

Bhartrhari:

Language, Thought and Reality

(Proceedings of the International Seminar
Delhi, December 12-14, 2003)

Edited by

MITHILESH CHATURVEDI

Foreword by

G.C. PANDE

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS PUBLISHERS
PRIVATE LIMITED • DELHI

First Edition : Delhi, 2009

© Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited

ISBN: 978-81-208-3399-9

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS

41 U.A. Bungalow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi 110 007
8 Mahalaxmi Chamber, 22 Bhulabhai Desai Road, Mumbai 400 026
203 Royapettah High Road, Mylapore, Chennai 600 004
236, 9th Main III Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore 560 011
Sanas Plaza, 1302 Baji Rao Road, Pune 411 002
8 Camac Street, Kolkata 700 017
Ashok Rajpath, Patna 800 004
Chowk, Varanasi 221 001

PRINTED IN INDIA

By Jainendra Prakash Jain at Shri Jainendra Press,
A-45 Naraina, Phase-I, New Delhi 110 028
and Published by Narendra Prakash Jain for
Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited,
Bungalow Road, Delhi 110 007

Some Remarks on the Term 'vākyabheda' in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā*

NORIYUKI KUDO

Sanskrit grammarians, especially the Pāṇinīyas, have long discussed how the rules prescribed in the Aṣṭādhyāyī are to be interpreted and managed. This means that there has been a long history of disagreement concerning the interpretation of these grammatical rules. Commentators such as Kātyāyana, Patañjali and so on have used a grammatical technique called 'yogavibhāga: rule-split' in order to explain, or to efficiently apply, some of rules that they had on their hands.¹ According to Joshi-Roodbergen, "The term *yogavibhāga* is restricted to the case where a special rule is made effective for general purposes by taking away the special condition and by putting the remaining general condition as a separate rule."² In the

* This paper is a revised English version of Kudo 1997.

¹ According to Padhy 2001: xix-xxi, a number of the cases where *yogavibhāga* is discussed in several commentaries is as follows: By Kātyāyana = 31 cases (P.1.1.17-18; 1.2.48; 1.4.9; 1.4.17; 1.4.58-59; 2.1.11-12; 2.3.62; 2.4.70; 2.4.83; 3.1.46; 3.1.67; 3.1.85; 3.2.4; 3.3.14; 3.3.15; 3.4.2; 4.3.1; 4.3.116; 5.3.5; 6.1.1; 6.1.32-33; 6.1.89; 6.1.102; 6.3.10; 7.2.62; 7.3.116; 7.3.118-119; 8.2.24; 8.3.58; 8.3.59; 8.4.3); by Patañjali, 57 cases; in the Kāśīkāvṛtti 36 cases (4 from the Vārttika; 12 from the MBh; in the Siddhāntakaumudī, 27 (4 from Vārttika; 6 from the MBh; 10 from the Kāśīkā). As to the number of rules, F. Kielhorn counts differently: by Kātyāyana, 25 cases and by Patañjali, 70 cases ("Notes on the Mahābhāṣya 7: Some devices of Indian grammarians," in: *The Indian Antiquary* 16, August 1887: 247).

² Joshi-Roodbergen 1969: 95, fn. 477a. They also say: "Generally, in the case of *yogavibhāgas*, the (a) rule is intended for a wider application, so that it will cover more examples. But it has

commentaries on the Aṣṭādhyāyī – the Mahābhāṣya, the Kāśikāvṛtti and the Siddhāntakaumudī, etc. – we have instances where this *yogavibhāga* is proposed by someone only to have its proposal rejected by some other commentator(s).

The word '*vākyabheda*: splitting of the sentence' is used by grammarians in the course of interpreting of rules, and it seems to approximate *yogavibhāga* in its literal sense. Needless to say, '*vākyabheda*' is a well-known technical term in the textual tradition of the Mīmāṃsakas.³ According to them, it expresses the principle that each injunction should deal with only one thing. If a single sentence has more than two things to be realized, it would lead to a fault. That faulty construction is called '*vākyabheda*' and such 'splitting of the sentence' must be avoided.⁴

This paper attempts to investigate the usage of *vākyabheda* in the Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā (MBhD) of Bharṭṛhari. While Patañjali did not use this word in his MBh, Bharṭṛhari introduces this word into the grammatical text, and as far as I know he is the first to do so. Here, I would like to show the difference, if any, between *yogavibhāga* and *vākyabheda* especially in the first textual material, the MBhD. In the following, due to the limit of space, I shall confine myself to dealing with the meaning of the word *vākyabheda*; therefore other technical problems, such as the nature of the rule, its operation, scope and so on, will not be treated here. My question is whether or not the *vākyabheda* is to be regarded as a fault which causes double meanings to be derived from one sentence; or is it simply another interpretive device which is to be negatively accepted as in the Mīmāṃsā tradition?

to be kept in mind that this (a) rule is not meant to make other rules redundant. *Yogavibhāga* is meant for *iṣṭasiddhi* 'the establishing of desired forms', not for *aniṣṭasiddha* 'the establishing of undesired cases'." Joshi-Roodbergen 1993: 87.

³ Jaiminiya Sūtra 1.2.25: *vidhau ca vākyabhedah syāt*. 2.1.46: *arthahatvād ekam vākyaṃ sākāṅkṣam ced vibhāge syāt*. 47: *sameṣu vākyabhedah*.

⁴ According to Kuroda [1993: 252], they attempt to avoid this *vākyabheda* as far as possible when they interpret the Vedic injunctions; on the other hand, in case of interpreting the sūtras, sometimes it is accepted as a final decision though passively. See also Edgerton 1929 (reprinted 1986): 14: "It means this: except in an originative injunction (*utpatti-vidhi*), not more than one thing may be enjoined at one time. That is, each section or sentence of the ritual code should deal with only one thing. Otherwise confusion would ensue. A single sentence should be devoted to laying down a single thing. Only in an originative injunction, laying down the general nature of a rite, is it felt that more than one subsidiary matter may be enjoined also, along with the main injunction, because the subsidiaries are really included in the main injunction, and so the unity of the subject-matter does not suffer thereby; in such a case we have a 'particularized injunction,' as we saw. But otherwise, to enjoin two things at once involves *vākyabheda*; the sentence is split. And this must be avoided."

1. Instances found in the MBhD

Bhartṛhari used the word *vākyabheda* seven times in his MBhD of which we have at present an incomplete text, that is, its available portion covers only upto P.1.1.55.

§1.1 FIRST EXAMPLE

In this case Bhartṛhari actually used the word *yogabheda*, which is quite an unusual word in the MBhD,³ while Kaiyaṭa, who wrote his commentary on the MBh. on the basis of the MBhD, reworded this to read as *vākyabheda*; we can surmise from this that their significance is the same (see below).

P.1.1.3: *iKo guṇavṛddhī*.

Usage: with P.7.3.84: *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*.

P.1.1.3 is a *paribhāṣā* rule and prescribes a substitution of *guṇa* for the vowel of a stem which is followed by a particular suffix such as *sārvadhātuka* and *ārdhadhātuka* suffixes. However, its substituendum is not specified here; thus the rule is operative with other rules.

MBhD on MBh ad P.1.1.3 [Fasc. I, 15.15-19]: *tatrāpekṣāyāṃ satyāṃ kimartham yogabhedenaṅpekṣā kriyate, na punar ekam evābhisambaddham vākyam? tatraivam apekṣiṣyāmahe — guṇavṛddhī iti ye guṇavṛddhī, te iKo bhavata ity etad anena bhāṣyeṇa kathayati — idaṃ tatrāpekṣyate / ... yathaiiva tarhi idaṃ tatrāpekṣyate, evam ihāpi tadape[kṣi]ṣyāmaha iti /*

Pradīpa on do. [I, 200 left]: *anyatarārtham punar iti vadatāvaśyam evaṃ sambandhaḥ kartavyo "yatra guṇavṛddhiśabdoccāraṇena guṇavṛddhī vidhīyete tatreKa iti upatiṣṭhate" iti / anyathā yātā vātetyādiṣu vidhyarthatve sambhavati katham anyatarārtham punar vacanaṃ syād ity ucyate? avaśyakartavyāyāṃ cāpekṣāyāṃ ekavākyatayai vāpekṣā 'stu / tenaikarūpa evārtho, na tu vākyabhedena svātantryaṃ pāratantryaṃ ca /*

Tr.: Now, when (mutual) expectation has to be there, why should expectation be made on the basis of independent rules? [emphasis given by NK. Those that follow are the same.] Why should not (they be regarded) as one integrated sentence? We can then (supply what is) needed thus: *Guṇa* and *Vṛddhi*, which are taught by (uttering the words) *guṇaḥ, vṛddhiḥ*, they (take the place) of *iḥ*. This is what he says in the Bhāṣya: "This will be made a necessary part of it... Well then

³ The word *yogabheda* appears once in the VP III.14.86 [= Iyer 85]: *taddhito yogabhedena vākyam vā syād vibhāṣitam | parimānādihike tatra prathamā śiṣyate punaḥ || Helārāja Comm. (p. 192): atrāpy adhyāropeṇābhedasambandhe mānameyayogo niyamena na pralīyeta sāmīpyāder api sambhavād iti 'tad asya parimānam' (P.5.1.57) iti yogavibhāgena taddhitaḥ syāt | vākyam vā mahāvibhāṣayā, prashtaḥ parimānam eṣāṃ vr̥hīṇām iti |* Apparently, this word is regarded as *yogavibhāga*.

just as this is made a necessary part of it, that also will be made a necessary part of it [tr. by G. B. Palsule, p. 39].⁶

What is discussed here is that if P.7.3.84 should be read with P.1.1.3 to have a correct derivation, in other words, if both P.1.1.3 and P.7.3.84 are each incomplete in itself, why are these two rules prescribed separately in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, one in chapter one and the other in chapter seven? The word *yogabheda* simply means 'separate/different rule' (in other words, P.1.1.3 and P.7.3.84 are different rules). Thus, in this case, the word *yogabheda* has nothing to do with the matter of 'rule-splitting'; hence, it is not equivalent to *yogavibhāga*.

§1.2 SECOND EXAMPLE

In the commentary on P.1.1.34.

P.1.1.34: *pūrvaparāvaradakṣiṇottarāparādharāṇi vyavasthāyām asaṃjñāyām.*

P.1.1.35: *svam ajñātidhanākhyāyām.*

P.1.1.36: *antaram bahiryogopasamvyānayoḥ.*

These three rules tell us that the words *pūrvā*, etc. are called *sarvanāman* (pronominal) when they denote a particular sense.⁷ A problem arises: since those words are enumerated in the Gaṇapāṭha 241.15-17 (exactly in the same sentences), what is the purpose of giving these rules twice?

⁶ Translator's Notes, p. 143: "*īatrāpekṣāyām satyām* ... etc. makes a point which is not made expressly in the Mbh. Bhar. says that if neither P.1.1.3 nor P.7.3.84 etc. is complete in itself and requires (*apekṣā*) the other to complete it, what is the use of regarding them as two independent rules (*vākyabhedena*)?"

⁷ As to the reading of these rules, there is a diversity of interpretations among modern scholars concerning the problem whether or not P.1.1.32 continues to the following rules and whether or not the word *na* in P.1.1.29 should be read with them. Here, I will quote some of their readings:

Kiparsky 1979: 84 "These rules [= P.1.1.34-36, noted by NK] have been analyzed in an exemplary way by Bloomfield (1927). His interpretation, which I have followed in the above translation, differs in two respects from the traditional one. First, he takes the *anuvṛtti* of *vibhāṣā jasi* (32) no further than the next rule, whereas the tradition continues it all the way to 36. Bloomfield correctly notes that *ca* in 33 signals the *niṛtti* (discontinuation) of *vibhāṣā jasi*." He also says [p. 86]: "Note that we do not read *na* from 29 into this rule [= 32, noted by NK], as it stopped by *ca* in 31." As to his reading, Joshi-Roodbergen 1991: 41 rejects: "But there is no sufficient evidence to say that *ca* discontinues *na*." See also Joshi-Bhate 1984: 112-29.

Katre 1987: 15 on P.1.1.32: "[The t.t.] *sarvanāman* 27] optionally (*vibhāṣā*) denotes [the class words whose first member is *sarva-* 27, (occurring at the end of 1.1.27) a *dvandva* compound 31] before (the nominative plural *sUP* ending) *jas*." On P.1.1.36: "[The t.t.] *sarvanāman* 27 optionally denotes 32] the words *pūrvā* 'front, eastern,' [before affix *jas* 32] provided they are employed in the sense of relative situation (*vyavasthā*) and not used as proper names (*asaṃjñāyām*)."

MBh ad P.1.1.34 [I, 93, 6]: *idaṃ tarhi prapojānaṃ Jasi vibhāṣāṃ vākṣyāmīti /*

MBhD on MBh ad P.1.1.34 [Fasc. III, 29.48]: *tatra pūrvādīnāṃ nityā saṃjñā tribhiḥ sūtraiḥ punar vidhiyate / vākyabhedena ca svaritacihnāsañjanāt pratisūtram Jasi vibhāṣānumīyate / na cedam ekavākyabhāve vibhāṣāyāḥ sambhavati / pratipadoccāraṇaṃ vākyabhedena vibhāṣāyāḥ saṃnidhānārtham / ākāṅkṣāsambhave 'sati tu yuktaṃ ekavākyatvam /*

Pradīpa on do. [I, 343 left]: *vākyabhedena ca vibhāṣā Jasi vidhiyate/ yathā 'mi pūrvāḥ [P.6.1.107]' 'saṃprasāraṇāc ca [P.6.1.108]' ity atra vākyabhedena 'vā chandasi [P.6.1.106]' iti saṃbandhāc chandasi vikalpaḥ kriyate iti bhāvaḥ /*

Tr.: With reference to this the [sic.] (*sarvanāma*) *saṃjñā* is permanently given to *pūrvā* etc. by the three rules. And owing to the attachment of *svarita* mark a separate sentence (is understood) by means of (which) optional (*sarvanāmasaṃjñā*) before *jas* is understood in every rule. This (statement about) option is not possible if (the rule) is one sentence. The reading of each word is meant for connecting (the statement) with option through a separate sentence. In the absence of expectancy, however, it is proper (to understand the rule as) one sentence (tr. by V.B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhate, pp. 79-80).⁸

Based on Patañjali's answer, Bhartṛhari states that it is for the sake of the continuation (*anuvṛtti*) of P.1.1.32 (*vibhāṣā Jasi*) in P.1.1.34-36: the optional assignment of the term *sarvanāman* to *pūrvā*, etc. If this *vākyabheda* is not allowed in interpreting the rule, since there is no word 'ca' in P.1.1.33 we cannot read P.1.1.32 as being optionally assigned to P.1.1.34-36. In order to read 32 continuously with 34-36, we need some sort of extra treatment; that is, since these three rules are mentioned in the Gaṇapāṭha, we would

Sharma 1990: 32-34: on P.1.1.32: "*dvandve (31) samūse jasi vibhāṣā sarvādīni sarvanāmasaṃjñāni (27) na (29) bhavanti*"; on P.1.1.36: "*purvādīni vibhāṣā jasi (32) sarvanāmasaṃjñāni (27) bhavanti vyavasthāyām asaṃjñāyām.*"

Joshi-Roodbergen 1991: 41 on P.1.1.32: "(*sarva* 'all', etc. are) preferably (*na vibhāṣā*) (called *sarvanāman* 'pronoun') before (the pl. nom. ending) *jas* (in a *dvandva* cp.). 1. The rules P.1.1.27, P.1.1.29 (*na*) and P.1.1.31 are continued"; on P.1.1.34: "1. The items *sarvādīni* (P.1.1.27), *na* (P.1.1.29), *dvandve* (P.1.1.31) and *vibhāṣā jasi* (P.1.1.32) are discontinued. In fact, whatever is reinforced by *ca* in P.1.1.31 is discontinued."

⁸ Translators' Notes, pp. 212-13: "*vākyabhedena ca* etc. ... However, if the repetition in these three rules [= P.1.1.34-36. noted by NK] is meant to serve some other purpose as pointed above, how can they achieve this purpose? The author's solution to this problem is the device of *vākyabheda*. According to this device, a rule is supposed to contain two *vākyas* or statements. Each of the rule *pūrvaparā* ... etc. accordingly consists of two statements. One statement simply teaches the *sarvanāmasaṃjñā* for *pūrvā* etc. whereas the other teaches optional *sarvanāmasaṃjñā* to *pūrvā* etc. before the nominative plural (suffix *jas*). This *vākyabheda* or understanding two sentences from a rule is obtained by imagining that all the three rules are marked with a *svarita* ...

"In this way the repetition serves a double purpose: it repeats the *sarvanāmasaṃjñā* of *pūrvā* etc. which results in cancelling the non-application of *tasī* etc. and it also helps *vākyabheda* leading to another statement by connecting itself with the words *jasi vibhāṣā*."

expect 34-36 to have an additional meaning. To supply this additional meaning, Bhartṛhari introduces *svarita*-markings to these rules. If P.1.1.34-36 are marked with *svarita*, according to P.1.3.11 we can read these rules as having additional function, namely, the optional assignment of the term *sarvanāma* to *pūruva* etc. ending in nom. pl. by the force of *anuvṛtti*. Therefore, the *vākyabheda* means in this case 'by reading P.1.1.34-36 in two ways.' One sentence prescribes "an assignment of the term *sarvanāmasamjñā* to the words *pūruva*, etc." and the other is that "when they end in nom. pl. they are optionally assigned *sarvanāmasamjñā*."

§1.3. THIRD EXAMPLE

In the commentary on P.1.1.42: *Śi sarvanāmasthanam*; P.1.1.43: *sUḌ anapūṃsakasya*. P.1.1.42 is a *samjñā* rule and prescribes what is called *sarvanāmasthāna* (strong case ending). By P.1.1.42 endings indicated by sigla /*Śi*/ [= n. pl. Nom., Acc. by P.7.1.20: *Jaś-Śasoḥ Śiḥ*] are called *sarvanāmasthāna*; by 43 all nominal endings indicated by sigla /*sUḌ*/ [= sg. Nom., Acc.: du. Nom., Acc.: pl. Nom.] are called *sarvanāmasthāna* with the exception of those of a neuter.⁹

MBhD on MBh ad P.1.1.42-43 [Fasc. VII, 22.5-9] *apara evaṃ varṇayanti, yadi yathā 'Śi sarvanāmasthānam' iti svatantram lakṣaṇam samjñāyām evaṃ vākyabhedenā 'sUḌ sarvanāmasthānam' tato 'napūṃsakasyeti pratiśedhavākye ayaṃ doṣaḥ /*

Uddyota [I, 369 left]: *Śi sarvanā° / bhāṣye 'asamarthasamāsāś ce' ti dūṣaṇāntaram / tatrāsāmārthyam – asaṃbandhāt / ceta vākyabhedasyāpi saṃgrahaḥ /*

Tr.: Others explain thus: If *suḍ sarvanāmasthānam* (is read as) an independent sentence (laying down the name *sarvanāmasthāna* separately) just as *śi sarvanāmasthānam* is an independent rule teaching the name *sarvanāmasthāna*, then the defect (results) in the prohibitive rule *anapūṃsakasya* [tr. by V. B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhatte, p. 80].¹⁰

Although this *vākyabheda* appears in the opinion of other grammarians, the word *vākyabheda* means 'sentence divided into two' as stated in the text: *vākyabhedenā 'sUḌ sarvanāmasthānam' tato 'napūṃsakasye' ti*. This sentence-splitting is rejected, of course.

In this case, by means of the *vākyabheda* we have two operations derived from this single rule P.1.1.43: (1) to assign the designation

⁹ As to the reading '*anapūṃsakasya*', the commentators have discussed how to interpret a negative compound '*anapūṃsaka*'.

¹⁰ Translators' Notes, p. 196: "*apara evaṃ ...* etc. The author cites the view of other grammarians in this connection [sic]. According to them although the rule *śi sarvanāmasthānam* and *suḍ anapūṃsakasya* are put together in the Vār. and they together form one topic, they should be treated separately as they are two separate sentences. In fact they are two independent rules. Therefore, the negation *anapūṃsakasya* is connected with the latter rule alone."

sarvanāmasthāna to *sUT* [general]; (2) to cancel its application to a neuter stem [special]. This is a case of dividing the sentences into two and its usage is quite similar to *yogavibhāga*.¹¹

§1.4. FOURTH EXAMPLE.

In the commentary on P.1.1.44: *naveti vibhāṣā*, discussing P.1.2.3-4.

P.1.2.3: *vibhāṣorṇoḥ*; P.1.2.4: *sārvadhātukam a-PIT*.

The former prescribes that [a suffix beginning with *iṬ*^{1.2.2}] is optionally regarded as marked with *Ñ*^{1.2.1}] when it is added to the verbal base *ūrṇu* "to cover." The latter prescribes that a *sārvadhātuka* suffix which is not marked with *P* [is regarded as marked with *Ñ*^{1.2.1}].

MBh ad P.1.1.44 [I, 106, 12-14]: *yady api nānaivam api samdehaḥ / katham / praurṇuvīti / sārvadhātukam aPIT* (P.1.2.4) *iti vā nitye prāpte 'nyatra vāprāpta ubhayatra veti / aprāpte /*

MBhD on MBh ad P.1.1.44 [Fasc. VII, 38.8-11]: *guṇapraṭiṣedho 'tra kāryam / sa tu kiṃ nityaḥ praṭiṣedha āhosvit vibhāṣeti / etad āha — 'ekam ced' iti / yady apy nānā evam api samdehaḥ / katham punar 'vibhāṣorṇoḥ' (P.1.2.3) ity etat 'sārvadhātukam aPIT' (P.1.2.4.) ity atra vartate? iṬas cāPITtvāt vākyabhedenā pravṛttir ity anumīyate.*

Pradīpa [I, 383 left]: *ūrṇor vibhāṣeti / 'vibhāṣorṇoḥ' iti sūtram yady 'asamyogāl iṬ KID' (P.1.2.5) ity atrānuvartate, ūrṇus cāsamyogānta evety asamyogagrahanād vākyabhedenorṇoḥ parasyeDāder iṬo nityam KIItvam prāptam vikalpyate, tataḥ prāptavibhāṣā / iḌupaṭivanārtham tu sthānāntare sūtram pathitam / atha tatra sūtram nānuvartate, paraviṭpratiṣedhas ca, tataḥ — aprāptavibhāṣā / atha pūrva-ṅviṭpratiṣedhaḥ, tadā — ubhayatreṭi samśayaḥ /*

Uddyota [ibid.]: *vākyabhedenety asya vikalpyata ity anenānvayah / idam sarvam ÑITtvaKITtvayor aikyābhimānena /*

Pradīpa on do. [I, 383 right]: *sārvadhātukam aPID ity atra yadi vibhāṣorṇor ity etad vākyabhedenā sambadhyate, tataḥ — prāptavibhāṣā / athāsambandhaḥ pūrvaṅviṭpratiṣedhaḥ, tataḥ — ubhyatravibhāṣā / paraviṭpratiṣedhe tu — aprāpte /*

Uddyota on do: *vākyabhedeneti / pṛthakpāthasāmarthyād iti bhāvah /*

Tr.: Here rejection of *guṇa* is the grammatical operation. Is this rejection obligatory? Or optional? In this connection (Patañjali) says: "If (the *kitva* and the *ñitva* are) one and the same" etc. "There is a doubt even when (the *kitva* and the *ñitva*) are different." How? The (rule) *vibhāṣorṇoḥ* is continued in the rule

¹¹ In the translation, the editors translate the word *vākyabheda* as 'independent rule.' However, since P.1.1.43 is divided into two — '*sUT* (*sarvanāmasthānam*)' and '*anapūṃsakasya*' —, this word should be translated as 'rule-splitting.'

sārvadhātukam apit. Since *iṭ* is not *pit*, it is inferred that the rule (*vibhāṣorṇoḥ*) applies as a separate statement [ibid., p. 105].¹²

If P.1.2.3 and 4 are joined together in one rule, it would lead to a wrong restriction of the operation in P.1.2.4. That is, P.1.2.4 can be applied to only one example, i.e., *ūrṇu*. That is why Bhartṛhari says “*iṭaś cāPITtvāt*”. His statement is intended to express the difference of scope between P.1.2.3 and 4. In this case, the word *vākyabheda* means ‘separate/different rule’ as stated by Nāgeśa: *prthakpāṭhasāmarthyād iti bhāvah*.

§1.5. FIFTH EXAMPLE

Under P.1.1.44; discussion of P.3.1.48 and 66.

P.3.1.48: *Ni-śri-dru-sru-bhyaḥ kartari CaṆ*.

P.3.1.61: [*dhātoḥ*^{5.1.22} *IUN*⁴⁵ *Cleḥ*⁴⁴ *kartari*⁴⁸ *CiN* *te*⁶⁰] *dīpa-jana-budha-pūri-tāyi-pyāyi-bhyo* ‘nyatarasyām. This rule prescribes that Aorist marker *CiN* is introduced optionally after verbal roots *dīp-* ... only when *ta* [*IUN* substitute] denotes an agent.

P.3.1.66: *CiN bhāvakarmanōḥ*: This rule says that *CiN* is introduced after verbal roots when *ta* [*IUN* substitute] denotes either *bhāva* or *karman*.

MBh ad do. [ibid., 107, 8-9]: *katham ca prāpte katham vāprāpte katham vobhyatra / bhāvakarmanōḥ* [P.3.1.66] *iti vā nitye prāpte* ‘nyatra vāprāpta ubhayatra veti / aprāpte / kartarīti hi vartate / evam apī samdeho nyāyī vā kartari, karmakartari veti. nāsti samdehaḥ /

MBhD on do. [Fasc. VII, 40.19-20]: *yadi kartarīty etad apī svaryate, tatra kartṛparigrhītā dīpādāyo vākyabhedena kriyāsabdam labhante /*

Pradīpa on do. [I, 385 left]: *bhāvakarmanor iti / ‘CiN bhāvakarmanor’ ity atra sūtre yadi dīpajanety etad sūtram anuvartya vākyabhedena sambandhaḥ kriyate prthagpāṭhasāmarthyāt. tadā – prāptavibhāṣā / atha nānuvartate paraviṣṭāḥ ca, tadā – aprāptavibhāṣā / pūrvaviṣṭāḥ tūbhayatra – iti samśayaḥ /*

Tr.: If (the word) *kartari* is also marked with *svartia*, then *dīp* etc. being connected with *kartṛ*, there is a separate sentence and, therefore, (a separate) verb [ibid., p. 109].¹³

¹² Translators’ Notes, pp. 234-35: “The author of the *Dīp.* explains Pat.’s argument as follows: The rule *vibhāṣorṇoḥ* is continued in P.1.1.4 [sic.; read P.1.2.4]: *sārvadhātukam apit* which thus yields two statements: (1) an *apit* *sārvadhātuka* suffix added to a root is regarded as *nit* and (2) *iḍādi* *sārvadhātuka* suffix following *ūrṇu* is optionally regarded as *nit*. P.1.2.3 thus obviously becomes a *prāptavibhāṣā*. However, if it is not continued in P.1.2.4, then both the rules, namely P.1.2.3 and 1.2.4, having independent scopes, conflict with each other in derivations like *praurṇuvīti*. If *paraviṣṭāḥ* is accepted, the application of P.1.2.3 being restricted to suffixes other than *sārvadhātuka apit* suffixes, it is an *aprāptavibhāṣā*. Pat. accepts the latter view.”

¹³ Translators’ Notes, pp. 239-40: “... After the *anuvṛtti* of the word *dīpa* ... in the rule *bhāvakarmanōḥ*, however, we obtain two separate statements rather than one single statement from the rule as follows: (1) *CiN* is invariably substituted in the place of *Cā* added to a root when

In this case, when P.3.1.61 is read with the word *kartari* continued from P.3.1.48, a condition for an optional application of P.3.1.61 is that "when *-ta* [3rd sg. A] denoting an agent is added to the verbal bases" If this *anuvṛtti* is rejected and a verbal ending *-ta* is regarded to express 'bhāva', then P.3.1.66 is introduced here; *CiN* should be obligatorily added to. But here a conflict between *CiN*as *kartari* (61) and *CiN* as *bhāvakarmanoh* (66) occurs. Therefore, rules 61 and 66 should be treated as separate rules. This is clearly stated by Kaiyata: *prthagpāthasāmarthyāt* (on the strength of different formulas).

§1.6. SIXTH EXAMPLE.

In the commentary on P.1.1.48: *eCa iGhrasvādeṣe*.

This rule is a *paribhāṣā* rule and prescribes a short replacement [*iK* = *i, u, ṛ, ḷ*] for vowels *eC* [= *e, o, ai, au*].

MBh ad P.1.1.48 [I, 117, 12]: *viṣayārtham etat syāt /*

MBhD on MBh ad P.1.1.48 [Fasc. VIII, 17, 6-12]: *hrasvādeṣe = hrasvādeṣavidhau, idam upatiṣṭhate 'eCo iG bhavati' iti / itarathā hi hrasvādeṣa ity asyāvācāna ihāpi prāpnoti — deḅvadatteti / tasmāt hrasvāsāsanaviṣaye 'hrasvo bhavati' iti vākyabhedenopatiṣṭhate, prātipadikasya hrasvo bhavati, eCas tu iG bhavatiṭy eCo 'nyatra hrasvo bhavati /*

Pradīpa on do. [I, 406 right]: *viṣayārtham iti / yatra hrasvo vidhīyate tatraivāsyopasthānaṃ yathā syāt, deḅvadatteti plutādividhāv upasthānaṃ mā bhūt / asmimś copasthite vākyabedenaiCa iKo vidhīyamānā antaratamā dīrghā eva prāpnuvanti / hrasvasya bādhitatvād dīrghēṣu kṛteṣu punar hrasvā 'prasaṅgaḥ /*

Uddyota on do.: *ekavākyabhāvenaiCa iti / ekavākyabhāvo nāma 'eCa iK' ity asya hrasve śeṣabhāvah / na tu parasparaniyogā bhāvah / anvayas tu vākyabhedenaiyeti /*

Tr.: This (rule) may be for (mentioning) the domain: *i, u, ṛ, ḷ* become substitutes of *e, o, ai, au* where a short (substitute) is laid down.

This (expression) viz. '*i, u, ṛ, ḷ* take the place of *e, o, ai, au*' presents itself in the *hrasvādeṣa*, i.e. in the rule which teaches a short substitute. For, otherwise, (i.e.) if *hrasvādeṣe* is not read (in the rule), (an *iK*) becomes due even here in *Deḅvadatteti*. Therefore, in a rule which teaches a short substitute (saying:) 'a short substitute takes place', this (i.e. *eca iK*) presents itself as an independent sentence (thus resulting in the meaning:) (1) There is a short substitute for (the final of) a nominal stem, (and) (2) for *ec* (i.e., *e, o, ai, au*), however, *ik* (i.e., *i, u, ṛ, ḷ*) is the

ta conveying *bhāva* or *karman* follows, and (2) *CiN* is optionally substituted in the place of *Ci* added to *dīpa, jan ...* etc. when *ta* conveying *bhāva* or *karman* follows. The rule is thus a combination of two statements. The word *dīpajana ...* which is continued in the rule *bhāvakarmanoh* does not form part (*aṅga*) of the rule. Pāṇini certainly intended these two separate statements otherwise he would have made one rule as *bhāvakarmanor dīpajanabudhapūri-lāyīpyāyibhyo 'nyatarasyām* rather than two separate rules as they exist in the present *sūtrapāṭha*."

substitute. Thus a short (substitute) will be there except for *ec* [tr. by G. B. Palsule and V. B. Bhagavat, p. 67].¹⁴

As stated by Bhartṛhari, P.1.1.48: *eCa iGghrasvādeṣe* is divided into two sentences: *prātipadikasyā hrasvo bhavati, eCas tu iG bhavati*. According to this division, we have two operations: (1) replacement of a short vowel in place of a final vowel of a neuter stem; (2) in case the final vowel is *eC*, it is replaced by *iK*. For example, P.1.2.47: *hrasvo naṇṇumsake prātipadikasya* (a short vowel is substituted for the final vowel of a nominal stem when it is used in the neuter). If the substitute is not read here, /*eC*/ would be replaced by *guru*-vowel, namely *pluta*, by P.8.2.86. In order to avoid this wrong substitution, there should be rules which prescribe an operation of substituting a *hrasva* and its substitute separately. Thus, the word *vākyabheda* means 'splitting the rule into two'.¹⁵

§1.7. SEVENTH EXAMPLE

In the commentary on P.1.1.51: *ur aṅ rAparaḥ*.

This rule prescribes that /*aṅ*/ [a, i, u], coming as a substitute in the place of /*ṛ*/, is automatically followed by /*ṛ*/. A problem arises; how to replace /*ṛ*/ by /*aṅ*/ and to add /*ṛ*/ after it?

MBh ad P.1.1.51 [I, 125, 17-18]: *kim idam ur aṅ raparavacanam anyanivṛttyartham/uḥ sthāne 'Ṇ eva bhavati rAparaś ceti/āhosvid rAparatvamātram anena vidhāyate/uḥ sthāne 'Ṇ cānaṅ ca aṅ tu rApara iti /*

MBhD on MBh ad P.1.1.51 [Fasc. VIII, 30, 24-25]: *kim idam ur aṅ rAparavacanam anyanivṛttyartham? iKogunavṛddhisūtre (P.1.1.3) 'sya sūtrasya vijñātaṃ pāratantryam / saty. api tu pāratantrye ṣaṣṭhīnirdeśaviśayatvamātram asyeti yatra ṣaṣṭhī tatrāyam apūrvam ādeśāntarāṇāṃ bādhakam nirvartayati / nirvartya [cā]syaiva rAparatvam vidhatte vākyabhedāt – uḥ sthāne 'Ṇ bhavati, sa ca rApara iti /*

Pradīpa on do. [I, 424 right]: *kim idam iti / ṣaṣṭhīprakaraṇād yatra ṣaṣṭhī tatredam upatiṣṭhate / tatra kim ādeśāntarāṇāṃ bādhakam aṇam nirvartayati, tasya ca vākyabhedena rAparatvam / āhosvid*

¹⁴ Translators' Notes, p.165: "This *Dīp.* works out the effect of the *viśayārtham* view. P.1.2.47 teaches a short substitute for the final of a neuter stem. Therefore, by the present rule, the words *eca ig (bhavati)* enter into that rule. At this time we get two statements (*vākyabheda*): (1) *prātipadikasya hrasvo bhavati* '(a final vowel of neuter) nominal stem is replaced by a short vowel' and (2) *eca ig bhavati* 'under the same circumstance (the final) *ec* is replaced by *ik*'. The effect of this twofold statement is that a short substitute comes in when the original vowel is other than *ec*, while if it is *ec*, it will be replaced by *ik*. This *ik* will necessarily be a long *ik* on account of *āntaratamya*. The desired short *ik* will not be available."

¹⁵ Although in the translation the word *vākyabheda* is translated as 'independent sentence,' it is clear from its context that P.1.1.48 is divided into two sentences, each of which prescribes one grammatical treatment.

rAparatvamātram anena kriyate, uḥ sthāne lakṣaṇāntareṇa niṣpanno yo 'N sa rApara iti praśnaḥ //

Uddyota on do.: *vākyabhedena — NN ityādir (P.6.1.197) udātto bhavati, rvarṇasya tu aN bhavati sa ca rAparaḥ — ity artha iti bhāvah /*

Tr.: ... The subservience of this rule is known from (the MBh. on) the rule *ito guṇavṛddhi* (P.1.1.3). In spite of its being subservient, all (rules) containing a Genitive (of *r*) form its province. Therefore, where (ever) there is a Genitive (of *r*), there it produces a new substitute (viz. *aṇ*) which supersedes other substitutes. And having produced it, it enjoins a *r* to follow that (substitute) only, this (latter) on the basis of the splitting of the sentence (into two): "(1) *aṇ* takes the place of *r*. and (2) that (*aṇ*) is followed (invariably) by *r*". ... [tr. by G. B. Palsule and V.B. Bhagavat, pp. 85-86].¹⁶

According to the Nyāsa, there are three interpretations concerning this rule; the Padamañjarī adds one more interpretation.¹⁷

Nyāsa [I. 175]:

(1) *r* -> *aN* followed by *r*.

uḥ sthāne aN rAparatvañ ca anenobhayaṃ vidhīyate (in the place of /*r*/ a substitute /*aN*/ which is followed by /*r*/ is replaced; both operations are prescribed by this rule).

(2) *r* -> *aN* (by some rule) and later -> *aNr*.

lakṣaṇāntareṇa vihitasyāN uḥ sthāne paścād anena rAparatvamātram kriyate some other rule prescribes the replacement of /*r*/by/*aN*/ and subsequently an addition of /*r*/ alone is enjoined by this rule [P.1.1.51]).

(3) *r* -> *aN* (by some rule) and -> *aNr* (1.1.51).

uḥ sthāne lakṣaṇāntareṇa vidhīyamāno 'N vidhānakāla eva tena lakṣaṇāntareṇa saha saṃhatya rAparatvaviśiṣṭo 'nena bhāvīyate (/aN/ which is prescribed by some other rule to replace /*r*/) being joined with that rule only when it is formulated, is delimited by subsequential /*r*/; this substitution is done by this rule).

Padamañjarī [I. 175]:

(1) *r* -> *aN* followed by *r*.

uḥ sthāne raparo 'N bhavaty anena rAparatvaviśiṣṭo 'N bhāvīyate. = (N- 1)

¹⁶ Translators' Notes, p. 232: "The *Dīp. yatra ṣaṣṭhī tatra* ... pinpoints the exact scope of this rule (*yatra ṣaṣṭhī tatra*), and says that this *aṇ* substitute supersedes other claimants (*ādesāntarāṇāṃ bādhakam*). — This rule is further analysed and shown to be consisting of two statements: (1) *uḥ sthāne aṇ bhavati*, and (2) *sa ca raparaḥ* as the MBh. says. It is necessary to resort to this *vākyabheda, ekatra vidheyadvayāsambhavāt (Chāyā)*."

¹⁷ For details, see Sharma 1990: 52-53. Cf. Joshi-Roodbergen 1991: 71. They say: "we conclude that the *guṇa/vṛddhi* operation and the addition of *r* are meant to take place at the same time."

(2) $r \rightarrow aN + r$.

uḥ sthāne 'N eva bhavati, sa ca rApara iti aNanaNprasaṅge 'N niyamate, tasya ca rApa[ra]tvam vidhīyate. (/aN/ with a following /r/ alone comes in place of /r/).

(3) $r \rightarrow aN$ (by some rule) and later $- \rightarrow aNr$ (1.1.51).

uḥ sthāne vihito 'N ity anūdyā tasya vidhānottarakāle rAparatvamātram vidhīyate. = (N- 2).

(4) $r \rightarrow aN$ (by some rule) and $- \rightarrow aNr$ (1.1.51).

yah uḥ sthāne 'N vidhīyate ity anūdyā tasya prasaṅgāvasthāyām eva rApa[ra]tvamātram vidhīyate. = [N- 3]

The above diversity of interpretations is based on how these two operations should be done: whether one operation is independently applied and then the other operation is employed subsequently. Dividing P.1.1.51 into two sentences, we have two operations represented by each sentence: (1) replacement of /aN/ to /r/; (2) /r/ follows /aN/. Although these two are concurrently employed, it is obvious that P.1.1.51 is a rule which has two grammatical treatments — replacement of /aN/ and addition of /r/. Therefore, in this case, the word *vākyabheda* means 'splitting the rule into two (sentences),' each having one grammatical operation respectively.

2. In sum

As we have seen, the usage of the word *vākyabheda* in the MBhD is either in the sense of 1) separate/different rule [1, 4, 5], 2) double meaning [2], or 3) splitting one rule into two (or more) [3, 6, 7]. The second usage is somewhat isolated but to read one sentence in two different ways postulates two independent sentences in reading. At least, our material tells us that the *vākyabheda* sometimes functions as the *yogavibhāga* with respect to the dividing of the rule into two (or more). Since the observations made in the present paper are based solely on one source, the MBhD,¹⁸ which itself is an incomplete text, they are necessarily limited, hence we inevitably need to further investigate and compare these findings with the later

¹⁸ In the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari, we have two instances of the use of '*vākyabheda*':

II. 448: *ekatiṅ yasya vākyam tu śāstre nīḍālakṣaṇam | tasyātiṅgrahaṇenārtho vākyabhedān na vidīyate* || [= Iyer 443] (According to him [= Kātyāyana] who holds that the fixed definition of the sentence is that it should have only one verb, there would be a different sentence if there were more than one verb and, therefore, the mention of *atiṅgaḥ* [= P.8.1. 28] would be useless.)

471: *bhedanīrvacane tu asya pratyekam vā samāpyate | śrutīrvacanabhinnā vā vākyabhede 'vatiṣṭhate* || [= Iyer 466] (When the complex whole is analysed into its parts, the meaning of the sentence is connected with each part. Or the mention of the accessories is split up into many because of the plural suffix in it, results in the splitting up of the sentence.) [Sanskrit text and its numbering from Rau edition, English translation from Iyer 1977].

commentaries of the Pāṇinīyas. However, it seems to be certain that the above-mentioned distinction in the usage of the *vākyabheda* is not found consistently in the interpretations of the Pāṇini's sūtras and at least it is safe to say that the word *vākyabheda* has a wider denotation than that of *yogavibhāga*. In other words, the *vākyabheda* is inclusive of the notion of *yogavibhāga* but not vice versa.

As quoted above (Joshi-Roodbergen 1969: 95), the usage of the term *yogavibhāga* is restricted: to divide the rule into two (or more) – one for a sentence including an(non)-application in a particular case and the other for a sentence having an application in general. The implementation of *yogavibhāga* as a grammatical technique is thus for the purpose of dividing the scope or the condition for application.

However, the cases where the *vākyabheda* is understood to denote 'splitting the rule' are ones wherein two (sometimes opposite) operations are prescribed in one single rule as in the instances of (3), (6), and (7); each operation is then represented in one divided sentence by means of the *vākyabheda* and the operations are continuously or oppositely applied. It is most likely that when the grammarian(s) divided the rule, their criterion for doing so might have been to negotiate the conflict between a special/particular and a general range of application prescribed in the rule. Even though the rule allowed for two different interpretations, that does not necessarily constitute a fault, unlike the Mīmāṃsakas. The term *vākyabheda* is thus a sort of interpretive method that does not impart any change to the status of the rule, although it is not so technical or restrictive as *yogavibhāga*.¹⁹

¹⁹ It is well known that there are instances where a rule (or a word in the rule) is interpreted in two different ways and discussed which interpretation to accept. It is a case of interpretation of a negative compound included in the rule. There are two interpretations: *paryudāsa* and *prasajyaṣṭiśedha*. In the former interpretation, a meaning of negation is directed only to the last member of the compound and so the meaning of negative compound is regarded as an exception to the rule; in the latter, an operation is applied tentatively but it is cancelled. This latter interpretation is nothing but a 'dividing the rule into two sentences' or 'reading one rule in two sentences.' Those two interpretations sometimes do not stand each other; since two different meanings are based on one rule (word), we must cast away one interpretation as a fault. This is a case of 'double meaning' of the *vākyabheda*. The Nyāsa on P.1.1.42-43 says (I, 156): *tathā hi — vidhīṣṭiśedhayor virodhād ekena vākyena tāvac chakyo na vidhātum iti vākyabhedah kartavyah — 'sUṭ sarvanāmasthānasamjño bhavati. naṣṭasakasya ca na bhavati' iti.*

We have another instance wherein the *vākyabheda* and two negations are related together, see the Padamañjarī on P.3.3.19 (3, 25): *kārahagrahaṇam ityādi — paryudāse hi nañivayuktanyāyena kartur anyasmims tatsadṛṣe kāraṇa eva pralīlir bhavati, yathā — abrahmaṇa iti kṣatriyādau. tasmāt paryudāse kārahagrahaṇam na kartavyam. prasajyaṣṭiśedhe tu vākyabhedena samjñāyām GHaÑ bhavati, kartari tu na bhavati eṣo'rtho bhavati. tatra prathame vākye'rthanirdeśābhāvād "anirdiṣṭārthāḥ pratyayāḥ svārthe bhavanti" [Pbh 113] iti svārtha eva syāt.*

ABBREVIATIONS

- KV = Kāśikāvṛtti, with Jinendrabuddhi's Nyāsa (Kāśikāvivarāṇapañjikā) and Haradatta's Padamañjarī, eds. D.D. Shastri and K.P. Shukla, six volumes, Prachya Bharati Series, Varanasi: Tara Publications, 1965-67 [text referred by volume and page].
- MBh = Mahābhāṣya, (a) edited by F. Kielhorn (revised by K.V. Abhyankar), three volumes, Poona: BORI, 1962, 1965, 1972, [text referred by volume, page, and line], (b) — with Pradīpa and Uddyota, eds. Bhārgavaśāstrī Bhikāji Joshi et al. six volumes, Vrajajīvan Prācyabhāratī Granthamālā no. 23, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan 1988 (reprint of NSP edition); Vol. 2 is edited by M.M. Pandit Shivadatta Sharma [text referred by volume, page and column].
- MBhD = Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā. fasc. I, G.B. Palsule, 1985; fasc. III, V.B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhate, 1986; fasc. VII, V.B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhate, 1990; fasc. VIII, G.B. Palsule and V.B. Bhagavat, 1991, Poona: BORI.
- PM = Padamañjarī, see KV.
- SK = Siddhāntakaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita with Bālamānoramā and Tattvabodhinī, eds. Giridhara Śarmā Caturveda and Paṅameśvarānanda Śarma Bhāskara, four Volumes, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1958-1961.
- VP = Vākyapadiya of Bhartṛhari, ed. Wilhelm Rau, Wiesbaden 1977 (Abhandlung für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Bd. 42.4).

Although it is not a comprehensive result of investigation, the number of instances wherein *vākyabheda* is discussed in the Kāśikāvṛtti, the Nyāsa, and the Padamañjarī is 2 [P.6.1.94, 8.1.18], 12 [P.1.1.43, 1.1.50, 2.4.83, 4.2.51, 6.1.2, 6.1.94, 6.1.107, 6.1.108, 6.2.148, 6.2.173-74, 8.1.10, 8.1.18] and 12 [P.1.1.50, 1.3.67, 2.4.83, 3.1.1, 3.1.88, 3.3.19, 4.3.2, 6.1.94, 6.1.107, 6.1.108, 6.2.49, 8.1.18] times respectively. Here I simply quote the two passages in the KV (for details, see Kudo 1999): on P.6.1.94, *eṅi parārūpam* [4, 562]: *kecid "vā sŪPy āpisaleḥ* [P.6.1.93] *ity anuvarttayanti. tac ca vākyabhedenā sŪBdhātau vikalpaṃ karoti — upeṣakīyati, upaiṣakīyati, upodanīyati, upaudanīyati;* on P.8.1.18, *anudāttaṃ sarvaṃ apadādau* [4, 262]: *sarvagrahaṇaṃ sarvaṃ anūdyamānaṃ vidhiyamānaṃ cānudāttaṃ yathā syād iti* | [p. 263] *tena yuṣmadasmadādeśānāṃ api vākyabhedenānudāttaṃ vidhīyate* |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Edgerton, F. (1929): *Mīmāṃsānyāyaparakāśa*. Reprint, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1986.
- Iyer, K.A. Subrahmania (1977): *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari. kāṇḍa II: English Translation with Exegetical Notes*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Joshi, S. D. and Saroja Bhate (1984): *The Fundamentals of Anuvṛtti*, University of Poona.
- Joshi, S.D. and J.A.F. Roodbergen (1969): *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya: Avyayibhāvatatpuruṣāhnikā*, University of Poona.
- (1991): *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini with Translation and Explanatory Notes*. Vol. I (1.1.1.-75), New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- (1993): *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini with Translation and Explanatory Notes*. Vol. II (1.2.2-1.2.73), New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Katre, S.M. (1987): *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, University of Texas Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul (1980): *Pāṇini as a Variationist*, edited by S.D. Joshi, Cambridge and London: MIT, co-published by the Poona University Press, Pune.
- Kudo, Noriyuki. (1997): "Bunpoukisokukaisyaku ni okeru bunsyoubunkatsugihou — Bhartṛhari Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā no youreikara" ["Vākyabheda as Technique of Interpretation in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya-Dīpikā"], in: *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [= *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*] 46-1: 461-457(L) (in Japanese).
- (1999): "Kāśīkāvṛtti ni mirareru bunsyoubunkatsugihou — yogavibhāga to vākyabheda" ["Vākyabheda in the Kāśīkāvṛtti"], in: *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [= *Journal of the Indian and Buddhist Studies*] 48-1: 530-526(L) (in Japanese).
- Kuroda, Hiroshi, (1993): "Veda to sutora niokeru kasitsu no umu nituite" ["Vākyabheda in Veda and Mīmāṃsāsūtra"], in *Shūkyō Kenkyū* [= *Journal of Religious Studies*] 66-4 [No. 295]: 251-252 (in Japanese).
- Padhy, Kishore Chandra (2001): *Pāṇinīyavyākaraṇe Yogavibhāgavimarsaḥ*. Delhi: Bharatiya Book Corporation.
- Sharma, Rama Nath (1987): *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, Vol. I, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.
- (1990): *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, Vol. II, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.