



HAL
open science

Kāśikāvṛtti and Cāndravyākaraṇa: A Comparison of the Pratyāhārasūtra Section

Emilie Aussant

► **To cite this version:**

Emilie Aussant. Kāśikāvṛtti and Cāndravyākaraṇa: A Comparison of the Pratyāhārasūtra Section. Pascale Haag & Vincenzo Vergiani. Studies in the Kāśikāvṛtti. The section on Pratyāhāras – Critical Edition, Translation and Other Contributions, Società Editrice Fiorentina – Manohar, 2009. halshs-01501396

HAL Id: halshs-01501396

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01501396v1>

Submitted on 4 Apr 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ÉMILIE AUSSANT

Kāśīkāvṛtti and Cāndravyākaraṇa:
*A Comparison of the Pratyāhārasūtra Section*¹

Introduction

This paper is devoted to a comparison of the *Pratyāhārasūtra* (psū) section of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* with that of the *Kāśīkāvṛtti*. The *Cāndravyākaraṇa* is a grammar of the Sanskrit language, composed in Sanskrit and intended for Buddhists. Although it has disappeared from the Indian territory, it has been maintained and transmitted in countries where Buddhism became widespread.² The aim of its author, the Buddhist scholar Candragomin, who is thought to have lived around the 4th-5th century CE, is to present an effortless, clear and exhaustive grammar. In fact, it is the first great revised edition of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A.) of Pāṇini: Candra preserves most of the content of the Pāṇinian treatise but forsakes its generative pattern and adopts a thematic scheme. He also incorporates some of Kātyāyana's and Patañjali's suggestions.

The present study is justified in so far as the *Kāśīkāvṛtti* shows numerous similarities with the commentary on this grammar (the *Cāndravṛtti*—CV— which was believed for a long time to

¹ I warmly thank Pascale Haag, Vincenzo Vergiani and Thomas Oberlies for their remarks, criticisms and advice. I would also like to thank Saroja Bhate for her help in reading the *Pratyāhārasūtra* section of the C.

² Cf. Balbir (2000: 270-71).

have been composed by Candraraja himself; today some scholars maintain that its author was a certain Dharmadāsa³), even if the *Kāśikāvṛtti* does not make reference to it explicitly. To date, the origin of these similarities has given rise to two main hypotheses. According to one view, defended in particular by R. Vedalankar (1977: 250-69) and P. Visalakshy (1981), the *Kāśikā* was influenced by the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa* and the *Cāndravṛtti*. According to another, both the *Kāśikā* and the *Cāndravṛtti* were inspired by another text: S.D. Joshi, J.A.F. Roodbergen (1991-1992) and J. Bronkhorst (especially 2002: 185-195) believe that this common source probably belonged to the Pāṇinian tradition; T. Oberlies (1996: 285-86) thinks that it was rather a lost commentary on the *Jainendravṛtyākaraṇa*.

The study of the psū section of the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa* with its *vṛtti*, compared to that of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, confirms the existence of numerous similarities between the two texts; very few elements of the *Cāndravṛtti* are not found in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. In order to grasp somewhat better the peculiarities of this parallelism, I have examined the divergences shown by the two texts: for what reasons do they differ in some passages?

As I will try to show in this paper, some divergences can be explained very simply. This is particularly the case of the differences related to the reference text (cf. 2.2): the *Cāndravṛtti* refers to Candraraja's *sūtras*, whereas the *Kāśikāvṛtti* refers to Pāṇini's. This is also the case of the differences in vocabulary (cf. 2.2 "Other divergences"): it is indeed well-known⁴ that the technical terminology used by Candraraja differs considerably from the one used by Pāṇini. It is more difficult to justify some other divergences, like the presence or the absence of sequences or of sentences. The third part of this paper is essentially devoted to this kind of problems.

1. Presentation of the psū section of the two texts

Some details concerning the conventions adopted in this paper:

a) underlined types indicate that the sequence in question differs in both texts;

b) bold-faced types indicate that the sequence in question is found in both texts but in different places;

³ Cf. Dash (1986: 17-21), Oberlies (1996: 267; 2006: 380-81). For a different view on this issue, cf. Bronkhorst (2002: 182-85).

⁴ Cf. Dash (1980; 1986: 54-62).

c) the numbering [1] etc. corresponds to the one adopted for the present critical edition of the psū section of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*;

d) in tables 2.1 and 2.2, the = symbol indicates a correspondence, the ≠ symbol indicates a non-correspondence;

e) abbreviations:

[SS]: several missing sentences

[S]: missing sentence

[W]: missing word

[EX]: missing example

[SU]: missing *sūtra*;

f) reference edition of the *Cāndravṛtti*: *Cāndra-vṛtti, der original Kommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra*, herausgegeben von Bruno Liebich, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 14, Leipzig, 1918 [reprint: Kraus Reprint Ltd., Nendeln, 1966];

g) reference edition of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*: the critical edition presented in this book.

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
[1] <i>siddham praṇamya sarvajñaṃ sarvīyaṃ jagato gurum. laghuvīspāstasampūrṇam ucyate śabdalakṣaṇam.</i>	[1] <i>vṛtau bhāsyē tathā dhātunāmapārāyanādīsu. vīprakīrnasya tantrasya kriyate sārasamgrahah 1 </i>
[2] [SS] <i>atha kimartha varṇānām upadeśaḥ? pratyāhārthaḥ. pratyāhāro hi lāghavena śāstrapravṛttyarthaḥ.</i>	[2] <i>atha śabdānuśāsanam. keśām śabdānām? laukikānām vaidikānāmca. kathamanuśāsanam? prakṛtyādivibhāgaparikalpanayā sāmānyaviśeṣavatā lakṣaṇena. atha kimartha varṇānām upadeśaḥ? pratyāhārthaḥ. pratyāhāro [W] lāghavena śāstrapravṛttyarthaḥ.</i>
[3] a i u ṇ 1 <i>a i u ity anena krameṇa varṇān upadiśyānte ṇakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārtham. tasyoccāranam bhavaty ekena: ṛko 'ṇo ralāv [C. 1.1.15] ity akāreṇa. jātinirdeśas cāyam.</i>	[3] a i u ṇ 1 <i>a i u ity anena krameṇa varṇān upadiśyānte ṇakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārtham. tasya grahanam bhavaty ekena ur aṇ raparah [A 1.1.52] ity akāreṇa. [S]</i>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[4] [SS]</p>	<p>[4] <i>hrasvam avarnam prayoge samvrtam. dīrghaphlutayos tu vivrtatvam. tesām sāvarnyaprasiddhyartham akāra iha śāstre vivrtah pratijñayate. tasya prayogārtham a a [A. 8.4.68] iti śāstrānte pratyāpattih karisyate.</i></p>
<p>[5] r l k 2 r l ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāms cānte kakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārtham. tasyoccāranam bhavati caturbhih: ako ki dīrgha [C. 5.1.106] ity akāreṇa, iko yan aci [C. 5.1.74] itikāreṇa, ugita [C. 5.2.44] ity ukāreṇa, iko 'no ralāv [C. 1.1.15] ity rkāreṇa.</p>	<p>[5] r l k 2 r l ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāms cānte kakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārtham. tasya grahanam bhavati tribhih. akah savarṇe dīrghah [A. 6.1.101] ity akāreṇa, iko gunavrdhī [A. 1.1.3] itikāreṇa, ugitaś ca [A. 4.1.6] ity ukāreṇa [SU] </p>
<p>[6] akārādayo varṇāḥ pracuraprayogaviśayās, teśāṃ sujñānam upadeśaprayojanam. lkāras tu klpistha eva prayujyate, klpes ca pūrvatrāsiddham [C. 6.3.27] iti latvam asiddham, tata rkāra evāckāryāṇi bhaviṣyantīti kim artham lkāra upadiśyate?</p>	<p>[6] akārādayo varṇāḥ pracuraprayogaviśayās teśāṃ sujñānam upadeśe prayojanam. lkāras tu klpistha eva prayujyate, klpes ca pūrvatrāsiddham [A. 8.2.1] iti latvam asiddham, tatra rkāra evāckāryāṇi bhaviṣyantīti kim artham lkāra upadiśyate?</p>
<p>[7] latvavidhānād yāni parāṇy ackāryāṇi tāny lkāre yathā syur iti. kāni punas tāni? plutaḥ svarīto dvīrvacanam ca: kṛṣptaśikha, prakṛptaḥ, kṛpptavān iti.</p>	<p>[7] latvavidhānād yāni parāṇy ackāryāṇi tāny lkāre yathā syur iti. kāni punas tāni. plutaḥ, svaritah, dvīrvacanam [W]. kṛṣptaśikhaḥ, prakṛptaḥ, kṛpptavān iti.</p>
<p>[8] yac cāsaktijam asādhu śabdārūpam tadanukaraṇasyāpi sādhutvam iśyate; tatsthasyāpy lkārasyāckāryapratipattiyartham upadeśahkrīyate. itakaitiprayoktavye śaktivaikalyāt kumāryā itaka iti prayuktaḥ. tam anyo 'nukaroti: kumāry itaka ityam aheti.</p>	<p>[8] yac cāsaktijam asādhuśabdārūpam t a d a n u k a r a ṇ a s y ā p i sādhutvam iśyate. tatsthasyāpy lkārasyāckāryapratipattiyartham upadeśahkrīyate. itakaitiprayoktavye śaktivaikalyāt kumāry itaka iti prayukte, tad anyo 'nukaroti kumāry itaka ity [W] aheti.</p>
<p>[9] e o ṇ 3 e o ity etau varṇāv upadiśyante ṇakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārtham. tasyoccāranam bhavaty ekena: iko 'den kriyārthāya [C. 6.2.1] ity ekāreṇa.</p>	<p>[9] e o ṇ 3 e o ity etau varṇāv upadiśyante ṇakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārtham. tasya grahanam bhavaty ekena eṇi pararūpam [A. 6.1.94] ity ekāreṇa.</p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[10] ai au c 4 ai au ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāms cānte cakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasyocāranam bhavati caturbhiḥ: <u>aca</u> <u>ādaijhetur araktavikāra</u> [C. 5.2.36] ity akāreṇa, khitica ekāco 'ma [C. 5.2.4] itikāreṇa, eco 'yavāyāva [C. 5.1.75] ity ekāreṇa, <u>ajāgrniśvīnām sicy atāny ādaij</u> [C. 6.1.3] ity aikāreṇa.</p>	<p>[10] ai au c 4 ai au ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāms cānte cakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavati caturbhiḥ. <u>acah</u> <u>parasmin pūrvavidhau</u> [A 1.1.57] ity akāreṇa, <u>ica ekāco 'm pratyayavac ca</u> [A. 6.3.68] itikāreṇa, <u>eco 'yavāyāvah</u> [A. 6.1.78] ity ekāreṇa, <u>vrdhir ādaic</u> [A. 1.1.1] ity aikāreṇa.</p>
<p>[11] pratyāhāre 'nubandhānām katham ajgrahaṇeṣu na ? <u>jñāpakād apradhānatvāl lopaś ca balavān iti.</u></p>	<p>[11] pratyāhāre 'nubandhānām katham ajgrahaṇeṣu na. <u>ācārād apradhānatvāl lopaś ca balavattarah</u> [W].</p>
<p>[12] varṇeṣu ye varṇaikadeśā varṇāntarasamānākṛtayaṣ teṣu tatkāryaṃ na bhavati, tacchāyanukāriṇo hi te na punas ta eva; pṛthakprayatnanirvartyaṃ hi varṇam icchanty ācāryāḥ.</p>	<p>[12] varṇeṣu ye varṇaikadeśā varṇāntara-samānākṛtayaṣ teṣu tatkāryaṃ na bhavati. tacchāyanukāriṇo hi te, na punas ta eva. pṛthakprayatna-nirvartyaṃ hi varṇam icchanty ācāryāḥ.</p>
<p>[13] <u>nugvidhilādeśanatvesu</u> ṛkāre pratividhātavyam.</p>	<p>[13] <u>nudvidhilādeśavināmesu</u> ṛkāre pratividhātavyam.</p>
<p>[14] ha ya va ra <u>la n</u> 5 ha ya va ra <u>la</u> ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte <u>nakāram</u> itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasyocāranam bhavati <u>dvābhyām: inah śa</u> [C. 6.4.34] itikāreṇa, <u>iko yaṃ aci</u> [C. 5.1.74] iti <u>yakāreṇa. ingrahaṇāni sarvāny anena nakāreṇa, angrahaṇāni tu pūrvena nakāreṇa. jātinirdeśaś cāyam</u> [SU].</p>	<p>[14] ha ya va ra <u>t</u> 5 ha ya va ra [W] ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte <u>takāram</u> itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasya <u>grahanam</u> bhavaty <u>ekena śaś cho 'ti</u> [A. 8.4.63] ity <u>akāreṇa</u>. [SU] [SS]</p>
<p>[15] ayaṃ repho yakārāt para upadiśyate. tasya yarupādāne yayupādāne <u>yamupādāne copādāne</u> sati [EX] prātar nayatīty atra yaro ṇami ṇam vā [C. 6.4.140] iti <u>ṇamādeśah</u> prāpnoti, [EX] <u>nadihrada</u> ity atrāco <u>rahād</u> dve [C. 6.4.141] iti <u>dvirvacanaṃ prāpnoti</u>, [EX] <u>naram rathenety</u> atrānusvārasya yayi yam [C. 6.4.151] iti <u>yamādeśah</u> prāpnoti.</p>	<p>[15] ayaṃ repho yakārāt para upadiśyate. tasya <u>yargrahanena yaygrahanena</u> [W] ca <u>grahane sati svar nayati</u> prātar nayatīty atra yaro 'anunāsike 'anunāsiko vā [A. 8.4.45] ity <u>anunāsikah</u> prāpnoti, <u>madrahrado bhadrahada</u> ity atrāco <u>rahābhyām</u> dve [A. 8.4.46] iti <u>dvirvacanaṃ prāpnoti</u>. <u>kundam rathena vanam rathenety</u> atrānusvārasya yayi <u>parasavamaḥ</u> [A. 8.4.58] iti <u>parasavamaḥ</u> prāpnoti.</p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[16] <i>naīṣa doṣaḥ. ākṛtau padārthe samudāye sakṛl lakṣye lakṣaṇam pravartata iti [W] darśane yaro ṇāmi ṇām veti ṇām pratyāsannataro bhavatiṭy evam etat pravartate tad anena gakarādīnām ṇākārādayo ye yathāsvam sthānato guṇataś ca pratyāsannatarāś te vihitāḥ. ye ca na sthānato nāpi guṇataś ca sthānamātreṇa guṇamātreṇa ca [W] te sarve nivartitā iti sthānamātreṇa pratyāsanno rephasya ṇākāro na bhavati. dvīrvacane 'pi rephasya yarantarbhāve 'pi sati yat kāryitvam prāptam tat sāksāc chiṣṭena nīmītabhāvena bādhyata iti na dvīr ucyate rephaḥ. anusvārasya yayi yam ity etad apy anusvārasya nīmītapratyāsannatarām sakṛd eva yamam vidadhāti. na ca rephasya nīmīttasyānunāsikah pratyāsannataro 'astīti na bhaviṣyati [EX] naram rathenety atra.</i></p>	<p>[16] <i>naīṣa doṣaḥ, ākṛtau padārthe samudāye sakṛl [W] lakṣaṇam pravartata ity etasmīn darśane yaro 'nunāsike 'nunāsiko vā [A. 8.4.45] [W] antaratamo bhavatiṭy evam etat pravartate. tad anena gakarādīnām ṇākārādayo ye yathāsvam sthānato guṇataś cāntaratamāś te vihitāḥ. ye tu na sthānato nāpi guṇataḥ [W], sthānamātreṇa guṇamātreṇa vā antaratamāś te sarve nivartitā iti sthānamātrāntaratamo rephasya ṇākāro na bhavati. dvīrvacane 'pi rephasya yarantarbhāve [W] sati yarkāryam prāptam, tat sāksāc chiṣṭena nīmītabhāvena bādhyata iti na dvīr ucyate rephaḥ. anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ [A. 8.4.58] ity etad apy anusvārāntaratamam sakṛd eva parasavarṇam vidadhāti. na ca rephasyānusvārāntaratamah savarno 'stīti na bhaviṣyati kundam rathena, vanam rathenety atra.</i></p>
<p>[17] <i>atra hakārādiṣv akāra uccāranārthah, anyatra prayojanābhāvāt, halām api jātinīrdeśāt. [SS]</i></p> <p>[18] [SS]</p>	<p>[17] [S] <i>atām madhye visarjanī-yajihvāmūlyopadhmanīyānām apy upadeśaḥ kartavyah. kim prayojanam? urah kena, urah kena, urah pena, urah pena. atra advyavāye [A. 8.4.2] iti natvam yathā syād iti.</i></p> <p>[18] lan 6 <i>la ity ekam varṇam upadiśya pūrvāś cānte nakāram itam karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya grahanam bhavati tribhiḥ. anudīti savarnasya cāpratyayah [A. 1.1.69] ity akāreṇa, inkoh [A. 8.3.57] itikāreṇa, iko yan aci [A. 6.1.77] iti yakāreṇa.</i></p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[19] [SS]</p>	<p>[19] <i>ingrahaṇāni sarvāni pareṇa ṅakāreṇa. angrahaṇāni tu pūrveṇa</i> [W], <i>anuditsavarnasya cāpratyayah</i> [A. 1.1.69] <i>ity etad ekam anena.</i></p>
<p>[20] [SS]</p>	<p>[20] <i>atha kim artham ajgrahanam evaitan na kriyate? naivam śakyam. antahsthanām api hi savarnānam grahanam isyate sāyṅyantā. sāvūvatsarah. yaḥllokam. taḥllokam ity atrānusuvarasyānunāsike yayi parasavarne kṛte tasya yargrahaṇena grahanād dvirvacanam yathā syād iti.</i></p>
<p>[21] [SS]</p>	<p>[21] [W] <i>hakārādiṣv akāra uccāraṇārthah, nānubandhah. lakāre tvanunāsika itsamjñakah pratijñāyate, tena uran raparah</i> [A. 1.1.51] <i>ity atra pratyāhāragrahaṇaḥ laparatvam api bhavati.</i></p>
<p>[22] ṅa ma ṅa ṅa na m 6 <i>ṅa ma ṅa ṅa na ity etān varṅān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte makāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasyoccarānam bhavati pañcabhiḥ: śas cho 'mi</i> [C. 6.4.157] <i>ity akāreṇa, anusvārasya yayi yam</i> [C. 6.4.151] <i>iti yakāreṇa, yaro ṅami ṅam vā</i> [C. 6.4.140] <i>iti ṅakāreṇa</i> [S], <i>vinmator mam iti makāreṇa, ṅamo hrasvād dve</i> [C. 6.4.17] <i>iti ṅakāreṇa.</i></p>	<p>[22] ṅa ma ṅa ṅa na m 7 <i>ṅa ma ṅa ṅa na ity etān varṅān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte makāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasya grahaṇam bhavati tribhiḥ. pumaḥ khayy ampare</i> [A 8.3.6] <i>ity akāreṇa, halo yamām yami lopah</i> [A. 8.4.64] <i>iti yakāreṇa, [SU] ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṅ nityam</i> [A. 8.3.32] <i>iti ṅakāreṇa. ṅamantād dah</i> [US 1.111] <i>iti ṅakāreṇāpi grahaṇam asya drśyate.</i></p>
<p>[23] <i>ke cit tu sarvāṅy etāni pratyāhāragrahaṇāni ṅakāreṇa bhavantu iti makārānubandham pratyācakṣate. tathā ca sati ṅamo hrasvād dve</i> [C. 6.4.17] <i>iti</i> [W] <i>dvitvabhājor jhabhor abhāvād dvitvābhāvapratipattau pratipattigauravaṃ syāt.</i></p>	<p>[23] <i>ke cit tu sarvāṅy etāni pratyāhāragrahaṇāni ṅakāreṇa bhavantu iti makāram anubandham pratyācakṣate, tathā ca sati ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṅ nityam</i> [A. 8.3.32] <i>ity atrāgaminor jhabhor abhāvād āgamābhāvapratipattau pratipattigauravaṃ bhavati.</i></p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[24] jha bha ṅ 7 <i>jha bha ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte ṅakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasyoccāranam bhavaty ekena: ata ād yaṅi [C. 6.2.39] iti yakāreṇa.</i></p>	<p>[24] jha bha ṅ 8 <i>jha bha ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte ṅakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya grahanam bhavaty ekena. ato dīrghaḥ yaṅi [A. 7.3.101] iti yakāreṇa.</i></p>
<p>[25] gha dha dha ṣ 8 <i>gha dha dha ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte śakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasyoccāranam bhavati dvābhyām: jhaṣa ekācaḥ sdhvor baśo bhaṣ [C. 6.3.69] iti jhakārahakārahābhyām.</i></p>	<p>[25] gha dha dha ṣ 9 <i>gha dha dha ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte śakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya grahanam bhavati dvābhyām. ekāco baśo bhaṣ jhaśantasya sdhvoḥ [A. 8.2.37] iti bhakārajhakārahābhyām.</i></p>
<p>[26] ja ba ga ḍa da ś 9 <i>ja ba ga ḍa da ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte śakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasyoccāranam bhavati pañcabhiḥ: bhobhagoaghobhyo śi loṣa [C. 6.4.24] ity akāreṇa, haśi cāto ror [C. 5.1.119] iti hakāreṇa, vaśi [C. 5.4.128] iti vakāreṇa, jhalo jaś [C. 6.3.67] iti jakāreṇa [W], jhaṣa ekācaḥ sdhvor baśo bhaṣ [C. 6.3.69] iti bakāreṇa.</i></p>	<p>[26] ja ba ga ḍa da ś 10 <i>ja ba ga ḍa da ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāṃś cānte śakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya grahanam bhavati śadbhiḥ. bhobhagoaghoapūrvasya yo śi [A. 8.3.17] ity akāreṇa, haśi ca [A. 6.1.114] iti hakāreṇa, neḍvaśi kṛti [A. 7.2.8.] iti vakāreṇa, jhalām jaś jhaśi [A. 8.4.53] iti jakārajhakārahābhyām, ekāco baśo bhaṣ jhaśantasya sdhvoḥ [A. 8.2.37] iti bakāreṇa.</i></p>
<p>[27] kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta v 10 <i>kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta ity etān varṇān upadiśyānte vakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasyoccāranam bhavaty ekena: naś chavy apraśān [C. 6.4.3] iti chakāreṇa. khaphagrahaṇam uttarārtham.</i></p>	<p>[27] kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta v 11 <i>kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa ta ity etān varṇān upadiśyānte vakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārārtham. tasya grahanam bhavaty. ekena naś chavy apraśān [A. 8.3.7] iti chakāreṇa. khaphagrahaṇam uttarārtham.</i></p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[28] ka pa y 11 ka pa ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāms cānte yakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasyoccāranam bhavati pañcabhiḥ: anusvārasya yayi yam [C. 6.4.151] iti yakāreṇa, maya uño 'ci va [C. 6.4.16] iti makāreṇa, jhayo ho jhay [C. 6.4.156] iti jhakāreṇa, pumaḥ khayy ami [C. 6.4.2] iti khakāreṇa, cayah śari dvitīya [C. 6.4.158] iti cakāreṇa.</p>	<p>[28] ka pa y 12 ka pa ity etau varṇāv upadiśya pūrvāms cānte yakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasya grahanam bhavati caturbhiḥ. anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ [A. 8.4.58] iti yakāreṇa, maya uño vo vā [A. 8.3.33] iti makāreṇa, jhayo ho 'anyatarasyām [A. 8.4.62] iti jhakāreṇa, pumaḥ khayy ampāre [A. 8.3.6] iti khakāreṇa. [SU]</p>
<p>[29] śa śa sa r 12 śa śa sa ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte repham itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasyoccāranam bhavati pañcabhiḥ: yaro nāmi nām vā [C. 6.4.140] iti yakāreṇa, halo jharām jhari sasthāne loḥo vā [C. 6.4.155] iti jhakāreṇa, khari car jhala [C. 6.4.148] iti khakāra [SU] [W]cakārabhyām, nṇoh kuktukau śari [C. 6.4.12] iti śakāreṇa.</p>	<p>[29] śa śa sa r 13 śa śa sa ity etān varṇān upadiśya pūrvāms cānte repham itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasya grahanam bhavati pañcabhiḥ. yaro 'nunāsike 'nunāsiko vā [A. 8.4.45] iti yakāreṇa, jharo jhari savarṇe [A. 8.4.65] iti jhakāreṇa, khari ca [A. 8.4.55] iti khakāreṇa, abhyāse car ca [A. 8.4.54] iti cakāreṇa, śarpūrvāh khayah [A. 7.4.61] iti śakāreṇa.</p>
<p>[30] ha l 13 ha ity ekaṃ varṇam upadiśya pūrvāms cānte lakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasyoccāranam bhavati ṣadbhiḥ: śidānekāl sarvasya [C. 1.1.12] ity akāreṇa, hali pīty uta aud [C. 6.2.30] iti hakāreṇa, supi vali tadvad [C. 6.3.51] iti vakāreṇa, ralo halāder idutoḥ sani ca [C. 6.2.21] iti rephena, jhalo jhali [C. 6.3.55] iti jhakāreṇa, śala igupāntād adrṣo 'niṭah ksa [C. 1.1.65] iti śakāreṇa.</p>	<p>[30] ha l 14 ha ity ekaṃ varṇam upadiśya pūrvāms cānte lakāram itaṃ karoti pratyāhārātham. tasya grahanam bhavati ṣadbhiḥ. alo 'ntyāt pūrvā upadhā [A. 1.1.65] ity akāreṇa, halo 'nantarāh samyogah [A. 1.1.7] iti hakāreṇa, loḥo vyor vali [A. 6.1.66] iti vakāreṇa, ralo vyupadhād dhalādeḥ sams ca [A. 1.2.26] iti rephena, jhalo jhali [A. 8.2.26] iti jhakāreṇa, śala igupadhād anīṭah ksaḥ [A. 3.1.45] iti śakāreṇa.</p>
<p>[31] atha kimartham upadiśto 'py ayam hakārah punar upadiśyate? adēvīkalpakṣavidhāvidhāyō yathā syur iti.</p>	<p>[31] atha kimartham upadiśto 'pi [W] hakārah punar upadiśyate? kittva [W] ksa [W] idvidhāyō yathā syur iti.</p>

CĀNDRAVYĀKARAṆA	KĀŚIKĀVṚTTI
<p>[32] <i>tatra snihitvā snehitvety atra ralo halāderidutoḥ sani ca</i> [C. 6.2.21] <i>ity adenvikalpo yathā syāt, liheścālikṣad iti śala igupāntād adṛśo 'niṭaḥ ksa</i> [C. 1.1.65] <i>iti kso yathā syāt, rudihī svapihīti valādīlakṣaṇād id yathā syāt. adāgdhām iti jhalgrahaṇeṣu ca hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt.</i></p>	<p>[32] <i>[W] snihitvā [EX] ity atra ralo vyupadhād dhalādeḥ saṃś ca</i> [A. 1.2.26] <i>iti kittvam yathā syāt. liher [W] alikṣad iti śala igupadhād anītaḥ ksaḥ</i> [A. 3.1.45] <i>iti kso yathā syāt, rudihī, svapihīti valādīlakṣaṇa id yathā syāt. adāgdhām iti jhalgrahaṇeṣu ca hakārasya grahaṇam yathā syāt.</i></p>
<p>[33] <i>ha ya va ra la n̄ ity atra tarhi kimarthaṃ hakāra upadiśyate?</i> [W] <i>aśgrahaṇe [W] haśgrahaṇe ca grahaṇam yathā syāt.</i> [EX][EX] [EX]</p>	<p>[33] <i>ha ya va ra ṭ [pṣū. 5] ity atra tarhi kimarthaṃ [W] upadiśyate? adgrahaṇeṣu aśgrahaṇeṣu ca [W] [W] haśi ceti ca grahaṇam yathā syāt. mahā hi saḥ, devā hasanti, brāhmano hasati.</i></p>
<p>[34] <i>nañāñāvāḥsyurekasmāc, caturbhyaś ca kacau, nasau. dvābhyām jñeyau, pañcabhyo rśmyah, śadbhyo las tu vidhīyate.</i> [S] <i>esa pratyāhārah pūrvavyākaraṇeṣu api sthīta eva. ayam tu viśeṣah: aiaus iti yad aśit tad aiauj iti krtam. tathā hi: laghāv ante dvayoś ca bahvaśo guruh, trnadhānyānām ca dvyasām</i> [phit-sūtra 2.19.4] <i>iti pathyate.</i></p>	<p>[34] <i>ekasmān nañānavatā dvābhyām śas tribhya eva kanamāḥ syuh. jñeyau cayau caturbhyo rah pañcabhyah śalau śadbhyah. iti pratyāhārah.</i> [SS]</p>

2. Types of divergences

I distinguish three types of divergences:

First type: several sentences, a sentence, a word, an example or a *sūtra* are present or absent in one text, but not in the other. This type of divergence becomes clearly visible in the parallel presentation of the two texts: for example, in section [2], the symbol [SS] that appears in the *Cāndravṛtti* text corresponds to the underlined sentence sequence *atha... lakṣaṇena* of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* text; the symbol [W] that appears in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* text corresponds to the underlined word *hi* of the *Cāndravṛtti* text.

In this type of divergences, I include the cases of sequences that are in both texts but at different places. These cases, indicated by bold-faced types, are the following: [14 CV] = [18-19 KV] and [17 CV] = [21 KV].

Second type: divergences concerning words of common usage and examples. See table 2.1, part 3.1 (common usage vocabulary) and part 3.2 (examples);

Third type: divergences related to the reference text. See table 2.2, part 3.1 and part 3.3.

2.1 Common usage vocabulary, examples

CV	KV	Localization
<i>uccāraṇam</i>	<i>grahaṇam</i>	[3], [5], [9], [10], [14], [22], [24], [25], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30]
<i>tataḥ</i>	<i>tatra</i>	[6]
<i>kumāryā... prayuktaḥ</i>	<i>kumārī... prayuṅkte</i>	[8]
<i>tam</i>	<i>tad</i>	[8]
<i>jñāpakāt</i>	<i>acārāt</i>	[11]
<i>balavān</i>	<i>balavattaraḥ</i>	[11]
<i>anena</i>	<i>pareṇa</i>	[14 CV]=[18-19 KV]
<i>upādāne × 4</i>	<i>grahaṇa- × 3</i>	[15]
<i>ca</i>	<i>tu</i>	[16]
<i>ca</i>	<i>vā</i>	[16]
<i>yat kāryitvam</i>	<i>yarkāryam</i>	[16]
<i>syāt</i>	<i>bhavati</i>	[23]
<i>valādīlakṣaṇād id</i>	<i>valādīlakṣaṇa id</i>	[32]

2.2 Divergences related to the reference text (KV→A.; CV→C.)

Numer of possible combination of the <i>anubandhas</i>		<i>sūtras</i> quoted		Other divergences		Loc.
CV	KV	CV	KV	CV	KV	
4	3	5.1.106 = 6.1.101 5.1.74 ≠ 1.1.3 5.2.44 ≠ 4.1.6 1.1.15				[5]
1	1	6.2.1 ≠ 6.1.94				[9]
4	4	5.2.36 = 1.1.57 5.2.4 = 6.3.68 5.1.75 = 6.1.78 6.1.3 ≠ 1.1.1				[10]
				<i>nug ṇatveṣu</i>	<i>nuḍ vināmeṣu</i>	[13]
2	1	6.4.34 ≠ 8.4.63 5.1.74		<i>hayavaralaṅ hayavarala ṇakāram</i>	<i>hayavaraḥ hayavara ṭakāram</i>	[14]
				<i>yamuḥpādāne ṇamādeśaḥ yamādeśaḥ</i>	<i>anunāsikaḥ parasavarṇaḥ</i>	[15]
				<i>ṇaṃ ṇratyāsannatarah ṇratyāsannatarāḥ sihānamātreṇa ṇratyāsannaḥ anusvārasya nimittapratyāsannataram yamam nimittasyānunāsikaḥ ṇratyāsannatarah</i>	<i>antaratamaḥ antaratamāḥ sihānamātrāntaratamaḥ anusvārāntaratamam parasavarṇam anusvārāntaratamaḥ savarṇaḥ</i>	[16]
5	3	6.4.157 ≠ 8.3.6 6.4.151 ≠ 8.4.64 6.4.140 Vedic sū. ¹ 6.4.17 = 8.3.32				[22]
				<i>dviṭvabhājor dviṭva°</i>	<i>āgaminor āgama°</i>	[23]
				<i>ṇhakārabhakārābhyām</i>	<i>bhakārābhyām</i>	[25]

¹ This *sūtra* does not have any reference. According to the editor K.C. Chatterji (p. 7), it could be a rule of the Vedic section that has not been discovered yet

Numer of possible combination of the <i>anubandhas</i>		<i>sūtras</i> quoted	Other divergences		Loc.
CV	KV		CV	KV	
5	4	6.4.151 = 8.4.58 6.4.16 = 8.3.33 6.4.156 = 8.4.62 6.4.2 = 8.3.6 6.4.158			[28]
5	5	6.4.140 = 8.4.45 6.4.155 = 8.4.65 6.4.148 = 8.4.55 6.4.148 8.4.54 6.4.12 ≠ 7.4.61			[29]
6	6	1.1.12 ≠ 1.1.65 6.2.30 ≠ 1.1.7 6.3.51 ≠ 6.1.66 6.2.21 = 1.2.26 6.3.55 = 8.2.26 1.1.65 = 3.1.45			[30]
			<i>adenvikalpa</i> <i>adenvikalpaḥ</i>	<i>kittva</i> <i>kitvam</i>	[31] [32]
			<i>ha ya va ra la ṅ</i> <i>aśgrahaṇe haśgrahaṇe</i> <i>ca</i>	<i>ha ya va ra ṅ</i> <i>aśgrahaṇeṣv</i> <i>aśgrahaṇeṣu</i>	[33]
			<i>ṅaṅaṅavāḥ syure</i> <i>kasmāc catvrbhyaś ca</i> <i>kacau ṅasau </i>	<i>ekasmān ṅaṅaṅavaṭā</i> <i>dvābhyām śastribhya</i> <i>eva kaṅamāḥ syuḥ </i>	[34]
			<i>dvābhyām jñeyau</i> <i>pañcabhyo rśmyaḥ</i> <i>śaḍbhyo las tu</i> <i>vidhīyate </i>	<i>jñeyau cayau catvrb-</i> <i>hyo raḥ pañcabhyaḥ</i> <i>śalau śaḍbhyaḥ </i>	[34]

3. Analysis

3.1 Terminology

Generally, on the terminological level (cf. 2.1 and 2.2 “Other divergences”), the *Cāndravṛtti* seems to be more precise than the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

a) Concerning the words of common usage (cf. 2.1), one observes that when the different vocalic phonemes with which the *anubandha* is articulated have to be mentioned, the *Cāndravṛtti* uses *uccāraṇa*, a term that refers explicitly to the pronunciation, whereas the *Kāśikāvṛtti* resorts to *grahaṇa*, a

a term with a wider extension, which is not related specifically to the articulation of sounds.⁵ Moreover, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* uses *grahaṇa* in other contexts, like in [15], while the *Cāndravṛtti* employs the word *upādāna*. Another divergence concerning the vocabulary of common usage is to be noted: in [11], the *Cāndravṛtti* resorts to *jñāpaka* “teaching, indication” where the *Kāśikāvṛtti* uses *ācāra* “masters’ practice”. One may explain this divergence by the fact that Candra, the founder of his own school, does not have any authority to follow, unlike the authors of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*: the word *ācāra* evokes, more frankly, the “weight” of the tradition or of a spiritual heritage, while from this viewpoint *jñāpaka* seems more neutral.

b) As for the technical vocabulary (cf. 2.2 “Other divergences”), several criteria can explain the choices of Candra and his commentator. It would seem that, in general, the *Cāndravṛtti* prefers a transparent or descriptive terminology⁶: one notes particularly the use of *ṇatva* (in [13]), of *ñamādeśa* (in [15])⁷ and of *yamādeśa* (in [15]), terms that correspond to *vināma*, *anunāsika* and *parasavarṇa* respectively in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.⁸ In addition to this transparency, some of the terms used in the *Cāndravṛtti* have a narrower extension than the terms to which the *Kāśikāvṛtti* resorts: *ṇatva*, for example, refers exclusively to the cerebralization of *n*, while *vināma* designates the cerebralization of both *n* and *s*. Another example is the expression *yamādeśa*, used instead of *parasavarṇa*: the former refers to a nasal substitute, whereas *parasavarṇa* designates any homogeneous phoneme. In other cases, the subtleties of the Pāṇinian analysis are obliterated in favour of generalization and, therefore, of simplification: the sequence *-ññ* in an utterance such as *udaññ āste* “he is seated in the northern direction” is described, in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, as the addition of an augment (*āgama*) identical with the final consonant of the previous

⁵ Otherwise, the term *grahaṇa* is used very frequently in Kātyāyana’s *vārttikas* and in the *Mahābhāṣya*.

⁶ Remember that the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa* is presented as a term-less grammar: *candropajñam asaṃjñakam vyākaraṇam (Cāndravṛtti in Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa 2.2.68)*.

⁷ The abbreviation *ñam* is already used in the *uṇādi-sūtras* (cf. Cardona 1976: 148). It is therefore an ancient grammatical term, not proper to Pāṇini.

⁸ Note, moreover, that the two technical terms *vināma* and *anunāsika* are known to be very ancient (cf. Renou 1942, 3rd part, s.v., and Abhyankar, 1961, s.v.), whereas the terms used by Candra and in the commentary appear with Pāṇini (like *parasavarṇa*) or even after him (like *ṇatva*).

word; Candra and his commentator consider the same sequence as a simple reduplication (*dve*, *dvitva*) of the consonant (cf. [23]). Likewise in [32], the *Cāndravṛtti* resorts to the term *adeṅvikalpa* (lit. “option of |a|, |e| or |o|”) where the *Kāśikāvṛtti* uses *kittva*; the phenomenon referred to here is the optional realization of *guṇa* vowels, conditioned by the presence of some suffixes optionally bearing the marker *k* (hence *k-ittva*): the expression *adeṅvikalpa* in the *Cāndravṛtti* simply mentions the optional realization of the *adeṅ* vowels, that is, it lays stress on the phenomenon itself, while the expression *kittvavikalpa* in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* refers to the optionality of the marker *k* with some suffixes, which conditions the realization of the *guṇa* vowels, thus emphasizing the cause of the phenomenon.⁹ These terminological choices, which are possible because of the absence of an authority to be respected,¹⁰ can be explained by the will of making Pāṇini’s grammar less ambiguous and more accessible.¹¹

However, it should be noted that this tendency to simplification is not systematic. For example, in [13] the *Cāndravṛtti* resorts to the technical term *nuK* where the *Kāśikāvṛtti* uses *nuD*. One may think that the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa* and the *Cāndravṛtti* wanted to generalize the term *nuK* instead of using the three items *nuK*, *nuD* and *nuM*¹² found in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This is not the case, though, for it appears that Candra and his commentator also resort to the two other terms.¹³

3.2 Examples

Below I give a table where all the examples quoted in both texts occur.¹⁴

⁹ See Translation, n. 54.

¹⁰ This fact, already mentioned, can equally explain the choice of a term such as *pratyāsannatara* in [16] where the *Kāśikā* uses *antarātama*, a usual term in the Pāṇinian tradition (cf. A. 1.1.50).

¹¹ It is interesting to notice that the *Jainendravṛtyākaraṇa* of Devanandin (500 or 700 AD?), the oldest work of the Jain school of grammar known to us, which is also based on Pāṇini’s treatise, does not follow the same tendency as Candra. Instead of simplifying and clarifying the rules, Devanandin retains and even expands further the economy of expression (on this point, cf. Scharfe 1977: 168).

¹² These three terms designate three kinds of *n* infixes. For *nuK*, cf. e.g. A. 4.1.32, for *nuT*, cf. e.g. A. 7.1.54 and for *nuM*, cf. e.g. A. 7.1.58.

¹³ *nuD* occurs in C. 2.1.32 and C. 5.2.93 particularly; *nuM* occurs in C. 5.4.10 and following.

¹⁴ The order in which the examples of the table occur is identical with that of their quotation in the texts.

CV	KV	Localization
<i>kl̥ṣptaśikhah prakl̥ptah kl̥p̥ptavān</i>	<i>kl̥ṣptaśikhah prakl̥ptah kl̥p̥ptavān</i>	[7]
<i>ṛtaka ṭtaka</i>	<i>ṛtaka ṭtaka</i>	[8]
<i>prātar nayati nadīhradah</i>	<i>svar nayati prātar nayati madrahradah bhadrahradah</i>	[15]
<i>naraṃ rathena</i>	<i>kunḍam rathena vanam rathena</i>	[15] [16]
	<i>urah keṇa urah keṇa urah peṇa urah peṇa</i>	[17]
	<i>saṅgyantā sāvṛvatsara yatllokam tatllokam</i>	[20]
<i>snihitvā snehitvā alīkṣat rudihī svapīhī adāgdhām</i>	<i>snihitvā alīkṣat rudihī svapīhī adāgdhām</i>	[32]
	<i>mahā hi saḥ devā hasanti brāhmaṇo hasati</i>	[33]

I will start with two general observations:

1) only 3 of the 14 examples quoted in the *Cāndravṛtti* do not occur in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*;¹⁵

2) the *Kāśikāvṛtti* gives many more examples than the *Cāndravṛtti* (27 to 14).

These two tendencies characterize the whole section: the quasi-totality of what is said in the *Cāndravṛtti* occurs in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* and the *Cāndravṛtti* is less detailed than the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

¹⁵ As is shown in the Introduction, section 2.2.3 (h), the majority of the mss read both *snihitvā* and *snehitvā*. Thus, if one considers the majority reading, only 2 of the examples are not found.

a) The examples quoted in [7] are found in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 19): *kl̥ṣptaśikha, kl̥ptah, prakl̥ptah*. However, it should be noted that the item *kl̥pptavān* is missing in the *Mahābhāṣya* and that the item *kl̥ptah* does not occur in any of the texts studied here.

b) The examples quoted in [8] are found in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 19): *aśaktyā kayācid brāhmaṇyā rtaka iti prayoktavya ltaka iti prayuktam | tasyānukaraṇam brāhmaṇy ltaka ity āha kumāry ltaka ity āheti*. Although the subject under discussion and the examples are the same, the form of the passage is slightly different in the *Mahābhāṣya* and in the two texts compared here.

c) Among the examples quoted in [15], the following occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, pp. 27-28): *anunāsikasya. svar nayati prātar nayatīti* [...]; (vol. 1, p. 27): *dvirvacanasya. bhadrahradaḥ madrahrada iti* [...]. It is to be noted that the order in which the last two examples are quoted is not the same in the *Mahābhāṣya* and in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.¹⁶

d) Among the examples quoted in [15] and [16], the following occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 28): *parasavarṇasya. kuṇḍam rathena. vanaṃ rathena*.

e) Among the examples quoted in [17], the following occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 28): *kiṃ prayojanam. ṇatvam. uraḥ keṇa, uraḥ peṇa*.¹⁷

f) The examples quoted in [20] are found in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 16): *tad yathā. saṅgyantā savṛvatsara yaḷḷokam taḷḷokam iti. anusvāraḥ sthānī yaṇam anunāsikaṃ prakalpayati*.

g) Among the examples quoted in [32], the following occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 27): *yadi pūrvopadeśaḥ kittvaṃ vidheyam. snihitvā snehitvā. sisnihiṣati sisnehiṣati*. [...]. *ksavidhiḥ. ksaś ca vidheyah. adhuḥṣat alikṣat*. [...]. *iḍvidhiḥ. iḍ ca vidheyah. rudihi svapihi*. [...]. *jhalgrahaṇāni ca*. [...]. *adāgdhām adāgdham*. It is to be noted that not all the examples given in the *Mahābhāṣya* appear in the two texts compared here.

h) Among the three examples quoted in [33], which occur only in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, the following are found in the *Mahābhāṣya* (vol. 1, p. 27): *ihāpi yathā syāt. mahā hi saḥ*. [...]. *ihāpi yathā syāt. puruṣo hasati. brāhmaṇo hasatīti*. It should be noticed that the example *devā hasanti*, quoted in the

¹⁶ F. Kielhorn (1880) mentions the following variant: L. 1 Ben. *madradaḥ bhadrahradaḥ*.

¹⁷ F. Kielhorn (1880) mentions the following variant: L. 21 *uraḥkeṇa urakeṇa. uraḥpeṇa urapeṇa*. The edition of Dr. Bal Shastri (2001, 6 vol.) selects the version with four examples.

Kāśikāvṛtti in order to show that *h* has to be included in the abbreviation *aś*,¹⁸ does not occur in the extract of the *Mahābhāṣya* quoted above (the two examples *puruṣo hasati* and *brāhmaṇo hasati* illustrate one and the same fact, which results from the application of the rule A. 6.1.114 *hasi ca*).

Conclusive remarks concerning the examples:

(1) in half of the cases (i.e. [8], [15], [16], [20]), the examples quoted by the *Kāśikāvṛtti* seem to be directly borrowed from the *Mahābhāṣya*;

(2) in the case of the examples occurring in [7], it is not impossible that the *Kāśikāvṛtti* based itself on the *Cāndravṛtti* or that both borrowed from a third source: the items are the same and are quoted in the same order. Likewise, in the case of section [32], not all the examples of the *Mahābhāṣya* have been preserved and one observes that both texts have selected the same items (concerning *snehitvā*, cf. Introduction, section 2.2.3 (h));

(3) among the four examples quoted in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* which do not occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* (i.e. *kl̥p̥tavān*, *ura keṇa*, *ura peṇa* and *devā hasanti*), only one is quoted in the *Cāndravṛtti* (i.e. *kl̥p̥tavān*); in most cases, then, any hypothesis of borrowing from this text is excluded. In order to explain the examples *uraḥ keṇa* and *uraḥ peṇa*, one can invoke the use by the *Kāśikāvṛtti* of a version of the *Mahābhāṣya* where the four items *uraḥ keṇa*, *uraḥ keṇa*, *uraḥ peṇa* and *uraḥ peṇa* were quoted (cf. note 15). In order to explain the example *devā hasanti*, which does not seem to appear in any version of the *Mahābhāṣya*, one may wonder whether this is an innovation or a borrowing from a source other than the *Cāndravṛtti*.

3.3 Presence/absence of some sequences

The question is now to explain the presence or the absence of some sequences. My assumption is that the presence of a sequence can be explained by the problem(s) that it is supposed to solve (conversely, the absence of a sequence might indicate the absence of a problem to be solved).

¹⁸ It is only if *h* is included in *aś* that the rules A. 8.3.17 and A. 8.3.22 will apply. If so, one can obtain the form *devā hasanti*. In order to obtain the form *mahā hi saḥ*, *h* has to be included in *aṭ* (so that A. 8.3.9 and 8.3.3 will apply) and in *aś* (so that A. 8.3.17 and 8.3.22 will apply). Thus, the form *devā hasanti* does not really bring any new information, nor does it teach anything more than the form *mahā hi saḥ*.

Beginning of section [2]: the sentence *atha śabdānuśāsanam*, which is found only in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (and in all manuscripts, see Edition, p. 00), seems to be a direct borrowing from the *Mahābhāṣya*. According to Kaiyaṭa,¹⁹ the purpose of this sentence is to inform about the direct or ultimate aim of grammar. Nāgeśa²⁰ specifies that the use of the word *atha* is explained by its auspicious character. As it is not really meant to solve a major problem, this may explain the absence of this sentence in the *Cāndravṛtti*.

The absence of the sequence *keṣāṃ śabdānām? laukikānām vaidikānām ca*²¹ in the *Cāndravṛtti* can be explained by the fact that Candra's grammar does not deal with Vedic words (or that it possibly dealt with them separately, in a lost section²²). If there is no alternative, this precision loses indeed its *raison d'être*. One will observe that the sequence *katham annu°...lakṣaṇena* of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, relating to the manner of imparting the teaching of words, does not occur verbatim in the *Paspaśā*.

Section [3]: the sequence *jātinirdeśaś cāyam* of the *Cāndravṛtti* (which occurs also in [14] and, in a slightly different form, in [17]), which is missing in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, could be a reformulation of the vārttika *ākṛtyupadeśāt siddham* (particularly *Paspaśā*, vol. 1, p. 75) "This (i.e. the teaching of all the phonemes including high-pitched, low-pitched, modulated, nasalized, long, trimoric) is realized because of the teaching of the generic form."²³ It is to be noted that this remark does not occur in the corresponding section of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

Section [4]: the sentence sequence relating to the /a/ phoneme which occurs in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*²⁴ does not occur in the *Cāndravṛtti*, probably for the following reason: the question of the degree of openness of the /a/ phoneme seems to be a typical topic of Prātiśākhya and Śikṣā works, technical treatises of the Vedic literature; thus, once again, if

¹⁹ Vol. 1, p. 3.

²⁰ Vol. 1, p. 5.

²¹ Which is also a borrowing from the *Mahābhāṣya* (cf. *Paspaśā*, vol. 1, pp. 3 and 6).

²² On this point, see the first note of K.C. Chatterji, in his edition of the *Cāndravṛttikāraṇa* (p. 1).

²³ On the *ākṛtipakṣa* and the reasons for not accepting it, cf. Deshpande 1975: 17-31.

²⁴ The *Mahābhāṣya* also takes up the question of the opening of the /a/ phoneme, but the discussion is not worded in the same terms (cf. *Mahābhāṣya* on *a i u Ī*, vol. 1, p. 79 ff.).

Candra does not deal with Vedic words, why should he refer to treatises relating to these words? Another fact that shows Candra's lack of interest in the degree of openness of /a/ is that there is no *sūtra* in the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* corresponding to the last *sūtra* of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (i.e. A. 8.4.68: *a a*).

Section [11]: the verse quoted in [11] recalls four vārttikas on *ha ya va ra Ṭ* (vol. 1, p. 144). On the use of the terms *ācārāt/jñāpakāt*, cf. 3.1.

Section [17]: the sequence *aṭāṃ madhye... ṇatvaṃ yathā syād iti* in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* could be a slightly altered borrowing from the *vārttika* on vt. 6 ad *ha ya va ra Ṭ* (vol. 1, p. 133) or a borrowing from a third unknown source. This sequence deals with the teaching of the phonemes called *ayogavāha* (lit. "that which pulls without being harnessed", i.e. attested without being taught), namely *visarjanīya*, *jihvāmūliya*, *upadhmānīya*, *anusvāra*, *anunāsikya* and *yama*. The vt. 6 stipulates that these units have to be taught between the psū 1 and 5 so that the *ṇ* substitute of *n* is realized after *r* or *ṣ*, also when a vowel, a semi-vowel or *ḥ* are inserted between them (cf. A. 8.4.2 and note 1, p. 291 in the French translation of P.-S. Filliozat, 1975). Thus, this passage partly concerns the organization of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (teaching of the *ayogavāha* phonemes in the psū section) and, if one excepts the *visarjanīya*, refers to phonetic facts which occur mostly in Vedic language (*jihvāmūliya*, *upadhmānīya*), which may explain its absence from the *Cāndrāvṛtti*.

Section [20]: the sequence *saṅgyantā... yathā syād iti* of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* may be a borrowing from the *Mahābhāṣya*, vt. 3 on *a i u Ī* (vol. 1, p. 87). Here again, the mentioned facts occur mainly in Vedic.

Section [21]: the sequence *lakāre... laṅaratvam api bhavati* of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* is linked with the *guṇa* degree of /l/ (*laṅaratvam*), a very unusual phoneme, which occurs only in some forms of the verb *KṛP*. The little importance of this fact may easily explain its absence in the *Cāndrāvṛtti*.

Section [34]: the end of this sequence, which does not occur in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, refers to ancient grammars (*pūrvavyākaraṇeṣu*) especially to the *Phīṣūtra* of Śāntanava. The *Phīṣūtra*, which is probably post-Pāṇinian, gives rules for the accentuation of nominal bases according to their phonologic shape and their meaning. This reference to the work of Śāntanava indicates that Candra resorted to this source, though dedicated to accentuation, a language feature that is found mainly in Vedic. This seems to confirm

the hypothesis according to which Candra has really dealt with Vedic facts, but in a separate (and lost) section.

If the *Kāśikāvṛtti* does not mention this sequence, it is probably because it does not take the *Phīṣūtra* into account and, therefore, the equivalence between *aṢ* and *aC* is not relevant for it.

One may notice, then, that there are two main reasons to explain the presence of several sequences in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* and their absence in the *Cāndravṛtti*: 1) these sequences, like section [20], refer to linguistic facts belonging to Vedic; 2) these sequences, like section [17], refer to facts peculiar to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

3.4 Conclusive remarks

One notes that, for the concerned section, the content of the *Cāndravṛtti* occurs in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* in its quasi entirety: the only sequence of the *Cāndravṛtti* that does not appear in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* is the end of the final sequence, which refers to the *Pratyāhārasūtras* of ancient grammars and quotes rules of the *Phīṣūtra*. Here too, then, there is a strong similarity between the two texts. Could this constitute a solid argument to prove the influence of the *Cāndravṛtti* on the *Kāśikāvṛtti*? I am not completely convinced of that. The main reason is that the similarity of the two texts for the concerned section does not invalidate the hypothesis according to which both texts borrowed from a third source. Where the *Kāśikāvṛtti* deviates from the *Mahābhāṣya* and seems to draw closer to the *Cāndravṛtti* —as, for instance, in the case of the examples of sections [7] and [32]— nothing forbids to think that it does not borrow from the *Cāndravṛtti*, but from another source on which the *Cāndravṛtti* is also based. Moreover, if the *Kāśikāvṛtti* has mainly drawn its inspiration from the *Cāndravṛtti*, from what source does it draw the example *devā hasanti* in section [33]?

The observations presented in this paper would certainly be more consistent if the *Jainendravṛtyākaraṇa* were provided with a *Pratyāhārasūtra* section; unfortunately, this is not the case for the version which has come down to us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- CANDRAGOMIN, *Candra-vṛtti, der original Kommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra. Herausgegeben von Bruno Liebich*, 1918. Abhandlungen fuer die Kunde des Morgenlandes 14, Kraus Reprint Ltd., Nendeln, Leipzig 1966.
- *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa of Candragomin*. Edited by K.C. Chatterji, 2 vols., Deccan College, Poona 1953.
- KAIYAṬA, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣyam with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa's Uddyota*. With notes by A.G. Shastri, edited by Dr. B. Shastri, 6 vols., Prati-bha Prakashan, Delhi.
- JAYĀDITYA AND VĀMANA, *Kāśīkāvṛtti of*, the edition used in this paper is the critical edition presented in this book.
- NĀGEŚA, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa's Uddyota*. With notes by A.G. Shastri, edited by Dr. B. Shastri, 6 vols., Prati-bha Prakashan, Delhi.
- PĀNINI, *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Roman transliteration and English translation by S.M. Katre, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1989.
- PATAÑJALI, *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Edited by Franz Kielhorn, 1880. Third edition revised and furnished with additional readings, references and select critical notes by K.V. Abhyankar, vol. 1, The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1962.
- *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣyam with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Nāgojibhaṭṭa's Uddyota*. With notes by A.G. Shastri, edited by Dr. B. Shastri, 6 vols., Prati-bha Prakashan, Delhi.

Studies

- ABHYANKAR, Koshinath Vasudev (1961), *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, The Oriental Institute, Baroda.
- BALBIR, Nalini (2000), "Candragomin ou Candra", in *Corpus représentatif des grammaires et des traditions linguistiques* (tome 2), Hors-Série H.E.L., Société d'Histoire et d'Epistémologie des Sciences du Langage, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, Paris, pp. 270-72.
- BRONKHORST, Johannes (2002), "The Cāndra-vyākaraṇa: Some Questions", in Deshpande, M.M., Hook, P.E.

- (Eds.), *Indian Linguistic Studies. Festschrift in Honor of George Cardona*, Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, pp. 182-201.
- CARDONA, Georges (1976), *Pāṇini. A survey of research*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- DASH, Prafulla Chandra (1980), "Candra and the 'asaṃjñāka vyākaraṇa'", Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit – Studies 5, Poona, pp. 187-97.
- (1986), *A Comparative Study of the Pāṇinian and Cāndra Systems of Grammar (Kṛdanta portion)*, Ramanand Vidya Bhavan, New Delhi.
- DESHPANDE, Madhav M. (1975), *Critical Studies in Indian Grammarians I. The Theory of Homogeneity [Sāvarnya]*, Michigan Series in South and Southeast Asian Languages and Linguistics, Ann Arbor.
- DEVASTHALI, G.V. (1967), *The Phiṣṣūtras of Śāntanava*, University of Poona, Poona.
- FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain (1975), *Le Mahābhāṣya de Patañjali avec le Pradīpa de Kaiyaṭa et l'Uddyota de Nāgeśa – Adhyāya 1, Pāda 1, Āhnika 1-4*. Traduction par P.-S. Filliozat, Institut Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry.
- JOSHI, Shiva Dattatreya, ROODBERGEN, J.A.F. (1991-1992), "Evidence in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* for an Authentic Pāṇinian Tradition Independent of Patañjali", *Bulletin of the Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute*, 51-52, pp. 131-35.
- OBERLIES, Thomas (1996), "Das zeitliche und ideengeschichtliche Verhältnis der *Cāndra-Vṛtti* zu anderen V(ai)yākaraṇas (Studien zum Cāndravākaraṇa III)", *Festschrift Paul Thieme, Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, 20, pp. 265-317.
- (2006), "Zum Sūtrapāṭha des Cāndravākaraṇa (Studien zum Cāndravākaraṇa IV)", in von Hüsken, U., Kieffer-Pülz, P., Peters, A. (Eds.), *Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, Indica et Tibetica Verlag, Marburg, pp. 379-95.
- RENOU, Louis (1942), *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit* (3 parts), E. Champion, Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études, Paris.
- SCHARFE, Harmut (1977), *Grammatical Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Collection A History of Indian Literature, ed. by J. Gonda, vol. V, fasc. 2, Wiesbaden.
- VEDALANKAR, Raghuvir (1977), *Kāśikā kā samālocanātmak adhyayan [A Critical Study of the Kāśikā]*, Nag Publishers, Delhi.

VISALAKSHY, P. (1981), "The influence of Cāndra and Kātantra Grammars on *Kāśikāvṛtti*", Vishveshwaranand Indological Journal 19, pp. 45-49.