The Cāndra-vyākaraṇa: Some questions
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1. Cāndra-Sūtra and Cāndra-Vṛttī: one or two authors?

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

---

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


---

Vṛttī. What further conclusions can be drawn from this?

It goes without saying that the temptation is great to see in this use of the first and third persons proof that the author of the Cāndra-Vṛttī did not compose the Cāndra-Sūtra. Yet it would be overhasty to draw this conclusion without considering the habits of the age concerned. These habits appear to have been rather varied, for we find that a text like the Yoga Bhāṣya uses vāksyāmaḥ to refer to the Yoga Sūtra, the different authorship of which is not in doubt.2 The author of the Tattvārthādīgama Bhāṣya uses both first and third person verbal forms to refer to the sūtras on which he comments, and whose author appears to have been different.3 It is not so easy to find out how authors of both the basic text and the commentary referred, in their commentary, to the basic text, for few certain cases of such combinations are known from the first millennium. But one undoubted example is Maṇdana Miśra’s Brahmaśiddhi, which consists of verses and commentary. Maṇdana uses the third person on several occasions in the commentary to refer to his own verses.4 Another example is the first chapter of Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇavārttika. Unlike Maṇdana, Dharmakīrti uses the first person (vāksyāmaḥ) a few times in his commentary to refer to the text commented upon.5 In other words, the use of vāksyai in the Cāndra-Vṛttī does not allow us to conclude anything whatsoever.

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

---

2. On YS 2.29, 40, 46.
4. E.g., p. 75 l. 4: darśayati; p. 23 l. 17: āha.
5. See Gnoi, 1969: xvi n.
Another argument is more interesting. The Vyrti uses in certain cases the words samjñā and nāman where the Sūtra has nāman and ākhyā respectively. This deviation between Sūtra and Vyrti constitutes the strongest argument I know of in support of a double authorship, even though it is hard to assess how strong an argument it really is.

There is another circumstance that seems to me relevant in the present discussion. The Cāndra-Sūtra is not complete without the Vyrti! A glance at Liebich’s Konkordanz Panini - Candra (1928) shows that the Cāndra-Sūtra was not meant to be shorter than Panini’s grammar. It omits, to be sure, in its present form rules on accent, Vedic rules and samjñā-sūtras; but we know that the first two either existed or were planned (see the above remarks on accentual anubandhas), while samjñā-sūtras were left out on purpose. In general the Cāndra-Sūtra follows Panini’s grammar in all its details. Indeed, no attempt is made to leave out rules that produce non-current forms. And yet, sometimes the Cāndra-Sūtra skips a number of Pāṇini’s sūtras. Why? Does the author of the Cāndra-Sūtra lose interest in these cases in the forms prescribed by the Aṣṭādhyāyī? In practically all these cases the skipped sūtras, or the forms they are meant to produce, recur in the Cāndra-Vyrti. In other words, Cāndra-Sūtra and Cāndra-Vyrti together represent practically the whole of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, with the exception of the portions specified above. The Cāndra-Sūtra by itself does not do so; it presents the irregular image of a text which sometimes follows the Aṣṭādhyāyī step by step, and at other occasions walks through the field covered by the Aṣṭādhyāyī with seven-league boots.

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

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

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

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

---

7. Not everywhere! On eight occasions both the Cāndra-Sūtra and the Vyrti use samjñā (Dash, 1986: 59; read 1.1.123 for 1.1.23). Note that the Vyrti does not always reintroduce the Pāṇinian term: vaiyākaraṇākhyā (P. 6.3.7) becomes nāman in CS 5.2.10, samjñā in the Vyrti; samjñā in P. 5.1.62 becomes ākhyā in CS 4.1.65, nāman in the Vyrti; samjñā in P. 7.3.67, on the other hand, becomes ākhyā in CS 6.1.95, and remains ākhyā in the Vyrti.
8. Proof is constituted by Oberlies’ (1989: passim) comment “nicht zu belegen”, which occurs on virtually every single page of his translation of parts of the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa in connection with the forms to be produced by Candra’s rules.

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

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

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

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

(ii) Consider first the line

yathā nāṃgraṇaḥ anuvṛtāpalaśaṃārstham
“Like the use of num which serves to characterize an anuvāra”

given in Bhartṛhari’s commentary (Ms 9a6; CE I.22.11-12; AL 26.21; Sw 32.1). This line constitutes here an example, meant to illustrate Bhartṛhari’s statement to the effect that artha in arthaśambandhe is not used for its own sake, but in order to characterize the connection (sambandhapalaśaṃatvena). Where did Bhartṛhari find this example?

The same line is found in the Kāśīkā on P. 8.4.2

11. Cp. Bronkhorst, 1983: 382; Oberlies, 1996: 311 n. 150. Note that the Nyāsa (vṛttiḥ Pāṇini-pratītīdām sūrdām vivaranām Cullī-Bhaṭṭi-Nālūśāvivacanam) and the Padamatiṣṭha (Pāṇini-pratītīdām sūrdām Kuntiprabhūtkaravivacanam vivaranām), both on the first introductory stanza of the Kāśīkā, state explicitly that these names refer to commentators on Pāṇini’s grammar.

12. The Mahābhāṣya has twice anuvāraviśeṣaṇam nāṃgraṇaḥ (Mahā-bh vol. I p. 29 l. 11; vol. III p. 454 l. 4, on P. 8.4.2).
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[The suffix] thāL [prescribed by P. 5.3.111 pratnapāra:] viśvemāt thāL [chandasi] is not included in the Mahābhāṣya. But an effort is made [to include it] as follows: 'The same [suffix] thāL [prescribed by P. 5.3.23] when expressing manner (prakārvacane) is the one which comes, in Sacred Language, after [the words] pratna etc. [in accordance with P. 5.3.111], in their own meaning.' [What is described in the Bhāṣya are] 'ending in m' are am and ām. 'Having the meaning of kṛtvā' are kṛtvāUC, SUC, and dhā. 'tasl and vatl, nā and nān' [in the Bhāṣya]: [tasl is prescribed by P. 4.3.112 and 113] tenakādik and tasī ca. vatl [is prescribed by P. 5.1.115] tena tulyam kriyad ced vatsī. There is enumeration of this many in the gana; thus it is read.

We see that Bhartrhari, while primarily commenting on the enumeration of indeclinables in the Mahābhāṣya, makes use of a gana he knows, and which contains more than just what is enumerated in the Bhāṣya. Bhartrhari himself states in so many words that āṣī and thāL are not read in the 'Vārttika', i.e., in the Bhāṣya. The gana known to Bhartrhari seems, moreover, to have contained the phrases taslādhis taddhita edhāc paryantah; it also had tasl, āṣī and thāL, in that order.

The gana known to Bhartrhari appears to be very close to the one contained in the Kāśīkā on P. 1.1.37 (varādiniśīlam ayayam), which has: taslādhis taddhita edhāc paryantah, śāstasa, kṛtvāc, svac, āsthālam, caryarthā ca, am, ām. The Cāndra-vyākaraṇa, on the other hand, does not, to my knowledge, contain anything like it. The Mahāvṛtti on Jaimendra-vyākaraṇa 1.1.74 contains an enumeration corresponding to the one accompanying P. 1.1.37, but nothing remotely resembling Bhartrhari's words can be found in it. Again we are led to believe that Bhartrhari and the Kāśīkā made use of the same earlier text; since our earliest source of Pāṇinian gānas is the Kāśīkā, a commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī, we may assume that this earlier text used by both Bhartrhari and the Kāśīkā, too, was a commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī.

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

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

\[
\text{\textit{tad yathā\textit{ gāgā hi rāpenātītā tannāmikā 'paṃ upādāyantī gāgā iti} devalādīrūpenātīryamānā dhakam gāḡeya iti.}}
\]

For example, [the river] Gāgā when referred to in its own form, having that (i.e. \textit{Gāgā}) as its name, produces \textit{[the suffix] a\textit{v}, [which gives rise to]} gāḡa \textit{son of Gāgā}. When it is being referred to as the goddess etc. [of that name, it produces the suffix \textit{dhak}, [which gives rise to]} gāḡeya.

The occurrence of \textit{tannāmikā} in the first half of this passage shows that Bhārtṛhari derives gāḡa with the help of P. 4.1.113 ay\textit{vadhābhīyo naddimānāsībhīyas tannāmikābhīyas.} This is interesting because the Kāśīkā lists gāḡa under P. 4.1.112 \textit{śivādhībhīyo 'n}, and does not use P. 4.1.113 in the derivation of gāḡa. Apparently Bhārtṛhari did not find gāḡa in the gana \textit{śivādī}, in the commentary on the Aṣṭādhāyī which he decided to follow in this respect.

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

\[
gāḡaḡāsābhād̄ha pathyate tikādīphihiu śubhāśaśād̄hayā ca samāvesārtham tena t-rai̇rȧp grandma bhavati gāḡaḡa gāḡaśaṇāh gāḡaśaṇīh
gāḡaśaṇīh
gāḡaśaṇīh
\]

The word gāḡa is listed [in the gana \textit{śiva} etc.] in order to include [the suffix \textit{a\textit{v}}] along with [the suffix \textit{phi\textit{h}}] on account of [gāḡa being included in the gana] \textit{tika} etc. (P. 4.1.154) and \textit{a\textit{v}} \textit{hak} on account of [gāḡa being included in the gana] \textit{sabha} etc. (P. 4.1.123). There are therefore three forms: gāḡa (with \textit{a\textit{v}}), gāḡaḡa (with \textit{phi\textit{h}}), gāḡaśaṇī.

16. This mode of expression is once connected with Āpāsī in the Mahābhāṣya (vol. II p. 281 I. 3-5; on P. 4.2.25 śloka-v. 2): \textit{tathā cāpi tānu evaṁ dēnur anahitā kam upādāyatitā tēnānām samāhu dainukhīnī.} It also occurs elsewhere, e.g. in the Nyāsa (vol. III p. 332 I. 27-28, on P. 4.1.41; vol. IV p. 117 I. 29, on P. 5.1.129) and in the Padāvatijāti (vol. III p. 405 I. 18, on P. 4.1.86). Compare in this connection Kumārila Bhaṭṭajī's Tantrāvatīṭa on MS 3.4.14, p. 368: \textit{karaṇatam evem uve tānna nābhyena kāryaṇaśc avān śvām vihakthiṁ notāpadyati; and p. 369: ... tad eva siddhaḥpāladvī phalabhāḥdīm vihakthiṁ anupādāyād api śiśānī punar upādāyanaśc.}
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(with phi\textit{h}), gāḡeya (with \textit{dhak}).

Since we know (Bronkhorst, 1983: 373 f.) that the Kāśīkā did not tamper with ganas, we must conclude that it found the word gāḡa in the gana \textit{śivādī} already in the earlier commentary. Yet the above passage reads more or less like a justification of the presence of gāḡa in \textit{śivādī}. Does this justification make sense? Doesn't Bhārtṛhari succeed equally well in deriving gāḡa, without a mention of gāḡa in \textit{śivādī}? Why didn't the Kāśīkā, like Bhārtṛhari, derive gāḡa with the help of P. 4.1.113 ay\textit{vadhābhīyo naddimānāsībhīyas tannāmikābhīyas}? The reason is found under P. 4.1.121 dy\textit{vacah}, which is, according to the Kāśīkā, an exception to P. 4.1.113. P. 4.1.121 prescribes \textit{dhak} (\textit{= cya}) after words of two syllables ending in a feminine suffix. This would account for gāḡeya, but—4.1.121 being an exception to 4.1.113—would at the same time exclude the form gāḡa. The Kāśīkā—or rather, the commentary which it follows—solves the problem by avoiding both the sūtras 4.1.113 and 121 in this connection. Gāḡa is now derived by P. 4.1.112 \textit{śivādhībhīyo 'n, gāḡeya} by P. 4.1.123 \textit{śubhāśaśād̄hayā ca}. This is accomplished by adding the term gāḡa to both the appropriate ganas. (Note in passing that for Bhārtṛhari and his example P. 4.1.121 cannot have been an exception to P. 4.1.113.)

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

\[
gāḡaḡāsābhād̄daḥ iha pāṭhād dvyāc; gāḡaḡaḥ śubhāśaśaśād̄hayā dhak; gāḡeyaḥ tīkādāpāṭhāḥ phiḥ; gāḡaśaṇīh
gāḡaśaṇīh
\]

But here we find no explanation whatsoever of this derivation of gāḡa. Nor do we find any indication that CS 2.4.51 (\textit{dyacah}; \textit{=} P. 4.1.121) is an exception to CS 2.4.42 (\textit{naddimānāśc bhīyas}; \textit{=} P. 4.1.113). So why did the Candra-Vṛtti include gāḡa in the gana \textit{śivādī}? Apparently for no other reason than that it found the word there in one of the commentaries on the Aṣṭādhāyī it follows. It is therefore not possible to maintain that the Kāśīkā here simply borrowed from the Candra-vyākaraṇa. Quite on the contrary, in order to understand what underlies the procedure of the Candra-vyākaraṇa in this case, we have to consult the Kāśīkā, which better preserves the information contained in the earlier commentary which influenced the Candra-vyākaraṇa.
The Mahāvṛtti on Jainendra-vyākaraṇa 3.1.101 contains some lines which correspond in their content with the lines from the Kāśīkā cited above. The most probable conclusion to be drawn from this is that the Mahāvṛtti was influenced, directly or indirectly, by the same early commentary that also influenced the Cāndra-Vṛtti and the Kāśīkā.

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

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

CS 4.4.72: pūndadakṣṇaṃ bhūmeh
After [compounds ending in] bhūmi preceded by pūṇu etc., [comes the samāsanta-suffix ac].
CS 4.4.73: samkhyāya nigodavaryo ca
After [compounds ending in] nadi, godavari and [bhūmi] preceded by a numeral, [comes the samāsanta-suffix ac].

The Cāndra-Vṛtti gives as examples: pūṇdubhūmah, udagbhūmah, kṣṇabhūmah (for 4.4.72), and paṇcanadham, saptagodavaram, dvibhūmah prāśadaḥ, dasabhūmakam sūtram (for 4.4.73).

The Kāśīkā on P. 5.4.75 contains the following verse:

kṣṇadakṣṇaṃpūṇāyē bhūmer acpratayaṃ smṛtaḥ!
godavaryā tadyā ca sakṣṭyaś utteṇa yadī!

This justifies the following examples: kṣṇabhūmah, pūṇdubhūmah, udagbhūmah, paṇcanadham, paṇcagodavaram. However, the examples dvibhūmah prāśadaḥ and dasabhūmakam sūtram are not covered by this verse, yet they are desired. The Kāśīkā, therefore, adds the line: bhūmer apī sakṣṭhyāyēbhūmah acprataya iṣayate, followed by these two examples.

The question is: did the Kāśīkā in this case borrow from the Cāndra- vyākaraṇa? One argument pleads in favour of this position:

dasabhūmakam sūtram looks like a Buddhist expression. However, if we accept this position, we must not only assume that the author of the Kāśīkā at times wrote in verse, but that he was not capable of formulating the verse—which has already twice the number of syllables as the two sūtras of Candra combined—in such a manner as to express the same meaning as those two sūtras; he has to add an ṣīṣa in simple prose. Borrowing in the other direction seems far more likely. That is to say, the verse appears to have preceded both Candra and the Kāśīkā. Either Candra or someone before him realized that the examples dvibhūma and dasabhūma should also be included. Candra managed to express the new situation very elegantly in two short sūtras. The Kāśīkā preserved the verse but, following either Candra or the earlier unknown grammarian, added the above line. In any case it seems more than likely that both Candra and the Kāśīkā were influenced by the same earlier grammarian.

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

all (!) mss. The temptation is great to conclude that Bhartṛhari knew P. 5.4.129 in a slightly different form—perhaps *pratimabhāṅ ājñunor jñāh*—which was also the reading known to Candra. Since the Kāśikā has this sūtra in its correct form, we may have to conclude that in this case the Kāśikā follows another sūtra reading—and therefore another commentary on the Astādhyāyī—than the Candra-vyākaraṇa. It certainly does not borrow here from the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa, which has the incorrect sūtra *samprajā jñāno jñāh* (4.2.130). The Mahāvṛtti first gives the two incorrect forms *samjña* and *prajña*, then observes that according to some *jñā* should be used instead of *jñā*. However, both opinions, according to the Mahāvṛtti, are correct. (*jñā ity ukārāntaḥ keśāntiṣaśād eṣahā! matādāvayaḥ api pramānāṃ*)

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

P. III 3.122 adhyāyasūtraḥ adhārāvidyāṣaṃ kā ca originally did not contain the words adhārā and avāyā, which have been inserted from Katāyana’s Vārttika on the preceding rule (Vol. II. p. 155). The word avāyā, which is mentioned in the same Vārttika, is in the Kāśikā given in the commentary on P. III.3.122. In the Mahābhāṣya, Vol. II. p. 146, l. 20, where the rule has been quoted, the MSS. give it as read in the Kāśikā, excepting that the MS. K omits from it adhārā. Kaiiyapa on P. III.3.121 has the remark—adhārāvidyāṣaṃ kād adhibhāyāṣaṃ abhāyāṣaṃ vārttikā darśanād abhāyāṣaṃ prakāṣṭaṃ.

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

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

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

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

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

*maryādāvacanābhāve pi viprakāśarparatvaḥ vivakṣāyāḥ anadyataanavidhir bhavyaḥ evai yo 'yam adivā niravatidhi gantavayā tasya yad avaraṃ kauśāmyāḥ tatraudanām bhoktāsmahe!*

If no limit is expressed, the rule regarding “not that same day” (CS 1.3.3) is certainly [applied], because distance is intended to be expressed. [An example is:] “The limitless road that must be traversed—on the part of it which is this side of Kauśāmbi we shall eat (bhoktāsmahe; second future) rice.”
Distance is intended to be expressed by the verbal form bhoktāsmahe. Yet this verb is used only in connection with the early part of the journey, between ‘here’ and Kauśambi. The example also makes mention of a “limitless road”, and this cannot but concern the part from ‘here’ to Kauśambi as much as the part beyond Kauśambi. For this expression is added in order to bring out the sense of the second future; it is absent in the parallel example concerning the first future. It follows that a limitless road separates Kauśambi from the position of the author of the Vyātti. And even though no precise conclusions can be drawn from this information, it is none-the-less justified to think that the distance from the position of the author to Kauśambi was considerable. It excludes an area too close to Kauśambi, as proposed by Scharfe.17

Scharfe’s discussion of this “index fossil” is marred by the fact that his comparative treatment of it in a number of grammatical texts made him lose sight of the introductory phrase reproduced above, which does not appear to introduce the “index fossil” in any of the other texts. Yet this phrase, as we have seen, is of vital importance for understanding the precise significance of the example in the Cāndra-Vyātti. Scharfe makes a further mistake: the fact that some of the other grammarians specify “that they would eat twice on the first leg of their respective journeys” (my emphasis) leads him to the conclusion that Candra, who does not add this specification, lived a one day journey away from Kauśambi. This conclusion does not only sin against “the distance intended to be expressed” and “the limitless road”, but also against “the rule regarding ‘not that same day’”.18

We turn to the date of the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa. Since Sūtra and Vyātti were apparently composed more or less simultaneously, evidence derived from the Vyātti is valid for the Cāndra-Sūtra too. The Cāndra-Vyātti cites Kālidāsa’s Rāghuvamśa and

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

18. For further criticism of Scharfe’s discussion, see Aklujkar, 1991: 29-30 n. 11.
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Kumārasambhava (Oberlies, 1989: 13; Rau, 1996: 337). The concluding verses of the Vākyapadīya-Vyātti mention “Ācārya Candra and others”. They further suggest that Bharathari is later than Candra ‘etc.’ The Vākyapadīya-Vyātti, in its turn, is older than Dignāga. This provides the following chronological sequence:

Kālidāsa
Cāndra-vyākaraṇa
Bharathari
Vākyapadīya-Vyātti
Dignāga

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

4. Conclusions

The conclusions to be drawn from the above material are not very different from those presented in my 1983 article. And indeed, the aim of this article was not to present new findings, but to better support earlier conclusions. It can now with more certainty than before be maintained that Cāndra-Sūtra and Cāndra-Vyātti—even though different authorship of these two works cannot altogether be ruled out—must be looked upon as belonging together, as essentially one work conceived as such right from the beginning. It has also been more satisfactorily established that the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa and the Kāśikā shared at least one earlier source (other than the Mahābhāṣya and the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa). This does not, of course, exclude the possibility that the Kāśikā knew the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa, but decisive evidence to that effect is not known to me.21 One might in this connection cite, with Oberlies (1989: 10), the

19. See also Hahn, 1992: 33.
20. See Bronkhorst, 1988: 111, which states the reasons for believing that these verses belong to the Vākyapadīya-Vyātti. It can of course not be proved with absolute certainty that the Candra here mentioned is the author of the Cāndra-Sūtra, and the identification is not self-evident. Yet the strong influence of the Mahābhāṣya on the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa agrees with this identification.
example yenaṁsa tena gataḥ, found both in the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa (on CS 2.2.8) and the Kāśikā (on P. 2.1.14). This seems no doubt "typical Buddhist idiom", even though it may not be completely unknown to Brahmanical literature. It is however to be noted that this idiom occurs, in Buddhist Sanskrit literature, almost exclusively with upa-sam-kram, upa-gam, and upa-i, and probably never with only gam. Of slightly (but how much?) more weight may be the expression dasabhāmaṇaṁ sūtram considered above, and the expression ajaryam āryasaṁgataṁ (which resembles Āryaśaṅkarśaṇa’s Jñātakamālā 22.88) both in the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa (on CS 1.1.116) and in the Kāśikā (on P. 3.1.105). It is, finally, hoped that a misinterpretation introduced into the "second index fossil" by Scharfe has now been cleared away.
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