in the case of] *śrāddhāya nigrhṇate* ('he restrains himself for the benefit of the *śrāddhā* ceremony') and *patye śete* ('she lies down for the benefit of her husband') (see M 1.330 ll. 18-19 *ad* A 1.4.32): this or the like is the meaning. And the [additional] mention of the action [beyond the patient of the action] does not only have *grhṇāti* ('he takes') and the like as its domain (i.e. the domain of the relevant Pāṇini's rule), because [no restriction] has been revealed in the commentary.

Rule and passage cited or referred to:

- A 1.4.32: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.56.
- M 1.330 ll. 18-19 *ad* A 1.4.32: *kriyāgrahaṇam kartavyam | ihāpi yathā syāt | śrāddhāya nigrhṇate | yuddhāya saṁnahyate | patye śete |*
The [additional] mention of action (*kriyā*) [beyond the patient (*karman*) of the action] has also been enjoined [as what the agent directly targets on as the recipient of his action]. Here too, it could be applied [as in the following examples]: *śrāddhāya nigrhṇate* ('he restrains himself for the benefit of the *śrāddhā* ceremony'), *yuddhāya saṁnahyate* ('he arms himself for the sake of the war'), *patye śete* ('she lies down for the benefit of her husband').

Comment:

Medhātithi reflects on the dative form *lokapālebhyaḥ* which accompanies the gerund form of the verbal base *praṇam-* ('to bow down') as the recipient, i.e. the direct beneficiary of the action of paying homage, without any intermediary role played by the patient (*karman*) of the action (according to A 1.4.32). This is elucidated with some examples in the quoted passage from the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.330 ll. 18-19 *ad* A 1.4.32). Again, the formula *kriyāgrahaṇam kartavyam* suggests that it deals with a *vārttika*, but Kielhorn did not single out this sentence as such. Nonetheless, this additional teaching is rejected by Patañjali in the lines following those quoted here, where he manages to achieve the desired extension without modifying the text of the rule but simply by framing the action itself as a form of artificial *karman* (*kṛtrima*).

153. Medh ad MDh^M 8.30 [TL] (M*)

pranaṣṭasvāmikaṃ rikthaṃ rājā tryabdaṃ nidhāpayet |
arvāk tryabdā dharet svāmī pareṇa nṛpatir haret || 8.30 ||

The king should cause a property whose owner has disappeared to be preserved for a period of three years. By the end of the three years, the owner could maintain [ownership]; beyond that, the king could take it over.

[...] *trivarṣavat tryabde nībabhāvaḥ* (see M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* A 2.4.30) | *abdaśabdaḥ saṃvatsaraparyāyaḥ* [...]

In the case of *tryabda-* ('three years'), there is the absence of the feminine affix *ŌP* as in the case of *trivarṣa-* ('a group of three years') (see M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* A 2.4.30); the word-form *abda-* ('year') is a synonym for *saṃvatsara-* ('id.').

Passage referred to:

- M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.4.30: *akārāntottarapado dviguḥ striyām bhāṣyate iti | pañcapūlī | daśapūlī |*
 A *dvigu* compound whose latter constituent ends with the vowel *a* is used in the feminine gender [as in the examples] *pañcapūlī-* ('a group of five bunches') [and] *daśapūlī-* ('a group of ten bunches')."

Comment:

Medhātithi explains the *dvigu* compound *tryabda-* ('three years'), inflected as a singular neuter form according to Pāṇini's explanation (see A 2.4.17).²⁸⁷ Nonetheless, Patañjali, who, in our view, is directly referred to in this commentarial section, teaches the use of the feminine affix *ŌP* at the end of a *dvigu*. In fact, Medhātithi recalls a passage from the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* A 2.4.30), later taken up in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 2.4.17),²⁸⁸ which closely resembles a *vārttika*, but is not classified as such in Kielhorn's edition, where the use of the feminine gender is taught for the *dvandva* compound nominal stems ending in short vowel *-a*.

²⁸⁷ A 2.4.17: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.90.

²⁸⁸ KV *ad* A 2.4.17: *akārāntottarapado dviguḥ striyām bhāṣyate | pañcapūlī | daśapūlī* "A *dvigu* compound whose final constituent ends with the vowel *a* is used in the feminine gender [as in the examples] *pañcapūlī-* ('a group of five bunches') [and] *daśapūlī-* ('a group of ten bunches')."

154. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.40 [TL] (A, A*)

dātavyam sarvavarṇebhyo rājñā caurair hṛtam dhanam |
rājā tad upayuñjānaś caurasyāpnoti kilbiṣam || 8.40 ||

Wealth taken away by thieves should be returned by the king to the members of all classes; the king who appropriates it accrues the guilt of the thief.

[...] *caurāhṛtam* ity anyasmin pāṭhe *caurair āhṛtam*²⁸⁹ iti vigrhya sādhanam kṛtā (see A 2.1.32) iti samāsaḥ | pāṭhāntare *caurahṛtam* iti *trītyā* (A 2.1.30) iti yogavibhāgāt pūrvavad vā samāsaḥ | ayam tv atrārtho yac *caurair hṛtam* aśakyapratyāyananam tad rājñā svakośād dātavyam | [...]

In another reading, i.e. *caurāhṛtam*, if analysed as ‘taken away by the thieves’ (*caurair āhṛtam*), the compound [should be] formed [by combining] a *sādhana* (i.e. an instrument or an agent) [with the *kṛt* derivative noun *caura-*] (see A 2.1.32). In another [further] reading, i.e. *caurahṛtam*, the compound should be formed according to a previous rule due to the splitting of the rule A 2.1.30 [by considering] *trītyā* [as taken apart]. However, this is the meaning here, namely ‘taken by the thieves’ (*caurair hṛtam*): if it is not possible to recover it (i.e. what has been stolen), the latter should be given by the king from his treasure.”

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 2.1.30: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19.
- A 2.1.32: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi lists and comments on the variant readings of the phrase *caurair hṛtam* (‘taken by the thieves’). The first variant reading cited is the compound *caurāhṛtam* (declined in the nominative neuter singular), analysed as a *tatpuruṣa* compound formed by rule A 2.1.32 that teaches to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound by combining a nominal *pada* denoting an agent or an instrument (here *caurair*) with a *kṛt* derivative stem (here *āhṛtam*). The second variant reading cited is the compound *caurahṛtam* (declined in the nominative neuter singular), again analysed as a *tatpuruṣa* compound, which is supposed to be formed

²⁸⁹ Mandlik features the variant reading *caurebhya āhṛtam*, while Gharpure presents the variant reading *caurair samāhṛtam*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle have the variant reading *caurair āhṛtam*, which is the most correct from both a Pāṇinian (as it aligns with A 2.1.32) and a textual perspective (as it serves as a better *vigraha* for the discussed variant *caurāhṛtam*).

according to rule A 2.1.30 read by means of a *yogavibhāga*, i.e. by taking *tr̥tīyā* apart from the rest of the rule. Therefore, this compound is formed by combining a nominal stem inflected in the instrumental case (here *cauraiḥ*) with another *pada* (here *hṛtam*).

155. Medh ad MDh^M 8.41 [TE/TL] (A², A*²)

*[jātijānapadān] dharmān śreṇīdharmāmś ca dharmavit |
samīkṣya kuladharmāmś ca svadharmam pratipādayet || 8.41 ||*
[The king] who knows the *dharma* should impart the individual
dharma [just] after examining the *dharma*s of castes and inhabited
countries, the *dharma*s of guilds and the *dharma*s of families.

kurukāpiśakāśmīrādideśo niyatāvadhir janapadam | tatra bhavā (see A 4.3.53)
dharmā jānapadāḥ | kecit²⁹⁰ tatra bhavanti ye taddeśavyapadeśair anuṣṭhīyante |
atha vā tannivāsino janā²⁹¹ mañcāḥ krośantītivad²⁹² janapadaśabdenābhīdhīyante
| teṣām anuṣṭheyā jānapadāḥ | tasyedam (A 4.3.120) *iti taddhitaḥ | jāter jānapadā*
jātijānapadā iti ṣaṣṭhīsamāsaḥ (see A 2.2.8) | [...]

A *janapada* is a place such as Kuru, Kāpiśa, Kāśmīra and the like whose boundaries are well settled. [The *taddhita* derivative stem] *jānapada-* (declined in the plural) [denotes] laws ‘being in the place X’ (see A 4.3.53). Some [laws], which are observed by the inhabitants of that place, are [intended as] ‘obtained there.’ Or rather, the people inhabiting that [place] are denoted by the word-form *janapada-* as when it is said that the stands (i.e. people who are sitting in the stands) are crying (*mañcāḥ krośanti*). [Those among] their [laws] which have to be observed [are called] ‘belonging to the inhabited countries’ (*jānapadāḥ*). [This word-form] is a *taddhita* derivative stem formed according to *tasyedam* (A 4.3.120). [The compound] *jātijānapada-* (declined in the plural) is a compound whose *upasarjana* is inflected in the genitive case (see A 2.2.8) with ‘laws belonging to the countries pertaining to all the castes’ (*jāter jānapadāḥ*).

vr̥ddhāc chaḥ (A 4.2.114) *iti taddhite prasakte chāndasatvād aṇ eva kṛtaḥ* | [...]

²⁹⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *kim ca*. Jha, Dave, and Olivelle present the variant reading *kecit*. This appears to be the reading in manuscript S, as noted by Jha (1924: I, 275).

²⁹¹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *janās tāvat*. Jha, Dave, and Olivelle omit *tāvat*.

²⁹² Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *krośantīty atra*. Jha, Dave, and Olivelle present the variant reading *krośantītivat*.

[The word-form *jānapadāḥ*] is only formed by means of [the *taddhita* affix] *aN* due to its being *chandas*, while there should be an automatic involvement²⁹³ of the *taddhita* affix *cha* according to *vṛddhāc chaḥ* (A 4.2.114).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 2.2.8: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19.
- A 4.2.114: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.10.
- A 4.3.53: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.
- A 4.3.120: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.34.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the compound *jātijānapada-*, which is analysed as a *ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣa* (thus, by indirectly resorting to rule A 2.2.8), whose *vigraha* is ‘laws belonging to the inhabited countries pertaining to all the castes’ (*jāter jānapadāḥ*). More specifically, the commentator details the right-hand constituent of the compound, i.e. *jānapada-*, as a *taddhita* derivative stem formed according to A 4.3.120, i.e. to denote ‘belonging to X’ (the *taddhita* affixes provided by this rule are those taught from A 4.1.83 onwards). However, we think that while explaining what a *janapada* is, Medhātithi first seems to refer to the meaning ‘being in the place X’ (*tatra bhavaḥ*) of A 4.3.53. Later in the comment, he explains that the affix used is *aN* (introduced by A 4.1.83), even though the *taddhita* affix *cha* (= *-īya*) is expected (taught for the nominal stems including a *vṛddhi* syllable as its first syllable) in accordance with A 4.2.114. Such an exception relies on the fact that this form is requested *metri causa* (indicated as a *chāndasatva*).

156. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.46 [E] (A⁴)

sadbhir ācaritaṃ yat syād dhārmikais ca dvijātibhiḥ |
tad deśakulajātīnām aviruddhaṃ prakalpayet || 8.46 ||

[The king] should establish [the behaviour] that would be observed by wise men and righteous twice-borns, if it is not incompatible with that of the regions, families, and castes.

²⁹³ As for this interpretation of the past participle *prasakta-* as part of the terminological constellation surrounding the crucial term *prasaṅga*, see Pontillo (2008) and Freschi and Pontillo (2013).

[...] *anyas tv āha | deśāntare dhārmikāḥ sadbhir dvijair yad aviruddham*²⁹⁴
śrutyā smṛtyantareṇa vācaryate tad deśāntare 'pi rājā prakalpayet |
yathodvṛṣabhayajñādayodīcyesu prasiddhās te prācyair dākṣiṇātyaiḥ prācīyais
cānuṣṭheyāḥ | kutaḥ | ācārād dhi smṛtir anumātavyā smṛteḥ śrutiḥ | sā ca yady
evam anumīyata udīcyair etat kartavyam iti tatra taddhitasya bahuṣv artheṣu
smaraṇāt tatra jātaḥ (A 4.3.25) *tatra bhavaḥ* (A 4.3.53) *tata āgataḥ* (A 4.3.74)
tam abhiprasthitaḥ śeṣe (A 4.2.92) *iti caitasya lakṣaṇavikārobhayaṛūpatvād*²⁹⁵
*anyeṣv apy artheṣu pratipadam anupāteṣu*²⁹⁶ *taddhitasmarāṇān nāsty udīcyo*
nāma ya udīcyāśabdena nivartyeta | [...]

But another [author] maintains: the king should ratify what is acknowledged as a practice of virtuous men and righteous twice-born individuals in another country if it does not conflict with those acknowledged by the *śruti* and the *smṛti*. For instance, the Udvṛṣabha-sacrifice and the like, which are well-established among the people from the northern country, should also be performed by those from the eastern, southern, and western countries. Why? Indeed, the *smṛti* has to be inferred based on custom, the *śruti* from the *smṛti*. When it is said ‘It has to be made by people from the northern country’, the *taddhita* [affix] is recorded as endowed with many meanings, i.e. ‘born in the place X’ (A 4.3.25), ‘being in the place X’ (A 4.3.53), ‘arrived from the place X’ (A 4.3.74), ‘with the meanings not taught in the previous rules’ (A 4.2.92) because the *taddhita* [affix] is also recorded as conveying other meanings falling within one or other of the ‘distinctive feature’ or ‘modification’ categories. And, if this (i.e. the *śruti*) is inferred in this way, there is no one who is named as ‘northern’ who could be excluded by means of the word-form *udīcyā*-.

Rules cited:

- A 4.2.92: *śeṣe* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
 [A *taddhita* affix (hence taught) occurs after a nominal stem] in a residual meaning.
- A 4.3.25: *tatra jātaḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *aṅ* 4.1.83]
 [The *taddhita* affix *aṅ* occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘born in the place X.’

²⁹⁴ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *yadi viruddham*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *yad aviruddham*.

²⁹⁵ In his edition, Olivelle notes that the *Dharmakośa* (1.77 and 5.118) includes the variant reading *lakṣaṇādhikārobhaya*-.

²⁹⁶ In his edition, Olivelle notes that the *Dharmakośa* (5.118; but not 1.77) includes the variant reading *anupātteṣu*.

- A 4.3.53: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.
- A 4.3.74: *tata āgataḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 1 *taddhitāḥ* 76]
[The *taddhita* affixes introduced after A 4.1.83 occur after a nominal stem] to denote ‘arrived from the place X.’

Comment:

In the debate about the extension and sources of custom (*ācāra*), Medhātithi cites the position of an author maintaining the possibility of extending a good practice from one place to another or better from the inhabitants of a given country to another. This opinion is based on the fact that when, for instance, a practice is enjoined for the *udīcyas*, i.e. people coming from the northern country, the *taddhita* affix involved may convey more than one meaning so that the denotation of this ethnonym is anything but determinate. This is the reason why four *taddhita* rules (i.e. A 4.2.92, 4.3.25, 4.3.53 and 4.3.74) are simply listed here as an exemplification of this assumption: indeed, the derivative stem *udīcyā-* could be formed according to A 4.3.25 to denote ‘born in the North’, to A 4.3.53 to denote ‘being in the North’, and to A 4.3.74 to mean ‘arrived from the North.’ This is possible because these three rules are included under the domain of the *śeṣe* rule A 4.2.92.

157. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.48 [TE] (A, A*)

yair yair upāyair arthaṃ svaṃ prāpnuyād *uttamarṇikāḥ* |

tais tair upāyaiḥ saṃgrhya dāpayed adhamarṇikam || 8.48 ||

After capturing him, [the king] should oblige the debtor to pay with all the means through which the creditor might (re-)obtain his own wealth.

[...] *uttamarṇa eva uttamarnikāḥ* | *uttamaṃ ca tad rṇaṃ cottamarṇam* | *tad asyāstīty* (see A 5.2.94) *uttamarṇikāḥ* | ***ata iniṭhanau*** (A 5.2.115) *iti rūpam* | [...] [The *taddhita* derivative stem] *uttamarṇika-* corresponds to [the *bahuvrīhi* compound] *uttamarṇa-* (lit. ‘the one whose asset is an [unpaid] debt, i.e. the creditor’). [The *karmadhāraya* compound] *uttamarṇa-* (which is the etymon of both the masculine *uttamarṇaḥ* and the *taddhita* derivative stem *uttamarṇika-*) [must be analysed as] ‘what is an asset (*uttama*) and also a debt (*rṇa*).’ [The *taddhita* derivative stem] *uttamarṇika-* [is denoted as] ‘X belongs to Y’ (see A 5.2.94). This form is in accordance with *ata iniṭhanau* (A 5.2.115).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 5.2.94: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.108.
- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi explains the *taddhita* derivative stem *uttamarṇika-* (‘creditor’), which is formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN* taught by A 5.2.115 in the sense of ‘X belongs to Y’ to the neuter nominal stem *uttamarṇa-*. The latter etymon is analysed as a *karmadhāraya* compound meaning ‘what is an asset and also a debt’ (following A 2.1.49).²⁹⁷ This is also the etymon of the *bahuvrīhi* compound *uttamarṇa-* (lit. ‘the one whose asset is an [unpaid] debt, i.e. the creditor’), which, at the beginning of this excerpt, is said to be equivalent to the *taddhita* derivative stem *uttamarṇika-*.

158. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.57 [TE/TL] (A, A*)

*[jñātāraḥ] santi meṭy uktvā diśety ukto diśen na yaḥ |
dharmasthaḥ kāraṇair etair hīnaṃ tam iti nirdiśet || 8.57 ||*

If one (i.e. the plaintiff) says “There are people who know me”, but when he is asked to indicate them, and he does not indicate [them], the judge should declare him as the losing party for these well-known reasons.

[...] *jñātāra* iti *trṇnantam* eva (see A 3.2.135) | *tatredam* iti *dviṭyāntaṃ* yujyate *khalarthatṛnām* (A 2.3.69) iti *śaṣṭhī* nīśedhāt | [...]

[The word-form] *jñātṛ-* (lit. ‘knower’) precisely ends with [the *kṛt* affix] *ṭṛN* (see A 3.2.135). In this case, the latter is combined with a noun ending with the accusative case ending due to the prohibition of the genitive case ending according to *khalarthatṛnām* (A 2.3.69).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 2.3.69: *na lokāvyayaniṣṭhākhalarthatṛnām [śaṣṭhī 50 kartṛkarmanoh kṛti 65]*

²⁹⁷ A 2.1.49: *pūrvakālaikasarvajaratpurāṇanavakevalāḥ samānādhikaraṇena [sup 2 samāsaḥ 3 saha supā 4 tatpuruṣaḥ 22]* “[An inflected noun denoting] something which precedes in time or [the nominal stems] *eka-* (‘one’), *sarva-* (‘all’), *jarat-* (‘old’), *purāṇa-* (‘ancient’), *nava-* (‘new’) and *kevala-* (‘alone’) combines with [an inflected noun] which is co-referential (lit. ‘which shares the same substratum’) [to form a *tatpuruṣa karmadhāraya* compound].”

[A genitive case ending] does not occur [to denote an agent or a patient when the *kṛt* affix] is a substitute of the *lakāras* (i.e. *LAṬ*, *LAṆ*, etc.) or [the affix] *u*, or [the affix] *uka(Ṇ)*, an indeclinable, a *niṣṭhā* [affix] (i.e. *Kṭa* and *KṭavatU*: see A 1.1.26),²⁹⁸ [an affix] denoting the sense of *KhaL*, or [the *kṛt* affix] *ṭṛN*.

- A 3.2.135: *ṭṛn* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *vartamāne* 123 *tacchīlataddharmatatsādhukāriṣu* 134]
[The *kṛt* affix] *ṭṛN* occurs [after a verbal base to denote the agent's habit, duty, or excellence].

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi explains the *kṛt* derivative stem *jñāṭṛ-*, which is formed by applying the *kṛt* affix *ṭṛN* to the verbal base *jñā-* ('to know') according to A 3.2.135, teaching to form *kṛt* derivative stems denoting the agent's habit, duty, or excellence by means of the affix *ṭṛN*. Then, he focuses on the use of the accusative case ending instead of the genitive case ending, since the latter in this context is forbidden by A 2.3.69. The latter rule teaches not to use the genitive when, among the other affixes, the *kṛt* affix *ṭṛN* occurs.

159. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.62 [TE] (A*², Vt*)

grhiṇaḥ putriṇo *maulāḥ* *kṣatraviṣṭūdrayonayāḥ* |
arthyuktāḥ sākṣyam arhanti na ye kecid anāpadi || 8.62 ||

Householders, men having sons, natives, those born from Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras—[these], if called by the plaintiff, are entitled to give testimony and not everybody, except in the case of an emergency.

[...] *evaṃ maulā api vyākhyeyāḥ* | *maulā jānapadās taddeśābhijanāḥ* | *te hi svajanajñātimadhye pāpabhīrutayā na mithyā vadanti* | *mūlaṃ pratiṣṭhā sā yeṣāṃ asti te maulāḥ* (see A 5.2.103; M 2.397 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 5.2.103) | *arthakathanam etat* | *taddhitas tu bhavārtha*²⁹⁹ (see A 4.3.53) *eva kartavyaḥ* | *yo hi yatra bhavaḥ*³⁰⁰ *so 'pi tasyāstity aviruddham* | [...]

²⁹⁸ A 1.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.1.

²⁹⁹ Mandlik, Gharpure and Olivelle feature the variant reading *bhavārthaḥ*. Jha and Dave present the variant reading *bhāvārthaḥ*. This is recorded in a note by Jha (1924: I, 282): "for *bhāvartha* read *bhavārtha* as in P.O."

³⁰⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *bhāvaḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *bhavaḥ*.

[The word-form] *maula-* also has to be explained in this way. *maulas* are the inhabitants of this country, the noble descendants of this place. Indeed, they do not speak falsehood due to their fear of committing a sin among their own people and relatives. [The etymon] *mūla-* (lit. ‘root’) means “point of support.” [The word-form] *maula-* (declined in the nominative masculine plural) [denotes] those to which it (i.e. the point of support) belongs (see A 5.2.103; M 2.397 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 5.2.103). This is the explanation of the meaning. However, a *taddhita* affix in the meaning of ‘obtaining in which place’ (see A 4.3.53) has to be applied. Indeed, one also lives where he was born: there is no contradiction in this.

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 4.3.53: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.
- A 5.2.103: *aṆ ca* [*prātipadikāt* 1 *taddhitāḥ* 76 *tad asyāsty asmin* 94 *tapassahasrābhyām* 102]
[The *taddhita* affix] *aṆ* also occurs [after the nominal stems *tapas-* (‘religious austerity’) and *sahasra-* (‘thousand’) to denote ‘X belongs to Y’ and ‘X exists in Y’].
- M 2.397 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 5.2.103: *anprakaraṇe jyotsnādibhya upasaṃkhyānam*
In the context of the application of the [*taddhita*] affix *aṆ*, an additional teaching should be made as for after the nominal stem *jyotsnā-* (‘moonlight night’) and the like.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi focuses on the *taddhita* derivative stem *maula-*: at first, he explains that the output meaning is ‘native’, i.e. one of the two taught for the affix *matUP* in A 5.2.94: *tad asya* (‘belonging to X’). The latter meaning is extended to the *taddhita* affix *aṆ* by rule A 5.2.103, read with the help of the relevant Vt. 2 *ad* A 5.2.103 (M 2.397 l. 1), so that this affix is applied to nominal stems other than those taught in A 5.2.103, i.e. *tapas-* (‘religious austerity’) and *sahasra-* (‘thousand’). Then, the scholar analyses the nominal stem at stake based on the *taddhita* affix *aṆ* in the sense taught by rule A 4.3.53, applied to the nominal stem *mūla-* (‘root’) which is considered as meaning ‘point of support.’ We remark that the same mechanism of extension provided by Vt. 2 *ad* A 5.2.103 is depicted in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* passage on the relevant rule (see KV *ad* A 5.2.103).³⁰¹

³⁰¹ KV *ad* A 5.2.103: *yogavibhāga uttarārtho yathāsaṃkhyārthas ca | anprakaraṇe jyotsnādibhya upasaṃkhyānam* “The splitting of the rule is targeted on the latter [word]

160. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.77 [TL] (A, GS)

eko lubdhas tv asākṣī syād bahvyaḥ śucyo 'pi na striyaḥ |
strībuddher asthiratvāt tu doṣaiś cānye 'pi ye vṛtāḥ || 8.77 ||

A single covetous man should not be a witness, nor women, even though they are many and virtuous, due to the instability of a woman's mind, nor other men who are affected by faults.

[...] *śucya itīkāro durlabho voto guṇavacanāt* (A 4.1.44) *iti vidhānāt |*
*kṛdikārāt*³⁰² (*bahvādi* list, GS 3 in KV *ad* A 4.1.45) *iti kecit samarthayante ||*

Regarding [the word-form *śuci-* declined in the feminine nominative plural, namely] *śucyaḥ*, the sound *ī* (i.e. the feminine ending) cannot be obtained according to *voto guṇavacanāt* (A 4.1.44). [Nonetheless], some people suppose that [it can be obtained] according to the *kṛdikārāt* (*bahvādi* list, GS 3 in KV *ad* A 4.1.45).

Rule and passage cited:

- A 4.1.44: *voto guṇavacanāt* [*pratipādikāt* 1 *striyām* 3 *nīṣ* 40]
 [The feminine affix *Ṇīṣ* preferably occurs after a nominal stem] ending with the short vowel *u* and denoting a quality.
- *bahvādi* list, GS 3 (in KV *ad* A 4.1.45): see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46.

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi comments on the unexpected feminine form *śucyaḥ* instead of *śucayaḥ* (i.e. a nominative plural from the nominal stem *śuci-* 'pure') by resorting to a third *sūtra* included on the *bahvādi* list (also recorded by KV *ad* A 4.1.45), which teaches to apply the feminine affix *Ṇīṣ* to a *kṛt* nominal stem ending in the short vowel *i* excluding the affix *KtiN* (taught by A 3.3.94).³⁰³

161. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 [TE/TL] (A², A^{*3}, Vt^{*}, KV^{*})

sabhāntaḥ sāksīṇaḥ prāptān arthipratyarthisaṃnidhau |

and the meaning occurring according to the order of enumeration. In the context of applying the affix *aṆ*, an additional teaching should be carried out as happens after the nominal stem *jyotsnā-* ('moonlight night') and the like (see M 2.397 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 5.2.103)."

³⁰² Gharpure features the variant reading *kṛdekārāt*, which is an imperfect citation of GS 3 (KV *ad* A 4.1.45). The other editions present the variant reading *kṛdikārāt*, which corresponds to the exact citation of GS 3.

³⁰³ A 3.3.94: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46.

prāḍvivāko 'nuyuñjīta vidhinānena sāntvayan || 8.79 ||

The examining judge should question the witnesses who entered the court in the presence of the plaintiff and defendant, conciliating [them] in this manner.

sabhāyām antaḥ sabhāntaḥ | *śauṇḍāditvāt samāsaḥ* (see A 2.1.40) | [...]

[The word-form] *sabhāntar* [must be analysed as] 'within (*antar*) the court (*sabhāyām*)': due to its being part of the list beginning with *śauṇḍa-* ('fond of spirituous liquor'), [this] compound [is formed according to A 2.1.40].

pr̥cchatīti prāṭ kvib (see A 3.2.178) *vacipracchīśridrūsruprūvām dīrgho* 'samprasāraṇam ca' (see M 2.136 l. 4 Vt. 2 ad A 3.2.178; KV ad A 3.2.178) *iti prāṭ* | *viśeṣeṇa dharmasamkateṣu vivaktīti vivākaḥ* | *kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam* (A 3.3.113) *iti* | *kartari ghañ* (cf. A 3.3.19) | *cajoḥ ku ghinnyatoḥ* (A 7.3.52) *iti kutvam* | *prāṭ cāsau vivākaś ca prāḍvivākaḥ* ||

[The word-form] *prāś-* [means] 'he interrogates': *prāś-* [is formed by applying the *kṛt* affix *KviP* (see A 3.2.178), [by applying] the replacement [of the vowel in the verbal base] with a long vowel and the *samprasāraṇa* replacement of *vac-* ('to speak'), *prach-* ('to ask'), *śri-* ('to cause to lie on'), *dru-* ('to run'), *śru-* ('to hear'), *pru-* ('to spring up') (see M 2.136 l. 4 Vt. 2 ad A 3.2.178; KV ad A 3.2.178). Especially in difficult situations for the *dharma*, [the word-form] *vivāka-* [denotes] 'one who pronounces [judgements] (*vivakti*)' [and is formed] according to *kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam* (A 3.3.113). [The *kṛt* affix] *GHañ* occurs in the sense of an agent (cf. A 3.3.19). There is a substitution [of the palatal stop] with [the velar stop] *k* according to *cajoḥ ku ghinnyatoḥ* (A 7.3.52). And the one who is *prāś-* as well as a *vivāka-* is called *prāḍvivāka-* (analysed as a *karmadhāraya* compound, lit. 'one who interrogates' and 'one who pronounces judgements', i.e. 'chief-judge').

Rules and passages cited or referred to:

- A 2.1.40: *saptamī śaundaiḥ* [*samāsaḥ* 3 *saha supā* 4 *vibhāṣā* 11 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 22]
A noun inflected in the locative case ending [marginally] combines with [an inflected noun of] the list beginning with *śauṇḍa-* ('fond of spirituous liquor') [to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound].
- A 3.2.178: *anyebhyo 'pi drśyate* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *tacchīlataddharmatatsādhukāriṣu* 134 *kvip* 177]

[The *kṛt* affix *KviP*] is also seen [after] other [verbal bases to denote the agent's habit, duty and excellence].

- A 3.3.19: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6.
- A 3.3.113: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1.
- A 7.3.52: *cajoḥ ku ghinnyatoḥ* [*aṅgasya* A 6.4.1]

[The velar stop] *k* occurs in place of the final [palatal stops] *c* and *j* [of a pre-suffixal base], except when it is followed by an affix with the *GH* marker or by the affix *ṆyaT*.

- M 2.136 1. 4 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.178: *vacipracchyāyatastukaṭaprujuśrīṇām dīrghaś ca*

A replacement [of the vowel in the verbal base] with a long vowel of *vac-* ('to speak'), *prach-* ('to ask'), *āyatastu-* ('praising at length'), *kaṭapru-* ('moving on the mat', i.e. 'worm'), *ju-* ('to be quick'), *śri-* ('to cause to lie on') occurs.

- KV *ad* A 3.2.178: *tathā cāha | kvib vacipracchyāyatastukaṭaprujuśrīṇām dīrgho 'saṃprasāraṇam ca | vaci vāk prācchi śabdaprāṭ | āyatastūḥ | kaṭaprūḥ | jūḥ | śrīḥ |*

And he (= Kātyāyana) also said: [the affix] *KviP*, replacement [of the vowel in the verbal base] with a long vowel and the *saṃprasāraṇa* replacement of *vac-* ('to speak'), *prach-* ('to ask'), *āyatastu-* ('praising at length'), *kaṭapru-* ('moving on the mat'), *ju-* ('to be quick'), *śri-* ('to lay on') [are taught]. In the case of [the verbal base] *vac-*, [the *kṛt* derivative stem] *vāk-* ('language') [is formed]; in the case of [the verbal base] *prach-*, [the *kṛt* derivative stem] *śabdaprāś-* ('asking to speak') [is formed]; [in the case of the verbal base *stu-*], [the *kṛt* derivative stem] *āyatastu* ('praising at length') [is formed]; [in the case of the verbal base *pru-*], [the *kṛt* derivative stem] *kaṭaprū-* ('moving on the mat', i.e. 'worm') [is formed]; [in the case of the verbal base *ju-*], [the *kṛt* derivative stem] *jū-* ('quick') [is formed]; [in the case of the verbal base *śri-*], [the *kṛt* derivative stem] *śrī-* ('splendour') [is formed].

Comment:

In the first excerpt, Medhātithi explains the composition of *sabhāntar* ('within the court') as a *saptamītatpuruṣa* formed in accordance with A 2.1.40. By citing this rule, he relies on the *śaundādī* list, even though the latter does not include the indeclinable *antar-* ('within'), but rather the synonymical nominal stem *antara-* ('interior').

Instead, a part of the second excerpt is a little puzzling. Let us start with the more comprehensible parts of this explanation. Medhātithi is focussing here on the compound *prāḍvivāka-*, which generally denotes a ‘chief-judge’ in the Dharmaśāstra texts.³⁰⁴ Before analysing the compound per se (as a *karmadhāraya*), he analyses the two members. The first member, i.e. *prāś-* (lit. ‘the one who asks for’, i.e. ‘interrogator’), is said to be derived from the verbal base *prach-* (‘to ask’) by clearly referring to the *Kāśikāvṛtti* passage on A 3.2.178 (KV *ad* A 3.2.178), in which the affix *KviP*, the replacement of the verbal base vowel with a long vowel and the *saṃprasāraṇa* replacement of *prach-* (among other verbal bases) are taught.

We remark that the verbal bases do not perfectly match with those quoted by Medhātithi. Furthermore, the verbal bases mentioned in this *Kāśikāvṛtti* passage are the same as those included in Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.178 (M 2.136 l. 4), which, however, merely teaches the vowel replacement. More specifically, two of these verbal bases are combined with a nominal stem as a left-hand constituent, namely *āyatastu-* and *kaṭapru-* (self-evidently used to form two *upapadasamāsas*). The verbal base *ju-* (‘to press forwards’) is included in both the mentioned grammatical passages but not in Medhātithi’s and *vice versa* the verbal bases *dru-* (‘to run’) and *śru-* (‘to hear’) are quoted by Medhātithi but not in Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.178 and KV *ad* A 3.2.178. Nonetheless, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* passage is closer to Medhātithi’s text than the mentioned *vārttika*, because Kātyāyana mentions the affix *KviP* and the *saṃprasāraṇa* substitution in two different *vārttikas* on the relevant rule, namely Vt. 1 and Vt. 3 *ad* A 3.2.178 (M 2.135 l. 17; M 2.136 l. 14). In other words, Medhātithi’s sentence is quite different from those used by Kātyāyana to explain A 3.2.178, while it resembles the *Kāśikāvṛtti* passage including the affix *KviP* and the *saṃprasāraṇa* substitution together with the replacement of the vowel in the verbal base with its long counterpart.

As for the analysis of the nominal stem *vivāka-*, Medhātithi states that its etymon is the verbal base *vivac-*, after which the *kṛt* affix *GHaÑ* occurs. Its application seems to be in contrast with A 3.3.19 that teaches to apply this *kṛt* affix to denote a *kāraka* other than the agent in the case of a proper name (*saṃjñāyām*). In this regard, the direct quotation of A 3.3.113 is difficult to understand: this rule, in fact, teaches to apply the *kṛtya* affixes (cf. A 3.1.96ff.) and the *kṛt* affix *LyuT*—and not *GHaÑ*—under the *bahulam* condition. To solve this matter, we propose that the *karṣ* meaning conveyed by the *kṛt* affix *LyuT*, according to A 3.1.134,³⁰⁵ is extended to the *kṛt* affix *GHaÑ* precisely by means of *bahulam*. In this way,

³⁰⁴ See, in this regard, Olivelle (2016b).

³⁰⁵ A 3.1.134: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.115.

the semantic constraint *akartari* taught in the quoted A 3.3.19 is annulled, and the *kṛt* affix *GHañ* can occur after the verbal base *vivac-* in the sense of agent. On the other hand, the *saṃjñāyām* constraint of A 3.3.19 is overpassed by Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19 (M 2.146 l. 1),³⁰⁶ extending the application of *GHañ* to all possible contexts (as also confirmed by Patañjali's explanation and the *Kāśīkāvṛtti* comment on the relevant *vārttika*: see M 2.146 ll. 2-3 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19;³⁰⁷ KV *ad* A 3.3.19).³⁰⁸ Finally, Medhātithi also cites rule A 7.3.52 teaching the phonic replacement occurring in this case, i.e. the replacement of the palatal stop *c* with the velar stop *k* before an affix whose marker is *GH*, such as *GHañ*.

162. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.82 [TE] (A*)

sākṣye 'nṛtaṃ vadaṇ pāśair badhyate vāruṇair bhrśam |
vivaśaḥ śatam ājātīs tasmāt sākṣyaṃ vaded ṛtam || 8.82 ||

The one giving false testimony is steadily bound by [the fetters] of Varuṇa, powerless for one hundred births; therefore, one should speak the truth in a testimony.

[...] *ājātīr iti nāyaṃ maryādābhividhyor ān* (see A 2.1.13) | *tathā sati pañcamī syāt | tasmād upasargo 'yam anarthakaḥ pralambata*³⁰⁹ *itivat*³¹⁰ | [...]
[In the word-form] *ājātī-* ('births'), this [*ā-*] is not [the prefix] *āñ* denoting 'boundary' or 'inclusion' (see A 2.1.13). If it were such, there would be an ablative [ending]. Therefore, this is a meaningless particle such as in the case of *pralamba-* ('hanging down' = *lamba-* 'id.').

³⁰⁶ M 2.146 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6.

³⁰⁷ M 2.146 ll. 2-3 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19: *asaṃjñāyām api hi ghañ dṛśyate* "Indeed, [the *kṛt* affix] *GHañ* is also perceived in [a derivative stem] which is not a proper name."

³⁰⁸ KV *ad* A 3.3.19: *karṭṛvarjite kārake saṃjñāyām viṣaye dhātoḥ ghañ bhavati | prāsyanti taṃ prāsaḥ | prasīvyanti taṃ prasevaḥ | āharanti tasmād rasam iti āhāraḥ |* "[The *kṛt* affix] *GHañ* occurs after the verbal base to denote a *kāraka* other than the agent in the restricted sphere of proper names. [The examples are]: *prāsa-* ('missile') [in the sense of] 'they discharge it'; *praseva-* ('sack') [in the sense of] 'they sew it up'; *āhāra-* ('food') [in the sense of] 'they enjoy a taste of it.'

³⁰⁹ Gharpure and Olivelle feature the variant reading *pralambate*. Mandlik, Jha and Dave present the variant reading *pralambaḥ*, which we have decided to adopt.

³¹⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *iti yāvat*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *itivat*.

Rule referred to:

- A 2.1.13: *āñ maryādābhividhyor* [*samāsaḥ* 3 *saha supā* 4 *avyayībhāvaḥ* 5 *vibhāṣā* 11 *pañcamyā* 12]
[The prefix] *āñ* denoting ‘boundary’ or ‘inclusion’ [marginally combines with a noun inflected with the ablative ending to form an *avyayībhāva* compound].

Comment:

Here Medhātithi focuses on the prefix *ā-* of the compound *ājāti-* (‘birth’) and explains that it is not formed by means of the prefix *āñ* taught by A 2.1.13. This rule teaches to form an *avyayībhāva* compound with such a prefix meaning ‘boundary’ or ‘inclusion’ combined with a noun inflected in the ablative. However, this is not the case since Medhātithi considers *ā-* as a meaningless prefix.

163. Medh ad MDh^M 8.97 [TE] (A)

yāvato bāndhavān yasmin hanti sākṣye 'nṛtaṃ vadan |
tāvataḥ saṃkhyayā tasmin śṛṇu saumyānupūrvaśaḥ || 8.97 ||

Listen, my dear, by means of an orderly enumeration, how many are the relatives one kills in this [lawsuit] in which one makes false statements in the context of the testimony.

[...] *yasmin sākṣya iti vyadhikaraṇasaptamī | yasmin dravyabhedabhinne vyavahāre yat sākṣyaṃ tatra tannimittaṃ yad anṛtaṃ ity eṣā viśayasaptamī | aparā yasya ca bhāvena* (A 2.3.37) *iti | atha vā dravyabhedāt sākṣyabhedas tatra samānādhikaraṇa eva | [...]*

yasmin sākṣye: the locative case ending [of these two words] has a different referent. [The first locative form] *yasmin* [means] ‘in a legal dispute’ which is divided (into parts) due to the division of the substance [denoted]: this is a locative case ending conveying a domain, which is the witnesses’ evidence—that is said to be false—grounded there (i.e. in the legal dispute). The second [locative case ending] is according to *yasya ca bhāvena* (A 2.3.37). Or rather, the difference from the specific substance is the specific testimony: in this case, there is just co-referentiality.

Rule cited:

- A 2.3.37: *yasya ca bhāvena bhāvalakṣaṇam* [*saptamī* 36]

[A locative case ending] also occurs after a stem whose action is a feature of [another] action.

Comment:

Medhātithi explains that the double locative *yasmin* and *sākṣye* in this verse can either be coreferential or not. He concentrates on the hypothesis that proposes that the two locatives refer to two different things and thus convey a different syntactic meaning. In the latter case, *yasmin* should be designated as *viṣayasaptamī*, i.e. it should convey the domain, and *sākṣye* should be the so-called locative absolute construction, taught in A 2.3.37.

164. Medh ad MDh^M 8.98 [TE] (Vt*)

*pañca paśvanṛte hanti daśa hanti gavānṛte |
śatam aśvānṛte hanti sahasraṃ puruṣānṛte || 8.98 ||*

One kills five [generations] in the case of false [testimony] concerning livestock; one kills ten [generations] in the case of false [testimony] concerning cows; one kills one hundred [generations] in the case of false [testimony] concerning horses [and] one thousand [generations] in the case of false [testimony] concerning men.

paśunimittam anṛtam | śākapārthivavat samāsaḥ (see M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 ad A 2.1.69) | [...]

[The compound *paśvanṛta-* means] ‘falsehood grounded in livestock.’ [This is a] compound such as *śākapārthiva-* (‘king eating vegetables’).

Passage referred to:

- M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 ad A 2.1.69: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.146.

Comment:

Medhātithi here explains the compound *paśvanṛta-* as a ‘falsehood grounded in livestock.’ Therefore, this is analysed as a *karmadhāraya* formed by means of Vt. 8 ad A 2.1.69 (M 1.406), thus by inferring a zero-replacement of a supposed further constituent (i.e. the mechanism of *padalopa*), namely *nimitta-* (‘ground’).

165. Medh ad MDh^M 8.99 [TL] (A)

*hanti jātān ajātānś ca hiranyārthe 'nṛtaṃ vadan |
sarvaṃ bhūmyanṛte hanti mā sma bhūmyanṛtaṃ vadīḥ || 8.99 ||*

One destroys those who are born and those who are not born yet by making false statements for the sake of gold; one destroys all in the case of false statements concerning land: never make false statements concerning land.

[...] *mā vādīr bhūmisaṃbandhy asatyam | smottare laṇ ca* (A 3.3.176) *iti*³¹¹ | [...] ‘Never utter’ (*mā vādīh*) falsehood concerning land: [the substitutes of the *lakāra IUN* occur] according to *smottare laṇ ca* (A 3.3.176).

Rule cited:

- A 3.3.176: *smottare laṇ ca* [*māni luṇ* 175]
[The substitutes of the *lakāra IUN* (= aorist)] and *LAN* (= imperfect) occur
[in the co-occurrence of the particle *mā*] when [the particle] *sma* follows.

Comment:

Medhātithi explains the use of the prohibitive injunctive which here matches the imperfect tense form (without an augment) plus the particle *sma* with the negative particle *mā* (*mā sma* [...] *vādīh*) by resorting to A 3.3.176. The latter rule teaches to apply the substitutes of the *lakāra IUN* (= aorist), as well as those of *LAN* (= imperfect), when both the negative particle *mā* and the asseverative particle *sma* occur.

166. Medh ad MDh^M 8.107 [TE] (Vt*, M, M*)

tripakṣād *abruvan sākṣyam ṛnādiṣu naro ’gadaḥ |*

tad ṛṇam prāpnuyāt sarvaṃ daśabandhaṃ ca sarvataḥ || 8.107 ||

After exceeding three fortnights, a man free from disease who does not give testimony about debts and the like would be charged with the whole debt and one-tenth [part] of the total amount.

*pañcadaśhorātrāṇi pakṣaḥ | trayāṇāṃ pakṣāṇāṃ samāhāras tripakṣam | akārāntottarapado*³¹² *dviguḥ* (M 1.480 l. 6 ad Vt. 2 ad A 2.4.30) *iti strīṭve prāpte pātrādidarśanāt pratiṣedhaḥ* (see M 1.480 ad Vt. 3 ad A 2.4.30) | *yady evaṃ tripakṣīti*³¹³ *na prāpnoti | chāndasas tatra līṅgavyatyayaḥ | lyablope karmaṇi*

³¹¹ Mandlik, Jha and Dave omit the section *smottare* [...] *iti*.

³¹² Mandlik presents the variant reading *ākārānta*^o. The others feature the correct variant reading *ākārānta*^o.

³¹³ Mandlik omits *iti*, whereas the others do not.

pañcamī (see M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.28) | *trīṇ pakṣān yāvad atītya yaḥ sākṣyaṃ na dadāti*³¹⁴ | *agado 'pīḍitaśarīras tad ṛṇaṃ*³¹⁵ *prāpnuyād ity arthaḥ* [...]

A *pakṣa-* ('the half of a lunar month') consists of 15 days and nights. [The compound] *tripakṣa-* is a *samāhāra* [*dvigu*] compound denoting a group of three *pakṣas*. Even though the feminine gender is obtained according to [the teaching] *akārāntottarapado dviguḥ* (M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.4.30), there is a prohibition because of the perception (i.e. the use) of *pātra-* and the like (see M 1.480 *ad* Vt. 3 *ad* A 2.4.30). If it is so, the word-form *tripakṣī-* is not obtained. The change in gender here depends on the metrics. The ablative ending (*tripakṣāt*) is in the sense of patient with a zero-replacement of [the word ending with] the affix *LyaP* (see M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.28). The one who as long as he has exceeded three fortnights does not give testimony, even though he is healthy (*agada*), i.e. he is not distressed in his body, should take on that debt (i.e. he should bear that burden): this is the meaning.

Passages cited or referred to:

- M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.4.30: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.30.
- M 1.480 l. 12 *ad* Vt. 3 *ad* A 2.4.30: *pātrādibhyaḥ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ* | *dvipātram* | *pañcapātram* |
After [the nominal stem] *pātra-* and the like, a prohibition has to be taught. [as in the examples] *dvipātra-* ('a group of two cups') [and] *pañcapātra-* ('a group of five cups').
- M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.28: *pañcamīvidhāne lyablope karmaṇy upasaṃkhyānam*
When the ablative ending is taught it should be added that it is used in the sense of patient in the case of the zero-replacement of [the verbal form ending with the affix] *LyaP*.

Comment:

Medhātithi explains the use of the ablative ending in the *samāhāra* compound *tripakṣa-* both from a morphological and syntactic perspective. Since the etymon ends with the short vowel *a* and on the basis of Patañjali's commentary on Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.4.30 (M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.4.30), he assumes that the compound should be inflected as a feminine noun and shows that it is an exception included

³¹⁴ Mandlik presents the variant reading *yaṃ sākṣyaṃ na gadatīti*, while the others have the variant reading *yaḥ sākṣyaṃ na dadāti*.

³¹⁵ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *tatsadr̥śaṃ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *tad ṛṇaṃ*.

on the list beginning with *pātra*- ('leaf') mentioned in Patañjali's commentary on Vt. 3 *ad* A 2.4.30 (M 1.480 l. 12 *ad* Vt. 3 *ad* A 2.4.30). The two passages are also included in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* comment on A 2.4.17,³¹⁶ i.e. in the comment on the rule teaching the neuter form for *samāhāra* compounds, which is also the rule that leads Medhātithi to include such exceptions in his commentary. On the other hand, the ablative *tripakṣād* is interpreted in line with Vt. 1 on A 2.3.28 (M 1.455 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.28), exemplified by Patañjali and the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (see M 1.455 l. 5 *ad* Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.28 = KV *ad* A 2.3.28),³¹⁷ as if its *vigraha* were *trīṇ pakṣān atīya* ('after exceeding three fortnights'), with a zero-replacement of the gerund *atīya* (formed by means of the affix *LyaP* under A 7.1.37)³¹⁸ conveying the sense of the action of 'exceeding.'

167. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.110 [TE] (A*, Vt)

maharṣibhiś ca devaiś ca kāryārthaṃ śapathāḥ kṛtāḥ |
vasiṣṭhaś cāpi śapathaṃ śepe pajjavane nṛpe || 8.110 ||

Oaths have been sanctioned by great seers and deities for the sake of [settling] matters, and Vasiṣṭha also sanctioned an oath before King Paijavana.

[...] *vasiṣṭhaś ceti prthānnirdeśaḥ prādhānyakhyāpanārthaḥ | śapathaṃ kṛtavān ity arthaḥ | upapadād eva viśeṣāvagataḥ śapatiḥ karotyarthaṃ mātṛe vartate | yathā yajñam yajata iti svapoṣaṃ puṣṭa iti tathā śapathaṃ śepa iti jñeyam | śapa upalambhane*³¹⁹ (M 1.280 l. 19 Vt. 8 *ad* A 1.3.21) *iti liṭi* (see A 3.2.115) *prathamapurūṣātmanepadaikavacane śepa iti rūpam | [...]*

“And Vasiṣṭha”: there is a separate mention [for this episode] for making [its] significance known. “Having made an oath”: this is the meaning. Precisely due to the co-occurring word which has a specific meaning, the verbal base *śap-* (*śapati*) is used merely in the sense of ‘to make’ (*karoti*): just as [in expressions like] *yajñam yajate* (‘he performs —lit. sacrifices—a sacrifice’), *svapoṣaṃ puṣṭaḥ* (‘he prospers for his own prosperity’), so this should be recognised [in the expression] *śapathaṃ śepe* (‘he swears an oath—lit. a swearing’). [After applying the substitutes of the *lakāra*] *lIT* (= perfect; see A 3.2.115) in the first person singular

³¹⁶ A 2.4.17: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.90.

³¹⁷ M 1.455 l. 5 *ad* A 2.3.28 = KV *ad* A 2.3.28: *prāsādam āruhya prekṣate prasādāt prekṣate* “*prasādāt*, i.e. after sitting on the terrace, he looks around from the terrace.”

³¹⁸ A 7.1.37: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.4.

³¹⁹ Mandlik presents the variant reading *śepa upalebhe*. The other editions feature the variant reading *śapa upalambhane*.

(= English third person singular: he/she/it) in the Ātmanepada diathesis according to [the teaching] *śapa upalambhane* (M 1.280 l. 19 Vt. 8 *ad* A 1.3.21), the form *śepe* [is obtained].

Rule and passage cited or referred to:

- A 3.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.23.
- M 1.280 l. 19 Vt. 8 *ad* A 1.3.21: *śapa upalambhane*
After [the verbal base] *śap-* ('to swear'), [the Ātmanepada diathesis occurs] in the sense of 'touching (a body with an utterance: see KV *ad* A 1.3.21).'³²⁰

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi reflects on the phrase (corresponding to a *figura etymologica*) *śapatham śepe*, formed by the verbal form *śepe*, i.e. a third-person singular perfect in the Ātmanepada diathesis from the verbal base *śap-* ('to swear'), and the accusative *śapatham* (of the relevant *kṛt* derivative stem, formed with the *uṇādi kṛt* affix *atha*—found in US 3.112-113³²¹—according to A 3.3.1).³²²

After explaining that, given the co-occurrence of *śapatham*, the verbal base *śap-* in this specific context has the same meaning as *kṛ-* ('to do'), Medhātithi focuses on the morphological derivation of *śepe*. This is actually formed by applying the substitutes of the *lakāra IIT* (according to A 3.2.115), specifically that of the third-person singular (which Medhātithi refers to with the grammatical label *prathamapurusa* 'first person'). The Ātmanepada diathesis is finally

³²⁰ KV *ad* A 1.3.21: *śapa upalambhana iti vaktavyam | vācā śarīrasparśanam upalambhanam | devadattāya śapate | yajñadattāya śapate* | "[The additional teaching] *śapa upalambhana* should be taught: *upalambhana* [means] 'touching a body with an utterance' [such as in the following examples]: *devadattāya śapate* ('he swears to Devadatta' = 'he touches Devadatta's body with an utterance') [and] *yajñadattāya śapate* ('he swears to Yajñadatta' = 'he touches Yajñadatta's body with an utterance')."

³²¹ US 3.112-113: [...] *śīṅśapirugamivañcajīvipraṇibhyo 'thaḥ || saptabhyo 'thaḥ syāt śayatho 'jagaraḥ | śapathaḥ* | [...] "[The *uṇādi* affix] *atha* occurs after [the verbal bases] *śīṅ* ('to sleep'), *śap-* ('to swear'), *ru-* ('to roar'), *gam-* ('to go'), *vañc-* ('to go crookedly'), *jīv-* ('to live'), and *prāṇ-* ('to breathe'). After these seven verbs, [the *uṇādi* affix] *atha* should occur, [as for example] *śayatha-* (lit. 'one who sleeps much') [means] 'boa constrictor', *śapatha-* ('oath'), [etc.]."

³²² A 3.3.1: *uṇādayo bahulam [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 kṛt 3.1.93 vartamāne 3.2.123]* "[A *kṛt* affix] part of the list beginning with *uṇ* variously [occurs after a verbal base to denote the present tense].

justified by resorting to Vt. 8 *ad* A 1.3.21 (M 1.280 l. 19), which extends rule A 1.3.21 (actually dealing only with the verbal base *krīḍ-* ‘to play’)³²³ to the verbal base *śap-*: this *vārttika* teaches that the Ātmanepada diathesis occurs after such a verbal base in the sense of *upalambhana*, which, following the *Kāśikāvṛtti* interpretation (KV *ad* A 1.3.21), means ‘touching a body with an utterance’ (*vācā śarīrasparśanam upalambhanam*).³²⁴

168. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.112 [TE] (Vt*)

kāminīṣu *vivāheṣu* *gavāṃ* *bhakṣye* *tathendhane* |
brāhmaṇābhyupapattau *ca śapathe nāsti pātakam* || 8.112 ||

In the case of a [false] oath [pertaining] to lovers, marriages, ox-feed, firewood, and protection of Brāhmaṇas, there is no sin causing the loss of caste.

[...] *viśayasaptamī ceyam na nimittasaptamī* (cf. M 1.458 l. 16 Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36) | *tena yasyām evaikākinyām yathāpy ete tatroktarūpaśapathe na*³²⁵ *doṣaḥ* | *nimittasaptamyām tu nimitte paradravyāpahāre doṣaḥ syāt* | [...]

This is a locative of dominion and not a locative of purpose (cf. M 1.458 l. 16 Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36). There is no fault in the case of an oath with the form here described as said in this context in the case of [an oath] pertaining to a single woman. If it were a locative of purpose, there would be no fault [in swearing] for the purpose of stealing the wealth of others.

Passage referred to:

- M 1.458 l. 16 Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36: *nimittāt karmasamyoge*
 After [a nominal stem denoting] a cause, there is a connection with the object.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the use of the locative in the verse (in the forms *kāminīṣu*, *vivāheṣu*, *bhakṣye*, *indhane* and *brāhmaṇābhyupapattau*, governed by *śapathe*) which, rather than denoting cause (*nimittasaptamī*), is

³²³ A 1.3.21: *krīḍo 'nusamparibhyaś ca [ātmanepadam 12 ānaḥ 20]* “[The Ātmanepada diathesis occurs] after [the verbal base] *krīḍ-* (‘to play’) [after the prefix *āN*] and after [the prefixes] *anu-*, *sam-*, and *pari-*.”

³²⁴ As regards the interpretation of the latter *vārttika* in the Vyākaraṇa tradition, see Yagi (2002).

³²⁵ Mandlik and Gharpure omit *na*, while the others do not.

employed to denote dominion (*viśayasaptamī*). Both terms are used starting from the *Kāśikāvṛtti*: the term *nimittasaptamī* is used in KV *ad* A 1.1.5 and A 1.1.45, whereas *viśayasaptamī* occurs in KV *ad* A 1.1.45, A 2.4.35 and A 7.2.67. However, the use of the locative as purpose is already taught by Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36 (M 1.458 l. 16), although the term *nimittasaptamī* is not used by Patañjali.

169. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.123 [TE] (Vt, Vt*)

*kauṭasākṣyaṃ tu kurvāṇāṃs trīṇ varṇān dhārmiko nṛpaḥ |
pravāsayed daṇḍayitvā brāhmaṇaṃ tu vivāsayet || 8.123 ||*

A righteous king should banish [from the kingdom] [the members of] the three [upper] classes who make fraudulent statements after fining [them]; however, he should send a Brāhmaṇa into exile.

[...] *brāhmaṇaṃ tu vivāsayet | vāsaso 'paharaṇaṃ vivāsaṇaṃ grhabhaṅgo vā | vivāsaṇaṃ*³²⁶ *vivāsaṃ vā*³²⁷ *karoti tat karoti iti nīci* (see M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26) *ṇāv iṣṭavat* (M 3.230 l. 2 Vt. 1 *ad* A 6.4.155) *iti ṭilope rūpam | [...]*
'But he should send a Brāhmaṇa into exile' (*brāhmaṇaṃ tu vivāsayet*): [the word-form] *vivāsaṇa-* [denotes] the action of taking off one's clothes or sending into exile. The form used before [the *kṛt* affix] *ṆiC* in the sense of 'he does it' (see M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26)—namely, he is unclothed (*vivāsaṇa*) or he is sent into exile (*vivāsa*)—is that used in the case of the zero-replacement of the syllable beginning with the last vowel (*ṬI*) (*vivāsa-ayet*) according to *ṇāv iṣṭavat* (M 3.230 l. 2 Vt. 1 *ad* A 6.4.155).

Passages cited or referred to:

- M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.61.
- M 3.230 l. 2 Vt. 1 *ad* A 6.4.155: *ṇāv iṣṭavat prātipadikasya*
[A zero-replacement of the syllable beginning with the last vowel (*ṬI*) of the pre-suffixal base occurs] before [the *kṛt* affix] *ṆiC* as if it were before [the affix] *iṣṭhaN*.

Comment:

Medhātithi gives two etymologies for *vivāsayayet*, i.e. the third-person singular *parasmaipada* of the optative of the denominative from the verbal form *vivas-*:

³²⁶ Mandlik and Jha omit *vivāsaṇaṃ*, while the others do not.

³²⁷ Olivelle adds *vā*, which we have decided to maintain as it makes better sense if one considers the previous section, where Medhātithi offers two etymological explanations for *vivāsayayet*.

the first of these derives from the nominal stem *vivāśas-* ('unclothed'), while the second is from the nominal stem *vivāśa-* ('leaving home'). The meaning of the verbal form at stake is explained as being formed according to Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26 (M 2.34 l. 8, also taken up later by KV *ad* A 3.1.26), while the morphological formation with the zero-replacement of the syllable beginning with the last vowel (*ṭI*)³²⁸ depends on Vt. 1 *ad* A 6.4.155 (M 3.230 l. 2, also quoted by KV *ad* A 6.4.155).

170. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.134 [TL] (A, A*)

sarṣapāḥ ṣaṭ yavo madhyas triyavaṃ tv ekakṛṣṇalam |

pañcakṛṣṇalakā māśas te suvarṇas tu ṣoḍaśa || 8.134 ||

Six *sarṣapas* (lit. 'mustard seeds') equal to one middle-size *yava* (lit. 'barleycorn'); three *yavas*, one *kṛṣṇala* (lit. 'blackberry'); five *kṛṣṇalas*, one *māśa* (lit. 'bean'), sixteen [*māśas*], one *suvarṇa* (lit. 'gold').³²⁹

[...] *pañcakṛṣṇalā asmin santi pañcakṛṣṇalikaḥ*³³⁰ | *ata ini ṭhanau* (A 5.2.115) *iti ṭhan kartavyaḥ | pañcakṛṣṇalakāḥ iti pāṭhe kabanto bahuvrīhiḥ* (see A 5.4.154) | [...] [The expected *taddhita* derivative stem] *pañcakṛṣṇalika-* [means that] five *kṛṣṇalas* (i.e. blackberries of the plant *Abrus Precatorius* L. used as a measure of weight) are included in this. [The *taddhita* affix] *ṭhaN* should be applied according to *ata ini ṭhanau* (A 5.2.115). In the case of the [actual] reading *pañcakṛṣṇalakāḥ*, [this] is a *bahuvrīhi* compound ending with [the *taddhita samāsānta*] affix *kaP* (see A 5.4.154).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.
- A 5.4.154: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.46.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the *taddhita* derivative stem *pañcakṛṣṇalakā-*. First, he cites the expected form *pañcakṛṣṇalika-* formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN* to the nominal stem of the *dvigu* compound *pañcakṛṣṇala-* according to A 5.2.115, i.e. due to the etymon's final short vowel

³²⁸ The definition of *ṭI* occurs in A 1.1.64 (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.125).

³²⁹ This rule lists five particular standard weights.

³³⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure place *pañcakṛṣṇalikaḥ* after *kartavyaḥ*, while Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the text as it is.

-a. Then, he focuses on the actual reading *pañcakṛṣṇalaka-*, which is said to be formed as a *bahuvrīhi* compound based on the same etymon (*pañcakṛṣṇala-*), obtained by applying the *taddhita samāsānta* affix *kaP* in accordance with A 5.4.154.

171. Medh ad MDh^M 8.150 [TL]

yaḥ svāminānanujñātam ādhiṃ *bhunkte 'vicakṣaṇaḥ* |
tenārdhavṛddhir bhoktavyā tasya bhogasya niṣkṛtiḥ || 8.150 ||

Half the interest should be refunded by the one who, being non-discerning, enjoys the pledge without the owner's permission as the restoration of that enjoyment.

[...] *bhunkte 'vicakṣaṇa ity akāraḥ saṃhitayā praśliṣṭanirdiṣṭo veditavyaḥ* | [...] 'He, being non-discerning, enjoys' (*bhunkte 'vicakṣaṇaḥ*): after inserting the syllable *a*, it should be understood as coalescent.

Comment:

Medhātithi focuses on the sequence *bhunkte 'vicakṣaṇaḥ* ('he, being non-discerning, enjoys') and, in particular, comments on the prefix *a-* (= *naN*) of the word-form *avicakṣaṇa-*, here represented by an *avagraha*. The scholar improperly defines this phenomenon as a *praśliṣṭanirdeśa*, which is a non-Pāṇinian type of *sandhi*, attested from the *Mahābhāṣya* onward (see e.g. M 1.469 ll. 14-15 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.3.69), consisting in assuming an additional sound in the reading of a complex word or a sequence of words.

172. Medh ad MDh^M 8.153 (A*²)

nāṭisāṃvatsarīm *vṛddhiṃ na cādrṣṭām vinirharet* |
cakravṛddhiḥ kālavṛddhiḥ kārītā kāyikā ca yā || 8.153 ||

One should charge a rate of interest that is neither beyond one year nor authorised, but that is a cyclical rate of interest, a temporal rate of interest, [one that is] contractual or [one that is] corporeal.

saṃvatsare bhavā sāṃvatsarī (see A 4.3.53) | *tām*³³¹ *atīkrāntā sāṃvatsarī* (see A 2.2.18) | *bhavapratyayārthaḥ sāmāthyād antarbhūtaḥ* | *atha vā saṃvatsaram atīkrāntā atisaṃvatsareti prāpte vṛddhīkārau chandastulyatvāt kartavyau* | [...]

³³¹ The editions of Mandlik and Gharpure omit *tām*, while the others do not.

[The feminine word-form, referred to *vrddhi* ('rate of interest')] *sāṃvatsarī* [means] 'relating to one year' (see A 4.3.53). [The feminine compound] (*ati*-)*sāṃvatsarī* [means] 'going (*krāntā*) beyond (*ati*-)' that (i.e. the rate of interest relating to one year) (see A 2.2.18). The meaning of the affix conveying the sense of 'related to' (*bhava*) is involved due to its suitability. Or rather, after forming [the compound] *atisāṃvatsarā-* in the sense of 'going beyond one year', the *vrddhi* and the syllable *ī* should be applied due to [their] being equal in metrics.

Rule referred to:

- A 2.2.18: *kugatiprādayaḥ* [*saha supā* 2.1.4 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 2.1.22 *nityam* 17]
[The indeclinable word] *ku-* and the units termed *gati* or belonging to the list beginning with *pra-* [compulsorily combine with an inflected noun, to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound].
- A 4.3.53: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.

Comment:

Here Medhātithi comments on the compound *atisāṃvatsarī-* ('going beyond one year'), that refers to the word *vrddhi-* ('rate of interest') by giving two explanations. First, he starts with the *taddhita* derivation of *sāṃvatsarī-* ('relating to one year') according to A 4.3.53 with the feminine affix *ÑīP* being applied on the basis of A 4.1.15.³³² Then, he forms a *tatpuruṣa* compound formed by means of A 2.2.18 combining the prefix *ati-* ('beyond') with the *taddhita* derivative stem *sāṃvatsarī-*. The second explanation starts by combining the prefix *ati-* with the noun *sāṃvatsara-* forming a feminine compound *atisāṃvatsarā-* in accordance with A 2.2.18. Then, the *taddhita* derivative stem *sāṃvatsarī-* is formed with the abovementioned rule. In this form, Medhātithi states that the presence of the *vrddhi* vowel in the syllable *-sām-* and the feminine ending *-ī* in place of *-ā* is due to their being equal in terms of metrics: indeed, in a *pathyā* form, the long *ā* is an *anceps* syllable of *pāda* a (thus, both *a* and *ā* can fit); the long *ī* is in a long syllable of *pāda* b (thus, both *ā* and *ī* can fit).

173. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.157 [TE] (A, A*)
samudrayānakuśalā deśakālārthadarśinaḥ |

³³² A 4.1.15: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.87.

sthāpayanti tu yām vṛddhiṃ sā tatrādhigamaṃ prati || 8.157 ||

Those competent in sea travel who are capable of forecasting gain with regard to place and time establish the interest rate [to be paid] at the time of returning.

[...] *tatrādhigamaṃ pratīti* | *pratiḥ karmapravacanīyo 'dhigamasya lakṣaṇatvāl lakṣaṇetthaṃbhūtākhyāne* (A 1.4.90) *tadyukte ca dvitīyā* (see A 2.3.8) ||

‘At the time of returning’ (*tatrādhigamaṃ prati*): *prati* is a preposition due to its being an indication for *adhigama-* (‘act of acquiring’) according to *lakṣaṇetthaṃbhūtākhyāne* (A 1.4.90) and the accusative case ending occurs in what is syntactically connected with this (see A 2.3.8).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 1.4.90: *lakṣaṇetthaṃbhūtākhyānabhāgavīpsāsu pratipayanavaḥ* [*nipātaḥ* 56 *karmapravacanīya* 83]
[The particles] *prati*, *pari* and *anu* [are designated as *karmapravacanīyas*] when they indicate a characteristic, a statement of fact, a division and a distributive function.
- A 2.3.8: *karmapravacanīyayukte dvitīyā*
The accusative case ending occurs (after a nominal stem) in connection with a *karmapravacanīya*.

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi explains the use of *prati* that governs the accusative form of *adhigama-* (‘act of acquiring’) due to the fact that it is a preposition (*karmapravacanīya*, that is a technical term meaning ‘that which is to be announced by the action’), taught by A 1.4.90. Moreover, he hints at rule A 2.3.8, which enjoins the use of the accusative case governed by a *karmapravacanīya*.

174. Medh ad MDh^M 8.163 [E] (A*)

mattonmattārtādhyadhīnair bālena sthavireṇa vā |
asambaddhakṛtaś caiva vyavahāro na sidhyati || 8.163 ||

A transaction [carried out] by someone who is drunk, insane, distressed or subject [to someone else], by a minor or an aged man and one that has been carried out by an unauthorised person is not admissible.

[...] *uktaṃ ca*

*kāmakrodhābhiyuktārtabhayavyasanapīḍitāḥ*³³³ |

*rāgadveṣaparītās ca*³³⁴ *jñeyās tv aprakṛtiṃ gatāḥ || iti* | (NSm 1.37)

kāmādīnām dvandvaṃ kṛtvā pīḍitaśabdena taiḥ pīḍitā iti sādhanam kṛteti
trītyāsamāsaḥ (see A 2.1.32) | [...]

And this is said:

“Those who are assailed by desire and anger, and those who are oppressed by distress, fear and calamity and surrounded by attachment and hatred should be known as abnormal (lit. ‘having gone beyond the standard’).” (NSm 1.37)

After forming a *dvandva* made up of *kāma*- and the like combined with the word-form *pīḍita*- in the sense of ‘oppressed by Xs’, a [*tatpuruṣa*] compound with the sense of *sādhana* (i.e. an instrument or an agent) is formed by combining an instrument with a *kṛt* derivative stem (see A 2.1.32).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.1.32: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106.

Comment:

In this excerpt, Medhātithi comments on the long *tatpuruṣa* compound *kāmakrodhābhiyuktārtabhayavyasanapīḍitā*- (‘assailed by desire and anger, and those who are oppressed by distress, fear and calamity’) that appears in a verse from the *Nāradaśmṛti* (NSm 1.37) which he quotes in the commentary itself. He analyses this as a *tatpuruṣa* compound whose left-hand constituent is a *dvandva* compound while the right-hand constituent is the *kṛt* derivative stem *pīḍita*- (‘oppressed’) according to A 2.1.32.

175. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.171 [TE] (A)

[anādeyasya] cādānād adeyasya ca varjanāt |

daurbalyam khyāpyate rājñāḥ sa pretyeha ca naśyati || 8.171 ||

³³³ Mandlik features the variant reading °*abhiyuktārthobhayavyasana*°. Gharpure has the variant reading °*abhiyuktārthā bhayavyasana*°. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading °*abhiyuktārtabhayavyasana*°.

³³⁴ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *rāgadveṣaparās ceti*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *rāgadveṣaparītās ca*.

From accepting what has not to be accepted and from avoiding what has not to be given, the king's weakness is proclaimed, and he is lost after death and in this world.

anādānārham anādeyam | **arhe kṛtyaḥ** (A 3.3.169) | [...]

[The word-form] *anādeya-* [denotes] what he does not deserve to receive: [this is formed] according to *arhe kṛtyaḥ* (A 3.3.169).

Rule cited:

- A 3.3.169: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.103.

Comment:

Medhātithi explains the *kṛtya* affix employed in the verbal form *anādeyam* (i.e. future passive participle from the verbal base *āda-* with the negative prefix) according to A 3.3.169, which teaches that the *kṛtya* affixes (taught from A 3.1.96³³⁵ onwards) occur in the sense of deserving a given action (*arhe*).

176. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.173 [TE] (A*)

*tasmād yama iva svāmī svayaṃ hitvā priyāpriye |
varteta [yāmyayā] vṛtṭyā jitakrodho jitendriyah* || 8.173 ||

Therefore, like Yama, after abandoning what is pleasant and unpleasant for himself, the lord should adopt Yama's behaviour, mastering his anger and mastering the faculties of perception.

[...] *tad dhitrā*³³⁶ *yamavat prajāsu tulyaḥ paripālāne vyavahāre ca syāt | īdṛśī hi yamasya vṛttir dṛṣṭā | yamasyety aṇo bādhakaṃ* (see A 6.4.148) *tatraupasamkhyānikam yakāram icchanti* | [...]

After laying aside this, like Yama, he should be similar [to him] with regard to the subjects both in protecting [them] and in dealing [with them]. Yama's behaviour is indeed seen as such. When it is said 'Yama's' (*yamasya*), they desire the blocking (*bādhaka*) of [the *taddhita* affix] *aṇ* (see A 6.4.148) and the addition of the sound *ya* [to obtain the *taddhita* derivative stem *yāmya-*].

³³⁵ A 3.1.96: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.103.

³³⁶ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *tad viditrā*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *tad dhitrā*.

Rule referred to:

- A 6.4.148: *yasyeti ca* [*bhasya* 129 *lopaḥ* 134 *taddhite* 147]
The final *i* and the final *a* [of a *BHA* nominal stem is zero-replaced]
before the long vowel *ī* as well as [before a *taddhita* affix].

Comment:

Medhātithi explains the formation of the qualifying word *yāmya-* as a *taddhita* derivative stem from the etymon *yama-*. The explanation is somewhat puzzling because the expression *aṇo bādhakam* is far from being clear. We interpret *bādhaka*, literally meaning ‘blocking’, as a reference to the zero-replacement of the *taddhita* affix *aN*, which can be one of those taught from A 4.1.83 up to 4.4.2 in several meanings and from A 5.4.36 up to A 5.4.38 in the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*). Of course, the application of the *taddhita* affix *aN*, the final sound (-*a*) of the etymon (*yama-*) is subject to A 6.4.148, i.e. it is replaced with zero.³³⁷ However, in order to explain the morphological formation of *yāmya-* (in particular, of the final syllable -*ya*), Medhātithi hypothesises the addition of the sound *ya* to the derivative stem obtained: the latter passage is obviously non-Pāṇinian. Finally, we report that Jha (1999: VI, 224) seems to segment the text so that the reference to *yaṇ* (which is not an affix, but just the *pratyahāra* for the semivowels) can be read.

177. Medh ad MDh^M 8.179 [TE] (A*, Vt*)

kulaje vṛttasaṃpanne dharmajñe satyavādini |
mahāpakṣe dhaniny ārye nikṣepam nikṣiped budhaḥ || 8.179 ||

A sage should place a deposit in [the hands of] a man born into a noble family, endowed with good moral conduct, well-versed in the *dharma*, speaking the truth, followed by many adherents, wealthy, and who is an Ārya.

[...] *nikṣepam*³³⁸ | *nikṣipyamāṇam suvarṇādidravyaṃ karmasāadhanena ghañocyate* (see A 3.3.19; M 2.246 l. 1 Vt. 2 ad A 3.3.19) | [...]

³³⁷ Even if *aN* in Medhātithi’s text were the corresponding *pratyahāra* (*aN* = -*a*, -*i*, -*u*) instead of the *taddhita* affix, i.e. if the author directly hinted at the application of A 6.4.148 (namely the *lopa* of the final sound of the etymon *yama-*), the involvement of the affix *aN* should however be implied by the rule itself (because of the *taddhite* constraint).

³³⁸ Mandlik and Gharpure omit *nikṣepam*, while the others do not. In his edition, Olivelle notes that the same happens in the *Dharmakośa* (1.738).

[The *kṛt* derivative stem] *nikṣepa-* [means] a substance such as gold that is deposited: it is said [to be formed] with the *kṛt* affix *GHañ* conveying the sense of patient (see A 3.3.19; M 2.246 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19).

Rule and passage referred to:

- A 3.3.19: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6.
- M 2.246 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6.

Comment:

Medhātithi explains the *kṛt* derivative stem *nikṣepa-* as being formed by means of the affix *GHañ* taught by A 3.3.19, but read as taught by Vt. 2 (M 2.246 l. 1), i.e. by excluding the output constraint *saṃjñāyām*, since the affix *GHañ* is *de facto* used in nominal stems which are not proper names (as Patañjali himself notices and the three *Kāśikāvṛtti* examples clearly show: see M 2.246 ll. 2-3 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19;³³⁹ KV *ad* A 3.3.19).³⁴⁰

178. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.202 [TE] (A^{*3}, KV*, N*)

*atha mūlam anāhāryaṃ prakāśakrayaśodhitaḥ |
adaṇḍyo mucyate rājñā nāṣṭiko labhate dhanam || 8.202 ||*

Then, [when] the source is not producible, the one who is justified because the purchase took place in broad daylight is set free by the king since he should not be punished; the one who aims at what has been lost (i.e. ‘the former owner’) regains possession of [his] property.

[...] *naṣṭam anveṣate nāṣṭikaḥ | naṣṭam asyāstīty evaṃ ṭhani kṛte* (see A 5.2.115) *prajñāditvāt svārthiko 'ṇ kartavyaḥ* (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38) | *naṣṭam prayojanam asyeti vā* (see A 5.1.109) | [...]

The one who aims at what has been lost is called *nāṣṭika*. In this way, due to his consciousness and the like, that which is lost belongs to him, when the affix *ṭhan* is applied (see A 5.2.115), the affix *aṇ* should be applied in the same sense (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38). Otherwise, his purpose is what is lost (see A 5.1.109).

³³⁹ M 2.246 ll. 2-3 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79.

³⁴⁰ KV *ad* A 3.3.19: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79.

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 5.1.109: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.31.
- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.
- A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- KV *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- N *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.

Comment:

Medhātithi explains the *taddhita* derivative stem *nāṣṭika-* as being derived from the nominal stem *naṣṭa-* (‘what is lost’) by applying the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN* in the sense of ‘X (in this case, what is lost) belongs to Y’ according to A 5.2.115. Then, the affix *aN* while retaining the own meaning of the base (according to A 5.4.38, following KV *ad* A 5.4.38 and N *ad* A 5.4.38) is applied to obtain the *ṽṛddhi* replacement of the first vowel of the etymon (see our comment about Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71). As an alternative, with the phrase *naṣṭam prayojanam asya*, Medhātithi seems to be hinting at A 5.1.109, i.e. at the formation of a derivative stem by adding the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN* in the sense of “X is his/her/its purpose.”

179. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.214 [TE] (A*)

dattasyaiṣoditā dharmyā yathāvac anapakriyā |
ata ūrdhvaṃ pravakṣyāmi vetanasyānapakriyām || 8.214 ||

This legitimate non-delivery of the gift has been described properly:
 from here onward, I will explain the non-delivery of a salary.

[...] *yathāvac chabdasamudāya eva yāthātathye vartate | samyannirūpitety arthaḥ | atha vā yathāśabdo yogyatāyām vartate tām arhatīti vatiḥ kartavyaḥ* (see A 5.1.117) [...]

In the group of word-forms, *yathāvat-* occurs just in the sense of ‘adequacy’: the meaning is ‘[non-delivery of the gift] properly discussed.’ Or rather, the word-form *yathā* occurs in the sense of ‘suitableness’: [the *taddhita* affix] *vatI* should be applied [to this etymon] in the sense of ‘he deserves X’ (see A 5.1.117).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.1.117: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.2.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the word-form *yathāvat* by giving two explanations, the second of which is of a grammatical nature. He explains it as a

indeclinable *taddhita* derivative word formed by applying the affix *vatI* to *yathā* (in the sense of ‘suitableness’) according to A 5.1.117. We note that instead of the correct form *tad arham*, Medhātithi improperly cites the output meaning of this rule as *tad arhati*, which is actually the wording of rule A 5.1.63.³⁴¹

180. Medh ad MDh^M 8.220 [TE] (A*, M*, KV*)

nigrhya dāpayec cainaṃ samavyabhicāriṇaṃ |

[catuḥsuvarṇān] ṣaṇṇiṣkāś chatamānaṃ ca rājatam || 8.220 ||

After arresting [him], one should make the one who has violated the agreement pay [a fine of] six *niṣkas*, each weighing four *suvarṇas* (or: ‘together with four *suvarṇas*’), and a silver *śatamāna*.

[...] *catvāri suvarṇāni yeṣāṃ niṣkāṇāṃ parimāṇaṃ te catuḥsuvarṇā niṣkāḥ | [...]*
anye tu sahārthe bahuvrīhiṃ kṛtvā trīṇ daṇḍān āhuḥ | caturbhiḥ suvarṇaiḥ saha
ṣaṇṇiṣkān daṇḍanīyaḥ | daśa niṣkāḥ pratipādītā bhavanti |
bahuvrīhisiddhyartham sahārthe kathamcin matvartho (cf. A 5.2.94) yojitavyaḥ
| na hi citrābhir gobhiḥ sahitaś citragur devadatta iti bhavati (see M 1.420 l. 25
ad Vt. 2 ad A 2.2.24; KV ad A 2.2.24) | ete ca trayo daṇḍā yadi ca tribhir eka iti
kāryāpekṣayā yojanam | [...]

Those whose measure of the *niṣkas* is four *suvarṇas* are called *catuḥsuvarṇā niṣkāḥ* (i.e. ‘the *niṣkas* consisting of four *suvarṇas*’). [...] However, some say that, after forming the *bahuvrīhi* [*catuḥsuvarṇa*-] in the meaning of ‘together’ (*saha*), there are three fines: together with four *suvarṇas*, the fine should be six *niṣkas* – ten *niṣkas* must be given. For the sake of forming a *bahuvrīhi*, the meaning of *matuP* (cf. A 5.2.94) should be joined somehow to the meaning of ‘together.’ Indeed, since he is conjoined with brindled cows, Devadatta is “the one possessing brindled cows” (*citragu*) (see M 1.420 l. 25 *ad Vt. 2 ad A 2.2.24*; KV *ad A 2.2.24*). And if these are three fines, the syntactical construction should imply the operation consisting of “one [fee made up of] three.”

Rule and passages referred to:

- A 5.2.94: see Medh ad MDh^M 1.108.
- M 1.420 l. 25 *ad Vt. 2 ad A 2.2.24*: *citraguḥ śabalagur iti*
 The one possessing brindled cows, the one possessing mottled cows.

³⁴¹ A 5.1.63: *tad arhati* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76] “[A *taddhita* affix among those taught by rules A 5.1.18-115 occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘he deserves X.’”

- KV *ad* A 2.2.24: *citrāgur devadattaḥ*
Devadatta is the one possessing brindled cows.

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the *bahuvrīhi* compound *catuḥsuvarṇa-* ('consisting of four *suvarṇas*'), which refers to the *dvigu* compound *ṣaṇṇiṣka-* ('six *niṣkas*'). The first explanation is that this compound as a regular *bahuvrīhi* refers to the amount of the *niṣkas*. The second explanation is that the *bahuvrīhi* conveys the sense of 'together' (*saha*); thus, the fines mentioned in the verse are three instead of two. Regarding this explanation, Medhātithi assumes that the possessive meaning (i.e. that of *matuP*: cf. A 5.2.94) should be added to that of 'together' and cites a traditional example found in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 2.2.24), but also in the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.420 l. 25 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.2.24).

181. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.228 [TE] (A*²)

yasmin yasmin kr̥te *kārye yasyehānuśayo bhavet |*
tam anena vidhānena dharmye pathi niveśayet || 8.228 ||

Whatever transaction has been accomplished, the king should cause the one who repented [of such a transaction] to enter the *dharm* path by means of this provision.

[...] *etac ca na kṛtaṃ*³⁴² *nivṛttam ucyate na prakrāntam* (see A 3.4.70; cf. A 3.4.71) | *na hy ayam ādikarmaṇi ktaḥ | na hi mukhyārthatyāge kāraṇam asti | yat tu kṛtaṃ nākṛtaṃ bhavatīti kṛtam api tat sādhyakāryapratishedhād akṛtam eva | yathā bhuktaṃ vāntam iti | [...]*

And this is not done: what is completed is defined [as done], not what is begun. Indeed, this past participle is not used in the sense of an incipient action (see A 3.4.70; cf. A 3.4.71). Indeed, there is no reason to neglect the main meaning. However, as far as [the principle according to which] what has been done does not become undone, even what has been done, due to the prohibition that what has to be accomplished can be done, is undone. Just like what has been eaten which is vomited.

Rules referred to:

- A 3.4.70: *tayor eva kṛtyaktakhalarthāḥ* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93]

³⁴² Jha and Dave add a second *kṛtaṃ*, which we have decided not to integrate.

The *kṛtya* [affixes], [the *kṛt* affix] *Kta* and [the affixes] conveying the meaning of *KHaL* occur [after a verbal base] to denote them alone (i.e. an agent or a patient: *karmaṇi ca bhāve ca* 3.4.69).

- A 3.4.71: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.226.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the use of the past participle *kṛta-* and excludes the fact that it is used in accordance with A 3.4.71, i.e. to signify the agent of an incipient action, since it is regularly used as a patient of a completed action (i.e. under rule A 3.4.70).

182. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.241 [TE] (A*)

*kṣetreṣv anyeṣu tu paśuḥ sapādaṃ paṇam arhati |
sarvatra tu sado deyaḥ kṣetrikasyeṭi dhāraṇā || 8.241 ||*

[In the case of harm] in other fields, a beast is worth one *paṇa* and a quarter, but, in every case, compensation should be given to the one to whom a field belongs: this is the settled rule.

[...] *kṣetrikasya*³⁴³ | *kṣetram asyāstīti vrīhyādītāṭ than*³⁴⁴ (see A 5.2.116) | [...] ‘Relating to a field’ (*kṣetrikasya*): [the *taddhita* affix] *thaN* occurs in the sense of ‘a field (*kṣetra-*) belongs to him’ due to [its] being part of the list beginning with *vrīhi-* (‘rice’) (see A 5.2.116).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.2.116: *vrīhyādibhyaś ca [prātipadikāt 4.1.1. taddhitāḥ 4.1. tad asyāsty asmin 94 ini thanau 115]*
[The *taddhita* affixes *inI* and *thaN*] also [occur after a nominal stem] of the *vrīhyādi* list [to denote ‘X belongs to Y’ or ‘X exists in Y’].

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi comments on the formation of the *taddhita* derivative stem *kṣetrika-* (lit. ‘relating to a field’) from the nominal stem *kṣetra-* (‘field’), which is said to be derived by applying the *taddhita* affix *thaN* in the sense of ‘X belongs

³⁴³ Mandlik and Gharpure omit *kṣetrikasya*, while the others do not.

³⁴⁴ All the editions feature the variant reading *thak*, but this does not fit within the Pāṇinian explanation of *kṣetriya-*: the reference to the *vrīhyādi* list is a clear reference to A 5.2.116, which teaches to apply the *taddhita* affixes *inI* or *thaN*, not *thaK*. Therefore, we have decided to emend *thak* to *than* to align it with its correct Pāṇinian explanation.

to Y': by referring to the group beginning with *vr̥hi-* ('rice'). This is a clear hint at rule A 5.2.116, which teaches the application of the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN* together with *inI*. We note that we have actually emended the printed text of this *Manubhāṣya* section, which features the variant reading *ṭhak*. This is, however, incorrect from a Pāṇinian point of view. Given the unambiguous reference to A 5.2.116, we proceeded with the emendation of *ṭhak* to *ṭhan*.

183. Medh ad MDh^M 8.265 [TL] (A*, Vt*)

*sīmāyām aviśahyāyām svayam rājaiva dharmavit |
pradiśed bhūmim ekeṣām upakārād iti sthitiḥ || 8.265 ||*

If the boundary cannot be determined, a king who indeed knows the *dharma* should himself allot land [just] to some people after [taking into account] the advantage [gained from this]: this is the settled rule.

[...] *lyablope pañcamī* (see A 7.1.37; M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 ad A 2.3.28) | *upakāram apekṣya* | [...]

[In the word-form *upakāra-* ('advantage') declined in the ablative case, i.e. *upakārāt*, the ablative ending occurs in the sense of a zero-replacement of [a verbal form ending with the affix] *LyaP* (see A 7.1.37; M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 ad A 2.3.28): [this word-form should be analysed as] 'after taking into account the advantage [gained from this]' (*upakāram apekṣya*).

Rule and passage referred to:

- A 7.1.37: see Medh ad MDh^M 1.4.
- M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 ad A 2.3.28: see Medh ad MDh^M 8.107.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi interprets the ablative form *upakārāt* from the nominal stem *upakāra-* ('advantage') in line with Vt. 1 ad A 2.3.28 (M 1.455), as if its *vigraha* were *upakāram apekṣya* ('after taking into account the advantage [gained from this]') with a zero-replacement of the gerund *apekṣya*, as explained by the relevant commentarial passages in Patañjali and the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (see M 1.455 l. 5 ad Vt. 1 ad A 2.3.28 = KV ad A 2.3.28).³⁴⁵

³⁴⁵ M 1.455 l. 5 ad Vt. 1 ad A 2.3.28 = KV ad A 2.3.28: see Medh ad MDh^M 8.107.

184. Medh ad MDh^M 8.266 [TE] (A, A*, Vt, Vt*)

*eṣo 'khilenābhihito dharmah sīmāvinirṇaye |
ata ūrdhvaṃ pravakṣyāmi [vākpāruṣya]vinirṇayam || 8.266 ||*

This *dharmā* about the settlement regarding boundaries has been explained with omissions. From here onwards, I will teach the settlement for verbal assault.

*pūrvopasaṃhāro 'parasamkṣepopanyāsaḥ ślokārthaḥ | daṇḍavācike (MDh^M 8.6)
ity uktvā kramabhedo lāghavāt (see A 2.2.34) vākpāruṣyaṃ syāt tato
daṇḍavyāpāraḥ | dvandve cetaretarayogād vyastakramasamāsārthapratipatter
ekaikasayobhayārthapratipādanād³⁴⁶ daṇḍaśabdena vāgartho³⁴⁷ 'py upātta iti kaḥ
kramabhedah (see M 1.432 ll. 20-21 Vt. 9 ad A 2.2.29) | tathā ca³⁴⁸
yathāsaṃkhyasūtrāraṃbho (A 1.3.10) mahābhāṣyakāreṇa samarthita etad eva
darśanam āsṛitya saṃjñāsamāsanirdeśāt (M 1.267 ll. 15-16 Vt. 1 ad A 1.3.10)
iti ||*

The object of this verse is a summary of what precedes and the statement of a compendium of the next section. After saying *daṇḍavācike* (in MDh^M 8.6), there is a difference in the order which depends on the shortness (of *daṇḍa*- 'physical [violence]' which is shorter than *vācika*- 'verbal [violence]': see A 2.2.34): there should [first] be verbal violence (*vāk-pāruṣya*) [and] afterwards what concerns physical violence (*daṇḍa*-) (see MDh^M 8.278, i.e. the closing verse of the *vākpāruṣya* section and the opening of the *daṇḍapāruṣya*). And in a *dvandva* compound, because of the mutual relationship [between the two constituents] (of the so-called *itaretarayoga*- vs. *samāhāra-dvandva*), since the meaning of both, i.e. of every single one (constituent) is stated, due to the statement of the meaning of the *samāsa* according to the word order of the separate constituents, the meaning of *vāc* is also obtained by means of the word-form *daṇḍa* (see M 1.432 ll. 20-21 Vt. 9 ad A 2.2.29): what will be the difference in the order? And thus this undertaking (a restriction) of the *sūtra yathāsaṃkhyā* (A 1.3.10) is established by the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*, after resorting to just this theory according to [the teaching] *saṃjñāsamāsanirdeśāt* (M 1.267 ll. 15-16 Vt. 1 ad A 1.3.10).

³⁴⁶ Mandlik has the variant reading °*arthah pratipādanād*. Gharpure feature the variant reading °*arthāpratipādanād*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading °*arthapratipādanād*.

³⁴⁷ Mandlik features the variant reading *vārthaḥ*. The other editions have the reading *vāgarthaḥ*.

³⁴⁸ Mandlik and Gharpure add a second *yathā*, which we have decided not to integrate.

Rules and passages cited or referred to:

- A 1.3.10: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.41.
- A 2.2.34: *alpāctaram* [*pūrvam* 30 *dvandve* 32]
[In a *dvandva* compound], the constituent containing the fewer number of vowels [is the first constituent].
- M 1.267 ll. 15-16 Vt. 1 *ad* A 1.3.10: *sañjñāsamāsanirdeśāt sarvaprasaṅgaḥ anudeśasya yathāsaṅkhyavacanam niyamārtham*
There is an automatic involvement of every item (i.e. the risk that every item in a sequence matches any other item in a sequence) due to an indication by means of a compound or a technical name. The purpose of the rule teaching (the criterion of) referring back to the former in a one-to-one order is a restriction.
- M 1.432 ll. 20-21 Vt. 9 *ad* A 2.2.29: *anyavācakenānyasya vacanānupapattir iti cet plakṣasya nyagrodhatvān nyagrodhasya plakṣatvāt svaśabdenābhīdhānam*
If we say that no expression of something arises through what expresses something else, [the answer is that] the denotation (*abhīdhāna*) of *plakṣa-* is caused by its being a *nyagrodha-* and the denotation of *nyagrodha-* is caused by its being a *plakṣa-*, although each of them is expressed by means of its own word form.

Comment:

Medhātithi compares the order of the constituents in the *dvandva* compound *daṇḍa-vāc-* from which the *taddhita* stem *daṇḍavācika-* (‘physical and verbal violence’) is derived, with the order of two relevant grounds for litigation (*vyavahārapada*), i.e. verbal violence (*vākpāruṣya*: MDh^M 8.267-278) and physical violence (*daṇḍapāruṣya*: MDh^M 8.279-301) and wonders why their order is different. After hinting at rule A 2.2.34, according to which *daṇḍa-* occupies the first slot in the *dvandva* *daṇḍavācike* simply because it contains the fewer number of vowels with respect to the second member *vācika-*, he emphasises the mutual relationship [between the two constituents] which characterises the so-called *itaretarayogadvandva* (in which the final number of the *samāsa* depends on the number of the denotata). Medhātithi even seems to resort to a fascinating theory advanced by Kātyāyana in Vt. 9 *ad* A 2.2.29³⁴⁹ (M 1.432 ll. 20-21), according to which, for instance, in the *dvandva* stem *plakṣanyagrodha-*, *plakṣa-* already also stands for *nyagrodha-* (even though the

³⁴⁹ A 2.2.29: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.119.

former member of the compound does not stand for the latter if it is absent and *vice versa*). All in all, Medhātithi explains that the word order does not actually affect the meaning of the *dvandva* nor does it create any hierarchy between the two members, so the fact that physical violence preceded the verbal one in the compound used in MDh^M 8.6 does not influence the order followed in dealing with the two kinds of violence in the next chapters (MDh^M 8.267-278 and 8.279-301). Finally, Medhātithi refers to the general principle of A 1.3.10, which teaches that, when there are two successive series of enumerated items, the order of the former must be respected. The latter rule is, however, read with the relevant Vt. 1 (M 1.267 ll. 15-16), which restricts its application in the case in which compounds and technical terms are used. In our opinion, Medhātithi is just hinting at the fact that *daṇḍavācika-* deriving from a compound is used in MDh^M 8.6, whereas the order of the two *vyavahārapada* sections respectively devoted to physical and verbal violence does not need to be respected.

185. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.273 [TE] (Vt)

śrutam deśam ca jātiṃ ca karma śārīram eva ca |

[vitathena] bruvan darpād dāpyaḥ syād dviśatam damam || 8.273 ||

The one who, due to contempt [for others], speaks falsely about sacred knowledge, country, caste, activity and even bodily constitution should be punished with a fine of two hundred [paṇas].³⁵⁰

[...] *vitathena vitatham anṛtam | prakṛtyādibhyaḥ* (M 1.452 l. 2 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.18) *iti tṛtīyā* | [...]

‘Through arrogance’ (*vitathena*): ‘arrogance’ [means] falsehood; the instrumental case ending is used according to *prakṛtyādibhyaḥ* (M 1.452 l. 2 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.18).

Passage cited:

- M 1.452 l. 2 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.18: *tṛtīyāvidhāne prakṛtyādibhya upasaṃkhyānam*

When the instrumental case ending is taught, it should be added that it is used after the nominal stem *prakṛti-* and the like.

³⁵⁰ In the context of fines, a number without further indication is understood as denoting *paṇas* ‘coins.’ See Olivelle (2005: 311).

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi explains the word-form *vitathena* (‘through arrogance’, ‘arrogantly’), inflected in the instrumental case based on a rule-extension taught by Kātyāyana in Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.18 (M 1.452 l. 2). The aim of this extension is to process the usages of the instrumental case ending to convey some other meaning than the agent (*kartṛ*) of a passive sentence and the instrument (*karaṇa*) (for instance, *prakṛtyā*, which assumes the meaning of ‘by nature’, ‘naturally’, ‘according to the original form’, etc.).

186. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.276 [TE] (Vt*)

brāhmaṇakṣatriyābhyām *tu daṇḍaḥ kāryo vijānatā* |

brāhmaṇe sāhasaḥ pūrvaḥ kṣatriye tv eva madhyamaḥ || 8.276 ||

[In the case of a verbal assault] between a Brāhmaṇa and a Kṣatriya (or: ‘in order to discipline Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas’), the fine should be imposed by the discerning [king]: there is the lowest punishment in the case of a Brāhmaṇa, while there is the middle one in the case of a Kṣatriya.

brāhmaṇakṣatriyābhyām parasparākrośe kṛte tayoṛ ayam daṇḍa ity evam adhyāhāreṇa yojanā | *tādarthyē caturthī vā* (see M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13) | *tadvinayāya daṇḍaḥ kartavyaḥ* | [...]

When a mutual verbal assault between a Brāhmaṇa and a Kṣatriya takes place, this is their ‘punishment’; thus, it is the construction with a [word] supplement. Otherwise, the dative ending [is used] in the sense of ‘for the sake of X’ (see M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13). The punishment has to be made with the aim of disciplining them.

Passage referred to:

- M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.245.

Comment:

Medhātithi here focuses on the *dvandva* compound *brāhmaṇakṣatriya-* (‘a Brāhmaṇa and a Kṣatriya’), which is inflected in the dual number, and gives two interpretations. First, he reads it as an instrumental and postulates an elliptical sentence where the locative phrase *parasparākrośe kṛte* (‘when a mutual verbal assault takes place’) is understood. In this case, the instrumental case is governed by the verbal action conveyed by the verbal nominal stem *krośa*, so the final meaning is that of the action of verbally arguing with each other. Second,

Medhātithi proposes that the dual compound should be read as a dative with the sense of purpose as taught by Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13 (M 1.449 l. 5).

187. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.284 [TE] (A^{*2}, Vt^{*})

tvagbhedakah śataṃ daṇḍyo lohitasya ca darśakah |
māmsabhettā tu ṣaṇṇiškān pravāsyas tv asthibhedakah || 8.284 ||

The one who breaks the skin should be punished [with a fine of] one hundred [*paṇas*] as well as the one who makes blood appear [by striking someone]; the one who tears the flesh [should be punished with a fine of] six Niṣkas, but the one who breaks bones should be exiled.

[...] *pravāsyō 'sthñām*³⁵¹ *bhedakas tatprayojaka iti | ghañantena samāsaṃ kṛtvā* (cf. A 3.3.18) *taṃ karotīti paṭhitavyo 'sthibhedakṛd iti* (see A 3.1.133; M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26) | [...]

The one who breaks bones (*asthnām bhedakah*, which paraphrases *asthibhedakah*) should be banished: [this one] has this (action) as his own purpose. After forming the compound (i.e. *asthibheda*- ‘bone-breaking’) with [a *pada*] ending in the affix *GHañ* (i.e. *bheda*-; cf. A 3.3.18), this should be read ‘he does this (i.e. the bone-breaking: *asthibheda*)’ [by applying the *kṛt* affix *ñiC* (according to M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26) and the *kṛt* affix *ñvuL* (according to A 3.1.133)], i.e. ‘he is one who performs the action of breaking bones.’

Rules and passage referred to:

- A 3.1.133: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.194.
- A 3.3.18: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.64.
- M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.61.

Comment:

Medhātithi focuses on the derivation process of the *kṛt* derivative stem *asthibhedaka*-. In the beginning, he dwells on the etymon *asthibheda*-, which is analysed as a *ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣa* compound in the sense of the ‘breaking of bones’ (*asthnām bhedah*), made up of the nominal stem *asthi*- and the *kṛt* derivative stem *bheda*- (formed by means of the affix *GHañ* applied to the verbal base *bhid*- in the sense of ‘the action of breaking bones’ according to A 3.3.18). Then, to

³⁵¹ Mandlik features the variant reading *pravāsyō 'syām*, while the others present the variant reading *pravāsyō 'sthñām*.

explain the whole stem *asthibhedaka-*, Medhātithi seems to resort to the *kṛt* affix *ṆiC* (taught by A 3.1.26)³⁵² in accordance with the relevant Vt. 5 (M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26) in the sense of ‘he is one who performs the action of breaking bones’ (*asthibhedakṛt*). We remark that such a complex derivation process is due to the prohibition of A 2.2.15,³⁵³ namely the combination of a nominal *pada* declined in the genitive case with a *kṛt* derivative stem formed by the affix *trC* or the *aka*-affixes (which include the affix *ṆvuL*).

188. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.291-292 [TE] (A)

chinnanāsyē | *bhagnayuge tiryakpratimukhāgate* |
akṣabhaṅge ca yānasya cakrabhaṅge tathaiva ca || 8.291 ||
chedane caiva yantrāṇām yoktraraśmyos tathaiva ca |
ākrande cāpy apaihīti na daṇḍam manur abravīt || 8.292 ||

In the case of [a cow’s] cut nose-cord, broken yoke, moving crosswise or in front; in the case of a chariot’s split axle as well as a split wheel; in the case of the cutting of fetters as well as ropes and bridles; in the case of [anyone] crying out ‘get out of here!’, there is no punishment—thus Manu taught.

nāsāyām bhavaṃ nāsyam | *śarīrāvayavād yat* (A 5.1.6) | *nāsikāpuṭasaṃyoginī balīvardānām rajjur aśvānām khalīnām hastinām aṅkuśaḥ* | *tasmin chinne trūṭite* | *yuge ca bhagne* | *rathāṅgakāṣṭham yugam* | *chinnam nāsyam asyeti bahuvrīhiṇā ratha ucyate paśur vobhayor api sāksāt pāraṃparyeṇa sambandhāt* | [...]

[The right-hand constituent of the *bahuvrīhi* compound *chinnanāsyā-*, namely the *taddhita* derivative stem] *nāsyā-* [means] ‘relating to the nose.’ [It is formed] according to *śarīrāvayavād yat* (A 5.1.6). [This] is the rope passed through the nostrils of bullocks, the bit of a bridle for horses, [and] the elephants’ hook, when this is cut, i.e. snapped, and when the yoke is broken. [The word-form] *yuga-* (‘yoke’) [denotes] a piece of wood as a part of the chariot. The cart or the animal is called (*chinnanāsyā-*) by means of a *bahuvrīhi* compound, [the *vigraha* of which is] ‘whose rope for the nose has snapped’, because both are directly or indirectly connected with it.

³⁵² A 3.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.30.

³⁵³ A 2.2.15: *trjakābhyām kartari* [*samāsaḥ* 2.1.3 *saha supā* 2.1.4 *sup* 2.1.9 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 2.1.22 *ṣaṣṭhī* 8 *na* 10 *karmaṇi* 14] “[A nominal *pada* ending in the genitive case] denoting the patient [does not combine in a *tatpuruṣa* compound with another nominal *pada*] ending in [the affixes] *trC* or *-aka-* (i.e. the *kṛt* affixes *ṆvuC*, *ṆvuL*, *vuṆ*, *vuN*, and *ṢvuN*, and the *taddhita* affixes *ḌvuN*, *vuK*, *vuC*, *vuṆ* and *vuN*).”

Rule cited:

- A 5.1.6: *śarīrāvayavād yat [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhita 4.1.76 tasmai hitam 5.1.5]*
[The *taddhita* affix] *yaT* occurs [after a nominal stem] denoting a limb of the body [in the sense of ‘good for it’], the bit of a horse’s bridle.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi explains the *bahuvrīhi* compound *chinnanāśya-* referring to an understood noun meaning ‘cart’ or ‘animal’, whose *vigraha* is *chinnam nāsyam asya*, namely it is a possessive *bahuvrīhi* meaning ‘endowed with a nasal rope which has snapped.’ First of all, he analyses its right-hand constituent, i.e. the *taddhita* derivative *nāśya-* obtained by means of the *taddhita* affix *yaT* applied to the nominal stem *nāsā-* according to A 5.1.6, teaching to use such an affix after a nominal stem denoting a limb of the body.

189. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.298 [TE] (A*²)

gardabhājāvikanām tu daṇḍaḥ syāt pāñcamāśikaḥ |
māśikas tu bhaved daṇḍaḥ śvasūkaranipātane || 8.298 ||

In the case of donkeys, goats or sheep, the fine should amount to five *māśas*, but in the case of killing a dog or a pig, the fine should amount to one *māśa*.

pañca māśāḥ parimāṇam asyeti pāñcamāśikaḥ (see A 5.1.18, A 5.1.57) | [...]

That whose measure amounts to five *māśas* is called *pāñcamāśika-* (see A 5.1.18, A 5.1.57).

Rules referred to:

- A 5.1.18: *prāg vateṣ thañ [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76]*
[The *taddhita* affix] *thañ* [occurs after a nominal stem] to denote the sense of affixes introduced by the rules taught up to rule A 5.1.15.
- A 5.1.57: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.

Comment:

Here Medhātithi is commenting on the *taddhita* derivative stem *pāñcamāśika-* by means of the *vigraha* *pañca māśāḥ parimāṇam asya*. It is therefore explained as being formed from the *dvigu* compound *pāñcamāśa-* (‘five *māśas*’) by applying the *taddhita* affix *thañ*, introduced by A 5.1.18 and taught in this output meaning by A 5.1.57.

190. Medh ad MDh^M 8.328 [TE] (A*)

matsyānām pakṣiṇām caiva tailasya ca ghṛtasya ca |
māṃsasya madhunaś caiva yac cānyat paśusaṃbhavam || 8.328 ||
 [In the case of stealing]³⁵⁴ fish, birds, oil, ghee, meat, honey and
 anything else produced from animals.

[...] *prakṛtyantare tailaśabdaḥ snehavācī na tilavikāra eva* (cf. A 4.3.134) | [...] The word-form *taila-* (lit. ‘sesame oil’) [also] stands for another item of the same nature (i.e. it stands as a hypernym for all oils), conveying the sense of ‘oiliness’: it is not indeed the ‘modification of sesame’ (i.e. ‘sesame oil’: cf. A 4.3.134).

Rule referred to:

- A 4.3.134: see Medh ad MDh^M 2.42.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the word-form *taila-*, which is used as a hypernym for every kind of oil instead of conveying the mere sense of ‘sesame oil’ as a ‘modification of sesame’ and thus reflecting its *taddhita* derivation by means of A 4.3.134.

191. Medh ad MDh^M 8.339 [TE] (A*, Vt*, KV*, N*)

vānaspatyaṃ mūlaphalaṃ dārvagnyartham tathaiva ca |
trṇam ca gobhyo grāsārtham asteyaṃ manur abravīt || 8.339 ||
 Trees for [producing] fire and timber as well as roots and fruits and
 grass for cows for the purpose of their eating: those should not be
 stolen—thus Manu taught.

*vanaspataya*³⁵⁵ *eva vānaspatyaṃ vrkṣāḥ | svārthe pratyayaḥ* (see A 5.4.38; KV ad A 5.4.38; N ad A 5.4.38) | [...]

[The word-form] *vānaspatya-* (inflected with the nominative neuter singular ending) [denotes] trees, i.e. precisely *vanaspati-* (inflected with the nominative masculine plural ending). The [*taddhita*] affix (i.e. *aN*; see A 5.4.38; KV ad A 5.4.38; N ad A 5.4.38) occurs [while retaining] the own meaning [of the base].

³⁵⁴ We infer the locative *haraṇe* (‘in the case of stealing’) from MDh 8.324.

³⁵⁵ Mandlik, Gharpure and Dave feature the variant reading *vanaspata*. Jha and Olivelle present the variant reading *vanaspataya*. In his edition, Olivelle notes the variant reading *vanaspatiḥ* found in the *Dharmakośa* (1.1722).

tṛṇaṃ ca gobhyaḥ | tādarthye caturthī (see M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13) | *gograhaṇāt prastārārthaṃ doṣa eva | ye tu grāsārthapadena gavām abhisambandham icchanti teṣāṃ gobhya iti nopapadyate | śaṣṭhī hi tatra yuktā* || [In the phrase] *tṛṇaṃ ca gobhyaḥ* ('and the grass is for cows'), the dative ending is used in the sense of 'being intended for this' (see M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13). Due to the mention of *go-* ('cow'), it should be a shortcoming if the aim were a bed of straw. According to those who maintain that by means of the word *grāsārtha-* (lit. 'whose purpose is eating'), there is already a connection with cows, *gobhyaḥ* is inappropriate. Indeed, in this case, the genitive case ending should be the right one (i.e. *gavām grāsārtham*).

Rules and passages referred to

- A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.245.
- KV *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- N *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.

Comment:

Medhātithi gives a general explanation of the formation of the collective neuter noun *vānaspatya-* derived from *vanaspati-* with the *taddhita* affix *aṇ* occurring in the own meaning of the base (according to A 5.4.38, following KV *ad* A 5.4.38 and N *ad* A 5.4.38; see our comment on Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71). Then, he concentrates on the use of the dative ending for *go-* governed by the noun *grāsārtha-* according to the first *vārttika* appended to the general rule introducing the dative (A 2.3.13),³⁵⁶ i.e. Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13 (M 1.449 l. 5), which teaches to use the dative specifically in the sense of 'being intended for this' (*tādarthye*). However, an alternative is proposed, i.e. the genitive *gavām* that is dependent on *grāsārtha-* should replace the dative *gobhyaḥ*. In our view, here the scholar is resorting to the etymological meaning of *grāsārtha-* ('whose purpose is eating').

192. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.346 [TL] (A*)

sāhase vartamānaṃ tu yo marṣayati pārthivaḥ |

sa vināśaṃ vrajaty āśu vidveṣaṃ cādhiḡacchati || 8.346 ||

A king who forgives a man who lives in violence quickly descends into ruin and falls into hatred.

³⁵⁶ A 2.3.13: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.56.

[...] *sāhase sthitam puruṣam yo marṣayati | prakṛtyarthe 'yam ṇic* (see A 3.1.25)
| [...]

The one who forgives a man (*yo marṣayati*) living in violence; [in the verbal form *marṣayati*], this [*kṛt* affix] *ṆiC* occurs in the sense of the verbal base (see A 3.1.25).

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.25: *satyāpapāśarūpavīṇātūlaślokaśenāloamatvacavarmavarṇa-cūrṇacurādibhyo ṇic*
[The *kṛt* affix] *ṆiC* occurs after [the nominal stems] *satya-* ('truth'), *pāśa-* ('snare'), *rūpa-* ('form'), *vīṇā-* ('Vīṇā lute'), *tūla-* ('cotton'), *śloka-* ('Śloka verse'), *senā-* ('army'), *loma-* ('hair'), *tvacA-* ('skin'), *varman-* ('defensive armour'), *varṇa-* ('colour') and *cūrṇa-* ('powder flour') and after [the verbal bases] of the list beginning with *cur-* ('to steal').

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the verbal form *marṣayati* ('he suffers') derived from the verbal base *mṛṣ-* with the *kṛt* affix *ṆiC*, which, nonetheless, does not add a new meaning to that of the original verbal base (in line with the verbal bases of the tenth present class, i.e. of the *curādi* list, mentioned in A 3.1.25), as explained in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 3.1.25).³⁵⁷

193. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.373 [TE] (A*²)

saṁvatsarābhiśastasya duṣṭasya dviguṇo damaḥ |

vrātyayā *saha saṁvāse cāṇḍālyā tāvad eva tu || 8.373 ||*

The fine for the guilty man who is accused [again] within one year is doubled, and the same indeed [applies] in the case of intercourse with a Vrātya and Cāṇḍāla woman.

³⁵⁷ KV *ad* A 3.1.25: [...] *curādibhyaḥ svārthe* "After the verbal bases of the list beginning with *cur-* ('to steal') [the *kṛt* affix *ṆiC* occurs while retaining] the own meaning [of the base]."

[...] *vrātaḥ pūgaḥ saṃghas tena carantī*³⁵⁸ *pumścalīti kathaṃcid yaḥ kartavyaḥ*³⁵⁹ | *atha vā*³⁶⁰ *vrātaṃ arhati vrātyety astu yakāro daṇḍādīḥ*³⁶¹ (see A 5.1.66) | *kā ca vrātaṃ*³⁶² *arhati* | *yānekapuruṣopabhogyā pumścalī sā hi puruṣavrātaṃ arhati* | *atha vānekapuruṣasvāmikā grāmasya*³⁶³ *dāsyas ca vrātyāḥ* | *ye tūdvāhahīnāṃ vrātyāṃ*³⁶⁴ *manyante teṣāṃ mate na mukhyaḥ śabdārthaḥ* | *ayaṃ hi vrātyaśabdaḥ smṛtikāraiḥ sāvitṛīpatiteṣu prayuktaḥ* | [...]

[The word-form] *vrāta-* [means] ‘host’, ‘group’: the woman who has intercourse with the latter (lit. ‘this’), which has to be formed (lit. ‘done’) as such, is called *pumścalī-* (‘harlot’). Or rather, she is entitled to a host [of men]: let [her] be a *vrātyā*! A nominal stem of the list beginning with *daṇḍa-* (‘stuff’) contains the sound *y* (see A 5.1.66). And who (f.) is entitled to a host? The *pumścalī* is the one (f.) who is enjoyed by more than one man: indeed, [she] is entitled to a host of men. Or rather, the female servants of the village who have more than one lord are, indeed, *vrātyās*. But there are some people who think that *vrātyā* is one (f.) who is still to be married. In their opinion, the meaning of the word-form is not the primary one. Indeed, according to the authors of the *Smṛtis*, the word-form *vrātya-* is used to denote those who have lapsed from the privilege of pronouncing the Sāvitrī-formula.³⁶⁵

[...] *vrātyabhāryā tu saty api saṃbandhe na vrātyaśabdena śakyābhidhātum* | *so ’yam ity abhisāṃbandhe hi puṃyogād ākhyāyām* (A 4.1.48) *iti tathā bhavitavyam* | [...]

³⁵⁸ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *caritaṃ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *carantī*. In his edition, Olivelle notes that the variant reading *carati* is found in the *Dharmakośa* (1.1861).

³⁵⁹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *pumścalī kartavyaṃ* (also in *Dharmakośa* 1.1861). Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *pumścalīti kathaṃcid yaḥ kartavyaḥ*.

³⁶⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure omit *vā*, while the others do not.

³⁶¹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *vrātyety asteyakārāṃ daṇḍādīḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *vrātyety astu yakāro daṇḍādīḥ*.

³⁶² Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *śatam*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *vrātaṃ*.

³⁶³ Mandlik and Gharpure add *dāsyasatram eva*, which, following the other editions, we have decided not to integrate.

³⁶⁴ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *ye tadvāhahīnā vrātyā*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *ye tūdvāhahīnāṃ vrātyāṃ*.

³⁶⁵ For the discussion of the passages including the Sāvitrī-formula, see Candotti and Pontillo (2015: 154-169).

However, the Vrātya's wife, even though there is a connection [to her husband], cannot be named by means of the word-form *vrātya-* (just denoting the male Vrātya). In relation to the fact that he is this (i.e. *vrātya-*, which is a masculine noun), [the rule] *pumyogād ākhyāyām* (A 4.1.48) should be applied [to form the feminine of *vrātya-* by means of the feminine affix *Ṇiṣ*] (consequently, the feminine noun *vrātyā-* does not denote a Vrātya's wife).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 4.1.48: *pumyogād ākhyāyām* [*prātipadikāt 1 strīyām 3 ṇiṣ 40*]
[The affix *Ṇiṣ* occurs after a (masculine) nominal stem] ending in short *a* [to form a feminine nominal stem] due to [her] relationship with the male.
- A 5.1.66: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.159.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the feminine noun *vrātyā-* and gives several explanations. The first of these proposes the feminine noun *pumścali-* as a synonym, and the denotatum is a woman who has intercourse (*car-* equivalent to *cal-*) with a group. Indeed, the word-form *pumścali-* is generally interpreted as 'harlot.' However, it belongs to the lexicon of the *vrātyas* and is still veiled in mystery. Notwithstanding this, Medhātithi interprets it in one of its plausible etymological meanings from *pums-* "man, male" and considers the verbal base *cal-* as an allotrope of *car-*, probably in the specific sense of "to have intercourse." The third hypothesis is that *vrātyā* is a synonym for *dāsī-*, i.e. a servant girl in a village. Some people believe that this is the name of an unmarried woman, which in this case is a secondary meaning. Finally, a fifth explanation is indeed a grammatical derivation of *vrātyā* from *vrāta-* in the sense of 'to be entitled to a host' according to A 5.1.66. Finally, Medhātithi cites A 4.1.48 as a piece of evidence that the feminine noun *vrātyā-* does not denote the wife of a Vrātya since, according to such a rule, her name should be formed by means of the feminine affix *Ṇiṣ* (therefore, it should be **vrātī*).³⁶⁶

194. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.379 [TE] (A, A*⁴)

mauṇḍyaṃ prāṇāntiko daṇḍo brāhmaṇasya vidhīyate |
itareṣāṃ tu varṇānāṃ daṇḍaḥ *prāṇāntako* *bhavet || 8.379 ||*

³⁶⁶ Regarding the discussed etymology of the word *vrātya-* see Candotti and Pontillo (2015: 165-166) and Ferrero (2024a).

Shaving one's head is enjoined for the Brahmanas as capital punishment (lit. 'reaching the end of breathing' or 'determining the end of life'); however, for the other classes, there should be capital punishment.

[...] *prāṇānām antaṃ gacchati prāṇāntaṃ* (see A 4.3.85) *vā karoti prāṇāntakaḥ* (see A 4.4.34) | *anyeṣv api drśyate* (A 3.2.101) *iti ṇvul*³⁶⁷ (see A 3.1.133) | *anye tu prāṇāntika iti pāṭhāntaram* | *prāṇānte bhavaḥ prāṇāntiko 'dhyātmāditvāt thañ* (see A 5.1.109) | [...]

[The word-form] *prāṇāntaka-* [means] 'it reaches the end of breathing' (see A 4.3.85) or 'it determines the end of life' (see A 4.4.34). [The *kṛt* affix] *ṇvul* (see A 3.1.133) occurs [after the nominal stem *prāṇānta-*] according to *anyeṣv api drśyate* (A 3.2.101). Other people [support] another reading, i.e. *prāṇāntika-* (i.e. in line with the first hemistich); "the condition of being at the end of life" is called *prāṇāntika-*. The affix *ṭhañ* is due to its being [connoted as] individuality, etc.³⁶⁸ (see A 5.1.109).

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 3.1.133: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.194.
- A 3.2.101: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.62.
- A 4.3.85: *tad gacchati pathidūtayoḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1. *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]
[The *taddhita* affixes taught after A 4.1.83 occur after a nominal stem] to denote 'he goes to X' when a path or a messenger is the (final) denotation.
- A 4.4.34: *śabdadarduraṃ karoti* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1. *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *ṭhak* 1]
[The *taddhita* affix *ṭhak* occurs after the nominal stem] *śabda-* ('sound') or *dardura-* (here meaning 'sound of a drum') to denote 'he makes/determines X.'
- A 5.1.109: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.31.

Comment:

The target of this commentarial section is the nominal stem *prāṇāntaka-*, which seems to be the variant reading in the version of Manu's text used by Medhātithi.

³⁶⁷ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *daṇḍaḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *ṇvul*.

³⁶⁸ We have decided to translate *adhyātmāditvāt* in this way because *adhyātmādi* is not the name of a list.

However, first of all, he hints at a meaning rule taught to denote the sense of ‘going to X’, provided that the output denotes a path or a messenger (see A 4.3.85), and the first denotation is perhaps the only partially acceptable one, if one assumes that a metaphor has been used (namely the end of life envisioned as the end of a path). Secondly, he refers to A 4.4.34, which teaches the *taddhita* affix *ThaK*, despite the fact that this rule better accounts for the other reading of *prāṇāntika-*, it is taught for two specific nominal stems (i.e. *śabda-* and *dardura-*) which cannot be assimilated to *prāṇānta-*. Thus, perhaps the puzzling mention of rule A 3.2.101 which teaches the *kṛt* affix *Da* after the verbal base *jan-*, here might have been exclusively used to introduce a sort of exception, i.e. the hypothesis that the *taddhita* affix *thaK* also occurs after other nominal stems, exactly as the *kṛt* affix appears after the verbal base *jan-* when it is used with another nominal base as its *upapada*. On the other hand, he resorts to the *kṛt* affix *ṆvuL*, taught by A 3.1.133, to derive a nominal stem from a compound nominal stem, which is also peculiar, so that the sentence *anyeṣv api dṛśyate* might hint at such an extension. The final derivation of *prāṇāntika-* by means of the affix *ThaṆ* according to A 5.1.109 might allude to the denotation of ‘individuality is its *prayojana*’ since somehow the purpose of the punishment at stake is the individual’s death.

195. Medh ad MDh^M 8.383 [TE] (A*², KV*, N*)

[*sahasraṃ*] *brāhmaṇo daṇḍaṃ dāpyo gupte tu te vrajan |*
śūdrāyāṃ kṣatriyaviśoḥ sāhasro vai bhaved damaḥ || 8.383 ||

A Brāhmaṇa who has intercourse with women of these two protected [groups] (i.e. Kṣatriya and Vaiśya women) should be punished with a fine of one thousand [*paṇas*]. Indeed, a fee of one thousand [*paṇas*] should be imposed on Kṣatriya and Vaiśya [men who had intercourse] with a Śūdra woman.

[...] *sahasram eva sāhasram svārthiko 'ṇ* (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38) | *sahasraṃ vā asyāsti sāhasro daṇḍo 'nyapadārthaḥ*³⁶⁹ (see A 5.2.94) | *matvarthīyo 'ṇ* (see A 5.2.94) ||

[The word-form] *sāhasra-* only [means] *sahasra-*. [The *taddhita* affix] *aṆ* occurs [while retaining] the own meaning [of the base] (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38;

³⁶⁹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *sahasraṃ vā daṇḍo 'sti sāhasro daṇḍo 'tra padārthaḥ*. Jha and Dave have the variant reading *sahasraṃ vā yasmin daṇḍo 'sti sāhasro daṇḍo 'tra padārthaḥ*. Olivelle presents the text as *sahasraṃ vā asyāsti sāhasro daṇḍo 'nyapadārthaḥ*, and we decided to adopt the latter version.

N *ad* A 5.4.38). Otherwise, a fee consisting of a thousand (*sāhasra*) [analysed as] ‘a thousand (*sahasram*) belongs to X’ (see A 5.2.94), is an exocentric formation (lit. ‘whose conveyed meaning is that of another word’): [the *taddhita* affix] *aN* occurs in the sense of *matUP* (see A 5.2.94).

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 5.2.94: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.108.
- A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- KV *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- N *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.

Comment:

Here, Medhātithi explains the qualifier *sāhasra-* used for the noun *daṇḍa-* as being formed with the *taddhita* affix *aN* (applied in its own sense, according to A 5.4.38, following KV *ad* A 5.4.38 and N *ad* A 5.4.38; see our comment on Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36) which conveys the same sense as its etymon *sahasra-* (‘thousand’) or as a *bahuvrīhi* compound to which the affix *aN* in the sense of *matUP* applies, i.e. in a possessive sense (according to A 5.2.94).

196. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.392 [TE/TL] (A^{*2}, KV*, N*)

prativeśya *anuveśyau ca kalyāṇe viṃśatidvije |*

arhāv abhojayan vipro daṇḍam arhati māṣakam || 8.392 ||

When a Brāhmaṇa does not feed the neighbours living in front and behind, who are deserving, at a festival with twenty [Brāhmaṇa] twice-borns he is obliged [to pay] a fine of one Māṣaka.

*viśanty asminn iti veśo nivāsaḥ tatpratigataḥ prativeśo*³⁷⁰ *grhābhimukhas*³⁷¹ *tatra bhavaḥ* (see A 4.3.53) *prativeśyaḥ*³⁷² | *ādidīrghapāṭhe*³⁷³ *svārthiko 'n* (see A 5.4.38; KV *ad* A 5.4.38; N *ad* A 5.4.38) | [...]

[The word-form] *veśa* [denotes] the abode: inside the latter, they enter. The *prativeśa* has gone towards it, with his face towards the house; who is in this place is the *prativeśya-* ('the neighbour [in front]'). In the reading with the first long vowel, [the *taddhita* affix] *aN* occurs with the same sense.

Rules and passages referred to:

- A 4.3.53: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.
- A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- KV *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.
- N *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātiti explains the derivative stem *prativeśya-* ('neighbour') on the basis of the *taddhita* rule A 4.3.53, after giving the etymology of the simple noun *veśa-* from the verbal base *viś-* ('to enter') and a nominal synonym of the prefix *prati-*, namely *abhimukha*. Moreover, he resorts to the affix *aN* (according to A 5.4.38, following KV *ad* A 5.4.38 and N *ad* A 5.4.38; see our comment on Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36) to justify the first long vowel of the alternative reading *prātiveśya-* ('id.').

197. Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.412 [TE] (A*)

*dāsyam tu kārayaṃ lobhād brāhmaṇaḥ saṃskṛtān dvijān |
anicchataḥ prābhavatyād rājñā daṇḍyaḥ śatāni śaṭ || 8.412 ||*

A Brāhmaṇa who, out of [his] cupidity, makes initiated twice-born men undertake a service of slavery, even though they do not want

³⁷⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *prativeśyaḥ* (also *Dharmakośa* 1.1628). Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *prativeśaḥ*.

³⁷¹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *prṣtagrābhimukhaḥ*. Jha and Dave present the variant reading *grhābhimukhaṃ*. Olivelle reads *grhābhimukhas* (as a correction of the previous variant reading), which we have decided to adopt.

³⁷² Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *prātiveśyaḥ* (also *Dharmakośa* 1.1628). Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *prativeśyaḥ*.

³⁷³ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *prāgdīrghapāṭhe*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *ādidīrghapāṭhe*. In his edition, Olivelle notes that the variant reading *pradīrghapāṭhe* is found in the *Dharmakośa* (1.1628).

to, because of [his] superiority, should be fined by the king six hundred [*paṇas*].

[...] *prabhavato bhāvaḥ*³⁷⁴ *prābhavatyaṃ prabhutvam* (see A 5.1.124) | [...] [The *taddhita* derivative stem] *prābhavatya-* [means] ‘condition of being superior’, i.e. ‘power’ (see A 5.1.124).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.1.124: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36.

Comment:

Medhātithi here explains the abstract noun *prābhavatya-* (‘condition of being superior’) on the basis of the etymon *prabhavat-* (‘superior’) by hinting at A 5.1.124, which teaches the affix *Ṣyañ* in the sense of ‘condition of X’ (*tasya bhāvaḥ*).

Ninth adhyāya (10 passages)

198. Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.17 [TE] (A*)

śayyāsanam alaṃkāraṃ kāmam krodham anāryatām |
drogdhṛbhāvaṃ *kucaryāṃ ca strībhyo manur akalpayat || 9.17 ||*
 Manu arranged couch and seat, ornament, desire, anger, vileness,
 malice, and misconduct with women.

[...] *drogdhṛbhāvaḥ* | [...] *druheḥ kartari tṛcā* (see A 3.1.133) *bhāvaśabdena samāsaḥ* | [...] *drogdhṛbhāva-* (‘condition of being malevolent’, i.e. ‘malice’): [...] the compound [is formed by the *kṛt* derivative stem] from the [verbal base] *druh-* (‘to hurt’) by means of [the affix] *tṛC* to denote the agent [as the left-hand constituent] (see A 3.1.133) combined with the word-form *bhāva-* (‘condition’) [as the right-hand constituent].

³⁷⁴ All the editions but Olivelle’s feature the variant reading *vācaḥ*. Olivelle reads *bhāvaḥ*, which we decided to adopt as it aligns better with Medhātithi’s explanation of the noun *prābhavatya-*.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.133: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.194.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the compound *drogdhṛbhāva-* (‘condition of being malevolent’, i.e. ‘malice’), formed by the *kṛt* derivative stem *drogdhṛ-* (‘injurer’ or ‘malevolent’) as the left-hand constituent and the nominal stem *bhāva-* (‘condition’) as the right-hand constituent. As for *drogdhṛ-*, he refers to the *kṛt* affix *trC* occurring in the sense of agent (*kartari*). Therefore, rule A 3.1.133 is correctly recalled.

199. Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.19 [E] (A*)

*tathā ca śrutayo bahvyo nigītā nigameṣv api |
svālakṣaṇyaparīkṣārthaṁ tāsāṁ śṛṇuta niṣkṛtīḥ*³⁷⁵ || 9.19 ||

And, in a like manner, there are numerous passages from Vedic scriptures (*śruti*) even proclaimed in the Veda for the sake of investigating the specific characteristics of them (i.e. women)—listen to [those prescribing] expiations!

[...] *nigamaśabdo vedaparyāyo dr̥ṣṭaprayogaś ca | babhūthātatantha ityādi nigame*³⁷⁶ (see A 7.2.64) | *vedārthavyākhyānāṅgavacano 'py asti | nigamaniruktavyākaraṇāny aṅgānīti | nirukte hi prayogo nigamā ime bhavanti* (Nir 1.1) *iti | tasyeha śrutigrahaṇād vā vakṣyamāṇodāharaṇāc cāsaṃbhavaḥ*³⁷⁷ | *ato vedavacano nigamaśabda iha gr̥hyate* | [...]

The word-form *nigama-* is a synonym of *veda-* and is used as such (lit. ‘having the use which is seen’) [just as it is used with this meaning in] *babhūthātatantha ityādi nigame* (see A 7.2.64). It also denotes the ancillary [works] explaining the meaning of Vedic texts [just as it is used in statements like]: “the hermeneutics of Vedic texts and the traditional grammar are ancillary.” Indeed, in the *Nirukta*,

³⁷⁵ We note that, in Olivelle’s critical edition (2005: 749-750, 963-964), the variant reading *niṣkṛtīḥ* (found in all the other editions) is discarded in favor of *ākṛtīḥ* (lit. ‘constituent parts,’ here ‘sections’), which is found in all ST manuscripts and considered as a *lectio difficilior*.

³⁷⁶ Jha and Dave omit the section *babhūthātatantha ityādi nigame* and in its place only *nigamaḥ* is found. We maintained the version found in Mandlik, Gharpure and Olivelle, in which *babhūthātatantha ityādi nigame* appears.

³⁷⁷ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *ca saṃbhavaḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *cāsaṃbhavaḥ*.

there is the use [of the word-form *nigama-*]: “These are *nigamas*” (Nir 1.1). In this case, due to the mention of *śruti* by this [word-form, i.e. *nigama-*], the impossibility [of even denoting the ancillary texts] will also be stated due to the example (i.e. Nir 1.1). Then, in this case, the word-form *nigama-* is meant to denote *veda-*.

Rule referred to:

- A 7.2.64: *babhūthātatanthajagr̥bh̥mavavar̥theti nigame* ||
[The forms] *babhūtha* (‘you have become’), *ātatantha* (‘you have spread’), *jagr̥bh̥ma* (‘we have seized’) and *vavar̥tha* (‘you have covered’) occur in Vedic literature.

Comment:

To explain the fact that the word-form *nigama-* is used in this passage to denote the Veda, Medhātithi uses an abbreviated quotation (partly summed up by means of *ādi-*) to refer to A 7.2.64, where we find the locative constraint *nigame* which does indeed mean “in the Vedic literature.” This quotation from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is evidently not grammatical but is part of the group of encyclopaedic references to the Vyākaraṇa. Finally, we note that Jha’s edition (1999: II, 246) omits the citation of Pāṇini’s *sūtra* in the reconstructed text, which is then restored by Olivelle from the other editions consulted.

200. Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.46 [E] (A*)

*na niṣkrayavisargābhyāṃ bhartur bhāryā vimucyate |
evaṃ dharmam vijānīmaḥ prāk prajāpatinirmitam* || 9.46 ||

Neither by being sold nor repudiated is the wife released from her husband; thus, we recognise it as the law established by Prajāpati in ancient times.

[...] *yata udvaheta* (MDh 3.4) *iti kartrabhiprāyakriyāphalaviṣayād ātmanepadāl* (see A 1.3.72) *liṅgān nānyena*³⁷⁸ *saṃskṛtānyasya bhāryā bhavati | yathā nāhavanīyādaya ādhātur anyasya kriyādināhavanīyādivyapadeśyāḥ* | [...]

Because, as it is said in *udvaheta* (‘she should be lead away [from her parents’ house]’: MDh 3.4), she cannot be lawfully wedded to another man, i.e. become another man’s wife, based on the hint that the *Ātmanepada* [is used] in the specific

³⁷⁸ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *nānyeva*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *nānyena*.

sense of the outcome of an action whose purpose is the agent's (see A 1.3.72), just as the ritual fire and the like are not designated for another man other than the one who established them by a ritual action and the like.

Rule referred to:

- A 1.3.72: *svaritañītaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* [ātmanepadam 12]
After a verbal base marked with a *svarita* vowel or *Ñ* as a marker, [an Ātmanepada ending occurs] when the outcome of the action whose purpose is the agent's is denoted.

Comment:

While commenting on this verse that deals with the indissolubility of the wife's marital bond, Medhātithi quotes the verbal form *udvaheta* involved in MDh 3.4, focusing on the Ātmanepada diathesis used in accordance with A 1.3.72. This rule teaches the specific use of the Ātmanepada to convey the sense of the outcome of the action whose purpose is the agent's. The agent understood in the term *bhāryā* ('wife') is, of course, the *bhārtr* ('husband').

201. Medh ad MDh^M 9.59 [J] (A*)

devarād vā sapīṇḍād vā striyā samyañniyuktayā |
prajepsitādhigantavyā saṁtānasya parikṣaye || 9.59 ||

In the case of dissolution of the lineage, the desired progeny should be obtained from the husband's brother or the kinsman belonging to the same *piṇḍa* through the woman who has been properly appointed.

[...] *prajepsitādhigantavyā vidhau kṛtye* (see A 3.1.96) | *īpsitaśabdena kāryakṣamatām*³⁷⁹ *āha | tato duhitary andhabadhirādau ca jāte punar niyogo 'nuṣṭheyah* ||

prajepsitādhigantavyā ('the desired progeny should be obtained') is in the sense of the *kṛtya* affix as an injunction (see A 3.1.96). By means of the word-form *īpsita* (lit. 'desired'), [Manu] expresses the ability [to fulfil] one's duties. Therefore, if the daughter has given birth to a blind, deaf, or similar [child], the levirate should be carried out again.

³⁷⁹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *kāryākṣamatām*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *kāryakṣamatām*.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.96: see *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.103.

Comment:

This passage is part of the group of grammatical sections in which the references to Pāṇini's grammar are linked to the topic of injunctions (*vidhi*). In this case, the injunction is said to be inherent in the *kr̥tya* affix occurring in the future passive participle *adhigantavya-* ('to be obtained'), i.e. *tavya* (taught by A 3.1.96).

202. *Medh ad MDh^M* 9.74 [TE] (A*)

vidhāya vṛttiṃ bhāryāyāḥ pravaset kāryavān narah |
avṛttikarśitā hi strī [praduṣyet] sthitimaty api || 9.74 ||

After supplying subsistence for [his] wife, a man should leave home engaged in a business. For, a woman, emaciated for the absence of subsistence, could fall morally, even if [she is] virtuous.

[...] *sthitimaty api | sthitiḥ kulācāras tatsaṃpannā kṣudhāvasare dīnā doṣam avāpnuyād anyam bhartāram āśritya jīvātīti bhāvyata etat | sambhāvanāyām liṅ* (see A 3.3.154) ||

sthitimaty api ('even if virtuous'): [the word-form] *sthiṭi-* ('virtuous conduct') means 'appropriate family duty'; [the wife] who is endowed with the latter [is *sthitimati*]. In a moment of hunger, it [may be] caused to happen that the miserable [wife] could fall into sin: she lives on after resorting to another man (lit. 'husband'). [The substitutes of the *lakāra*] *līṅ* (in the verbal form *praduṣyet* 'he could fall morally') occurs in the sense of expectation (see A 3.3.154).

Rule referred to:

- A 3.3.154: *sambhāvane 'lam iti cet siddhāprayoge [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 liṅ 152]*
 [The substitutes of the *lakāra* *līṅ* occur after a verbal base] to denote expectation, provided that [the indeclinable word] *alam* ('able') is not explicitly used.

Comment:

Medhātithi here reflects upon the optative form *praduṣyet* (from the verbal base *duṣ-* 'to fall morally'), which is formed by means of a substitute of the *lakāra līṅ*. This *lakāra* denotes the expectation of anything that may happen according to A 3.3.154. The latter rule teaches to form optative verbal forms (by applying the

substitutes of the *lakāra IIN*) to convey the meaning of ‘expectation’ (*sambhāvana*) when the sense of *alam* (‘able’) is not explicitly used, i.e. to denote that the subject is able to perform the action conveyed by the verbal base.

203. Medh ad MDh^M 9.104 [TE] (A*)

*ūrdhvaṃ pituś ca mātus ca sametya bhrātaraḥ samam |
[bhajeraṇ] paitṛkaṃ riktham anīśās te hi jīvatoḥ || 9.104 ||*

After [the death] of their father and mother, the brothers, having reunited, should divide the paternal inheritance into equal parts: for, while [their parents] are alive, they are unable [to do that].

bhajeraṇn iti prāptakālatāyām liṇ (see A 3.3.164) | [...]

bhajeraṇ (‘they should divide’): [a substitute of the *lakāra*] *IIN* [is used] to denote appropriate timeliness (see A 3.3.164).

Rule referred to:

- A 3.3.164: *liṇ cordhvamauhūrtike [dhātoḥ 3.1.91 loṭ ca 162 praiṣātisargaprāptakāleṣu kṛtyāś ca 163]*
[The substitutes of the *lakāra*] *IIN* (= optative), [those of the *lakāra IOT* (= imperative) and the *kṛtya* affixes occur after a verbal base to denote an invitation, granting permission, and proper time], provided that it happens immediately afterwards.

Comment:

Medhātithi here explains the optative verbal form *bhajeraṇ* derived from the verbal base *bhaj-* as denoting appropriate timeliness (*prāptakālatā*), thus recalling rule A 3.3.164. The latter rule teaches to derive verbal forms by means of *IIN* (= optative), *IOT* (= imperative) and the *kṛtya* affixes denoting an invitation (*praiṣa*), granting permission (*atisarga*), and proper time (*prāptakala*).

204. Medh ad MDh^M 9.114 [TE] (Vt*)

*sarveṣāṃ dhanajātānām ādadītāgryam agrajaḥ |
yac ca sātīśayaṃ kiṃcid [daśataś] cāpnuyād varam || 9.114 ||*

Among all the goods of every kind, the elder son should take the best, and he should obtain something that is eminent and the preferable out of ten.

[...] *anye tu svārthe tasīm* (≠ M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44) *cācakṣyate* | *daśaiva daśato varān iti bahuvacanam paṭhanti* | *daśa varān ādadīta* | [...]

Others recognise [the affix] *tasI* [after the nominal stem while retaining] the meaning [of the base] (≠ M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44). [The form] *daśatas* just [means] *daśa* ('ten'). They read the plural form *varān* ('ten preferable ones'): he should take the ten preferable ones.

Passage referred to:

- M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93.

Comment:

Here Medhātithi is commenting on the *taddhita* derivative form *daśatas* by saying that some exclude the proper meaning taught in Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44 (M 2.436 l. 11), i.e. the ablative sense, but while retaining the own meaning of the base (*svārthe*). The final reading of *daśatas* is as if it were *daśa* and, accordingly, he cites a variant reading of *varam* as *varān* (accusative masculine plural).

205. Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.119 [TE] (A*)

ajāvikam caikaśapham na jātu viṣamam bhajet |

ajāvikam tu viṣamam jyeṣṭhasyaiva vidhīyate || 9.119 ||

One should never divide the remaining goats and sheep and solidungulate animals (in the case of an extra head of cattle after the division). It is enjoined that the remaining goat or sheep belong to the eldest brother.

[...] *ajāvikam iti paśudvandvavibhāṣaikavadbhāvaḥ*³⁸⁰ (see A 2.4.12) ||

[In the word-form] *ajāvikam* (inflected in the nominative neuter singular, 'goats and sheep'), the status as if it denoted a single thing is according to the *vibhāṣā* rule concerning the *dvandva* compounds denoting 'cattle' (see A 2.4.12).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.4.12: *vibhāṣā* *vṛkṣamṛgatṛṇadhānyavyaṇjanapaśu-śakunyaśvavaḍavapūrvāparaadharottarāṇām* [*ekavacanam* 1 *dvandvaḥ* 2]

³⁸⁰ Gharpure features the variant reading *paśudvandvāmvadhavikavadbhāvaḥ*. Mandlik, Jha and Dave present the variant reading *paśudvandvavidhāv ekavadbhāvaḥ*. Olivelle reads *paśudvandvavibhāṣaikavadbhāvaḥ*, which we have decided to adopt.

[A *dvandva* compound is] marginally [singular in number], provided that its members are nominal stems denoting trees (*vrkṣa*), animals (*mṛga*), grasses (*trṇa*), cereals (*dhānya*), decorations (*vyañjana*), cattle (*paśu*), birds (*śakuni*), and [the irregular compounds] *aśvavaḍava*- ('horses and mares'), *pūrvāpara*- ('first and last') and *adharottara*- ('upper and lower').

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the singular number of the *dvandva* compound *ajāvika*- ('goats and sheep') according to A 2.4.12, which teaches to marginally form *dvandvas* in the singular number (i.e. commonly labelled as *samāhāradvandvas*) when, among other possibilities, their compound members denote cattle (*paśu*).

206. Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.253 [TE]

*rakṣaṇād āryavṛttānām kaṇṭakānām ca śodhanāt |
narendrās tridivam yānti prajāpālanataparāḥ || 9.253 ||*

Due to the protection of the ones whose behaviour is that of Āryas and due to the removal of the thorns, the kings whose purpose is guarding their subjects go to the most sacred heaven.

*āryam³⁸¹ śāstranoditam³⁸² kartavyam itarānuṣṭhānaniṣedhaḥ³⁸³ | tadvṛttam
yeṣām ity uttarapadalopī samāsaḥ | [...]*

'Ārya' [means] 'what has to be done impelled by the treatises'; there is the prohibition of undertaking something else. This is a compound with a zero-replacement of the second constituent meaning 'of those whose behaviour is the latter.'

Comment:

While commenting on the compound *āryavṛtta*- ('whose behaviour is that of Āryas') in this passage, Medhātithi resorts to the hypothesis of a zero-replacement of an assumed second constituent (i.e. the mechanism of *padalopa*),

³⁸¹ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *āryavṛttam* (also found in *Dharmakośa* 1.1692). Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *āryam*.

³⁸² In his edition, Olivelle notes that the variant reading *śāstracoditam* is found in the *Dharmakośa* (1.1692).

³⁸³ Mandlik features the variant reading *kartavyetarānuṣṭhānaniṣedhaḥ* (also found in *Dharmakośa* 1.1692). Gharpure presents *kartavyo 'nuṣṭhānaniṣedhaḥ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *kartavyam itarānuṣṭhānaniṣedhaḥ*.

namely *śāstra*- ('treatise'), as postulated in the grammatical tradition. In our view, the meaning of this excerpt from the *Manubhāṣya* can be interpreted in a Mīmāṃsīc manner: the *kartavya*—i.e. duty, or in other words, *dharma*—is *ārya* because it was *nodita*, a synonym for *codita*, i.e. enjoined in the *śāstra*, which here most likely refers to the Veda.

207. Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.292 [TE] (A)

sarvakaṇṭakapāpiṣṭhaṃ *hemakāraṃ tu pārthivaḥ |*
pravartamānam anyāye chedayet khaṇḍaśaḥ kṣurairiḥ || 9.292 ||

The king should cause the goldsmith behaving unjustly who is the worst of all thorns³⁸⁴ to be cut to pieces with razors.

yāvantaḥ kecana kaṇṭakāḥ pūrvam uktās teṣāṃ pāpatamaḥ suvarṇakāraḥ | yadi nirdhāraṇe śaṣṭhī | katham na na nirdhāraṇe (A 2.2.10) *iti samāsābhāvaḥ | [...]*
As much as thorns are described above, the worst among them is the goldsmith. If the nominal stem ending with a genitive case (i.e. *sarvakaṇṭaka*- 'all thorns') [combines with another nominal stem *pāpiṣṭha*- 'worst'] in the partitive sense, why is the compound not avoided according to *na nirdhāraṇe* (A 2.2.10)?

Rule cited:

- A 2.2.10: *na nirdhāraṇe* [*samāsaḥ* 2.1.3 *saha supā* 2.1.4 *sup* 2.1.9 *tatpuruṣaḥ* 2.1.22 *śaṣṭhī* 8]
[An inflected noun ending in the genitive case] does not combine [with another inflected noun to form a *tatpuruṣa*] when it is used in the partitive sense.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the *tatpuruṣa* compound *sarvakaṇṭakapāpiṣṭha*- ('the worst among all the thorns'), which is formed notwithstanding the fact that Pāṇini forbids its compounding according to rule A 2.2.10. This rule teaches not to form *tatpuruṣa* compounds combined by a nominal *pada* inflected in the genitive case to convey the partitive sense. In fact, as correctly recorded by Medhātithi, the compound *sarvakaṇṭakapāpiṣṭha*- in Manu's text is exceptionally formed in derogation of such a rule.

³⁸⁴ The word-form *kaṇṭaka*- is a technical term denoting a criminal or an anti-social person within a kingdom. The king is duty-bound to 'eradicate' these thorns (*kaṇṭakoddharaṇa*, see MDh 9.252) or 'clean' them (*kaṇṭakaśodhana*, see MDh 9.253), i.e. take police action against criminals. In this regard, see Olivelle (2005: 332).

Tenth adhyāya (3 passages)

208. Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.33 [TE/TL] (A², A*)

maitreyakaṃ tu vaideho mādhūkam samprasūyate |
nṛṇ praśamsaty ajasraṃ yo ghaṇṭātāḍo 'ruṇodaye || 10.33 ||

A Vaideha³⁸⁵ generates a sweet-voiced Maitreyaka: he, who rings
 the bell at dawn, perpetually lauds (noble-)men.

[...] *mādhūkam* | *upamāpadam etat madhūkakusumatulyaṃ madhurabhāṣitvāt*
 (see A 5.3.107) | *atha vā madhukāyatiṭi anyeṣv api drśyate* (A 3.2.101) *iti ḍaḥ |*
anyeṣām api (A 6.3.137) *iti dīrghaḥ | svārthikena cādivṛddhiḥ | [...]*
mādhūkam ('sweet-voiced'): this is an inflected noun expressing a comparison
 [meaning] 'equal to the Madhūka blossom' because he speaks sweetly (see A
 5.3.107). Or rather, [the *kṛt* affix] *Ḍa* [is applied] to denote 'he behaves like the
 Madhūka blossom' according to *anyeṣv api drśyate* (A 3.2.101). The long vowel
 [in the second syllable] is due to *anyeṣām api* (A 6.3.137), and the *vṛddhi* of the
 beginning [syllable is explained] by means of [the *kṛt* affix applied] in its own
 meaning.

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 3.2.101: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.62.
- A 5.3.107: *śarkarādibhyo 'ṇ [pratipādikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 ive 96]*
 [The *taddhita* affix] *aṇ* [occurs after a nominal stem] of the *śarkarādi*
 list ('gravel and the like') [to denote 'similar to'].
- A 6.3.137: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.10.

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi is commenting on the derivative stem *mādhūka-*. First,
 he explains it as a *taddhita* derivative stem in the sense of comparison by means
 of A 5.3.107, probably considering the *śarkarādi* list as an open sample list, thus
 applying it to the etymon *madhūka-* (not included on such a list). Alternatively,
 Medhātithi interprets the word-form *mādhūka-* as a *kṛt* derivative stem formed by
 applying the affix *Ḍa* to convey the sense of *madhukāyati* ('he behaves like the
 Madhūka blossom'), i.e. the denominative verbal form from the nominal stem
madhuka- ('Madhūka flower' = *Bassia Latifolia* L.), according to A 3.2.101. The

³⁸⁵ According to the account in the *Mānavadharmasāstra*, a Vaideha is the son generated
 from the union of a Śūdra man and a Vaiśya woman (see MDh^M 10.11) or between a
 Vaiśya man and a Brāhmaṇa woman (see MDh^M 10.13).

latter rule teaches to apply the *kṛt* affix *Da* to the verbal base *jan-* ('to generate'), but it can also be extended to other verbal bases (thanks to *api*). Furthermore, he explains the two long vowels: the second long vowel is due to A 6.3.137, which teaches to replace the short vowel *-a* of the last *pada* in the case of continuous utterance, while the first long vowel is justified with the application of the *kṛt* affix *Da* mentioned above.

209. Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.44³⁸⁶ [TE/TL] (A³, A*)

paunḍrakāś cauḍadraviḍāḥ kāmbojā yavanāḥ śakāḥ |
pāradāpahlavāś cīnāḥ kirātā daradāḥ khaśāḥ || 10.44 ||

The chiefs of the Puṇḍrakas, Coḍas, Draviḍas, Kāmbojas, Yavanas, Śakas, Pāradas, Pahlavas, Cīnas, Kirātas, Daradas, and Khasas³⁸⁷.

puṇḍrakādayaḥ śabdāḥ paramārthato janapadaśabdā iha tu kṣatriyeṣu mukhyāś tatsaṃbandhatvāj janapadeṣu vartanta ity etaddarśanam āśritam (see A 4.1.166) | *yathā lubvidhau*³⁸⁸ *tasya nivāsaḥ* (A 4.2.69) *janapade lup*³⁸⁹ (A 4.2.81) *iti na tu yathā lub yogāprakhyānāt*³⁹⁰ (A 1.2.54) *iti* | [...]

puṇḍraka- and the like are word-forms whose most common sense is 'inhabited country', but, in this context, its relevant perspective is grounded on the fact that [these word-forms denoting] the chiefs among *kṣatriyas* are used in the sense of 'inhabited countries' due to [their] connection to them (see A 4.1.166). For, [the etymons are formed] according to *tasya nivāsaḥ* (A 4.2.69) [and] *janapade lup* (A 4.2.81) according to the *lup* rule, but *lub yogāprakhyānāt* (A 1.2.54) [is] not [applied].

³⁸⁶ We remark that Medhātithi's version of MDh 10.44 is slightly different to the one established from the manuscripts by Olivelle (2005: 819). For the sake of comparison, text and translation are the following: *puṇḍrakāś coḍadraviḍāḥ kāmbojā yavanāḥ śakāḥ | pāradāḥ pahlavāś cīnāḥ kirātā daradāś tathā* || "Puṇḍrakas, Coḍas, Draviḍas, Kāmbojas, Yavanas, Śakas, Pāradas, Pahlavas, Cīnas, Kirātas, and Daradas" (tr. Olivelle 2005: 210).

³⁸⁷ The nominal stem *khaśa-* is a variant spelling of *khasa-*.

³⁸⁸ All the editions but Olivelle's feature the variant reading *lugvidhau*. Olivelle reads *lubvidhau*, which is the correct one based on the Pāṇinian explanation given by Medhātithi: indeed, the correct type of zero-replacement is *LUP* and not *LUK*.

³⁸⁹ All the editions but Olivelle's feature the variant reading *lug*. Olivelle reads *lup*, which is the correct one based on the Pāṇinian explanation given by Medhātithi.

³⁹⁰ All the editions but Olivelle's feature the variant reading *lugyogāt prakhyānāt*. Olivelle reads *lub yogāprakhyānāt*, which is the correct one based on the Pāṇinian explanation given by Medhātithi.

Rules cited or referred to:

- A 1.2.54: *lub yogāprakhyānāt* [*aśiṣyam* 53]
The zero-replacement by *LUP* [must not be taught] because its relationship with its etymon is not known.
- A 4.1.166: *janapadaśabdāt kṣatriyād añ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tasyāpatyam* 92]
[The denominal derivative affix *añ* occurs after a nominal stem] which is a word denoting a country which is the name of a warrior clan [when the output meaning is ‘descendant of X’].
- A 4.2.69: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 7.193.
- A 4.2.81: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 7.193.

Comment:

Medhātithi here reflects on the derivation of some of the word-forms that are part of the verse (i.e. *paṇḍraka-*, *cauḍa-*, and *kāmboja-*) that indicates the Kṣatriya chiefs of the countries, i.e. those of the Puṇḍrakas (more commonly: the Puṇḍras; see below), Coḍas and Kāmbojas. These country names are derived from the homophonous ethnonyms, i.e. from their respective inhabitants, by applying rule A 4.2.81, which teaches a zero-replacement of the affix *añ* (taught by A 4.2.69) expected in order to derive the name of a country from the name of its inhabitants. Even if Medhātithi does not explicitly refer to this rule, the name of the chiefs of these regions is then derived in accordance with A 4.1.166 by applying the affix *añ* to the country name: *puṇḍraka* + *añ* (A 4.2.69) > *paṇḍraka-* + *LUP* (4.2.81) > *puṇḍraka-* + *añ* > *paṇḍraka-* (A 4.1.166).

Finally, a note on the nominal stem *paṇḍraka-* is needed. If we consider just the rules cited or alluded to by Medhātithi (i.e. A 4.1.166, 4.2.69, and 4.2.81), its etymon could only be *puṇḍraka-*, even though the country in question is what is commonly referred to as that of the Puṇḍras. We note that not only does Jha (1999: VII, 283-284) make no reference to rule A 4.1.166, but that he also wrongly cites the etymon of the word-form *paṇḍraka-* since he refers to it as *puṇḍra-*: if the etymon were *puṇḍra-*, the outcome derivative stem would be *paṇḍra-* (i.e. without the final affix *-ka*) if only the rules cited by Medhātithi were taken into consideration. In order to obtain the *taddhita* derivative stem *paṇḍraka-* from *puṇḍra-*, another of Pāṇini’s rules has to be applied, i.e. A 4.2.125,³⁹¹ which teaches to apply the *taddhita* affix *vuñ* to a nominal stem

³⁹¹ 4.2.125: *avṛddhād api bahuvacanaviṣayāt* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *śeṣe* 92 *deśe* 119 *vṛddhāt* 120 *vuñ* 121 *janapadavadhyoḥ* 124] “[The *taddhita* affix *vuñ* occurs after a nominal stem in the *vṛddhi* ablaut] as well as in the non-*vṛddhi* ablaut [meaning

meaning ‘inhabited country’ or its boundaries to denote a residual meaning (such as that of ‘born there’ taught in A 4.3.25³⁹² or ‘being there’ taught in A 4.3.53,³⁹³ just as the traditional examples report). The same affix *añ* taught by A 4.1.166 would then be applied to this nominal stem: *punḍra* + *vuñ* (A 4.2.125) > *paunḍraka-* + *añ* (A 4.1.166) > *paunḍraka-*.

210. Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.88 [TE] (Vt*²)

apah śastraṃ viṣaṃ māmśaṃ somaṃ gandhāṃś ca sarvaśaḥ |
kṣīraṃ kṣaudraṃ dadhi ghṛtaṃ tailaṃ madhu guḍaṃ kuśān || 10.88 ||
 Water, weapon, poison, meat, Soma, and all kinds of perfumes, milk,
 honey, curds, clarified butter, sesame oil, beeswax, molasses, Kuśa
 grass.

[...] *madhu madhūcchiṣṭaṃ ekadeśalopāt* (cf. M 1.136 l. 5 Vt. 9 *ad* A 1.1.56; M 1.136 l. 8 Vt. 10 *ad* A 1.1.56) *devadatto datta itivat* | [...]

[The word-form] *madhu-* (‘beeswax’) [stands for] *madhūcchiṣṭa-* (‘remainder of the beeswax’) due to the zero-replacement of a [word’s] portion (*ekadeśalopa*: cf. M 1.136 l. 5 Vt. 9 *ad* A 1.1.56; M 1.136 l. 8 Vt. 10 *ad* A 1.1.56) just as in the case of saying *datta-* for *devadatta-*.

Passages referred to:

- M 1.136 l. 5 Vt. 9 *ad* A 1.1.56: *ekadeśavikṛtasya upasaṅkhyānam*
There [should be] the inclusion of [a linguistic unit] which has been modified.
- M 1.136 l. 8 Vt. 10 *ad* A 1.1.56: *ekadeśavikṛtasyānanyatvāt siddham*
This is well established, because of the non-diversity of [a linguistic unit] which has [merely] been modified in a part.

Comment:

Here Medhātithi is focusing on the word-form *madhu-* (‘beeswax’), which he interprets as standing for *madhūcchiṣṭa-* (‘remainder of the beeswax’) according to a procedure here defined as ‘zero-replacement of a [word’s] portion’ (*ekadeśalopa*). We remark that *ekadeśa* is a grammatical term, found in Vt. 9-10 *ad* A 1.1.56 (M 1.136 ll. 5, 8) referring to a phonetic replacement (*ādeśa*), while

‘inhabited country’ or its boundaries] provided that it is in the plural [to denote a residual meaning].”

³⁹² A 4.3.25: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.46.

³⁹³ A 4.3.53: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26.

Medhātithi is dealing with the replacement of a whole *pada* of a supposed compound, i.e. *madhūcchiṣṭa-*.

Eleventh adhyāya (12 passages)

211. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.44 [TL/TE] (A)

*akurvan vihitaṃ karma ninditaṃ ca samācaran |
prasañjan indriyārtheṣu prāyaścittīyate narah || 11.44 ||*

The man not carrying out the enjoined act, accomplishing the forbidden one and clinging to the objects of sense is obliged to perform atonement (alternatively: ‘[he] desires to perform atonement’).

[...] *prāyaścittīyate | prāyaścittaśabdo rūḍhirūpeṇa viśiṣṭe naimittike vartate | tadetīcchati veti vinimayaḥ*³⁹⁴ *kartavyo vyatyayo bahulam* (A 3.1.85) *iti* | [...] *prāyaścittīyate* (lit. ‘he is obliged to perform atonement’): the word-form *prāyaścitta-* is used in the form [that conveys] the conventional meaning to denote a particular exceptional rite. Or rather, in the sense of ‘he desires [to perform atonement] at that time’, an exchange should be applied according to *vyatyayo bahulam* (A 3.1.85).

Rule cited:

- A 3.1.85: *vyatyayo bahulam* [*chandasi* 84]
The interchange (of affixes 3.1.1) variously occurs [in the domain of Vedic literature].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the verbal form *prāyaścittīyate*, which he interprets as a denominative formed from the nominal stem *prāyaścitta-* (‘atonement’) by means of—we assume—Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26 (M 2.34 l. 8).³⁹⁵ The latter allows the formation of a derivative verbal base by means of the affix *ṆiC* (that commonly conveys a causative sense) starting from a nominal stem (in other

³⁹⁴ Gharpure omits *vinimayaḥ*, while the others do not.

³⁹⁵ Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.61. The affix *ṆiC* is not a purely causative affix; rule A 3.1.25 indeed teaches *ṆiC* as a denominative affix or as the *vikaraṇa* for the tenth-class verbal stems. Nonetheless, *prāyaścitta-* is neither a tenth-class verbal stem nor one of the nominal stems listed in rule A 3.1.25.

words, this formation is, in fact, a denominative). In this case, the derivative verbal base would be *prāyaścittaya-* from which the Parasmaipada form would be *prāyaścittayati* and the passive form would be *prāyaścittīyate* ('he is obliged to perform atonement'). As an alternative, Medhātithi proposes that the sense of *prāyaścittīyate* is 'he desires [to perform] atonement', possibly formed—we hypothesise—by means of A 3.1.8.³⁹⁶ The latter rule teaches to form a derivative verbal base by applying the affix *KyaC* after an inflected noun which expresses the object of this newly-formed verbal form denoting the agent's wish. The derivative verbal base is *prāyaścittīya-*, where the final vowel of the etymon (*prāyaścitta-*) is replaced by a long vowel *ī* according to A 7.4.33.³⁹⁷ The only rule Medhātithi directly cites is A 3.1.85, which points out a variation (*vyatyaya*) of the affixes applied to the verbal bases in Vedic literature. In this case, we assume that he is inferring an interchange between the affix *ṆiC* (Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26) and the affix *KyaC* (A 3.1.8).

212. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.55 [TE] (M)

anṛtaṃ ca [samutkarṣe] rājagāmi ca paiśunam |
guroś cālīkanirbandhaḥ samāni brahmahatyayā || 11.55 ||
 And falsehood for the sake of self-elevation, slander brought before
 the king, and perseverance in [stating] falsehood against the teacher
 are equal to the murder of a Brāhmaṇa.

samutkarṣa iti nimittasaptamī carmaṇi dvīpinam hanti (M 1.458 l. 18 *ad* Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36) *itivat* | [...]
samutkarṣe ('for the sake of self-elevation'): the locative is used to denote a cause, such as 'he kills the leopard for the sake of its skin' (M 1.458 l. 18 *ad* Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36).

Passage cited:

- M 1.458 ll. 17-19 *ad* Vt. 6³⁹⁸ *ad* A 2.3.36: *nimittāt karmasamyoge saptamī vaktavyā | carmaṇi dvīpinam hanti dantayor hanti kuñjaram | keśeṣu camarīm hanti śimni puṣkalako hataḥ ||*

³⁹⁶ A 3.1.8: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.52.

³⁹⁷ A 7.4.33: *kyaci ca [aṅgāsya 6.4.1 ī 31 asya 32]* "[The long vowel *ī*] also occurs [in place of the short vowel *a*, when it is at the end of the pre-suffixal base] before [the affix] *KyaC*."

³⁹⁸ M 1.458 l. 16 Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.112.

When, after [a nominal stem denoting] a cause, there is a connection with the object, the locative case should be taught: “He kills the leopard for the sake of [its] skin”; “he kills the elephant for the sake of [its] tusks”; “he kills the yak for the sake of [its tail] hair (pl.)”; “the musk-deer is killed for the sake of [its] scrotum.”

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi is reflecting upon the use of the locative *samutkarṣe* (from the nominal stem *samutkarṣa-* ‘self-elevation’) to denote a cause (*nimittasaptamī*) by recalling Patañjali’s comment on Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36 (M 1.458 ll. 17-19 *ad* Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36). In accordance with Patañjali’s commentary on this *vārttika*, the locative should be employed in the case of a nominal stem denoting a cause and a connection with the object. In this regard, Medhātithi cites one of the four examples uttered by Patañjali, i.e. *carmaṇi dvīpinaṃ hanti* (‘he kills the leopard for the sake of its skin’).

213. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.59 [TE] (A*)

*govadho [yājya]saṃyājyaṃ pāradāryāt mavikrayāḥ |
gurumātrpitṛtyāgaḥ svādhyāyāgnyoḥ sutasya ca || 11.59 ||*

Killing a cow, sacrificing for people for whom one should not perform sacrifices, adultery and the sale of one’s liberty, abandoning the teacher, mother and father, and [abandoning] both the Vedic recitation and ritual fire, or the son.³⁹⁹

*ayājyā aviruddhāpātakiśūdrādayas teṣāṃ saṃyājyaṃ⁴⁰⁰ saṃyājanam | bhāve
nyac chāndasaḥ* (see A 3.1.123) | [...]

ayājyāḥ (‘people for whom one should not perform sacrifices’) are the Śūdras and the like who are not incompatible [with sacrifice] and have not fallen from the caste: for them, *saṃyājyaṃ* (‘officiating a sacrifice’) [means] the action of officiating. [The application of the *kṛt* affix] *NyaT* in the sense of action is a Vedic feature (see A 3.1.123).

³⁹⁹ These elements are listed in the section on secondary sins (*upapātaka*) that cause the loss of caste (MDh^M 11.59-66, corresponding to MDh 11.60-67 in Olivelle’s edition).

⁴⁰⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *asaṃyājyaṃ*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *saṃyājyaṃ*.

Rule referred to:

- A 3.1.123: *chandasi niṣṭarkyadevahūyapraṇīyonnīyocchiṣyama-rya-staryadhvaryakhanyakhānyadevayajyāprcchyapraṭiṣīvyabrahmavādyabhāvyastāvypacāyyapṛḍāni* [*dhātoḥ* 91 *kṛtyāḥ* 95]

In the domain of Vedic literature, [verbal forms formed by means of *kṛtya* affixes (i.e. *yaT*, *KyaP*, and *ṆyaT*) such as] *niṣṭarkya-* ('to be opened by unscrewing'; < *niṣ-kṛt-* + *ṆyaT*), *devahūya-* ('invocation of the gods'; *deva-* + *hve-* + *KyaP*), *praṇīya-* ('to be led on'; *pra-nī-* + *KyaP*), *unnīya-* ('to be led upwards'; *ud-nī-* + *ṆyaT*), *ucchiṣya-* ('to be left'; *ud-śiṣ-* + *KyaP*), *marya-* ('mortal'; *mṛ-* + *yaT*), *starya-* ('to be laid low'; *str-* + *yaT* + *ṬāP*), *dhvaryā-* ('to be thrown down'; *dhvṛ-* + *yaT*), *khanya-* ('coming from ditches'; *khan-* + *yaT*), *khānya-* ('to be dug out'; *khan-* + *ṆyaT*), *devayajyā-* ('worship of the gods'; *deva-* + *yaj-* + *ṆyaT* + *ṬāP*), *āprcchyā-* ('to be inquired'; *ā-prach-* + *KyaP*), *praṭiṣīvyā-* ('to be sewed on'; *praṭi-siv-* + *KyaP*), *brahmavādyā-* ('rivalry in sacred knowledge'; *brahman-* + *vad-* + *ṆyaT*), *bhāvyā-* ('to be effected'; *bhū-* + *ṆyaT*), *stāvya-* ('to be praised'; *stu-* + *ṆyaT*), *upacāyyapṛḍa-* ('gold'; *upa-ci-* + *ṆyaT* + *pṛḍa-*) [are derived as *nipātanās*].

Comment:

While commenting on which categories of men fall into the group of *ayājyas* (i.e. 'people for whom one should not offer sacrifices'), Medhātithi recalls the application of the *kṛt* affix *ṆyaT* to denote an action in the domain of Vedic literature as taught by rule A 3.1.123. The latter rule teaches to form a series of irregular *kṛt* derivative stems (by means of the *kṛtya* affixes *yaT*, *KyaP* and *ṆyaT*, respectively introduced by A 3.1.97,⁴⁰¹ A 3.1.106,⁴⁰² A 3.1.124)⁴⁰³ as *nipātanās*. On the list of forms enounced in this rule, the compound *devayajyā-* ('worship of deities') is formed by the nominal stem *deva-* ('deity') and the *kṛt* derivative stem *yajyā-* ('worship'); the derivation process is the following: *deva-* + *yaj-* + *ṆyaT* (taught by A 3.1.124) + the feminine affix *ṬāP* (taught by A 4.1.4).⁴⁰⁴ However, the latter rule does not apply in the specific case of *ayājya-* because no *nipātana* is implied. The *kṛtya* affix *ṆyaT* is regularly applied after the verbal base *yaj-*

⁴⁰¹ A 3.1.97: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.23.

⁴⁰² A 3.1.106: *vadaḥ supi kyap ca* [*dhātoḥ* 91 *kṛtyāḥ* 95 *yat* 97 *anupasarge* 100] "[The *kṛtya* affix] *KyaP* as well as [the *kṛtya* affix *yat*] occur [after the verbal base] *vad-* ('to speak'), provided that it does not co-occur with a preverb, but with a nominal *pada*."

⁴⁰³ A 3.1.124: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.94.

⁴⁰⁴ A 4.1.4: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.69-70.

according to the general rule A 3.1.124, which teaches to apply such an affix to a verbal base ending in a consonant. There is no need to recall the related Vedic form *devayajyā-* taught by A 3.1.123, which, as explained above, is not a gerundive.

214. Medh ad MDh^M 11.87 [TE/J] (A*²)

*hatvā garbham avijñātām etad eva vrataṁ caret |
rājanyavaiśyau cejānāv ātreṣīm eva ca striyam || 11.87 ||*

After killing an indistinct embryo (i.e. an embryo of whom the sex is still unknown), a Kṣatriya and a Vaiśya who have sacrificed, and a woman just after her period, one should indeed observe this vow.

[...] *ātreṣīm striyam atrigotrajātām* (see A 4.1.15; 4.1.122) | [...] ‘The Ātreṣī woman’ (*ātreṣīm striyam*) [means] ‘[the woman] born into the lineage of Atri’ (see A 4.1.15; 4.1.122). [...]

[...] *anye tv ātreṣīm garbhasāhacaryād ṛtumatīm āhuḥ | patyate bhrūṇahātreṣyās⁴⁰⁵ ca hanteti | bhrūṇahā brāhmaṇavadhakārī sā⁴⁰⁶ | sā ca brāhmaṇy eva | atra kukṣyāv avaśyaṁ garbha uhyata ity ātreṣī | yady apīdṛśyām vṛttau taddhito* (cf. A 4.1.122) *na smaryate prayogānusāreṇa tu bhavatīti ||*

But others state that *ātreṣī-* [means] ‘woman just after her period’ due to the association with an embryo (i.e. the embryo that the menstruating woman is believed to have killed), as when it is said: “The killer of an embryo-killer (*bhrūṇahan*) and a woman just after her period (*ātreṣī*) loses caste.” The *bhrūṇahan* is the one (f.) who has committed the murder of a Brāhmaṇa, and the latter is just a Brāhmaṇa woman. In this case, [the word-form] *ātreṣī* [means] that an embryo is certainly carried in [her] womb (i.e. that she knows that she is pregnant). Even if this *taddhita* [affix] (i.e. *dhaḌ*: cf. A 4.1.122) is not taught in such a meaning, ‘[this] is accepted in accordance with the usage.’

Rules referred to:

- A 4.1.15: *ṭiḍḍhānañdvayasajdaghnañmātractayapṭhakṭhañkañkvarapaḥ* [prātipadikāt 1 striyām 3 NīP 5]

⁴⁰⁵ There is a need to emend the printed reading *ātreṣās* (nominative masculine plural of the word-form *ātreya-*, lit. ‘male descendant of Atri’) to *ātreṣyās* (genitive feminine singular of the word-form *ātreṣī-*). Our thanks to David Brick for noting this point.

⁴⁰⁶ Mandlik omits *sa*, while the others do not.

The feminine affix *ÑP* [occurs after a nominal stem] ending with an affix whose marker is *Ṭ* and with the affixes *ḍha*, *aÑ*, *aÑ̃*, *dvayasaC*, *daghnaC*, *mātraC*, *tayaP*, *ṬhaK*, *ṬhaÑ̃*, *KaÑ̃*, *KvaraP* [to form a feminine nominal stem].

- A 4.1.122: *itaś cāniñah* [prātipadikāt 1 *taddhitāḥ* 76 *samarthānām* *prathamād vā* 82 *tasyāpatyam* 92 *ḍhak* 120]
[The *taddhita* affix *ḍhaK* occurs after a nominal stem] ending in short *-i* excluding [the *taddhita* affix] *iÑ̃* [to denote ‘descendant of X’].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi reflects on the etymology of the word-form *ātreṇī*. First, this is explained as deriving from the etymon *atri-* by means of the affix *ḍhaK* according to A 4.1.122, with the addition of the feminine affix *ÑP* based on A 4.1.15. The first rule teaches to form *taddhita* derivative stems in the meaning of ‘descendant of X’ (*tasyāpatyam*) by adding the affix *ḍhaK* after a nominal stem ending in short *-i* (excluding those ending in affix *-iÑ̃*). Instead, the second rule teaches to apply the feminine affix *ÑP* after a nominal stem ending with several affixes, including *ḍhaK*. Therefore, the derivation process is the following: *atri-* ‘Atri’ + *ḍhaK* (A 4.1.122) > *ātreya-* ‘male descendant of Atri’ + *ÑP* (A 4.1.15) > *ātreṇī-* ‘female descendant of Atri.’ Second, another hypothesis is provided: this word-form is explained as meaning a ‘woman just after her period’, even if, as he underlines, this meaning of the *taddhita* affix is not taught in Pāṇini’s grammar. Therefore, the latter is an example of paretymology. Based on a parallel passage in the *Vasiṣṭhadharmasūtra* (VDh 20.35-36), *ātreṇī* is ascribed a paretymology that explains its derivation as being from the adverb *atra* + the verbal base *i-*: “[the one] in which (*atra*) the future [offspring] comes into being (*i-*).” Here is Vasiṣṭha’s explanation: *ātreṇīm vakṣyāmo rajasvalām ṛtusnātām ātreṇīm āhuḥ* || *atra hy eṣyadagpatyam iti* || “We will explain who an *Ātreṇī* is. They say that *Ātreṇī* is a woman who has bathed after her menstrual period, for in her (*atra*) the future (*i-*) offspring comes into being” (tr. Olivelle 2000: 435). As demonstrated by Jamison (1991: 213-223), this paretymology is well-grounded in the Dharmaśāstra and is likely connected to the god Atri as a symbol of abortion in the *Śrautasūtra* tradition. In fact, in addition to the *Dharmasūtra* and *Smṛti* passages, Medhātithi seems to resort to a “floating statement of explanation” by asserting that “[this] is accepted in accordance with the usage” (*prayogānusāreṇa tu bhavatīti*): this is most probably the common explanation given to the word-form *ātreṇī-* by Dharmaśāstra scholars. In our opinion, it is interesting that, besides providing the well-known paretymology,

Medhātithi tried to at least cite (albeit without following) the proper Pāṇinian derivation of this word-form.

215. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.93 [E] (A)

*surā vai malam annānām pāpmā ca malam ucyate |
tasmād brāhmaṇarājanyau vaiśyaś ca na surāṃ pibet || 11.93 ||*

The Surā is the filth of broken grains, and filth is called sin; therefore, neither a Brāhmaṇa and a Kṣatriya, nor a Vaiśya should drink the Surā.

*annaśabdo yady apy adanakriyākarmaṇi vyutpādyate tathāpi vrīhyādiprabhṛtāv
eva bhaktasaktvapūpādaḥ prasiddhataraprayogaḥ | tathā ca **annena**⁴⁰⁷
vyañjanam (A 2.1.34) iti bhedopapattiḥ | [...]*

Even if the word-form *anna-* denotes the object of the action of eating (i.e. ‘food’), [in this passage], it has the meaning which is more commonly attributed just to *vrīhi-* and the like [or to] boiled rice, groats, and flour cakes [since *anna-* means ‘broken grain’ here]: and so, the reason for the distinction [between *anna-* and all the other word-forms mentioned] is *annena vyañjanam* (A 2.1.34).

Rule cited:

- A 2.1.34: *annena vyañjanam* [samāsaḥ 3 saha supā 4 sup 9 vā 18 tatpuruṣaḥ 22 tṛtīya 30]
[An inflected noun] meaning ‘condiment’ combines [with a nominal *pada* ending in the third nominal ending (instrumental case)] denoting ‘food’ [to form a *tatpuruṣa* compound].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi reflects upon the meaning of the word-form *anna-* (lit. ‘eaten’ from *ad-* + *-na*), which, unlike its etymological meaning of ‘food’, here specifically denotes ‘broken grain.’ In this regard, he states that, in this passage, *anna-* is endowed with a meaning more commonly attributed to word-forms such as *vrīhi* (‘Vrīhi rice’), *bhakta-* (‘boiled rice’, but lit. ‘distributed’), *saktu-* (‘groats’), and *apūpa-* (‘flour cake’). In his opinion, the distinction between *anna-* (‘food’) and the other word-forms mentioned is based on A 2.1.34, which uses *anna-* in the general sense of ‘food.’ We conclude that Medhātithi cites the rule

⁴⁰⁷ Mandlik features the variant reading *anyena*, while all the others present the variant reading *annena*.

at stake only for encyclopaedic purposes, drawing from his repertoire of reference linguistic forms from the Vyākaraṇa.

216. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.94 [TL] (A)

*gauḍī paiṣṭī ca [mādhvī] ca vijñeyā trividhā surā |
yathaiṣaivaikā tathā sarvā na pātavyā dvijottamāḥ || 11.94 ||*

The Surā has to be known as threefold: made of sugar, made of ground grains, and made of honey. A single one as well as all of these should not be drunk by the best twice-borns.

[...] *mādhvīti katham yāvatā guṇena mādhavīti bhavitavyam | saṃjñāpūrvako vidhir anityaḥ* (cf. NPBh 93)⁴⁰⁸ *iti parihāraḥ | jñāpakam cāsyāḥ paribhāṣāyā or od*⁴⁰⁹ *iti vaktavye or guṇaḥ*⁴¹⁰ (A 6.4.146) *iti guṇagrahaṇam | [...]*

How [the word-form] *mādhvī* ('Mādhvī liquor') [is explained]? As long as the *guṇa* is applied, [the correct form] should be *mādhavī* ('Mādhavī liquor'). This is an exception according to which "a rule is not constant when what is taught is denoted by a technical term" (*saṃjñāpūrvako vidhir anityaḥ*; cf. NPBh 93), and the clue to this Paribhāṣā is the mention of *guṇa* in *or guṇaḥ* (A 6.4.146) when *or od* ("The sound *o* occurs in the place of *u*") should be taught.

Rule cited:

- A 6.4.146: *or guṇaḥ* [*aṅgasya* 1 *bhāṣya* 129 *taddhite* 144]
Guṇa replaces [the *aṅga* final sound of a *BHA* nominal stem] ending in -*u* [after a *taddhita* affix].

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi resorts to the content of a metarule (which would much later become Nāgeśa's NPBh 93) in order to account for the form *mādhvī* instead of the regular *mādhavī*-. In the derivative stem, the *guṇa* replacement of the final vowel *u* of the etymon *madhu*- is not applied in accordance with the mentioned Paribhāṣā which teaches that a rule implying a technical term is not constantly applied. Medhātithi also recalls the clue for this Paribhāṣā which

⁴⁰⁸ NPBh 93: *saṃjñāpūrvakavidher anityatvam* "There is no constancy in a rule whose teaching is denoted by a technical term."

⁴⁰⁹ Mandlik features the variant reading *ād*, while the others read *od*.

⁴¹⁰ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *tadguṇa*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *or guṇaḥ*, which corresponds to the actual citation from A 6.4.146.

consists in the broad teaching of a *guṇa* replacement of *u* taught in A 6.4.146 instead of the limited replacement of *u* with *o*. It is assumed that this entails the possibility to limit the application by means of the quoted Paribhāṣā.

217. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.95 [TL] (A)

yakṣarakṣaḥpiśācānnaṃ madyaṃ māṃsaṃ surāsavam |

tad brāhmaṇena nāttavyaṃ devānām aśnatā haviḥ || 11.95 ||

Wine, meat, Surā and liquors are the food of Yakṣas, Rakṣas, and Piśāca. This should not be enjoyed by a Brāhmaṇa eating the oblation to the gods.

[...] *surā cāsavaś ca surāsavam* | *jātir aprāṇinām* (A 2.4.6) *ity ekavadbhāvaḥ* [...]

[The word-form] *surāsavam* [means] ‘Surā and liquors’; the singular number is due to *jātir aprāṇinām* (A 2.4.6)

Rule cited:

- A 2.4.6: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.119.

Comment:

Medhātithi here comments on the singular number of the *dvandva* compound *surāsava-* (‘Surā and liquors’) according to A 2.4.6, which, as explained above (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.119), teaches to form *dvandvas* in the singular number (commonly known as *samāhāradvandvas*) denoting class except in the case of living beings.

218. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.103 [TL/TE] (A*)

gurutalpo *’bhibhāṣyainas talpe svapyād ayomaye* |

sūrmīm jvalantīm svāśliṣyen mṛtyunā sa viśudhyati || 11.103 ||

The one who had intercourse with the teacher’s wife, after confessing his sin, should sleep on a couch made of iron, should embrace a red-hot column, [and] he is purified [just] through death.

gurutalpagah | *gurutalpīti vā pāṭhaḥ* | *talpīti matvarthīyena* (see A 5.2.115) *viśiṣṭa eva strīpuṃsayoḥ saṃsarga ucyate* | *gurur ācāryaḥ pitā ceti* | *talpaśabdo dāravacanaḥ* | [...]

[The word-form *gurutalpa-* (‘one who violates his teacher’s bed’) means] ‘one who gets into his teacher’s bed’ (*gurutalpaga*): alternatively, the reading is

gurutalpin (id.). When [the word-form] *talpin* is mentioned, just the particular connection between a man and a woman is expressed by means of [the *taddhita* affix] denoting *matUP* (i.e. the possessive affix *inI*: see A 5.2.115). [The word-form] *guru-* [means] ‘teacher’ and ‘father.’ The word-form *talpa-* [metonymically] expresses ‘wife’ (lit. ‘bed’).

Rule referred to:

- A 5.2.115: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44.

Comment:

While commenting on the reading *gurutalpa-* (‘one who violates his teacher’s bed’) by means of the synthetic compound *gurutalpaga-* (‘one who gets into his teacher’s bed’), Medhātithi also cites the variant reading *gurutalpin-*, which is explained as a *taddhita* derivative stem formed by means of a *taddhita* affix meaning *matUP*, i.e. the possessive affix *inI*, taught by A 5.2.115 (see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44).

219. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.108 [TL] (Vt*)

upapātakasamyukto goghno *māsaṃ yavān pibet |*
kṛtavāpo vased goṣṭhe carmaṇā tena samvṛtaḥ || 11.108 ||

One who is guilty of a secondary offence causing loss of caste by killing a cow should swallow barleycorns for a month, he should dwell in a cowshed after shaving his hair, wrapped in the skin of that [killed cow].

goghno goghātī mūlavibhujādidaśanāt kaḥ (see M 2.98 l. 18 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.5) | [...]

goghna- [means] ‘cow-killer’ (*goghātīn-*): [the *kṛt* affix] *Ka* occurs as it is seen in the *mūlavibhujādi* list (see M 2.98 l. 18 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.5).

Passage referred to:

- M 2.98 l. 18 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.5: *kaprakaraṇe mūlavibhujādibhyaḥ upasaṅkhyānam*
In the topic of [the *kṛt* affix] *Ka*, there is the additional statement that it occurs after the *mūlavibhujādi* list (‘chariot and the like’).

Comment:

In this case, Medhātithi is commenting on the *kṛt* derivative stem *ghna-* connected to the nominal stem *go-* (‘cow’) to form a so-called *upapādasamāsa*. The latter is said to be formed by applying the *kṛt* affix *Ka* to the verbal base *han-* (‘to kill’): to explain this derivation, he refers to Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.5⁴¹¹ (M 2.98). We remark that the list mentioned in such a *vārttika*, i.e. *mūlavibhujādi*, is not part of the Gaṇapāṭha and was invented by Kātyāyana himself. Finally, one might wonder whether Medhātithi is recalling this *vārttika* which is an *ad hoc* rule for the *nipātana* derivation of *goghna-* (and *dāśa-*). In our view, a possible solution is that A 3.4.73 teaches to derive such a *nipātana* form with the meaning of *saṃpradāna*, i.e. the recipient of the action denoted by the verbal base (thus, *goghna-* would mean ‘the one for whom a cow is killed’, generally referring to a guest). Instead, in Manu’s text, *goghna-* is formed to denote the patient of the action denoted by the verbal base *han-* (thus, meaning ‘the cow-killer’). Therefore, to apply such a meaning, Medhātithi needed to extend Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.5 (which cites a list not found in the Gaṇapāṭha) to *goghna-*.

220. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.173 [E] (A*)

amānuṣīṣu *puruṣa udakyāyām ayoniṣu* |
retah siktva jale caiva kṛcchraṃ sāntapanam caret || 11.173 ||

After emitting semen in female non-human beings, in a man, in a woman in her period, in places different from the vagina, or indeed into water, one should perform the Sāntapana penance.

amānuṣyo vaḍavādyāḥ | *gor amānuṣīṭve* ‘*pi sakhīsayonisagotrāśiṣyabhāryāsu*⁴¹²
*snuṣāyām gavi ca talpasamaḥ*⁴¹³ | *avakaraḥ* (≈ GDh 23.12-13) *iti viśeṣavihitam*
eva | [...] *sakhī cātra yā puruṣavan maitrīm āgatā na tu yā sakhyuḥ strī* | *na hy*
atra puṃyogāt pravṛttiḥ (cf. A 4.1.48) | *na ca bhāryāsambandhena sambandho*
’sti sayonipadena vyavadhānāt | [...]

⁴¹¹ A 3.2.5: *tundaśokayoh parimrjāpanudoh* [*dhātoḥ* 3.1.91 *kṛt* 3.1.93 *karmaṇi* 1 *kaḥ* 3]
 “[The *kṛt* affix *Ka* occurs after the verbal bases *parimrj-* (‘to purify’) and *apanud-* (‘to remove’), provided that [the nominal stems] *tunda-* (‘protuberant belly’) and *śoka-* (‘sorrow’) are co-occurring [in the sense of patient].”

⁴¹² All the editions but Olivelle’s feature the variant reading *sakhīsayonisagotrāśiṣyābhāryāsu*. Olivelle reads *sakhīsayonisagotrāśiṣyabhāryāsu*, which is corrected after GDh 23.12-13.

⁴¹³ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *gurutalpasamam eva*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *talpasamaḥ*.

The non-human exemplar is the horse and the like. Even though the cow is [included] in the category of female non-human beings, it is distinctly prescribed that “[sex] with a female friend, a uterine sister, a woman belonging to the same lineage, the pupil’s wife, the son’s wife, and a cow equals sex with [the teacher’s] wife [and] the student’s breaking of the chastity vow” (≈ GDh 23.12-13). [...] And, in this context (i.e. in Gautama’s quotation), [the word-form] *sakhī-* (‘female friend’) [means] a woman that has sanctioned a friendship as if she were a man and not the woman of a friend. For, in this case, [the feminine affix] is not applied to denote the relationship with the male (cf. A 4.1.48), and there is no grammatical relation (i.e. of *sakhī-*) with something which is in relation to *bhāryā-* (‘wife’) due to the interposition of the inflected noun *sayoni-* (‘uterine sister’) (and others) [between the two *padas sakhī-* and *bhāryā-* within the compound].

Rule referred to:

- A 4.1.48: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.373.

Comment:

While reflecting upon the animals included in the word-form *amānuṣīṣu* used in Manu’s text, Medhātithi cites one of Gautama’s *sūtras* to refer to the particular status held by cows (*go*), i.e. GDh 23.12-13 (which is slightly different from the version established in Olivelle’s critical edition through the manuscripts; cf. Olivelle 2000: 176).⁴¹⁴ In the comment referring to this *sūtra*, the scholar focuses on the use of the word-form *sakhī-* (‘female friend’), which is said not to be used in relationship with its masculine counterpart nominal stem *sakha-*, thus inferring the non-application of rule A 4.1.48. The latter rule teaches to form feminine nominal stems by applying the affix *NīṢ* due to the female’s relationship with her male counterpart.

221. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.181 [TE] (A*)

yo yena patitena^[īṣām] *saṃsargaṃ yāti mānavah |*
sa tasyaiva vrataṃ kuryāt tatsaṃsargavisuddhaye || 11.181 ||

⁴¹⁴ Here is Gautama’s passage from Olivelle’s critical edition (GDh 23.12-13): *sakhīsayonisagotrāśīṣyabhāryāsu sunuṣāyām gavi cagurutalpasamah | avakara ity eke |* “Sex with one’s female friend or sister, a woman belonging to one’s lineage, the wife of one’s pupil, one’s daughter-in-law, and a cow is equal to sex with the wife of an elder. According to some, it is equal to a student’s breaking the vow of chastity.” (tr. Olivelle 2000: 177).

A man who associates with an outcaste among them should perform his same observance for the purification from the association with him.

[...] *eṣām iti nirdhāraṇe śaṣṭhī* (see A 2.3.41) | [...]

[In the word-form] *eṣām* ('among them'), the genitive case ending is used in the partitive sense (see A 2.3.41).

Rule referred to:

- A 2.3.41: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.139.

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the genitive form *eṣām* ('among them') from the pronominal stem *tad-* by referring to the partitive use of the genitive case according to A 2.3.41.

222. Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.250 [TE] (A)

*sakṛj japtvāsyavāmīyaṃ śivasamkalpam eva ca |
apahrītya suvarṇaṃ tu kṣaṇād bhavati nirmalaḥ* || 11.250 ||

Despite taking gold away, one becomes immediately sinless after muttering the hymn beginning with *asya vāmasya* (RV 1.164.1) and indeed the Śivasamkalpa.⁴¹⁵

[...] *asyavāmaśabdo 'smin sūkte 'stīti matau chaḥ sūktanāmnoḥ* (A 5.2.59) *iti śabdavyutpattiḥ | asya vāmasya palitasya hotuḥ* (RV 1.164.1) *iti dvāpañcaśadṛcam sūktam* | [...]

[The *taddhita* affix derivative stem *asyavāmīya-* means that] the word-form *asyavāma-* is found in the relevant Vedic hymn: the derivation of [this] word-form is according to *matau chaḥ sūktanāmnoḥ* (A 5.2.59). The Vedic hymn [beginning with] *asya vāmasya palitasya hotuḥ* (RV 1.164.1: "Of this dear, old Hotṛ priest") is made up of fifty-two stanzas.

Rule cited:

- A 5.2.59: *matau chaḥ sūktasāmnoḥ* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76]

⁴¹⁵ See, in this regard, VS 32.1-6.

[The *taddhita* affix] *cha* occurs [after a nominal stem] to denote *matUP*, provided that the outcome is the designation of a Vedic hymn (*sūkta*) or Sāmavedic hymn (*sāman*).

Comment:

In this passage, Medhātithi comments on the *taddhita* derivative stem *asyavāmīya-*, which is formed from the etymon *asyavāma-* by means of the affix *cha* according to A 5.2.59. This rule teaches to form *taddhita* derivative stems by applying *cha* to denote the sense of *matUP* designating a Vedic hymn (*sūkta*) or Sāmavedic hymn (*sāman*). In this case, the etymon *asyavāma-* consists of the *pratīka* of RV 1.164, i.e. *asya vāmasya* (see RV 1.164.1), thematised as an *a*-stem, i.e. *asyavāma*.

Twelfth adhyāya (1 passage)

223. Medh *ad* MDh^M 12.87 [E] (A, M*, KV*)

vaidike *karmayoge* *tu sarvāṇy etāny aśeṣataḥ |*
antarbhavanti kramaśas tasmīms tasmin *kriyāvidhau* || 12.87 ||

However, in the performance of ritual duties prescribed by the Veda, all these [activities] are implied in their entirety, in regular order, [and] in each relevant rule of action.

[...] *kriyāvidhiḥ karmavidhir vaidikaḥ | karmayoge*⁴¹⁶ *karmaprayoge bahiḥ saṃpādyāvasthāḥ | etāny upaniṣadvedābhyāsādīny antarbhavanti | tasminn iti vyāpyatayā kvacit kasyacit samam eṣām antarbhāvam āha | karmayoga ity ukte kriyāvidhigrahaṇam ślokapūraṇārtham |* ***kratuyajñebhyaś ceti***⁴¹⁷ (A 4.3.68) *tadvad vā*⁴¹⁸ *somayāgabhedena bhedo vyākhyeyaḥ* (see M 2.312 ll. 17-20 *ad* A 4.3.68; KV *ad* A 4.3.68) | [...]

⁴¹⁶ Mandlik and Gharpure feature the variant reading *karmavidhir vaidikakarmayoge*. Jha, Dave and Olivelle present the variant reading *karmavidhir vaidikaḥ | karmayoge*.

⁴¹⁷ All the editions but Olivelle's feature the variant reading *kratuṃ yajñebhya iti*. Olivelle reads *kratuyajñebhyaś ceti*, which is the actual citation from A 4.3.68. We have decided to maintain the latter.

⁴¹⁸ All the editions but Olivelle's feature the variant reading *tad vā*. Following the version found in the *Dharmakośa* (5.636), Olivelle corrects it to *tadvad vā*. We have decided to maintain the latter as it makes better sense to the text.

[The word-form] *kriyāvidhi-* [means] ‘Vedic injunction of actions.’ [The word-form] *karmayoge* (locative singular from *karmayoga-*) [means] ‘in the practice of rituals’, i.e. after creating the conditions outside (namely, out of the *karmayoga-*). These, i.e. the constant repetition of the Veda and *Upaniṣads* and the like, are included [among these conditions]. [The word-form] *tasmin* (lit. ‘in this’) [means here that], through the obtainment of some [act] in some place, [Manu] states the inclusion of these on the same level (i.e. Manu equates all the conditions included in the *kriyāvidhi*). Since [the word-form] *karmayoga-* has already been mentioned, the mention of the [word-form] *kriyāvidhi-* has been employed for the sake of [metrically] completing the *śloka*. Or rather, such as [in the case of] *kratuyajñebhyaś ca* (A 4.3.68), a distinction should be explained through the distinction between Soma and [other kinds of] oblation (see M 2.312 ll. 17-20 *ad* A 4.3.68; KV *ad* A 4.3.68).

Rule and passages cited or referred to:

- A 4.3.68: *kratuyajñebhyaś ca* [*prātipadikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *tatra bhavaḥ* 53 *tasya vyākhyāne* 66 *ṭhañ* 67]
[The *taddhita* affix *ṭhañ*] also [occurs after the nominal stems] consisting of words consisting in names of *kratu-* (‘sacrificial rite’) and *yajña-* (‘offering’) [to denote ‘being in the place X’ or ‘commentary on X’].
- M 2.312 ll. 17-20 *ad* A 4.3.68: *kratugrahaṇam kim artham | yajñebhya itīyati ucyamāne ya eva saṃjñībhūtakāḥ yajñās tata utpattiḥ syāt | āgniṣṭomikāḥ rājasūyikāḥ vājapeyikāḥ | yatra vā yajñāśabdo ’sti | nāvayajñikāḥ pākayajñikāḥ | iha na syāt | pāñcaudanikāḥ sāptaudanikāḥ śātaudanikāḥ | kratugrahaṇe punaḥ kriyamāṇe na doṣo bhavati | atha yajñagrahaṇam kim artham | kratubhya itīyaty ucyamāne ya eva saṃjñībhūtakāḥ kratavas tata utpattiḥ syāt | āgniṣṭomikāḥ rājasūyikāḥ vājapeyikāḥ | iha na syāt | pāñcaudanikāḥ sāptaudanikāḥ śātaudanikāḥ | yajñagrahaṇe punaḥ kriyamāṇe na doṣo bhavati ||*
There is the mention of *kratu-*: what is the reason? Since such a mention, i.e. *yajñebhyaḥ*, is made, in which the *yajñāḥ* are precisely transformed into a technical term, therefore, there should be the occurrence [of *kratubhyaḥ*]: *āgniṣṭomika-*, *rājasūyika-*, and *vājapeyika-* (which are respectively commentaries on the relevant *agnīṣṭoma*, *rājasuya*, and *vājapeya*—all Soma sacrifices). Or rather, where there is the word-form *yajña-*: *nāvayajñika-* and *pākayajñika-* (which are respectively commentaries on the relevant *nāvayajña* and *pākayajña*; in this case, *kratu-* and *yajña-* in rule A 4.3.68 only convey their own form). [The

taddhita affix *ṭhañ*] should not apply here: *pāñcaudanika-*, *sāptaudanika-*, *śātaudanika-* (which are respectively commentaries on the relevant *pañcaudana*, *saptaudana*, and *śataudana*—all non-Soma sacrifices). When the mention of *kratu-* is made again, there is no shortcoming. Then, there is the mention of *yajña-*: what is the reason? Since such a mention of *kratubhyaḥ* is made, in which the *kratavaḥ* are precisely transformed into a technical term, therefore, there should be the occurrence [of *yajñebhyaḥ*]: *āgniṣṭomika-*, *rājasūyika-*, and *vājapeyika-*. [The *taddhita* affix *ṭhañ*] should not apply here: *pāñcaudanika-*, *sāptaudanika-*, *śātaudanika-*. When the mention of *yajña-* is made again, there is no shortcoming.

- KV *ad* A 4.3.68: [...] *kratubhyaḥ ityeva siddhe yajñagrahaṇam asomayāgebhyo 'pi yathā syāt | pāñcaudanikaḥ | dāśaudanikaḥ | bahuvacanam svarūpavidhinirāsārtham ||*

When *kratubhyaḥ* is just established, there is the mention of *yajña-* so that [the affix *ṭhañ*] also occurs after the names of non-Soma sacrifices, e.g., *pāñcaudanika-*, *dāśaudanika-*. The plural form is used to obtain a rule going beyond the own forms (of *kratu-* and *yajña-*).

Comment:

Medhātithi comments on the apparent quasi-repetition of *karmayoga-* and *kriyāvidhi-* in Manu's text by resorting to a comparable quasi-repetition of the sense conveyed by *kratu-* and *yajña-* in rule A 4.3.68. Since there is a distinction between *kratu-* and *yajña-*, because only the former one is a Soma sacrifice, the word-forms *karmayoga-* and *kriyāvidhi-* are respectively a hyponym and a hypernym. For the commentator, *kriyāvidhi-* also includes acts which are not ritual practices (such as the recitation of Vedic stanzas and Upaniṣadic texts). In this case, he evidently recalls a *Kāśikāvṛtti* statement (KV *ad* A 4.3.68), which in turn is based on a long explanation included in the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 2.312 ll. 17-20 *ad* A 4.3.68).

3. Study: An examination of the selected Medhātithi's grammatical passages

On the structure of the study

Here we will propose a reflection on the gathered material by organising it according to the several categories we selected in the *Preliminary note*. In fact, each passage surveyed in the section devoted to the *Textual analysis* has been classified with the relevant acronyms (see Chapter 2).

3.1. *Grammatical passages with linguistic purposes (TL)*

The passages in which Medhātithi explains or interprets word-forms from the *Mānavadharmasāstra* text by resorting to one or more rules selected from Pāṇini's grammar or its commentaries are considerably far fewer than those explaining the meaning of such words, i.e. where an exegesis of the text he is commenting on is carried out in terms of signification. The total number of passages labelled with this acronym is fifty-two.

For instance, in passage No. 9, the scholar comments on the ablative form *mukhabāhūrupādātāḥ*. This is a *dvandva* compound that combines the nouns *mukha-* 'mouth', *bāhu-* 'arm', *ūru-* 'thigh' and *pāda-* 'foot', which are the parts of the god Prajāpati from whom the four social classes stemmed. First of all, he almost pedantically connects the single body parts to the specific *varṇa* which was born from each of them (*mukhād brāhmaṇam bāhubhyām rājanyam ūrubhyām vaiśyam sūdraṃ pādātā iti* 'from the mouth, [he creates] Brāhmaṇas', 'from the arms, [he creates] Kṣatriyas', 'from the thighs, [he creates] Vaiśyas', 'from the feet, [he creates] Śudras.'). This is a rather pointless exercise from an exegetical point of view for two reasons. First of all, the names of the four classes are in fact specified in the same *Mānavadharmasāstra* text and, secondly, a sort of everyday common version (*laukika*) of the technical *yathāsāmṛkhyam* procedure taught in A 1.3.10 is readily available to all, since this rule teaches that if the number of items listed in two sets in a rule is equal, a one-to-one correspondence must be established between them. Thus, in our opinion, this redundant comment is instead targeted at drawing attention to the less obvious

morphological tool used at the end of this *dvandva* compound, instead of the ablative plural ending *mukhabāhūrupādebhyaḥ*, which one would normally expect at the end of a so-called *itaretarayogadvandva*. Indeed, the plural form *mukhabāhūrupādebhyaḥ* explicitly conveys the plurality of the body parts, as the sum of one mouth and (at least) two arms, two thighs and two feet, while in *mukhabāhūrupādātāḥ* no number is indicated. The morphological tool used instead of the ablative plural ending of the final constituent *pāda-* is the *taddhita* affix *tasI*, taught as an option in A 5.4.45, precisely to denote the sense of ablative. This affix is an *avyayam*, i.e. an indeclinable linguistic form in accordance with A 1.1.38, a rule which extends this designation to the *taddhita* affixes without all the endings (*asarvavibhakti-*). According to A 1.1.37, the term in fact mainly designates all the members of the *svarādi* list and the particles (*nipātas*) taught in the grammar in the section A 1.4.56-97. The expected nominal ending after an *avyaya* is replaced by zero according to A 2.4.82.⁴¹⁹

It is clear that there is no doubt about the interpretation of the meaning of the compound and that Medhātithi's interest in this case is exclusively linguistic. He also comments again on the *taddhita* affix *tasI* taught by A 5.4.45 in passages Nos. 13 and 122; *tasI* taught by A 5.4.46 in passage No. 55; *tasI* taught by A 5.4.47 after a nominal stem inflected in the instrumental case in passages Nos. 45, 71, 88, and *-tas* applied according Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44 in passages Nos. 17, 99 and 204. Passages Nos. 13, 17, 45 are another three cases of these nine which have been classified as TL.

In some cases Medhātithi's purpose is evidently that of explaining complex forms, such as in passage No. 15 where the feminine form *tāvacchatī* denoting a group 'of so many hundreds' is analysed as a *dvigu* compound in order to explain the application of the feminine affix *ŌP* in accordance with A 4.1.21. The latter teaches the use of this affix after a nominal stem ending in *-a*, consisting of a *dvigu* compound, provided that it is not a non-head constituent, to form a feminine nominal stem. The second member of this compound, *śata-*, in fact ends in *-a* and is a *saṅkhyā* but even *tāvat* is designated as a *saṅkhyā* according to A 1.1.23. A 4.1.21 is an *apavāda* rule with respect to the *utsarga* A 4.1.4, according to which the feminine affix should be *ṬāP*. In this case, this is a purely morphological derivational explanation.

⁴¹⁹ A 2.4.82: *avyayād āpsupah* [luk 58] "After an indeclinable, [LUK zero-replacement] occurs in the place of a feminine *āP* affix or of a nominal ending." As for zero-phenomena, see below Section 2.6.

Medhātithi sometimes makes extensions of rules that are not attested even in the commentaries on the grammar of Pāṇini up to the *Kāśikāvṛtti* but are found in later Vyākaraṇa texts. This mechanism is found in the passages implying the *svārthe* use of the *taddhita* affix *aN*: Nos. 16, 33, 115, 145, 178, 191, 195 and 196. In all these instances, Medhātithi hypothesises the application of the affix *aN* in a “semantically neutral” sense (following D’Avella 2018: 128) or while retaining the own meaning of the base (as we translated in Chapter 2), i.e. *svārthe*. Indeed, an entire section of Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, specifically that between A 5.3.1 and 5.4.160, is recognised by later Vyākaraṇa authors as teaching the *taddhita* affixes in the *svārthe* sense (see e.g. KV *ad* A 5.3.1).⁴²⁰ In particular, the *taddhita* affix *aN* is taught as a *svārthika* in rule A 5.4.38 (explicitly cited in No. 145), which prescribes its application after the *prajñādi* list. However, this list is considered as “closed” up to the *Kāśikāvṛtti* itself, making it impossible to apply *aN* in a *svārthe* sense in all the cases concerned. It is the later author Jinendrabuddhi, however, who treats this list as exemplificatory (*ākṛtigaṇa*) in his commentary on this rule (N *ad* A 5.4.38: *prajñādir ayam ākṛtigaṇaḥ*), thereby making it possible to extend it to all nominal stems. Let us take an example. In No. 16, when Medhātithi comments on the compound *dvādaśasāhasra-* (‘consisting of twelve thousand’), he first concentrates on the right-hand constituent *sāhasra-*, which he analyses as a *taddhita* derivative stem formed by applying the *svārthika taddhita* affix *aN* to the numeral base *sahasra-* (‘thousand’) according to A 5.4.38 (interpreted through N *ad* A 5.4.38). Therefore, *sāhasra-* ends up having the same meaning as its etymon *sahasra-*, that is, ‘thousand.’ Then, in the subsequent section, the discussion is expanded to the whole compound *dvādaśasāhasra-*, which is said to be formed by another *taddhita* affix *aN*, taught in A 5.1.57—this time not in the *svārthe* sense, but with the output meaning ‘this is the measure of X’ (see also Section 3.2.4.3). As regards the use of rules that will later be found in later grammatical literature, it is also worth mentioning No. 216, where the linguistic form explained is *mādhvī-* in place of the expected *mādhavī-*. In this passage, in addition to citing A 6.4.146, Medhātithi hints at a metarule which will correspond to NPBh 93 in Nāgeśa’s much later collection of *Paribhāṣās* (c. 17th-18th century),⁴²¹ teaching that a rule implying a technical term is not constantly applied.⁴²²

⁴²⁰ It is noteworthy that, despite being traditionally well documented (see e.g. M 2.98 l. 10 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.4 and KV *ad* A 5.3.1), this is not a category taken into account by Pāṇini.

⁴²¹ For the chronology of Nāgeśa, see Coward and Raja (1990: 323-324).

⁴²² In the relevant rule A 6.4.146 the technical term is *guṇa*.

On a few other occasions, it is not entirely clear why Medhātithi elaborates linguistic reasoning in the way he does. This can be seen, for instance, in No. 153. While commenting on the *dvigu* compound *tryabda-* ('three years'), it is somewhat puzzling that he chooses to resort to a passage of the *Mahābhāṣya* that is not classified as a *vārttika* by Kielhorn, although it has all the characteristics of a genuine *vārttika* (M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.4.30). In this passage of Patañjali, the feminine gender is adopted for a *dvigu* compound whose latter constituent ends in a vowel, such as *pañcapūlī-* ('a group of five bunches') or *daśapūlī-* ('a group of ten bunches'). Yet the *dvigu* compound Medhātithi is commenting on, *tryabda-* ('three years'), is inflected as a singular neuter form, which regularly complies with A 2.4.17: *sa napuṃsakam* [*ekavacanam* 1], "That (i.e. a *dvigu* compound A 2.4.1 and a *dvandva* compound A 2.4.2-16) [treated as singular in number] is neuter in gender." Thus, this raises the question of what exactly Medhātithi is trying to accomplish. Is he reminding his audience of an important grammatical provision that applies elsewhere, or is he emphasizing that the relevant verse of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* does not conform to this traditional teaching?

At other times, the author does show some initiative and perhaps even a certain nonchalance in handling his derivations in order to justify an unexpected form of the text. For instance, he resorts to a device often adopted by Patañjali, called *yogavibhāga*, i.e. the splitting of a rule, in No. 45, where, to explain the *upapadasamāsa* *hṛdga-*, as a correct form with *hṛd-* instead of *hṛdaya-* as the left-hand constituent, he proposes that rule A 6.3.50 should be split into two parts. As a consequence, the wording of the first rule obtained by *yogavibhāga* is just *hṛdayasya hṛd* '*hṛd-* occurs in the place of *hṛdaya-*', without paying any attention to the right-hand constituents placed by Pāṇini as a constraint. It is noteworthy that this *yogavibhāga* is advanced by Medhātithi, while it is not documented either in the *Mahābhāṣya* or in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

Medhātithi sometimes has recourse to the *praśliṣṭanirdeśa*, for example in No. 49, where in order to justify the accusative case of *prākkūlān* 'the tufts of Kuśa grass having the tips turned eastward' depending on the participle *paryupāsīna-* 'sitting', he cites rule A 1.4.46 *adhiśṁsthāsām karma* [*kārake* 23 *ādihāraḥ* 45] "[In the domain of *kāraḥ*], the *karman* denotes [the substratum] when the verbal bases *śī-* ('to lie'), *sthā-* ('to stand'), and *ās-* ('to sit') co-occur with the prefix *adhi-*", reading it as if the first word included a *praśleṣa* (i.e. the coalescence and consequently the double reading of the same vowel *ā*). In this way, the wording should include *sthā-*, *ā-* and *ās-* instead of *sthā-* and *ās-* and this prefix *ā-* (= *aṅ*) consequently triggers the patient (*karman*) *kāraka* and thus the accusative case

ending (according to A 1.4.2) for *prākkūlān*, governed by *paryupāsīnaḥ* and read in parallel with the *praśliṣṭanirdeśa* mechanism, as if it were to be segmented in the following manner: *pary-upa-ā-as-īna-*.

All things considered, Medhātithi mentions Pāṇini's rules or commentarial grammatical materials in order to account for unexpected linguistic forms adopted in the *Mānavadharmasāstra*. He sometimes also discusses variant readings, assessing them precisely on the basis of his notable Vyākaraṇa expertise. At times he demonstrates an innovative side, showing himself to be partially independent from the historical Pāṇinian authorities when he resorts to the most "creative" interpretative devices plausibly drawn from Patañjali's repertoire and filtered through the *Kāśikāvṛtti* which he then applies to linguistic forms different from those targeted on by the great author of the *Mahābhāṣya*.

3.2. Grammatical passages with exegetical purposes (TE)

Most of the passages devoted to linguistic-grammatical issues in Medhātithi's commentary have been here labelled as being of a textual-exegetical nature [TE] and they are all targeted on explaining or interpreting a lexeme of the *Mānavadharmasāstra* text or one of its variant readings through one of Pāṇini's grammatical rules or a commentarial passage, especially drawn from *vārttikas*, *Mahābhāṣya* and *Kāśikāvṛtti*. The broad technical background against which these explanations are encapsulated can also be perceived in some passages that mention mechanisms belonging to the *alaṃkāraśāstra* tradition, such as the *āropa* 'superimposition' of a sense onto another in passage No. 73, where the sense of *adhi-*+ *iK* ('to turn the mind towards') is superimposed onto that conveyed by the verbal base *ākāṅkṣ-* 'to long for' included in the *Mānavadharmasāstra* passage there commented on. He recognises and explains a *figura etymologica* in passage No. 167, where a third-person singular form of the perfect of the verbal base *śap-* co-occurs with the corradical noun *śapatha-* inflected in the accusative case. Medhātithi teaches to consider the verbal base as conveying a generic sense, as if it were a verbal form derived from *kṛ-* 'to make' and quotes another couple of analogous examples. In passage No. 101 the author singles out a metaphorical identification in the compound *vipramukhāgni-* 'mouths of Brāhmaṇas that are fires' and he resorts to A 2.1.56 in order to account for it in a grammatical way.

3.2.1. *Phonetic issues*

There are very few passages in Medhātithi's commentary that are devoted to phonetic issues in the wording of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* verses. The *Index Locorum* consistently shows a low number of rules quoted from the last three books of the grammar (see Chapter 6). In passage No. 77 for instance the scholar explains the short final vowel of the left-hand member of the *tatpuruṣa* compound *mauñji-bandhana-* 'when the girdle made of Muñja grass is tied.' The expected feminine member is in fact *mauñjī-* with a final long vowel *ī*, but he explicitly quotes rule A 6.3.63, which teaches the replacement under various conditions of *-ī* (= *Ñī*) and *-ā* (= *āP*) with the matching short vowel *-i* and *-a* before the right-hand constituent of a compound in a proper name or in the domain of Vedic literature. Since to the best of our knowledge there are only a few Late Vedic works (i.e. BDh 1.3.6, VDh 2.32 and 2.62) which actually attest the use of this compound, we are inclined to believe that Medhātithi classified this compound as a technical term. In another example, i.e. passage No. 216, a technical term is still considered as the cause of exceptions, but reference is made to the relevant wording of the rule and not the analysed linguistic form. In this case, he explains the use of the linguistic form *mādhvī-* as a name for liquor in place of the expected *mādhavī-* (with a *guṇa* replacement of the *aṅga* final sound of a *BHA* nominal stem ending in *-u* after a *taddhita* affix, taught by A 6.4.146) by resorting to a metarule teaching that a rule is not constant when whatever is taught is denoted by a technical term such as this very *guṇa*. In Nāgeśa's later collection of *Paribhāṣās*, the relevant metarule is NPBh 93, which reads *saṃjñāpūrvakavidher anityatvam* "There is no constancy of a rule whose teaching is denoted by a technical term" (see also Section 3.1).

On the contrary, passage No. 80 focuses on a phenomenon of the lengthening of the final vowel of the left-hand compound constituent *pari-* when the right-hand constituent ends in the *kṛt* affix *GHañ*. The constituent ending with the *kṛt* affix *GHañ* is *vāda-* obtained, according to A 3.3.18, by applying the *kṛt* affix *GHañ* to the verbal base *vad-* ('to speak') to denote an action (*bhāve*). When *vāda-* is combined with *pari-* as the right-hand constituent, the short final vowel *i* of the latter is replaced by the matching long vowel *ī* in accordance with the sandhi rule A 6.3.122: *upasargasya ghañy amanuṣye bahulam [uttarapade 1 dīrghaḥ 111 saṃhitāyām 114]* "[In continuous utterance, a long vowel] occurs in place of the final vowel of a prefix [before a right-hand compound constituent] ending in [the *kṛt* affix] *GHañ* under various conditions, provided that a human being is not denoted."

Seldom does the author step outside the Pāṇinian grammatical framework and propose special phonetic shifts. For example, in passage No. 176, after deriving *yāmya-* in the sense of ‘belonging to Yama’ as a *taddhita* derivative stem from the etymon *yama-* (which is the renowned theonym Yama) by applying the *taddhita* affix *aN*, he refers to a blocking (*bādhaka*) of this affix and merely mentions the addition of the sound *ya*, thus adopting an un-Pāṇinian approach. To sum up, Medhātithi does not seem to be maximally interested in phonetic issues and only rarely uses the inherent rules of Pāṇini, especially for *sandhi* matters.

3.2.2. Verbal inflection

Very few of the grammatical passages we have marked as textual-exegetical are explicitly dedicated to verbal inflection (No. 47, 167, 203), even though they are certainly an interesting topic for discussion.

The first case (No. 47) is a verse dealing with the pupil’s duties before he receives instruction, Medhātithi clarifies the use of the future active participle *adhyeṣyamāṇa-* (lit. ‘being about to study’) from the verb *adhī-* (‘to study’). Morphologically speaking, it is formed according to A 3.3.14 with the *kṛt* affixes termed *sat*, which, based on A 3.2.127, are *ŚatR* and *ŚānaC*. In other words, the latter are those affixes that form the present active and middle participles that take the place of the substitutes of the *lakāra* *lṛṭ* and are used to form the future indicative under A 3.3.13. On the semantic side, he explains that it has the sense of proximate future (*pratyāsanna*) which, along with engagement and desire, are the three meanings he recognises for the future (in accordance with the section from A 3.3.3 onward). The aim of this commentary might have been to disambiguate the verbal form *adhyeṣyamāṇa-*, which he may have considered as challenging for, first of all, his students at his *gurukula* (see also Chapter 4) and then the readers of the *Manubhāṣya*, to understand.

The second case (No. 167) is a verse dealing with the oaths sanctioned by great seers and deities, which also mentions Vasiṣṭha’s oath before Paijavana, and here Medhātithi focuses on the verbal form *śepe* combined with the accusative *śapatham* (‘he sanctioned an oath’). He analyses *śepe* as being produced by the verbal base *śap-* (‘to swear’) to which one substitute of the *lakāra* *lṛṭ* is applied. The substitutes of the *lakāra* *lṛṭ* form the perfect according to A 3.2.115 to denote an unwitnessed past. In this case, the substitute of the *lakāra* that occurs is that for the *prathamapūruṣa*, the traditional first person singular, corresponding to the

English third person singular: he/she/it. We note that the perfect tense is correctly used here in accordance with Pāṇini's terms to convey the sense of a past action (*bhūte*, coming from A 3.2.84) which did not happen in the present day (*anadyatane*, coming from A 3.2.111) and which the speaker/writer did not witness directly (as indicated by the locative constraint *parokṣe*, the specific feature of *IIṬ* introduced in A 3.2.115). As for the meaning conveyed by this verbal form, Medhātithi quotes M 1.280 l. 19 Vt. 8 *ad* A 1.3.21, which teaches that it is inflected in the Ātmanepada and denotes 'to touch the body with an utterance' (using KV *ad* A 1.3.21 to clarify this reference further).

The last case (No. 203) deals with the use of the optative in the verbal form *bhajeran* ('they should divide') in a verse devoted to inheritance. Medhātithi recalls A 3.3.164 to state that a substitute of the *lakāra IIṆ*, forming the optative, is used here to denote appropriate timeliness (*prāptakālatā*) which, together with invitation (*praiṣa*) and granting permission (*atisarga*), is one of the possible meanings for *IIṆ* dictated by this rule.

Of course, there are other cases in the *Manubhāṣya* which mention features of verbal inflection and these have sometimes been discussed in other sections of this study. One example is No. 23, which deals with the substitutes of the *lakāra IET*, taught by Pāṇini as forming the subjunctive in the sense of *IIṆ* under A 3.4.7. Another example is No. 136, in which a verbal form conjugated in the perfect tense following A 3.2.115, i.e. *babhūvuḥ* (from the verbal base *bhū-*), is read by Medhātithi as the relevant present form, i.e. *bhavanti*, to conform to a custom of his times. However, this is undoubtedly one of the grammatical topics which least interests Medhātithi, and indeed he uses the abovementioned No. 23, which we have marked as 'juridical', to articulate his argument on injunction (see Section 3.3).

3.2.3. Nominal inflection

Medhātithi only seems to comment on nominal inflection topics in order to reflect on the syntactical function of the nominal endings in peculiar contexts and he refers to specific rules of Pāṇini's grammar or commentarial passages to account for the relevant usages. Morphological annotations are totally lacking.

For instance, in passage No. 42 (which we have also considered as partly "juridical": see Section 3.3), he focuses on the genitive form of the indefinite pronoun *kaścit*, which appears in place of the expected dative. The use of the genitive is justified by the absence of the sense of recipient (*sampradāna*)

conveyed by the dative (as per A 2.3.13) and thus fits the residual meaning (*śeṣe*) that the genitive may express according to A 2.3.50.

Sometimes he corrects the use of syntactical cases found in the *Mānavadharmasāstra*, for example in passage No. 147, where he replaces the plural accusative *vaṇijāḥ* with the plural instrumental *vaṇigbhiḥ*, because rule A 1.4.52 does not apply since the verbal base *dāpaya-* (< *dā-* + *ṆiC*: ‘to cause to give’) does not meet any constraint provided by the rule.

In passages Nos. 85, 100 and 120, Medhātithi emphasises the use of a dative not as a recipient (*sampradāna*) as it is taught by A 2.3.13, but in the sense of ‘for the sake of X’ (*tādarthyē*), as suggested in a *vārttika*, namely M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13: *caturthīvidhāne tādarthyē upasaṅkhyānam* “When the dative ending is taught, the additional statement *tādarthyē* [should be made].” For instance, in passage No. 120 the plural dative form *bhūtebhyaḥ* has to be interpreted as ‘for the sake of all the living beings.’ Special attention is also paid to some locative cases, such as in passage No. 168 where five locative forms (*kāminīṣu*, *vivāheṣu*, *bhakṣye*, *indhane*, *brāhmaṇābhyupapattau*) depending on another locative *śapathe*, are all interpreted as locatives of dominion (*viśayasaptamī*) and not as locatives indicating a cause (*nimittasaptamī*) as instead seems to be suggested in a passage in the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.458 l. 16 Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36: *nimittāt karmasamyoge* “After [a nominal stem denoting] a cause, there is a connection with the object”). Thus, the meaning of the phrase is “In the case of a [false] oath [pertaining] to lovers, marriages, ox-feed, firewood, and protection of Brāhmaṇas” and not “In the case of a [false] oath caused by lovers, marriages, ox-feed, firewood, and protection of Brāhmaṇas.”

Medhātithi also underlines the usage of the accusative case ending that complies with A 2.3.5 (*kālādhvanor atyantasaṃyoge* [*dvitīyā* 2] “[The accusative] is used after words denoting time and distance in the sense of total connection”) instead of with the general accusative case ending rule A 2.3.2 where the accusative is assigned to denote a patient. This happens for instance in passage No. 56.

The alternative use of a singular or plural nominal form to denote a class and ultimately a plural entity in accordance with A 1.2.58 (*jātyākhyāyām ekasmin bahuvacanam anyatarasyām* “The plural number optionally occurs when a singularity has to be denoted, provided that a class is signified”) is emphasised in passages Nos. 66 and 109. In passage No. 85 Medhātithi sheds light on a masculine plural form (*dārāḥ*) used to denote a female being, namely a wife, and quotes a passage drawn from the *Kāśikāvṛtti* on A 1.2.53, where other *pluralia tantum* forms are listed. Again, it is interesting to note his reflection on grammatical gender when, in passage No. 135, he explains that the genitive plural

phrase *sarveṣāṃ mṛgāṇāṃ* ('of all animals') also included female animals, because the speaker's intention is simply to express the universal (i.e. the species). He plausibly refers to a *vārttika* (M 3.157 l. 15 Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42: *kukkuṭyādīnāṃ aṇḍādiṣu puṃvadvacanam*) which explains that the *puṃvadvacanam*, lit. "the expression as if they were in the masculine gender" is proper to [the word-forms] *kukkuṭi-* ('fowl') and the like, before *aṇḍa-* ('egg') and the like.

These are just a few of the many examples devoted to the syntactic function and signification of the gender and number of inflected nominal forms analysed in Medhātithi's commentary to better explain the meaning or clarify his interpretation of the root text.

3.2.4. *Derivative stems*

3.2.4.1. *Derivative verbal bases*

Medhātithi does not devote much attention to the category of derivative verbal bases, among which only the following three affixes are covered: *KyaC* (No. 39), *ṆiC* (Nos. 31, 78, 99, 123, 132, 169, 187, 192; also mentioned in a metarule cited in No. 147; also inferred in No. 211) and *yaK* (No. 76).

Nevertheless, it should be noted that considerable importance is attributed to the affix *ṆiC*, which Medhātithi recalls on several occasions. The affix *ṆiC* is introduced in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with no specific meaning that is conveyed in A 3.1.25, which teaches that it occurs after a series of nominal stems (e.g. *satyāpa-* 'truth') and a list of verbal bases in the list *curādi* ('to steal and the like'). Medhātithi hints at this rule in No. 192, while commenting on the verbal form *marṣayati* ('he suffers') given that *mṛṣ-* is included in the *curādi* list as confirmed by the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 3.1.25). No. 78 is an example of the affix *ṆiC* in its basic causative meaning according to A 3.1.26, as indicated by Medhātithi. In contrast, in No. 31, he asserts that no causative meaning is conveyed despite the occurrence of *ṆiC*. The most widespread case concerning *ṆiC* recalled in the *Manubhāṣya* involves Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26 (M 2.34 l. 8) where *ṆiC* has a denominative sense: the reference to this *vārttika* occurs in the cases of Nos. 99, 123, 132, 169 and 187. Among these, passage No. 169 stands out because of Medhātithi's grammatical acumen. While explaining the optative verbal form *vivāsayet* as a denominative from *vivāsa-* ('sending into exile') or *vivāsas-* ('taking off clothes'), he correctly refers to Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26 to indicate the

occurrence of *ṆiC* in the denominative sense. He then brilliantly cites Vt. 1 *ad* A 6.4.155 (M 3.230 l. 2) to justify the zero-replacement of the last vowel before the optative ending *vivās-a-ayet* (> *vivāsayet*, after zero-replacing *a*).

Continuing with the use of *ṆiC* as a denominative, Medhātithi hypothesises a very complex kind of derivation in one of the two explanations given for the verbal form *hāpayati* (lit. ‘he causes [someone] to abandon’) in passage No. 99. The first and simplest is that *hāpayati* is a causative verbal form formed according to A 3.1.26 with the affix *ṆiC*, but its causative sense is not realised since the speaker had no intention of expressing it. The second and most articulated derivation (dare we say, even too articulated) is that *hāpayati* is a denominative verbal stem formed using the affix *ṆiC* under Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26 from the *upapādasamāsa* *hāpya-*. The latter, in turn, is derived from the nominal stem *hā-* (‘to omit’)—to which the affix *KviP* (consisting in a zero-replacement, based on A 6.1.67) is attached according to A 3.2.76—compounded with the verbal base *āp-* (‘to obtain’), i.e. the base *hāp-*, to which the affix *ṆyaT* is applied according to A 3.1.124—which would denote a patient (*karman*) according to A 3.4.70—but to which the affix *KviP* is again applied (and zero-replaced) to denote an agent (*kartr*) following A 3.2.76. Such an explanation, which appears in No. 99, may be unnecessary in the context where it is found. However, we assume that it might have served as a teaching tool, since it presents a series of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* rules in a single passage.

3.2.4.2. Deverbal derivative nominal stems (*kr̥t*)

One of the most recurrent grammatical arguments within the group of textual-exegetical passages we identified in Medhātithi’s *Manubhāṣya* is the *kr̥t* derivation, just as in the case of purely linguistic ones (Nos. 3, 11, 45, 54, 132, 158, 160, 161, 208, 219).

The *kr̥t* affixes covered by Medhātithi’s explanations in this group of passages are *ka* (No. 133), *Kta* (Nos. 111, 181), *Ktvā* (No. 143), *KviP* (No. 99), *GHañ* (Nos. 23, 123, 177, 187; also dealt with in a phonetic rule in No. 80), *trC* (No. 198), *Ḍa* (Nos. 194, 208), *ṆyaT* (Nos. 18, 99, 213; also accounted for by a phonetic rule in No. 161), *ṆvuL* (Nos. 187, 194), *Lyu* (No. 105), *LyuT* (Nos. 1, 26), *ŚatR* (Nos. 39, 81, 122), and *kr̥tya* affixes (No. 175).

Medhātithi’s remarks are generally imbued with a Pāṇinian perspective and the middle part of this section will focus on some extensions that are not immediately reflected in the Vyākaraṇa tradition. Within this large group of highlighted

affixes, it is worth discussing a few cases of *kṛt* derivation that Medhātithi dealt with on more than one occasion.

Among the *kṛts* he deals with, Medhātithi also devotes attention on more than one occasion to the affix *GHañ*, which he notes in instances that include its roles as action (*bhāve*: No. 123, 187), patient (*karmaṇi*: Nos. 23, 177), and, somewhat irregularly in Pāṇinian terms, agent (*kartari*: No. 161). Medhātithi usually includes a *kṛt* derivative stem with *GHañ* in discussions involving further derivations with other affixes. Nos. 23 and 177 are good examples of derivatives with the affix *GHañ* alone. In No. 177, the word-form *nikṣepa-* is described as ‘a substance (such as gold) that has been deposited.’ This is understood as a *nomen rei actae* from the verbal base *nikṣip-* (‘to deposit’), with *GHañ* conveying the sense of patient (*karman*), according to A 3.3.19. This rule allows the affix to be used in a role other than the agent (*kartṛ*), as provided by the semantic constraint *akartari*, in the case of a proper name (*saṃjñā*). However, since this is not a *saṃjñā*, in order to apply this rule in this case, Medhātithi refers to Vt. 2 appended to A 3.3.19 (M 2.246 l. 1) which also extends this rule to cases other than *saṃjñā*. The same type of derivation is applied in No. 23 to explain the formation of *veda-* (denoting the Veda as the first source of knowledge) from the verbal base *vid-* (‘to know’).

More complex derivations are approached in the other cases. Starting with Nos. 123 and 187, in which the affix *GHañ* conveys the sense of action, the derivation in both instances involves applying the affix *ñiC* discussed above, especially in its denominative sense, according to Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26. As an example, let us take No. 187, where Medhātithi explains the *kṛt* derivation of *asthibhedaka-* (‘one who breaks bones’). The etymon is the compound *asthibheda* (‘breaking bones’), made up of *asthi-* (‘bone’) and *bheda-* (a *kṛt* derivative stem ending in affix *GHañ* following A 3.3.18) by means of affix *ñiC* which is applied in accordance with Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26. The *kṛt* affix *ñvuL* (= *-aka*) is applied to this etymon to form the final derivative stem *asthibhedaka-*.

No. 161 is the last of this sub-group and one of the most original ‘grammatical extensions’ in Medhātithi’s *Manubhāṣya*, where many *kṛt* affixes occur, including *GHañ*, which seems to be used irregularly from a Pāṇinian point of view. While commenting on the right-hand constituent of the compound *prāḍvivāka-* (‘chief-judge’), i.e. *°vivāka-*, which is explained as a *kṛt* derivative stem from the verbal base *vivac-*, Medhātithi hypothesises a peculiar derivation: he first quotes A 3.3.113 to refer to the application of the affix *Lyuṭ* occurring under various conditions (*bahulam*) and then he mentions the application of the affix *GHañ* but in the irregular sense of agent (*kartṛ*), which, however, seems to

be in contrast with the previously mentioned A 3.3.19 because of its *akartari* constraint. We guess that, with no parallels in the Vyākaraṇa literature, Medhātithi extends the *karṭr* meaning of the *kṛt* affix *Lyuṭ*, which is regulated by A 3.1.34, to the affix *GHañ* thanks to the condition *bahulam*: this is how we think that Medhātithi manages to overcome the *akartari* constraint and how the affix *GHañ* can “regularly” occur after the base *vivac-* in the sense of agent. However, another hypothesis could be that Medhātithi considers the previously discussed Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19, effectively extending the application of *GHañ* to all possible contexts.

Finally, it is worth noting the two references to the *kṛt* affix *Ḍa*, namely Nos. 194 and 208, which highlight an especially puzzling grammatical discussion. In the latter case, Medhātithi hypothesises the *kṛt* derivation by means of *Ḍa* to explain the verbal form *madhukāyati* (‘he behaves like the Madhūka blossom’) as a denominative from *madhūka-* (‘Madhūka flower’ = *Bassia Latifolia* L.); the rule at stake here is A 3.2.101, which teaches to apply the *kṛt* affix *Ḍa* to the verbal base *jan-* (‘to generate’), but which is then extended to other verbal bases thanks to the use of *api* in the rule itself, as confirmed by Patañjali’s commentary on this very rule (M 2.112 l. 20 *ad* A 3.2.101). The explanation for the former instance is rather more puzzling: while commenting on the *taddhita* derivative stem *prāṇāntaka-* (‘enjoined as capital punishment’), A 3.2.101 is cited together with a reference to *ṆvuL* based on A 3.1.133 but to explain a *taddhita* derivative stem and not a *kṛt*. We may suppose that these unusual references to *kṛt* rules rather than *taddhita* ones are intended to support an extension allowing the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaK* to occur after nominal stems other than *śabda-* and *dardura-*, as taught in A 4.4.34. However, this extension is still in need of further clarification.

3.2.4.3. Denominal derivative nominal stems (*taddhita*)

The derivative forms known as *taddhitāntas* (also simply called *taddhitas*), i.e. word-forms ending with a denominal derivative affix (*taddhita*) are mentioned in fifty-six passages of Medhātithi’s commentary. Note that in several passages *taddhitas* and *samāsas* are both mentioned because a *taddhitānta* can be used as a constituent of a compound or vice versa a compound can play the role of etymon for a *taddhitānta*. On the contrary no special attention is paid to the optionality of *taddhitas* and their relationship with the compounds in Scharfe’s (1983) terms. Excluded from the count of the fifty-six passages on *taddhitas* are those that

involve *taddhita* affixes occurring at the end of compounds (*samāsa*), i.e. the *samāsānta* affixes, which are treated in a separate section (see Section 3.2.4.3.1). Beginning with the affix *vatI*, which is used to form an indeclinable *taddhitānta* form, this affix is analysed in several passages. Among these, in No. 12, *vidhivat-* (lit. ‘according to the rule’) is derived by applying the *taddhita* affix *vatI* in the meaning of ‘deserving’ according to A 5.1.117: *tad arham [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76 vatih 115]* “[The *taddhita* affix *vatI* occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘deserving X.’”⁴²³

The affix *vatI* in passage No. 20 is instead interpreted as a realisation of the affix called *matUP* by Pāṇini in A 5.2.94: *tad asya asty asminn iti matup [prātipadikāt 4.1.1 taddhitāḥ 4.1.76]* “[The *taddhita* affix] *matUP* [occurs after a nominal stem] to denote ‘X belongs to Y’, ‘X exists in Y.’” Thus, it forms the non-indeclinable *taddhitānta* stem *ātmavat-* (lit. ‘having a soul’), which, however, is said not to convey the possessive meaning typical of *matUP*. Medhātithi instead interprets this derivative stem as having the output meaning *ātmano hitam icchan* (“longing for what is good for himself”), thereby alluding, it seems, to A 5.1.5. Such an allusion may be Medhātithi’s own interpretive contribution and need not be considered Pāṇinian.

Very common *taddhita* affixes are often singled out merely in order to select a special meaning that actually fits the context. For example, this is the case in passage No. 16, where two instances of the affix *aN* are assumed in order to explain the meaning of the compound *dvādaśasāhasra-*. The first is applied only to form the right-hand constituent *sāhasra-* from *sahasra-* in the *svārthe* sense (i.e. while retaining the meaning of the base), following Jinendrabuddhi’s interpretation of A 5.4.38, which we have discussed previously (see Section 3.1). The second is the *taddhita* affix *aN* applied to the whole compound according to A 5.1.57, with the meaning ‘this is the measure of X’ (*tad asya parimāṇam*). The compound thus ultimately acquires the meaning ‘consisting of (a measure of) twelve thousand.’ Another frequently mentioned *aN* affix is the one introduced in A 4.1.83 and valid up to A 4.4.2. Consider, for instance, passage No. 112, where this affix is resorted to account for the formation of three parallel *taddhita* derivative stems: *raurava-* (lit. ‘coming from the *ruru*’ > ‘the *ruru*’s meat’), *pārṣata-* (lit. ‘coming from the *parṣat*’ > ‘the *parṣata*’s meat’), and *aiṇeya* (lit. ‘coming from the *eṇa*’ > ‘the *eṇa*’s meat.’) Indeed a specific meaning is assigned to these three forms by means of the use of the locative *vikāre*, by means of which he self-evidently refers to rule A 4.3.134, which teaches to form *taddhita*

⁴²³ A similar explanation is given, for instance, in No. 2 and No. 179.

derivatives by adding a *taddhita* affix taught from 4.1.83 onwards to denote ‘the transformation of X’ (thus, ‘coming from X’, ‘made of X’), in our case the meat which comes from these species of animals, i.e. their transformation.

In the passages devoted to these *taddhita* derivative forms, the author seems to be in line with the common literary commentaries which so often focused on *taddhitas* and compounds. This is evident, for instance, in No. 116, where Medhātithi recalls the *svārthe* application of the *taddhita* affix *Ṣyañ* according to KV *ad* A 5.1.124, rather than referencing Pāṇini’s own rule. This tendency may be explained by the fact that such forms abound with intrinsic technicalities and the sense conveyed by very common and polysemous affixes or by the apparent opacity of certain compounds is often and easily misinterpreted.

However, there are some passages, where the author’s grammatical analysis is tinged with a substantial degree of uncertainty and the guiding principle seems to be more semantic-interpretive than technical-grammatical. For instance, in passage No. 208 the word at stake is *mādhūka-* traditionally intended as ‘sweet-voiced.’ At first, Medhātithi explains it as a *taddhita* derivative stem formed according to A 5.3.107: *śarkarādibhyo ’ṇ* [*pratipādikāt* 4.1.1 *taddhitāḥ* 4.1.76 *ive* 96] “[The *taddhita* affix] *aN* [occurs after a nominal stem] of the *śarkarādi* list (‘gravel and the like’) [to denote ‘similar to’].” He probably considered the *śarkarādi* list as an *ākṛti* (‘exemplificative’) list i.e. a sample list open to be integrated with other nominal stems, including *madhūka-*. Nevertheless, he alternatively interprets the word-form *mādhūka-* as a *kṛt* derivative stem formed by applying the affix *Ḍa* to convey the sense of *madhukāyati* (‘he behaves like the Madhūka blossom’), i.e. the denominative verbal form from the nominal stem *madhūka-* (‘Madhūka flower’ = *Bassia Latifolia* L.), according to A 3.2.101. The latter rule teaches to apply the *kṛt* affix *Ḍa* to the verbal base *jan-* (‘to generate’), but he plausibly considered that it could also be extended to other verbal bases (because *api* was included in the wording of this rule).⁴²⁴

In passage No. 144 Medhātithi is even uncertain between the analysis of *māsasaṃcāyika-* as a *taddhitānta* or as a *bahuvrīhi* compound—a point then applies also to other two words found in the same verse of Manu: *śaṇmāsanicāya-* and *samānicāya-*. At first he singles out the compound *māsasaṃcāya*, read as ‘a [food] supply convenient for a month (*māsa*)’ or ‘[food] supply lasting a month’ as the etymon for the *taddhitānta* ending with the affix *ṭhaN* (taught by A 5.2.115)

⁴²⁴ Furthermore, the scholar goes on to explain the two long vowels: the second long vowel is due to A 6.3.137, which teaches to replace the short vowel *-a* of the last *pada* in the case of continuous utterance, while the first long vowel is justified with the application of the *kṛt* affix *Ḍa* mentioned above.

in the sense of ‘belonging to X.’ The author seems to allude to it by means of the periphrasis *so 'syāsti*. As an alternative, he proposes the reading of *māsasaṃcayika-* as a *bahuvrīhi* compound and we assume that he postulated at the end the use of the *samāsānta taddhita* affix *kaP* (according to A 5.4.154). In this case Medhātithi also provides a variant reading, i.e. *māsasaṃcayaka-*. Ultimately, as far as explanations of *taddhitāntas* are concerned, we conclude that Medhātithi proves to be very skilled and often more densely technical than other commentators of works belonging to different literary genres, perhaps due to the specific technical nature of the Dharmaśāstra root text he deals with.

3.2.4.3.1. *Denominal derivative nominal stems ending compounds (samāsānta)*

This paragraph discusses the textual-exegetical passages singled out in Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* that include references to the *samāsānta* affixes, which are part of the broader group of *taddhita* affixes (see Section 3.2.4.3). In Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the final section on *taddhitas*, A 5.4.68-160, is devoted to *samāsānta* affixes, namely affixes that are placed at the end of compounds (*samāsa*). There are seven grammatical passages in which Medhātithi deals with *samāsānta* affixes, either by directly quoting Pāṇini's rules (No. 150) or making indirect reference to them (No. 38, 43, 44, 144, 170). There is also a further passage for which we have hypothesised the postulation of another of these rules (No. 114). The *samāsānta* affix that Medhātithi recalls in most cases (No. 38, 43, 114, 144, 170) is *kaP* (= *-ka*), taught in the *vibhāṣā* rule A 5.4.154 as being the *samāsānta* affix that marginally occurs at the end of a *bahuvrīhi* compound to denote a *śeṣa*, i.e. a meaning other than what has been stated in the rules of a particular section (in this case, the rules on the *samāsāntas*). Indeed, Medhātithi refers to the application of this *samāsānta* affix to explain the final syllable *ka* of *bahuvrīhi* compounds (e.g. *pañcakṛṣṇalaka-*, lit. ‘having five *kṛṣṇalas*’, in No. 170). In all these examples, the rule that Medhātithi had in mind was, in our opinion, A 5.4.154. Due to the fact that it is a *śeṣa* rule, A 5.4.154 adapts to the compounds commented on by Medhātithi, whose formation and meaning do not fall within the cases covered by the previous rules Pāṇini taught for *samāsāntas*. It should be noted that Medhātithi did not interpret the modifier *vibhāṣā* used in A 5.4.154 in the original Pāṇinian sense of “marginally” (as reconstructed by Kiparsky 1979), but as a broader indication of optionality, meaning that it could be applied to all the cases analysed in the *Manubhāṣya*.

There is only one additional *samāsānta* affix that Medhātithi cites in two instances (No. 44, 150), namely *ṬaC* (= *-a*). In the first case (No. 44), Medhātithi actually comments on the non-application of A 5.4.106 which teaches *ṬaC* after a *samāhāradvandva*. This regards the *bahuvrīhi* compound *pragudaṇmukha-* (‘whose face is turned towards the east or north’) and illustrates that fact that it cannot be analysed as a *samāhāradvandva* precisely because this rule is not applied. In the second case (No. 150), he quotes rule A 5.4.106—the first and only direct quotation for all the *samāsānta* affixes—to account for the final *-a* of the etymon of the *taddhita* derivative stem *daṇḍavācika-* (formed with *ṭhaN*, i.e. = *-ika*, as taught in A 5.2.115).

It goes without saying that Manu’s verses contain many instances of *samāsānta* affixes appearing in compounds which Medhātithi chose not to mention or explain in his *Manubhāṣya* (we have included relevant instances in our textual study: *ḌaC* in No. 43 and *aC* in No. 97). It is evident that the *samāsānta* affixation was one of the grammatical areas that Medhātithi did not aim to cover in detail, particularly when compared to his in-depth analysis of compounds or *taddhita* derivatives.

3.2.5. Compounds (samāsa)

Sixty-four passages of the *Manubhāṣya* comment on compounds included in the *Mānavadharmasāstra*. In general, the importance of the commentaries is that they commonly try to disambiguate the syntactical relation between the two or more constituents of compounds, because the case endings are zero-replaced by default according to A 2.4.71: *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ* [luk 58] “[*LUK* zero-replacement] of a nominal case ending which occurs as a part of a verbal base or of a nominal stem.”

Notably, *bahuvrīhi*s compounds are certainly one of the most difficult categories to analyse and the *Manubhāṣya* also dedicates much space to such compounds. A prime example is passage No. 180 where we find the *bahuvrīhi* compound *catuḥsuvarṇa-* (‘consisting of four *suvarṇas*’) which refers to a fine that must be paid for transgressing an agreement. At first it is analysed as a regular *bahuvrīhi* which merely refers to the number of coins included, but then a second explanation is added, according to which the *bahuvrīhi* might convey the sense of ‘together’ (*saha*), in the sense of ‘together with four *suvarṇas*.’ This second explanation thoroughly changes the meaning of the verse, because it adds another fine. With regard to the latter analysis, Medhātithi assumes that the possessive

meaning (i.e. that of the *taddhita* affix *matuP* taught in A 5.2.94) should be added to that of ‘together’ and cites a traditional example found in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 2.2.24), but also in the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.420 l. 25 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.2.24). There are also several intriguing passages in which logic plays a main role alongside grammatical skills in examining a *bahuvrīhi* compound. For instance, in passage No. 44 the compound *pragudaṇmukha-* is analysed as a *bahuvrīhi* meaning ‘whose face is turned towards the east or north.’ In his explanation, Medhātithi realises that *prag-udaṇ-* cannot be classified as either a *samāhāra-* or an *itaretarayoga-dvanda* because a face cannot be simultaneously turned in both directions. He further notices that it cannot be a *samāhāra* compound also on the basis of a morphological trait, because in accordance with A 5.4.106, if it were a *samāhāra*, it should end with the syllable *a* (= *ṬaC*) as a *samāsānta* affix (see also Section 3.2.4.3.1).

However, Medhātithi often preforms an accurate morphological analysis of this category of compounds and also pays attention to constituent order: for instance in passage No. 47 he focuses on the *bahuvrīhi* compound *brahmāñjalikṛta-* ‘whose palms are joined in the *brahmāñjali*’, whose right-hand slot is occupied by a past participle. Of course, the most common word order, taught by A 2.2.36, assigns the past participle to the left-hand slot, but *brahmāñjalikṛta-* is read according to rule A 2.2.37, which refers to a list of exceptions, i.e. compounds which optionally admit the opposite order, such as the heading *ahitāgni-* preferably used in this way, but also admitted as *agnyāhita-*.

Medhātithi often shows some uncertainty when analysing these structures or better he seems to enjoy discussing the classification of a compound, as if it were a particularly entertaining or stimulating intellectual game. In passage No. 70, for instance, the compound *brahmajanman-* is analysed in two different ways. First of all it is interpreted as if its meaning were ‘a birth whose purpose is that of seizing (i.e. learning) the Veda’ and in this case he relies on a *vārttika* which explains the formation of *karmadhāraya* compounds such as *śākapārthiva-* (lit. ‘king-vegetables’),⁴²⁵ where a further constituent *bhojin-* ‘eating’ is postulated and replaced with zero, so that the final meaning is assumed to be ‘king eating vegetables’, in other words a ‘vegetarian king’ The *vigraha* of *śākapārthiva-* should be *śākabhojī pārthivaḥ*, i.e. *śākena bhojī pārthivaḥ* (‘a king who eats vegetables’) according to A 2.1.32⁴²⁶ In the compound *brahmajanman-*, a

⁴²⁵ See M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69.

⁴²⁶ According to A 2.1.32 (see passage No. 48), the constituent analysis of the relevant *taṭpuruṣa* compound is: *śākena bhojīti sa śākabhojī*.

constituent conveying the sense of ‘seizing’ is zero-replaced. By once again resorting to a *padalopa* (see also Section 3.2.6), Medhātithi offers an alternative analysis of *brahmajanman-* as *brahmagrahaṇārthaṃ janma* (‘birth whose purpose is seizing the Veda’), where the additional constituent *grahaṇārtha-* is zero-replaced. In passage No. 114, the author compares an analysis of the same compound as *bahuvrīhi* and one as *tatpuruṣa*. The compound at stake is *kusūladhānyaka-*. At first, he reads it as a *bahuvrīhi* whose *upasarjana kusūladhānya-* means ‘the grain [contained] in a granary’, and we assume that the author postulates the use of a *taddhita samāsānta* affix *kaP* according to A 5.4.154. Then, he analyses *kusūladhānyaka-* (which is indeed a variant reading with a palatal sibilant instead of a dental one) as a *tatpuruṣa* compound in the sense of ‘grain whose measure is a granary’) to which the *taddhita* affix *ṭhaN* (= *ika*) is applied according to A 5.2.115, even though the affix *-ika* is not segmentable in this compound.

It is true to say that the scholar focuses on all the categories of compounds but he pays particular attention to the *bahuvrīhi* and the *upapadasamāsa*. Sometimes he seems to favour the latter category, recognising it even where there is no reason to do so. For example, in passage No. 22, after analysing the formation of the *taddhita* derivative stem *amaralokatā-* by singling out the *taddhita* affix *taL* added to the *karmadhāraya* compound *amaraloka-* (‘the immortal world’) according to A 5.1.119 (together with the *taddhita* affix *ṭāP* taught by A 4.1.4), he assumes that *loka-* might have been a *kṛt* derivative nominal stem meaning ‘seeing’ or ‘seen’, and that *amaraloka-* (in the sense of ‘turning into one who sees the gods’ or ‘seen as if he were a god’) might thus be defined as an *upapadasamāsa* according to A 3.1.92. It is clear that, in this passage, a speculative interest in semantics prevails over the attempt to provide a correct grammatical analysis.

As far as the copulative compounds are concerned, there is plenty of mentions of these as final forms or as constituents of other compounds. He shows to follow the post-Pāṇinian classification of them and the relevant terms, respectively *samāhāra-* and *itaretarayoga-dvandvas*. For instance, in passage No. 139, Medhātithi labels the compound *pūṇyaphala-* as a *dvandva* of the former type, since it is used in the singular number and neuter gender, as Pāṇini himself taught in A 2.4.2 and 2.4.17, even though he did not use the specific technical term. We assumed that the specific rule that allows the formation of this assumed *dvandva* compound may be A 2.4.6, because *pūṇya* and *phala* can be considered as class names (*jāti*) of inanimate beings (*aprāṇin*). In passage No. 23, he analyses the compound *smṛtiśīla-* (‘the tradition and the custom’) inflected as a dual noun.

In this regard he writes: *dvandvaś cāyam itaretarayoge* ‘And this [compound *smṛtiśīla-*] is a *dvandva* [whose constituents are] in mutual connection.’ It is clear that Medhātithi relies on the commentarial tradition on the compounds explained by Pāṇini, in this case *in primis* M 1.434 ll. 10-12 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29.

Although a rare occurrence, Medhātithi does occasionally break faith with Pāṇini's grammar. It is interesting to note how he interprets the *tatpuruṣa* compound *sarvakaṇṭakapāpiṣṭha-* in the sense of ‘the worst among all the thorns’, in a way that was expressly prohibited by Pāṇini according to rule A 2.2.10 (*na nirdhāraṇe*). This rule forbids the formation of *tatpuruṣa* compounds that include a nominal *pada* inflected in the genitive case to convey the partitive sense. It goes without saying that Medhātithi is well aware of the fact that the compound *sarvakaṇṭakapāpiṣṭha-* in Manu's text is exceptionally formed in derogation of such a rule.

3.2.6. Zero phenomena

We also find some interesting passages devoted to the zero-phenomena in Medhātithi's commentary. The general term for zero is *lopa*, which is defined *adarśana*, literally “non-perception” (see Pinault 1989: 347; Benson 1990: 124; Pandit 1990: 13). The first attestation of a zero-phenomenon is passage No. 6. Here Medhātithi mentions a zero replacement by *LUK* restricted to *chandas* texts (see also Section 2.7) according to A 7.1.39, which teaches to replace a nominal ending with zero. In fact, while analysing the sequence *ādyādyasya*, he hints at the zero-replacement of a genitive case ending *sya* of the first element in the supposed repetition *ādyasyādyasya* following A 8.1.4.

Medhātithi is also interested in the zero-replacement rules of *taddhita* affixes such as A 4.2.81, which for examples he quotes in passage No. 149. The commented text includes four word-forms denoting ‘inhabited countries’ (*janapadas*), i.e. *kurukṣetra-* (‘country of the Kurus’), *matsya-* (‘country of the Matsyas’), *pañcāla-* (‘country of the Pañcalas’), and *śūrasenaja-* (‘country of the Śūrasenas’). In his commentary, Medhātithi explains that *matsya-* and *pañcāla-* are also used as the name of the peoples who live in the homonymous countries.⁴²⁷

In passage No. 11 the author explains the *upapadasāmāsa udbhijja-* (‘born from sprouting’) by resorting to an analysis of *udbhid-* as meaning the action of sprouting (*udbhedana*) on the basis of A 3.2.61 which teaches to form derivative

⁴²⁷ As for analogous explanations see e.g. No. 209.

deverbal nominal stems by applying a *KviP* affix to some specific verbal bases (even those co-occurring with a preverb and with a nominal *pada*) precisely to denote an action (*bhāva*). Although A 3.2.61 normally implies the *kartari* meaning by *anuvṛtti* from A 3.1.57, Medhātithi interprets *KviP* here in the *bhāve* sense so as to analyse *udbhijja-* as ‘born from *udbhid-*’, with *udbhid-* understood as expressing an action. This interpretive extension is likely influenced by Vt. 9 *ad* A 3.3.108, which allows *KviP* to denote an action after the *sampadādi* list. Since this list does not appear to function as an *ākṛtigāṇa*, the extension to *udbhid-* must be regarded as Medhātithi’s own reasoning.

Sometimes Medhātithi seems to misuse the notion of *lopa*, in disagreement with Pāṇini’s use but in line with later grammarians. In particular, in passage No. 183 he interprets the ablative form *upakārāt* from the nominal stem *upakāra-* ‘advantage’ by resorting to Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.28 (M 1.455), as if its *vigraha* included the gerund form *apekṣya* governing the accusative *upakāram* (‘after taking into account the advantage [gained from this]’). In other words, he assumes that a zero-replacement of this gerund *apekṣya* must be postulated in order to account for *upakārāt*, as explained by a *vārttika*.⁴²⁸

Let us also mention another extension of the zero-notion in passage No. 210, where he interprets the word-form *madhu-* ‘beeswax’ included in the verse from the *Mānavadharmasāstra* he is commenting on, as if it stood for *madhūcchiṣṭa-* (‘remainder of the beeswax’) due to the zero-replacement of a portion [of the word] (*ekadeśalopa*). He uses a term that appears in both the *vārttikas* and the *Mahābhāṣya*.⁴²⁹

As is well known, the *padalopa*, i.e. the zero-replacement of an inflected word is extremely rare in Pāṇini’s grammar, although it certainly becomes of common use from Kātyāyana onward, especially in order to explain the *vigraha* of compounds.⁴³⁰ In passage No. 91, Medhātithi resorts to the so-called *uttarapadalopa*⁴³¹ (taught by Kātyāyana in M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69) in order to explain the *bahuvrīhi* compound *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadīnāman-* (‘whose name is a constellation, tree or river’), inflected in the feminine accusative case *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadīnāmñi* and used as a qualifier for the maiden (*kānyāṃ* in MDh 3.8) whom a twice-born should not marry according to the *Mānavadharmasāstra*. Preliminarily *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadī-* is analysed as a *dvandva* compound in the sense of ‘constellations, trees and rivers.’ Then, a *tatpuruṣa* compound with the genitival

⁴²⁸ See M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.28 = KV *ad* A 2.3.28, translated in passage No. 166.

⁴²⁹ See M 1.136 l. 5 Vt. 9 *ad* A 1.1.56; M 1.136 l. 8 Vt. 10 *ad* A 1.1.56.

⁴³⁰ See also Candotti and Pontillo (2013: 102).

⁴³¹ See Deshpande (1985a: 37-39); Pontillo (2013: 99-107).

sense (*śaṣṭhīsamāsa*) is formed as *ṛkṣavṛkṣanadīnāman-* in the sense of ‘the name of constellations, trees and rivers.’ Finally, Medhātithi postulates that a final member (*uttarapada*) of this compound, i.e. a second mention of *nāman-*, is zero-replaced, to form the mentioned *bahuvrīhi* compound.⁴³²

3.2.7. Chandas

One of the most interesting groups in the textual-exegetical passages singled out in Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* is the category related to *chandas*. The latter has been a critical term in Vyākaraṇa ever since its inception, given that the locative semantic constraint *chandasi* is broadly used in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in more than two hundred rules dealing with Vedic special features. On the other hand, as clearly explained by Deshpande (1985b: 124, 140–141), Pāṇini's rules, unless otherwise specified, apply both to the Vedic language and to the contemporary standard language of his time.⁴³³ The constraint *chandasi* plausibly refers to the four Vedic *Samhitās* according to the interpretation given by Kiparsky (2012: 4): “*chandas* was meant (or was understood) in the narrower sense of *Samhitā* text.” Prior to this, a more general meaning, namely “the sacred literature”, was proposed by Thieme (1935: 67-72) and endorsed by Kiparsky himself (1979: 56).⁴³⁴ Although we generally agree with Kiparsky's interpretation of *chandasi* as referring to the four Vedic *Samhitās* (see e.g. Candotti and Pontillo 2022c: 1-2), it is far from certain whether this is the right interpretation for the label *chāndasa* used in the *Manubhāṣya* and we will try to explain the reasons behind our position.

First of all, in passage No. 6. while reflecting upon applying a *LUK* zero-replacement of the genitive case ending *-sya* (when the genitive form *ādyasya* is expected to form *ādyasyādyasya* according to A 8.1.4), Medhātithi explicitly states that there is no distinction between *smṛti* texts (like the MDhŚ) and *chandas* (*chandobhir aviśeṣāt smṛtīnām* lit. ‘due to the non-distinction between *smṛti* and *chandas* texts’). Thus, we realise that this domain has to be interpreted in a broader sense as ‘Vedic literature.’ In passage N° 77, rule A 6.3.63 *nyapoḥ saṃjñāchandasoḥ bahulam* is quoted by Medhātithi (simply by means of the

⁴³² An analogous explanation is given in No. 70.

⁴³³ See also Renou (1941: 248-249); Renou (1969: 992-993); Bronkhorst (1982: 278).

⁴³⁴ It is noteworthy that Bronkhorst (1982: 276; 280-281) maintains that the language of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* is closest to Pāṇini and that (1991: 104) “Pāṇini did not know much of Vedic literature in its present form, that is, in the collections known to us.”

string *nyāpor bahulam*) in order to explain the final short vowel of the left-hand constituent of the compound *mauñjibandhana-*. If this rule is actually quoted because of the *chandasi* constraint and not because of the *saṃjñāyām* one, then *chandas* should include Dharmasūtras, since to the best of our knowledge the compound *mauñjibandhana-* only occurs in BDh 1.3.6, VDh 2.32 and 2.62.

Now, this raises the question as to how far this non-distinction between *chandas* and *smṛti* texts actually extends. In our view, the scope of this non-distinction is based on the fact that *smṛtis* are generally metrical texts, a much simpler explanation than any attempt to extend the status of *chandas* texts as Vedic texts to the MDhŚ. In fact, if we return to passage No. 6, we can see that a *LUK* zero-replacement is indeed included in an *Aṣṭādhyāyī* rule specifically taught with the constraint *chandasi*, namely A 7.1.39, but the traditional examples are endless locative forms such as *vyòman* for the expected *vyòmani* ('in the heaven') and not endless forms of the genitive. Thus, this passage does not refer to a specific *chandasi* rule, while its purpose is perhaps to account for the metrical issue of having one syllable less, as Medhātithi himself declares by means of the ablative *vṛttānurodhāt* ('because of conforming to the meter', i.e. 'due to metrical exigencies').

Analogously, passage No. 111 is devoted to the irregular position (*paranipāta*) of the past passive participle *yata-* in the compound *vāgyata-* ('the one by whom the speech is restrained'). Medhātithi justifies this *paranipāta* as a *chāndasa* feature. The issue of the order of past participles as members of Bahuvrīhi compounds is the main subject of rules A 2.2.36-37 and the unexpected order in *vāg-yata-* can be connected to the *ahitāgnyādi* list appearing in rule A 2.2.37. This list also includes Vedic compounds but the specific form at stake actually occurs in several Kalpasūtra passages, but not in the four Saṃhitās. However, Medhātithi might have considered this form to be due to metrical exigencies, i.e. Medhātithi might have been suggesting that the sequence – ◡ X at the end of *pāda* b must metrically conform to the *pathyā* form of the *śloka* metre.

Passage No. 155 concerns the *taddhita* derivative stem *jānapada-* ('belonging to an inhabited country'), which is the right-hand constituent of the compound *jātijānapada-* ('belonging to castes and inhabited countries') in Manu's verse. Medhātithi asserts that this stem is formed with the *taddhita* affix *aN* (= -a) following A 4.3.120 instead of the affix *cha* (= -īya) under A 4.2.114, due to its being a *chāndasa* feature, plausibly because it avoids an extra syllable that would be included by applying the *taddhita* affix *cha* (which would not have been added by using the affix *aN*), thus fitting into the *śloka* meter.

Passage No. 166 regards the use of the masculine gender in the *dvigu* compound *tripakṣa-* (inflected in the ablative case as *tripakṣāt* in Manu's verse), which is recorded as an exception on the *patrādi* list found in Patañjali's commentary on Vt. 3 *ad* A 2.4.30 (M 1.480 l. 12 *ad* Vt. 3 *ad* A 2.4.30), instead of the expected feminine according to the *Mahābhāṣya* section on Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.4.30 (M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.4.30). Medhātithi describes the use of the masculine here as a *chāndasa* feature. To the best of our knowledge, *tripakṣa-* is only attested once in ŚGS 4.3.2. Thus, it seems feasible that Medhātithi once again considered it as a metrical feature, based on the fact that he makes reference to the avoidance of the feminine ablative *tripakṣāyāḥ* with an extra syllable (compared to the masculine *tripakṣāt*) that would have broken the *śloka* meter.

Passage No. 33 regards the word-form *aupanāyana-* ('ceremony of the sacred thread'), a *taddhita* stem formed with the affix *aN* standing for *upanayana-* ('id.'). After asserting that the long vowel of the syllable *-nā-* depends on A 6.3.137, Medhātithi advances an alternative hypothesis that the *vṛddhi* of both *padas* in the *taddhita* derivative stem (*aupa-* < *upa-*; *nāyana-* < *nayana-*) is a *chāndasa* feature. In this case, while the word form at stake, i.e. *aupanāyana-* is not attested in the Vedic corpus, it is plausible that Medhātithi wanted to suggest that the two vowels had undergone *vṛddhi* to fit into the sequence $\cup - \cup X$, which is typical of *pāda* b in the *pathyā* form of the *śloka* meter.

Moreover, in passage No. 172 Medhātithi uses *chandas* as a compound member in *chandastulyatva-* ('being equal in metrics') without referring to any specific Pāṇinian *chandasi* rules or a *chandas* feature (*chāndasa*). The term *chandas* is here used to provide an explanation for the long *ā* in the syllable *-sām-* and the final long *ī* of the stem *atisām̐vatsarī-*, which are equal to their short counterparts *a* and *i* in the *pathyā* metrical scheme of the *śloka*. Thus, the handed-down *atisām̐vatsarī* is metrically equivalent to *atisām̐vatsari-*. In this specific case, based on Medhātithi's argument, *chandas* no doubt refers to metrics and not to Vedic literature.

However, another important point, in our opinion, is to understand whether the qualifier *chāndasa* has a direct relationship with any of Pāṇini's rules that include the *chandasi* constraint or not. Of course, we cannot be sure that all the rules taught by Pāṇini potentially refer to Vedic usages (beyond the everyday language) and that those labelled with the locative constraint *chandasi* simply described linguistic phenomena restricted to the Vedic sources,⁴³⁵ i.e. not shared with the

⁴³⁵ The bulk of the non-restricted rules, *de facto* apply to both the Vedic sources and the everyday language, as convincingly shown by Deshpande (1985b: 124).

standard language. Indeed, as Kiparsky explained (1979: 57), the so-called Vedic rules are extensions rather than restrictions of Classical rules and “typically involve listing additional environments where a rule applies in Vedic.”

Let us examine the relationship between the so-called Vedic rules taught by Pāṇini and the label *chāṇḍasa* in the *Manubhāṣya*. For instance, passage No. 213 explains the *kṛt* derivation of *ayājya-* (‘people for whom one should not perform sacrifices’) by means of the affix *ṆyaT* with the help of the sentence *bhāve ṇyac chāṇḍasaḥ*, which probably hints at A 3.1.123. This is a *chāṇḍasi* rule in Pāṇini’s grammar which teaches specific derivations by *nipātana* which include *devayajyā-* (‘worship of deities’). Nevertheless, we note that *ayājya-* is not mandatorily formed in accordance with rule A 3.1.123, but rather with the more general A 3.1.124, which teaches to apply the *kṛt* affix *ṆyaT* in the sense of action. On the contrary, the *kṛt* derivation in question in passage No. 211 is the peculiar case of the variation (*vyatyaya*) of *kṛt* affixes within Vedic literature, occurring under various conditions based on A 3.1.85, which is an *Aṣṭādhyāyī* rule including the *chāṇḍasi* constraint. The verse by Manu on which Medhātithi is commenting concerns the exchange between the *kṛt* affixes *ṆiC* (in a denominative sense as regulated by Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26) and *KyaC* (as taught by A 3.1.8) with regard to the verbal form *prāyaścittīyate*. Nonetheless, he does not classify this linguistic phenomenon as *chāṇḍasa*.

There are indeed several passages which are classified as *chāṇḍasa* by the scholar but which cannot be associated with any special *Aṣṭādhyāyī chāṇḍasi* rule. The compound *śaṇatāntavī-* (‘made of threads of Śaṇa hemp’) in passage No. 36 is formed by applying the *taddhita* affix *aṆ* according to A 4.3.134, which is not a *chāṇḍasi* rule, but Medhātithi explains the *vṛddhi* vowel *ā* in *°tāntavī-* as a *chāṇḍasa* feature. Nonetheless, the word-form *tāntava-* does occur in the Vedic corpus (see e.g. GB 1.2.4.14-16). In passage No. 137 Medhātithi labels the *kṛt* derivation of *paśughna-* (‘slaughtering cattle’) as a *chāṇḍasa* word-form. This is the right-hand constituent of the compound *vṛthāpaśughna-* (‘one slaughtering cattle without motivation’) in Manu’s verse, in which the affix *Ka* is used, according to A 3.2.4 (which requires the splitting, i.e. *yogavibhāga* of the rule’s segment *supi* based on Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.4 (M 2.98 l. 5)). *paśughna* often occurs in the Vedic corpus (see e.g. AVŚ 14.1.62, 14.2.18) but is not explained by any special Vedic rule in Pāṇini’s grammar.

The absence of a real reference to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī chāṇḍasi* rules is indisputable in passage N° 11, where Medhātithi defines the unexpected nominative plural *oṣadhyaḥ* (i.e. the nominative plural of the feminine nominal stem *oṣadhī-*), employed in the MDhŚ text in place of the word-form *oṣadhayaḥ* (i.e. the

nominative plural of the feminine nominal stem *oṣadhi-*), the expected regular form from a Pāṇinian perspective. After proposing an alternative explanation (with GS 3, which is included on the exemplificative list *bahvādi* appended to A 4.1.45, found, for instance, in KV *ad* A 4.1.45), Medhātithi maintains that the nominative plural *oṣadhyah* could also be considered as a *chāṇḍasa* feature. Both Bloomfield's Vedic Concordance and the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit* show us that the form of nominative plural *oṣadhyah* does not occur in the Vedic corpus (where instead we find *oṣadhīḥ*), but its presence here might be due to metrical exigencies because *oṣadhyah* has one syllable less than the expected *oṣadhyah* and thus fits the verse's *śloka* meter. But what is especially noteworthy is that there is no *chāṇḍasi* rule in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* that teaches the use of this form which, on the contrary, is expressly prohibited in the domain of *mantras* by rule A 6.3.132.

Finally, when we read passage No. 128 where the participle *rudyamāna-* ('crying'), inflected in the Ātmanepada diathesis to convey the meaning of agent (*karṭṛ*), is explained as a *chāṇḍasa* feature, we realise that this label does not refer exclusively to metric requirements or to the *chāṇḍasi* rules in Pāṇini's grammar. On the contrary, it is assigned to linguistic forms that do not comply with Pāṇinian principles, in line with what Olivelle (1998b: 182) properly explained in general about Sanskrit commentators' use of the term *chāṇḍasa*. This form and its meaning in fact violate rule A 1.3.13, which teaches that the Ātmanepada diathesis denotes an eventuality (*bhāva*) or a patient (*karman*), and rule A 1.3.78, which teaches that it is the Parasmaipada diathesis that signifies an agent.

3.3. *Grammatical passages with juridical purposes (J)*

Although Medhātithi's grammatical notes mainly contain grammatical passages with linguistic or exegetical purposes, we have found twenty instances which seem to have a more or less juridical intent. These are cases when a rule of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* or a passage from Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* is quoted or referred to so as to elucidate a normative principle or a characteristic of *dharma* or to assert the role of injunction in Manu's text.

As far as the latter is concerned, Medhātithi generally devotes significant attention to the discussion of injunction (*vidhi*) within Manu's verses. This can be explained by the substantial influence that the Mīmāṃsā school exerted on the Dharmaśāstra (see Kane 1962-1975: V, 1152-1351; Bandyopadhyay 2016; Limaye 2018; Olivelle 2023; Lubin 2023; Davis 2023; Freschi 2024).

As brilliantly summarised by Freschi (2023a: 1-2), the intersection between Mīmāṃsā and Dharmaśāstra revolves around four essential poles: a common background (with *sūtra* texts as foundations); reliance on the Veda; stress on commands (both injunctions and prohibitions) and consideration of actions whose outcomes are unseen and empirically unverifiable. The last three are mainly developed in later Dharmaśāstra when it comes to be considered as a discipline and its theoretical boundaries are established. In this regard, Freschi (2023a: 3) states that “[a] real champion of this more theoretical approach was Medhātithi [...], the main author to apply Mīmāṃsā rules to Dharmaśāstra.” Indeed, in the academic discourse on the relationship between Mīmāṃsā and Dharmaśāstra, scholars engage—either directly or indirectly—with the arguments put forth by Medhātithi. Recent studies by Baron and Freschi (2023), Chebrol (2023) and again Freschi (2023b) have specifically focused on Medhātithi’s Mīmāṃsā-inspired thought. Furthermore, Yoshimizu (2012; 2020; 2024) clearly demonstrated that the primary Mīmāṃsā source from which Medhātithi derived his Mīmāṃsā-based discussions is likely Kumārila’s *Tantravārttika* (dated to the seventh century CE), in turn taking up several arguments from Śabara’s *Śabarabhāṣya* (whose dating is highly uncertain, but can be hypothetically placed between the fourth and fifth centuries CE).⁴³⁶ Our study has revealed several sections of Medhātithi’s *Manubhāṣya* in which grammatical passages are used in arguments on *vidhi* grounded in Mīmāṃsā. In brief, the Mīmāṃsā school posits that the Veda is self-existent, uncreated, and authorless and infallibly concerned with what should and should not be done. According to the Mīmāṃsākas, all Vedic passages ultimately make sense; however, only the injunctive statements (*vidhi*) found therein serve as a direct means of knowledge, whereas explanatory passages (*arthavāda*) only play a supportive role (see Freschi 2017). Generally speaking, the *vidhi* discussed by the Mīmāṃsākas includes prescriptions for performing ritual actions (*karman*) (see Freschi, Ollett, and Pascucci 2019). A large part of the grammatical references with judicial purposes are mainly limited to discussing the presence or absence of injunction in verbal affixes, as in the following passages: Nos. 19, 23, 27, 28, 30, 51, 58, 74, 86, 201. In this regard, Medhātithi repeatedly refers to future passive participle (or gerundive) affixes which correspond to the so-called *kṛtya* affixes in Pāṇini. This group of affixes is taught in section A 3.1.95-3.1.132.

⁴³⁶ On the chronology of Śabara and Kumārila, see Verpoorten (1987: 8, 22).

No. 201 is a prime example of a passage in which injunction is recognised in a *kṛtya* affix where the future passive participle *adhigantavya-* ('to be obtained') is said to be formed with a *kṛtya* affix (i.e. *tavya*, taught by A 3.1.96) with the injunctive sense.

An example that takes the opposite direction is No. 19 (later taken up in No. 27), in which, despite the presence of the affix *tavya* in the future passive participles *adhyetavya-* ('to be studied') and *pravaktavya-* ('to be taught'), such an affix does not occur in the injunctive sense but to denote 'the fact of deserving' (*arhe*, according to A 3.3.169). The reason for this distinction is that Medhātithi asserts that prescriptive statements (*vidhi*) first appear in the second *adhyāya* of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*. In contrast, only explanatory statements (*arthavāda*) are found in the first *adhyāya*. The commentator thus seeks an alternative denotation for the future passive participle in question, referring to rule A 3.3.169.

Indeed, the injunctions of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* begin to be dictated appropriately in the second *adhyāya*, in which Manu discusses the *dharma* (MDh 2.1) and its four roots (MDh 2.6-11),⁴³⁷ namely *śruti* (lit. 'listening', generally interpreted as 'revelation', referring to Vedic scriptures), *smṛti* (lit. 'memory', generally interpreted as 'tradition', referring to post-Vedic scriptures), *ācāra* ('conduct', of virtuous Brāhmaṇas experts in *dharma*), and *ātmatuṣṭi* ('personal preference').⁴³⁸

Of particular significance is Medhātithi's discussion of the role of injunction in No. 23, in which the "*rātrisattra* theorem" (*rātrisattranyāya*) as developed in later Mīmāṃsā literature is invoked. He first distinguishes explanations (*arthavāda*) from injunctions (*vidhi*): the *arthavādas* are not prescriptive per se but only if accompanied by another section containing the injunction. To explain

⁴³⁷ The subject of the roots of *dharma* (*dharmamūla*) is treated in several Dharmaśāstra texts (see ĀpDh 1.1.1-3, GDh 1.1-2, BDh 1.1.1-4, VDh 1.4-7, MDh 2.6-11, YSm 1.7). Due to the breadth of the topic and the fact that it has been covered in great depth by many scholars, here we refer to the following works: Kane (1962-1975: 1, 6-11), Lingat (1973: 3-17), Menski (2003: 125-130), Francavilla (2006: 85-204), Davis (2007), Acquarone (2015: 11-18), Olivelle (2018b), and Giudice (2024c). On the particular status of *smṛti*, see also Pollock (1997), Lariviere (1997), and Brick (2006).

⁴³⁸ We wish to clarify that the common interpretation of *ātmatuṣṭi* as a kind of appeal to conscience does not align with the interpretation that this root of *dharma* likely held in Manu and generally the Dharmaśāstra texts. Instead, it is connected to the later (mistaken) reinterpretation made by modern scholars. As Davis (2007) demonstrates, to whom we refer for further details, the meaning of *ātmatuṣṭi* in the Dharmaśāstra is a legal sensitivity towards making personal choices about what is right and wrong in specific situations.

this concept, Medhātithi takes the example of the doctrine of five fires taught in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* by citing the *pratīka* of ChUp 5.10.9, namely *steno hiranyasya surām pibamś ca* ('the one who steals gold and the one who drinks the Surā'). In fact, this sentence lacks any prescriptive force unless it is completed by the rest of the passage, particularly the verb *patanti* ('they lapse'), which can be analysed either as indicative or subjunctive in the present tense. At this point, Medhātithi cites an explanatory rule that he defines as a Paribhāṣā, which reads as follows: *vidhyuddeśo vidheḥ pratipādakaḥ nārthavādaḥ* "what is taught by the injunction is that which brings about the injunction, not the explanations." This Paribhāṣā is known only from Medhātithi's text, which does not refer to its source. However, we note that this may have been a Mīmāṃsā-inspired principle that circulated in Medhātithi's milieu.

Whatever the origin of this explanatory rule, it furthers the discussion on injunction. Where, then, does the prescriptive force of a passage such as the one cited from the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* originate? Medhātithi answers that the statement becomes injunctive due to the perception of a finite verbal form. In particular, the finite verbal forms that contain the injunction are in themselves those conjugated in the optative, which, in Pāṇinian terms, are those formed with the substitutes of the *lakāra IIN* in accordance with A 3.3.161. In fact, this rule teaches that, among its other meanings, the optative occurs to denote injunction (*vidhi*). However, other finite verbal forms may also have this prescriptive force, even though they are not conjugated in the optative. These forms are those (apparently) conjugated in the present indicative, namely formed with the substitutes of the *lakāra IAT* according to A 3.2.123. Indeed, it can be assumed that, instead of the indicative, they are conjugated in the subjunctive, namely formed with the substitutes of the *lakāra IET* under A 3.4.7. Based on this rule, in the domain of Vedic literature, the subjunctive occurs to denote the exact meanings of *IIN*, which include *vidhi*. In addition to *patanti* in ChUp 5.10.9, Medhātithi cites a further Vedic passage as an example, i.e. PB 23.2.4. Again, the prescriptive force is due to the finite verb *pratitiṣṭhanti* ('they are well founded'). In both cases, these final verb forms (apparently conjugated in the indicative) are taken as subjunctives to make them injunctive on the basis of A 3.4.7, thus making the entire passages in which they are found injunctive. In another portion of the comment on the same verse (No. 23), Medhātithi cites a passage in verse from an otherwise unknown work called *Smṛtīviveka*, where the name of Pāṇini is expressly pronounced to say that he teaches that injunction is denoted through the affix *IIN* and the rest (thus inferring *IET* but also the *kṛtya* affixes in the case of non-finite verbal forms).

Medhātithi's discussion in this passage directly invokes the Mīmāṃsā argument of the *rātrisattra* (lit. 'sacrificial session at night'), which is very common in later Mīmāṃsā texts but already appears in Śabara's *Śabarabhāṣya* (Śab *ad* PMS 4.3.17-18). While discussing PMS 4.3.17-18, Śabara draws on TS 5.1-10 to show that something mentioned only in an explanatory passage (*arthavāda*) may nonetheless be treated as a result of the sacrifice enjoined in a given rule (see Yoshimizu 2012: 663).

Let us further note that Medhātithi takes up with the same conclusion of inferring the application of *IEṬ* as denoting injunction based on A 3.4.7 while commenting on another verse, that is No. 39. Along the same lines, he also comments on the fact that in another passage, i.e. No. 30, the use of a present indicative verbal form (*kriyate*, which cannot be analysed as conjugated in the subjunctive) is precisely what indicates the absence of *vidhi*, while at the same time providing the additional indication of the obtainment of the effect (*phala*) in this specific case. Apart from injunctions, there are another ten passages in the group labelled as judicial: Nos. 14, 21, 24, 42, 87, 93, 94, 103, 136, 138, 214.

Proceeding in order, in the excerpt dealing with Manu's lineage, mentioned in two verses of the first *adhyāya* (No. 14), Medhātithi cites an excerpt from the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV *ad* A 2.1.19) to demonstrate that a *vaṃśa*, which is generally connoted as a family lineage, can also refer to a lineage of people engaged in the same activity. This holds true, for instance, for Vyākaraṇa, in which the sages are also considered to be in a lineage made of seers (suffice it to mention the famous *trimuni*, the three-headed lineage consisting of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali). The *Kāśikāvṛtti* excerpt is indeed cited to give the example of a *dvimuni* lineage of Vyākaraṇa, i.e. a two-headed lineage of grammatical seers.

In the section commenting on the first verse of the second *adhyāya*, which contains an invitation to learn the *dharma* (No. 21), Medhātithi focuses on the participle *sevita*- (lit. 'served') by hinting at the rule teaching the *kṛt* affix *Kta* that forms the past passive participle (A 3.2.102). He uses this reference to demonstrate that the *dharma* is constant over time, i.e. it belongs to both the past and the present.

In the passage on a verse from the same *adhyāya*, where it is stated that Manu declares any *dharma* relating to anybody as being fully expressed in the Veda (No. 24), Medhātithi explains the derivative stem *sarvajñānamaya*-, which refers to the Veda, as being formed by the *taddhita* affix *mayaT*, but following alternatively two different rules. The first hypothesis is A 4.3.143, where such an affix is applied with the sense of 'transformation of X', whereas the second is A 4.3.82, where the affix occurs in the meaning of 'coming from X' (descended from A 4.3.74).

The eventual aim of this excerpt also relates to the so-called Satkāryavāda, i.e. to the philosophical theory about causation, according to which the effect pre-exists in the cause. By appealing to a well-known Mīmāṃsā argument, the passage emphasises the prominent role of the Veda as a means of knowledge by asserting its pre-existence as a cause in the knowledge derived therefrom—its effect—and through which one can reach a sphere inaccessible to perception, namely *dharma*. In passage (No. 42) which we also analysed in connection with nominal inflection concerning the use of the genitive instead of the dative (see Section 3.2.3 above), Medhātithi states that leftovers should not be given to those who do not understand that the leftovers have been assigned to them, such as dogs, cats, and the like. He further notes that, in the case of leftovers, the meaning of the verbal base *dā-* used in Manu's verse is not fully expressed: although there is a cessation of ownership on the part of the giver, there is no corresponding appropriation on the part of the receiver.

At the beginning of the third *adhyāya* (No. 87) a reference to A 3.4.21 teaches the priority of the action conveyed by the gerund affix *Ktvā* as compared to the main clause. By means of this, Medhātithi reflects on whether the return of the Vedic student from the teacher's house (*samāvartana*) and the bath graduation (*snāna*) should be considered as part of the marriage rites of the man who has just become a householder (*grhastha*).⁴³⁹

A section dealing with the Brāhma marriage⁴⁴⁰ in the same *adhyāya* (No. 93) on the use of the word-form *upayamana-*, which literally means 'taking for one's self' but which, precisely based on the cited A 1.3.56, denotes the act of marrying. In this context, Medhātithi utilises this rule to elucidate the profound meaning of marriage under ancient Indian law, positing that a husband makes the wife his own.

⁴³⁹ For a fresh perspective on the householder, see the volume edited by Olivelle (2019) and the contributions contained therein.

⁴⁴⁰ This is the first of the eight canonical forms of marriage in all classifications of marriage rites according to ancient Indian law, found in both Dharmaśāstra texts (ĀpDh 2.11.17-2.12.4, GDh 4.6-15, BDh 1.20.1-16, VDh 1.28-35, MDh 3.20-35, YSm 1.58-61, VSm 24.17-37, NSm 12.38-44) and non-Dharmaśāstra ones (ĀśGS 1.6.1-8, AŚ 3.2.1-13, KāS 3.1.19, 3.5, MBh 1.67.8-14, 1.96.6-12, 13.44.3-11). In the classification found in Manu's treatise, which generally serves as the 'canonical' classification for later Dharmaśāstra texts (MDh 3.20-35), the eight forms are ordered as follows: Brāhma, Daiva, Ārṣa, Prājāpatya, Āsura, Gāndharva, Rākṣasa and Paiśāca. In this regard, see Sternbach (1941), Kane (1962-1975: II.1, 503-508, 519), Dumézil (1979), Trautmann (1981), Campanile (1984), Jamison (1996: 207-250), Rocher (2012), Ducoeur (2015), and Giudice (2022; 2024b: 720-721; 2025: 91-92).

In the passage that talks about *upayamana-* (lit. ‘taking for one’s self’, thus ‘marrying’) found in a verse dealing with the marriage of the same *adhyāya* (No. 94), Medhātithi cites a specific rule teaching that Ātmanepada substitutes of the *lakāras* occur after the verbal base *yam-* combined with the preverb *upa-* in the sense of ‘to marry’ (A 1.3.56). The commentator uses this rule to explain the profound understanding of marriage: the husband accepts his wife as he accepts a gift, and consequently, marriage consists in making a woman his own.

An excerpt reflecting on the monthly Śrāddha ceremony honouring the ancestors, i.e. the Anvāhārya (No. 103), makes reference to A 5.2.85 in order to demonstrate that the feeding of the Brāhmaṇas (*brāhmaṇabhojana*) should be understood as the core of the Śrāddha ceremony compared to, for instance, the offering of riceballs (*piṇḍanirvapaṇa*).

As regards a passage from the fifth *adhyāya* (No. 136), in the context of sacrifices, Medhātithi demonstrates the fact that, even at his time, the sacrificial cakes were made of eatable birds and beasts, by asserting that the speaker did not intend to denote the past in the perfect verbal form *babhūvuḥ* (formed according to A 3.2.115), thus taking it as an equivalent to the present *bhavanti*.

In another excerpt from the same *adhyāya* (No. 138), Medhātithi demonstrates that, among the eight types of murderers (*ghātaka*) listed by Manu, the buyers and sellers of meat (*krayavikrayin*) are not killers themselves, or better, are not felt to be killers (*nihantr*), partly in contrast to Manu’s teaching. He does this by resorting to A 1.4.54 which asserts that the actions of buying and selling meat are not the same as that of killing, denoted by the verbal base *han-*. He then relies on A 1.4.55 to state that only the killer, the prompter (*hetu*) of the action, kills animals because he does it to make a living, while the buyer and seller only deal with meat killed by others.

Finally, in the section discussing *ātreṇ-* (lit. ‘female descendant of Atri’, meaning ‘woman just after her courses’ in legal texts) found in a verse of the eleventh *adhyāya* (No. 214), Medhātithi first provides its regular grammatical etymology: the word-form *ātreṇ-* is a *taddhita* derivative stem from *atri-* (name of a sage), formed with the *taddhita* affix *dhaḌ* under A 4.1.122, together with the addition of the feminine affix *ŌP* according to A 4.1.15. Subsequently, the commentator provides the meaning of this word-form attested in Dharmaśāstra sources: ‘woman just after her period.’ This extra-grammatical meaning is associated with the embryo due to a paronymology well-grounded in the Dharmaśāstra tradition. As explained in a passage from the *Vasiṣṭhadharmasūtra* (VDh 20.35-36), the word-form *ātreṇ-* paronymologically derives from the adverb *atra* (‘here’) combined with the verbal base *i-* (‘to go’): the Ātreṇī is the woman in which (*atra*)

a child will come into being (*i-*). This paretymology is connected to considering the god Atri as a symbol of abortion in the *Śrautasūtras* (see Jamison 1991: 213-223). The Ātreṃ, as a newly menstruating woman, is viewed as being an embryo-killer (*bhrūṇahan*) and, therefore, guilty of killing a Brāhmaṇa in her womb.⁴⁴¹ Medhātithi makes a fascinating statement at the end of this section: the Vyākaraṇa does not explain such an etymology (since the *taddhita* affix *dhaK* is not taught in this sense), but the extra-grammatical denotation Medhātithi mentioned must be accepted according to usage. To sustain this, the commentator cites a statement whose source we were unable to find: *prayogānusāreṇa tu bhavātīti* “[this] is accepted in accordance with the usage.” Nevertheless, Medhātithi still wanted to include the grammatical explanation of the word-form *ātreyī-* as a *taddhita* derivative stem. According to our underlying assumption, this is probably due to didactic purposes.

In conclusion, Medhātithi does not prioritise the juridical use of grammar over linguistic and exegetical purposes. The commentator undoubtedly has other argumentative tools to provide legal interpretations for Manu’s text. However, in those passages where grammatical references are employed in a juridical sense, it is striking how the Vyākaraṇa proves to be an excellent foundation for Medhātithi’s arguments, especially those inspired by Mīmāṃsā doctrine.

3.4. Grammatical passages with encyclopaedic purposes (*E*)

We conclude this study with the twenty-five collected passages in which Medhātithi uses grammatical sources for encyclopaedic purposes. These regard instances where a grammatical rule from Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* or a passage from Kātyāyana’s *vārttikas*, Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Kāśikāvṛtti* has been quoted or referred to as an authority to explain content that is not strictly part of the text which he is commenting on, but whose purpose is instead to enhance encyclopaedic comprehensiveness.

This category is, by definition, the most miscellaneous; however, we have identified three thematic groups to organise the passages in question.

The first, which includes the largest number of passages in this category (Nos. 1, 7, 28, 35, 40, 62, 63, 64, 108, 156, 199, 215, 223), groups the grammatical passages where Vyākaraṇa is referenced as a significant authority outside Dharmaśāstra. Grammar, recalled with reference to Pāṇini alone or to the entire

⁴⁴¹ Regarding the Dharmaśāstra perspective on abortion, see Kane (1962-1975: II, 148), Ferrara (2022: 26-33) and Andrijanić (2023: 53-56).

tradition, is either used as a means of comparison or to strengthen Medhātithi's arguments.

At the very outset of his commentary on the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* (No. 1), Medhātithi first mentions the beginning of the *Mahābhāṣya* (M 1.1 l. 1) and then Pāṇini's name to compare the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*. This immediately underscores the prominent role assumed by the Vyākaraṇa as a reference in commenting on Manu's treatise. Notably, Medhātithi uses the Vyākaraṇa tradition as a term of comparison to raise two objections to Manu's work. The first objection is that the purpose of Manu's treatise is explicitly stated at the beginning as a means of helping the reader to get a better understanding of the whole work. On the contrary, Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* presents its content immediately without clarifying its scope, since it is assumed that the work is easily understood. The second objection regards the length of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*, which is justified by its focus on providing a thorough explanation of each precept, omitting nothing to ensure transparency, as compared to the conciseness of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, justified by its *sūtra* style. In this context, to clarify the significant comparison with the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Medhātithi cites a well-known sentence frequently used in the Vyākaraṇa tradition, "Pāṇini's fame is known even to a child" (*ākumāraṃ ca yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ*), which appears in a similar form in two passages of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (see KV *ad* A 1.4.89 = KV *ad* A 2.1.13).

In a passage dealing with Prajāpati as the agency that assigns names to all the objects in the first *adhyāya* (No. 7), the first rule of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A 1.1.1) is cited along with the inception of the *Piṅgalasūtra* (PiñS 1.1.1) and Yāska's *Nirukta* (Nir 1.1) as an example of a *saṃjñāsūtra*, an aphoristic prose passage that provides essential designations of categories relevant to the work in which it is embedded. Although the numerous passages on injunction (discussed in Section 3.3) are evidence of Medhātithi's adherence to the principles of the Mīmāṃsā school, there seem to be at least two (Nos. 7 and 25) in which he strengthens his position against the Mīmāṃsā theory of the permanence of language (*nityatā*), which aligns more closely with the perspective of the Nyāya school. As for other places where Nyāya thought is invoked, the maxim on the impermanence of language cited in passage No. 25 also appears, for instance, in Vātsyāyana's *Nyāyabhāṣya* on the *Nyāyasūtra* (NBh 1.1.35). Notably, Vyākaraṇa authors likewise uphold this view on the non-permanence of language in key passages, such as M 1.136 l. 5 – 1.138 l. 10 *ad* Vtt. 9-17 *ad* A 1.1.56. Furthermore, in the same passage from Medhātithi's commentary, two Nyāya

technical terms are employed: *pratijñā*- ('to postulate') and *nigam*- ('to conclude').⁴⁴²

In a section dealing with the place fit for sacrifices from the second *adhyāya* (No. 28), Medhātithi relies on A 1.4.45, the metarule that designates the *kāraka* denoting the substratum (*ādhāra*) as *adhikaraṇa*. More specifically, he relies on the terminology used in this rule to reflect on the notion of substratum.

In the same *adhyāya* that refers to a verse about the Vedic student's clothing (No. 35), Medhātithi cites Pāṇini by name and contextually references rule A 1.3.10 to show that language itself can help in associating items with their possessors, even if no other indication is given.

While commenting on a verse regarding the duties of a twice-born who has to sip water and wash his orifices (No. 40), Medhātithi uses the example of the future passive participles *puṣya*- and *siddhya*- which, since they are derived as ready-made forms (*nīpātana*), have the restricted meaning of particular asterisms as taught by A 3.1.116 to justify the specific ritual use of the verbal base *sprś*- meaning 'to sip water.'

In a section dealing with addressing an older Brāhmaṇa (No. 62), Medhātithi expands the discussion about greeting formulas, noting the uselessness of the inflected noun *asau* combined with *nāmāham asmi* in the formula used in Manu's verse (*asau nāmāham asmīti* "I whose name is so-and-so") because it is redundant.⁴⁴³ He points out that the authors of Sūtras frequently borrow some word-forms from the *smṛti* sources (understood in the sense of human-made literature), as in the case of the borrowing of the term *dvītiya* for the accusative case ending, which the Sūtrakāras borrowed from Pāṇini's rule A 2.3.2. This point allows Medhātithi to cite a certain *yajñasūtra* (which, according to our interpretation, is a 'rule on the sacrifice'; cf. Jha 1999: III, 392) as a *smṛti* passage,

⁴⁴² Another reference to the Nyāya school appears in No. 28, where Medhātithi argues that what looks like a *vidhi* is in fact merely an *arthavāda*, taking as an example the formula *jartilayavāgvā juhuyāt* ("he should present an oblation of wild sesamum and rice gruel"). A note in Olivelle's edition of the *Manubhāṣya*, which draws on a study by Muroya (2009-2010), points out that a reconstructed passage from the lost Nyāya treatise titled *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* contains a comparable analysis of the same formula. In that text, as in Medhātithi's discussion, the expression *jartilayavāgvā juhuyāt* is ultimately treated as an explanatory statement that merely imitates the form of an injunction, without functioning as a true injunction of its own.

⁴⁴³ By the way, we note that the most complete form of greeting includes the word-form *bhoḥ* added afterwards. A recent study by Brick (2016) explores this particle as a linguistic marker of Brahmanical identity.

stating that one's proper name is expressed alongside the pronoun, so as to demonstrate the optionality of mentioning *asau* in Manu's verse.

In the same *adhyāya*, while commenting on one of Manu's verses which teaches that one should say "I" in response to those who do not know how to address people by their proper name and women (No. 63), Medhātithi first cites A 8.2.83 to exemplify that an extra-long high-pitched vowel has to be substituted for the last vowel (metalinguistically termed as *ṬI*) of the proper name of the person being greeted if he is not a Śūdra. Then, by making reference to a passage from Patañjali's *Paspaśā*, he adds that, as Manu teaches, for those who do not know this and for women, one should simply answer "I", which demonstrates the importance of studying grammar when learning all greeting formulas.

In the same section on greetings, while commenting on a verse that teaches to lengthen the final vowel *a* together with the previous syllable at the end of the proper name of the Brāhmaṇa being addressed (No. 64), Medhātithi twice mentions Pāṇini by name and recalls A 8.2.83 once again. This is further clarified by the citation of A 1.1.64 which explains the metalinguistic element termed as *ṬI*, i.e. the portion beginning with the last vowel of a word-form.

In the commentarial passage on a verse indicating the period of time that must pass before the older and younger brothers can marry if the middle brother gets married first (No. 108), Medhātithi cites a passage from the *Gautamadharmasūtra* (GDh 18.19), where he infers the reading of *proṣita-* from GDh 18.16 (variant reading for *pravrajite*) with the principle of the governing rule (*adhikāra*). Given its extensive use in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Medhātithi cites A 1.3.11 as an authoritative reference for its mechanism.

In an excerpt from the eighth *adhyāya* (No. 156) which comments on the king's establishment of the behaviour to be observed by the wise and twice-borns, Medhātithi makes a digression on custom (*ācāra*), the third root of *dharma* (*dharmamūla*) in the Dharmaśāstra. After recognising the foundation of custom in revelation (*śruti*) and tradition (*smṛti*), which are the first and second *dharmamūlas*, he reflects upon the extension of a custom that is well-established in a given place—such as the Udvṛṣabha sacrifice in the northern country (*udīcyā*)—to another—which in this example are the eastern (*prācyā*), southern (*dākṣiṇātyā*), and western countries (*pratīcyā*). To demonstrate the effectiveness of this custom in the different countries, Medhātithi employs grammatical references to clarify that the word-forms denoting this kind of label, such as *udīcyā-* for 'northern' (even though it applies to all those listed above), are anything but clear-cut and unambiguous. Indeed, in his example, Medhātithi asserts that *udīcyā-* can be formed with several *taddhita* affixes, each endowed

with distinct output meanings, respectively those taught by A 4.3.25 ('born in the North'), A 4.3.53 ('being in the North'), and A 4.3.74 ('arrived from the North'), based on the fact that they fall under the section included in the domain of A 4.2.92.

In a passage commenting on a verse regarding expiation (No. 199), Medhātithi asserts that the word-form *nigama-* found in the relevant verse in Manu's text is used as a synonym for *veda-*. To strengthen this interpretation, he refers to a rule in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* where the locative *nigame* is employed in the sense of 'in the Vedic literature', i.e. A 7.2.64.

In a section on a verse from the eleventh *adhyāya* regarding the Surā (No. 215), Medhātithi focuses on the meaning of the word-form *anna-*, which is not used in the general—and most frequent—sense of 'food', but in the specific meaning of 'broken grain.' As a comparison, he adds that *anna-* is used as a hypernym meaning 'food' in Pāṇini's rule A 2.1.34, where it is opposed to the term *vyañjana-* ('condiment').

The last example in this group is the only excerpt from the twelfth *adhyāya* which comments on the apparent quasi-repetition of *karmayoga-* and *kriyāvidhi-* (No. 223). According to Medhātithi, despite their similarity, they denote different things, namely, 'performance of ritual duties' (*karmayoga*) and 'rule of action' (*kriyāvidhi*) and the latter does not denote ritual practices. To strengthen his argument, he refers to another quasi-repetition found precisely in the Vyākaraṇa, i.e. that of *kratu-* and *yajña-* in A 4.3.68. Just as happens in Manu's case, even these two are interpreted by later Vyākaraṇa authors as denoting two diverse things, i.e. a Soma sacrifice (*kratu*) and a Vedic sacrifice in general (*yajña*), which are respectively, a hyponym and a hypernym (see M 2.312 ll. 17-20 *ad* A 4.3.68; KV *ad* A 4.3.68).

The second thematic group we identified within the encyclopaedic passages are those that delineate a boundary between the Dharmaśāstra and Vyākaraṇa, specifying their distinct areas of 'technical' action. Occasionally, they also clarify why particular word-forms or syntagms convey specific meanings in Manu's treatise, precisely because it is part of the legal literature (Nos. 68, 125, 138, 141). These passages are highly relevant in illustrating the significance that Pāṇini and the entire Vyākaraṇa hold for Medhātithi.

The last of the singled-out passages from the second *adhyāya* deals with the definition of *ācārya-*, i.e. 'preceptor' (No. 68), and here Medhātithi explains that such a word-form has a specific meaning in the Dharmaśāstra: it refers to the one who, after initiating a pupil, teaches him the Veda, the ritual literature (*kalpa*, which pertains to the *Kalpāsūtra* texts), and the esoteric doctrine (*rahasya*, related

to the *Upaniṣad* texts). Here, the scholar asserts that this peculiar meaning of *ācārya-* is not the one found in the Vyākaraṇa since it is not rooted in the Veda. Indeed, this is one of the passages demarking a clear-cut line between the Dharmaśāstra and Vyākaraṇa. In contrast to legal literature, which gives instructions as to what should be done, grammatical literature explains the relationship between word-forms and their meanings.

In his commentary on a verse from the fourth *adhyāya* (No. 125) that indicates the way one should behave towards a Śūdra, Medhātithi explains that the meaning of the word-form *dharma-* in the relevant verse from Manu's treatise is 'treatise concerning understanding *dharma*' and asserts that the Dharmaśāstra differs from other subsidiary sciences, including the Vyākaraṇa because, unlike the others, it has a suprasensory meaning. In this regard, Medhātithi again states that the principal aim of the Vyākaraṇa is to discover the meaning of complex sentences by analysing the meaning of inflected nouns.

While commenting on a verse from the fifth *adhyāya* (No. 138) that deals with the eight kinds of killers identified by Manu, Medhātithi makes a digression in which he underscores that the Smṛtikāras cannot be authorities in connecting word-forms and meanings, which is the field of Pāṇini and, more generally, the Vyākaraṇa. Indeed, the Dharmaśāstra authors limit themselves to being mere users rather than teachers of traditional grammar.

This point is further developed in a digression about a verse on the purification of metal and stone objects and gems found within the same *adhyāya* (No. 141). The field in which Vyākaraṇa authors operate involves the derivation of word meaning and the distinction between right and wrong word formations. In contrast, the Dharmaśāstra authors are, instead, concerned with establishing what should be done in compliance with the Veda and, in some cases, custom.

Finally, the third thematic group includes other passages that make incidental reference to the Vyākaraṇa tradition only to add information to the relevant commentarial sections and not to demonstrate arguments or compare the Dharmaśāstra with the Vyākaraṇa (Nos. 25, 33, 102, 142, 174, 200, 220). The first passage, from the second *adhyāya* (No. 25), deals with the four *dharmamūlas* and features a discussion about repetitions. Here, Medhātithi refers to the impermanence of language by quoting *anityaḥ śabdaḥ* ('language is impermanent'), a concept typically associated with the Nyāya school (see, for example, a passage from Vātsyāyana's *Nyāyabhāṣya* on the *Nyāyasūtra*, i.e. NBh 1.1.35). To support his point that language is not eternal, Medhātithi refers to Patañjali as a Śāstrin who explains a *sūtra* of Pāṇini or a *vārttika* of Kātyāyana and then repeats that explanation at the conclusion of the discussion.

In an excerpt from the second *adhyāya* addressing the *upanāyana* of a Brāhmaṇa (No. 33), Medhātithi directly cites Pāṇini by name to add information to the root text, where the word-form *rājan-* is included. More specifically, he asserts that it served as the etymon for the *taddhita* derivative stem *rājya-*, based on A 5.1.124, and was commonly understood to mean ‘chief of a country’, which refers to A 4.1.168.

A passage from the third *adhyāya* contains a digression on the ritual blessing exclamation *svāhā* (No. 102) and includes a reference to Pāṇini’s rule A 2.3.16, which deals with the use of the dative in co-occurrence with various forms of exclamation, including *svāhā*.

In the commentary section on a verse in the fifth *adhyāya* (No. 142) which talks about the fact that sonless Brāhmaṇas are denied access to heaven, Medhātithi cites a passage from the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* (AitB 33.1). He comments on the absence of gender in this passage seeing that the speaker does not denote any gender by using the word-form *aputra-* (generically meaning ‘without children’, and not ‘without sons’ or ‘without daughters’) as compared to the automatic involvement (technically called *prasaṅga*) of the masculine gender while expressing words, which is a specific topic discussed in post-Pāṇini Vyākaraṇa (see M 2.144 ll. 13-15 *ad* Vt. 1 *ad* A 3.3.18, taken up in KV *ad* A 3.3.18).

In the commentary section on a verse from the eighth *adhyāya* that deals with transactions conducted by unsuitable persons (No. 174), Medhātithi quotes a verse from the *Nāradaśmṛti* (NSm 1.37) and includes a grammatical note thereon. He cites A 2.1.32 to explain that the *tatpuruṣa* compound *kāmakrodhābhīyuktārtabhayavyasanapīḍitā-* (‘assailed by desire and anger, and those who are oppressed by distress, fear, and calamity’) found in Nārada’s verse has the *kṛt* derivative stem *pīḍita-* (‘oppressed’) as its right-hand constituent, based on Pāṇini’s rule which was mentioned above.

An excerpt from the ninth *adhyāya* discussing a verse on the non-release of a wife sold or repudiated from her marital bond (No. 200), Medhātithi refers to another verse from Manu’s treatise (MDh 3.4). He asserts that the verbal form *udvaheta* (‘he marries’) in this verse, which signifies the action of a husband marrying a wife, is conjugated in the Ātmanepada diathesis to denote the outcome of the action whose purpose is that of the agent according to A 1.3.72.

In a section dealing with a verse on the Sāntapana penance (No. 220), Medhātithi cites two *sūtras* from the *Gautamadharmasūtra* (GDh 23.12-13) while reflecting on the animals included in the group of *amānuṣin-* appearing in the verse by Manu previously commented on. However, in relation to Gautama’s passage, he introduces an element to the discussion that is not about animals but instead

concerns the word-form *sakhī*, constituting a *pada* of a long *dvandva* compound in GDh 23.12. In this case, Medhātithi states that the feminine stem *sakhī* is not formed as a female counterpart of the nominal stem *sakha-* ('friend'), and therefore does not mean 'male friend's wife'—as it does in A 4.1.48—but simply denotes 'female friend.'

Compared to all the other passages we examined, our general impression of this undoubtedly miscellaneous group of grammatical passages is that they clearly show the originally oral approach of this commentary. Bearing in mind the importance the Vyākaraṇa held for Medhātithi, it is reasonable to think that, as a *guru*, when teaching his students, he would have provided examples from the grammatical sphere to enhance their understanding and offer structured digressions on various aspects of his ongoing—oral—explanation of verses from Manu's treatise. This pronounced oral structuring was maintained in the written and transmitted form of the *Manubhāṣya*. However, in our opinion, it is also reasonable to assume that what remains of this type of passage is probably only a small part of the 'encyclopaedic' additions that included Medhātithi's original explanations of Manu's verses imparted in his lessons at his *gurukula*.

4. Conclusion

In this concluding chapter of this volume, we aim to present its main findings and key takeaways.

Firstly, let us emphasise that we believe a thorough understanding of the passages from the *Manubhāṣya* examined here, based on the grammatical tradition, will significantly deepen the overall knowledge of Medhātithi's interpretation of the *Mānavadharmasāstra*.

Overall, based on our analysis of the relationship with the grammatical sources we could reconstruct, we are convinced that Medhātithi paid little attention to contemporary sources. Instead, he preferred to rely on his traditional knowledge and the most authoritative and current commentaries on Pāṇini. This conclusion aligns with the observation that he seemed to favour logical argumentation over quotations from other texts, as maintained by Derrett (1976: 176), Olivelle (2016: 126), and Davis and Brick (2018: 39).

One of the unexpected but welcome outcomes of the present research is the discovery of evidence that the primary grammatical source for Medhātithi is the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (see e.g. Nos. 5, 14, 35, 36, etc.). The second most crucial grammatical source used is the collection of Kātyāyana's *vārttikas* (including some self-evident *vārttikas* which are not labelled as such in Kielhorn and Abhyankar's edition: see Nos. 45, 151, 152, 153), which seems to be adopted as a sort of updated version of Pāṇini's grammar. There is evidence that Medhātithi draws on the next phase of the grammatical tradition that followed *Kāśikāvṛtti*. In particular, he relies on Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*, which contains 'innovative' extensions to the works of Kātyāyana and Patañjali and the *Kāśikāvṛtti* that also appear in Medhātithi's work (Nos. 16, 33, 115, 145, 178, 191, 195, 196). Ultimately, there are a few cases in which what Medhātithi teaches does not align faithfully with Pāṇini's rules or the traditional commentarial tradition. There are various original extensions of Pāṇini's rules included in Medhātithi's commentary (see Nos. 20, 54, 90, 161): they may not have been invented by him but may have been taught in works that we have not examined or that have been lost, or they may simply have been transmitted orally.

However, when an explanation of the same rule dealt with by the *Manubhāṣya* is available in both the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, some detail indicates that the latter is used as the source rather than the former (see e.g. passage No. 161).

This is an important finding because the *Kāśikāvṛtti* was commented upon by Jinendrabuddhi in his *Nyāsa* during the 8th-9th centuries CE, which shows a notable interest in the text. However, the circulation of this text is otherwise poorly attested in the period between the *prācīnavyākaraṇa* ('ancient grammar') and the *navyavyākaraṇa* ('new grammar').⁴⁴⁴

In fact, on one hand, the *Mahābhāṣya* remained the most authoritative commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and as a result, the valuable and frequently quoted sub-commentary titled *Pradīpa* by Kaiyaṭa (11th-12th centuries CE) was composed, even though Patañjali's work was limited to a selection of rules. On the other hand, traditional grammatical texts began shifting into works that reorganised the topics explained by Pāṇini and that adopted the so-called *prakriyā* arrangement of rules, rather than commenting on individual rules systematically, such as the time-honoured *Siddhāntakaumudī* by Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita (16th-17th centuries CE).⁴⁴⁵

It is evident that when a rule is also discussed in the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* simply reiterates the conclusions established by Patañjali, often adopting and illustrating the same examples and aiming to clarify the content. This is why, in these cases, we chose to document the *Manubhāṣya*'s passage based on both the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. However, the testimony of the significant role played by the *Kāśikāvṛtti* in the background of Medhātithi's work suggests that anyone seeking to trace the whole history of indigenous grammar should include all available commentaries that provide information about the fate of the ancient grammars. In particular, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* appears to have been preserved in commentary traditions and possibly even within pedagogical circles.

We often observe how Medhātithi enjoys discussing the analysis of intricate *taddhitānta* nominal stems or the various possible classifications of individual compounds, showcasing his erudition, sometimes favouring one variant reading over another. In these instances, grammar appears to be merely a tool for interpreting the text, justifying unconventional or unexpected linguistic forms, or serving as a vessel for erudition, but other passages point elsewhere. It is indeed impossible to justify the presence of some generic or misplaced grammatical explanations (see e.g. Nos. 5 and 114) except by imagining they were types of excursions intended for pupils who, in the context of the *gurukula* (taking up the discussion of Davis 2018: 371-372), while trained in the laws of Manu, were also

⁴⁴⁴ As for the circulation of the Pāṇinian literature in South Asia, see e.g. Vergiani (2017: 77-79).

⁴⁴⁵ See Bali (1976: 59-64); Ferrero (2024b: 15-28).

instructed in Pāṇini's grammar, to whom the highest homage was paid. The *Kāśikāvṛtti*, for pedagogical purposes, might have retained its prestige for a long time and remains today the only fairly widespread alternative to the *Siddhāntakaumudī* (or its shorter versions created in the 17th century CE by Varadarāja, Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita's disciple, namely the *Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī*, the *Laghusiddhāntakaumudī*, and the *Sārasiddhāntakaumudī*) as a reliable and traditional handbook.

Through an integral reading of the *Manubhāṣya* with the purpose of identifying Vyākaraṇa references, we have identified many more passages than are recognised by earlier editions and translations of the *Manubhāṣya*. Indeed, the Vyākaraṇa passages Medhātithi uses in his commentary are usually difficult to be recognised because, in most cases, they only alluded to with a few matching words rather than being fully quoted.⁴⁴⁶ It is difficult not to associate such a high density of grammatical passages directly with the inherently technical nature of the root text, where the letter of each rule must be understood with great precision, overcoming any ambiguities.

In light of the evidence gathered, particularly the high number of Pāṇinian references within the commentary, Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* constitutes a *sui generis* work in the Dharmaśāstra tradition itself, when compared to other early commentaries to normative root texts (e.g. Viśvarūpa's *Bālakrīḍā* on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛiti*) and later digest-like commentaries (e.g. Vijñāneśvara's *Mitākṣarā*, formally also a commentary to Yajñavalkya's text). However, another commentary that pays some attention to the grammatical aspects of the source text following a Pāṇinian perspective is Haradatta's *Ujjvalā* on the *Āpastamadharmasūtra* (see, in this regard, Olivelle 1999). Since it was composed centuries after the *Manubhāṣya* (assumably between 1100 and 1300 CE),⁴⁴⁷ Haradatta may have adopted Medhātithi's approach when writing his linguistic notes.

This comparison highlights the uniqueness of Medhātithi's modes of argumentation, in which grammar played a significant role, with frequent occurrences and highly expert use of Vyākaraṇa sources in commenting on Manu's root text. This uniqueness in the Dharmaśāstra tradition is evident primarily from the number of 'Vyākaraṇa-oriented' passages in Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya*. When we put in relation the number of grammatical passages we selected from the *Manubhāṣya* with those we can find in other Dharmaśāstra

⁴⁴⁶ For the comparison with the *Manubhāṣya*'s earlier editions by Jha and Olivelle, see the tables provided in Chapter 8.

⁴⁴⁷ Regarding the chronology of Haradatta, see Olivelle (2000: 20).

commentaries, it will result that others encompass far fewer passages in which Vyākaraṇa serves such a significant role in commenting on the root texts, especially if we consider the variegated degrees of application (textual-linguistic, textual-exegetical, juridical and encyclopaedic) the Vyākaraṇa had in Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya*. In other *Bhāṣyas* of the Dharmaśāstra tradition, the Vyākaraṇa tends to function as a minor commentary tool, with occasional and potentially genuinely 'indispensable' use for understanding the linguistic aspects of the root text's section scrutiny.⁴⁴⁸

To complete the picture of Medhātithi's eccentricity as a Dharmaśāstra commentator, we include the range of extra-Dharmaśāstra sources he utilises to address textual or contextual issues in the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*. Among these sources, in addition to Vyākaraṇa, we find philosophical ones, notably Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya (as discussed in Section 3.4 for the passages where philosophical and grammatical passages are juxtaposed), as well as Vedic sources and Vedāṅga texts such as *Gṛhyasūtras* and *Śrautasūtras* (which appear interspersed in some passages analysed in Section 2, still in relationship with Vyākaraṇa: see Nos. 23, 28, 31, 32, 62).

The number of technical grammatical passages in the *Manubhāṣya* is even significantly higher than those found in a normal Sanskrit commentary, where the linguistic analysis of the root text—in the first four 'services' of a commentary (*padaccheda*, *padārthokti*, *vigraha*, and *vākyayojanā*), following Tubb and Boose (2007)⁴⁴⁹—is not always addressed through the Vyākaraṇa sources. Indeed, we note that there are some significant exceptions to this trend. The first exception is found in the Kāvya tradition. While grammatical erudition is generally a hallmark of the Kāvya style, the attention devoted to the Pāṇinian analysis of the Kāvya

⁴⁴⁸ These assertions are also based on research conducted by Alessandro Giudice, who sought to collect and examine all the Vyākaraṇa-oriented passages within the *Mitākṣarā* of Vijñāneśvara. The goal was to compare how Medhātithi and Vijñāneśvara used Vyākaraṇa in their commentaries. The preliminary results of this research were presented at the 2024 Conference of the Italian Association of Sanskrit Studies (AISS), held in Frascati from 11 to 13 October 2024, in a paper titled "The use of Vyākaraṇa sources in Medieval Dharmaśāstra: A Comparison between Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* and Vijñāneśvara's *Mitākṣarā*." A written version of this paper will be included in the conference proceedings. Finally, an additional article is planned that will gather all the Vyākaraṇa-oriented passages found in the three major commentaries on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* by Viśvarūpa, Vijñāneśvara, and Aparārka, comparing them to Medhātithi's arguments of the same nature.

⁴⁴⁹ For a review of the 'services of a commentary' as defined by Tubb and Boose (2007), especially in the context of Mahākavya texts, see Klebanov (2016: 1-45; 2020: 523-536).

texts changed within the commentarial tradition.⁴⁵⁰ Notably, there was a later group of commentators on the Mahākāvya genre who produced their own works with a very ‘Vyākaraṇa-oriented’ style. This was likely connected to the didactic purpose of many later commentaries of teaching Sanskritists how to apply Pāṇini’s rules in real language use. A prime example of this commentarial style is Mallinātha (14th-15th century), who commented on several Mahākāvya works (e.g. the *Sarvaṅkaṣā* on Māgha’s *Śiśupālavadha*).⁴⁵¹ However, it should be noted that this only represents a later phase in the production of Kāvya commentaries. Earlier authors of Mahākāvya commentaries, as well as those producing commentaries on Kāvya genres other than the Mahākāvya, much more rarely provided linguistic explanations of the root text, limiting themselves to give account of unusual linguistic forms and less systematically referring to the Pāṇinian tradition. A second exception is found in the work of the 14th-century commentator of the Vedas: Sāyaṇa. Especially on the commentarial sections on the first *maṇḍalas* of the *Rgvedasamhitā*, he systematically resorted to Pāṇini’s grammar to explain the Vedic text (see, e.g., Devasthali 1963). Nevertheless, there is a great, significant difference between Medhātithi and the authors we mentioned. Unlike Mallinātha or Sāyaṇa, Medhātithi is not systematic in his use of the Vyākaraṇa. His interest was not to apply it as a single hermeneutic tool for the analysis of Manu’s text. In our understanding, Medhātithi held Vyākaraṇa as a part of the set of technical disciplines, where we also find the works pertaining to the *kalpa* (like the *Gṛhyasūtras* and *Śrautasūtras*) and some *darśana* (such as the arguments of the Mīmāṃsā), to which he resorts to explain the *Mānavadharmasāstra* and make it converse with the intellectual reality of which he was a part.

With this volume, drawing on our daily commitment in studying Sanskrit technical literature, especially Dharmaśāstra and Vyākaraṇa, we ultimately aimed to highlight Medhātithi’s status as a scholar in his own right, beyond being merely one of the greatest commentators on the *Mānavadharmasāstra*. We hope this

⁴⁵⁰ The grammatical expertise characteristic of Kāvya resulted in the exceptional creation of a ‘grammar manual’ in the Kāvya style: the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* (c. 7th century). Although it is traditionally classified as a Mahākāvya, it would be more accurately categorised as a Śāstrakāvya. Consequently, Jayamaṅgala’s 11th-century commentary on the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* systematically identifies all the Pāṇinian references embedded in the text. Further information on the Bhaṭṭikāvya can be found in Narang (1969) and Sudyka (2000).

⁴⁵¹ Regarding the chronology, as well as the list of works, of Mallinātha, see Lalye (2002: 11-19).

work paves the way for further research on this notable medieval author, whom scholars have yet to study in depth from multiple perspectives.

5. Abbreviations and bibliography

Abbreviations

- A *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Ed. Sharma (1987-2003).
AitB *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa*. Ed. Aufrecht (1879).
AŚ *Arthaśāstra*. Ed. Kangle (1969).
ĀpDh *Āpastambadharmasūtra*. Ed. Olivelle (2000).
ĀśGS *Āśvalāyanagrhyasūtra*. Ed. Stenzler (1864).
BDh *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra*. Ed. Olivelle (2000).
BŚS *Baudhāyanaśrautasūtra*. Ed. Kashikar (2003).
ChUp *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. Ed. Olivelle (1998a).
GB *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*. Ed. Gaastra (1919).
GDh *Gautamadharmasūtra*. Ed. Olivelle (2000).
Kum Kumāṛila's *Tantravārttika ad Jaimini's Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*. Ed. Abhyankar and Joshi (1971-1980).
KāS *Kāmasūtra*. Ed. Goswami (1912).
KS *Kāṭhasaṃhitā*. Ed. von Schroeder (1900).
KV Jayāditya and Vāmana's *Kāśikāvṛtti*. Ed. Mishra (1985).
M *Mahābhāṣya*. Ed. Kielhorn (1962-1972).
MBh *Mahābhārata*. Ed. Sukthankar, Belvalkar, and Vaidya (1933-1971).
MDh *Mānavadharmasāstra*. Ed. Olivelle (2005).
MDh^M Medhātithi's version of the *Mānavadharmasāstra*.
Medh Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya*. Ed. Jha (1999).
MS *Maitrāyaṇīsaṃhitā*. Ed. von Schroeder (1970-1972).
N Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*. Ed. Mishra (1985).
NBh Vātsyāyana's *Nyāyabhāṣya* on the *Nyāyasūtra*. Ed. Thakur (1997).
Nir Yāska's *Nirukta*. Ed. Bhadkamkar (1918).
NPBh Nāgeśa's *Paribhāṣā*. Ed. Abhyankar (2001).
NSm *Nāradaśmṛti*. Ed. Lariviere (2003).
PārGS *Pāraskaragrhyasūtra*. Ed. Stenzler (1878).
PB *Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa*. Ed. Śāstrī and Śāstrī (1935-1936).
PiñS *Piṅgalasūtra*. Ed. Śāstrī (1874).
PMS Jaimini's *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*. Ed. Abhyankar and Joshi (1971-1980).
ṚV *Ṛgvedasaṃhitā*. Ed. Aufrecht (1877).

- Śab Śābara's *Śābarabhāṣya ad Jaimini's Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*. Ed. Abhyankar and Joshi (1971-1980).
 ŚBM *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, Mādhyandina recension. Ed. Weber (1849).
 ŚveUp *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*. Ed. Oberlies (1995; 1996; 1998).
 US *Uṇādisūtra*. Ed. Böhtlingk (1844).
 VDh *Vasiṣṭhadharmasūtra*. Ed. Olivelle (2000).
 VS *Vājasaneyisaṃhitā*. Ed. Weber (1852).
 VSm Viṣṇusmṛti. Ed. Olivelle (2009).
 Vt Kātyāyana's *vārttikas*, quoted in M.
 YSm *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*. Ed. Olivelle (2020).

Primary literature

- Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev (ed.). 2001. *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa. Edited and explained by Franz Kielhorn. Part II: Translation and Notes*. 2nd ed. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research (1st ed. 1960).
 Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev, and Ganesasastri Ambadasa Joshi (eds.). 1971-1980. *Śrīmajjaiminipraṇite Mīmāṃsādarśane: Mīmāṃsakakāṇṭhīrava-Kumārīlabhaṭṭapraṇita-Tantravārttikasahita-Śābarabhāṣyopetaḥ*. 2nd ed. Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvaliḥ, 97. Poona: Anandashram (1st ed. 1929-1934).
 Aufrecht, Theodor (ed.). 1877. *Die Hymnen des R̥gveda*. 2 Vols. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.
 Aufrecht, Theodor (ed.). 1879. *Das Aitareya Brāhmaṇa: Mit Auszügen aus dem Commentare von Sāyaṇācārya und anderen Beilagen*. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.
 Bhadkamkar, H. M. (ed.). 1918. *The Nirukta of Yāska (with Nighaṇṭu) edited with Durga's commentary*. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, 73. Bombay: Government Central Press.
 Böhtlingk, Otto (ed.). 1844. *Die Uṇādi-Affixe*. St. Petersburg: Gedruckt Bei Der Kaiserl. Akademie Der Wissenschaften.
 Bühler, Georg (ed.). 1886. *The Laws of Manu*. The Sacred Books of the East, 25. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 Colebrooke, Henry Thomas (ed.). 1801. *A Digest of Hindu Law*. 2 Vols. London: Wilson and Co. Oriental Press.
 Dave, J. H. (ed.). 1972-1984. *Manu-Smṛiti with Nine Commentaries by Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda, Nandana,*

- Rāmacandra, Maṇirāma, Govindarāja and Bhāruci*. 6 volumes. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. (ed.). 1975. *Bhāruci's Commentary on the Manusmṛti*. 2 Vols. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Eggeling, Julius (ed.). 1882-1900. *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa: According to the Text of the Mādhyandina School*. The Sacred Books of the East, 12, 26, 41, 43, 44. 5 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gaastera, Dieuke (ed.). 1919. *Das Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gharpure, J. R. (ed.). 1920. *Manusmṛiti with the Bhāṣya of Bhaṭṭa Medhātithi*. First Edition. Bombay: Bombay Vaibhav Press.
- Gharpure, J. R. (ed.). 1958. *Manusmṛiti with the Bhāṣya of Bhaṭṭa Medhātithi*. Second Edition with the help of Swami Kevalananda of the Prājña Maṭha of Wai. Poona: Aryasamskriti Mudranalaya.
- Goswami, Sri Damodar Lal (ed.). 1913. *Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana, with the Commentary of Yaśodhara*. Kashi Sanskrit Series, 29. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Jha, Ganganath (ed.). 1920-1926. *Manu-Smṛti with the "Manubhāṣya" of Medhātithi. Edited with the Help of Several Manuscripts*. 5 Vols. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.
- Jha, Ganganath (ed.). 1932-1939. *Manu-Smṛti with the "Manubhāṣya" of Medhātithi. Edited with the Help of Several Manuscripts*. 3 Vols. Allahabad: Indian Press; Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal. Reprinted with the translation in Jha (1999).
- Jha, Ganganath (ed.). 1999. *Manu-Smṛti with the "Manubhāṣya" of Medhātithi. Edited with the Help of Several Manuscripts*. With a foreword by Albrecht Wezler. 10 Vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Kangle, R. P. (ed.). 1969. *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. Part I: A Critical Edition and Glossary*. 2nd ed. Bombay: University of Bombay (1st ed. 1960).
- Kashikar, Chintaman Ganesh (ed.). 2003. *Baudhāyanaśrautasūtram*. Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts.
- Katre, Sumitra M. (ed.). 1987. *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kielhorn, Franz (ed.). 1962-1972. *Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. 3 Vols. 3rd ed. revised by Kashinath Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (1st ed. 1880-1885).
- Lariviere, Richard W. (ed.). 2003. *The Nārada-smṛti*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (orig. ed. 1989).

- Joshi, Laxmanshastri (ed.). 1937-1941. *Dharmakośa. Vyavahāarakāṇḍa*. Vol. 1. Parts 1-3. Wai: Prājña Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala.
- Joshi, Laxmanshastri (ed.). 1988-2003. *Dharmakośa. Varṇāśramadharmakāṇḍa*. Vol. 5. Parts 1-3. Wai: Prājña Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala.
- Mandlik, V. N. (ed.). 1886. *Mānava-Dharma Śāstra with the Commentaries of Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda, Nandana, and Rāmachandra*. 2 Vols. Bombay: Ganpat Krishnaji's Press.
- Mishra, Shrinarayana (ed.). 1985. *Kāśikāvṛtti of Jayāditya and Vāmana: Along with Commentaries Vivaraṇapañcikā-Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra*. 6 Vols. Ratnabharati Series, 5-10. Varanasi: Ratna Publications.
- Oberlies, Thomas (ed.). 1995. "Die Śvetāsvatara-Upaniṣad Einleitung – Edition und Übersetzung von *Adhyāya* I (Studien zu den „mittleren“ Upaniṣads II – 1. Teil)." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 39: 61-102.
- Oberlies, Thomas (ed.). 1996. "Die Śvetāsvatara-Upaniṣad Einleitung – Edition und Übersetzung von *Adhyāya* II–III (Studien zu den „mittleren“ Upaniṣads II – 2. Teil)." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 40: 123-160.
- Oberlies, Thomas (ed.). 1998. "Die Śvetāsvatara-Upaniṣad Einleitung – Edition und Übersetzung von *Adhyāya* IV–VI (Studien zu den „mittleren“ Upaniṣads II – 3. Teil)." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 42: 77-138.
- Olivelle, Patrick (ed.). 1998a. *The Early Upaniṣads: Annotated Text and Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick (ed.). 2000. *Dharmasūtras: The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Olivelle, Patrick (ed.). 2005. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick (ed.). 2009. *Viṣṇu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Vaiṣṇava-Dharmaśāstra*. Harvard Oriental Series, 73. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick (ed.). 2019. *Yājñavalkya. A Treatise on Dharma*. Murty Classical Library of India, 20. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick (ed.). 2020. *Yājñavalkya Dharmaśāstra. The Textual History of a Hindu Legal Code*. Delhi: Primus Books.
- Olivelle, Patrick (ed.). 2021. *Searchable Electronic Edition of the Manubhāṣya Commentary of Medhātithi on the Mānava-dharmaśāstra*. Last updated May 2021. <https://sites.utexas.edu/sanskrit/resources/dharmasastra/medhatithi/> (accessed 03/12/2025).

- Renou, Loius (ed.). 1966. *La Grammaire de Pāṇini, traduite du Sanskrit avec des Extraits des commentaires indigènes*. 2 Vols. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Śāstrī, Viśvanātha (ed.). 1874. *Chandaḥsūtra of Piṅgalācārya: With the Commentary of Halāyudha*. Calcutta: Ganeśa Press.
- Śāstrī, A. Chinnaswami Śāstrī, and Pattābhīrāma Śāstrī (eds.). 1935-1936. *Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa. Belonging to the Sāma Veda: With the Commentary of Sāyaṇāchārya*. 2 vols. Kashi Sanskrit Series, 105. Benares: Jaya Krishna Das Haridas Gupta, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Sharma, Rama Nath (ed.). 1987-2003. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. 6 Vols. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Stenzler, Adolf Friedrich (ed.). 1864. *Gr̥hyasūtraṇi. Indische Hausregeln, Sanskrit und Deutsch. I. Āśvalāyana*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Stenzler, Adolf Friedrich (ed.). 1878. *Gr̥hyasūtraṇi. Indische Hausregeln, Sanskrit und Deutsch. II. Pāraskara*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Sukthankar, Vishnu S., Belvalkar Shripad K., and Paraśurāma L. Vaidya (eds.). 1933-1971. *The Mahābhārata. For the first time critically edited*. 19 vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Thakur, Anantalal (ed.). 1997. *Gautamīyanyāyadarśana with Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*. Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research.
- von Schroeder, Leopold (ed.). 1900. *Kāṭhakaṁ: Die Saṁhitā der Kaṭha-śākhā*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- von Schroeder, Leopold (ed.). 1970-1972. *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā: Die Saṁhitā der Maitrāyaṇīya-Śākhā*. 4 Vols. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner (orig. ed. 1881-1886).
- Weber, Albrecht (ed.). 1849. *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Śākhā with Extracts from the Commentaries of Sāyaṇa, Harisvāmin and Dvivedāṅga*. Berlin: Dümmler / London: Williams and Norgate.
- Weber, Albrecht (ed.). 1852. *The Vājasaneyī-saṁhitā in the Mādhyandina- and the Kāṇva-śākhā with the Commentary of Mahīdhara*. Berlin: Dümmler.

Secondary literature

- Andrijanić, Ivan. 2023. “Pobačaj u najstarijoj brahmanističkoj vjerskoj i pravnoj književnosti.” *Obnovljeni Život* 78 (5): 537-547.
- Bali, Suryakant. 1976. *Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: His Contribution to Sanskrit Grammar*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Bandyopadhyay, Anindya. 2016. “Law of Prohibition: A Link Between *Mimāṃsā* and *Dharmaśāstra*.” In Kumar, Shashi Prabha, and Uma C. Vaidya

- (eds.). *Sūtra, Smṛti and Śāstra. Selected Papers Presented in the 'Sūtra, Smṛti and Śāstra' Section at the 16th World Sanskrit Conference (28 June – 2 July 2015) Bangkok, Thailand*. Delhi: DK Publishers Distributors.
- Baron, Emily, and Elisa Freschi. 2023. "Action, Intention, and Negligence: Manu and Medhātithi on Mental States and Blame." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 51: 25-47.
- Béguelin, Marie-José. 2002. "Étymologie 'Populaire', Jeux de Langage et Construction du Savoir Lexical." *Semen* 15: 155-172.
- Benson, James W. 1990. *Patañjali's remark on aṅga* (Oxford University South Asian Studies Series), Delhi-Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bhate, Saroja. 1989. *Pāṇini's Taddhita Rules*. Poona: University of Poona.
- Borghero, Anita M. 2023. *The Pāṇinian Notion of Nominal Coordination in the Light of the Vedic Literature Praxis*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Asian, African and Mediterranean Studies, University of Naples "L'Orientale".
- Brick, David. 2006. "Transforming Tradition into Texts: The Early Development of Smṛti." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 34 (3): 287-302.
- Brick, David. 2016. "Bhoḥ as a Linguistic Marker of Brahmanical Identity." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 136 (3): 567-590.
- Brick, David. 2023. *Widows under Hindu Law*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brodbeck, Simon. 2009. "The Bhāradvāja Pattern in the *Mahābhārata*." In Koskikallio, Petteri (ed.). *Parallels and Comparisons: Proceedings of the Fourth Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas (DICSEP 4), September 2005*. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 1-43.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1982. "The Variationist Pāṇini and Vedic: A Review Article." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 24: 273-282.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1991. "Pāṇini and the Veda reconsidered." In Deshpande, Madhav M., and Saroja Bhate (eds.). *Pāṇinian Studies. Professor S.D. Joshi Felicitation Volume*. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, 75-121.
- Campanile, Enrico. 1984. "Sulla struttura del matrimonio indoeuropeo." *Studi Classici e Orientali* 33: 273-286.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2004. "Substitution as a Descriptive Model in Pāṇini's Grammar: Towards an Opposition Between Phonological and Morphological Level?" In Ronzitti, Rosa, and Guido Borghi (eds.). *Atti del Secondo Incontro Genovese di Studi Vedici e Pāṇiniani (Genova, 23 luglio 2003-15 ottobre 2003)*. Recco: Le Mani, 1-45.

- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2013. "The Earlier Pāṇinian Tradition on the Imperceptible Sign." In Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo (eds.). *Signless Signification in Ancient India and Beyond*. London: Anthem Press, 99-154.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2015. "Aims and Functions of *Vrātyastoma*-Celebrations: A Historical Appraisal." In Pontillo, Tiziana, et al. (eds.), *The Volatile World of Sovereignty. The Vrātya Problem and Kingship in South Asia and Beyond*. Delhi: DK Printworld, 153-213.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2017. "Late Sanskrit Literary Theorists and the Role of Grammar in Focusing the Separateness of Metaphor and Simile." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 45 (2): 349-380.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2019. "Lexical Subordination in Derivation and Compounding: Pāṇini's Focusing on the Non-Head." *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 58 (2): 155-175.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2022a. "Singling Out the Place Where Rules Apply: Materials from the Discussion on Pāṇini's Description of Substitution." In Scharf, Peter (ed.). *Śabdānugamaḥ. Indian Linguistic Studies in Honor of George Cardona. Vol. 1. Vyākaraṇa and Śabdabodha*, 385-430.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2022b. "Panini's Zero Morphs as Allomorphs in the Complexity of Linguistic Context." In Torella, Raffaele (ed.). *Italian Scholars on India. Vol. 1. Classical Indology*, 13-54.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2022c. "Dispensing with Ellipsis in the Analysis of Sanskrit *bahuvrīhi*: Resurfacing, Testing and Assessing Pāṇini's Model." *Journal of South Asian Linguistics* 12 (1): 1-22.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2024a. "Once Again on Speaker's Intention (*vivakṣā*): Bhartṛhari's Speculation on the Compounds of the *Śastrīśyāma*-Type (VP 3.14.360-389)." In Bansat-Boudon, Lyne, and Sylvain Brocquet (eds.). *Comme une qui entra dans la forêt bruissante. Hommage à Marie-claude Porcher. Bulletin d'études Indiennes* (36): 201-227.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2024b. "Constituent-order in Sanskrit *Bahuvrīhi* Compounds: The Role of the Qualifier." In Reynaud, Savina, Trenchini, Maria Paola, and Enrica Galazzi (eds.). *History of Linguistics 2021. Studies in the History of the Language Sciences*, 133. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 129-144.
- Candotti, Maria Piera, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2025. "Binary Structure of Pāṇini's Treatment of Syntax." In D'Avella, Victor, Hugo, David, and Andrey Klebanov (eds.). *Indological Studies in Honour of S.L.P. Anjaneya Sarma. Collection Indologie*. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient, 19-49.

- Cardona, George. 1974. "Pāṇini's Kāraṇas: Agency, Animation and Identity." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2: 231-306.
- Chebrol, Madhulika. 2023. "Asvatantra: Medhātithi on the Non-Independence of Women." *Religions of South Asia* 17 (1): 77-102.
- Coward, Harold G., and K. Kunjunni Raja. 1990. *The Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies. Volume 5: The Philosophy of the Grammarians*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- D'Avella, Victor. 2018. *Creating the Perfect Language: Sanskrit Grammarians, Poetry, and the Exegetical Tradition*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of South Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Chicago.
- Davis, Donald R. Jr. 2007. "On Ātmatuṣṭi as a Source of Dharma." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 127 (3): 279-296.
- Davis, Donald R. Jr. 2018. "History of the Reception of Dharmaśāstra." In Olivelle, Patrick, and Donald R. Davis, Jr. (eds.), *Hindu Law: A New History of Dharmaśāstra*. The Oxford History of Hinduism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 371-382.
- Davis, Donald R. Jr. 2023. "Sex with Purpose: Mimamsa Rules and the Dharma of Marital Intercourse." *Religions of South Asia* 17 (1): 23-43.
- Davis, Donald R. Jr. and David Brick. 2018. "Social and Literary History of Dharmaśāstra: Commentaries and Legal Digests." In Olivelle, Patrick, and Donald R. Davis, Jr. (eds.), *Hindu Law: A New History of Dharmaśāstra*. The Oxford History of Hinduism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 30-45.
- Deeg, Max. 1995. *Die altindische Etymologie nach dem Verständnis Yāska's und seiner Vorgänger. Eine Untersuchung über ihre Praktiken, ihre literarische Verbreitung und ihr Verhältnis zur dichterischen Gestaltung und Sprachmagie*. Dettelbach: Josef H. Röhl.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. 1973. *Dharmaśāstra and Juridical Literature*. A History of Indian Literature, 4.2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. 1976. *Essays in Classical and Modern Hindu Law*. Leiden: Brill.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. 1985a. *Ellipsis and Syntactic Overlapping: Current Issues in Pāṇinian syntactic Theory*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. 1985b. "Historical Change and the Theology of Eternal Sanskrit." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 98 (1): 122-149.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. 1990. "Semantics of Kāraṇas in Pāṇini: An Exploration of Philosophical and Linguistical Issues." In Matilal, Bimal Krishna, and Puruṣottama Bilimoria (eds.), *Sanskrit and Related Studies: Contemporary*

- Researches and Reflections*. Sri Garib Das Oriental Series, 84. Delhi: Sri Satguru, 33-57.
- Devasthali, Govind Vinayak. 1963. "Sāyaṇa Utilising Pāṇini in his *Ṛgvedabhāṣya*." *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (New Series)* 38: 165-173.
- Ditrich, Tamara. 2011. "The Typology of *Āmreḍita* Compounds in the Rig-Veda." *Acta linguistica asiatica* (1): 71-83.
- Ducoeur, Guillaume. 2015. "Les traités normatifs brāhmaniques dans le comparatisme des mariages indo-européens de G. Dumézil." *Anabases* 22: 27-48.
- Dvivedi, H.P. 1975. "The *Svārthika* Secondary Affixes in Sk. According to Pāṇini." *Indian Linguistics* 36: 152-156.
- Dumézil, Georges. 1979. *Mariages indo-européens: Suivi de quinze questions romaines*. Paris: Payot.
- Ferrara, Marianna. 2022. "Donne a misura di dharma nell'India antica." In Lisoni, Alessia, and Alessandro Saggioro (eds.). *Religioni e parità di genere. Percorsi accidentati*. Temi e Testi, 220. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 17-40.
- Ferrero, Valentina. 2024a. "Vrātya and vrātina in Sanskrit Grammatical Sources." In Cielas, Hermina, and Tiziana Pontillo (eds.). *Shades of Violence: Aggression and Domination in Indian Culture. Part I. Vedic Studies*. Cracow *Indological Studies* 26 (1): 141-161.
- Ferrero, Valentina. 2024b. *Sarvanāmaprakaraṇam. Tracing the relevance of pronouns by reading navya vyākaraṇa commentaries*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Literature, Languages and Cultural Heritage, University of Cagliari.
- Francavilla, Domenico. 2006. *The Roots of Hindu Jurisprudence: Sources of Dharma and Interpretation in Mīmāṃsā and Dharmasāstra*. Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum et Fontes Iuris Asiae Meridianae et Centralis, 7. Torino: AIT.
- Freschi, Elisa, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2013. *Rule-extension strategies in Ancient India: Ritual, exegetical and linguistic Considerations on the Tantra- and Prasāṅga- Principles*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Freschi, Elisa, Ollett, Andrew, and Matteo Pascucci. 2019. "Duty and Sacrifice: A Logical Analysis of the Mīmāṃsā Theory of Vedic Injunctions." *History and Philosophy of Logic* 40 (4): 323-354.
- Freschi, Elisa. 2017. "Mīmāṃsā." In Bilimoria, Purusottama (ed.). *History of Indian Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 148-156.
- Freschi, Elisa. 2023a. "Guest Editorial." *Religions of South Asia* 17 (1): 1-5.
- Freschi, Elisa. 2023b. "Getting into the Mind of Medhātithi: The Arguments on Corporal Punishment." *Religions of South Asia* 17 (1): 64-76.

- Freschi, Elisa. 2024. "Mīmāṃsā and Dharmaśāstra Sources on Permissions." In Maas, Philipp A., and Anthony Cerulli (eds.). *Suhṛdayasaṃhitā: A Compendium of Studies on South Asian Culture, Philosophy, and Religion. Dedicated to Dominik Wujastyk*. Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis, 28. Heidelberg: Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing, 195-218.
- Giudice, Alessandro. 2022. "Le classificazioni matrimoniali nella letteratura indiana antica." *Studi Classici e Orientali* 68: 43-90.
- Giudice, Alessandro. 2024a. "Future as Past in Central Asian Gāndhārī. A Note on the Relationship between *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.2.112–114 and the Usage of the Future Tense to Denote Past Actions in Niya Prakrit." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 67 (3): 205-228.
- Giudice, Alessandro. 2024b. "The 'Orthodoxisation' of the Ancient Indian Marriage by Bride Price (*śulka*). Insights into the Ārṣa and Āsura Forms of Marriage in and out of the Dharmaśāstric Tradition." *Asiatische Studien – Études Asiatiques* 78 (4): 719-759.
- Giudice, Alessandro. 2024c. "Law and Religion in Brahmanism: The Dharmaśāstra." In Wolfe, Brendan N. et al. (eds.). *St Andrews Encyclopaedia of Theology*. <https://www.saet.ac.uk/Hinduism/LawandReligioninBrahmanism> (accessed 03/12/2025).
- Giudice, Alessandro. 2025. "Marriage as a Means of Political Alliance. A New Reading of Arjuna's Marriages as Recounted in the *Ādiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* based on Artha- and Dharmaśāstra." In Stasik, Danuta, and Anna Trynkowska (eds.). *Striving for Harmony in Indian Culture and Society*. Warsaw: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa, 90-111.
- Gren-Eklund, Gunilla. 1986. "The Cots are Crying." In Kahrs, Eivind (ed.). *Kalyāṇamitrāraṇam. Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*. Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, Oslo, Series B: Skrifter 70. Oslo: Norwegian University Press, 79-97.
- Grieco, Beatrice. 2023. "On *āmreḍitas* in Sanskrit: Evidence from Vedic Prose." *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 61 (2): 57-87.
- Haag, Pascale, and Vincenzo Vergiani. 2011. *Studies in the Kāśikāvṛtti. The Section on the Prayāhāras*. London-New York: Anthem Press.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1991. *The Ravenous Hyenas and the Wounded Sun: Myth and Ritual in Ancient India*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1996. *Sacrificed Wife/Sacrifer's Wife. Women, Ritual, and Hospitality in Ancient India*. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jha, Ganganath. 1924. *Manusmṛti. Notes*. 2 Vols. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

- Joshi, S.D. 1971. "On expressing *kāraṅkas* apropos of Pāṇini 2.3.1." *Indian Linguistics* 32 (2): 107-112.
- Joshi, S.D. and Saroja Bhate. 1984. *The Fundamentals of Anuvṛtti*. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class B, n° 9, Pune: University of Poona.
- Kahrs, Eivind. 1984. "Yāska's *Nirukta*: The Quest for a New Interpretation." *Indologica Taurinensia* 12: 139-154.
- Kahrs, Eivind. 1998. *Indian Semantic Analysis. The Nirvacana Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kane, Pandurang Vaman. 1962-1975. *History of Dharmaśāstra*. 5 Vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1979. *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. Poona: Poona University Press; Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul, and Johan Frederik Staal. 1969. "Syntactic and Semantic Relations in Pāṇini." *Foundations of Language* 5, 83-117.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2012. "Pāṇini, Variation, and Orthoepic Diaskeuasis." *Asiatische Studien – Études Asiatiques* 66: 327-335.
- Klebanov, Andrey. 2016. *Texts Composed While Copying. A Critical Study of the Manuscripts of Selected Commentaries on the Kirātārjunīya, an Epic Poem in Sanskrit*. PhD dissertation. Universität Hamburg.
- Klebanov, Andrey. 2020. "Application of Structure Analysis to the Study of Sanskrit Commentaries on Mahākāvya. A General Overview of the Subject with a Special Reference to the Commentaries on the *Kirātārjunīya*." In: Anandakichenin, Suganya, and Victor B. D'Avella (eds.). *The Commentary Idioms of the Tamil Learned Traditions*. Pondicherry: EFEO, IFP, 523-590.
- Lalye, P.G. 2002. *Makers of Indian Literature: Mallinātha*. Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Lariviere, Richard W. 1997. "Dharmaśāstra, Custom, 'Real Law' and 'Apocryphal' Smṛtis." In Kölver, Bernhard (ed.). *Recht, Staat und Verwaltung im klassischen Indien / The State, the Law, and Administration in Classical India*. Berlin-Boston: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, 97-110.
- Limaye, S. K. 2018. *Mīmāṃsā Rules of Interpretation: Principal Commentators of Dharmaśāstra*. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation.
- Lingat, Robert. 1973. *The Classical Law of India*. Tr. J. D. M. Derrett. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lubin, Timothy. 2023. "The Brahmin Felon and the Wise Thief." *Religions of South Asia* 17 (1): 44-63.
- Menski, Werner F. 2003. *Hindu Law: Beyond Tradition and Modernity*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- Mocci, Davide, and Tiziana Pontillo. 2023. "How to Select the Right Verbal Person: A Change of Perspective Between Pāṇini and His Commentators." In Poddighe, Elisabetta, and Tiziana Pontillo (eds.). *Resisting and Justifying Changes II. Testifying and Legitimizing Innovation in Indian and Ancient Greek Culture*. Nuova Biblioteca di Studi Classici e Orientali, Supplementi alla rivista Studi Classici e Orientali, 7. Pisa: Pisa University Press, 443-491.
- Muroya, Yasutaka. 2009-2010. "A Study on the Marginalia in Some Nyāyamañjarī Manuscripts: The Reconstruction of a Lost Portion of the Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens / Vienna Journal of South Asian Studies* 52-53, Text Genealogy, Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique (2009-2010): 213-267.
- Narang, Satya Pal. 1969. *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya: A Study*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 1998b. "Unfaithful Transmitters: Philological Criticism and Critical Editions of the Upaniṣads." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 26 (2): 173-187.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 1999. "Sanskrit Commentators and the Transmission of Texts: Haradatta on *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 27 (6): 551-574.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2006. "Explorations in the Early History of the Dharmaśāstra." In Olivelle, Patrick (ed.). *Between the Empires: Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE*. New York: Oxford University Press, 169-191.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2016a. *A Dharma Reader: Classical Indian Law*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2016b. "Judges and Courts in Ancient India: On *dharmastha* and *prāḍvivāka*." In Gunkel, Dieter, et al. *Festschrift Stephanie Jamison*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 305-313.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2018a. "Social and Literary History of Dharmaśāstra: The Foundational Texts." In Olivelle, Patrick, and Donald R. Davis, Jr. (eds.), *Hindu Law: A New History of Dharmaśāstra*. The Oxford History of Hinduism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 15-29.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2018b. "Epistemology of Law: *dharmapramāṇa*." In Olivelle, Patrick, and Donald R. Davis, Jr. (eds.), *Hindu Law: A New History of Dharmaśāstra*. The Oxford History of Hinduism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 49-59.
- Olivelle, Patrick (ed.). 2019. *Grhastha: The Householder in Ancient Indian Religious Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2023. "How to Change Law in Classical India: Hermeneutics in the Service of the Legal Profession." *Religions of South Asia* 17 (1): 6-22.

- Patkar, Madhukar Mangesh. 1978. *Nārada, Brhaspati and Kātyāyana: A Comparative Study in Judicial Procedure*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Pandit, M.D. 1990. *Zero in Pāṇini*. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit class, B 12. Poona: University of Poona.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1989. “Parole articulée et vérité; Travaux à partir du corpus védique; Pāṇini et l’enseignement grammatical; Procédés pāṇinéens; Le système de Pāṇini.” In Auroux, Sylvain (ed.). *Histoire des idées Linguistiques. Tome 1: La naissance des métalangages en Orient et en Occident*. Liege-Bruxelles: P. Mardaga Editeur, 293-401.
- Pisani, Vittore. 1967. *L’etimologia. Storia, questioni, metodo*. 2nd edn. Brescia: Paideia (1st edn. 1947, Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier).
- Pollock, Sheldon. 1997. “The «Revelation» of «Tradition»: śruti, smṛti, and the Sanskrit Discourse of Power.” In Lienhard, Siegfried, and Irma Piovano (eds.). *Lex Et Litterae: Studies in Honour of Professor Oscar Botto*. Torino: CESMEO, 395-417.
- Pontillo, Tiziana. 2003a. “Morfi ‘zeromorfi’ in Pāṇini: un’introduzione alle regole specifiche di formazione con zero fonologico nella posizione di dati morfemi.” *AIWN. Annali Dip. Studi Mondo Classico e Mediterraneo Antico. Sezione Linguistica. Istituto Orientale Napoli* 22 (2000) [2003]: 129-184.
- Pontillo, Tiziana. 2003b. “La definizione di *upasarjana*- in Pāṇini.” In Ronzitti, Rosa, and Guido Borghi (ed.). *Atti del Primo Incontro Genovese di Studi Védici e Pāṇiniani (Genova, 16 luglio 2002)*. Recco: Le Mani, 21-35.
- Pontillo, Tiziana. 2008. “The Edible Part of the Rice in the *Mahābhāṣya* Imagery: What are the Husks of Rules? What is *A-Tantram*?” *Pandanus* ’08: 79-96.
- Pontillo, Tiziana. 2013. “‘Where the Sense is Intended although the Corresponding Speech Unit is Not Employed:’ The *Ekāśeṣa* Case.” In Cardona, George (ed.). *Vyākaraṇa Across the Ages. Proceedings of the 15th World Sanskrit Conference. Delhi 5-10 January 2012 (Vol. II: Vyākaraṇa Session)*. Delhi: DK Printworld, 107-143.
- Pontillo, Tiziana. 2021. “The Need for an Affix Signifying a Shift-Meaning in Nominal Derivation: Towards a Sanskrit of Non-Native Speakers.” *Quaderni del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* 1: 95-115.
- Radicchi, Anna. 1991. “On *Gaṇapāṭhas* and the *Gaṇapāṭha* Ascribed to Pāṇini.” In Deshpande, Madhav M. (ed.). *Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference. Vol. V: Pāṇini and the Veda*. Leiden: Brill, 65-73.
- Radicchi, Anna. 1993. “Vivakṣā in the *Vākyapadīya*.” In Bhate, Saroja, and Johannes Bronkhorst (eds.). *Bharṭṛhari, Philosopher and Grammarian: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Bharṭṛhari (University of Poona, January 6-8, 1992)*, Bern: Peter Lang, 221-234.

- 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*, Pisa: Giardini, 53-63.
- Radicchi, Anna. 2000. "Vivakṣā in Kāśikāvṛtti: Jayāditya and Vāmana." In Dhaky, Madhusudan A., and J.B. Shah (eds.), *Makaranda (Madhukar Anant Mehendale Festschrift)*. Ahmedabad: Sharadaben Chimanbhai Educational Research Centre, 89-114.
- Renou, Louis. 1941. "The Valid Forms in *Bhāṣā*." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 17: 245-250.
- Renou, Louis. 1955. "Chandasi." In *Études Védiques et Pāṇinéennes* 1, Paris: Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Université de Paris, 115-117.
- Renou, Louis. 1969. "Pāṇini." In Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.), *Linguistics in South Asia. Current Trends in Linguistics*, 5. The Hague-Paris: Mouton.
- Rocher, Ludo. 2012. "The Sūtras and Śāstras on the Eight Types of Marriage." In Rocher, Ludo (ed.), *Studies in Hindu Law and Dharmasastra*, ed. Donald R. Davis Jr., London: Anthem Press, 587-596.
- Roodbergen, Jouthe A. F. 2008. *Dictionary of Pāṇinian Grammatical Terminology*. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Scharfe, Hartmut. 1977. *Grammatical Literature. A History of Indian Literature*, 5.2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Scharfe, Hartmut. 1983. "Secondary Noun Formation in Pāṇini's Grammar - What was the Great Option?" In Joshi, Shivram Dattatray, and Sureshachandra Dnyaneshwar Laddu (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini (Held in July 1981)*. Poona: University of Poona, 53-57.
- Scharfe, Hartmut. 2008. "Pāṇinian Accounts of the Vedic Subjunctive: *leṭ kṛṇvaṭe*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 51 (1): 1-21.
- Scharfe, Hartmut. 2009. *A New Perspective on Pāṇini*, Turin, AIT.
- Sternbach, Ludwik. 1941. "A Sociological Study of the Forms of Marriage in Ancient India (A Résumé)." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 22 (3/4): 202-219.
- Sudyka, Lidia. 2000. "What Does the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* Teach?" *Studia Indologica* 7: 451-462.
- Thieme, Paul. 1935. *Pāṇini and the Veda. Studies in the Early History of Linguistic Science in India*. Allahabad: Globe Press.
- Thieme, Paul. 1938. *Der Fremdling im Rgveda. Eine Studie über die Bedeutung der Worte ari, arya, aryaman und ārya*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Thieme, Paul. 1955. "Rev. The Sanskrit Language by T. Burrow." *Language* 31: 428-448.

- Tubb, Gary A., and Emery R. Boose. 2007. *Scholastic Sanskrit: A Manual for Students*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- Vergiani, Vincenzo. 2017. "A Tentative History of the Sanskrit Grammatical Traditions in Nepal through the Manuscript Collections." In Vergiani, Vincenzo, Formigatti, Camillo Alessio, and Daniele Cuneo (eds.). *Indic Manuscript Cultures through the Ages: Material, Textual, and Historical Investigations*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 77-130.
- Vergiani, Vincenzo. 2022. "Vivakṣā and the Formation of Meaning According to Bhartṛhari." In Francesco Sferra and Vincenzo Vergiani (eds.). "Verità e bellezza": *Essays in Honour of Raffaele Torella*. Unior Press: Napoli, 1253-1324.
- Verpoorten, Jean-Marie. 1987. *Mīmāṃsā Literature*. A History of Indian Literature, 6.5. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Yelle, Robert A. 2013. *Semiotics of Religion. Signs of the Sacred in History*. London/New York: Bloomsbury.
- Yoshimizu, Kiyotaka. 2012. "Kumārila and Medhātithi on the Authority of Codified Sources of *dharma*." In Voegeli, François, et al. (eds.). *Devadattīyam. Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*. Bern: Peter Lang, 643-681.
- Yoshimizu, Kiyotaka. 2020. "Kumārila's Theory of Kingship and Its Background: Eligibility for the Rājasūya." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu)* 69 (1): 488-481.
- Yoshimizu, Kiyotaka. 2024. "Brahmanical Views on the Social Class of a King. Translation of the *Aveṣṭi* Section of the *Tantravārttika* and the Rājaśabdārthaprakāśa Section of the *Vīramitrodaya*." In Ishikawa, Kan (ed.). *Aspects of the Literary Sources in South Asian Historical Studies*. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 11-49.

6. Index locorum

Vyākaraṇa passages

Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A):

A 1.1.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.21 (T)

A 1.1.23: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.69-70 (T)

A 1.1.26: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.1 (Fn)

A 1.1.64: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.125 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.123 (Fn)

A 1.1.68: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.129 (T)

A 1.2.54: Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.44 (T)

A 1.2.58: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.31 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.137 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.165 (T)

A 1.3.10: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.41 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.266 (T)

A 1.3.11: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.161 (T)

A 1.3.13: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.108 (T)

A 1.3.21: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.110 (Fn)

A 1.3.56: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.27 (T)

A 1.3.64: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.9 (Fn)

A 1.3.72: Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.46 (T)

A 1.3.78: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.108 (T)

A 1.4.3: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.129 (Fn)

A 1.4.4: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.129 (Fn)

A 1.4.5: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.129 (Fn)

A 1.4.6: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.129 (Fn)

A 1.4.24: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.23 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.116 (T)

A 1.4.29: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.116 (T)

A 1.4.32: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.56 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.23 (T)

A 1.4.33: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.20 (T)

A 1.4.45: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.23 (T)

A 1.4.46: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.23 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.75 (T)

A 1.4.51: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.23 (T)

A 1.4.52: Medh *ad* MDh^M 7.127 (T)

A 1.4.54: Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.51 (T)

A 1.4.55: Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.51 (T)

A 1.4.58: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.4 (Fn)

A 1.4.90: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.157 (T)

A 1.4.91: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.220 (T)

A 1.4.100: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.108 (Fn)

A 2.1.4: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.7 (T)

A 2.1.5: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.147 (Fn)

A 2.1.6: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.2 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.7 (T)

A 2.1.7: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.66 (T)

A 2.1.13: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.82 (T)

A 2.1.18: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.58 (Fn)

A 2.1.19: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.61-62 (Fn)

A 2.1.21: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.147 (Fn)

A 2.1.30: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.177 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.40 (T)

A 2.1.32: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.74 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.146 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.226 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.102 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.40 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.163 (T)

A 2.1.34: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.93 (T)

A 2.1.36: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.108 (T)

A 2.1.40: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (T)

A 2.1.49: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.48 (Fn)

- A 2.1.52: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.69-70 (T)
 A 2.1.55: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106 (Fn),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.147 (T)
 A 2.1.56: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.106 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.238 (T), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 3.88 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.195
 (T)
 A 2.1.57: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.238 (T)
 A 2.2.6: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.7 (T)
 A 2.2.8: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.39 (T), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 4.71 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.195
 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.53 (T), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 8.41 (T)
 A 2.2.9: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.58 (Fn)
 A 2.2.10: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.139 (Fn),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.292 (T)
 A 2.2.12: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.39 (T)
 A 2.2.15: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.284 (Fn)
 A 2.2.18: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.147 (Fn),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.153 (T)
 A 2.2.23: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19 (T)
 A 2.2.24: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (Fn)
 A 2.2.25: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.58 (T)
 A 2.2.29: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.119 (Fn),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.266 (Fn)
 A 2.2.31: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.83 (T)
 A 2.2.34: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.266 (T)
 A 2.2.36: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.70 (Fn),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19 (T)
 A 2.2.37: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.70 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.74 (T), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 3.19 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.226
 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.83 (T)
 A 2.3.2: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.101 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.122 (T)
 A 2.3.5: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.101 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.27 (T)
 A 2.3.8: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.157 (T)
 A 2.3.13: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.56 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.245 (Fn), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 3.81 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.192
 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.339 (Fn)
 A 2.3.16: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.111 (T)
 A 2.3.23: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.155 (T)
 A 2.3.36: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.23 (Fn),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.192 (T)
 A 2.3.37: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.97 (T)
 A 2.3.41: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.139 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.36 (T), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 11.181 (T)
 A 2.3.47: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.129 (Fn)
 A 2.3.50: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.56 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.39 (T)
 A 2.3.52: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.162 (T)
 A 2.3.61: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.111 (T)
 A 2.3.62: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.56 (Fn)
 A 2.3.65: Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.66 (T)
 A 2.3.69: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.57 (T)
 A 2.4.2: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.90 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.53 (Fn)
 A 2.4.6: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.119 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.7 (T), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 5.53 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.95
 (T)
 A 2.4.8: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.40 (T)
 A 2.4.11: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.190 (T)
 A 2.4.12: Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.119 (T)
 A 2.4.17: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.90 (Fn),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.119 (Fn), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 3.7 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.53
 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.30 (Fn), Medh
ad MDh^M 8.107 (Fn)
 A 2.4.71: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.52 (Fn)

- A 3.1.7: *Medh ad MDh^M* 4.194 (T)
 A 3.1.8: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.52 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 11.44 (Fn)
 A 3.1.18: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.74 (Fn)
 A 3.1.25: *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.346 (T)
 A 3.1.26: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.30 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.172 (T), *Medh ad*
MDh^M 3.61 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.284
 (Fn)
 A 3.1.57: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.46 (Fn)
 A 3.1.67: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.167 (T)
 A 3.1.85: *Medh ad MDh^M* 11.44 (T)
 A 3.1.87: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.145 (Fn)
 A 3.1.88: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.166 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.167 (T)
 A 3.1.92: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.5 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.70 (Fn), *Medh ad*
MDh^M 2.96 (Fn)
 A 3.1.95: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.107 (T)
 A 3.1.96: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.103 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.16 (T), *Medh ad*
MDh^M 2.162 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.1
 (Fn), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.171 (Fn), *Medh*
ad MDh^M 9.59 (T)
 A 3.1.97: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.16 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.23 (T), *Medh ad*
MDh^M 2.84 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 11.59
 (Fn)
 A 3.1.100: *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.1 (T)
 A 3.1.106: *Medh ad MDh^M* 11.59 (Fn)
 A 3.1.108: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.94 (Fn)
 A 3.1.116: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.53 (T)
 A 3.1.123: *Medh ad MDh^M* 11.59 (T)
 A 3.1.124: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.94 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 3.61 (T), *Medh ad*
MDh^M 11.59 (Fn)
 A 3.1.133: *Medh ad MDh^M* 4.194 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.284 (T), *Medh ad*
MDh^M 8.379 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 9.17
 (T)
 A 3.1.134: *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.115 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 3.155 (T), *Medh ad*
MDh^M 8.79 (Fn)
 A 3.1.136: *Medh ad MDh^M* 4.195 (T)
 A 3.2.1: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.5 (T)
 A 3.2.4: *Medh ad MDh^M* 5.38 (T)
 A 3.2.5: *Medh ad MDh^M* 11.108 (Fn)
 A 3.2.61: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.46 (T)
 A 3.2.76: *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.61 (T)
 A 3.2.77: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.96 (T)
 A 3.2.80: *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.45 (T)
 A 3.2.82: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.4 (Fn)
 A 3.2.84: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.1 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 5.23 (Fn)
 A 3.2.101: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.62 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.379 (T), *Medh ad*
MDh^M 10.33 (T),
 A 3.2.102: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.1 (T)
 A 3.2.115: *Medh ad MDh^M* 5.23 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.110 (T)
 A 3.2.123: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.6 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.28 (T)
 A 3.2.124: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.52 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 4.49 (T)
 A 3.2.126: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.208 (T)
 A 3.2.127: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.70 (Fn)
 A 3.2.135: *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.57 (T)
 A 3.2.168: *Medh ad MDh^M* 4.27 (Fn)
 A 3.2.178: *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.79 (T)
 A 3.2.188: *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.39 (T)
 A 3.3.1: *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.110 (Fn)
 A 3.3.18: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.201 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 4.64 (T), *Medh ad*
MDh^M 8.284 (T)

- A 3.3.19: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.179 (T)
A 3.3.93: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (Fn)
A 3.3.94: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.77 (Fn)
A 3.3.113: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (T)
A 3.3.117: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.13 (T)
A 3.3.121: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (Fn)
A 3.3.133: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (T)
A 3.3.154: Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.74 (T)
A 3.3.161: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.107 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.1 (T)
A 3.3.164: Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.104 (T)
A 3.3.169: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.103 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.171 (T)
A 3.3.176: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.99 (T)
A 3.3.121: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (Fn)
A 3.4.7: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.52 (T)
A 3.4.21: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.4 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.4 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.1 (T)
A 3.4.70: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.94 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.61 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.228 (T)
A 3.4.71: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.226 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.228 (T)
A 3.4.73: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.108 (Fn)
A 3.4.78: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.86 (T)
A 4.1.4: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.69-70 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.5 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.8 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.59 (Fn)
A 4.1.6: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.129 (Fn)
A 4.1.14: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.8 (Fn)
A 4.1.15: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.153 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.87 (T)
A 4.1.21: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.69-70 (T)
A 4.1.44: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.77 (T)
A 4.1.45: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (Fn)
A 4.1.48: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.373 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.173 (T)
A 4.1.53: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19 (Fn)
A 4.1.82: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71 (Fn)
A 4.1.83: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.42 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.259 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.38 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.41 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.173 (Fn)
A 4.1.92: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.10 (Fn)
A 4.1.121: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.157 (Fn)
A 4.1.122: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.87 (T)
A 4.1.166: Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.44 (T)
A 4.1.168: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (T)
A 4.2.24: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.58 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.189 (T)
A 4.2.25: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.38 (T)
A 4.2.37: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.10 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.5 (T)
A 4.2.43: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38 (T)
A 4.2.60: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26 (Fn)
A 4.2.69: Medh *ad* MDh^M 7.193 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.44 (T)
A 4.2.70: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.10 (Fn)
A 4.2.81: Medh *ad* MDh^M 7.193 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.44 (T)
A 4.2.92: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.42 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.41 (T)
A 4.2.114: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.10 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.41 (T)
A 4.2.125: Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.44 (Fn)

- A 4.3.25: *Medh ad MDh^M* 7.193 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.41 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 10.44 (Fn)
A 4.3.47: *Medh ad MDh^M* 6.38 (T)
A 4.3.53: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.26 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 3.1 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.157 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 7.193 (Fn), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.41 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.62 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.153 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.392 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 10.44 (Fn)
A 4.3.60: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.26 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.44 (Fn)
A 4.3.68: *Medh ad MDh^M* 12.87 (T)
A 4.3.74: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.7 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.46 (T)
A 4.3.81: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.7 (T)
A 4.3.82: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.7 (T)
A 4.3.85: *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.379 (T)
A 4.3.120: *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.34 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.41 (T)
A 4.3.133: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.42 (Fn)
A 4.3.134: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.7 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.41 (T), *MDh^M* 2.42 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.259 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 5.8 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.328 (T)
A 4.3.135: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.41 (Fn)
A 4.3.143: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.7 (T)
A 4.3.154: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.41 (T)
A 4.4.2: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.42 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.173 (Fn)
A 4.4.34: *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.379 (T)
A 4.4.75: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.31 (Fn)
A 4.4.98: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.31 (T)
A 5.1.5: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.108 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.31 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.52 (T)
A 5.1.6: *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.291-292 (T)
A 5.1.18: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.58 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.298 (T)
A 5.1.38: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.31 (T)
A 5.1.57: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.71 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 3.1 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.298 (T)
A 5.1.63: *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.214 (Fn)
A 5.1.66: *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.159 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.373 (T)
A 5.1.109: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.31 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.202 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.379 (T)
A 5.1.115: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.2 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.58 (Fn)
A 5.1.116: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.2 (Fn)
A 5.1.117: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.2 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 1.58 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.214 (T)
A 5.1.118: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.2 (Fn)
A 5.1.119: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.5 (T)
A 5.1.124: *Medh ad MDh^M* 2.36 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 4.18 (Fn), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.412 (T)
A 5.2.39: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.69-70 (T)
A 5.2.48: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.20 (Fn),
Medh ad MDh^M 2.38 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 7.130 (T)
A 5.2.53: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.20 (T)
A 5.2.56: *Medh ad MDh^M* 7.130 (T)
A 5.2.59: *Medh ad MDh^M* 11.250 (T)
A 5.2.85: *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.113 (T)
A 5.2.94: *Medh ad MDh^M* 1.108 (T),
Medh ad MDh^M 8.48 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.62 (Fn), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.220 (T), *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.383 (T)
A 5.2.100: *Medh ad MDh^M* 3.7 (T)
A 5.2.103: *Medh ad MDh^M* 8.62 (T)

A 5.2.115: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.1 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.39 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.7 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.28 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.195 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.18 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.4-7 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.48 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.134 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.202 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.103 (T)
A 5.2.116: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.241 (T)
A 5.2.127: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.7 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 7.95 (T)
A 5.2.128: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.7 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.8 (T)
A 5.2.131: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.74 (Fn)
A 5.3.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.155 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.190 (Fn)
A 5.3.74: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.115 (T)
A 5.3.107: Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.33 (T)
A 5.4.9: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38 (T)
A 5.4.17: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.79 (T)
A 5.4.24: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.189 (T)
A 5.4.36: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.173 (Fn)
A 5.4.38: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71 (T); Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.10 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.38 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.173 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.202 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.339 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.383 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.392 (T)
A 5.4.42: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.54 (T)
A 5.4.43: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.96 (T)
A 5.4.44: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.100 (Fn)

A 5.4.45: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.31 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.59 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.33 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.49 (T)
A 5.4.46: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.100 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.6 (T)
A 5.4.47: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.100 (Fn)
A 5.4.73: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.58 (T)
A 5.4.77: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.4-7 (T)
A 5.4.78: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.39 (Fn)
A 5.4.106: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.61 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.4-7 (T)
A 5.4.154: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.46 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.58 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.190 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.7 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.18 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.134 (T)
A 5.4.160: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.155 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.190 (Fn)
A 6.1.14: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38 (Fn)
A 6.1.67: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.96 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.61 (Fn)
A 6.2.109: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38 (Fn)
A 6.2.170: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.74 (T)
A 6.3.42: Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.9 (Fn)
A 6.3.50: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.62 (T)
A 6.3.63: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.169 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.38 (T)
A 6.3.85: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38 (Fn)
A 6.3.91: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.69-70 (T)
A 6.3.111: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.10 (Fn)
A 6.3.122: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.201 (T)
A 6.3.132: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (T)
A 6.3.135: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.10 (Fn)
A 6.3.136: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.10 (Fn)

A 6.3.137: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.10 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 10.33 (T), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 2.36 (T)
 A 6.4.36: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.4 (Fn)
 A 6.4.48: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.58 (Fn)
 A 6.4.77: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.52 (Fn)
 A 6.4.146: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.94 (T)
 A 6.4.148: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.157 (Fn),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.173 (T)
 A 6.4.155: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.52 (Fn)
 A 6.4.168: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (Fn)
 A 7.1.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1 (Fn)
 A 7.1.37: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.4 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.116 (T), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 8.107 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M
 8.265 (T)
 A 7.1.39: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.20 (T)
 A 7.2.64: Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.19 (T)
 A 7.2.82: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.108 (Fn)
 A 7.3.20: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.136 (T)
 A 7.3.50: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.58 (Fn)
 A 7.3.52: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (T)
 A 7.3.107: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.129 (T)
 A 7.4.33: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.44 (Fn)
 A 8.1.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.20 (Fn)
 A 8.1.2: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.20 (Fn)
 A 8.1.4: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.20 (T)
 A 8.2.83: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.123 (T),
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.125 (T)

Kātyāyana's *vārttikas* (Vt):

M 1.6 l. 16: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.160 (T)
 M 1.136 l. 5 Vt. 9 *ad* A 1.1.56: Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 10.88 (T)
 M 1.136 l. 8 Vt. 10 *ad* A 1.1.56: Medh
ad MDh^M 10.88 (T)
 M 1.267 ll. 15-16 Vt. 1 *ad* A 1.3.10:
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.266 (T)

M 1.280 l. 19 Vt. 8 *ad* A 1.3.21: Medh
ad MDh^M 8.110 (T)
 M 1.323 l. 22 Vt. 4 *ad* A 1.4.23: Medh
ad MDh^M 1.23 (Fn)
 M 1.324 l. 1 Vt. 5 *ad* A 1.4.23: Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 1.23 (Fn)
 M 1.336 Vt. 12 *ad* A 1.4.51: Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 2.101 (T)
 M 1.403 l. 20 Vt. 5 *ad* A 2.1.69: Medh
ad MDh^M 4.195 (T)
 M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 *ad* A 2.1.69: Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 2.146 (T), MDh^M 3.9 (T), Medh
ad MDh^M 8.4-7 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M
 8.98 (T)
 M 1.432 ll. 20-21 Vt. 9 *ad* A 2.2.29:
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.266 (T)
 M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.13: Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 2.245 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.81
 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.32 (T), Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 8.276 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.339
 (T)
 M 1.452 l. 2 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.18: Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 8.273 (T)
 M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.28: Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 8.107 (Fn)
 M 1.458 l. 16 Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36: Medh
ad MDh^M 8.112 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M
 11.55 (Fn)
 M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 *ad* A 3.1.26: Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 3.61 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.64
 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.194 (T), Medh
ad MDh^M 8.123 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M
 8.284 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.44 (Fn)
 M 2.69 l. 10 Vt. 14 *ad* A 3.1.87: Medh
ad MDh^M 2.145 (T)
 M 2.98 l. 5 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.4: Medh *ad*
 MDh^M 5.38 (T)

M 2.98 l. 18 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.5: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.108 (T)
 M 2.135 l. 17 Vt. 1 *ad* A 3.2.178: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (Fn)
 M 2.136 l. 4 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.2.178: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (T)
 M 2.136 l. 14 Vt. 3 *ad* A 3.2.178 Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (Fn)
 M 2.146 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.179 (T)
 M 2.154 l. 18 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.108: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.4 (Fn)
 M 2.155 l. 9 Vt. 9 *ad* A 3.3.108: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (T)
 M 2.246 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.179 (T)
 M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 *ad* A 4.3.60: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44 (T)
 M 2.370 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.1.124: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.18 (Fn)
 M 2.397 l. 1 Vt. 2 *ad* A 5.2.103: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.62 (T)
 M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.62 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.155 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.61 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.114 (Fn)
 M 3.157 l. 15 Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42: Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.9 (T)
 M 3.230 l. 2 Vt. 1 *ad* A 6.4.155: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.123 (T)

Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (M):

M 1.1 l. 1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1 (T)
 M 1.1 ll. 18-19: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.1 (T)

M 1.2 ll. 7-9: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T)
 M 1.3 ll. 7-8: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.123 (T)
 M 1.4 l. 24: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.31 (Fn)
 M 1.6 ll. 24-25: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.160 (T)
 M 1.136 l.5 – 1.138 l. 10 *ad* Vtt. 9-17 *ad* A 1.1.56: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.21 (Fn)
 M 1.290 ll. 8-9 *ad* A 1.3.64: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.9 (T)
 M 1.323 ll. 23-24 *ad* Vt. 4 *ad* A 1.4.23: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.23 (Fn)
 M 1.324 ll. 2-5 *ad* Vt. 5 *ad* A 1.4.23: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.23 (Fn)
 M 1.330 ll. 18-19 *ad* A 1.4.32: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.23 (T)
 M 1.334 ll. 1-3 *ad* A 1.4.51: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.23 (T)
 M 1.420 l. 25 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.2.24: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.220 (T)
 M 1.434 ll. 9-10 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.41 (T)
 M 1.434 ll. 10-12 *ad* Vt. 15 *ad* A 2.2.29: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T)
 M 1.455 l. 5 *ad* Vt. 1 *ad* A 2.3.28: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.107 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.265 (Fn)
 M 1.458 ll. 17-19 *ad* Vt. 6 *ad* A 2.3.36: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.55 (T)
 M 1.469 ll. 14-15 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.3.69: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.150 (Fn)
 M 1.480 l. 6 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 2.4.30: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.30 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.107 (T)
 M 1.480 l. 12 *ad* Vt. 3 *ad* A 2.4.30: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.107 (T)
 M 2.58 ll. 11-13 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.1.67 (T)

M 2.112 l. 20 *ad* A 3.2.101: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.62 (T)
 M 2.144 ll. 13-15 *ad* Vt. 1 *ad* A 3.3.18: Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.157 (T)
 M 2.155 l. 10 *ad* Vt. 9 *ad* A 3.3.108: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (Fn)
 M 2.246 ll. 2-3 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 3.3.19: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.179 (Fn)
 M 2.312 ll. 17-20 *ad* A 4.3.68: Medh *ad* MDh^M 12.87 (T)
 M 2.370 l. 20 Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.1.124: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.18 (Fn)
 M 2.436 l. 12 *ad* Vt. 1 *ad* A 5.4.44: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93 (Fn)
 M 3.157 ll. 16-17 *ad* Vt. 2 *ad* A 6.3.42: Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.9 (T)
 M 3.230 ll. 7-8 *ad* A 6.4.155: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.52 (Fn)

Jayāditya and Vāmana's *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV):

KV *ad* A 1.1.5: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.112 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 1.1.45: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.112 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 1.3.21: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.110 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 1.4.33: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.20 (T)
 KV *ad* A 1.4.51: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.23 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 1.4.89: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1 (T)
 KV *ad* A 2.1.13: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.1 (T)
 KV *ad* A 2.1.19: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.61-62 (T)

KV *ad* A 2.2.24: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.220 (T)
 KV *ad* A 2.3.28: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.107 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.265 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 2.4.17: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.30 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 2.4.35: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.112 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 3.1.25: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.346 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 3.1.26: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.123 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 3.2.80: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.45 (T)
 KV *ad* A 3.2.101: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.62 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 3.2.178: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (T)
 KV *ad* A 3.3.18: Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.157 (T)
 KV *ad* A 3.3.19: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.79 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.179 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 3.3.94: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 3.3.121: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 3.4.70: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.94 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 4.18: Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.18 (T)
 KV *ad* A 4.1.45: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.77 (T)
 KV *ad* A 4.1.53: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.19 (T)
 KV *ad* A 4.3.60: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.26 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 4.3.68: Medh *ad* MDh^M 12.87 (T)

KV *ad* A 4.3.134: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.42 (T)
 KV *ad* A 5.2.103: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.62 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 5.2.127: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.44 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 5.3.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71 (Fn), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 5.4.9: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 5.4.24: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.189 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 5.4.38: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.10 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.38 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.202 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.339 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.383 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.392 (T)
 KV *ad* A 5.4.44: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.93 (Fn)
 KV *ad* A 6.2.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.41 (T)
 KV *ad* A 6.3.137: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.10 (T)
 KV *ad* A 7.2.67: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.112 (Fn)

Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa* (N):

N *ad* A 1.4.51: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.23 (Fn)
 N *ad* A 5.4.38: see Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.71 (T); Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 4.10 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 6.38 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.202 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.339 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.383 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.392 (T)

Nāgeśa's *Paribhāṣā* (NPBh):

NPBh 93: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.94 (T)

Gaṇasūtra (GS):

GS 3, *bahvādi* list (in KV *ad* A 4.1.45):
 Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.77 (T)

Uṇādisūtra (US):

US 3.112-113: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.110 (Fn)

Dharmaśāstra passages

Baudhāyanadharmasūtra (BDh):

BDh 1.3.6: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.169 (Fn)

Gautamadharmasūtra (GDh):

GDh 18.16: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.161 (T)
 GDh 18.19: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.161 (T)
 GDh 23.12-13: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.173 (T)

Nāradaśmṛti (NSm):

NSm 1.37: Medh *ad* MDh^M 8.163 (T)

Vasiṣṭhadharmasūtra (VDh):

VDh 2.32: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.169 (Fn)
 VDh 2.62: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.169 (Fn)

Yājñavalkyaśmṛti (YSm):

YSm 1.2: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.41 (T)

Vedic Saṃhitās

Ṛgvedasaṃhitā (RV):

RV 1.164.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.250 (T)
 RV 10.90: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.31 (Fn)
 RV 10.129: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.21 (Fn)

Kaṭhasaṃhitā (KS):

KS 10.6: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38 (Fn)

Maitrāyaṇīsaṃhitā (MS):

MS 1.9.4.8: Medh *ad* MDh^M 3.27 (T)

Vājasaneyisaṃhitā (VS):

VS 32.1-6: Medh *ad* MDh^M 11.250 (Fn)

Brāhmaṇas

Aitareyabrāhmaṇa (AitB):

AitB 25.7: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.23 (T)

AitB 33.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 5.157 (T)

Gopathabrāhmaṇa (GB):

GB 1.2.4.14-16: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.42 (Fn)

Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, Mādhyandina recension (ŚBM):

ŚBM 2.2.4.5: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.46 (T)

ŚBM 3.2.1.23: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (Fn)

Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa (PB):

PB 23.2.4: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T),
Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.28 (T)

Upaniṣads

Chāndogyopaniṣad (ChUp):

ChUp 5.10.9: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T)

ChUp 6.1.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.38 (Fn)

Śvetāśvataropaniṣad (ŚveUp):

ŚveUp 1.15: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.23 (T)

Vedāṅga sources

Baudhāyanaśrautasūtra (BŚS):

BŚS 3.19: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.122 (Fn)

Āśvalāyanagrhyasūtra (ĀśGS):

ĀśGS 1.17.1-4: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (Fn)

Pāraskaragrhyasūtra (PārGS):

PārGS 1.17.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.30 (T)

PārGS 1.17.2: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.31 (T)

Piṅgalasūtra (PiñS):

PiñS 1.1.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.21 (T)

Yāska's *Nirukta* (Nir):

Nir 1.1: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.21 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 9.19 (T)

Nir 1.8: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.4 (Fn)

Nir 2.5: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.4 (Fn)

Mīmāṃsā sources

Jaimini's *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*

(PMS):

PMS 1.1.2: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T)

PMS 2.3.3: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.36 (Fn)

PMS 4.3.5: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.107 (T)

Śabara's *Śabarabhāṣya ad* Jaimini's

Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra (Śab):

Śab *ad* PMS 1.3.4: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.21 (Fn)

Śab *ad* PMS 4.3.17-18: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.6 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.28 (T), Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.107 (T)

Kumārila's *Tantravārttika ad*

Jaimini's *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* (Kum):

Kum *ad* PMS 1.3.4: Medh *ad* MDh^M 1.21 (Fn)

Kum *ad* PMS 2.3.3: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.34 (Fn)

Nyāya sources

Vātsyāyana's *Nyāyabhāṣya* on the
Nyāyasūtra (NBh):

NBh 1.1.35: Medh *ad* MDh^M 2.12 (T)

7. Glossary of technical terms

- aṅga*: pre-affixal base.
adhikaraṇa: substratum.
adhikāra: governing rule.
apavāda: exception.
ācāra: custom.
apādāna: sense of ablative.
utsarga: general rule.
kartṛ: agent.
karman: patient.
kṛt: primary derivative.
chandas: domain of Vedic literature; more rarely, domain of metrical literature (see Section 3.2.7).
chāndasa: Vedic feature; more rarely, metrical feature (see Section 3.2.7).
taddhita: secondary derivative.
dhātu: verbal base.
nipātana: ready-made linguistic form.
paribhāṣā: metarule.
pratyaya: affix.
prasaṅga: automatic involvement.
prātipādika: nominal stem.
yogavibhāga: splitting of a grammatical rule.
lopa: zero-replacement, distinguished in three types: *LUK*, *LUP* and *ŚLU*.
śruti: ‘revelation’, i.e. the group of sacred texts that are part of the Vedic corpus.
samāsa: compound, distinguished in *avyayībhāva* (adverbial compound), *tatpuruṣa* (determinative compound, with the *karmadhāraya* and *dvigu* as frequent subtypes), *dvandva* (copulative compound, further distinguished in *itaretaradvandva* and *samāhāradvandva*) and *bahuvrīhi* (exocentric compound).
samāsānta: a type of *taddhita* derivatives that occurs after a compound.
saṅkhyā: numerals, but also the nominal stems *bahu-*, *gaṇa-* and those ending in *vatUP* (= *-vat*) and *ḌatI* (= *-at*).
saṃpradāna: recipient.
saṃbandha: grammatical relation.

smṛti: 'tradition', i.e. the group of texts that are part of post-Vedic scriptures and transmitted by human teachers.

svārthika: affix that occurs while retaining the own sense of the base.

svārthe: referred to an affix that occurs while retaining the own sense of the base.

śabda: word-form.

vārttika: gloss.

vidhi: injunction.

vibhakti: ending.

vivakṣā: intention of the speaker.

vyavahāra: i) (linguistic) daily linguistic usage; ii) (legal) judicial procedure.

8. Table of quotations in comparison with Jha's and Olivelle's editions of the *Manubhāṣya*

We present the collection of quotations and references to textual passages from the grammatical tradition (by Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, Patañjali, etc.) as cited in the two major editions of Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* used for this study—Jha (1999) and Olivelle (2021)—and compare them with those we have identified.⁴⁵² The table below only includes those references directly incorporated into the text, with their translations provided immediately following the relevant passage (indicated in the *Index locorum* as T). It does not include references placed in the footnotes for the purposes of completeness or comparison (marked as Fn in the *index locorum*).

Verse	Jha	Olivelle	Giudice and Pontillo
1.1	// // // // //	// // // “Pat I, 1” (corresponding to M 1.1 l. 1) //	A 1.4.51 A 3.3.113 A 3.3.117 M 1.1 l. 1 KV <i>ad</i> A 1.4.89 = KV <i>ad</i> A 2.1.13
1.2	//	//	A 5.1.117
1.4	//	//	A 7.1.37
1.7	A 2.1.4 //	// //	A 2.1.4 A 2.1.6
1.10	// A 6.3.137 //	// A 6.3.137 //	A 4.2.37 A 6.3.137 KV <i>ad</i> A 6.3.137

⁴⁵² We note that the editions by Mandlik, Gharpure and Dave also contain references to the Vyākaraṇa tradition, especially Pāṇini. However, due to their limited number or their dependence on Jha's edition—at least in the case of the second edition by Gharpure and the edition by Dave (see Section 1.3)—we have chosen not to include them in this table.

1.20	A 5.2.53 // //	A 5.2.53 // //	A 5.2.53 A 7.1.39 A 8.1.4
1.21	A 1.1.1	A 1.1.1	A 1.1.1
1.23	// // “[T]his has been fully justified in the <i>Bhāṣya</i> (of Patañjali)” (hinting at M 1.334 ll. 1-3 <i>ad</i> A 1.4.51)	// // “Pat on Pāṇ 1.4.51” (corresponding to M 1.334 ll. 1-3 <i>ad</i> A 1.4.51)	A 1.4.24 A 1.4.51 M 1.334 ll. 1-3 <i>ad</i> A 1.4.51
1.31	//	A 5.4.45	A 5.4.45
1.40	A 2.4.8	//	A 2.4.8
1.46	// // // “ <i>Vārtika</i> on Pāṇini 4.1.45” (wrong indication)	// // // //	A 3.2.61 A 6.3.132 M 2.155 l. 9 Vt. 9 <i>ad</i> A 3.3.108 GS 3 (in KV <i>ad</i> A 4.1.45)
1.58	//	A 5.1.117	A 5.1.117
1.59	//	//	A 5.4.45
1.61-62	//	//	KV <i>ad</i> A 2.1.19
1.69-70	A 1.1.23 A 2.1.52 (wrongly indicated as A 2.1.25) A 4.1.4 A 4.1.21 A 5.2.39 A 6.3.91	A 1.1.23 A 2.1.52 A 4.1.4 A 4.1.21 A 5.2.39 A 6.3.91	A 1.1.23 A 2.1.52 A 4.1.4 A 4.1.21 A 5.2.39 A 6.3.91
1.71	// // // //	// // // //	A 5.1.57 A 5.4.38 KV <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38 N <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38
1.93	“ <i>Vārtika</i> on Pāṇini 5.4.44” (hinting at	//	M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 5.4.44

	M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 5.4.44)		
1.94	//	//	A 3.1.124
1.103	//	//	A 3.1.96
	//	//	A 3.3.169
1.108	//	//	A 5.1.5
	//	//	A 5.2.94
2.1	//	//	A 3.2.102
2.5	A 3.2.1	A 3.2.1	A 3.2.1
	//	//	A 5.1.119
2.6	//	//	A 3.3.19
	//	//	A 3.3.161
	//	//	A 3.4.7
	//	//	M 2.246 l. 1 Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 3.3.19
	//	//	M 1.2 ll. 7-9
	//	//	M 1.434 ll. 10-12 <i>ad</i> Vt. 15 <i>ad</i> A 2.2.29
2.7	A 4.3.81	A 4.3.81	A 4.3.81
	//	//	A 4.3.82
	//	//	A 4.3.143
2.12	General grammatical note		
2.13	//	//	A 3.3.117
2.16	//	//	A 3.1.96
2.23	//	A 1.4.45	A 1.4.45
	//	//	A 3.1.97
2.26	//	//	A 4.3.53
	“ <i>Vārtika</i> on Pāṇini 4.3.60” (hinting at M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 4.3.60)	//	M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 4.3.60
2.28	//	//	A 3.2.123
2.30	//	//	A 3.1.26
2.31	//	//	A 4.4.98
	//	//	A 5.1.5
	//	//	A 5.1.38
	//	//	A 5.1.109
2.36	//	//	A 4.1.168
	//	//	A 5.1.124

	// A 6.3.137 (wrongly indicated as A 6.3.198) // //	// A 6.3.137 // //	A 5.4.38 A 6.3.137 KV <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38 N <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38
2.38	// // A 5.4.9	// // A 5.4.9	A 4.2.43 A 5.2.48 A 5.4.9
2.41	A 1.3.10 // // // //	A 1.3.10 // // // //	A 1.3.10 A 4.3.154 M 1.434 ll. 9-10 <i>ad</i> Vt. 15 <i>ad</i> A 2.2.29 KV <i>ad</i> A 6.2.1
2.42	// //	// //	A 4.3.134 KV <i>ad</i> A 4.3.134
2.44	// A 5.2.127 “ <i>Vārtika</i> on Pāṇini 4.3.60” (hinting at M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 4.3.60)	// // //	A 5.2.115 A 5.2.127 M 2.310 l. 9 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 4.3.60
2.46	//	//	A 5.4.154
2.52	// // // //	// // // //	A 3.1.8 A 3.2.124 A 3.4.7 A 5.1.5
2.53	//	A 3.1.116	A 3.1.116
2.54	A 5.4.42	A 5.4.42	A 5.4.42
2.56	// // //	// // //	A 1.4.32 A 2.3.13 A 2.3.50
2.58	// // // //	// // // //	A 2.2.25 A 4.2.24 A 5.4.73 A 5.4.154
2.61	//	//	A 5.4.106

2.62	A 3.2.101 (wrongly indicated as A 6.2.101) A 6.3.50 // “ <i>Vārtika</i> on Pāṇini 5.4.44 (hinting at M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 5.4.44)	A 3.2.101 A 6.3.50 // //	A 3.2.101 A 6.3.50 M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 5.4.44 M 2.112 l. 20 <i>ad</i> A 3.2.101
2.66	A 2.1.7	A 2.1.7	A 2.1.7
2.70	A 2.2.37 // //	// // //	A 2.2.37 A 3.3.13 A 3.3.14
2.74	A 2.1.32 // A 6.2.170	// // //	A 2.1.32 A 2.2.37 A 6.2.170
2.75	A 1.4.46	A 1.4.46	A 1.4.46
2.79	//	//	A 5.4.17
2.84	//	//	A 3.1.97
2.86	//	//	A 3.4.78
2.90	A 2.4.2	A 2.4.2	A 2.4.2
2.96	// A 5.4.43	// A 5.4.43	A 3.2.77 A 5.4.43
2.100	//	//	A 5.4.46
2.101	// A 2.3.5 “ <i>Vārtika</i> ” (hinting at M 1.336 Vt. 12 <i>ad</i> A 1.4.51)	A 2.3.2 A 2.3.5 //	A 2.3.2 A 2.3.5 M 1.336 Vt. 12 <i>ad</i> A 1.4.51
2.106	A 2.1.32 A 2.1.56	// A 2.1.56	A 2.1.32 A 2.1.56
2.107	//	//	A 3.1.95
2.108	A 2.1.36	A 2.1.36	A 2.1.36
2.116	// A 1.4.29 //	// A 1.4.29 //	A 1.4.24 A 1.4.29 A 7.1.37
2.119	A 2.4.6	A 2.4.6	A 2.4.6
2.122	A 2.3.2	A 2.3.2	A 2.3.2

2.123	A 8.2.83 //	A 8.2.83 “Pat I: 3” (corresponding to M 1.3 ll. 7-8)	A 8.2.83 M 1.3 ll. 7-8
2.125	// A 8.2.83	// A 8.2.83	A 1.1.64 A 8.2.83
2.129	// //	// //	A 1.1.68 A 7.3.107
2.137	A 1.2.58 (wrongly indicated as A 3.2.58)	A 1.2.58	A 1.2.58
2.139	A 2.3.41	A 2.3.41	A 2.3.41
2.140	General grammatical note		
2.145	“ <i>Vārtika</i> on Pāṇini 3.1.87” (hinting at M 2.69 l. 10 Vt. 14 <i>ad</i> A 3.1.87)	“Pāṇ Vār 14 on 3.1.87” (corresponding to M 2.69 l. 10 Vt. 14 <i>ad</i> A 3.1.87)	M 2.69 l. 10 Vt. 14 <i>ad</i> A 3.1.87
2.146	“ <i>Vārtika</i> on Pāṇini 2.1.60” (hinting at M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 <i>ad</i> A 2.1.69, with a mistake in the numbering)	“Pāṇ Vār 8 on 2.1.69” (corresponding to M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 <i>ad</i> A 2.1.69)	M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 <i>ad</i> A 2.1.69
2.155	A 2.3.23 //	A 2.3.23 //	A 2.3.23 M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 5.4.44
2.160	““ <i>siddhe</i> <i>śabdārthasamband</i> <i>he</i> , etc. (in the <i>Mahābhāṣya</i>)”” (corresponding to M 1.6 l. 16) //	“Pāṇ Vār in Pat I: 6” (corresponding to M 1.6 l. 16) //	M 1.6 l. 16 M 1.6 ll. 24-25
2.162	A 2.3.52	A 2.3.52	A 2.3.52
2.165	//	//	A 3.1.96
2.166	//	//	A 3.1.88
2.167	// A 3.1.88	// A 3.1.88	A 3.1.67 A 3.1.88

2.169	A 6.3.63	A 6.3.63	A 6.3.63
2.172	//	//	A 3.1.26
2.189	// //	// //	A 4.2.24 A 5.4.24
2.201	A 6.3.122	A 6.3.122	A 6.3.122
2.208	A 3.2.126	A 3.2.126	A 3.2.126
2.220	“Pāṇini’s Sūtra ‘ <i>abhir abhāge</i> ’” (corresponding to A 1.4.91)	A 1.4.91	A 1.4.91
2.238	A 2.1.56 A 2.1.57	A 2.1.56 A 2.1.57	A 2.1.56 A 2.1.57
2.245	“ <i>Vārtika</i> on Pāṇini 2.3.13” (hinting at M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.13)	//	M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.13
2.247	//	//	KV <i>ad</i> A 1.2.53
3.1	// // // A 5.1.57 A 5.2.115 (wrongly indicated as A 5.2.145) //	// // // // A 5.2.115 “Pat I: 1” (corresponding to M 1.1 ll. 18-19)	A 3.1.100 A 3.3.161 A 4.3.53 A 5.1.57 A 5.2.115 M 1.1 ll. 18-19
3.4	//	//	A 3.4.21
3.6	//	//	A 5.4.46
3.7	// // // //	// // // //	A 2.4.6 A 5.2.100 A 5.2.127 A 5.2.128
3.8	//	//	A 5.2.128
3.9	//	//	M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 <i>ad</i> A 2.1.69
3.19	A 2.1.30 // //	A 2.1.30 A 2.2.8 //	A 2.1.30 A 2.2.8 A 2.2.23

	// // // //	// // // //	A 2.2.24 A 2.2.36 A 2.2.37 KV <i>ad</i> A 4.1.53
3.27	A 1.3.56	A 1.3.56	A 1.3.56
3.34	//	//	A 4.3.120
3.36	//	//	A 2.3.41
3.38	// A 6.3.36	// A 6.3.63	A 4.2.25 A 6.3.63
3.39	// A 2.2.12 // A 3.2.188 //	// A 2.2.12 // A 3.2.188 //	A 2.2.8 A 2.2.12 A 2.3.50 A 3.2.188 A 5.2.115
3.45	A 3.2.80 (wrongly indicated as A 3.2.20) //	A 3.2.80 (wrongly indicated as A 3.2.20) //	A 3.2.80 KV <i>ad</i> A 3.2.80
3.61	// // // // //	// // // // //	A 3.1.26 A 3.1.124 A 3.2.76 M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 <i>ad</i> A 3.1.26 M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 5.4.44
3.81	//	//	M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.13
3.88	A 2.1.56	A 2.1.56	A 2.1.56
3.111	//	//	A 2.3.16
3.113	//	A 5.2.85	A 5.2.85
3.136	A 7.3.20	//	A 7.3.20
3.155	A 3.1.134 //	A 3.1.134 //	A 3.1.134 A 5.3.74
3.157	//	//	A 4.3.53
3.159	//	//	A 5.1.66
3.161	//	A 1.3.11	A 1.3.11
3.165	A 1.2.58	A 1.2.58	A 1.2.58

3.190	A 2.4.11 (wrongly indicated as A 2.4.10) //	//	A 2.4.11 A 5.4.154
3.226	“Pāṇini’s aphorism <i>sadhanam kṛtā</i> ” (corresponding to A 2.1.32) //	//	A 2.1.32 A 3.4.71
3.259	//	//	A 4.3.134
4.5	//	//	A 4.2.37
4.7	// //	// //	A 2.2.6 A 5.2.115
4.10	A 4.2.114 // // //	A 4.2.114 // // //	A 4.2.114 A 5.4.38 KV <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38 N <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38
4.18	//	//	KV <i>ad</i> A 5.1.124
4.20	//	//	A 1.4.33
4.27	// //	// //	A 2.3.5 M 2.58 ll. 11-13 <i>ad</i> Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 3.1.67
4.28	//	//	A 5.2.115
4.32	//	//	M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.13
4.33	//	//	A 5.4.45
4.49	// //	// //	A 3.2.124 A 5.4.45
4.64	// //	// //	A 3.3.18 M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 <i>ad</i> A 3.1.26
4.71	//	//	A 2.2.8
4.80	General grammatical passage		
4.83	A 2.2.31 //	A 2.2.31 //	A 2.2.31 A 2.2.37
4.102	//	//	A 2.1.30
4.108	// //	// //	A 1.3.13 A 1.3.78
4.147	A 2.1.55	A 2.1.55	A 2.1.55

4.177	A 2.1.30	A 2.1.30	A 2.1.30
4.192	// //	// //	A 2.3.13 A 2.3.36
4.194	// // //	// // //	A 3.1.7 A 3.1.133 M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 <i>ad</i> A 3.1.26
4.195	A 2.1.56 // A 3.1.136 // //	A 2.1.56 // A 3.1.136 // //	A 2.1.56 A 2.2.8 A 3.1.136 A 5.2.115 M 1.403 l. 20 Vt. 5 <i>ad</i> A 2.1.69
5.8	// //	// //	A 4.1.4 A 4.3.134
5.9	// //	// “Pat III: 157 on Pāṇ 8.3.42” (typo for M 3.157 ll. 16-17 <i>ad</i> Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 6.3.42)	M 3.157 l. 15 Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 6.3.42 M 3.157 ll. 16-17 <i>ad</i> Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 6.3.42
5.23	//	//	A 3.2.115
5.38	// //	// //	A 3.2.4 M 2.98 l. 5 Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 3.2.4
5.51	// //	// //	A 1.4.54 A 1.4.55
5.53	// //	// //	A 2.2.8 A 2.4.6
5.66	A 2.3.65	A 2.3.65	A 2.3.65
5.110	General grammatical passage		
5.157	// //	// //	M 2.144 ll. 13-15 <i>ad</i> Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 3.3.18 KV <i>ad</i> A 3.3.18
6.1	//	//	A 3.4.21
6.18	// //	// //	A 5.2.115 A 5.4.154
6.38	// //	// //	A 4.3.47 A 5.4.38

	// //	// //	KV <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38 N <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38
7.95	//	//	A 5.2.127
7.127	“The <i>sūtra</i> ‘ <i>gatibuddhi &c.</i> ’ (Pāṇini)” (corresponding to A 1.4.52)	A 1.4.52	A 1.4.52
7.130	// //	// A 5.2.56	A 5.2.48 A 5.2.56
7.193	// //	// //	A 4.2.69 A 4.2.81
8.4-7	A 5.2.115 A 5.4.77 A 5.4.106 //	A 5.2.115 // A 5.4.106 //	A 5.2.115 A 5.4.77 A 5.4.106 M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 <i>ad</i> A 2.1.69
8.9	“Kātyāyana’s Vārtika on Pāṇini 1.3.66” (wrong indication)	“Pat I: 290, on Pāṇ 1.3.64” (corresponding to M 1.290 ll. 8-9 <i>ad</i> A 1.3.64)	M 1.290 ll. 8-9 <i>ad</i> A 1.3.64
8.23	// “ <i>śrāddhāya</i> [...] <i>śete</i> ” (corresponding to M 1.330 ll. 18-19 <i>ad</i> A 1.4.32)	// “Pat I: 330” (corresponding to M 1.330 ll. 18-19 <i>ad</i> A 1.4.32)	A 1.4.32 M 1.330 ll. 18-19 <i>ad</i> A 1.4.32
8.30	//	//	M 1.480 l. 6 <i>ad</i> Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 2.4.30
8.40	A 2.1.30 A 2.1.32	A 2.1.30 A 2.1.32	A 2.1.30 A 2.1.32
8.41	// A 4.2.114 (wrongly indicated as A 5.2.114) // A 4.3.120	// A 4.2.114 // A 4.3.120 (wrongly indicated as A 4.3.129)	A 2.2.8 A 4.2.114 A 4.3.53 A 4.3.120

8.46	// // // //	A 4.2.92 A 4.3.25 A 4.3.53 A 4.3.74	A 4.2.92 A 4.3.25 A 4.3.53 A 4.3.74
8.48	// A 5.2.115	// A 5.2.115	A 5.2.94 A 5.2.115
8.57	A 2.3.69 //	A 2.3.69 //	A 2.3.69 A 3.2.135
8.62	// // //	// // //	A 4.3.53 A 5.2.103 M 2.397 l. 1 Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 5.2.103
8.77	A 4.1.44 “ <i>Vārtika</i> on Pāṇini 4.1.45” (wrong indication)	A 4.1.44 //	A 4.1.44 GS 3 (in KV <i>ad</i> A 4.1.45)
8.79	A 2.1.40 // // A 3.3.113 A 7.3.52 // //	A 2.1.40 // // A 3.3.113 A 7.3.52 // //	A 2.1.40 A 3.2.178 A 3.3.19 A 3.3.113 A 7.3.52 M 2.136 l. 4 Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 3.2.178 KV <i>ad</i> A 3.2.178
8.82	//	//	A 2.1.13
8.97	//	A 2.3.37	A 2.3.37
8.98	//	“Pat I: 406” (corresponding to M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 <i>ad</i> A 2.1.69)	M 1.406 l. 5 Vt. 8 <i>ad</i> A 2.1.69
8.99	//	A 3.3.176	A 3.3.176
8.107	A 2.4.17 (wrong indication) // //	“Pat I: 480” (corresponding to M 1.480 l. 6 <i>ad</i> Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 2.4.30) // //	M 1.480 l. 6 <i>ad</i> Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 2.4.30 M 1.480 l. 12 <i>ad</i> Vt. 3 <i>ad</i> A 2.4.30 M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.28
8.110	//	//	A 3.2.115

	//	//	M 1.280 l. 19 Vt. 8 <i>ad</i> A 1.3.21
8.112	//	//	M 1.458 l. 16 Vt. 6 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.36
8.123	//	//	M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 <i>ad</i> A 3.1.26
	//	//	M 3.230 l. 2 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 6.4.155
8.134	//	//	A 5.2.115
	//	//	A 5.4.154
8.150	General grammatical passage		
8.153	//	//	A 2.2.18
	//	//	A 4.3.53
8.157	A 1.4.90	A 1.4.90	A 1.4.90
	//	//	A 2.3.8
8.163	A 2.1.32	//	A 2.1.32
8.171	//	A 3.3.169	A 3.3.169
8.173	A 6.4.148	//	A 6.4.148
8.179	//	//	A 3.3.19
	//	//	M 2.246 l. 1 Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 3.3.19
8.202	//	//	A 5.1.109
	//	//	A 5.2.115
	//	//	A 5.4.38
	//	//	KV <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38
	//	//	N <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38
8.214	//	//	A 5.1.117
8.220	//	//	A 5.2.94
	//	//	M 1.420 l. 25 <i>ad</i> Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 2.2.24
	//	//	KV <i>ad</i> A 2.2.24
8.228	//	//	A 3.4.70
	//	//	A 3.4.71
8.241	//	//	A 5.2.116
8.265	//	//	A 7.1.37
	//	//	M 1.455 l. 4 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.28
8.266	A 1.3.10	A 1.3.10	A 1.3.10
	//	//	A 2.2.34

	“This has been fully explained by the author of the <i>Mahābhāṣya</i> on Pāṇini 1.3.10” (corresponding to M 1.267 ll. 15-16 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 1.3.10) //	M 1.267 ll. 15-16 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 1.3.10 //	M 1.267 ll. 15-16 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 1.3.10 M 1.432 ll. 20-21 Vt. 9 <i>ad</i> A 2.2.29
8.273	A 2.3.18 (wrong indication)	“Kāt on 1.3.10–1” (wrong indication)	M 1.452 l. 2 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.18
8.276	//	//	M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.13
8.284	// // //	// // //	A 3.1.133 A 3.3.18 M 2.34 l. 8 Vt. 5 <i>ad</i> A 3.1.26
8.291-292	//	A 5.1.6	A 5.1.6
8.298	// //	// //	A 5.1.18 A 5.1.57
8.328	//	//	A 4.3.134
8.339	// // // //	// // // //	A 5.4.38 M 1.449 l. 5 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.13 KV <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38 N <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38
8.346	//	//	A 3.1.25
8.373	A 4.1.48 (wrongly indicated as A 4.1.18) A 5.1.66	A 4.1.48 A 5.1.66	A 4.1.48 A 5.1.66
8.379	// // // // //	// A 3.2.101 // // //	A 3.1.133 A 3.2.101 A 4.3.85 A 4.4.34 A 5.1.109
8.383	//	//	A 5.2.94

	// // //	// // //	A 5.4.38 KV <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38 N <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38
8.392	// // // //	// // // //	A 4.3.53 A 5.4.38 KV <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38 N <i>ad</i> A 5.4.38
8.412	//	//	A 5.1.124
9.17	//	//	A 3.1.133
9.19	Jha's edition omits this section	A 7.2.64	A 7.2.64
9.46	//	//	A 1.3.72
9.59	//	//	A 3.1.96
9.74	//	//	A 3.3.154
9.104	//	//	A 3.3.164
9.114	//	//	M 2.436 l. 11 Vt. 1 <i>ad</i> A 5.4.44
9.119	//	A 2.4.12	A 2.4.12
9.253	General grammatical passage		
9.292	A 2.2.10	A 2.2.10	A 2.2.10
10.33	// // //	A 3.2.101 // A 6.3.137	A 3.2.101 A 5.3.107 A 6.3.137
10.44	A 1.2.54 // A 4.2.69 A 4.2.81	A 1.2.54 // A 4.2.69 A 4.2.81	A 1.2.54 A 4.1.166 A 4.2.69 A 4.2.81
10.88	// //	// //	M 1.136 l. 5 Vt. 9 <i>ad</i> A 1.1.56 M 1.136 l. 8 Vt. 10 <i>ad</i> A 1.1.56
11.44	A 3.1.85	A 3.1.85 (wrongly indicated as A 3.3.85)	A 3.1.85
11.55	“ <i>carmaṇi dvīpinam hanti</i> ” (corresponding to M 1.458 ll. 17-19 <i>ad</i> Vt. 6 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.36)	“Pat on Pāṇ 2.3.36” (corresponding to M 1.458 ll. 17-19 <i>ad</i> Vt. 6 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.36)	M 1.458 ll. 17-19 <i>ad</i> Vt. 6 <i>ad</i> A 2.3.36

11.59	//	//	A 3.1.123
11.87	//	//	A 4.1.15
	//	//	A 4.1.122
11.93	A 2.1.34	A 2.1.34	A 2.1.34
11.94	A 6.4.146 (wrongly indicated as A 3.4.146)	A 6.4.146	A 6.4.146
11.95	A 2.4.6	A 2.4.6	A 2.4.6
11.103	//	//	A 5.2.115
11.108	//	“Kāt 2 on Pāṇ 3.2.5” (corresponding to M 2.98 l. 18 Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 3.2.5)	M 2.98 l. 18 Vt. 2 <i>ad</i> A 3.2.5
11.173	//	//	A 4.1.48
11.181	//	//	A 2.3.41
11.250	A 5.2.59	A 5.2.59	A 5.2.59
12.87	//	A 4.3.68	A 4.3.68
	//	//	M 2.312 ll. 17-20 <i>ad</i> A 4.3.68
	//	//	KV <i>ad</i> A 4.3.68

General index

This index includes entries for all notable elements discussed in the volume, including linguistic, legal, philological-textual, and literary items. The entries “Pāṇini” and “*taddhita*” are excluded due to their extremely high frequency throughout the book.

- abhyasya*: 112-113.
ablative: 36-38; 38fn; 39fn; 40; 46; 53fn; 119; 126-127; 136; 140; 173; 194-195; 244-245; 248-249; 265; 288; 311-312; 331; 333-334.
accusative: 36; 38; 39fn; 72; 96-98; 111-112; 120-121; 129; 134; 138; 142; 151; 162-163; 172; 192-193; 223; 237-238; 250; 256; 288; 314-315; 317; 319; 331; 345.
adhikaraṇa: 44fn; 71-73; 203-204; 345.
anubandha: 15; 55fn; 94; 142fn; 148; 179.
anuvṛtti: 32fn; 43; 43fn; 57; 211; 331.
aorist: 247.
apādāna: 36; 36fn; 37; 38fn; 39-40; 46; 126.
apekṣā: 63; 112; 114; 192; 195; 215; 264.
artha: 27; 28fn; 30; 31; 35-36; 36fn; 39; 52; 52fn; 58; 60; 60fn; 62-63; 69-70; 70fn; 72; 77; 83-84; 90fn; 95; 98-101; 101fn; 111; 116; 118-119; 120; 125; 128; 137; 142-143; 146; 149; 152-154; 164; 167; 169; 169fn; 172-173; 190-191; 200; 204; 206; 220-222; 229; 235-238; 240; 248-249; 261-263; 266; 266fn; 273; 275; 284; 300; 309.
arthavāda: 24; 60fn; 61; 61fn; 64; 70; 72-73; 123-124; 139; 163; 210; 337-338; 340; 345fn.
atonement: 151; 163; 295-296.
avyayībhāva: 30; 47fn; 74; 74fn; 107; 202; 245.
ācārya: 136-137; 303; 347-348.
ākāṅkṣā (*ākāṅkṣ-*): 60; 75; 75fn; 142; 154; 315.
ākṛtigāṇa: 44; 51-53; 53fn; 74; 81; 93; 108; 165; 174; 177-178; 189; 199; 206; 220-221; 313.
āropa (*āruh-*): 66; 72; 101; 142; 167; 219; 315.
ārdhadhātuka: 103fn.
ātmanepada: 109; 144-145; 166; 200-201; 201fn; 228-229; 229fn; 249-251; 251fn; 284-285; 318; 336; 342; 349.
bath graduate: 135; 135fn; 153; 158; 194; 218.

bahulam: 25; 27; 138; 145-146; 148-149; 152; 168; 241; 243; 250fn; 295; 316; 322-323; 332-333.

bahuvrīhi: 31; 33; 44fn; 49-50; 86fn; 91; 94-95; 102-104; 109-110; 132; 163-165; 185; 185fn; 187-188; 199; 219-221; 236-237; 253-254; 262-263; 271-272; 280; 325-329; 331-333.

brahman: 15; 76; 102; 113-114; 122-123; 147; 167; 169; 170fn; 298.
Brāhmaṇa: 39; 39fn; 40; 40fn; 52; 54; 63-64; 70; 77; 78-80; 82fn; 83-85; 89; 91; 94-95; 101; 105; 128; 131; 135; 138; 140; 142; 144; 156; 167; 174-177; 179-180; 190fn; 210; 217; 219; 228-229; 251-252; 269; 277; 279-281; 291fn; 296; 299; 301; 303; 311; 315; 319; 332fn; 338; 342-343; 345-346; 349.

causative: 77; 97fn; 146-147; 172-173; 295; 295fn; 320-321.

chandas: 28fn; 33-34; 42; 44; 63; 63fn; 80-81; 90-91; 101; 101fn; 146; 168; 184-185; 201; 211; 234; 254; 295; 298; 330; 332-336.

chāṇḍasa: 44-45; 79; 90; 184; 200; 211; 233-234; 247; 297; 332-336.

compound: 13-14; 22; 28; 30-31; 33-34; 34fn; 40-41; 42fn; 43; 44fn; 47; 47fn; 48fn; 49-52; 56; 58-59; 62; 66; 69; 74fn; 75; 78-79; 81; 85fn; 86fn; 91; 92fn; 93-95; 102-104; 107-110; 115-116; 116fn; 122-123; 125-128; 128fn; 132; 136; 139; 139fn; 140-141; 145-146; 148-149; 152-154; 156; 158-165; 167-175; 177-178; 182-185; 185fn; 188-190;

195; 197; 199-200; 202-203; 205-207; 209; 209fn; 210-211; 214; 219-227; 231; 231fn; 232-234; 236-237; 237fn; 241; 243; 245-246; 248-249; 253-255; 257; 263; 266-271; 271fn; 272; 279-280; 282-283; 288-290; 295; 298; 301; 303-304; 306; 311-316; 321-328; 328fn; 329-335; 349-350; 352.

dative: 53; 96; 97fn; 98; 100-101; 101fn; 125-126; 153; 174-176; 194; 204; 230; 269-270; 274; 318-319; 341; 349.

denominative: 96-97; 173; 196; 205; 222; 252; 291; 295; 295fn; 296; 320-323; 325; 335.

desiderative: 144; 193; 204-205.

dharma: 12; 21; 27; 52-53; 55-57; 59; 59fn; 60fn; 61fn; 62; 66; 68-69; 91; 103-104; 120; 151-152; 155; 157; 165-166; 193fn; 197-198; 201-203; 205-207; 212; 226-229; 233; 237-238; 241-242; 259; 265-266; 284; 290; 336; 338; 338fn; 340-341; 348.

dharmamūla: 59; 68; 338fn; 346; 348.

Dharmaśāstra: 11-13; 16-17; 19; 21; 26; 198; 216; 243; 300; 326; 336-337; 338fn; 341fn; 342-343; 346-348; 353-355.

dhātu: 30; 97fn; 120; 137; 144; 153; 191; 222; 276; 284; 327.

dual: 195; 269-270; 329.

dvandva: 40-41; 62; 66; 104; 115-116; 116fn; 127-128; 128fn; 140; 159-163; 183-184; 189; 195; 197; 205; 214; 226-227; 231; 257; 266-

269; 288; 288fn; 289; 303; 311-312; 314; 327; 329-331; 350.
dvigu: 48-50; 116fn; 156; 231; 231fn; 247-248; 253; 263; 272; 275; 312; 314; 336.
dvija: 55-56; 73; 112; 125; 136-137; 143; 145; 191; 195; 218; 235.
 emendation: 18-19; 73fn; 74-75; 83fn; 265.
 encyclopaedic: 21; 26; 85; 129; 284; 302; 343; 347; 350; 354.
 feminine affix: 42; 44; 44fn; 49-50; 132-133; 133fn; 146; 207-208; 231; 240; 277; 298; 300; 306; 312; 342.
 genitive: 29; 32fn; 33-34; 100; 101; 101fn; 126; 136; 142; 164-165; 167-170; 183fn; 194-195; 197; 202; 208; 214-215; 233; 237-238; 271; 271fn; 274; 290; 299fn; 307; 318-319; 330; 332-333; 341.
 gerund: 28; 113; 127; 159; 218; 230; 249; 265; 331; 341.
 gerundive: 229; 299; 337.
 Gr̥hyasūtra: 77-79; 354-355; 357.
guṇa: 302-303; 313fn; 316.
 imperative: 83fn; 287.
 imperfect: 247.
 injunction: 21; 55; 60; 60fn; 61-65; 69-70; 72-73; 76; 96; 114; 124-125; 143; 145; 154-157; 180; 182; 216; 285-286; 309; 318; 336-340; 344; 347fn.
 instrumental: 105; 110; 119; 120; 120fn; 141; 159; 164-165; 222-223; 233; 268-269; 301; 312; 319.
 intransitive: 54; 121-122; 222.
itaretarayoga: 62-64; 66; 89; 104; 115fn; 266; 267; 312; 328-330.

jāti: 84-86; 89; 110; 127; 135; 183; 185; 208; 214; 233-234; 268; 303; 329; 333.
 juridical: 11; 21; 47; 48; 55; 318; 336; 343; 354.
karmadhāraya: 59; 123; 139; 152; 202; 206; 209fn; 224; 227; 236; 237; 237fn; 241; 243; 246; 328-329.
karman: 25; 25fn; 38; 54; 58; 74; 111; 121; 144-145; 173; 201; 222; 230; 314; 321-322; 336-337.
kartṛ: 110; 138fn; 144-145; 158; 173; 184; 201; 205; 212-215; 222; 237; 243; 269; 321-323; 336.
kāraka: 25; 27; 36-39; 42; 63-64; 71-72; 99; 101; 111; 126; 155-156; 191; 213; 222; 243-244; 314; 345.
 Kātyāyana: 11-13; 15; 21-22; 29-30; 37fn; 38; 53; 69; 75fn; 121; 138-139; 163; 210; 228-229; 242-243; 267; 269; 305; 331; 340; 343; 348; 351.
kṛt: 14; 25-26; 28-30; 41; 42; 42fn; 43-44; 44fn; 54-55; 58-59; 63-64; 64fn; 69; 78-79; 81; 96; 98; 105-106; 106fn; 108-110; 116-117; 122; 126; 145; 149-150; 158; 170-173; 178-179; 184-185; 193; 195-196; 200-201; 204-207; 211; 215; 218; 232; 237-238; 240-244; 244fn; 250; 250fn; 252; 257; 260; 263-264; 270-271; 271fn; 275; 275fn; 278-279; 282; 291-292; 297-298; 304-305; 305fn; 316-317; 321-323; 325; 325fn; 329; 335; 340; 349.
kṛtya: 25; 53-54; 54fn; 55; 71-72; 114; 124; 143; 154; 157; 172; 241;

243; 258; 263-264; 285-286; 287; 298; 321; 337-339.

Kṣatriya: 39; 39fn; 40; 70; 77; 79-80; 81-82; 82fn; 83; 89; 91; 94; 105; 140; 210; 238; 269; 279; 292-293; 299; 301; 311.

Kṛta: 57; 57fn; 108; 110; 164; 170; 185; 238; 263-264; 321; 340.

lakāra: 55; 60-62; 62fn; 63; 65; 76; 95-96; 98; 108; 150; 155; 166; 201; 201fn; 238; 247; 249-250; 286-287; 317-318; 339; 342.

locative: 34; 43; 59; 59fn; 73; 99; 108fn; 117fn; 127; 136; 148fn; 161fn; 168; 186; 188fn; 200; 203fn; 204; 241; 245; 246; 251-252; 269; 273fn; 284; 296-297; 309; 318-319; 324; 332-334; 347.

marriage: 158-159; 166-169; 182; 251; 319; 341; 341fn; 342.

matvarthīya: 92; 156; 160-161; 187-188; 193; 206; 262; 279; 303.

metre: 81; 185; 333.

Mīmāṃsā: 21; 35; 60fn; 61fn; 68; 76; 82fn; 125; 217fn; 336fn; 337-341; 343-344; 354-355.

nipātana: 98-99; 227; 298; 305; 335; 345.

Nirukta: 16; 29; 35; 36fn; 283; 344.

niṣṭhā: 57; 57fn; 108; 164; 237-238.

nitya (*nityatā*): 27; 33-34; 55-57; 68; 98-99; 101; 116-117; 123-125; 142; 156; 161-162; 171-172; 178; 201; 255; 302; 302fn; 316; 344; 348.

nominal ending: 34; 42; 97; 154; 170; 301; 312; 312fn; 318.

nominative: 42-43; 45; 56; 88; 96-97; 133; 133fn; 141; 161fn; 183fn;

184; 208; 215; 229; 232; 239-240; 273; 288; 299fn; 335; 336.

numeral: 47; 49fn; 86; 113; 117; 313.

Nyāya: 69; 73; 344; 345fn; 348; 354.

optative: 61-63; 65-66; 77; 98; 147; 152; 155; 158; 230; 254; 288-298; 320; 322-323; 341.

pada: 30; 42; 44; 44fn; 47; 47fn; 58-59; 80-81; 117; 122; 128; 141; 171; 173; 177-178; 184; 209-211; 232; 246; 270; 290-292; 295; 298fn; 301; 306; 325fn; 329-331; 334; 350; 354.

parasmaipada: 59; 83fn; 109; 144; 201; 229; 252; 296; 336.

paribhāṣā (*paribhāṣ-*): 11; 21fn; 60; 61fn; 65; 128-129; 302-303; 313; 316; 339.

particle: 28-29; 29fn; 53; 53fn; 89; 151; 229; 244; 247; 256; 312; 345fn.

Paspaśā: 79; 130; 346.

passive: 25fn; 54-55; 55fn; 57; 59; 70; 73; 76; 93; 98; 109; 111; 114; 119fn; 145; 157; 163; 165; 170; 184-186; 199; 229; 258; 269; 286; 296; 333; 337-338; 340; 345.

past participle: 108-110; 126; 159; 185; 234fn; 263-264; 328; 333.

Patañjali: 11; 13; 15-16; 21-22; 26; 38; 43; 65-66; 69; 74; 79; 89; 91; 97; 97fn; 142; 193; 206; 209-210; 230-231; 244; 248-249; 252; 260; 265; 297; 315; 323; 334; 336; 343; 346; 348; 351-352.

patient: 25; 25fn; 27; 38; 44fn; 58-59; 100; 121; 126; 138fn; 142; 144-145; 185; 192-193; 201; 222; 230;

238; 248; 260; 264; 271fn; 305;
305fn; 314; 319; 321-322; 336.
perfect: 38; 210-211; 249-250; 315;
317-318; 342.
pitr: 148; 174; 297.
plural: 32-33; 39fn; 42; 42fn; 43-45;
73; 87-88; 115; 134-135; 141; 154;
183; 183fn; 184; 222; 229; 233;
239-240; 273; 288; 294fn; 299fn;
310; 312; 319; 335-336.
polysemy (polysemous): 85; 99;
122; 325.
praśleṣa: 111; 314.
praśliṣṭanirdeśa: 111; 254; 314-315.
pratyakṣa: 24-25; 37fn; 38; 181.
pratyāhāra: 15; 115.
prefix: 28-29; 111-112; 119; 149;
153; 188; 244-245; 251fn; 254-255;
258; 281; 314; 316.
present participle: 96; 149-150; 195.
rātrisattra: 61fn; 76; 76fn; 124;
124fn; 338; 340.
recipient: 100fn; 101; 153; 174; 191;
194; 204; 230; 305; 318-319.
reflexive: 138; 144-145.
replacement: 14; 33-35; 81-82; 86;
93-94; 97; 103fn; 106; 117; 126;
139-141; 178; 225; 227; 241-244;
246; 248-249; 252-253; 259; 261;
265; 289; 292fn; 293-295; 302-303;
312fn; 316; 321; 327; 330-333.
rūpakasamāsa: 122-123; 152;
175fn.
Śabara: 35; 61fn; 337; 337fn; 340.
samartha: 52fn; 149; 240; 300.
Satkāryavāda: 66; 66fn; 67fn; 68;
341.

samāsānta: 94-95; 102-104; 170;
184; 188; 219; 226-227; 253-254;
324; 326-329.
samāhāra: 41; 48; 48fn; 89; 104;
115; 115fn; 128; 160; 214; 227; 247-
249; 266; 289; 303; 327-329.
saṃbandha (*sambandhin*-): 35; 71;
90; 100; 113; 118; 137; 141; 159;
167; 169; 181; 207-208; 212; 214;
247; 271; 274; 276; 292; 305.
saṃjñā: 35; 37; 39fn; 48; 63-64;
64fn; 121; 133; 146; 168; 192;
201fn; 222; 243-244; 244fn; 260;
266; 302; 302fn; 316; 322; 332-333;
344.
saṃpradāna: 100-101; 109; 153;
174; 191; 194; 203-204; 229; 305;
318-319.
saṃprasāraṇa: 86fn; 241-243.
sāmarthya: 131; 131fn; 149; 154-
155; 208; 214; 254.
sandhi: 14; 83fn; 111-112; 142fn;
149; 254; 316-317.
sārvadhātuka: 145; 192-193.
siddha (*siddhi*): 24; 36; 62; 77-80;
87; 92; 128; 134; 137; 141; 154;
175; 180; 186; 211-212; 215; 224;
235; 262; 286; 294; 301; 310.
singular: 29-30; 39fn; 40-41; 46; 53;
56; 83fn; 115-116; 116fn; 117; 127-
128; 133; 135; 143; 148fn; 160;
161fn; 164; 172; 183; 183fn; 184;
195; 208; 214; 217; 227; 231-232;
249-250; 252; 273; 288-289; 299fn;
303; 309; 314-315; 317-319; 329.
Śrautasūtra: 129; 217fn; 300; 343;
354-355.

subjunctive: 62; 62fn; 63; 65; 96; 98; 318; 339-340.

substitute: 28-29; 55; 61; 61fn; 62-63; 65; 76; 96; 98; 106; 108; 127; 133; 150; 155; 166; 168; 201; 201fn; 210; 238; 247; 249-250; 286-287; 317-318; 339; 342; 346.

substitution: 29; 29fn; 50; 105-106; 130-132; 180; 241; 243.

Śūdra: 39; 39fn; 40; 70-71; 77; 105; 130; 134; 140; 146; 163; 165; 197; 238; 278; 291fn; 297; 311; 346; 348.

svārthe (*svārthika*): 50-51; 51fn; 52; 52fn; 60; 79; 81; 95; 102; 178-179; 183-184; 189-190; 206; 220; 259-260; 273; 275fn; 279; 281; 288; 291; 313; 324-325.

tatpuruṣa: 31; 109-110; 122-123; 125-126; 136; 139; 139fn; 141; 152; 161; 163-165; 169-170; 185; 188; 197; 202-203; 210; 221; 232; 234; 237fn; 241-242; 255; 257; 270; 271fn; 290; 301; 316; 328fn; 329; 330-331; 349.

tādarthya: 95; 147; 153; 174; 194; 269; 274; 319.

textual-exegetical: 21; 315; 317; 326; 332; 354.

ṬI syllable: 97fn; 132; 253fn; 301; 346.

textual-linguistic: 21; 354.

transitive: 54; 54fn; 138; 193.

twice-born: 56; 73; 98-99; 112; 125; 137; 143-145; 158; 163; 179; 179fn; 184; 191; 195; 203; 218; 234-235; 280-281; 302; 331; 345-346.

upapada (*upapadasamāsa*): 42fn; 59; 59fn; 106; 108fn; 127; 136; 243; 249; 279; 314; 329-330.

upamāna: 123; 175; 202.

upasarjana: 44fn; 49; 110; 136; 162fn; 188; 197; 199; 233; 329.

Vaiśya: 39; 39fn; 40; 70-71; 77; 79; 82fn; 83; 89; 91; 94; 105; 140; 238; 279; 291fn; 299; 301; 311.

variant reading: 18; 21; 29; 30fn; 33fn; 36fn; 48fn; 50fn; 51fn; 58fn; 60fn; 62fn; 66fn; 70fn; 80fn; 83fn; 87fn; 90fn; 91fn; 92fn; 94fn; 95; 95fn; 97-99; 100fn; 103; 108; 109fn; 111fn; 112fn; 116fn; 118fn; 120fn; 122fn; 124fn; 128fn; 131fn; 134fn; 142fn; 144fn; 147fn; 148fn; 149fn; 150fn; 161fn; 163fn; 164; 165; 169fn; 181fn; 186fn; 187fn; 188; 190fn; 191fn; 192fn; 196fn; 197fn; 198fn; 199fn; 203fn; 205; 208; 212fn; 214fn; 221fn; 225; 228fn; 232; 232fn; 233fn; 235fn; 238fn; 240fn; 244fn; 247fn; 248fn; 249fn; 257fn; 258fn; 264fn; 265; 266fn; 270fn; 273fn; 276fn; 278fn; 279fn; 281fn; 282fn; 283fn; 284fn; 285fn; 288fn; 289fn; 292fn; 297fn; 301fn; 302fn; 304; 305fn; 308fn; 315; 326; 329; 346; 352.

vārttika: 11; 15; 21-22; 30; 43; 53; 68-69; 74-75; 75fn; 106; 121-122; 138; 142; 207; 209-211; 228-231; 243-244; 251; 251fn; 274; 297; 305; 314-315; 319-320; 328; 331; 343; 348; 351.

Veda: 35-38; 52; 59-60; 61fn; 64;
 67-69; 73-75; 75fn; 109; 122-126;
 136-141; 143-144; 146-147; 149-
 150; 154-157; 159; 165; 169; 177fn;
 180; 182; 201-203; 215-216; 227;
 283-284; 290; 309; 322; 328; 337;
 340-341; 347-348; 355.
 Vedic initiation: 81; 113; 145.
 verbal ending: 29; 36fn; 114-115;
 145.
vivakṣā: 36; 37fn; 38-39; 77; 134;
 143-144; 169; 203; 208; 210; 217.
vyavahāra: 35; 46-47; 98; 137; 216;
 226; 245; 256; 258; 267-268.

vrddhi: 35; 39; 79-81; 90-91; 93-94;
 103; 148; 177-178; 189; 233-234;
 254-256; 261; 291; 293fn; 334-335.
 Yāska: 16; 29; 35; 344.
yogavibhāga: 105-106; 163; 203;
 211; 232-233; 239fn; 314; 335.
 zero: 33; 33fn; 34-35; 82; 97; 97fn;
 103; 103fn; 117; 117fn; 126-127;
 139-141; 162-163; 173; 224-225;
 227; 246; 248-249; 252-253; 259;
 265; 289; 292fn; 293-294; 312;
 312fn; 321; 327-333.



CORPUS IURIS SANSKRITICUM ET FONTES IURIS ASIAE MERIDIANAE ET CENTRALIS

*A Series on Social and Religious Law of India, South-East and Central Asia founded by
Oscar Botto*

1. *Dakṣa-smṛti*. Introduction, Critical edition, Translation and Appendices by IRMA PIOVANO, with a Foreword on the “Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum” by OSCAR BOTTO, Torino, 2002.
2. *Le Code népalais (AIN) de 1853*, par JEAN FEZAS, Introduction et Texte, 2 Tomes, Torino, 2000.
3. *Samvarta Tradition (Saṃvarta-smṛti and Saṃvarta-dharmaśāstra)*. Critically edited with English Translation by K.V. SARMA and S.A.S. SARMA, Torino, 2002.
4. *Śāṅkarasmṛti (Laghubharmaparakāśikā)*. Introduction, Critical edition, Translation and Appendix by N.P. UNNI, Torino, 2003.
5. *The Boundaries of Hindu law. Tradition, Custom and Politics in Medieval Kerala*, by DONALD R. DAVIS, JR., Torino, 2004.
6. *The Price of Purity. The Religious Judge in 19th Century Nepal. Containing the Edition and Translation of the Chapters on the Dharmādhikārin in Two (Mulukī) Ains*, by AXEL MICHAELS, Torino, 2005.
7. *The Roots of Hindu Jurisprudence. Sources of Dharma and Interpretation in Mīmāṃsā and Dharmaśāstra*, by DOMENICO FRANCAVILLA, Torino, 2006.
8. *Kapilasmṛti*. Critically edited with Introduction and Notes by S.A.S. SARMA and translated in collaboration with H. N. BHAT, Torino, 2007.
9. *Ritualisation and Segregation. The Untouchability Complex in Indian Dharma Literature with Special Reference to Parāśaramṛti and Parāśaramādhavīya*, by MIKAEL AKTOR, Torino, 2008.
10. *Provincialising Dharma. Studies on Legal Issues in the Himalaya*, edited by FLORINDA DE SIMINI, DOMENICO FRANCAVILLA, AXEL MICHAELS, Torino, 2024.

All the volumes are available at the website
<http://www.asiainstitutetorino.it/corpusiuris.html>