

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

MORE ON THE SOURCES OF THE KĀŚIKĀ*

(published in: *Problems in Vedic and Sanskrit Literature* (Ganesh Umakant Thite Felicitation Volume), ed. Maitreyee Deshpande, Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation, 2004, pp. 47-54)

The claim that the Kāśikā-vṛtti — the oldest surviving commentary on the whole of Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī — often drew its inspiration (in the form of sentences or examples) from the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa and from Devanandin's commentary on the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa has been discussed in another publication (Bronkhorst, 2002). It has there been shown that various passages from Bhartṛhari's work favour a different position: The Kāśikā rather borrowed from one or more earlier commentaries in the Pāṇinian tradition; these same commentaries on Pāṇini's grammar also influenced the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa and commentators in the traditions of the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa. This article will study evidence from an altogether different source.

Brahmasūtra 1.1.13 (for some commentators 1.1.14) is the second sūtra in the section which is sometimes called the Ānandamayādhikaraṇa, the Adhikaraṇa which deals with the description of Brahma as *ānandamaya*. Sūtra 1.1.12 mentions this term explicitly (*ānandamayo 'bhyāsāt*). The immediately following sūtra 1.1.13 has the form: *vikāraśabdān neti cen na prācuryāt*. If we accept that this sūtra does indeed deal with the word *ānandamaya*, in which the suffix *maya* has been added to *ānanda*, it becomes relevant to know that the suffix *maya* (*mayaT* in Pāṇini's grammar) can express the meaning *vikāra* — precisely the term used in the Brahmasūtra — according to Pāṇini. The Pāṇinian sūtra concerned is P. 4.3.144: *nityam vṛddhaśarādibhyaḥ*. This means, in view of its context: “[The suffix *mayaT* (143)] comes invariably after a *vṛddha* word and after *śara* etc. [in the two meanings (143) *vikāra* (134) and *avayava* (135)].” A word being *vṛddha* — by P. 1.1.73: *vṛddhir yasyācām ādis tad vṛddham* — when its first vowel is *vṛddhi* (i.e. *ā*, *ai*, or *au*), it seems clear that *ānandamaya* has been, or could have been, formed with the help of P. 4.3.144.

In the light of these reflections, Brahmasūtra 1.1.13/14 may therefore mean:

vikāraśabdān neti cen na prācuryāt

“If [you maintain that *ānandamaya* can] not [describe Brahma] because [the suffix *mayaT*] is expressive of modification (*vikāra*), [the answer is that this is] not [correct], because of the [meaning] ‘abundance’ [expressed by the suffix].”

* Even though it may be true that the “modern period in the history of Indology is characterized by hair-splitting, repetition, exhibitionism, over-perfection, obscurity and staleness” (Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 82, 2001 [2002], p. 312), it is hoped that the present detailed investigation will not displease Professor Thite whom it is meant to honour.

It seems therefore likely that Brahmasūtra 1.1.13 deals with a grammatical problem, even if it is not immediately clear what the precise justification of “because of the [meaning] ‘abundance’ [expressed by the suffix *mayaṭ*]” (*prācuryāt*) might be.¹

The classical commentators on the Brahmasūtra interpret the sūtra as indicated above. Śaṅkara does so in the following words:

[48]

*atrāha: nānandamayaḥ para ātmā bhavitum arhati/ kasmāt? vikāraśabdāt/
prakṛtivacanād ayam anyaḥ śabdo vikāravacanaḥ samadhigataḥ, ānandamaya iti,
mayaḥ vikārārthatvāt/ tasmād annamayādiśabdavad vikāraṣaye evānandamayaśabda
iti cet/ na/ prācurye ‘pi mayataḥ smaraṇāt/ “tatprakṛtavacane mayat” (P. 5.4.21) iti hi
pracuratāyām api mayat smaryate/ yathā ‘annamayo yajña’ ity annapracura ucyate,
evam ānandapracuraṃ brahmānandamaya ucyate/*

“It is objected that the highest self should not be *ānandamaya*. Why so? ‘Because [the suffix *mayaṭ*] is expressive of modification’: Because — given that in the word *ānandamaya*, after the word expressive of the origin to be modified (*prakṛti*), another element (*maya*) expressive of modification has been understood with it — *mayaṭ* has the meaning ‘modification’. Therefore the word *ānandamaya* [is used], just like the word *annamaya* etc., in the sense ‘modification’.

[This is] not [correct]. Because *mayaṭ* is known from tradition also to express abundance (*prācurya*).² For *mayaṭ* is taught to have the meaning ‘abundance’ in [P. 5.4.21] *tatprakṛtavacane mayat*. Just as a sacrifice that is abundant in food is called *annamaya*, in the same way Brahma, which is abundant in bliss (*ānanda*), is called *ānandamaya*.”

Bhāskara has the following to say about this sūtra:

*vikārārthavācino mayatpratyayasya darśanād annamayādivad amukhya
ātmānandamaya iti cet na prācuryārthe ‘pi mayaḥ vidhānāt/*

“If [you object] that the self is only secondarily (*amukhyaḥ*) *ānandamaya* because it is seen that the suffix *mayaṭ* is expressive of the meaning ‘modification’, [the answer is that this is] not [the case], because *mayaṭ* is also prescribed in the meaning ‘abundance’ (*prācurya*).”

Rāmānuja’s Śrībhāṣya introduces the sūtra, here numbered 1.1.14, with the following words:

¹ Sharma (1971: 96 ff.) does not mention the grammatical dimension of this sūtra; Renou (1957: 123 & 131 [471; 409 & 417]) does.

² Elsewhere (on Brahmasūtra 1.1.19) both Śaṅkara and Bhāskara explain *prācurya* as *prāyāpatti*; see Rüping, 1977: 10-11.

āha: nāyam ānandamayo jīvād anyaḥ, vikāraśabdasya mayaṭpratyayasya śravaṇāt/
“mayaḍ vaiṭayoḥ ...” iti prakṛtya, “nityaṃ vṛddhaśarādibhyaḥ” (P. 4.3.143-144) iti
vikārārthe mayaṭ smaryate/ vṛddhaś cāyam ānandaśabdaḥ/ nanu prācurye ‘pi mayaḍ
asti, “tatprakṛtavacane mayaṭ” (P. 5.4.21) iti smrteḥ/ yathā ‘annamayo yajñāḥ’ iti/ sa
evāyaṃ bhaviṣyati/

After reproducing an objection Rāmānuja continues:

tad etad anubhāṣya pariharati:

vikāraśabdān neti cen na prācuryāt (1.1.14)

naitad yuktam/ kutaḥ? prācuryāt: parasmīn brahmaṇy ānandaprācuryāt/ prācuryārthe
ca mayaṭaḥ sambhavāt/

[49]

“[Objection:] This [thing called] *ānandamaya* is not different from the *jīva* (the individual, lower, soul), because it contains the suffix *mayaṭ* which is expressive of modification. [The suffix] *mayaṭ* is taught in the meaning ‘modification’ in [P. 4.3.144] *nityaṃ vṛddhaśarādibhyaḥ* immediately following [P. 4.3.143] *mayaḍ vaiṭayoḥ ...* ‘Optionally *mayaṭ* in these two meanings ...’ And this word *ānanda* is a *vṛddha* word.

[Question:] But cannot *mayaṭ* also express the meaning ‘abundance’ (*prācurya*), on account of the tradition embodied in P. 5.4.21 (*tatprakṛtavacane mayaṭ*, as in ‘a sacrifice is *annamaya*’? That must no doubt be [the right interpretation].

...

Having repeated this [objection] he rejects it: ‘If [you maintain that the word *ānandamaya* can] not [describe Brahma], because it is expressive of a modification (*vikāra*), [the answer is that this is] not [correct], because of the [meaning] abundance [expressed by the word].’

(Brahmasūtra 1.1.14:) ***vikāraśabdān neti cen na prācuryāt***

This [objection is] not [correct]. Why? ‘Because of abundance’: Because there is abundance of bliss in the highest Brahma. Because *mayaṭ* can [be used] in the meaning abundance.”

Rāmānuja’s Vedāntadīpa comments as follows:

vikāraśabdān neti cen na prācuryāt (1.1.14)

ānandamayaḥ iti vikārārthān mayaṭchabdān nāyam avikṛtaḥ paramātmā/ asya ca
vikārārthatvam eva yuktam/ annamayaḥ iti vikāropakramād iti cen na/ pratyagātmāny
api na jāyate mriyate vā vipāścīt iti vikārapraṭiṣedhāt/ prācuryārtha evāyaṃ mayaḍ iti
nīścayāt/

“Wegen des Wortes ‘Umwandlung’ nicht, etwa? — Nein, wegen Reichlichkeit (Brahmasūtra 1.1.13/14).

Der Wonneartige ist wegen des Wortes *maya* (-artig, bestehend aus), das ‘Umwandlung’ bedeutet, nicht der höchste Ātman, der keiner Umwandlung unterliegt; und es ist zutreffend, dass dieses [Wort] die Bedeutung von Umwandlung hat, weil der Speiseartige am Anfang [des Abschnitts TaiUp 2,1.2] umwandlungsfähig ist. — Wenn [dies behauptet wird, ist zu erwidern]: Nein, weil auch an dem Einzelātman die Umwandlung ausgeschlossen ist: ‘Nicht entsteht oder stirbt der Weise’ (KaṭhUp 2,18); weil *maya* entschieden Reichlichkeit bedeutet ...”³

Madhva’s Anuvyākhyāna does not explain the link with grammar, but his commentator Jayatīrtha does.⁴

Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja do not fully resolve the problem of the word *prācuryāt*, but both mention in this connection P. 5.4.21. This sūtra, as we have seen, reads *tatprakṛtavacane mayat*, and does not use the word *prācurya*. Indeed, neither *prācurya* [50] nor any of its cognates are ever used in Pāṇini’s grammar. Why, then, do these commentators refer to this grammatical sūtra in order to justify the occurrence of *prācurya* in the Brahmasūtra?

It is at this point that the Kāśikā has to be taken into consideration. The Kāśikā on P. 5.4.21 explains the word *prakṛta* in the grammatical sūtra as: *prācuryeṇa prastutam*. Both the subcommentaries Nyāsa and Padamañjarī specify that the meaning of *prakṛta* is properly paraphrased by the word *prastuta* alone, so that the qualification *prācuryeṇa* looks at first sight superfluous. However, they then add that the presence of *vacana* (°*prakṛtavacane* instead of °*prakṛte*) justifies that qualification.

It must here be noted that the word *prācurya* occurs nowhere else in the Kāśikā, except precisely under sūtras 5.4.21 and 22, both times explaining *prakṛta* as *prācuryeṇa prastuta*. It does not occur at all in the Mahābhāṣya, which does not even comment upon sūtra 5.4.21. No modern Sanskrit-Sanskrit dictionary known to me — this includes the Vācaspatyam and the Śabdakalpadruma — lists *prācurya* among the meanings of *-pra*.

All this would at first sight suggest that not only Śaṅkara, Bhāskara, Rāmānuja and Madhva, but also the author of Brahmasūtra 1.1.13/14 were acquainted with the Kāśikā, or at least with part of the explanation of P. 5.4.21 presented in the Kāśikā. This idea would seem to find further support when we take the remainder of this explanation into consideration. The Kāśikā explains P. 5.4.21 in the following words:

*tatprakṛtavacane mayat (P. 5.4.21)/ tad it prathamā samarthavibhaktiḥ/
prācuryeṇa prastutaṃ prakṛtam/ prathamāsamarthāt prakṛtopādhike ‘rthe vartamānāt
svārthe mayatprayayo bhavati/ .../ annaṃ prakṛtam annamayam, apūpamayam/ apare*

³ Tr. Hohenberger, 1964: 9.

⁴ I have only had access to the edition of the text in Siauve, 1959: 54 ff., where part of Jayatīrtha’s commentary is given in a note: *mayatśabdo hi vikāra iva prācurye ‘pi mukhyaḥ/ tatprakṛtavacane mayat ity anusāsanāt/.*

punar evaṃ sūtrārtham āhuḥ/ prakṛtam ity ucyate ‘smin iti prakṛtavacanam/ tad iti prathamāsamarthāt prakṛtavacane ‘bhidheye mayaḥpratyayo bhavati/ annaṃ prakṛtam asmin annamayo yajñāḥ, apūpamayaṃ parva, vaṭakamayī yātrā/ dvayam api pramāṇam ubhayathā sūtrapraṇayanāt/

“**Tatprakṛtavacane mayaḥ** (P. 5.4.21). The word *tat* [in this sūtra] has a nominative case-ending, appropriate to express the sense of the suffix prescribed.⁵ *Prakṛta* [means] *prācuryeṇa prastutam* ‘abundantly established (?)’. The suffix *mayaḥ* occurs after a syntactically related nominal stem which ends in a nominative case-ending and denotes a thing qualified as *prakṛta* ... [Examples are:] Food that is *prakṛta* ‘abundantly established’ is *annamaya* ‘abundant food’; [similarly] *apūpamaya* ‘abundant cake’.

Others state that the meaning of the sūtra is as follows. *Prakṛtavacana* means that the word *prakṛta* is used with respect to it. The suffix *mayaḥ* occurs after a syntactically related nominal stem which ends in a nominative case-ending when [51] something with respect to which the word *prakṛta* is used is to be denoted. [Examples are:] A sacrifice in which food is abundantly established is called *annamaya*; [similarly] a festival [in which cake is established in abundance is called] *apūpamaya*; a procession [during which there are cakes in abundance is called] *vaṭakamayī*.

Both [these interpretations are] authoritative, because the sūtra has been composed in both ways.”

Understood in the manner proposed in the Kāśikā on P. 5.4.21, the expression *ānandamaya* can mean either ‘abundant bliss’ or ‘in which bliss is abundantly established’. It will be clear that this interpretation (‘Brahma is abundant bliss’ or ‘bliss is abundantly established in Brahma’) is to be preferred, from the point of view of the Vedāntin, to the earlier one (‘Brahma is a modification of bliss’). It seems therefore likely, not only that the author of Brahmasūtra 1.1.13/14 found the word *prācurya* in the explanation of P. 5.4.21, but that he was acquainted with the explanation of the sūtra which we now find in the Kāśikā.

And yet it seems impossible that he knew the Kāśikā. This commentary is believed to have been composed toward the end of the seventh century.⁶ Śaṅkara may roughly belong to the same period.⁷ The Brahmasūtra, however, must be older than Śaṅkara, and therefore older than the Kāśikā. The author of the Brahmasūtra cannot therefore have known the Kāśikā.

It is known that the Kāśikā relied upon earlier grammatical texts. It is therefore conceivable that it has taken from them the use of the word *prācurya* in the explanation of *prakṛta* in P. 5.4.21. It is even possible that the interpretation given to P. 5.4.21 in the Kāśikā was already present in one or more of those earlier texts.

⁵ Cp. Abhyankar, DSG p. 415 s.v. *samarthavibhakti*.

⁶ Oberlies, 1996: 273.

⁷ Cp. Vetter, 1979: 11 f.; Rüping, 1977: 12.

One possible source of the Kāśikā that is often mentioned is the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa. This grammar has a rule corresponding to P. 5.4.21; it is sūtra 4.4.9: *prakṛte mayat*. However, the explanation of this sūtra does not contain the word *prācurya* (one is entitled to ask whether this is linked to the fact that the sūtra does not use the word *vacana*). The Kāśikā did not, therefore, take the word *prācurya* in this particular context from the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa.

As another possible source for the Kāśikā Devanandin's commentary on the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa has been suggested. This commentary is now lost, but the surviving Mahāvṛtti has been influenced by it, so that this later commentary may sometimes help us. The sūtra corresponding to P. 5.4.21 is 4.2.28: *tatprakṛtoktau mayat*. The Jainendra Mahāvṛtti comments: *prakarṣeṇa kṛtaṃ prakṛtaṃ **pracuram** ity arthaḥ*. Here, then, we do indeed find the word *prapura*.

We are therefore confronted with the following question. Supposing that Devanandin's lost commentary on the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa did indeed attribute the [52] sense *prapura* to the suffix *-maya*, do we have to conclude that the author of the Brahmasūtra, a Brahmanical composition if ever there was one, used a Jaina grammar in order to find answers to grammatical questions? This seems extremely unlikely. The very presence of the word *prācurya* in Brahmasūtra 1.1.13 rather constitutes evidence that, long before the Kāśikā, a Brahmanical grammar gave the meaning *prapura/prācurya* to the suffix *-maya*. It is of course practically certain that this Brahmanical grammar must have been an earlier, now lost, commentary of Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī. The Kāśikā, we may further assume, took this specific explanation of the suffix *-maya* from that earlier commentary.

There is a similar question to be asked with regard to Śaṅkara. Must we assume that Śaṅkara used a Jaina grammar? Or alternatively, do we have to date him after the Kāśikā? Don't forget that according to Śaṅkara "*mayaṭ*" is known from tradition also to express abundance" (*pracuratāyām api mayat smaryate*). Rather than concluding that the tradition Śaṅkara here refers to is a Jaina grammar, we may conclude that Śaṅkara either referred to the Kāśikā or to an earlier commentary in the Pāṇinian tradition.

If, then, it seems safe to conclude that at least one commentary in the Pāṇinian tradition existed already before Brahmasūtra 1.1.13/14 was composed, and that this commentary exerted an influence on the Kāśikā, the practical consequence will be that what seems to be a quotation from the Kāśikā does not always have to be a quotation from that text, but may be a quotation from one of those earlier Pāṇinian commentaries.

This consequence is not without consequence of its own. Wezler and Motegi have recently (1998: XXVIII) proposed a date for the Yuktidīpikā that is based in an essential manner on the claim that the Yuktidīpikā quotes from the Kāśikā. If we consider that this claim is only based on the identical wording of a short phrase that occurs both in the Yuktidīpikā and in the Kāśikā (see Bronkhorst, 2003, for details), we are obliged to admit that this sentence may conceivably have been taken from an earlier commentary in the Pāṇinian

tradition.⁸ Dropping therefore the idea that the Yuktidīpikā must post-date the Kāśikā, we can concentrate on the other indications presented by Wezler and Motegi, and by Mejer (2000), and agree that the date proposed by Frauwallner, ca. 550 C.E., is, if not secured, at least possible or even probable.

References

- Bhāskara: Brahmasūtra Bhāṣya. In: *Brahmasūtrabhāṣyam Bhāskarācāryaviracitam*. Brahmasūtra with a commentary by Bhāskarācārya. Ed. Vindhyaeshvari Prasāda Dvivedin. Benares 1915. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 70, 185, 209.) Reprint: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1991 (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 20).
- [53]
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2002): “The Cāndra-vyākaraṇa: some questions.” *Indian Linguistic Studies: Festschrift in Honor of George Cardona*. Ed. Madhav M. Deshpande and Peter E. Hook. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Pp. 182-201.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2003): Review of Wezler and Motegi, 1998. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 153(1), 242-247.
- Hohenberger, A. (tr.)(1964): *Rāmānuja’s Vedāntadīpa. Seine Kurzauslegung der Brahmasūtren des Bādarāyaṇa*. Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischen Seminars der Universität. (Bonner Orientalistische Studien, N.S. 14.)
- Jainendra-vyākaraṇa. In: *Jainendra Vyākaraṇam by Pūjyapāda Devanandi with Jainendra Mahāvṛtti of Shri Abhayānandi*. Ed. Shambhu Nath Tripathi. Kāshī: Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha. 1956. (Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā, Sanskrit Grantha no. 17.)
- Mejer, Marek (2000): “Some observations on the date of the Yukti-dīpikā (apropos of a new edition).” *Studia Indologiczne 7: On the Understanding of Other Cultures*. Proceedings of the International Conference on Sanskrit and Related Studies to Commemorate the Centenary of the Birth of Stanislaw Schayer (1899-1941), Warsaw University, Poland, October 7-10, 1999. Ed. Piotr Balcerowicz & Marek Mejer. Instytut Orientalistyczny, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warsaw. Pp. 255-289.
- Oberlies, Thomas (1996): “Das zeitliche und ideengeschichtliche Verhältnis der Cāndra-vṛtti zu anderen V(ai)yākaraṇas (Studien zum Cāndravayākaraṇa III).” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20 (Festschrift Paul Thieme zum 90. Geburtstag am 18. März 1995 dargebracht von Schülern und Kollegen; ed. H.-P. Schmidt and A. Wezler), 265-317.
- Rāmānuja: *Śrībhāṣya*. Ed. N. S. Ramabhadracharya. Vol. I. Melkote: The Academy of Sanskrit Research. 1985. (The Academy of Sanskrit Research Series, 4.)
- Rāmānuja: *Vedāntadīpa*. In: *Vedāntadeepa*. A gloss on Brahmasūtras by ... Rāmānujācārya ed. by ... Bhaṭṭanāthaswāmy. Benares 1904. (Benares Sanskrit Series 69, 70 & 80.)
- Renou, Louis (1957): “Grammaire et Vedānta.” *Journal Asiatique* 245, 121-133. Reprints: Staal, 1972: 470-478; Renou, 1997: I: 407-419.
- Renou, Louis (1997): *Choix d’études indiennes*. Réunies par Nalini Balbir et Georges-Jean Pinault. 2 tomes. Paris. (Réimpressions de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 9.)
- Rüping, Klaus (1977): *Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Vedānta-Philosophie. Teil I: Philologische Untersuchungen zu den Brahmasūtra-Kommentaren des Śāṅkara und des Bhāskara*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, 17.)
- Śabdakalpadruma. *Shabda-kalpadrum or An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit Words ...*, by Raja Radha Kanta Deva. 5 volumes. Reprint: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1967. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 93.)
- Śāṅkara: *Brahmasūtra Bhāṣya*. Editions used: 1) Brahmasūtra-Śāṅkarabhāṣyam, edited, with the commentaries Bhāṣyaratnaprabhā of Govindānanda, Bhāmatī of Vācaspati, Nyāyanirṇaya of Ānandagiri, by J. L. Shastri. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi,

⁸ There is therefore no need to think that “the original reading of [the Yuktidīpikā] ... was only later replaced by a lucid explanation taken from the Kāśikā, maybe by the way of insertion of a marginal note”, as Mejer (2000: 270) suggests.

1996. 2) Brahmasūtra with Śāṅkarabhāṣya. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1964. (Works of Śāṅkarācārya in original Sanskrit, vol. III.)
- Sharma, B. N. K. (1971): *The Brahmasūtras and their Principal Commentaries (a critical exposition)*. Volume I. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. (Bharatiya Vidya Series, 28.)
- Siauve, Suzanne (1959): *Les noms védiques de Viṣṇu dans l'Anuvyākhyāna de Madhva (Brahma-Sūtra I, 1, adhikaraṇa 2 à 12)*. Texte avec traduction et notes. Pondichéry: Institut Français [54] d'Indologie. (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie, 14.)
- Staal, J. F. (ed.)(1972): *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: MIT Press. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi etc., 1985.
- Vācaspatyam. *Vachaspatyam (a comprehensive Sanskrit dictionary)* compiled by Sri Taranatha Tarkavachaspati. 6 volumes. Reprint: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi. 1969-1970. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 94.)
- Vetter, Tilmann (1979): *Studien zur Lehre und Entwicklung Śāṅkaras*. Wien. (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, 6.)
- Wezler, Albrecht and Shujun Motegi (ed.)(1998): *Yuktidīpikā. The most significant commentary on the Sāṃkhyakārikā*. Vol. I. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, 44.)

Abbreviation

- Abhyankar, DSG Kashinath Vasudev Abhyankar and J. M. Shukla, A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar, Second revised edition, Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1977.