1.1. In an interesting article (1974) the following theory was launched about the Yuktīdpikā by A. Wezler. This text has a peculiar method of presentation “so striking that the reader cannot fail to observe it” (p. 440f.). It consists in “[t]he juxtaposition of a detailed verbal paraphrase and a preceding, most concise nominal expression or sentence” which “can be observed… throughout it” (p. 438). The result is “that the text of the YD on the respective kārikās is not a sequence of arguments for and against, each being put forward only once, that, on the contrary, the train of thought is permanently interrupted by restatements of the opponent’s objections and defender’s rejoinders” (p. 440). Wezler thinks that “this stylistic peculiarity stands in need of… a convincing explanation” (p. 441). Such an explanation is suggested by Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya, “which aims at a critical discussion – not of the sūtras of Pāṇini, in the first place – but of Kātyāyana’s vārttikas on the sūtras of Pāṇini” (p. 443). The Mahābhāṣya “presents itself to a reader unaware of its containing the work of Kātyāyana, as a sequence of very short, epigrammatic nominal expressions, often difficult to understand, and comparatively longer verbal phrases meant to expound them” (p. 444). The surmise seems justified “that the kernel sentences regularly met with in the YD belong likewise to an author other than that of the YD, that accordingly one has to distinguish between the laconic Vārttika of an author X on the [Sāṅkhya-kārikā] and the true YD of an author Y, an extensive work written in normal Sanskrit prose that aims first of all at expounding this Vārttika” (p. 444).

“[C]onclusive evidence” (p. 446) in support of the correctness of this surmise is found, according to Wezler, in the fact that at least in the case of one such vārttika (arthāpattisambhavābhāvaceśṭānam anumānasiddeḥ [p. 32, l. 30]) a word (avacanam) must be supplied from an

* Financial assistance was provided by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z. W. O.).

1 Prof. Wezler informs me in a letter that he changed his views a number of years ago and came to conclusions regarding the Yuktīdpikā which agree with those presented in the present article. I thank Prof. Wezler for some further critical remarks.
earlier vārttika (upamaithyāvacanam āptopadeosiddheh [p. 32, l. 3]) by way of anuvrtti “the still being valid [of a term mentioned previously in one or many subsequent parts of the text]” (p. 445). Moreover, only on the assumption of the Yuktidipikā’s “containing an older vārttika text that belongs to another author . . . can one, e.g., account also for the otherwise illogical – fact that in the passage YD p. 56.15–16 . . . there is raised an objection by the opponent that is based on the assumption that hetumati means ‘characterized by a [logical] reason’ although in the foregoing it had already been stated that hetu is here synonymous with kārana, ‘cause’, (p. 56.11: tatra hetuh kāram ity anarthāntaram)” (p. 446).

The name of the older vārttika text must have been – as appears from a quotation by Vācaspatimiśra I – “Rājavārttika” (p. 450). 1.2. No one can deny that WEZLER’s theory represents a possibility. I doubt however whether the evidence provided proves the theory as conclusively as WEZLER maintained.

There can be no doubt that the text of the Yuktidipikā contains concise nominal expressions or sentences which we may safely call vārtikas. The question is whether these vārtikas were composed by an author other than the one of the Yuktidipikā. The use of anuvrtti among the vārtikas cannot be used as an argument, as little as the use of anuvrtti in, say, the sūtras of Candra’s grammar is an argument against Candra’s authorship of the Vṛtti on that grammar. It is at least conceivable that one single author wrote both the short expressions and their explanation, perhaps for mnemonic purposes and clarity respectively, or simply because he admired the style of the Mahābhāṣya (more on this below).

WEZLER’s second argument, concerning the interpretation of hetumati, must be studied somewhat more closely. The word hetumati ‘characterized by a hetu’ occurs in Sānkhyākārikā 10, as a qualification of syaktam ‘the manifest’. The Yuktidipikā first explains the word hetu (p. 56, l. 11): tatra hetuh kāram ity anarthāntaram. This word is here said to have been used in one of its senses, viz., as synonymous with kārana ‘cause’. Soon after this a vārttika voices the opinion of the opponent (p. 56, l. 15–16): hetumati ity avibhāṣaś ca sarvatra sadbhāvati ‘‘characterized by a hetu’ is a non-distinction (i.e. is not a distinctive property of the manifest) since it exists everywhere’’ (WEZLER, p. 440).

On p. 446 WEZLER tells us that it is “illogical” that an objection is raised “that is based on the assumption that hetumati means ‘characterized by a [logical] reason’ although in the foregoing it had already been stated that hetu is here synonymous with kārana ‘cause’”. However, this objection is directed not only against the use of hetumati in the kārikā but also against the interpretation proposed in the commentary. This becomes clear where the reply that hetu here refers to a causal factor (kāraka) is rejected on the ground that the general word hetu does not take a special meaning without an instigating factor to that effect (p. 56, l. 19–21: āha – tadanup Spotlight viṣeṣānupādānāt | hetu iti sāmānyāsadbodhī‘yam | sāmānyaasadbodi ca nārtha-prakaraṇasāmānyāsadbodāhisaṃbandhah antareṇa viṣeṣa ‘vātiṣṭhanta iti viṣeṣa upādevyāh sūtā | sa tu nopaśāyate | tasmāta te avidesa eveti ).

Since now WEZLER’s two arguments appear to be less strong than they seemed, we are back at the situation where his theory represents a possibility, and no more than that.

1.3. What is needed is, of course, some crucial evidence. Crucial evidence in support of WEZLER’s theory would be, for example, the discovery that the Yuktidipikā misinterprets a vārttika, or expresses an opinion different from the one expressed in a vārttika. I am not aware of any such case.

Strong evidence against WEZLER’s theory would be, for example, the discovery that roughly contemporaneously with the Yuktidipikā other works were composed in the same style – i.e. vārtikas plus discussions – works the single authorship of which is none-the-less not in doubt. Such evidence would gain in strength if such a work – the whole of it, including the comments on the vārtikas – were to call itself a ‘Vārttika’. Such a work exists.

1.4. The Tattvārthavārttika of Akalanka comments on the Tattva-rthasūtra, an early Jaina work in Sanskrit. Akalanka must have lived in the 7th or 8th century A.D. 2. His Tattvārthavārttika, which is also known by the name Rājavārttika, is written precisely in the way also the Yuktidipikā was written, viz. in a style which alternates between short nominal sentences and their detailed verbal paraphrase, as well as occasional further discussions in normal prose. The editor of this text, MAHENDRA KUMAR JAIN, has taken the trouble of having the nominal phrases printed in heavier type and providing (1) them with a serial number (the counting begins afresh with each new sūtra, as in KIELHORN’s edition of the Mahābhāṣya), so that the style and structure of the text become visible at first sight.

The Tattvārthavārttika has never been doubted to be the work of a single author, as far as I know. And indeed, at some places it can easily be seen that the nominal sentences do not by themselves constitute an independent work. Some examples are the following.

---

2 For a survey of the evidence see JAIN 1964: 171f.
TS 1.15 gives four subdivisions of the kind of knowledge called mati. They are: avagraha, icha, avayya and dharaṇa. Sūtra 1.18 (vyājanasūyavagrahā) states that the variety called avagraha concerns an object (arthā, TS 1.17) which is vyājana. This is explained by Devanandin, the author of the commentary Sarvārthasiddhi, and following him by Akalanka, as avayaka ‘indistinct’. I reproduce the beginning of Akalanka’s commentary on this sūtra, including the first nominal sentence which is contained in it (I p.66, l. 27 - p.67, l. 2):

vyājanaṃ avayaktaṃ sādvādīyataṃ tasyāvagrahā bhavati | kimartham

nominal sentences never ask questions. Had the nominal sentences constituted a separate work, the present sentence would have read parasparodītadukkhatvam nirdayatvā paraśparadrśāne sati kopotpat
teh śvaśat or the like. The fact that it does not say, shows that the nominal sentences are an integral part of the commentary.

It is interesting to see that also in the Tattvārthavārttika – as in the Yuktidipikā (see 1.1. and 1.2.) – words are understood from an earlier nominal sentence into a later one. An example is provided by the numbered sentences 9 and 10 on TS 4.12. Together with their explanations they read (I p.218, l. 28-31):

sūryasyādau grahanāṃ alpācataravād abhyarhitatvāc ca | 9 | sūryasabda ēdau pravayjate | kutaḥ | alpācataravād abhyarhitatvāc ca

Here the words alpācataravād abhyarhitatvāc ēdau grahanām (para-phrased as... pūrvaśaptaḥ) must be understood in sentence 10 from 9.

The nominal sentences are sometimes referred to in the Tattvārthavārttika itself. In the last quoted passage the compound vākyasaṣa is used to designate what must be supplied to the nominal sentence under consideration. The same word vāhya ‘sentence’ is seen to refer to nominal sentences elsewhere as well. The purpose of numbered sentence 8 on TS 2.49 is described as: uktānukārthasamgrahārtham ēdam vākyaṃ (I p.153, l. 11f.). And numbered sentence 8 on TS 3.5 proposes itself as a vākya must be made, which proposal is then rejected, in the following passage (I p.165, l. 28f.):

vākyavacanam iti cēna – udiṇaḥhetuprakārāpradaśārthatvāt | 8 | syād etat – vākyaṃ eva vaktvam parasparirādityadu

It may further be noted that nominal sentences do not accompany all of the sūtras. They are absent, e.g., in the case of TS 2.45, 46; 3.12, 15, 16, 17; etc. In this the Tattvārthavārttika resembles the Mahābhāṣya.

Numerous quotations from the Mahābhāṣya show that Akalanka was well acquainted with that work. He does not however mention its

name or the name of its author on any occasion, as far as I have been able to ascertain.

2.1. The preceding considerations give rise to an intriguing question. If at one time authors could use the name ‘Vārttika’ for a unitary work consisting of both short nominal phrases (vārttikas) and their discussion, could it be that they looked upon the prototype of this style, the Mahābhāṣya together with Kātyāyana’s vārttikas, as a single composition of one author as well?

The question need not be asked in this extreme form. After all, there are passages in the Mahābhāṣya where even a superficial reader can see that vārttikas are ascribed to other persons, e.g. where vārttikakāras are named, or where two interpretations are given of one vārttika. However, the bulk of the Mahābhāṣya is not like this. Kielhorn (1876a: 7) rightly observed: “...the commentators on the Mahābhāṣya, or other scholars who have written on Pāṇini... only occasionally contrast the views of Patañjali with those of the Vārttikakāra, and they tell us only incidentally that a particular statement is a Vārttika or belongs to Kātyāyana. And Patañjali himself, the author of the Great Commentary, is even more reticent.” Kielhorn seems to have been the first to separate vārttikas from bhāṣya in a systematic manner. Over thousand years before Kielhorn far fewer vārttikas may have been ascribed to Kātyāyana and other authors different from Patañjali. As a result much of the Mahābhāṣya may have been looked upon as written in precisely the style which also characterizes the Yuktidipikā and the Tattvārthāvārttikā.

A study of the use of the word vārttika in the Yuktidipikā seems to support this supposition. This word is used only once in YD, in a passage which occurs on p. 10f. The discussion is about Sāṅkhyaśāstra lab: duḥkha-rāja-duḥkhi-dhyāni jīvātmak niṣepanāhatake hetau. “Since there is affliction by the three kinds of suffering (duḥkha), there is inquiry into the cause which removes them (tad-d).”

On p. 10 the discussion centres on the relation between duḥkha- and tadh in this line. The opponent thinks there can be no connection between these two words, because several words intervene. Two replies are given. The first one is, briefly stated, that connection is made by meaning, not by proximity. The second reply deserves to be quoted in full (p. 10, l. 29 – p. 11, l. 6):

Moreover: [Connection between words which are not in immediate proximity is possible] because this is seen to be the case in the science of grammar. Also in the science of grammar there is seen to be connection between pronouns even though they are separated. And in yasya guṇasya hi bhāvadhārane sādhanavāśīsās taddhāhānāne bhavatā rājyamete (P. 5.1.119 v. 5) the connection between the words yasya and tad-, even though made by meaning, is accepted. Connection is accepted between [the sūtras] P. 4.1.1 and 1.4.21, and between 2.4.71 and 6.3.1, etc. Similarly, an example in the Vārttika is anādyadāvam udāhārini bhagini vahanā yāvam śaraṇam kumbham avacétam abhidhāvān iedrekhī (Mbh I p. 152–53). Not indeed is this in this [sentence], in spite of the proximity [of the words concerned], ‘carrying a bull on one’s head’ (śaraṇadūkha vahanam) or ‘running of the jar’ (kumbhasa saraṇam) the proper [connection]. And just as in these [grammatical examples] separated [words] are connected, so the connection [between duḥkha- and tad- in Sāṅkhyaśāstra] must be seen.”

6 This is an instance of a vārttika in the text of the Yuktidipikā.
7 This vārttika reads in KIELHORN’s edition (II p. 366, l. 10): nidadhām tu yasya guṇasya hi bhāvadhārane sādhanavāśīsās taddhāhānāne bhavatā.
8 This must be the intended meaning, as follows from two passages in Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣyasāsadhyā. Ms 31 c9–10 (AL 96.10–11, SW 113.21–23; CE III.3.26–27) reads: vijñāna ‘py arthasthānaḥ sambhādā dirāhāktaḥ yathā bhāṣya bhavacanam nyāyapratīpakād iti; Ms 32d7–8 (AL 99.21–22; SW 117.4–5; CE III.6.20–22) has: tha kathāṃ suṣo... lug alag utarapadā iti | airdṛṣṭāṃ vikrām utarapadāya anātra suṣo lug iti |
9 KIELHORN’s edition has: anādyadāvam udāhārini yāvam śaraṇam śaraṇam kumbham bhagini pācān abhidhāvān iedrekhī. The Bhāṣya explains this passage as follows (p. 153, l. 2f.): udāhārini bhagini yāvam śaraṇam śaraṇam kumbham bhagini pācān abhidhāvān iedrekhī. Note that Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣyasāsadhyā (Ms 35b5–6; AL 96.5–6; SW 113.16–17; CE III.3.21–22) has this example in a form closer to the Yuktidipikā’s: anādyadāvam udāhārini yāvam śaraṇam kumbham bhagini pācān abhidhāvān iedrekhī... nāsti anādyadāvam śaraṇam kumbham bhagini ca saraṇam iti.

4 See KIELHORN 1876a.
5 Even against this procedure doubts have been voiced. See ROCHER 1971: 315; JOSHI – RODDEBERG 1981: 140ff. n. 452.
The crucial sentence in this passage concerns the "example in the Vārttika". The phrase vārttika drṣṭāntaḥ can, to be sure, mean more than alone 'example in the Vārttika'. It can also mean 'example with respect to, i.e., a vārttika', and the like. The fact is that none of the acceptable interpretations of this phrase fits the example under consideration. This example occurs in a part of the Mahābhāṣya where a vārttika has been rejected and where it is shown that the aim of that vārttika can be obtained without it.

The sūtra under which the example occurs is P.1.1.58: na padāntadvīpaṃ vāparasāvarṇānusvāraṇaṃ tvaṃ divakṣaṃ jñānaśāstrī. This sūtra is an exception to the preceding one (P.1.1.57) and states that the substitute for a vowel is not like that what it replaces in the case of rules which concern 1) the end of a word, 2) the doubling of a sound, 3) the elision of ya before vara, 4) the accent, 5) a homogeneous sound, 6) an anusvāra, 7) a long vowel, 8) j, b, g, d, 9) c, t, k, p, s, s.

The first vārttika under this sūtra gives a further specification: pratisedhe svaraṇghya-lopajādeśa na sthānīvat. "In this prohibition [it must be stated that only] the substitute for a vowel which consists in elision (lopā) is not like that what it replaces (na sthānīvat) in the case of accent, long vowel, elision of ya". In other words, in these cases the substitute for a vowel which is anything else than elision is like that what it replaces (Mbh I p.152, l.18f.: yo hy angy ādēkah sthānīvat evaṁ bhavati).

The Mahābhāṣya rejects this vārttika in the following passage (I p.152, l.22 - p.153, l.3): na vākṣrayam iha hi lopī pi prakṛta ādēṣa pi vidhṛgahaṇam api prakṛtaṁ anuvartata dīrghādaya pi prakṛta ādēṣa pi nirāsyante kevalaṁ tatrābhisaṃbandhaṃ kartavyam | svaraṇaḥ kṣaraṇaḥ lopajādeśo na sthānīvat iti | ānuśūryena samāvīśīnāṃ yatāṣṭam abhisambandhaḥ sākṣaye kartum na ca iti ānuśūryena samāvīśīnāṁ | ānuśūryena āpi samāvīśīnāṁ yatāṣṭam abhisambandhaḥ bhavatī | tad yatāḥ | anāvādhaṃ uddhāri iha tvam harasi śravaṃ kumbhaṃ bhagini sācāṃ abhidhāvantaḥ adrākṣir iti | tasya yatāṣṭam abhisambandhaḥ bhavatī |

"This vārttika should not be uttered; because in this [vārttika] elision (lopā), substitute (ādēṣa) as well as the word vidhī 'rule' are valid [from P.1.1.58] since they are the subject-matter [of this sūtra], and also long (vowels) are mentioned [in P.1.1.58]. Only the correct connection [between the words of P.1.1.58] must be made in that [sūtra, in order to obtain the meaning expressed by the vārttika:] svaraṇaḥ kṣaraṇaḥ lopajādeśa na sthānīvat. [Objection:] Of [words] which are arranged in the [right] order, [such] a connection can be made as desired; these [words] however are not arranged in the [right] order. [Reply:] The connection also of [words] which are not arranged in the [right] order is as desired. For example: anāvādhaṃ uddhāri iha tvam harasi śravaṃ kumbhaṃ bhagini sācāṃ abhidhāvataḥ adrākṣir. The connection [between the words] of this [sentence] is as desired."

This passage is meant to show that vt. 1 is superfluous. The information which the vārttika was intended to convey is already contained in the sūtra. The order of terms in the sūtra seems hard to reconcile with the information thus to be conveyed, but an example shows that this can be no objection. This example therefore does not occur in a vārttika, nor does it illustrate a vārttika. We must conclude that the Yuktidīpikā used the word vārttika to denote more than just the nominal sentences which we ascribe to Kātyāyana.

The above does not imply that the author of the Yuktidīpikā was never aware of the difference in authorship between the short nominal sentences and at least parts of the Mahābhāṣya. In one passage about grammar (YD p.6, l.19f.) a distinction is made between a padakāra and a cūrṇikāra. The padakāra is said to have used the compound jātīvācakatan. Kielhorn's edition of the Mahābhāṣya has two vārttikas containing this compound: P.1.2.10 vt. 1, and P.4.1.14 vt. 7. To the cūrṇikāra is ascribed the sentence kāḍācid guṇo guṇivṛtiśe kho bhavati kāḍācid guṇān guṇo viśeṣyahe, which occurs in almost identical form for Mbh II p.356, l.8f. (on P.5.1.59). The term padakāra is rare as a name for the author of the vārttikas, but it occurs at least once more, viz., in Jindebruddhi's Nyāsa on the Kāśikā on P.3.2.21 (II p.558), where the reference is to P.1.1.72 vt. 9. The word cūrṇikāra is used to designate the author of the Mahābhāṣya in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā (Ms 4559, AL 13918[, Sw 161.21, CE IV 25.10; Ms 50d3, AL 155.16, CE V.1.15; Ms 60a11, AL 180.11, CE V.21.14), in Vṛṣabhadeva's Paddhati on Vākyapadiya 1.23 (p.63, l.12), in Helārāja's Prākritākaprakāśa on Vākyapadiya 3.1148 (= 3.14.447; II p.356, l.20 and p.357, l.1f.), 3.1186 (= 3.14.485; II p.371, l.24), by I-ching (see below), and elsewhere (Mīmāṃsaka 1973: I/331f.).

This is all the evidence yielded by the Yuktidīpikā. The impression it creates is that in some cases its author distinguished between the nominal sentences and their immediate discussion on the one hand, and more independent passages of the Mahābhāṣya on the other. However,
the evidence is not sufficient to come to any clear and definite conclusions on the basis of the Yuktidipikā alone.

2.2. The author of the Yuktidipikā appears to have known the Mahābhāṣyadipikā, Bhartrhari’s commentary on the Mahābhāṣya. How did Bhartrhari look upon the Mahābhāṣya?

2.2.1. (i) P. 1.1.38 (taddhitaś ca sarvavibhaktih) prescribes that a word which is formed with a taddhita suffix and does not take all case-endings, is called anyaya ‘indeclinable’. A number of vārttikas (in Kielhorn’s edition) express dissatisfaction with the formulation of this stūtra and propose specifications. Then vt. 6 together with the following Bhāṣya offer a better solution which reads (I p. 95, l. 9–11):

\[\text{siddham tu pāthāḥ} \mid \text{|| 6} \mid\]
\[\text{pāthāḥ vā siddham etat} \mid \text{katham pāthāḥ kartavyaḥ} \mid \text{tasilādaśaḥ prāk pasapaḥ} \mid \text{āspraḥūḍayāḥ prāk samāśaṁtebhyaḥ} \mid \text{māntaḥ} \mid \text{ktvṛthaḥ} \mid \text{tasvaye} \mid \text{nānādhi iti} \mid\]

“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 tāś/I, until pāśa/P (i.e. the taddhita suffixes taught in P. 5.3.7–46), from ās until the compound endings (taught in P. 5.4.42–67), [a suffix] which ends in r i.e. ām and am, P. 5.4.11–12), [a suffix] which has the meaning of kṛteṣa (P. 5.1.17–20), tāś and vāl (P. 4.3.113 and 5.1.115), nā and nā (P. 5.2.27).

One short passage in Bhartrhari’s comments on this enumeration uses the word vārttika twice (Ms 76c3–4; AL 226.5–6): vārttike tu taddhitaś prakṛte iti asir12 na pāthāḥ | tāḥ vīśvamāṃ tāḥ ity ayaḥ vārttike nopasamgrāhitaḥ | “Since taddhita [suffixes] are under discussion in the Vārttika, āṣ/I has not been enumerated. The suffix tāḥ [prescribed] in P. 5.3.111 is not included in the Vārttika”.

11 See Bronkhorst 1985: 93f. and notes 8 and 9 above.

12 The Kāśikā on P. 1.37 confirms that this must be the correct reading. In its list of indeclinables it enumerates: tālādāḥ taddhitaś edākāryantaḥ, stāstāḥ, kṛtvamuc, ācā, ācā-klau, ceyarthā sa, am, ām, ... Jindebadhivīḍi’s Nyāsa comments: satēdhā vā ity uṇāsīśeṇa uṇā dhamā ṣrīprasāyaḥ | ayaḥ ity udākaraṇam | Uṇādi suffixes are kṛt, not therefore taddhita. The stūtra: iva ārthāḥ (or inās cārthāḥ) is present in the surviving versions of the Uṇādi Sūtra, but not all commentators mention that ayaḥ is an indeclinable. An exception is Mahādeva’s Uṇādikosa 4.221.

13 This remark presupposes that Bhartrhari had before him a list of indeclinables much like the one in the Kāśikā on P. 1.37 (see the preceding note). This supports the view put forth elsewhere (Bronkhorst 1983: esp. section 3.4) that the Kāśikā was strongly influenced by earlier, pre-Bhartrhari, commentaries.

The first sentence of this passage does not contain unambiguous information regarding what is meant by the word vārttika. The second sentence on the other hand does. This sentence points at an oversight in the enumeration in the Bhāṣya of taddhita suffixes which form indeclinables: the suffix tāḥ [prescribed in P. 5.3.111 has been forgotten.14 Since the enumeration took place not in a nominal sentence but in the explanatory Bhāṣya, the word vārttika has here been used to indicate the latter.

(ii) Another passage on the same stūtra uses the word vārttika. P. 1.1.38 vt. 1 and its Bhāṣya consist of the following remarks (I p. 94, l. 10f.): asarvavibhaktāv avibhaktimittasyasopasamkhyānam || 1 || asarvavibhaktāv avibhaktimittasyasopasamkhyānam kartavyam | nānā vinā | “Regarding [the term] asarvavibhakti [in P. 1.1.38 taddhitaś ca sarvavibhaktih], addition of avibhaktimitta ‘not caused by a case-ending’” (vt. 1). “Regarding [the term] asarvavibhakti: the addition must be made of avibhaktimitta ‘not caused by a case-ending’. [Only thus can P. 1.1.38 cover the forms] nānā vinā.” The words nānā and vinā are formed with the help of P. 5.2.27 (vināḥkṛmyām nānāh na saha) in the sense ‘not together’ (na saha). The taddhita suffixes nā and nā cannot be described as asarvavibhakti; they have no relation whatever to any case-ending and must be described as avibhaktimitta ‘not caused by a case-ending’. Yet the words nānā and vinā are indeclinables.

Bhartrhari (Ms 74d4f.; AL 221.19f.) gives a long account of the ways in which earlier commentators (ṛṣiśūrvika) have explained the word asarvavibhakti and concludes his description of the last point of view as follows (Ms 75b1–2; AL 222.19–21): 

asmīṁa tu yo dūṣāḥ sa vārttikā eva darśitaḥ | nānā vinā iti | asarvavibhaktāv avibhaktimittam iti | “What is wrong in this [point of view] has however been pointed out in the Vārttika itself [with the words:] ‘For the sake of nānā and vinā, avibhaktimitta [must be added to] asarvavibhakti.’”

Note that Bhartrhari had not yet made a reference to vt. 1, nor to any vārttika on P. 1.1.38 for that matter. His present remark therefore appears to quote what Bhartrhari considered to be a or the ‘Vārttika’. Something like asarvavibhaktav avibhaktimittam does occur in a

Bhartrhari tries to make up for this in the following lines, where he proposes that the suffix tāḥ [prescribed in P. 5.3.111 is the same as tāḥ, prescribed in P. 5.3.23 which is included in the row ‘from tāś/I until pāśa/P’ and has therefore been included (yānās tu kriyate | ya eva prākārvacane tāḥ chandaśa sa eva prānāśāhya vārttī | 1) bhavaśī).
vārttika (vt. 1); nānā andвинā on the other hand are the illustrations given in the Bhāṣya.

(iii) A third passage in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā deals with P. 1.1.14 (nipāta ekāya anaṁ). The interpretation of this sūtra offers some difficulties which are discussed in the Mahābhāṣya. At one stage the following paraphrase is given of the part nipāta ekāya of the sūtra (I p. 70, l. 16–17): aj eva yo nipāta ity evan vijñāyate “[This part of the sūtra] will be understood as ‘the vowel which is a nipāta’.”

Bhartṛhari’s following remarks apparently pertain to this sentence (Ms 55d10 – 56a1; AL 168.11–12; CE V.12.4–6):

nipāta ity anēcā viśeyamāne tadantavidhyaprasaṅgād dosṣaprasaṅgō napatīṣṭhati | vārttikaviparīte tu viśeyate uttiṣṭhati samudāyasyārthe prayogat|

“When the word ‘vowel’ (ac) is qualified by [the designation] nipāta no fault results since there is no occasion for P. 1.1.72 to apply. In case the relation of qualified [to qualifier] is opposite to [what is said in] the Vārttika [such a fault] does result since a collection [of sounds] is used to [express a certain] meaning.”

In order to understand these remarks we recall that P. 1.1.72 (yena vidhiṣa tadantasya) is thus explained in the Kāśikā: yena viśeṣaṇe vidhīya stantasya āṁśantiṣṭha samudāyaṇya grāhako bhavati svaya ca rāpasya “With what as qualifier a rule is given, that denotes the collection [of sounds] which ends therewith, and itself”. In other words, if ac were qualifier and nipāta qualified, all nipātas which end in vowels would be denoted. Only by taking ac as qualified, nipāta as qualifier, can this contingency be avoided.

Our main interest lies with the remark about the or a vārttika. This is here particularly interesting since the Bhāṣya on P. 1.1.14 contains not a single vārttika in KELHORN’s edition15. Bhartṛhari apparently assigns this name to the Bhāṣya sentence aj eva yo nipātah. This sentence is not commented upon in the Mahābhāṣya in the manner usual with ‘real’ vārttikas. The question is however raised in Mbh (l. 17) if this sentence should be ‘uttered’, i.e. accepted as a statement regarding the correct interpretation of P. 1.1.14 (kim vakṣayam etad | na hi | ...). It seems therefore that Bhartṛhari uses the word vārttika not only for Bhāṣya passages which deal in one way or another with ‘real’ vārttikas, but also for (accepted or rejected) statements which are an obvious and inseparable part of the Bhāṣya.

(v) In another place (Ms 54c1, AL 164.17, CE V.9.3) Bhartṛhari uses the term samarthavārttika while apparently referring to a Bhāṣya passage on P. 2.11.1. samarthah padavīdhī. This Bhāṣya passage is quoted in extenso by Bhartṛhari, so that its identity is beyond doubt.

The Bhāṣya passage is Mbh I p.362, l. 17–21. This occurs in the midst of a discussion on the difference between compounded and uncompounded words. Among the characteristics of non-compounded words some are enumerated in the following statement which KELHORN does not number as a vārttika but which can easily be considered as one (I p.362, l. 13): samkhyaśeṣeṇa vaṇṭakāḥbhā́janam upasarpajanavīśesāṇam cayogyah “(indication of) particular number; clear indication of meaning; qualifier to the subordinate word; connection by means of (the particle) ca: ‘and’” (tr. Joshi 1968: 58).

The first item of this list is illustrated as follows (l. 14 f.): samkhyaśeṣeṇa bhavati vākye | rājaḥ pūrvaḥ rājāḥ pūrvaḥ rājāḥ pūrvaḥ iti | samāke na bhavati | rājapūrvaḥ iti || “(Indication of) particular number occurs in a non-compounded word-group, as in rājāḥ pūrvaḥ ‘man of a king’, rājāḥ pūrvaḥ ‘man of two kings’, rājāḥ pūrvaḥ ‘man of many kings’. In a compound it does not occur, as in rājapūrvaḥ ‘king-man’.”

(tr. Joshi, p.58).

The Bhāṣya then gives, by way of objection, an explanation why no particular number is understood in a compound (l. 15–17): astī kāraṇaṁ yenaśat evam bhavati | kim kāraṇam | yo ‘sva viśeṣaṇa śabdha tadāś∢mnidhyat | āṅgaḥ bhavaṁ tām uccāryat sa gaṇeyati sa viśeṣaḥ || “There is a reason why this happens to be so. What is that reason? Because that word (i.e. inflectional suffix) which expresses the specific (number), (inflectional suffix) is not there (in a compound). You better pronounce it (i.e. the inflectional suffix in the compound), sir, (and then you will see that) this specific (number) will be understood (even from a compound).” (tr. Joshi, p.60).

This objection is then answered by the passage which is quoted by Bhartṛhari, and which closes this discussion (I p.362, l. 17–21):
namu ca naitenaśaṁ bhavitayam | na hi śabdakṛtenā nāmāṁtena bhavitayam | arthaḥkṛtena nāma śabdena bhavitayam | tad evam dṛṣṭām artharāpam evaitat evanjanātyakam yanātra viśeṣo na gaṇeyata iti | avāsitaṁ ca itat evam viśeṣyam | yo hi manvantre yo ’sva viśeṣaṇa śabdha tadāś∢mnidhyat atra viśeṣo na gaṇeyata iti tasya viśeṣo gaṇeyat | apsucaroṇa gaṇuceva vṛṣṭiṣṭa iti ||

“But it cannot be like this; for meaning cannot be made by word, word must [rather] be made by meaning. It must be seen like this that the meaning here is such that no specific [number] is understood. And this must necessarily be understood in this way; for he who thinks that no

15 LIMAYE, PALSULE and BHAGAVAT (CE V Notes p.104) observe: “In the MS… there is a word vārttike before viparīte which we have dropped as there is no Vār. on this Sū."
specific [number] is understood here (i.e., in a compound) because there is nothing that is expressive of a specific [number], he would understand a specific [number] in [words like] āpsucara, gosucara, varāsāvaja (which are not expressive of a plural number in spite of the plural endings of their first constituents)."

Note that this passage is not a vārttika, nor is it a direct explanation of a vārttika. At best it is the last part of a discussion which arose in connection with a vārttika.

Bhārtrāhari quotes this passage (with insignificant variations) in order to drive home the point that "the presence or absence of a [particular] number is not the result of a particular expressive unit (śabda); the specific [number] is [rather] the result of the single integrated meaning" (tasmin na śabdaviśeṣakṛte saṃkhyāyāh paritāyoga-pādaṁ ekārthābhāvakṛta evaṁyam viśeṣaṁ). Immediately following this Bhārtrāhari remarks: tad etat sarvaṁvārttika eva nirnayeṣa. This apparently means: "This will be determined [in our commentary] on this same (eva) Vārttika connected with [P.2.1.1] sarvākha [para-viđhīh]." The same Vārttika cannot but refer to the Bhāṣya passage quoted by Bhārtrāhari. There certainly is no reason to think, and in the present sense of that term, since no such vārttika deals with Bhārtrāhari's problem.

2.2.2. One more passage remains which uses the term vārttika. This one (Ms 73a8–9; AL 217.12–13; CE VI (1) 29.13–15) cannot however be looked upon as evidence how Bhārtrāhari used this word. The reason is that in this case the Mahābhāṣyadipikā merely echoes the Mahābhāṣya. The latter work quotes a vārttika (P.8.3.13 vt. 2) saying (I p.93, l.5f.): vārttikakāra ca paṭhaṁ jāśaḥvād ieci ced uttaratāḥvād apavāda-prasanaṁ api. Bhārtrāhari follows, saying: pūrvaratrayidham iti liṅga-yoga tad-viśayatāniḥyathāṁ vārttike śabdāntaraviṣayam liṅgāntarām upaddate jāśaḥvād iti ced uttaratra iti.

Nor are the two occurrences of the word vārttikakāra of much use for our present purpose. In the first one (Ms 39a1; AL 117.14; Sw 137.15; CE IV 5.27) passages are under discussion where vārttikas and Bhāṣya agree; we cannot therefore draw any conclusion here regarding what is ascribed to the vārttikakāra. In the second occurrence (Ms 50d3; AL 155.6; CE V.1.15) the vārttikakāra is mentioned soon after the cāṛṣṭikāra, and two vārttikas (in Kielhorn's sense) are ascribed to him. Here again we can say no more than that also vārttikas in our sense are attributed to the vārttikakāra by Bhārtrāhari. Little can also be inferred from the one occurrence of the name Kāṭyāyaṇa in Bhārtrāhari's commentary (Ms 60b9; AL 181.9; CE V.22.7); it refers to the author of P.1.1.20 vt. 1.

Bhārtrāhari uses the word bhāṣyāśūtra three times, in two places of his commentary (Ms 12d2, AL 39.18, Sw 47.10, CE I 32.27 and Ms 71b10–1 c1, AL 213.15–17, CE VI (1) 26.4–5). On both occasions the context is a sentence of Patañjali na cedāniṁ acaryāḥ stārāni krtva nirantarayaṁ, in which, according to Bhārtrāhari, the word stāra refers to what he would call vākyas, i.e. to vārttikas of Kāṭyāyaṇa. The first time he uses bhāṣyāśūtra while commenting on a Bhāṣya passage which contains this sentence (see Ojha (1978, esp. pp. 222f.) and immediately following his second and preceding his third use of the word bhāṣyāśūtra Bhārtrāhari actually cites the sentence na cedāniṁ. . . . We must conclude that we cannot infer more from Bhārtrāhari's use of the word bhāṣyāśūtra than that he wanted to make clear that stāra in Patañjali's sentence did not denote stūras of Pāṇini.

Bhārtrāhari distinguishes a number of times in his Mahābhāṣyadipikā between a vākyakāra and a bhāṣyakāra. He does so explicitly at Ms 16b11–12 (AL 53.9–10, Sw 63.10, CE II 25.26–25; Ms 41b9 (AL 123.23, Sw 144.18, CE IV.11.11); Ms 65c11 (AL 197.8–9, CE VI [1] 9.23–24; Ms 104b5–6 (AL 298.6–7). It is clear that vākya is used to designate what we are wont to call vārttika. For example, Ms 29d9 (AL 92.9–10, Sw 108.6, CE II 19.20–20) reads: yad evoktam vākyakāreṇa vrītisamavāyārtha upadesa iti. The phrase vrītisamavāyārtha upadesaḥ here ascribed to the vākyakāra is vt. 15 of the first Åhnikā of the Mahābhāṣya (I p.13, l.2). Similarly, Ms 15c3–4 (AL 107.13–14, Sw 125.12, CE III.12.8–9) has vākyakārasya vrītīdṛṣṭah vākyarthaṁ uttarāttham iti vacanād. . . . Here P.1.1.3 vt. 7 (I p.47, l.20) is quoted and ascribed to the vākyakāra. Sometimes the word vākya alone refers to a vārttika. So Ms 76a3–4 (AL 225.1–3), which proposes to connect two vākyas which turn out to be vt. 4 and 5 on P.1.1.38 (vākyasya vākyena sambandhād adosajā idam eva sambandham upaniṣyate | avibhaktāv itarātthāvad aprasaiddhiḥ = [vt. 4] aśiṣṇam asaṃkhyam iti vā [ = vt. 5] . . . ). Similarly, Ms 68c2 (AL 205.6, CE VI [1] 25.25–26) summarizes the contents of P.1.1.27 vt. (vākyasya varṇānamatvam kaj arthah) in the words: akeṣā pravṛtiṣanām iti samāpo vākyārthaḥ; this is then contrasted with the opinion of the bhāṣyakāra: bhāṣyakārasa tu naivaṁ vākyārtham varṇayati | kevalam pāṭha-pravṛtiṣanāṁ upaniṣyati.

On one occasion Bhārtrāhari ascribes something to the Bhāṣya which at least one later author considers written by Kāṭyāyaṇa. Mrbh II.44. 17–18 (on P.3.1.35 vt. 1) has: evanat tarhi kāśyaneśu iti vādyatram | kīṁ
The only puzzling quotation is 4b. Since however 4b and 4c clearly belong together - both consist of two parts which are connected in the Bhāṣya with the words vataḥ paścād āha - and 4c belongs to a vārttika, we may not be troubled overmuch by 4b.²⁸

It should be clear by now that the division of the Mahābhāṣya which came to be generally accepted was not taken for granted by Bhaṭṭṛhari. Where we see in the short sentences which are commented upon in the Bhāṣya (the 'Vārttikas') the work of one author (or perhaps several of them), in the Bhāṣya the work of another, Bhaṭṭṛhari's idea on this matter was different. He too distinguished between at least two authors, but he drew the boundaries differently. We may not be able to say regarding each portion of the Mahābhāṣya to which author Bhaṭṭṛhari ascribed it.²⁹ It seems however clear that in his opinion many Bhāṣya portions and many, or most, vārttikas belonged together and had one single author. These parts of the Mahābhāṣya were apparently called 'Vārttika' by Bhaṭṭṛhari.

2.3. Little is known about the history of the Pāṇīnian grammar from Patañjali until Bhaṭṭṛhari (about 150 B.C. - 450 A.D.). Yet there is one surviving work which probably belongs to this period and which refers to the Mahābhāṣya and the vārttikas therein: Vyāḍī's Paribhāṣāvṛtti (see BRONKORST 1983: section 6). This work leaves no doubt that its author was well acquainted with the Mahābhāṣya (Abhyankar 1967: Intr. p. 11, 13-14). But it does not mention the Mahābhāṣya or its author Patañjali by name. It does however refer by name to the author of the vārttikas. Vyāḍī mentions the (or a) 'Vārttikakāra' twice, viz. on Paribhāṣās 6 (p. 6, l. 7) and 32 (p. 16, l. 16). The vārttikas referred to are P. 5.4.69 vt. 1 and P. 3.1.13 vt. 1 and 2 respectively. The non-mention of Patañjali and his Mahābhāṣya may indicate that these were not yet conceived of as different from 'Vārttikakāra' and 'Vārttika'.

A separate position is occupied by Śābara's Mīmāṃsābhāṣya. On sūtra 10.8.4 this work quotes a vārttika (P. 2.1.1 vt. 2), ascribes it to the

²⁸ The Vṛtti has a puzzling reference to a 'Vārttika' on VP 2.207, a passage which Prof. A.N. Akuljkar was kind enough to send to me after the completion of this article, and which can now also be found in K. A. Subramaniam Iyer's recent edition (p. 241): eya ... vārttike bhāṣāny uddhārayaḥ jugyopadeg jugyopade bhāṣānyād āhava iti. The context shows that the topic of discussion is meaningless (vārttika) suffixes, and indeed all the words enumerated are formed with such an affix: jugyopadeg by P. 3.1.5, jugyopade by P. 3.1.28, bhāṣānyād āhava by P. 5.4.7 and āhava by P. 5.4.29. But these words are not given as illustrations in either Bhāṣya or vārttikas. Perhaps we must conclude that the Vṛtti referred to another work called 'Vārttika', the precise name of which (eya ... vārttika) has become unrecognizable.

²⁹ Bhaṭṭṛhari may not have been certain about this himself in all cases.
(or a) 'Vārttikākāra' who is then named 'Kātyāyana' (nītyo hy asya naśābdasya subantasambandhena samāsa iti vārttikakārō bhagavān kātyāyano manyate sma | vācanaṇāṁthakyaḥ sa svabhāvasiddhavād iti [P. 2.1.1 vt. 2]). The information that the Vārttikākāra was called 'Kātyāyana' can be derived from the Bhāṣya on P. 3.2.118 (cf. Kielhorn 1876a: 26), with the implication that the author of the Bhāṣya was someone else. The Mahābhāṣya is repeatedly quoted in the Mīmāṃsābhāṣya (Garge 1952: 23-25), but never mentioned by name; its author is usually not mentioned either, but the words ācārya and abhiṣyukta are used once each in this connection. The impression is here created that neither the work nor its author had a generally accepted name.

This brings us to the remarkable fact that the names 'Pātañjali' and Mahābhāṣya do not seem to have been used in connection with grammar in any work older than the Vṛttī on Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadiya. They occur for the first time in VP 2.482 and 485, verses which are really part of the Vṛttī (Bronkhorst 1988: 123f.). Were these names invented in order to fill the lacuna which came about when it was discovered that more than one author had composed the Mahābhāṣya as it was known, viz., with vārttikas?

3.1. The striking agreement between the use of the word vārttika in the Yuktidipikā and in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadipikā, and the agreement which must consequently have existed between their views on the Mahābhāṣya, explain how 'Vārttika' could for some time come to denote a category of literary compositions in which short nominal sentences alternate with their explanations in a more verbal style, as exemplified in the Yuktidipikā and the Tattvārthavārttika (both of which are also called Rājavārttika). It may also explain something else which has long puzzled modern students.

I-ching, the Chinese pilgrim who visited India at the end of the 7th century, mentions in his chapter on the Sanskrit grammarians a work which he calls 'Vṛttisūtra' and ascribes to Jayāditya (Brough 1973: 255f.; cf. Takakusu 1896: 175f.). This work consists of 18,000 slokas and "supplements its sūtra-text, and discusses in detail numerous (possible) interpretations. ... It discusses fully the (grammatical) usages current in the world, and investigates the rules of (the language addressed to) the gods." The Vṛttisūtra is commented upon in the Cūrṇi. The Cūrṇi, which contains 24,000 slokas, "is a work of the learned Pātañjali." This, again, cites the former Sūtras. The Cūrṇi is again commented upon in the 'Bhartṛhariśūtra'.

At an earlier occasion (1983: App. I) I tentatively proposed that Jayāditya collected the vārttikas and vārttika-like statements found in the Kāśikā, and perhaps composed some of them. In this way, I suggested, I-ching's obvious confusion of Kātyāyana and Jayāditya would become understandable. 'Vṛttisūtra' would then be a name both for Kātyāyana's vārttikas and for the vārttika-like statements in the Kāśikā.

The present investigation has made another interpretation far more probable. Since we have now come to think that at this early date Kātyāyana's vārttikas were not looked upon as a separate work by themselves, I-ching cannot have heard about this as a separate work and then made a mistake about its authorship. Rather, he may have heard of the twofold division of the Mahābhāṣya which we now think was current at that time, viz. the division into a 'Vārttika' which contained far more than just nominal sentences, and the remainder of the Bhāṣya.

It appears that I-ching knew just this division, and used the names vṛttisūtra and cūrṇi for them. The first of these two names is peculiar in this context, but I-ching's account leaves us no choice. The name cūrṇi for the Mahābhāṣya, or much of it, is already familiar to us.

We see that according to I-ching's testimony the Vṛttisūtra is smaller, but not much smaller, than the Cūrṇi. Together they count 42,000 slokas, a number which may be less than half the total number of the Mahābhāṣya, but which is at any rate far closer to the truth than the number of 24,000 slokas said to be contained in the Cūrṇi.

---

20 Note that VP 2.482 and 485 have pātañjali, not 'Pātañjali'; see Bronkhorst 1983: section 7.3. Another early mention of the name, possibly designating the author of the Mahābhāṣya there as well, occurs in the Pāli Cūlavamsa 37.217; here the spelling is pāṭājali. The Yuktidipikā refers to a Śāṅkhya philosopher of this name on a few occasions. Normally it has 'Pātañjali', once (p. 121, l. 9 [with fn. 2]) pātañjali" it seems. The Yoga Bhāṣya (3.44) has 'Pātañjali'. See further Weber 1862: 147n.

21 The modern view is already present in Jindrabuddhi's Nyāsa where it explains (1 p. 4): bhāṣyam kātyāyanapraptānām vākyānām vicervānām patañjali-prasūtām. Similarly Haradatta's Padamāñjari.

22 The translation is Brough's (1973: 257), who points at the similarity of the second sentence with the opening lines of the Mahābhāṣya; see below.

23 Brough (1973: 257) suggests that the Chinese transcription "has apparently arisen from a confusion between the name of the author, Pātañjali, and a designation of his work: I-ching must have heard some such form as Pātañjala-bhāṣya". If I-ching heard 'Pātañjali' rather than 'Pātañjali' (see note 20 above), the confusion becomes even more intelligible.

24 I-ching does not seem to have had much idea of what a sloka was; see Brough 1973: 249 n. 8.
I-ching's description of the Vṛtīsūtra ("It discusses fully the (grammatical) usages current in the world, and investigates the rules of the language addressed to the gods"; see above) may reflect the opening lines of the Mahābhāṣya (केशम सबदानम | लक्षितकामाक्षितानम ca), as Brough (1973: 257) has pointed out. In this case the conclusion seems justified that these lines were considered part of the 'Vārttika' at that time.

The objection that the name 'Jayādītya' points toward the Kāśikā as being meant by 'Vṛtīsūtra' is not strong. The opinion that the Kāśikā had two authors, Jayādītya and Vāmana, is almost certainly wrong and probably due to Jinendrauddha's Nyāsa (Bronkhorst 1983: App. I). This means that we know little about who wrote the Kāśikā, and few conclusions can be drawn from the name 'Jayādītya'.

It must here be conceded that Brough was able to draw what appears to be correct conclusions merely from I-ching's statements, without the information which we now think we possess on the ideas which existed regarding the Mahābhāṣya in I-ching's time. He observed (1973: 257): "It seems likely, however, that I-ching was unable to discriminate between the Vārttikas and the Mahābhāṣya: witness his statement that the 'vṛtti-sūtra' consists of 18,000 ślokas; and the second part of the Chinese passage quoted makes sense if I-ching is basing it on the opening lines of the Mahābhāṣya...". This lack of discrimination, we now think, was not confined to I-ching.

3.2. The name 'Vārttika' did not only come to denote works like the Yuktidipikā and the Tattvārthavārttikā. In fact, among the early works called 'Vārttika'25 there are far more which are of a different type altogether. Most seem to follow the example of the verses quoted in the Mahābhāṣya, often called ślokavārttikā by the commentators (see Kielhorn 1886: 229 [215]). Indeed, several works are called 'Ślokavārttikā'. The most famous among them was composed by the Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila Bhāṭṭa. Another Ślokavārttikā was written by Vidyānanda and comments on the Tatvārtha Sūtra. There is also a Nirūktaślokavārttikā.

Besides the self-styled 'Ślokavārttikās' there are many 'Vārttikas' which consist of verse. From among the many instances may be mentioned Dhammakirti's Pramāṇavārttikā, Suresvara's Brahmaśūtra, Bhādārānyakopaniṣad- and Tatītiyopaniṣad-ārthānītikā, two Śivasūtra-ārthānītikā (one by Bhāskara, one by Varadarāja), and others.

25 The original Vārttika of Kātyāyana was, in accordance with its derivation, 'dealing with the procedure of the grammar of Pāṇini' (Thieme 1955: 429 [1967] n. 1). The later authors of Vārttikas may or may not have had a similar purpose in view.

26 This was pointed out to me by Prof. T. E. Vetter.

It is clear from this enumeration that 'Vārttika' came to designate primarily a commentary in verse-form. Prose Vārttikas like the Yuktidipikā and the Tattvārthavārttikā are few in number. Besides these two works there is Uddyotakara's Nyāyavārttikā which however contains only some passages in 'Vārttika' style (see Wezler 1974: 441f.). Other prose Vārttikas like Kumārila's Tantravārttikā, Vijñānavāsikṣu's Yogabhāṣyavārttikā and Kṛṣṇalilākṣa's Daivavārttikā do not seem to preserve a trace of it. Moreover, the 'Vārttika' style is used once in Jayantabhaṭṭa's Nyāyamaṇjarī (Wezler 1974: 442f.), a work which does not seem to have been considered a 'Vārttika' at any time. The same is true of the Nyāya Bhāṣya, in which this style was already noticed by Windisch (1888: 15f.). Something closely resembling this style is found in other works as well, e.g., in Śankara's Bhādārānyakopaniṣad-Bhāṣya. This means that the style of the Yuktidipikā and of the Tattvārthavārttikā stopped being looked upon as typical for prose Vārttikas rather soon. We may suspect that this was not unconnected with the changing ideas regarding the Mahābhāṣya.
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Abbreviations

AI. Abhyanark and Limaye’s edition of Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
Bh Bhartṛhari
CE ‘Critical edition’ of Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
Mbh Mahābhāṣya
Ms Manuscript of Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
P. Pāṇinian Sūtra
Sw Swaminathan’s edition of Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
TS Tattvārthasūtra
VP Vākyapadīya
YD Yuktidīpikā