

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

The Cāndra-vyākaraṇa: some questions*

(published in: *Indian Linguistic Studies: Festschrift in Honor of George Cardona*, ed. Madhav M. Deshpande and Peter E. Hook, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002, pp. 182-201)

1. Cāndra-Sūtra and Cāndra-Vṛtti: one or two authors?

Some arguments seem to indicate, at first sight, that the authors of the Cāndra-Vṛtti and of the Sūtra were different people.¹ The most important among these bases itself on the use in the Vṛtti of *vakṣyati* "he will state" and *karoti* "he makes" on the one hand, and of *vakṣyāmaḥ* "we will state" on the other. The third person verbal forms refer nine out of a total of ten times to one of the surviving Cāndra-sūtras; the one remaining case pertains to a particular accent, not dealt with in the surviving text. Of the ten occurrences of *vakṣyāmaḥ*, one refers demonstrably to another passage of the Vṛtti, eight to the treatment of accents which is missing in the surviving text, while one would seem to concern a sūtra. If we leave out of consideration, for the time being, the cases concerning accents, and suppose that the one puzzling use of *vakṣyāmaḥ* refers to the explanation of a sūtra in the Vṛtti rather than to the sūtra itself, we may be tempted to conclude that the Vṛtti uses the third person to refer to the Sūtra, and the first person to refer to other parts of the [183] Vṛtti. What further conclusions can be drawn from this?

It goes without saying that the temptation is great to see in this use of the first and third persons proof that the author of the Cāndra-Vṛtti did not compose the Cāndra-Sūtra. Yet it would be overhasty to draw this conclusion without considering the habits of the age concerned. These habits appear to have been rather varied, for we find that a text like the Yoga Bhāṣya uses *vakṣyāmaḥ* to refer to the Yoga Sūtra, the different authorship of which is not in doubt.² The author of the Tattvārthādhigama Bhāṣya uses both first and third person verbal forms to refer to the sūtras on which he comments, and whose author appears to have been different.³ It is not so easy to find out how authors of both the basic text and the commentary referred, in their commentary, to the

* An earlier version of this paper was read at the VIIIth World Sanskrit Conference held in Vienna, 1990. This earlier version is frequently criticised in a paper by Thomas Oberlies (1996), which however offers further material in support of some of the theses presented in it. While discussing my review (WZKS 36, 1992, 239-240) of his book on the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa (Oberlies, 1989), Oberlies (1996: 266 n. 2) accuses me of the 'Ungenauigkeit' of having claimed that he had prepared a critical edition. The 'Ungenauigkeit' is however his, for my review does not mention the expression 'critical edition', and nor does it suggest that Oberlies' book contains one. I thank Jan E.M. Houben, who made the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa available to me.

¹ These arguments are presented in detail by P.C. Dash (1986: 8-21). Cp. Rau, 1996: 336.

² On YS 2.29, 40, 46.

³ Bronkhorst, 1985: 169-170.

basic text, for few certain cases of such combinations are known from the first millennium. But one undoubted example is Maṇḍana Mīśra's Brahmasiddhi, which consists of verses and commentary. Maṇḍana uses the third person on several occasions in the commentary to refer to his own verses.⁴ Another example is the first chapter of Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika. Unlike Maṇḍana, Dharmakīrti uses the first person (*vakṣyāmaḥ*) a few times in his commentary to refer to the text commented upon.⁵ In other words, the use of *vakṣyati* in the Cāndra-Vṛtti does not allow us to conclude anything whatsoever.

It has been suggested, on the basis of the frequent references to accentual questions by means of the word *vakṣyāmaḥ*, that the author of the *Vṛtti* composed the (now missing) eighth Adhyāya of the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa, on accents. But this position is not without difficulties, for the Cāndra-Sūtra already uses a number of anubandhas that indicate accents (without explaining their significance). The surmise, meant to explain these anubandhas, according to which the author of the Sūtra only intended to compose a section on accentuation, but did not succeed in doing so, has obviously no other justification than the wish to uphold the hypothesis concerning the author of the *Vṛtti*; it need not detain us here.

[184]

Another argument is more interesting:⁶ the *Vṛtti* uses in certain cases the words *saṃjñā* and *nāman* where the Sūtra has *nāman* and *ākhyā* respectively.⁷ This deviation between Sūtra and *Vṛtti* constitutes the strongest argument I know of in support of a double authorship, even though it is hard to assess how strong an argument it really is.

There is another circumstance that seems to me relevant in the present discussion. The Cāndra-Sūtra is not complete without the *Vṛtti*! A glance at Liebich's Konkordanz Panini - Candra (1928) shows that the Cāndra-Sūtra was not meant to be shorter than Pāṇini's grammar. It omits, to be sure, in its present form rules on accent, Vedic rules and *saṃjñā-sūtras*; but we know that the first two either existed or were planned (see the above remarks on accentual anubandhas), while *saṃjñā-sūtras* were left out on purpose. In general the Cāndra-Sūtra follows Pāṇini's grammar in all its details. Indeed, no attempt is made to leave out rules that produce non-current forms.⁸ And yet, sometimes the Cāndra-Sūtra skips a number of Pāṇinian sūtras. Why? Does

⁴ E.g., p. 75 l. 4: *darśayati*; p. 23 l. 17: *āha*.

⁵ See Gnoli, 1960: xvi n.

⁶ Dash, 1986: p. 2 fn. 5.

⁷ Not everywhere! On eight occasions both the Cāndra-Sūtra and the *Vṛtti* use *saṃjñā* (Dash, 1986: 59; read 1.1.123 for 1.1.23). Note that the *Vṛtti* does not always reintroduce the Pāṇinian term: *vaiyākaraṇākhyā* (P. 6.3.7) becomes *nāman* in CS 5.2.10, *saṃjñā* in the *Vṛtti*; *saṃjñā* in P. 5.1.62 becomes *ākhyā* in CS 4.1.65, *nāman* in the *Vṛtti*; *saṃjñā* in P. 7.3.67, on the other hand, becomes *ākhyā* in CS 6.1.95, and remains *ākhyā* in the *Vṛtti*.

⁸ Proof is constituted by Oberlies' (1989: passim) comment "nicht zu belegen", which occurs on virtually every single page of his translation of parts of the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa in connection with the forms to be produced by Candra's rules.

the author of the Cāndra-Sūtra lose interest in these cases in the forms prescribed by the Aṣṭādhyāyī? In practically all these cases the skipped sūtras, or the forms they are meant to produce, recur in the Cāndra-Vṛtti. In other words, Cāndra-Sūtra and Cāndra-Vṛtti together represent practically the whole of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, with the exception of the portions specified above. The Cāndra-Sūtra by itself does not do so: it presents the irregular image of a text which sometimes follows the Aṣṭādhyāyī step by step, and at other occasions walks through the field covered by the Aṣṭādhyāyī with seven-league boots.

The twelve sūtras P. 6.3.9-20 constitute an example. These sūtras discuss in detail the cases where the first member of a compound [185] preserves a locative case-ending. Candra represents this whole discussion in one single sūtra: *saptamyā bahulam* (CS 5.2.11). Do we have to conclude that Candra was not interested in the details provided by Pāṇini (and by the Mahābhāṣya)? No such conclusion is necessary if we accept that the Vṛtti is a complement to the Cāndra-Sūtra: the Vṛtti presents the information which the Sūtra omits. The Vṛtti on CS 1.3.106, similarly, presents the contents of no fewer than eight Pāṇinian rules, P. 3.3.131-138. These and many other examples almost force us to conclude that Cāndra-Sūtra and Cāndra-Vṛtti were conceived of together. This does not necessarily exclude the possibility that two authors composed these two works — say a teacher and his student. But it makes it extremely unlikely that the Cāndra-Sūtra was ever conceived of as a self-contained work.⁹

2. Is the Kāśikā indebted to the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa?

Cāndra-vyākaraṇa and Kāśikā contain a large number of similar or even identical passages. A priori this suggests one of the following three explanations: a) the former borrowed from the latter; b) the latter borrowed from the former; c) both borrowed, directly or indirectly, from a common source. I will not here consider the possibility that the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa borrowed from the Kāśikā; chronological considerations make this unlikely. How do we choose between the two remaining options?¹⁰

Personally I consider it a priori improbable that the Kāśikā — a commentary in the Pāṇinian tradition — should have as a major source a text like the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa, which belongs after all to a different grammatical tradition. Wouldn't one

⁹ Compare Anna Radicchi's (1985: 67) remark: "Nel Cāndravāyākaraṇa è generalmente rispettata la ripartizione nella presentazione della materia: i sūtra danno l'inquadramento teorico generale mentre la vṛtti raccoglie il lessico, ..."

¹⁰ Oberlies (1996: 272) makes the useful observation that one should "zunächst einmal die uns tatsächlich erhaltenen grammatischen Werke auf Abhängigkeiten (etc.) untersuchen, che man daran geht, die Existenz nun verloren gegangener Grammatiken zu postulieren". He seems to think that this observation might help to choose between options b) and c). I fail to see how it could possibly do so.

rather expect the Kāśikā to draw its inspiration primarily from the Pāṇinian tradition, [186] say from earlier commentaries on the Aṣṭādhyāyī?

Is there evidence that any such commentaries existed? I have presented some such evidence in an earlier publication (1983): the Kāśikā explicitly mentions an earlier Vṛtti, in which connection the Nyāsa mentions the names of Cūlli, Bhaṭṭi, Nallūra etc.; Bhartṛhari refers to earlier Vṛttikāras in his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, and mentions one by name ('Kuṇi').¹¹ But there is more evidence, some of which I will now present.

(i) The Vṛtti on CS 4.2.8 refers to an alternative interpretation of that sūtra, which it ascribes to 'others' (*anye*), and which agrees with the interpretation presented by the Kāśikā under the corresponding rule P. 5.2.5. Chronological considerations do not allow us to think that the Vṛtti here rejects the Kāśikā. This leaves only one possibility: both the Cāndra-Vṛtti and the Kāśikā found this opinion in another, earlier work, most probably belonging to the Pāṇinian tradition. Oberlies (1996: 285-86) agrees with this conclusion, but prefers to think — here and in some other cases — that the source of both Cāndra-Vṛtti and Kāśikā is a lost commentary (by Devanandin) on the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa.

I shall now discuss some passages from Bhartṛhari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya (the 'Dīpikā') which throw further light on our present question:

(ii) Consider first the line

yathā numgrahaṇam anusvāropalakṣaṇārtham
Like the use of *num* which serves to characterize an anusvāra

given in Bhartṛhari's commentary (Ms 9a8; CE I.22.11-12; AL 26.21; Sw 32.1). This line constitutes here an example, meant to illustrate Bhartṛhari's statement to the effect that *artha* in *arthasambandhe* is not used for its own sake, but in order to characterize the connection (*sambandhopalakṣaṇatvena*). Where did Bhartṛhari find this example?

The same line is found in the Kāśikā on P. 8.4.2 [187] (*aṭkupvāṇinumvyavāye 'pi*): *numgrahaṇam anusvāropalakṣaṇārtham draṣṭavyam*. It does not occur in the Mahābhāṣya,¹² nor, to my knowledge, in the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa. How to explain this?

¹¹ Cp. Bronkhorst, 1983: 382; Oberlies, 1996: 311 n. 150. Note that the Nyāsa (*vṛtṭiḥ Pāṇini-praṇītānām sūtrānām vivaraṇam Cūlli-Bhaṭṭi-Nallūrādiviracitam*) and the Padamañjarī (*Pāṇini-praṇītānām sūtrānām Kuṇi-prabhṛtibhīr viracitaṃ vivaraṇam*), both on the first introductory stanza of the Kāśikā, state explicitly that these names refer to commentators on Pāṇini's grammar.

¹² The Mahābhāṣya has twice *anusvāra-viśeṣaṇam numgrahaṇam* (Mahā-bh vol. I p. 29 l. 11; vol. III p. 454 l. 4, on P. 8.4.2).

It seems implausible that the Kāśikā should borrow an example from Bhartṛhari that occurs in an otherwise completely unrelated context. No, we must rather assume that Bhartṛhari borrowed his example from a work belonging to the Pāṇinian tradition — most probably a commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī — which was also used by the Kāśikā. He cannot have borrowed it from Devanandin's lost commentary on the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa, for the corresponding sūtra in this grammar (5.4.86) reads *aṭkupvānvyavāye 'pi*, without *num*.

(iii) Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya (Mahā-bh vol. I p. 6 l. 6-7) mentions in a discussion the two Pāṇinian sūtras *karmaṇy aṅ* (P. 3.2.1) and *āto 'nupasarge kaḥ* (P. 3.2.3). Bhartṛhari's commentary gives the following illustrations: *kumbhakāra* and *kāṇḍalāva* for P. 3.2.1; *pārṣṇitra* and *goda* for P. 3.2.3 (Ms 6b3; CE I.15.1-2; AL 17.13-14; Sw 22.7-8). All these examples are also given by the Kāśikā under the sūtras concerned. Moreover, *kumbhakāra* and *kāṇḍalāva* are mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya on P. 3.2.1, and in the Cāndra-Vṛtti under the corresponding rule CS 1.2.1. *Goda* does not occur in the Bhāṣya on P. 3.2.3, but the word is used a number of times elsewhere in the Mahābhāṣya; it is also mentioned in the Cāndra-Vṛtti under the rule corresponding to P. 3.2.3, i.e., under CS 1.2.2. But *pārṣṇitra* is mentioned neither in the Mahābhāṣya nor in the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa. Where did Bhartṛhari find this form?

We can again exclude the possibility that the Kāśikā borrowed this example from Bhartṛhari. Rather, Bhartṛhari uses here some known illustrations which he, apparently, found in an earlier commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī, which was used by the Kāśikā, too. The example *pārṣṇitra* also occurs in the Mahāvṛtti on sūtra 2.2.3 of the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa, which corresponds to P. 3.2.3, but this does not interfere with this conclusion.

(iv) Vt. 6 on P. 1.1.38 (*taddhitaś cāsarvavibhaktiḥ*) proposes to enumerate the *taddhita* formations that are *avyaya* 'indeclinable', and the Bhāṣya thereon actually does so, in the following passage (Mahā-bh vol. I p. 95 l. 9-11):

[188]

siddham tu pāthāt (vt. 6)

pāthād vā siddham etat/ katham pāthah kartavyah/ tasilādayah prāk pāśapah/ śasprabhṛtayah prāk samāsāntebhyah/ māntah/ kṛtvo'rthah/ tasivatī/ nānāāv iti/

But [the desired result] is obtained by enumeration. (vt. 6)

Or this [desired result] is obtained by enumeration. How must the enumeration be made? From *tasIL* until *pāśaP* (i.e. the *taddhita* suffixes taught in P. 5.3.7-46), from *śas* until the compound endings [taught in P. 5.4.42-67], [a suffix] which ends in *m* (i.e. *ām* and *am*, P. 5.4.11-12), [a suffix] which has the meaning of *kṛtvas* (P. 5.4.17-20), *tasI* and *vatI* (P. 4.3.113 and 5.1.115), *nā* and *nāÑ* (P. 5.2.27).

The passage in Bhartṛhari's commentary which discusses the above enumeration is unfortunately very corrupt, but the following partial reconstruction seems in the main correct (Ms 76c1-7; CE VI(2).6.18-25; AL 226.1-10):¹³

tasilādayaḥ prāk pāśapaḥ/ ... gaṇo 'py evaṃ paṭhyate/ tasilādis taddhita edhācpariyanta iti/ śasprabhṛtayaḥ prāk samāsāntebhya iti/ bahvalpārthācchas ity ataḥ prabhṛti yāvan madrāt parivāpaṇe dāc iti/ ... tasipratyayaś ca pratiyoge yaś ca tenaikadik tasiś ceti/ ās iṇa āsiś ceti ayā iti/ vārttike tu taddhitāḥ prakṛtā iti āsir na paṭhitāḥ/ thāl viśvemāt thāl iti ayam vārttike nopasamgrhītaḥ/ yatnas tu kriyate/ ya eva prakāravacane thāl chandasi sa eva pratnādibhya svārthe bhavatīti/ māntaḥ am ām/ kṛtvo'rthaḥ/ kṛtvasuc suc dhā/ tasivatī/ nānāṇau/ tathā tenaikadik tasiś ca/ vatīḥ/ tena tulyam kriyā ced vatīr iti/ gaṇe pātha etāvātām iti paṭhitam/
 'From *tasIL* until *pāśaP*.' ... **The gaṇa, too, reads like this:** 'The *taddhita* [suffixes] from *tasIL* until and including *edhāC* (i.e. P. 5.3.7-46). [The line in the Bhāṣya] 'from *śas* until the compound endings' [corresponds to the section] from [P. 5.4.42] *bahvalpārthāc chas* [*kārakād anyatarasyām*] until *DāC* [in P. 5.4.67] *madrāt parivāpaṇe*. The suffix *tasI* [in the gaṇa] is the one connected with *prati* (prescribed in P. 5.4.44 *pratiyoge pañcamyās tasiḥ*) as well as the one [prescribed] by [P. 4.3.112 and 113:] *tenaikadik* and *tasiś ca*. [The suffix] *ās* [is prescribed in the Uṇādi sūtra] *iṇa āsiś ca* [which gives rise to the form] *ayās*.¹⁴ But [the Uṇādi (and therefore *kṛt*) suffix] *āsI* is not read in the Mahābhāṣya¹⁵ because *taddhita* [suffixes] are under discussion [there]. [189] [The suffix] *thāl* [prescribed by P. 5.3.111 *pratnapūrva-*] *viśvemāt thāl* [*chandasi*] is not included in the Mahābhāṣya. But an effort is made [to include it] as follows: 'The same [suffix] *thāl* [prescribed by P. 5.3.23] when expressing manner (*prakāravacane*) is the one which comes, in Sacred Language, after [the words] *pratna* etc. (in accordance with P. 5.3.111), in their own meaning.' [What is described in the Bhāṣya as] 'ending in *m*' are *am* and *ām*. 'Having the meaning of *kṛtvas*' are *kṛtvasUC*, *sUC*, and *dhā*. '*tasI* and *vatI*, *nā* and *nāṅ*' [in the Bhāṣya]: [*tasI* is prescribed by P. 4.3.112 and 113] *tenaikadik* and *tasiś ca*. *vatI* [is prescribed by P. 5.1.115] *tena tulyam kriyā ced vatīḥ*. **There is enumeration of this many in the gaṇa;** thus it is read.

We see that Bhartṛhari, while primarily commenting on the enumeration of indeclinables in the Mahābhāṣya, makes use of a gaṇa he knows, and which contains more than just what is enumerated in the Bhāṣya. Bhartṛhari himself states in so many words that *āsI* and *thāl* are not read in the 'Vārttika', i.e., in the Bhāṣya. The gaṇa known to Bhartṛhari seems, moreover, to have contained the phrases *tasilādis taddhita edhācpariyantaḥ*; it also had *tasI*, *ās* and *thāl*, in that order.

The gaṇa known to Bhartṛhari appears to be very close to the one contained in the Kāśikā on P. 1.1.37 (*svarādinipātam avyayam*), which has: *tasilādiḥ taddhita edhācpariyantaḥ, śastasi, kṛtvasuc, suc, āsthālau, cvyarthās ca, am, ām*. The Cāndra-vyākaraṇa, on the other hand, does not, to my knowledge, contain anything like it. The

¹³ This reconstruction differs in several respects from the ones in the two published editions.

¹⁴ The sūtra *iṇa āsiḥ* or *iṇaś cāsiḥ* is present in the surviving versions of the Uṇādi Sūtra. Not all commentaries mention that *ayās* is an indeclinable; an exception is Mahādeva's Uṇādikośa 4.221.

¹⁵ On the use of 'Vārttika' in order to refer to the Mahābhāṣya, see Bronkhorst, 1990.

Mahāvṛtti on Jainendra-vyākaraṇa 1.1.74 contains an enumeration corresponding to the one accompanying P. 1.1.37, but nothing remotely resembling Bhartṛhari's words can be found in it. Again we are led to believe that Bhartṛhari and the Kāśikā made use of the same earlier text; since our earliest source of Pāṇinian gaṇas is the Kāśikā, a commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī, we may assume that this earlier text used by both Bhartṛhari and the Kāśikā, too, was a commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī.

The preceding examples indicate that Bhartṛhari used a commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī which was also used by the Kāśikā. But we know that Bhartṛhari knew more than just one such commentary. At times he may have followed another commentary than the one that influenced the Kāśikā, or simply deviated from [190] the latter. The following example belongs to this category. It also shows that the Kāśikā, though almost identical with the Cāndra-Vṛtti, cannot in this case have borrowed from the latter.

(v) In the course of a discussion in the first Āhnika of his commentary (Ms 8a8-9; CE I.19.17-18; AL 23.4-5; Sw 28.1-2) Bhartṛhari gives the following example:

*tad yathā/ gaṅgā hi rūpeṇāśritā tannāmikā 'ṇam utpādayati gāṅga iti/
devatādirupeṇāśrīyamānā dhakam gāṅgeya iti/
For example, [the river] Gaṅgā when referred to in its own form, having that
(i.e. 'Gaṅgā') as its name, produces¹⁶ [the suffix] aṅ, [which gives rise to] gāṅga
'son of Gaṅgā'. When it is being referred to as the goddess etc. [of that name, it
produces the suffix] dhaK, [which gives rise to] gāṅgeya.*

The occurrence of *tannāmikā* in the first half of this passage shows that Bhartṛhari derives *gāṅga* with the help of P. 4.1.113 *avṛddhābhyo nadīmānuṣībhyas tannāmikābhyaḥ*. This is interesting because the Kāśikā lists *gaṅgā* under P. 4.1.112 *śivādibhyo 'ṇ*, and does not use P. 4.1.113 in the derivation of *gāṅga*. Apparently Bhartṛhari did not find *gaṅgā* in the gaṇa *śivādi*, in the commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī which he decided to follow in this respect.

Consider now the following explanation in the Kāśikā under P. 4.1.112:

*gaṅgāśabdah paṭhyate tikādiphīṇā śubhrādīdhakā ca samāveśārtham/ tena
trairūpyam bhavati/ gāṅgaḥ/ gāṅgāyaṇiḥ/ gāṅgeyaḥ/
The word gāṅgā is listed [in the gaṇa śiva etc.] in order to include [the suffix aṅ]
along with [the suffix] phiṅ on account of [gāṅgā being included in the gaṇa]
tika etc. (P. 4.1.154) and with [the suffix] dhaK on account of [gāṅgā being*

¹⁶ This mode of expression is once connected with Āpīśali in the Mahābhāṣya (vol. II p. 281 l. 3-5; on P. 4.2.45 ślokavṛ. 2): *tathā cāpīśaler vidhiḥ/ dhenur anāñi kam utpādayati/ dhenūnām samūho dhainukam/* It also occurs elsewhere, e.g. in the Nyāsa (vol. III p. 332 l. 27-28, on P. 4.1.41; vol. IV p. 117 l. 29, on P. 5.1.129) and in the Padamañjarī (vol. III p. 405 l. 18, on P. 4.1.86). Compare in this connection Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's Tantravārttika on MīS 3.4.13, p. 368: *karaṇatvam evedam uktena nyāyena kartṛvavat svām vibhaktim notpādayati*; and p. 369: *... tad eva siddhaphalatvāt phalabhūtām vibhaktim anutpādayad api śiṣṭāni punar utpādayiṣyanti*.

included in the gaṇa] *śubhra* etc. (P. 4.1.123). There are therefore three forms: *gāṅga* (with *aṅ*), *gāṅgāyani* [191] (with *phiṅ*), *gāṅgeya* (with *ḍhaK*).

Since we know (Bronkhorst, 1983: 373 f.) that the Kāśikā did not tamper with gaṇas, we must conclude that it found the word *gāṅgā* in the gaṇa *śivādi* already in the earlier commentary. Yet the above passage reads more or less like a justification of the presence of *gāṅgā* in *śivādi*. Does this justification make sense? Doesn't Bhartṛhari succeed equally well in deriving *gāṅga*, without a mention of *gāṅgā* in *śivādi*? Why didn't the Kāśikā, like Bhartṛhari, derive *gāṅga* with the help of P. 4.1.113 *avṛddhābhyo nadīmānuṣībhyas tannāmikābhyaḥ*? The reason is found under P. 4.1.121 *dvyacaḥ*, which is, according to the Kāśikā, an exception to P. 4.1.113. P. 4.1.121 prescribes *ḍhaK* (= *eya*) after words of two syllables ending in a feminine suffix. This would account for *gāṅgeya*, but — 4.1.121 being an exception to 4.1.113 — would at the same time exclude the form *gāṅga*. The Kāśikā — or rather, the commentary which it follows — solves the problem by avoiding both the sūtras 4.1.113 and 121 in this connection. *Gāṅga* is now derived by P. 4.1.112 *śivādibhyo 'ṅ*, *gāṅgeya* by P. 4.1.123 *śubhrādibhyaś ca*. This is accomplished by adding the term *gāṅgā* to both the appropriate gaṇas. (Note in passing that for Bhartṛhari and his example P. 4.1.121 cannot have been an exception to P. 4.1.113.)

Interestingly, the Cāndra-Vṛtti on CS 2.4.41 (which corresponds to P. 4.1.112) agrees with the Kāśikā. We read here:

*gāṅgāśabdād iha pāthād aṅ: gāṅgaḥ/ śubhrādipāthād ḍhak: gāṅgeyaḥ/
tikādipāthāt phiṅ: gāṅgāyaniḥ/*

But here we find no explanation whatsoever of this derivation of *gāṅga*. Nor do we find any indication that CS 2.4.51 (*dvyacaḥ*; = P. 4.1.121) is an exception to CS 2.4.42 (*nadīmānuṣīnāmno 'nādaijādyacaḥ*; ≠ P. 4.1.113). So why did the Cāndra-Vṛtti include *gāṅgā* in the gaṇa *śivādi*? Apparently for no other reason than that it found the word there in one of the commentaries on the Aṣṭādhyāyī it followed. It is therefore not possible to maintain that the Kāśikā here simply borrowed from the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa. Quite on the contrary, in order to understand what underlies the procedure of the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa in this case, we have to consult the Kāśikā, which better preserves the information contained in the earlier commentary which influenced the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa.

[192]

The Mahāvṛtti on Jainendra-vyākaraṇa 3.1.101 contains some lines which correspond in their content with the lines from the Kāśikā cited above. The most probable conclusion to be drawn from this is that the Mahāvṛtti was influenced, directly

or indirectly, by the same early commentary that also influenced the Cāndra-Vṛtti and the Kāśikā.

We cannot overestimate the importance of Bhartṛhari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, a closer study of which might bring to light much more evidence pertaining to the questions we are investigating. The above examples must, for the time being, suffice. They show clearly, as it seems to me, that any misgivings about the existence of pre-Candra commentaries on the Aṣṭādhyāyī, and their influence on Kāśikā and Cāndra-vyākaraṇa, are without foundation.

(vi) The contents of two sūtras of Candra correspond to a verse in the Kāśikā. The two sūtras read:

CS 4.4.72: *pāṇḍūdakkṛṣṇād bhūmeḥ*

After [compounds ending in] *bhūmi* preceded by *pāṇḍu* etc., [comes the *samāsānta*-suffix *ac*].

CS 4.4.73: *saṅkhyāyā nadīgodāvaryoś ca*

After [compounds ending in] *nadī*, *godāvarī* and [*bhūmi*] preceded by a numeral, [comes the *samāsānta*-suffix *ac*].

The Cāndra-Vṛtti gives as examples: *pāṇḍubhūmaḥ*, *udagbhūmaḥ*, *kṛṣṇabhūmaḥ* (for 4.4.72), and *pañcanadam*, *saptagodāvaram*, *dvibhūmaḥ prāsādaḥ*, *daśabhūmakaṃ sūtram* (for 4.4.73).

The Kāśikā on P. 5.4.75 contains the following verse:

*kṛṣṇodakpāṇḍupūrvāyā bhūmer acpratyayaḥ smṛtaḥ/
godāvaryoś ca nadyoś ca saṅkhyāyā uttare yadi//*

This justifies the following examples: *kṛṣṇabhūmaḥ*, *pāṇḍubhūmaḥ*, *udagbhūmaḥ*, *pañcanadam*, *pañcagodāvaram*. However, the examples *dvibhūmaḥ prāsādaḥ* and *daśabhūmakaṃ sūtram* are not covered by this verse, yet they are desired. The Kāśikā, therefore, adds the line: *bhūmer api saṅkhyāpūrvāyāḥ acpratyaya iṣyate*, followed by these two examples.

The question is: did the Kāśikā in this case borrow from the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa? One argument pleads in favour of this position: [193] *daśabhūmakaṃ sūtram* looks like a Buddhist expression. However, if we accept this position, we must not only assume that the author of the Kāśikā at times wrote in verse, but that he was not capable of formulating the verse — which has already twice the number of syllables as the two sūtras of Candra combined — in such a manner as to express the same meaning as those two sūtras; he has to add an iṣṭi in simple prose. Borrowing in the other direction seems far more likely. That is to say, the verse appears to have preceded both Candra and the

Kāśikā. Either Candra or someone before him realized that the examples *dvibhūma* and *daśabhūma* should also be included. Candra managed to express the new situation very elegantly in two short sūtras. The Kāśikā preserved the verse but, following either Candra or the earlier unknown grammarian, added the above line. In any case it seems more than likely that both Candra and the Kāśikā were influenced by the same earlier grammarian.

The Mahāvṛtti (under Jainendra-vyākaraṇa 4.2.71) cites the same verse as the Kāśikā, but instead of adding an iṣṭi so as to justify the forms *dvibhūma* and *saptabhūma*, it derives this justification from the word *ca* in the verse (*cakārād bhūmir api bhavati*). It does not give the example *daśabhūmakam sūtram*. One might be tempted to conclude from this that the Kāśikā borrowed this verse from the Mahāvṛtti, but the arguments presented above suggest that the verse and its examples are older than the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa and therefore much older than the Mahāvṛtti. It is not therefore necessary to assume that the Kāśikā borrowed in this case from the latter.

(vii) Wilhelm Rau (1996: 336) makes the following observation: "[CS] 4.4.119 *saṃprāḥ jānuno jñāḥ* [ist] gegen [P.] 5.4.129 [*prasambhyāṃ jānunor jñuḥ*]. M.W. ist dies die älteste Stelle, wo das Ungetüm auftaucht. Das Mahābhāṣya hat nichts zur Sache. Im Vākyapadīya 2.220 wiederholen sämtliche (!) kārikā-Mss den Fehler, dagegen bleiben der Amarakośa 2.6.47 und die Kāśikā 5.4.129 beim richtigen, ohne verhindern zu können, dass spätere [Candra's] Irrtum am Leben erhalten."

The Cāndra-vyākaraṇa prescribes *prajñā* instead of *prajñu*, and *saṃjñā* instead of *saṃjñu*. Vkp 2.220ab reads: *prajñāsaṃjñādyavayavair na cāsty arthāvadhāraṇam*. The editor has corrected the first compound into *prajñusaṃjñādyavayavair*, in the light of P. 5.4.129, but points out in a note that this emendation goes against [194] all (!) mss. The temptation is great to conclude that Bhartṛhari knew P. 5.4.129 in a slightly different form — perhaps *prasambhyāṃ jānunor jñāḥ* — which was also the reading known to Candra. Since the Kāśikā has this sūtra in its correct form, we may have to conclude that in this case the Kāśikā follows another sūtra reading — and therefore another commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī — than the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa. It certainly does not borrow here from the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa, which has the incorrect sūtra *saṃprāḥ jānuno jñāḥ* (4.2.130). The Mahāvṛtti first gives the two incorrect forms *saṃjñā* and *prajñā*, then observes that according to some *-jñu* should be used instead of *-jñā*. However, both opinions, according to the Mahāvṛtti, are correct. (*jñā ity ukārāntaḥ keṣāṃcid ādeśaḥ/matadvayam api pramāṇam*)

(viii) To conclude this section a few words must be said about the form of P. 3.3.122. We start from Kielhorn's brief observation regarding the form of this sūtra in the Mahābhāṣya (1885: 192-193 [195-196]; 1887: 181 [229]; I quote from the 1887 article):

P. III.3,122 *adhyāyanyāyodyāvasaṃhārādhārāvāyās ca* originally did not contain the words *ādhāra* and *āvāya*, which have been inserted from Kātyāyana's Vārttika on the preceding rule (Vol. II. p. 155). The word *avahāra*, which is mentioned in the same Vārttika, is in the Kāśikā given in the commentary on P. III.3,122. In the Mahābhāṣya, Vol. II. p. 146, l. 20, where the rule has been quoted, the MSS. give it as read in the Kāśikā, excepting that the MS. K omits from it *ādhāra*. Kaiyaṭa on P. III.3,121 has the remark — *adhyāyasūtra ādhārāvāyaśabdau vārttike darśanād abhiyuktaiḥ prakṣiptau*.

This laconic passage presents a real and serious problem. Do we have to assume that Patañjali himself changed the sūtra? He never does anything like it. And even if we assume that here, exceptionally, he interfered physically with the wording of a sūtra, why didn't he include *avahāra*? Or must we, alternatively, believe that the Kāśikā presents us the sūtra in its original form? In that case P. 3.3.121 vt. 1 becomes unintelligible. Neither of these two alternatives is therefore satisfactory.

There is however a third alternative. Thanks to the researches of V.P. Limaye, W. Rau and M. Witzel we now know what was not yet known to Kielhorn, viz., that the surviving mss. of the Mahābhāṣya (or at any rate the ones used for Kielhorn's edition) all go back to an archetype that may date from around 1000 C.E. [195] (see Bronkhorst, 1987: 14 f.). This archetype may have been contaminated, "improved upon", by the then standard reading of Pāṇinian sūtras. A rule like P. 3.3.122, which is only once cited in the Mahābhāṣya, would be particularly vulnerable to such "improvements".

This is a hypothetical solution, yet it is the only one which satisfactorily explains the situation. If it is correct, we must believe that someone after Patañjali and before the Kāśikā added the words *ādhāra* and *āvāya* to P. 3.3.122, but not *avahāra*. The Cāndra-Vṛtti on CS 1.3.101 has the list with *ādhāra* and *āvāya*, and without *avahāra*! Candra did not borrow his list from the Mahābhāṣya, because we now think that the Mahābhāṣya did not contain it. Nor did he borrow it from the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa (2.3.103), which has a different list, containing *āvāya* and *avahāra*, but not *ādhāra*. Inevitable conclusion: Candra borrowed his list from an earlier, but post-Patañjalian, work in the Pāṇinian tradition, the same work, probably, from which the Kāśikā borrowed P. 3.3.122 in its present form.

3. The geographical location and date of the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa.

In order to discover the geographical location of the author(s) of the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa we must make use of the "second index fossil" drawn attention to by H. Scharfe (1976). The relevant discussion in the Cāndra-Vṛtti concerns the use of the two future tenses *lṛt* (first future) and *luṭ* (second future). *lṛt* is prescribed for the future in general (CS 1.3.2), *luṭ* for the future other than today's (CS 1.3.3). The Vṛtti on CS 1.3.106 gives further clarifications; the for us important part reads:

*maryādāvacanābhāve 'pi viprakarṣaparavād vivakṣāyā anadyatanavidhir
bhavaty eva/ yo 'yam adhvā niravadhiko gantavyas tasya yad avaraṃ
kauśāmbiās tatraudanaṃ bhoktāsmāhe/*

If no limit is expressed, the rule regarding "not that same day" (CS 1.3.3) is certainly [applied], because **distance is intended to be expressed**. [An example is:] "The **limitless road** that must be traversed — on the part of it which is this side of Kauśāmbī we shall eat (*bhoktāsmāhe*; second future) rice."

[196]

Distance is intended to be expressed by the verbal form *bhoktāsmāhe*. Yet this verb is used only in connection with the early part of the journey, between 'here' and Kauśāmbī. The example also makes mention of a "limitless road", and this cannot but concern the part from 'here' to Kauśāmbī as much as the part beyond Kauśāmbī. For this expression is added in order to bring out the sense of the second future; it is absent in the parallel example concerning the first future. It follows that a limitless road separates Kauśāmbī from the position of the author of the Vṛtti. And even though no precise conclusions can be drawn from this information, it is none-the-less justified to think that the distance from the position of the author to Kauśāmbī was considerable. It excludes an area too close to Kauśāmbī, as proposed by Scharfe.¹⁷

Scharfe's discussion of this "index fossil" is marred by the fact that his comparative treatment of it in a number of grammatical texts made him lose sight of the introductory phrase reproduced above, which does not appear to introduce the "index fossil" in any of the other texts. Yet this phrase, as we have seen, is of vital importance for understanding the precise significance of the example in the Cāndra-Vṛtti. Scharfe makes a further mistake: the fact that some of the other grammarians specify "that they would eat **twice** on the first leg of their respective journeys" (my emphasis) leads him to the conclusion that Candra, who does **not** add this specification, lived a one day journey away from Kauśāmbī. This conclusion does not only sin against "the distance

¹⁷ For further inferences regarding Candra's location, see Bronkhorst, 1983: 397. Aklujkar (1991: 26-27 n. 6d) thinks that the view there expressed "is partly based on what Scharfe thought to be justified"; he further sees some (remote) similarities with the ideas of Satyakama Varma. Aklujkar disagrees with both these authors (as I do), and concludes: "Bronkhorst's composite view, therefore, stands doubly refuted and need not be discussed separately." I hope that the present exposition will allow Aklujkar to arrive at a better understanding of my point of view.

intended to be expressed" and "the limitless road", but also against "the rule regarding 'not that same day'".¹⁸

We turn to the date of the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa. Since Sūtra and Vṛtti were apparently composed more or less simultaneously, evidence derived from the Vṛtti is valid for the Cāndra-Sūtra too. The Cāndra-Vṛtti cites Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa and [197] Kumārasambhava (Oberlies, 1989: 13; Rau, 1996: 337).¹⁹ The concluding verses of the Vākyapadīya-Vṛtti mention "Ācārya Candra and others".²⁰ They further suggest that Bhartrhari is later than Candra 'etc.' The Vākyapadīya-Vṛtti, in its turn, is older than Dignāga. This provides the following chronological sequence:

Kālidāsa
Cāndra-vyākaraṇa
Bhartrhari
Vākyapadīya-Vṛtti
Dignāga

These different author and works must probably all be placed in a period of at most one hundred years, most of it in the fifth century. If it is true that at least the first four of these were located in more or less the same area in the west of India, this chronological proximity is in no way problematic.

4. Conclusions.

The conclusions to be drawn from the above material are not very different from those presented in my 1983 article. And indeed, the aim of this article was not to present new findings, but to better support earlier conclusions. It can now with more certainty than before be maintained that Cāndra-Sūtra and Cāndra-Vṛtti — even though different authorship of these two works cannot altogether be ruled out — must be looked upon as belonging together, as essentially one work conceived as such right from the beginning. It has also been more satisfactorily established that the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa and the Kāśikā shared at least one earlier source (other than the Mahābhāṣya and the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa). This does not, of course, exclude the possibility that the Kāśikā knew the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa, but decisive evidence to that effect is not known to me.²¹ One might

¹⁸ For further criticism of Scharfe's discussion, see Aklujkar, 1991: 29-30 n. 11.

¹⁹ See also Hahn, 1992: 93. For a recent discussion of Kālidāsa's date, see Bansat-Boudon, 1996: 19-28.

²⁰ See Bronkhorst, 1988: 111, which states the reasons for believing that these verses belong to the Vākyapadīya-Vṛtti. It can of course not be proved with absolute certainty that the Candra here mentioned is the author of the Cāndra-Sūtra, and the identification is not self-evident. Yet the strong influence of the Mahābhāṣya on the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa agrees with this identification.

²¹ Oberlies (1996) finds fault with this remark (p. 271 n. 17), and turns the situation on its head on p. 314: "[Es] wird deutlich geworden sein, dass es keinen zwingenden Grund gibt zu zweifeln, dass Cāndrasūtra/-

in this connection cite, with Oberlies (1989: 10), the [198] example *yenāgnis tena gataḥ*, found both in the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa (on CS 2.2.8) and the Kāśikā (on P. 2.1.14). This seems no doubt "typical Buddhist idiom", even though it may not be completely unknown to Brahmanical literature.²² It is however to be noted that this idiom occurs, in Buddhist Sanskrit literature, almost exclusively with *upa-sam-kram*, *upa-gam*, and *upa-i*, and probably never with only *gam*.²³ Of slightly (but how much?) more weight may be the expression *daśabhūmakam sūtram* considered above, and the expression *ajaryam āryasaṃgatam* (which resembles Āryaśūra's Jātakamālā 22.88) both in the Cāndra-vṛtti (on CS 1.1.116) and in the Kāśikā (on P. 3.1.105).²⁴ It is, finally, hoped that a misinterpretation introduced into the "second index fossil" by Scharfe has now been cleared away.

References

- Aklujkar, Ashok (1991): "Interpreting Vākyapadīya 2.486 historically (part 3)." In: Pāṇinian Studies. Professor S.D. Joshi Felicitation Volume. Ed. Madhav M. Deshpande and Saroja Bhate. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan. Pp. 1-47.
- Bansat-Boudon, Lyne (1996): Le théâtre de Kālidāsa. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1983): "On the history of Pāṇinian grammar in the early centuries following Patañjali." Journal of Indian Philosophy 11, 357-412.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1985): "On the chronology of the Tattvārtha Sūtra and some early commentaries." Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde [199] Südasiens 29, 155-184.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1987): Three Problems Pertaining to the Mahābhāṣya. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Post-graduate and Research Department Series No. 30. "Pandit Shripad Shastri Deodhar Memorial Lectures" [Third series].)
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1988): "Études sur Bharṭṛhari, 1: L'auteur et la date de la Vṛtti." Bulletin d'Études Indiennes 6, 105-143.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1990): "Vārttika." Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 34, 123-146.
- Dash, Prafulla Chandra (1986): A Comparative Study of the Pāṇinian and Cāndra Systems of Grammar (Kṛdanta Portion). New Delhi: Ramanand Vidya Bhawan.
- Edgerton, Franklin (1953): Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary. Volume I: Grammar. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1977.
- Gnoli, Raniero (ed.) (1960): The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti. The first chapter with the autocommentary. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente. (Serie Orientale Roma, XXIII.)
- Hahn, Michael (1992): "Über den indirekten Beweis bei literaturhistorischen Fragestellungen." Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 36, 91-103.

vṛtti ... der Kāśikā bekannt [war]. Es bleibt daher zu hoffen, dass zukünftig diese Abhängigkeit nur auf Grund wirklicher schlüssiger Indizien in Frage gestellt werden wird ..."

²² Consider, e.g., Mahābhārata (crit. ed.) 14.16.41: *acirāt tu gamiṣyāmi yenāhaṃ tvām acūcudam*. This might be translated: "But I will soon go [there], where I just urged you to go."

²³ See Simson, 1977. [Added in proofs: Sn 786 has *sa kena gaccheyya*. For further examples see BHSD s.v. *yena, yena-kāma*]

²⁴ Cp. Rau, 1996: 335. Note that both CS 1.1.116 and P. 3.1.105 read: *ajaryam saṃgatam*. The example *ajaryam āryasaṃgatam* may have been invented by any commentator, and the influence of *ajaryam hy āryasaṃgatam* in the Jātakamālā is far from certain.

- Jainendra-vyākaraṇa. The following edition has been used: Jainendra Vyākaraṇam by Puyapāda Devanandi with Jainendra Mahāvṛtti of Shri Abhayanandi. Éd. Shambhu Nath Tripathi. Kāshī: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha. (Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā, Samskrit Grantha no. 17.)
- Kāśikā. 1) Ed. Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D.G. Padhye. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University. 2 vol. 1969-70. 2) Ed., with the Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhipāda and the Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra, by Swami Dwarika Das Shastri and Pt. Kalika Prasad Shukla. Varanasi: Prachya Bharati Prakashan. 6 vol. 1965 f.
- Kielhorn, F. (1885): "Der Grammatiker Pāṇini." Nachrichten von der K. G. d. W. zu Göttingen 5, 185-199. Repr.: Kleine Schriften I (Wiesbaden, 1969) pp. 188-202.
- Kielhorn, F. (1887): "Notes on the Mahabhashya, 6. The text of Panini's Sutras, as given in the Kasika-Vṛtti, compared with the text known to Katyayana and Patanjali." Indian Antiquary 16, 178-184. Repr.: Kleine Schriften I (Wiesbaden, 1969) pp. 226-232.
- Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: Tantravārttika. In: *Śrīmaj-Jaimini-praṇīte Mīmāṃsādarśane sampūrṇas tṛtīyo 'dhyāyaḥ, Bhaṭṭa-Kumārila-praṇīta-Tantravārttika-sahita-Sābarabhāṣyopetaḥ, ... Kāśinātha Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyamkara ... tathā Gaṇeśaśāstrī Jośī ... ity etaiḥ pāṭhabhedatippaṇyādibhiḥ sahitaṃ punaḥ saṃśodhitam*. Poona: Ānandāśrama. 1984.
- [200]
- Liebich, Bruno (1928): Konkordanz Panini - Candra. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus. (Indische Forschungen, 6.)
- Mahādeva Vedāntin: Uṇādikośa. Edited, with the Uṇādi sūtras and full glossarial index, by K. Kunjunni Raja. University of Madras. 1956. (Madras University Sanskrit Series, 21.)
- Maṇḍana Miśra: Brahmasiddhi. Edited, with Śaṅkhaṇi's commentary, by S. Kuppuswami Sastri. Second edition. Delhi: Sri Śatguru Publications. 1984. (Sri Garib Das Oriental Series, 16.)
- Nyāsa. See Kāśikā.
- Oberlies, Thomas (1989): Studie zum Cāndravvyākaraṇa. Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV.4.52-148 und V.2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, 38.)
- Oberlies, Thomas (1996): "Das zeitliche und ideengeschichtliche Verhältnis der Cāndra-Vṛtti zu anderen V(ai)yākaraṇas (Studien zum Cāndravvyākaraṇa III)." StII 20 (Festschrift Paul Thieme), 265-317.
- Padamañjarī. See Kāśikā.
- Radicchi, Anna (1985): La teoria pāṇiniana dei Samāsa secondo l'interpretazione delle scuole grammaticali indiane dal quinto all'ottavo secolo d.C. Parte prima. Firenze: Elite. (Materiali dell'Istituto di Glottologia, Università di Cagliari, Anno accademico 1982-1983.)
- Rau, Wilhelm (1996): "Die vedischen Zitate in der Candra-Vṛtti." StII 20 (Festschrift Paul Thieme), 327-338.
- Scharfe, Hartmut (1976): "A second 'index fossil' of Sanskrit grammarians." Journal of the American Oriental Society 96, 274-277.
- Simson, Georg von (1977): "Zur Phrase yena ... tenopajagāma/upetya und ihren Varianten im buddhistischen Sanskrit." Beiträge zur Indieforschung. Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag. Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst. Pp. 479-488.

Abbreviations

AL	Edition of Bharṭṛhari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya ("Mahābhāṣyadīpikā") by K.V. Abhyankar and V.P. Limaye, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1970
CE	"Critical edition" of Bharṭṛhari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya ("Mahābhāṣyadīpikā") by various scholars, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1983-1991
CS	Cāndra-Sūtra; ed. B. Liebich, Candra-Vṛtti, Leipzig 1918.
Mahā-bh [201]	Patañjali, (Vyākaraṇa-)Mahābhāṣya, ed. F. Kielhorn, Bombay 1880-1885
Ms	Manuscript of Bharṭṛhari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya ("Mahābhāṣyadīpikā") reproduced, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1980
P.	Pāṇinian sūtra
Sw	Edition of Bharṭṛhari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya ("Mahābhāṣyadīpikā") by V. Swaminathan, Benaras Hindu University, 1965
Vkp	Bharṭṛhari, Vākyapadīya, ed. W. Rau, Wiesbaden 1977
vt.	vārttika
YS	Yoga Sūtra