

## THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE VĀKYA-KĀṆḌA-ṬĪKĀ\*

ASHOK AKLUJKAR

1.1 Since the date of its publication (1887) in the Benares Sanskrit Series, the *ṭīkā* on the verses of the second book of Bhartṛhari's *Trikāṇḍī* or *Vākyapadīya* (Aklujkar 1969:547-555) has been ascribed to Puṇya-rāja. A few scholars (e.g. Kosambi 1945:65.9-10, 67.7-9; Bhattacharya 1954:4-5) have given the name of the author of this commentary as Helā-rāja, but that is obviously due to oversight and is not intended to be a deliberately reached conclusion regarding the authorship of the work.<sup>1</sup> Thus, on the whole, the ascription to Puṇya-rāja has gone unchallenged in the writings of the compilers of manuscript catalogues, of the editors of Bhartṛhari's works, of the scholars working on Bhartṛhari's views and of the historians of Sanskrit grammar. However, it seems likely to me that a serious mistake has been made in deciding the problem of authorship in this case and that the *Vākyā-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā* is more likely to be a work of Helā-rāja, the well-known commentator of the

\* The present article is an extended version of the paper that I read before the South Asia section of the one hundred and eighty-first annual meeting of the American Oriental Society in Cambridge, Massachusetts (April 1971). Appropriately enough, it also marks an extension of the critical activity which Paṇḍita Charu Deva Shastri initiated more than forty years ago concerning the works of Bhartṛhari. I wish to acknowledge the assistance received from the Canada Council and to express my gratitude to Professor Wilhelm Rau and the obliging librarians at several manuscript libraries in India, without whose kindness the necessary manuscript material would not have become available to me.

1. According to Dvivedi (1961 : 8), Hari-vṛṣabha, Puṇya-rāja, and Helā-rāja are the three names of one and the same person, namely, Helā-rāja. P. P. S. Shastri (1930:4348) also remarks that Puṇya-rāja and Helā-rāja are identical. I do not think that these baseless views merit any discussion (cf. S. Iyer 1969:17). For a text-critical explanation of the name Hari-vṛṣabha, see Aklujkar 1972:182-183 fn. 2.

third book of the *Trikāṇḍī*, than of Puṇya-rāja.<sup>1</sup> The evidence favouring this view is manifold and considerably strong when taken cumulatively.

2.1 I am aware of the existence of twenty-seven manuscripts of the *vikya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā*.<sup>2</sup> From among them, eight are incomplete and do not contain any statements of ascription (these are Rau 1971:31-35, mss. E[2], E[17], E[18], E[19], E[22], E[25], E[26], and ms. new no. 781 in the Sanskrit College Library at Calcutta). One (Rau 1971:35, ms. E[21]) is complete as a commentary but does not contain a colophon stating the authorship. The colophons of two (Rau 1971:32, mss. E[4] and E[5]) are not known to me at present, as I have not so far been able to examine them in any form.<sup>3</sup> Thus, there remain sixteen manuscripts of whose colophons I have first hand knowledge. Out of them fourteen ascribe the commentary to Puṇya-rāja<sup>4</sup>, while two (Rau 1971:32, 34; mss.

1. (a) Charu Deva Shastri (193): 636-644, 1934 : Skt. Intro. 18-26; cf. Ramakrishna Kavi 1930:235-241; Kunhan Raja 1936:285-298) has convincingly argued that the commentary on the first book of the *Vākyapadīya* published in the Benares Sanskrit Series is, in fact, simply an abridgement of Bharṭṛ-hari's own *Vṛtti* and that Puṇya-rāja should not be credited with its authorship. Varma (1970:ḍa) cannot be correct, when he says, "*Puṇya-rāja ki [prathama kāṇḍa ki] ṭīkā kā prāmāṇika saṃskaraṇa paṃ. Raghunātha Śarmā ne khaṇḍita rūpa meṃ prastuta kiya hai. Prācīna upalabdha rūpa ki prāmāṇikatā nitānta saṃdigdha hai.*"
- (b) Note that in the present article I do not wish even to suggest that the *ṭīkā* on the second book is an abridgement of the *Vṛtti* of the second book; cf. 4.1 below and S. Iyer 1969:42-44.
- (c) I hope that in future publications, at least about Bharṭṛ-hari, scholars will refrain from using the words *ṭīkā* and *vṛtti* interchangeably. The indiscriminate use of these words by Abhyankar-Limaye (1965:17 fn. 11, 39 fn. 6, 44 fn. 3, 47 fn. 2, 53 fn. 14, 56 fn. 12, 57 fn. 6) is to be regretted.
2. Rau (1971:31-35) enumerates 26 manuscripts. I have omitted his E[12], as it is obviously a recent transcript, and added to his list of manuscripts (new) nos. 177 and 781 available in the library of the Sanskrit College at Calcutta,
3. From Abhyankar-Limaye 1965: II and 57 fn. 6, I get the impression that the colophon of E[4] runs thus: *iti Bharṭṛ-hari-kṛte Vākyapadīye dvitīyaṃ kāṇḍam. samāpiṭā ca Vākya-pradīpa-kārikā* (see 4.3 below). *Śāli-vāhana-śake 1456 Jayabde Śarad-tāu Āsvina-māse śukla-pakṣa ekādaśyām Godā-tīre dakṣiṇa-kūle Nṛ-simha-kṣetre Siddheśvara-deva-saṃnidhau Viśva-nāthasya Mukundena likhitam.* If this is actually the case then E[4], like E[21], is complete as a commentary, but does not contain any statement as to the author of the commentary.
4. These fourteen are E[1], E[3], E[6], E[8], E[9], E[10], E[11], E[13], E[15], E[16], E[20], E[23], E[24], and ms. new no. 177 in the Sanskrit College Library at Calcutta. In these, the author's name is generally (see fn. 9 below) mentioned as follows : *iti Śrī-Puṇya-rāja-kṛtā Vākyapadīya-dvītiya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā samāpiṭā.*

E[7] and E[14]) ascribe it to Helā-rāja.<sup>1</sup> Now, it would not be proper in this particular case to conclude that Puṇya-rāja must be the author on the ground that the manuscripts attributing authorship to him are more than those speaking of Helā-rāja as the author. In the first place, the manuscripts whose colophons ascribe the commentary to Puṇya-rāja are relatively recent. None of them is as old as manuscript E[7], which ascribes the commentary to Helā-rāja.<sup>2</sup> This is evident from the dates recorded by the scribes and also from a comparison of readings.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, there is room to suppose that the colophons crediting Puṇya-rāja with the authorship of the commentary arose out of confusion. But a similar supposition cannot be justified in the case of the other set of colophons. The name of Puṇya-rāja appears in the last line of the summary verses appended at the end of the prose commentary (see verse 58 in 2.2 below). It is possible to say, therefore, that this mention of Puṇya-rāja led some scribe into believing that the whole commentary came from Puṇya-rāja's pen.<sup>4</sup> But what explanation can one give for the action of those copyists who have

1. The colophon of these two manuscripts reads : *iti śrī-Bhūti-rāja-tanaya-Helā-rāja-viracite Vākya-pāḍīya-vyākhyāne Vākya-kāṇḍaḥ samāptāḥ*. The essential similarity (*iti Bhūti-rāja-tanaya-Helā-rāja...samāptāḥ*) of this colophon with the statements appearing at the end of each of the fourteen chapters of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* indicates its genuineness.
2. E[7] is dated *sāmvat tri-rasa-bhū* or A. D. 1609/1610 (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965:11-111; Rau 1971:32). The manuscript E[4] definitely antedates it by about seventy-five years. In all probability, E[21] also precedes it in time. But these latter manuscripts do not inform us about the author of the commentary. See fn. 4 above.
3. I shall discuss the geneology of the manuscripts of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-tikā* in a future study. In the meanwhile, note that I am not claiming that E[7] is the oldest available manuscript of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-tikā*; it is claimed to be older than only those manuscripts which ascribe the *tikā* to Puṇya-rāja.
4. It is also probable that the ascription to Puṇya-rāja is a result of several successive scribal errors. Suppose that the sentence originally appearing at the end of the summary verses was *iti śrī-Puṇya-rāja-kṛtā Vākya-pāḍīya-dvītiya-kāṇḍa-kārikāḥ samāptāḥ*. We can then imagine it to have passed through the following stages and assumed its presently accepted form (fn. 5 above) : (a)-*kāṇḍa-rikāḥ samāptāḥ* (omission of the second *kā* through haplography) > (b)-*kāṇḍa-tikāḥ samāptāḥ* (mistaking *ri* for *tī*, which is not improbable in the Deva-nāgarī script) → (c) -*kāṇḍa-tikāḥ samāptāḥ* (realization that *i* in *tikā* is the long one) → (d) -*kāṇḍa-tikā samāptāḥ* (realization that it would be odd to use a plural form for one *tikā*) → (e) -*kāṇḍa-tikā samāptā* (realization that the adjective must agree in number with the noun it qualifies). From among these, stage (b) is partially attested in manuscript E[6], where we read *tikā* instead of the expected *tikā*. Evidence for stage (d) is furnished by the manuscripts E[1], E [3], E[9], and E [10].

credited Helā-rāja with the authorship? Since the name Helā-rāja is not mentioned either in the prose commentary or the summary verses, they must have written the colophons ascribing the work to Helā-rāja only because such colophons existed in the manuscripts they copied. Thus, it is more likely that they alone have preserved the older and genuine tradition regarding the authorship.<sup>1</sup>

2. 2 For the second piece of evidence, let us turn to the concluding portion of the summary verses (significant variant readings are shown in parentheses) : *ity eva (evam) Vākya-kāṇḍasya pramāya-viśayāḥ smṛtāḥ (sphuṭam) / saṃgatiḥ kīrtitā laghvī samāsenā nirākulā* //56// *vidvaj-janānām yah khalu sarvatra gīyate jagati / tata upasṛtya viracitā rājānaka-Śūra-varma-nāmnā vai (nāmnaiḥ) //57// Śaśāṅka-śiṣyāc chrutvaitad Vākya-kāṇḍam samāsataḥ/ Puṇya-rājena tasyoktā saṃgatiḥ kārīkāśritā* //58// These mean: "These are said to be the topics to be known from the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*. A brief, but not unintelligibly compressed, statement of their mutual connections (or order) has been made with succinctness. Having approached (or come from) him who among the learned men is praised everywhere in the world (or who is praised everywhere in the world of learned men), one named rājānaka Śūra-varman has composed [this]. Having heard (learned) this *Vākya-kāṇḍa* briefly from the disciple of Śaśāṅka, Puṇya-rāja has given a statement of mutual connections in the form of verses (or relating to the verses of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*)".<sup>2</sup> Here I do not know how to reconcile

1. To say that the copyists had read Helā-rāja's commentary on the third book, had understood from it that he wrote a commentary on the second book too, and hence were led to change the colophon of the commentary on the second book would not be a straight-forward explanation. The copyist class of India is not known to have been that learned on a general scale or that much interested in the problems of authorship. Furthermore, since there is no evidence of Puṇya-rāja's authorship prior to the date of the oldest manuscript ascribing the commentary to Helā-rāja, such an explanation would involve assuming that very thesis which it seeks to prove. It would also force one to presuppose an impressive degree of deftness on the part of the copyist who allegedly deprived Puṇya-rāja of his authorship, for the colophons of E[7] and E[14] not only resemble those of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* (see fn. 6 above), but also are followed by *śrī-gopī-jana-vallabho vijayatetarām*, a distinct prayer associated with the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*, (S. Iyer 1963:209.19). Note also that E[7] and E[14] begin with *om gopī-jana-vallabho vijnyatetarām. om namaḥ śrī-bhagavat-Pāṇini-Kātyāyana-Patañjalibhyaḥ*, which again characteristically belongs to the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* (S. Iyer 1963:1.3).

2. (a) In the BSS edition the summary verses total 60. They are in fact 59. Verse 48 of the BSS edition consists of repetitions of 47cd and 49ab, and hence should be dropped. My references here presuppose this correction

verse 57 with verse 58. The former is composed in some variety of the *āryā* metre<sup>1</sup> and seems to give the credit of composing a statement of the topics discussed in the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* to Rājānaka Śūra-varman. Verse 58, on the other hand, is composed in the *anustubh* metre and declares Puṇya-rāja to be the composer of the statement summarizing the contents of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*.<sup>2</sup> In any case, it is evident that Puṇya-rāja does not claim, or is not given, credit for writing the commentary on the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*; his contribution is clearly limited to the composition of the summary verses (contrast S. Iyer 1969:41.2-4). Nor is Puṇya-rāja credited with having written a commentary on, or even having read for that matter, any other book of the *Trikāṇḍī*.<sup>3</sup> This hardly agrees with the indications in the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-tīkā* itself. It is clear from that *tīkā* that its author had written a commentary also on the first book, as it contains references to the first book (pp. 80. 12, 82. 14-15, 284. 12-13) and as it begins with (cf. S. Iyer 1965:x.11-14; 1969:41.13-23) *evam śabdasya prayojana-sahitam sva-rūpādikam leśato nirṇītam. tasya ca sādharanyena vācakatvaṁ vyavasthāpitam*: "Thus the nature, etc. of a linguistic unit have been partly determined along with the purpose [of the science of grammar]. That that linguistic unit expresses meaning has also been generally (or

and follow the numbering of Abhyankar-Limaye 1965: 195-196.

(b) Ramakrishna Kavi (1930:237) renders *saṃgatīḥ kārīkāśrītā* with 'the structure of the verses (of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*)' or 'linking of the *kārīkā*s.'

1. As available in the manuscripts and the printed editions, verse 57 is metrically defective. Prof. T. Venkatacharya of the University of Toronto suggests that we should read *vidaj-janānām* in the place of *vidvaj-janānām* to remove the metrical defect.
2. (a) Ramakrishna Kavi (1930:237) seems to have sensed the problem which verses 57 and 58 pose, for he remarks, "[The summary verses] are attributed to Śūra-varman or to Puṇya-rāja. The verse which contains the name of Śūra-varman appears to contain a clerical error; probably the author meant that Puṇya-rāja wrote his commentary for Śūra-varman."  
(b) Raghavan Pillai (1971: xvii) apparently is of the opinion that *rājānaka* Śūra-varman is simply another designation of Puṇya-rāja. In that case I fail to see why so many words intervene between *rājānaka-Śūra-varma-nāmnā* and *Puṇya-rājena* and why *viracitā* and *uktā* are employed to form mutually independent sentences with the two expressions in the instrumental case (*rājānaka-Śūra-varma-nāmnā viracitā* and *Puṇya-rājena uktā*). Would not one rather expect the sentence to be *rājānaka-Śūra-varma-nāmnā Puṇya-rājena viracitā* (or *uktā*), if what Raghavan Pillai says were to be the case?
3. (a) It follows from this observation that Kunhan Raja (1936:292-293) cannot be correct when he maintains that Puṇya-rāja wrote commentaries on all the three books of the *Trikāṇḍī*.  
(b) Raghavan (1963:745. 10-20) refers to Puṇya-rāja as the author of the commentary on the third book, but that is obviously due to oversight.

commonly)<sup>1</sup> established.” Helā-rāja’s authorship of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā*, on the other hand, can be easily reconciled with these indications; from his *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*, we know for certain that he had written a commentary called *Śabda-prabhā*, on the first book of the *Trikāṇḍī* (S. Iyer 1969:36-37, 410-411). Thus, it would be natural for Helā-rāja, and definitely not for Puṇya-rāja of the summary verses, to presuppose a reader’s awareness of the existence of his commentary on the first book.

2.3 In his commentary on the third book, Helā-rāja refers many times to the points discussed in the preceding books. Most of such references pertain or can be said to pertain, to Bhartṛhari’s *kārikās* and *Vṛtti* (Aklujkar 1972:181-198) of the first two *kāṇḍas* or to Helā-rāja’s so far undiscovered commentary on the first *kāṇḍa*.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, they cannot be used to determine Helā-rāja’s relationship to the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā*. However, there is one reference which can be said to have been made by Helā-rāja with his own commentary on the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* in mind. While explaining verse 3.9.105 (p.93.18-20; cf. Helā. 3.7.125 p. 329.6-7), he remarks : *ābādhādivad yuktam śabda-saṁskāra-nimittatvam asya. puruṣa-dharmeṣv api hi śāstram adhikṛtam iti vicāritam Vākyapadye*. “It is proper for this (property of the speaker called *āsaṁsā*) to become a cause in the derivation of a word as it is for anguish (or distress, *ābādhā*). It has been [already] discussed in the *Vākyapadya*<sup>3</sup> that the science [of grammar] is concerned also with the properties of persons [since, in the derivation of sentence-usable words, whether or not a particular suffix should be added to an inflectional base depends on the emotional state to be conveyed].” A statement corroborating this reference to what precedes is found only in the *ṭīkā* on verse 2.78 (pp. 109.17-111.8-11; cf. p. 146.16) : *śāstrasya tu śabdārtha-puruṣa-dharmeṣv adhikārah ..... puruṣa-dharmā vaktṛtva-pratipattṛtvaprabhṛtayah, tatra vaktṛdharmā ābādhāsūyā-saṁmati-kopa-kutsana-bhartsanādayaś ceti. pratipattṛ-dharmās tu kutsyamānatva-prabhṛtaya eva tatra śāstrasya pluta-dvir-vacanādi-vidhāyakatvenīdhikāra iti*. “The science [of grammar] is concerned with word (or linguistic unit), meaning, and the properties of persons.... The properties of persons are ‘being a speaker,’ ‘being a hearer,’ etc. Among them, the properties of the speaker are anguish, envy, respect, anger, censure,

1. i.e. with respect to both the word and the sentence, and without indulging in the problem of determining the fundamental or primary expressive unit.
2. This should be evident from the critical study of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* on which I am working at present and which I hope to publish in the future.
3. In Helā-rāja’s usage, the term *Vākyapadya* refers only to the first two books of the *Trikāṇḍī*; cf. Aklujkar 1969:549-550.

solding, etc. The properties of the hearer are, on the other hand: 'being censured', etc. The science [of grammar] is concerned with them as [a science] enjoining (the use of) prolonged vowels, reduplication, etc. "The similarity of diction (*śāstra*, *puruṣa-dharma*, *ābādha*, *adhikṛ*), in addition to that of content, between this statement and Helā-rāja's remark is self-evident. Furthermore, this statement is so far removed from the concerns of the *kārikās* that it seems unlikely that a statement similar to it could have once existed in Bhartṛhari's *Vṛtti*, although such a possibility cannot be ruled out with certainty, since the *Vṛtti* on 2. 77-151 is not available for verification in the only known manuscript. Thus, we find that a passage which is unique to a not-too-essential portion of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā* answers the expectation arising out of Helā-rāja's rather incidental remark in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*. This would be hard to account for, unless both works were authored by one and the same person.

2.4 Our present problem of authorship can be studied from one more angle. Suppose for a moment that Helā-rāja is the author of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā* and the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*. Then, since the same mind has produced both works, we should find some similarity of associations in them, just as, say, in the case of Śaṅkara's philosophical commentaries or of Kālidāsa's literary works. A careful examination of the two *ṭikās* reveals that this indeed is the case with the quotations in them as well as with their diction.

2.5 The *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā* quotes sixteen verses from the third book : pp. 98.6.8 (3.1.75cd, 3.1.75ab) 98.11-12 (3.1.76), 140.1-2 (3.3.55), 145.21-22 (3.14.485), 146.9-10 (3.14.484), 162.5-7 (3.14.156), 163.11-12 (3.7.156), 164.9.10 (3.7.159), 167.17-18 (3.1.1, 3.1.2ab), 176.17-18 (3.14.248), 208.18-21 (3.10.7-9), 213.4-5 (3.1.75cd), 240.1-2 (3.3.29). No discord is noticed between the explanations of these verses in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* and the contexts in which they are quoted in the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā*. In fact, there exists a certain degree of correspondence in terms of associations: (a) On BSS p. 162.5-7, verse 3. 14. 156 is cited in discussing the expression *pañcālā jana-padaḥ*. In the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* (p. 78.11-13), this cited verse is explained in the context of *pañcālā jana-padaḥ*. (b) After the conclusion of the section on *karma-pravacanīyas* (BSS p. 167.17-18), the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā* quotes verse 3.1.1. In the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* on verse 3.1.1 (pp. 3.18-7.14), the *karma-pravacanīya* section of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* is summarized. (c) The Pāṇinian aphorism (4.4.2) *tena divyati khanati jayati jitam* forms the context in which verses 3.10.7-9 are cited on BSS p. 208.18-21. The same is taken as an illustration, when verses 3.10.7-9 are explained in

the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*.

2.6 To look from the other direction, about fifteen<sup>1</sup> verses from the second book are quoted in Helā-rāja's commentary on the third book : 3.1.1. p. 5.1-4, 16-17, p. 7.11.12 (2.197, 199, 204, 202), 3.1.3 p. 10.14-15 (2.70), 3.1.52 p. 61.15 (2.382a), 3.1.58-59 p. 66.21-22 (2.247), 3.1.74 p. 78.11-12 (2.15), 3.1.87 p. 84.22 (2.14), 3.3.31 p. 145.6 (2.118), 3.7.24 p. 255.5-6 (2.203), 3.7.58 p. 275.2 (2.250), 3.7.158 p. 359.5-6 (2.204), 3.9.97 p. 90.7-8 (2.15), 3.11.15 p. 108.24 (2.57a), 3.14.75 p. 40.4-5 (2.15), 3.14.76 p. 41.4-5 (2.233), 3.14.94 p. 49.9 (2.250), 3.14.205 p. 99.1 (2.425), 3.14.249 p. 115.13 (2.14). Here again no irreconcilable elements are noticed between the contexts in which the verses are cited in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* and the explanations of the cited verses which are given in the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā*. Quite to the contrary, the following point of similarity is noticed: The *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā* on 2.233 (BSS p. 179.56) remarks *etad uktam bhavaty avidyaiva vidyopāya iti*. Helā-rāja's *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* on 3.14.76, where 2.233 is quoted, reads *avidyaiva hi vidyopāyah*.

2.7 Let us now move on to associations indicated by quotations from works other than those of Bhartṛhari. In this respect one would not arrive at a justifiable conclusion by studying the passages from Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali. Since the material we are dealing with belongs to the Pāṇinian school of Sanskrit grammar, quotations from the *muni-traya* are only to be expected. Now, if with the exclusion of such quotations in mind we study the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā* and the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*, we find that both works agree in quoting from the following authors : Kumārila : BSS pp. 93.21-23 (*ŚV*, *Sphoṭa-vāda*, 69), 117.13 (*ŚV*, *Aṇḍa-vāda*, 33); Helā. 3.1.50 p. 60.5-6 (*TV* 2.1.4. p. 411), 3.7.15 p. 243.14 (*ŚV*, *Śūnya-vāda*, 254), 3.11.30 p. 120.14 (*ŚV*, *Vākyaādhikaraṇa*, 160). Jayāditya-Vāmana: BSS pp. 164. 1-2 (*kāśikā* on Pāṇini 2.3.52), 210.4-5 (*Kāśikā* 1.2.32); Helā. 3.1.34 p. 41. 21 and 3.8.1 p. 18.29 (*Kāśikā* 2.3.46). Dharma-kīrti : BSS p. 182.9-10 (*PV* 4.226 p. 439); Helā. 3.1.40 p. 47.15 (*PV* 2.356cd p. 205), 3.1.93-94 p. 94.15-16 (*PV* 3.162cd-163ab p. 307), 3.1.100 p. 100. 3-4 (*PV* 3.92 p. 288), 3.2.9. p. 113.12-13 (*PV* 2.435 p. 226, fn. 1), 3.3.1 p. 123.2-3 (*PV* 1.4 pp. 4-5), 3.3.42 p. 153.10-11 (*PV* 4.226 p. 439), 3.7.24 p. 252. 10.-11 (*PV* 1.26 p. 17). Maṇḍana-miśra: BSS p. 145.23-24 (*Sphoṭa-siddhi* 9); Helā. 3.14. 484 p. 213.21-22 (*Sphoṭa-siddhi* 9). In this

1. I say "about" because 2.382a and 2.57a in the list given here may not have been intended to be quotations by Helā-rāja; it is quite probable that he may have used them simply as familiar phrases.



inclination toward quoting only certain texts, one more peculiarity is noticed. Two quotations are common to both works (BSS p. 182.9-10, Helā. 3.3.42 p. 153.10-11 : *PV* 4.226 p. 439; BSS p. 145.23-24, Helā. 3.14.484 p. 213.21-22: *Sphoṭa-siddhi* 9), and one of those quotations (*Sphoṭa-siddhi* 9) is strongly associated with the *Mahābhāṣya* (*Paspaśāhnika* p. I.12.18-20; and on Pāṇini 2.2.6 p. I.411.19-20) passage *tailam bhuktaṃ, ghṛtaṃ bhuktaṃ* in both of them; it occurs in exactly the same context, thus indicating the possible working of one mind.

2.8 The evidence furnished by the similarities of association is corroborated by some common stylistic features: (a) Use of certain not too common compound expressions (the components of most of these expressions can be found in many other works; but the combinations in which they appear in the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-tikā* and the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* do not seem to be common): *adūra-viprakarṣa* 'without being removed too far, keeping together as much as possible'<sup>1</sup> BSS pp. 199.17, 266.9; Helā. 3.10.8 p. 101.21-22, 3.14.49 p. 28.1, 3.14.53 p. 30.11, 3.14.213 p. 102.2; *ayaḥ-śalākā-kalpa* '[mutually unconnected or unmerged] like sticks of iron BSS pp. 129.21,<sup>2</sup> 255.6, 265.20, 267.12; Helā. 3.4.1-2 p. 182.15, 3.7.156 p. 355.13; *kāla-parivāsa* 'covering or envelop in the form of time' BSS p. 285.10; Helā. 3.7.2 p. 232.11, 3.7.56 p. 273.23, 3.9.24 p. 58.8, 3.9.26 p. 58.24, 3.14.372 p. 163.22; *dṛśya-vikalpa*<sup>3</sup> 'perceived object and the intellectual construct' BSS pp. 137.22, 269.5-6; Helā. 3.1.6 p. 17.18, 3.1.19 p. 32.14, 3.3.33 p. 147.1, 3.3.42 p. 153.16, 3.7.3 p. 234.5, 3.7.6 p. 237.12, 3.8.24 p. 31.21, 3.9.40 p. 63.22-23, 3.14.273 p. 125.11, 3.14.473 p. 210.5-6, 3.14.569 p. 248.1-2; *paramarṣi* 'great sage advocating existence (*bhāva*), teacher of *Sāṃkhya*,<sup>4</sup> BSS pp. 139.22, 204.22, 287.8; Helā.

1. This expression is used at least once by Kṣīra-svāmin. See his commentary on Amara-siṃha's *Amara-koṣa* 2.6.122-123.
2. From 2.8e below it is clear that here the printed text should be corrected to read *kila. ayaḥ-śalākā-kalpānām...*
3. A similar *dvandva* compound, *dṛśya-vikalpa*, is found in Jayantabhaṭṭa's *Nyāya-maṇjarī*, part I, p. 23.
4. (a) In Īśvara-kṛṣṇa's *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* (verse 69), the term *paramarṣi* is used to refer to Kapila.  
(b) A derivative adjective, *pāramarṣa*, is found in the writings of Helā-rāja (3.9.59 p. 71.4), Vācaspati-miśra (*Nyāya-kaṇikā* on Maṇḍana-miśra's *Vidhi-viveka* p. 461), Malliṣeṇa (*Syād-vāda-maṇjarī* on Hema-candra's *Anyayoga-vyavacchedikā* or *Vyavaccheda-dvātrīṃśikā*, verses 11-12), and Kṛṣṇa-līlā-śuka-muni (*Puruṣakāra* on Deva's *Daiva*, p. 15). It does not always mean 'stated by the teachers of *Sāṃkhya*', as one would expect it to mean.

3.3.64 p. 169.13.; *pāmsūdakavat* 'like dust and water'<sup>1</sup> BSS pp. 108.22, 171.22; Helā. 3.14.53 p. 30.14, 3.14.59 p. 33.2, 3.14.95 p. 51.11; and *sarva-pārṣada* 'serving as basis of, accommodating, all branches of knowledge'<sup>2</sup> BSS pp. 186.24, 253.21; Helā. 3.3.1 p. 122.15. (b) Frequent use of the word *ācchurita* 'coloured, tinged:' BSS pp. 173.2-3, 260.12, 261.8; Helā. 3.1.7-8 p. 20.7, 3.14.15 p. 8.24, 3.14.25 p. 13.1-3, 3.14.204 p. 98.1, 3.14.624 p. 272.26. (c) Choice of the term *adhyāsa* to express the relation of identification between word and meaning (BSS. pp. 67.1-10, 85.7-14, 141.5, 189.11-13.; Helā. 3.1.6 p. 18.17, 3.1.11 p. 23.5-7, 3.3.1 p. 123.5, 3.3.2p. 126.7-17, 127.2-3, 3.3.29 p. 143.3-4, 3.3.32 p. 145.15-17) in the place of Bhartṛhari's (*Triṣṭubh* pp. 26.4-5, 249.10-15; *Vṛtti* 1.23 p. 59.1-4, 1.67 p. 126.3, 1.24-26 p. 71.4; 2.128) *tādrūpyāpādana*, so 'yam ity abhisambandha, pratyastarūpatā, vipariṇāma, asyedambhāva, svarūpādhyāroha, adhyavasāya and abhijalpa, and Vṛṣabha's (p. 59.10-22) *abhinna-rūpatā*, *abhedalakṣana-sambandha*, and *sārūpya*.<sup>3</sup> (d) Preference for the terms *jāti-sphoṭa* and *vyakti-sphoṭa* respectively for *sphoṭa* viewed as a universal and *sphoṭa* viewed as a particular (BSS pp. 64.4.15, 76.19-20, 81.11-13 Helā. 3.1.6 p. 18.15-16, 3.1.7-8 p. 20.5-6). in the place of Bhartṛhari's and Vṛṣabha's *śabdākṛti* (or *śabda-jāti*) and *śabda-vyakti*. (*Vṛtti* 1.23 p. 52.2-7, p. 57.1-4, 1.93 p. 159.6) Employment of the indeclinable *kila* at the end of a sentence to suggest slight disapproval or less than hearty acceptance of a view:<sup>4</sup> BSS. pp. 97.13-14, 129.21 (see fn. 20 above), 176.19, 183.9-10, 194.18-19; Helā. 3.1.45 p. 50.19-20, 3.1.68p. 73.4-5, 3.7.70 p. 287.4-5, 3.7.85 p. 300.14-15, 3.11.22 p. 115.14, 3.13.10 p. 141.17, 3.14.32 p. 18.11-12, 3.14.188-189, p. 93.17, 3.14.360 p. 159.21-22, 3.14.367 p. 161.17. (f) Use of *yadi param* in the sense 'if at the most': BSS pp. 258.15-22, 259.8; Helā. 3.3.39 p. 151.8. (g) Paraphrase of *odanam pacati* in exactly the same word as *viklidyatas taṇḍulān vikledayati*: BSS p. 244.21-22; Helā. 3.8.1 p. 20.18.

1. According to Raghavan (1963 : 21), this expression is used by Bhoja in the eighth chapter of the *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*.
2. (a) As Raghavan (1963:722) mentions, Bhoja also employs the compound *sarvapārṣada* in his *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*.  
(b) For the relation of *sarva-pārṣada* to Patañjali's *sarva-veda-pāriṣada*, see S. Iyer 1951:86, 1969:74-75.
3. It need not be supposed that Bhartṛhari did not know the term *adhyāsa*. Patañjali's *Yogasūtra* 3.17 and Vyāsa's (?) *bhāṣya* on it employ the term. As I shall argue in a forthcoming article, both these works are older than Bhartṛhari's.
4. (a) Such use of *kila* is noticed also in the writings of Bhartṛhari (3.7.70), Jayanta-bhaṭṭa (*Nyāya-mañjarī*, part 1, p. 7). and Vaṣu-bandhu (see the references to Yaśo-mitra in (b) below).

2.9 Finally, attention must also be drawn to certain features of theoretical discussion that are shared by the commentary ascribed to Puṇya-rāja and by Helārāja's *Prakīrṇaka-prakāṣa*. It should be noted that these features are not necessitated by the contexts in which they appear and hence can be satisfactorily explained only as stemming from the author's personality and associations with theoretical concepts. Among them are : (a) Characterization of Bhartr-hari's effort as *prauḍha-vāda* or *praudhi-vāda*, when, in the view of the commentator, he is over-generous in offering options to his philosophical adversaries : BSS pp. 116.22, 250.19; Helā. 3.1.11 p. 23.7, 3.3.18 p. 135.17, 3.3.28 p. 142.7. (b) Acceptance of the relation of identification (*adhyāsa*) as more basic than that of capability (*yogyatā*) or that of cause and effect (*kārya-kāraṇa-bhāva*) : BSS pp. 67.1-10, 85.7-14, 141.4-6, 189.11-12; Helā. 3.1.11 p. 23.5-7, 3.3.1 p. 123.5, 3.3.2 p. 126.7-17, 3.3.29 p. 143.3-4. (c) comment to the effect that the relation of cause and effect between word and meaning is stated in deference to the view of the *Vijñāna-vādins* : BSS p. 67.4-5; Helā. 3.3.1 pp. 122.11-123.7. (d) Clarification of the distinction between *saṃghāta* (or *samudāya*) and *sphoṭa*: BSS p. 173.1-3; Helā. 3.8.7-8 p. 23.14-16.

3.1 I believe that the evidence I have presented above makes Helārāja's authorship of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-tikā* more than a likely proposition. Even when not taken cumulatively, it is sufficient at least to caution a reader against an uncritical acceptance of the descriptions "wrongly assigns" and "fälschlich" attached respectively by Abhyankar-Limaye (1965:II; cf. p. 231:30-32) and Rau (1971:33) to the colophons of manuscripts E[7] and E[14]. Its force would diminish only (a) if we discovered ascription to Puṇya-rāja in manuscripts or works older than 1609/1610 A. D., the date of E[7], (b) if we came across quotations from or statements on the contents of Helārāja's commentary on the second book and did not find passages answering our

(b) *kila-śabdah para-mata-dyotanārthah* (Yaśo-mitra, *Sphuṭārthābhidharma-kośa-vyākhyā*, *Kośa-sthāna* I, p. 12; cf. pp. 24,31,66,74,93,100; *Kośa-sthāna* II, pp. 2,42.47; *Kośa-sthāna* III, pp. 6,75). *kila iti surayah pramāṇānupapannatvenā-rucim prakāśayanti* (Vidyānanda on Samanta-bhadra's *Tukty-anuśāsana* verse 39, pp. 88-89). *kilety āgamāruci-nyakkaraneṣu. 'jaghāna Kamsam kila.'* '[evam kila] kecid vadanti.' 'ayaṃ kila yotsyate'. (Daṇḍa-nātha Nārāyaṇa. *Hṛdaya-hārini* on Bhoja's *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa*, part I, p. 35).

1. The acceptance by the Buddhists of *kārya-kāraṇa-bhāva* between word and meaning is evident from *Abhidharma-dīpa* with *Vibhāṣā-prabhā-vṛtti*, p. 274, and Sucarita-miśra's *Kāśikā* on Kumārila's *ŚV*, part III. p. 223. Besides *PV* 1.4, which is cited by Helārāja in the passage referred to here, the oft-quoted verse *vikalpa-yonayah śabdā vikalpāḥ śabdayonayah* from *Diṇ-nāga* also expounds the same view.

expectations in the present *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā*, or (c) if we found in the present *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā* quotations from or references to works or authors later than the tenth century A. D., the most likely date for Helā-rāja (Charu Deva Shastri 1930:652-653; S. Iyer 1963:xi 1969:39-40; Swaminathan 1967:23-35). As far as I am aware, such counter-evidence does not exist.

3.2 Nāgeśa (circa 1670-1750 A. D.) is the earliest author known so far who mentions Puṇya-rāja, mostly in the form Puñja-rāja (see 5.2 below), as the author of the commentary on the second book (cf. Madhava Krishna Sarma (1942:412): See *Laghu-maṇjūṣā* with the commentaries *Kuñcikā* and *Kalā* pp. 63, 109, 110, 148, 221, 229, 337, 344 (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965:223; cf BSS p. 137), 400-401, 403-404, 409, 413, 417-419, 421, 444, 451, 589, 609 (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965:226; cf. BSS p. 157), 612, 616, 654, 684 (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965:234; cf. BSS p. 232), 817 (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965:220; cf. BSS p. 115), 1155, 1188 (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965:217; cf. BSS pp. 69-70), 1367 (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965: 238; cf. BSS p. 274), 1368, 1437, 1494, 1568; and *Bṛhac-chabdendu-sekhara* p. 797. However, Nāgeśa's date is later by at least sixty years than that of the earliest manuscript ascribing the commentary to Helā-rāja. Moreover, along with the commentators of his *Laghu-maṇjūṣā* (e.g. *Kalā* p. 113.6-7), he occasionally refers to the commentary also as Helā-rāja's work (see 3.3 below), thus indicating his manuscript sources were not unanimous on the matter of authorship.

3.3 To come to references by later authors to Helā-rāja's commentary on the second *kāṇḍa*, I can at present think of only the following: (a) Kauṇḍa-bhaṭṭa, *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra* pp. 113-114: *ek-tiṅ vākyam iti vadatām Vārttikakārāṇām mate param na [pacati bhavati Deva-datta ity-ādau nighātaḥ]. vastutas tu 'ekatiṅviśeṣyakam vākyam' iti tad-abhiprāyasya Helārājyādau.....pratipāditatvāt tan mate 'pi bhavaty evety avadheyam.* (b) Nāgeśa, *Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara* p. 31 : *tad uktam Hariṇā 'pramāṇam eva hrasvādāv anupāttam pratiyate' (Vākyapadīya 2.307cd) iti. anupāttam api [ardha-]mātrā-rūpaṁ pramāṇam evopalakṣyata ity artha iti Helā-rājaḥ.* (c) Nāgeśa,<sup>1</sup> [*Laghu-*]śabdaratna p. 29 (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965:231): *Harir apy āha 'pramāṇam eva hrasvādāv anupāttam pratiyate' (Vākyapadīya 2.307cd).*

1. (a) I assume here that Nāgeśa is the real author of the [*Laghu-*]śabdaratna, not Hari Dikṣita.

(b) My notes show that Nāgeśa refers to Helā-rāja as the author of the commentary on the second book also on *Laghu-maṇjūṣā*, pp. 1133 and 1161. However, due to the unavailability of the edition from which I noted these pages, I am at present unable to verify the references.

*iti anupāttam apy ardha-mātra-rūpaṁ pramāṇam evopalakṣyata ity arthas* [ity artham?] *tasya Helā-rāja āha. evaṁ ca loke 'nya-śākhāsu ca dīrghā-diṣv apy ardha-mātraivodātteti bhāvaḥ*: From among these, (a) summarizes the remark *Vārttikakāraṣyāpy eka-tiṅ ity-atraika-tiṅtvam pradhina-tiṅ-antāpekṣayā pratipādyamānaṁ Sūtrakāra-matānugūṇyaṁ bhajata evety enayor nāsti mata-bhedaḥ*, appearing on BSS p. 270.22-24.<sup>1</sup> Corresponding to (b) and (c) is the passage on BSS pp. 209.16-210.1: *atra cārdha-hrasva-graḥaṇam ardha-mātrā-lakṣaṇasya pramāṇasyopalakṣaṇam iti tad eva tasmāt pratiyate...dīrgha-plutayor apy ādibhūtārdha-mātroddāttety ucyate*. To be sure, Kauṇḍa-bhaṭṭa and Nāgeśa do not reproduce the exact words from Helā-rāja's commentary on the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*, but whatever they report as the gist of his remarks therein is found in the present *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā*. We have, therefore, no justification to suppose that they had access to two distinct commentaries, one by Puṇya-rāja and the other by Helā-rāja, and that the commentary by Helā-rāja to which they had access was different from the available *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā*. It seems more straight-forward to assume that at least Nāgeśa was not uniformly informed on the matter of authorship by the manuscripts at his disposal.

3.4 One possible reference by Helā-rāja himself to his commentary on the second book has been discussed in 2.3 above. In that case a corresponding passage could be located in the *ṭikā* published in the Benares Sanskrit Series. However, there are two more possible references by Helā-rāja in the case of which, as far as I can determine, at present, passages expressing the same points are not found in the BSS *ṭikā*: (a) 3.7.84 p. 300.1: *tantraṇa hi śakti-dvayam apy abhidhātī pratiyaya iti Vākya-padiye nirṇītam*.<sup>2</sup> (b) 3.8.12 p. 26.15-17: *kriyopapadāśrayas tu pratiyayaḥ prakṛty-arthāśrayaḥ (iti) bhoktum pāka iti bhavatiṅ anantara-kāṇḍe nirṇītam. ihāpy agre nirṇeṣyate*.<sup>3</sup> Note that here Helā-rāja does not employ any expres-

1. Hari-vallabha Sāstrī's *Darpaṇa* commentary on *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhāṣaṇa-sāra* p. 114 says that the remark of Helā-rāja referred to by Kauṇḍa-bhaṭṭa is found in Helā-rāja's commentary on 2.444 (*bahuṣv api...*). Actually, it is found in the commentary on 2.446 (*tiṅ-antāntara-...*).
2. (a) The point is this: In a sentence like *iṣyate grāmo gantum*, the suffix in *iṣyate* is capable of indicating the *abhihitatva* of the object *grāma* with reference to both the actions—that of desiring and that of going. It is said to accomplish this two-way indication through *tantra*.  
(b) *Tantra* is touched upon in 2.77 (BSS pp. 104.17-105.5) and 2.475-477 (BSS pp. 281-283). The possibly relevant discussion of *pratyāyā* and *pratyāyaka* is found in 2.98-111 (BSS pp. 124-129).
3. (a) The places where one expects a discussion or mention of the point specified by Helā-rāja are as follows: 2.195 (BSS p. 161.18-20), 2.307 (BSS p. 209.4), 2.330ab (BSS p. 224. 13-16), 2.430-431 (BSS p. 264. 20-23).

sions like *asmabhiḥ* or *svavyākhyāyām*. The guess that (a) and (b) can be references to his commentary on the second book is entirely based on the observation that statements closely corresponding to what he says are not found either in the *kārikās* or the *Vṛtti* of the second book. This negative observation cannot assume any definitive force in the present state of our sources, as the text of the *Vṛtti* of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* is full of the gaps and hence does not preclude the possibility that it once contained the theses referred to by Helā-rāja. Besides, the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā* is yet to be critically edited; we do not as yet know whether any of its manuscripts indicate a loss of portions in the course of time.

3.5 As to the objections to Helā-rāja's authorship which may arise out of a study of the quotations in the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā*, I would like to state that there is not a single quotation in that work which can be assigned with certitude to a period later than the tenth century A. D. I hope to substantiate this point in a future textual study. In the meanwhile, it would not be improper to discuss one quotation which is especially likely to give rise to a doubt. According to Madhava Krishna Sarma (1942:411-412), the verse *satām ca na niṣedho 'sti, so 'satsu ca na vidyate/ jagaty anena nyāyena nañ-arthaḥ pralayaṁ gataḥ*|| quoted in the *ṭikā* on 2.241 (BSS p. 182) probably comes from one of the works of Śrī-harṣa who lived sometime during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A. D. However, new material has become available since Sarma wrote his article. Now we know definitely that the verse in question is at least six centuries older and that it actually belongs to the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* (4.226) of Dharma-kīrti. As 2.7 above shows, it is found also in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* (3.3.42 p. 153), Helā-rāja's authorship of which is incontestable.

4.1 Having thus argued in favour of ascribing the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā* to Helā-rāja, I would like to proceed on the assumption that it in fact is a work of Helā-rāja and would like to consider some of the implications of so doing. Firstly what sort of impact would this discovery have on our knowledge of the commentaries of the *Trikāṇḍī*? As is amply evident, the first two books of the *Trikāṇḍī* constitute a relatively independent work, called *Vākya-paddhya*, in Helā-rāja's view (Aklujkar 1969:549-550). One can, therefore, assume that he must have written similar commentaries on them. In other words, we should be able to guess at least a few features of Helā-rāja's yet undiscovered *Śabda-prabhā* commen-

(b) The remark *ihāpy agre nirṇeṣyate* refers to the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* on 3.8.58 p. 47. 4-7 and 3.14.444 p. 196.19-26.

tary on the first book by studying his commentary on the second book. These features seem to me to be the following: (a) The *Śabda-prabhā* could not have been like Vṛṣabha's commentary in that it must have principally explained only the *kārikās*, whereas Vṛṣabha's commentary explains both the *kārikās* and the *Vṛtti*. (b) Although primarily concerned with explaining only those verses which are intended by Bhartṛ-hari to form the *kārikā*-text of the *Brahma-kāṇḍa*, the *Śabdaprabhā*, in all probability, briefly commented also on those verses which are quoted by Bhartṛ-hari in his *Vṛtti* from such works as the *Samgraha* (e. g. pp. 102, 142, 153, 185, 194-195, 202-203, 209, 217-220); cf. BSS pp. 193, 239. (c) Besides the desire to explain the *kārikā* text, the motivation in writing the *Śabda-prabhā* must have been to supplement the *Vṛtti* wherever possible. Such a supplementation must have been achieved in the following respects: (i) Specification of Bhartṛ-hari's own view when a multitude of views is presented in his work; cf. e. g. BSS pp. 67.9-11, 71.7, 164.11-15; note *siddhāntārtha-satāttvataḥ* in the second introductory verse of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*. (ii) Setting Bhartṛ-hari's views in relation to the views of others; cf. e. g. BSS pp. 66.5-15, 71.2-9. (iii) Justification of Bhartṛ-hari's views wherever additional arguments favouring them could be offered; cf. e. g. BSS p. 76.8-12; note the expression *nirṇāta*, *nirṇaya*, etc. in *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* 3.1.37 pp. 44.23-45.3, 3.1.46 p. 54.8-9, 3.2.14 pp. 116.7-117.14, 3.9.62 pp. 72.26-73.1, 3.9.70 p. 76.19-22. (iv) Elaboration of points that were not fully elaborated in the *Vṛtti*; cf. *leśataḥ* in BSS p. 104. 4-6. (v) Clarification of the mutual connections of the *kārikās* and of the order followed in the discussion of various topics; cf. BSS pp. 64.1-17, 75.6-8, 76.16, 77.6-7, 81.14-17, 85.17-18, 86.22-87.2, 89.15-16, 90.18-91.1, 93.24-94.3, 130.23-131.4, 143.19-21, 152.1-4, 156.19-157.3, 162.18-19, 167.15.168.5, 173.4-5, 177.5-7, 186.8-16, 205.9-10, 212.9-19, 221.11-13, 234.9-15, 242.19-20, 269.21-22, 271.2-4, 271.22-23, 275.10-12, 216.10-17.

4.2 It seems that Helā-rāja completed his *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* long after he had completed the commentaries on the first two books. This is what one would expect in view of the impressive size of the *Prakīrṇaka* and in view of the difficulty involved in explaining it due to the absence of a *Vṛtti* by Bhartṛ-hari. The guess is supported also by the absence of references to the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* in the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-Ṭīkā* (references to the *Prakīrṇaka* itself are found on BSS pp. 67, 141, 264-265), by the fact that the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* and the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-Ṭīkā* are not

found together in one manuscript<sup>1</sup> and by the maturity and self-confidence noticeable in the style of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*.<sup>2</sup> However, these observations cannot be said to assume a conclusive force. Helā-rāja obviously had access to at least a couple of older commentaries on the *Prakīrṇaka* (see 3.1.50 p. 60, 3.1.57 p. 66, 3.1.65 p. 70, 3.1.68 p. 73, 3.1.71 p. 75, 3.1.87 p. 86, 3.1.105 pp. 103-104, 3.3.22 p. 138, 3.3.39 p. 151, 3.6.13 p. 221, 3.7.26 p. 256, 3.7.32 p. 260, 3.7.97 p. 310, 3.7.164 p. 368, 3.9.62 p. 72, 3.11.31 p. 121, 3.14.124 p. 63, 3.14.330 p. 148, 3.14.415 p. 181; also possibly 3.3.17 p. 135, 3.7.49 pp. 268-269; 3.8.15 pp. 27-28, 3.14.410 p. 179). Hence the absence of a *Vṛtti* might not have been a great handicap to him. The separation of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* manuscripts from those of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā* may also be a result of the tradition of thinking of the *Prakīrṇaka* as a relatively independent book; it need not necessarily imply that the composition of the two works was marked by a long interval. The maturity of style too cannot be attributed to the time factor alone; it may quite possibly be due to the influence of or indebtedness to, the works of previous commentators. Finally, the silence of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā* regarding the points discussed in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* could be a matter of pure coincidence.

4.3. We know the names of Helā-rāja's commentaries on the first and the third books of the *Trikāṇḍī*. They are respectively *Śabda-prabhā* and *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*. (or with the omission of *svārthe-ka-*, *Prakīrṇa-prakāśa*). A question, therefore, arises as to the name of his commentary on the second book. S. Iyer (1969:37) has drawn attention to the possibility that *Śabda-prabhā* might have been intended as the title of Helā-rāja's commentary not only on the first *kāṇḍa*, but also on the second *kāṇḍa*. This, however, seems unlikely to me. If at all Helā-rāja chose one name for his commentaries on the first two *kāṇḍas*, I would expect

1. The only exception to this statement is likely to be furnished by manuscript E[2] or F[2]. In this manuscript preserved in the library of the Oriental Institute at Baroda, fragments of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā* are found mixed with the fragments of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* (Rau 1971:31, 35-36). However, the very lack of order among its leaves indicates that the two works have been put together out of necessity rather than out of an awareness that they belong together.
2. Compare, for example, the accounts of how a mirage is seen:..*grīṣme marīcayo bhaumenoṣmanā syandamānā* [*spandamānā* ?] *dūrasthasya jala-jñānam upajanayanti* (BSS p. 204); *dinakara-kara-nikarāḥ prasarpanto nabho-deśam ūrdhvaḍharabhāvena samākrāmantas taraṅgākāra-pratyayam upadadhati pipāsūnām* (Helā. 3.13.8-9 p. 140). In the former, the author seems to have leaned heavily on Vātsyāyana's *Nyāya-bhāṣya*, pp. 18 and 345.



it to be *Vākya-pādiya-prakāśa* or *Vākya-pādiya-prabhā*. Then alone would it balance with *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*, the name for the commentary on the remaining *kāṇḍa*. Furthermore, it is quite clear from the opening statement of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-tikā* (BSS p. 63) as well as from the contents of the first two books that *śabda* is the principal concern of the first book and *vākya* of the second. The title *Śabda-prabhā* would, therefore, be hardly appropriate for the second book. In fact, any title not containing the word *Vākya* would not suit that book. Therefore, I am inclined to think that the title of Helā-rāja's *Vākya-kāṇḍa-tikā* was *Vākya-pradīpa*. It alone would form an appropriate link with *Śabda-prabhā* and *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*, and suggest a progression from *prabhā* 'flame' to *pradīpa* 'lamp' to *prakāśa* 'light'. It would also perhaps explain why the scribes have been occasionally misled to write *Vākya-pradīpa* in the place of *Vākya-pādiya* in certain manuscripts (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965:57 fn. 6; Rau 1962:379-382, 384, 386; S. Iyer 1963: 119.20). Note also that in the second concluding verse of his *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* (after 3.14.624, p. 272) Helā-rāja likens his commentary to a *pradīpa*.

5.1 As should be clear from 2.2 above, the aim of this paper is not to refute the claim of Puṇya-rāja's association with the second book, or to deny him the authorship of the summary verses, or to establish his identity with Helā-rāja. Within its context, therefore, one can justifiably ask who this Puṇya-rāja is and where he stands in relation to Helā-rāja. Rajendralāla Mitra (1877:112) and Ramakrishna Kavi (1930:235 fn. 3) have suggested that Puṇya-rāja may be the same person as Puñja-rāja, the author of a commentary on the grammar *Sārasvata-prakriyā* and of two works on poetics entitled *Dhvani-pradīpa* and *Śiśu-prabodhālankāra*.<sup>1</sup> This identification may be said to derive some support from Nāgeśa's use of the form Puñja-rāja (see 3.2 above), from the similarity between the two names (*ñj* can simply be a dialectal variation of *ny*), and from the fact that both Puṇya-rāja and Puñja-rāja are associated with works in the discipline of grammar. The date of Puñja-rāja would also not stand in the way of identification. That *Sārasvata* grammarian is definitely known to have lived between 1475 and 1520 A.D. (Gode 1941:120-124, 1953:68-72; cf. Haraprasāda Shāstrī 1931:134-136; Jambūvijayajī 1966:32), whereas the earliest manuscript in which Puṇya-rāja's summary verses are most probably (see 2.1 above) found, namely E[4],

1. The last work is edited and published by B. L. Shanbhogue in the *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, vols. 12-14, 1962-1965, Baroda. It is also published as no. 7 in the M.S. University Oriental Series.

belongs to 1534:1535 A. D. (Rau 1971:32). Therefore, until a manuscript containing the summary verses and written before 1475 A. D. is found, one cannot reject the thesis of possible identity at least on the basis of manuscript evidence. However, there are other serious difficulties in identifying Puṇya-rāja. In the first place, no manuscript of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-tīkā*, as far as I am aware, gives Puṇja-rāja as the form of the name of the author. Secondly, nowhere in the fairly extensive information about Puṇja-rāja, the Sārasvata grammarian, (see Hāraprasāda Shāstri 1931 and Gode 1941, 1953) do we find any mention of his association with either Śaśāṅka-śiṣya or Śūravarma as we find in the case of Puṇya-rāja (2.2 above). Nor does Puṇja-rāja claim in the list of his works that he wrote a work concerning Bhartṛ-hari or the *Trikāṇḍi*. I am, therefore, at present disposed to conclude that Puṇya-rāja, the author of the summary verses, is older than Puṇja-rāja. This is all the more likely to be the case, if, taking our cue from Charu Deva Shastri (1930: 653-654), we identify Śaśāṅka-śiṣya, from whom Puṇya-rāja 'heard' the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*, with Saha-deva, the earliest known commentator of Vāmana's *Kāvya-lankāra-sūtra-vṛtti*.<sup>1</sup> In fact, the hypothesis that Puṇya-rāja was a direct disciple of Saha-deva is strongly supported by the verses with which Saha-deva introduces and concludes his work: *ākarnya bhavatas tasmād dayitasya vidhīyate/ vivṛtiḥ Saha-devena Vāmanīyasya samprati//...catuṛ-daśānāmapi yaḥ prasiddho vidyā-sthitīnām para-pāradṛśvā/Śaśāṅka-pūrvam Dhara<sup>2</sup> ity udāraṁ yan-nāma loke nitarām prasiddham// tadīya-śiṣyaḥ Saha-deva-nāmā kule prasūtaḥ (or kule 'bhijātaḥ) khalu Tomaraṇām/ vyākhyām imām kāvyā-vicāra-śāstre vyadhata laghvīm iha Vāmanīye// Kāsmira-deśād apasarpato me śabdānuśuddhiṁ tri-muniṁ nīsamya/ avāpta-siddher varuṇātmaṁjasya prayojako 'bhūd iha Padma-nābhaḥ ||* A comparison of these verses with the concluding verses of Puṇya-rāja quoted in 2.2 above will reveal the following points of similarity: *ākarnya tasmāt, nīsamya* ← *Śaśāṅka-śiṣyāt śrutvā; Śaśāṅka-.....-śiṣyaḥ* ← *Śaśāṅka-śiṣyāt; Saha-deva-nāmā* ← *Śūra-varma-nāmnā; laghvīm* ← *laghvi; apasar-*

1. Raghavan Pillai (1971: xvii) draws our attention to the possibility that Śaśāṅka-śiṣya may mean 'a disciple of Candragomin, the grammarian.' But there is little, if any, likelihood that this could be the case. If we take Śaśāṅka-śiṣya to mean 'a disciple of Candragomin,' then Puṇya-rāja would be a disciple of the disciple of Candragomin. In that case he would be probably older than even Bhartṛ-hari, a part of whose work he is said to have summarized! Moreover, Raghavan Pillai has not pointed out any references to Candragomin with the word Śaśāṅka.
2. According to Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (*saṁvat* 2019:84-85), Kṣīra-svāmin (circa 1058-1108 A.D.) refers to Bhaṭṭa Śaśāṅka-dhara on p. 7 of his *Kṣīra-taraṅgiṇī* on Pāṇini's *Dhātu-pāṭha*.

*pataḥ* ← *apasṛtya*; *yan-nāma loke nitarām prasiddham* ← *vidvaj-janānām yaḥ khalu sarvatra giyate jagati*. Such an impressive similarity of diction and pattern even in the writing of incidental verses would be hard to account for unless either author is supposed to be within the range of direct influence by the other.

5.2 A further question is whether Puṇya-rāja is older than or contemporaneous with Helā-rāja. In other words, is it probable that the summary verses were known and available to Helā-rāja and that it was he who incorporated them toward the end of his commentary? Since the verses are found in all complete manuscripts (see 2.1 above) and are included before the statement of ascription in manuscripts E[7] and E[14] which ascribe the commentary to Helā-rāja, one is inclined to conclude that they probably formed a part of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā* manuscripts from a very early time and that Helā-rāja could have possibly appended them to his *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā*. But the manuscript evidence does not indicate anything more than this; it does not imply that the verses are definitely older than Helā-rāja's work. In fact, on the basis of evidence gleaned from a different source, one can almost conclusively prove that they cannot be older than the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā*. A comparison of them with the summary and comments at various points in the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭikā* (see 4. 1c(v) above) reveals, as I shall demonstrate in a future study, that the author who composed them has made every effort to follow as closely as possible the prose summary and comments. Thus, Puṇya-rāja seems to have lived after Helā-rāja not far removed in time. To judge from the component-rāja in his name, he can also be said to have probably come from the same family as Helā-rāja. That component is characteristic of the names in Helā-rāja's family as we can see from Helā-rāja's own name and those of his father and brother, Bhūti-rāja and Indu-rāja.

5.3 Ramakrishna Kavi (1930:235 fn. 3) and S. Iyer (1963: xiii) have hinted at the possibility that Puṇya-rāja may be identical with Phulla-rāja, from whose work (*kr̥ti*) two gaps in the text of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* have been filled (S. Iyer 1963: 261.8-268. 13, 280. 17-283.1). Since it does not seem very likely that three persons having so similarly structured names as Helā-rāja, Puṇya-rāja, and Phulla-rāja could be associated with the same work as commentators of the one sort or the other and since either form from the pair "Puṇya-rāja" phullarāja can be a result of the miswriting of the other, the identification of Puṇya-rāja with Phulla-rāja is a tempting proposition. Furthermore, like the former, Phulla-rāja seems to be later than

Helā-rāja and seems to have written the available commentarial pieces, not with the intention of commenting on the whole *Prakīrṇaka* or *Trikāṇḍī*, but with the specific intention of supplementing Helā-rāja's work (see Aklujkar, forthcoming). His interest in explaining the order of discussion (*saṃgati*) is also evident from pp. 265.2.13 and 282.1-5. However, these considerations being probabilistic in character, can hardly be called conclusive. Until the manuscripts furnish us with definite evidence that either the form Phulla-rāja or the form Puṇya-rāja could have resulted from a miswriting of the other, we cannot be certain that both the forms actually refer to one and the same person.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

(To avoid repetition of particulars, the names of commentators are listed in almost all cases only under the names of the authors commented upon.)

*Abhidharma-dīpa with Vibhāṣā-prabhā-vṛtti*. (Ed.) Jaini, Padmanabh S. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series no. 4. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute. 1959. [Author conjectured to be Vimāla-mitra by the editor on p. 133 of the introduction.]

Abhyankar-Limaye. See Bhartṛ-hari. *Trikāṇḍī* (b).

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1969. "Two Textual Studies of Bhartṛ-hari." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 89:547-63. New Haven.

—1972. "The Authorship of the Vākyapadīya-vṛtti". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Sudasiens*, 16:181-198. Vienna.

Amara-siṃha. *Amara-koṣa with Kṣtra-svāmin's Commentary*. (Eds.) Sharma and Sardesai, N. G. Poona Oriental Series no. 43. Poona: Oriental Book Agency. 1941.

Bhartṛ-hari. *Trikāṇḍī* (a) *kāṇḍa* 1. (Ed.) Subramania Iyer, K. A. *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛ-hari with the Vṛtti, and the Paddhati of Vṛṣabha-deva*. Deccan College Monograph Series no. 32. Poona: Deccan College. 1966 (b) *kāṇḍa* 2. *kārikās*: (Eds.) Abhyankar, K. V. and Limaye, V. P. *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛ-hari*. University of Poona Sanskrit and Prakrit Series no. 2. Poona: University of Poona. 1965. *Vṛtti*: See Aklujkar 1969:555-556. *ṭīkā*: (Ed.) Mānavalli, Gaṅgādhara Sāstrī. *Vākyapadīyam...Śrī-Bhartṛ-hari—...—virācitam ŚrīPuṇya-rāja-kṛta-prakāśākhya-ṭīkā-yutam*. Benares Sanskrit Series nos. 11, 19, 24. Benares: Braj B. Das & Co. 1887. (c) *kāṇḍa* 3 with Helā-rāja's *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* commentary. *saṃuddēśas* 1-7: (Ed.) Subramania Iyer, K. A. Deccan College Monograph Series

no. 21. Poona: Deccan College. 1963. *samuddeśas* 8-13: (Ed.) Sāmbaśiva Śāstri, K. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series no. 106. Trivandrum. 1935. *samuddeśa* 14: (Ed.) Ravi Varmā, L. A. University of Travancore Sanskrit Series no. 148. Trivandrum. 1942.

— *Tripādī*. (Eds.) Abhyankar, K. V. and Limaye, V. P. *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā of Bhartṛhari*. Post-graduate and Research Department Series no. 8. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1967-1970.

Bhattacharya, Ram Shankar. 1954. "A New Verse of the Saṁgraha." *Poona Orientalist*, 19:4-5. Poona.

Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. *Praudha-manoramā with the Commentaries Prabhā, Vibhā, Jyotsnā, Kuca-mardīnī, and Nāgeśa's* [see fn. 28 above] *Śabda-ratna*. (Ed.) Shastri, Sadashiva Sharma. Haridasa Sanskrit Grantha-mālā no. 23. Varanasi: Chowkhamba. 1934.

— *Nāgeśa's Bṛhacchabdendu-śekhara Commentary on Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's Siddhāntakaumudī*. (Ed.) Śāstri, Sitā Rāma. Sarasvatī Bhavana Grantha-mālā no. 87. Varanasi. 1960.

Bhoja. *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa with Daṇḍa-nātha Nārāyaṇa's Hṛdaya-hārīṇī Commentary*. (Ed.) Sāmbaśiva Śāstri, K. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series no. 117. Trivandrum. 1935.

BSS. See Bhartṛhari, *Trikāṇḍī* (b), *tīkā*.

Charu Deva Shastri, 1930. "Bhartṛhari a Critical Study with Special Reference to the Vākya-padīya and Its Commentaries." *Proceedings and Transactions of the Fifth Indian Oriental Conference*, 1: 630-665. Lahore.

— 1934. (Ed.) *Vākya-padīyam Prathamam Kāṇḍam*. Lahore: Ramlal Kapoor Trust.

Deva. *Daiva with Kṛṣṇa-līlā-śuka-muni's Puruṣakāra Commentary*. (Ed.) Yudhiṣṭhira Mimāṃsaka. Ajmer: Bhāratiya Prācya-vidyā Pratiṣṭhāna. *saṁvat* 2019.

Dharma-kīrti *Pramāṇa-vārttika with Manoratha-nandin's Vṛtti Commentary*. (Ed.) Dvārikādāsa Śāstri, Svāmī. Bauddha Bhārati Series no. 3. Varanasi. 1968.

Dvivedī, K. D. 1961. *Artha-vijñāna aura Vyākaraṇa-darsana*. Allahabad: Hindustani Academy.

Gautama. *Nyāya-sūtras with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya and Viśva-nātha Bhaṭṭācārya's Vṛtti*. (Ed.) Joshi, Digambar Nagesh. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series no. 91. Poona: Anandashram. 1922.

Gode, P. K. 1941. "The Oldest Dated Manuscript of Puñjarāja's Commentary on the Sārasvata-prakriyā—Dated A. D. 1556 (Saṁvat 1612)." *Adyar Library Bulletin*, 5:3:120-124. Madras. Reprinted in *Studies in Indian Literary History*, 1:68-72. Singhi Jain Series no. 37. Bombay Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavana. 1953.

Hārprasāda Shāstrī. 1931. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collections of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal*. Vol. 6. Calcutta.

Hema-candra. *Anyā-yoga-vyavacchedikā or Vyavaccheda-dvātrīṃśikā with Malliṣeṇa's Syād-vāda-mañjarī Commentary*. (Ed.) Dhruva, A. B. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series no. 33. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1933.

Īśvara-kṛṣṇa. *Sāṃkhya-kārikā with Vācaspati-miśra's Sāṃkhya-tattva-kaumudī Commentary and Śiva-nārāyaṇa Śāstrī's Sāra-bodhini Commentary*. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press. 1940.

Jambūvijayajī, Muni. 1966. (Ed.) *Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra of Malla-vādin with Śimha-sūri-gaṇin's Commentary*. Bhavnagar: Jain Ātmānanda Sabhā.

Jayanta-bhaṭṭa. *Nyāya-mañjarī*. (Ed.) Śukla, Sūrya Nārāyaṇa. Kashi Sanskrit Series no. 106. Benares: Chowkhamba. 1934/1936.

Kauṇḍa-bhaṭṭa. *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra with Bālakṛṣṇa Pañcoli's Prabhā Commentary and Hari-vallabha Śāstrī's Darpaṇa Commentary*. (Ed.) Pancholi, Balakrishna. Kashi Sanskrit Series no. 188. Varanasi : Chowkhamba. 1969.

Kosambi, D. D. 1945. "The Authorship of the Śatakatrayī" *Journal of Oriental Research*, 15:64-77. Madras.

Kumārila. *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārttika with Pārtha-sārathi-miśra's Nyāya-ratnākara Commentary*. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series no. 3. Benares. 1898.

— *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārttika with Sucarita-miśra's Kāśikā Commentary*. (Eds.) Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī, K. and Ramaswami Sastri, V. A. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series nos. 90, 99, 150. Trivandrum. 1926-1943.

— *Tantra-vārttika*. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series no. 97. Poona: Anandashram. 1929-1934.

Kunhan Raja, C. 1936. "I-tsing and Bhartṛ-hari's Vākyapadīya." *S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume*, 285-298. Madras.

Madhava Krishna Sarma, K. 1942. "Gleanings from the Commentaries on the Vākyapadīya" *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 23:405-412. Poona.

Maṇḍana-miśra. *Sphoṭa-siddhi*. (Ed., tr.) Subramania Iyer, K. A. Deccan College Building Centenary Series no. 25. Poona: Deccan College. 1966.

— *Vidhi-viveka with Vācaspati-miśra's Nyāya-kaṇikā Commentary*. (Ed.) Mānavallī, Tailaṅga Rāma-śāstrī. Kashi : Medical Hall. 1907.

Mitra, Rajendralala. 1877. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*. Part 1. Calcutta.

Nāgeśa. *Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhānta laghu-mañjūṣā with Bālam Bhaṭṭa's [=Vaidya-nātha Pāyagunḍe's?] Kalā Commentary and Durbalā-cārya's Kuṇḍikā Commentary*. (Ed.) Bhāṇḍārī, Mādhava Śāstri and Pathak, Madan Mohan. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series no. 44 or Nos. 191-192, 211-214, 227-228, 237-238, 253, 328, 333, 340, 345. Benares : Chowkhamba. 1925.

Pāṇini. *Aṣṭādhyāyī with the Kāśikā Commentary of Jayāditya and Vāmana*. (Ed.) Miśra, Śobhita. Kashi Sanskrit Series no. 37. Banaras: Chowkhamba. 1952.

Patañjali. *Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya*. (Ed.) Kielhorn, F. Third edition. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962.

— *Yoga-sūtras with Vyāsa's ? Bhāṣya and Śaṅkara's Commentary on the Sūtras and the Bhāṣya*. (Eds.) Rama Sastri, Polakam and Krishnamurthi Sastri, S. R. Madras : Government Oriental Manuscripts Library. 1952. [This Patañjali may be different from Patañjali, the grammarian.]

PV. See Dharma-kīrti.

Raghavan, V. 1963. *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*. Madras: Punarvasu.

Raghavan Pillai, K. 1971. (Ed., tr.) *The Vākya-pāṇini* [Books 1-2]. Delhi, Patna, Varanasi : Motilal Banarsidass.

Ramakrishna Kavi, M. 1930. "The Discovery of the Author's Vṛtti on the Vākya-pāṇini." *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*, 4:235-241. Rajahmundry.

Rau, Wilhelm. 1962. "Über Sechs Handschriften des Vākya-pāṇini." *Oriens*, 15:374-398. Wiesbaden.

— 1971. *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vākya-pāṇini und Seiner Kommentare*.

Abhandlungen der Marburger Gelehrten Gesellschaft no. 1. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

Samanta-bhadra. *Yukty-anuśāsana with Vidyānanda's Commentary*. (Eds.) and Srilala. Māṇikacandra Jain Grantha-mālā no. 25. 1919.

Sastri, P. P. S. 1930. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji's Sarasvati Mahāl Library, Tanjore*. Vol. 10. Srirangam.

Subramania Iyer, K. A. 1951. "The Point of View of the Vaiyākaraṇas." *Journal of Oriental Research*. 18:84-96. Madras.

— 1963. See Bhartṛhari, *Trikāṇḍī* (c).

— 1969. *Bhartṛhari: a Study of the Vākya-pāṇini in the Light of the Ancient Commentaries*. Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series no. 68. Poona: Deccan College.

ŚV. See Kumārila, *Mīmāṃsā-śloka-vārttika*.

Swaminathan, V. 1967. "On the Date of Helā-rāja." *Sri Venkateshwar University Oriental Journal*, 10 : 23-35. Tirupati.

TV; See Kumārila, *Tantra-vārttika*.

Varma, Satyakam. 1970. *Vākyapadiyam. (Brahma-kāṇḍa)...with Trilingual Commentary*. New Delhi : Munshiram Manoharlal.

Vṛṣabha, See Bharṭṛ-hari, *Trikāṇḍī* (a).

Yaśo-mitra. *Abhidharma-kośa-vyākhyā (I-III)*. (Ed.) Law, Narendra Nath. Calcutta Oriental Series no. 31. London : Luzac & Co. 1949.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka. *saṃvat* 2019. *Saṃskṛta Vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā Itihāsa*. Vol. 2. Ajmer : Bhāratīya Prācya-vidyā Pratiṣṭhāna.