

The Vedic and Svvara Chapters of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*

Ramhari Timalšina

One deep-rooted tradition of linguistic study that developed in the Indian sub-continent in the first millennium BCE was primarily focused on Vedic Sanskrit, and this endeavour established the first tier of literature on Sanskrit etymology (*nirukta*), metrics (*chandas*), lexicography (*nighaṇṭu*), phonetics (*śikṣā*), and grammar (*vyākaraṇa*). Around 350 BCE, Pāṇini composed a grammar of the Sanskrit language titled *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, addressing both the secular and Vedic domains. This text comes with eight chapters (*adhyāyas*), with each chapter subdivided into four sections (*pādas*) (Cardona 1997: 268). Pāṇini has treated the Sanskrit language as a whole, and he has given separate rules for the Vedic language only when they do not apply to the classical one, and in this sense, these rules are treated as an exception to the general rules that govern standard Sanskrit. Almost all of the later grammarians of the Pāṇinian tradition have adopted these Vedic and Svvara *sūtras* (the *sūtras* dealing with Vedic words and their pitch accents, respectively) into their works. Only a very late grammarian, Varadarāja (17th century), excludes these rules in his *Laghukaumudī*, itself an abridgement of Bhattojīdīkṣita's *Siddhāntakaumudī*. After Pāṇini, many grammarians who worked towards their own system of grammar broadly appropriated the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and maintained its generative character, their energy going into introducing more concise and easy texts for learning Sanskrit grammar.¹ These grammarians working outside of the Pāṇinian school excluded Vedic and Svvara *sūtras* in their grammatical works. Possibly the reason for this exclusion is that they were less interested in reformulating *sūtras* which deal with topics solely related to Vedic grammar. It

1 The *Kaumāralāta* by Kumāralāta (c. 325 CE), *Kātantravyākaraṇa* by Sarvavarman (c. 400 CE), *Jainendravvyākaraṇa* by Devanandin (c. 5th or 7th cent. CE), *Śākaṭāyanavyākaraṇa* by Pālyakīrti Śākaṭāyana (9th cent. CE), *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharana* by Bhojadeva (c. 1010–1055 CE), *Haima Śabdānuśāsana* by Hemacandra Sūri (1089–1172 CE), *Samkṣiptasāravyākaraṇa* by Kramadīśvara (12th cent. CE), *Mugdhabodha* by Vopadeva (late 13th cent. CE), *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa* by Anubhūtiśvarīpācārya (late 13th–14th cent. CE), *Supadmavyākaraṇa* by Padmanābhādatta (14th cent. CE), *Harināmāmṛtavyākaraṇa* by Rūpagosvāmin (16th cent. CE) (Mīmāṃsaka 1994: 608–424).

is also possible that as Vedic studies became more archaic later grammarians could not obtain a command over the Vedic language sufficient to reformulating the *sūtras* for Vedic grammar.

Candragomin (c. 450 CE), also known as Candrācārya or Candra (Cardona 1978), composed a grammar titled *Śabdalaṅkāra*, which is broadly a reworking of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, incorporating suggestions and comments added by Kātyāyana in his *vārttikas* and by Patañjali (2nd century BCE) in the *Mahābhāṣya*. Candragomin wanted to produce a concise but comprehensive text, and one that is also easy to follow. He also retained the rules governing Vedic words and pitch accents. Together with some others, he revitalized the tradition of the *Mahābhāṣya*, which had nearly disappeared (Cardona 1978). Since he begins his grammar with a benediction to Sarvajña,² Lord Buddha, we can surmise that he was an adherent of Buddhism. He abandoned Pāṇini's practice of placing the rules relating to Vedic words and pitch accents at the end of every discussed topic, relegating them instead to the end of his work: Vedic rules to the 7th and Svāra to the 8th chapter. At some point, however, these two chapters were lost. Therefore, the published texts of the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa* and the available manuscripts they are based on contain only the first six chapters, which deal with the classical Sanskrit language.

The Cāndra tradition rose in popularity, particularly among the Buddhist monasteries in what is now northern India, Nepal, and Tibet, where Buddhism flourished. It may be supposed that the monks in the Buddhist monasteries had little desire to spend a decade-long period of training in Sanskrit grammar, and Cāndra grammar offered an easy way for them to learn Sanskrit in a short time and begin their studies of the Mahāyāna texts. One might have thought, therefore, that Candra had no reason to compose rules for Vedic grammar. However, Candragomin's *Śabdalaṅkāra* and its commentaries and sub-commentaries show that not only Candragomin but all the grammarians from this tradition closely studied the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and *Mahābhāṣya* and discussed the grammatical rules dealing with Vedic words and pitch accents.

2 The benedictory verse reads:

siddham praṇamya sarvajñaṃ sarvīyaṃ jagato gurum |
laghuviśpaṣṭasampūrṇaṃ ucyate śabdalaṅkāraṃ ||

Translation: A short, clear, and complete [grammar called] *Śabdalaṅkāra* ('that which illuminates words') will be revealed after offering obeisance to the one who has attained the highest goal (*siddha*), who is omniscient (*sarvajña*, Lord Buddha), who is compassionate to all creatures (*sarvīya*), and who is the teacher of the whole world (*jagataḥ guru*).

In ancient India, many branches of knowledge had already been developed, and volumes of texts from these disciplines were compiled, and written in Vedic and classical Sanskrit before the spread of Buddhism. Buddhist canonical texts, recited orally from the 5th to the 1st century BCE, were first written down in Sri Lanka not earlier than 29 BCE in the Māgadhī or Pālī language (Gombrich 2006: 3). In the long historical development and greater areal expansion of Buddhism, numerous Buddhist texts were compiled, and also translated into different languages. As scholars from both Buddhist and Brāhmaṇical traditions shared the same socio-cultural background, their scholarly activities must have overlapped within various linguistic areas. As many branches of knowledge were emerging, and scholarly dialogue and debate very much alive among scholars, whether or not they spoke the same mother tongue, they must have shared a common language for their scholarly activities. Sanskrit was already established as a standardized language, and while other languages were emerging as possible competitors, Sanskrit won through. Competency in this common language was a prerequisite to engaging in such scholarly activities.

Theravāda Buddhist scholars relied on Māgadhī or Pālī as the primary language of their canons. Exceptionally, Buddhists of the [Mūla]sarvāstivāda monastic sect preferred Sanskrit as their canonical, scholarly, and perhaps even everyday language. It gradually became the language used for Buddhist scriptures and scholasticism, reflecting the rise of the language as a political and literary lingua franca of the subcontinent. For the Mahāyāna tradition, Sanskrit is more than a means of communication, as is exemplified in the mantric practices, *sūtra* teachings, and various *dhāraṇīs*. Aśvaghōṣa (80–150 CE), a Maḥasāṅghika scholar, is considered to be the first Buddhist who composed his works in classical Sanskrit (Olivelle 2005: 24). After Aśvaghōṣa, many Buddhist scholars, such as Nāgārjuna, Aśaṅga, Vasubandhu, Dīnāga, Bhāviveka, Haribhaṭṭa, Dharmakīrti, Candragomin, Gopadatta, Ravigupta, Vararuci, and Jñānaśrīmitra, wrote in classical Sanskrit. There of course is more than one reason for this preference. The dominance of Sanskrit in the intellectual landscape must have weighed heavily. Most of the technical terms in the various fields of knowledge must have already been coined in Sanskrit, whereas they were largely still lacking in other languages. The interest of a king, institution, or organization that financed or otherwise supported the composition of texts must also have figured in. Above all, the language preference of the readers targeted doubtless affected the outcome.

Seen through the lens of orthodox Brahmins, Buddhists had always been “re-vilers of the Veda,” and in this regard, Buddhists were the stereotypical *nās-tikas*. It is true that Buddhists do not recognize the epistemic authority of the Vedas. With this underlying premise, it was easy for Belvalkar (1915: 59), Śāstrī (1931: 115), S.K. De (1938: 258), M.M.K.V. Abhyankar (1986: 140), and others to hypothesize that Candragomin excluded Vedic and Svara sections from his grammar because he was a Buddhist.

Other scholars, however, have conjectured that Candragomin’s grammar did indeed contain sections on Vedic grammar and phonetic rules. According to Liebich (1903: 3), the Vedic and Svara sections were originally part of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* but were lost at some point. Mishra (1974: 148–157), Dwivedī (1987: 65–70), and Mīmāṃsaka (1994: 669–672) have adduced more evidence to argue along the same lines. In a modification of the arguments, Dash (1986: 30) claimed that Candragomin composed the *sūtras* of *adhyāyas* 1–6, while the later author of the *vṛtti* (i.e. Dharmadāsa) composed the *sūtras* of the no longer extant 7th and 8th *adhyāyas*.³ Similarly, Oberlies (1989: 3) maintains that Dharmadāsa authored the *Cāndravṛtti* together with the Vedic and Svara chapters of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*. The evidence that supports the hypothesis that the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* contains a Vedic section is as follows:

1. In the *Cāndravṛtti*’s commentary on the 6th Pratyāhārasūtra, one *sūtra*, ‘*vin mator mam*’, is given as an example of *mam* being used as a *pratyāhāra*. However, this *sūtra* is not found attested in the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* that has come down to us. One explanation would be that this *sūtra* fell within the Vedic chapter of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*.
2. *Cāndravṛtti* on 1.1.145 assures readers that accentuation be discussed in the eighth chapter (*svaram aṣṭame vakṣyāmah*). This suggests that there was a seventh chapter to the grammar. This chapter must be the chapter that treats Vedic words.
3. *Cāndravṛtti* on 5.1.63 contains the phrase *chāndaso varṇalopaḥ*, which hints at the existence of a Vedic chapter.

3 I have discussed the authorship of the *Cāndravṛtti* elsewhere and concluded that there were at least two versions of the *Cāndravṛtti* text, one longer and another shorter, one composed by Candragomin and the other by Dharmadāsa (Timalsina, 2022: 21–35).

The following is a list of supporting evidence for the hypothesis that the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* contains a Svvara section:

1. In the Pāṇinian grammar k, c, ñ, t, n, p, r, and l sounds are supplied as a part of suffixes and roots which are markers (*anubandhas*) for the application of particular Vedic accents. The same sounds are used in the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* in some suffixes. No other purpose for using *anubandhas* is mentioned in the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*. Therefore it can be assumed that Candra is following Pāṇini and uses these *anubandhas* for the determination of a particular accent.⁴
2. *Cāndravyākaraṇa* 1.1.23 reads *vyāpyāt kāmyac*, and the *vṛtti* on it explains the reason for using the *c* sound in *kāmyac* as '*cakāraḥ satiṣiṣtasvarabādhanārthaḥ*' (the purpose [of using] the letter *c* here is to restrict the subsequent prevailing accent by removing it after it has been obtained during the process of word formation). Such an explanation would be only possible when there is a Svvara chapter in the grammar.
3. The author of the *Cāndravṛtti* on 1.1.145 assures readers that accentuation will be discussed in the eighth chapter (*svaram aṣṭame vakṣyāmaḥ*). Similarly, at 4.3.93 he states that the particular accentuation will be discussed in the chapter on accentuation (*svaraviśeṣaṃ tu svarādhyāye vakṣyāmaḥ*).
4. *Cāndravṛtti* on 1.1.105, 1.1.108, 1.2.86, 1.3.6, 1.3.101, 2.3.2, 2.4.64, 3.1.67, 3.3.39, 3.4.54, 3.4.68, 4.2.96, 4.2.99, 4.3.90, and 5.1.81 uses technical terms like *svaritatatva*, *svarita*, *svara*, *prakṛtisvara*, and *ādyudātta*, which relate to accents, and in some of the cases the author even promises to explain the rules relating to them later.
5. *Cāndravṛtti* on 1.1.23, 1.1.60, and 1.2.49 each identify particular accents for particular words.

4 Such *anubandhas* are made in the following sūtras of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*:
 kit: phak, thak (2.3.17, 2.4.34, 2.4.78 and 2.4.119)
 cit: irac (1.4.9)
 ñit:ghañ (1.3. 7)
 tit: nyat (1.1.130)
 nit: śyan, san (1.1.87, 1.1.17)
 pit: tip, mip, sip, śap (1.4.1, 1.2.68, 1.4.28, 1.4.31, 6.3.105)
 rit: kelimar, anīyar (1.1.105)
 lit: nyal, ṇvul, thal (1.4.11, 1.4.14, 5.3.117, 5.4.160, 6.1.44)

6. *Cāndravṛtti* on 1.1.137, 1.1.138, and 1.2.8, wherein the *nipātana* (a word given without displaying its derivation) of some words involving the *ādyudātta* (acute accent) is discussed.
7. *Cāndravṛtti* on 1.1.134 presents the second portion of a *sūtra* as ‘*anau vasaḥ*’, which must be from the Svara section.⁵
8. The last *paribhāṣā* of the *Cāndraparibhāṣāsūtra* reads *svaravidhau vyañjanam avidyamānavat* (when an accent is being generated, any intervening consonant is treated as non-existent).⁶ This *paribhāṣā* would be needed in grammar when dealing with accents.

While working towards a critical edition of the *Sumatipañjika*, a commentary written by Sumati (10th cent. CE) on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, I noticed some additional supporting evidence. In this text, some *sūtras* are cited which must be from the Vedic and Svara sections of the grammar. The following is a list of these *sūtras*:

Sūtras from the Vedic section (see Timalsina 2022)

vyutpattāv am p. 112
supām subluk pūrvasavarṇam 1.1.20, 1.1.100, 1.1.119, 1.4.13

Sūtras from the Svara section (see Timalsina 2022)

kriyārthasyāntaḥ 1.1.23
syādir ādau 1.1.23
anudāttaṃ padam ekavarjam 1.1.23
yatrodāttalopaḥ 1.1.23
yāsāma 1.1.60
yato 'nāvasana 1.1.107
anau vasa 1.1.134

Multiple citations provided by Sumati relating to the *sūtras* of the Vedic and Svara chapters prove that Candragomin composed these sections and that they survived at least until the commentator’s time (the last quarter of the 10th century CE). Similarly, the *Śabdalakṣaṇavivarāṇapañjikā*, a commentary by

5 Chatterji (1953: 47) completes the *sūtra* as ‘*yato dvyaco 'nauvasaḥ*’.

6 The *Cāndraparibhāṣāsūtras* are published in Liebich 1928: 49–52.

Pūrṇacandra (c. 9th cent. CE) on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, in some explanations quotes *sūtras* that can only be from the Vedic or Svāra sections of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*.⁷

Not only contemporary scholars but also Puruṣottamadeva, a 12th-century scholar who composed many grammatical texts in the Pāṇinian tradition, writes in his *Bhāṣāvṛtti*⁸ that Candragomin composed a grammar only of the classical Sanskrit, implying that Puruṣottamadeva was unaware of the complete text of *Cāndravyākaraṇa*. This, however, is contradicted by Goyīcandra (second half of the 12th cent. CE), who in his commentary on the *Samkṣiptasārvyākaraṇa* states that he is well aware of the Vedic portion of Candragomin's grammar.⁹

Now that it is established that Candragomin did in fact compose Vedic and Svāra chapters in his grammar and that later scholars of the tradition also dealt with many *sūtras* from these chapters, we can discard the hypothesis made by Belvalkar and others, and go on to redefine the scope of Candra's *vyākaraṇa*. Nobody has denied that Candragomin was deeply influenced by Buddhism, but what compelled him to incorporate Vedic grammar into his concise grammar dedicated to educating persons primarily interested in Mahāyāna Sanskrit texts? Was it the case that since *vyākaraṇa* is a topic of *śāstras* (scientific treatises) Buddhist grammarians felt duty-bound to compose standard *śāstras* regardless of other interests? Or was Mahāyāna Buddhism itself open to the idea of pursuing studies of Vedic grammar? One of these hypotheses or both may be correct. The motivation for learning a *śāstra* would have differed depending on personal interest and the guru's tradition. Evidence scattered in grammatical texts of the Cāndra tradition indicates that Mahāyāna Buddhist scholars had a keen interest in Vedic studies. This would have opened up space for a much broader discourse, one at odds with contemporary readings that reinforce sectarian boundaries and so make the flow of ideas between schools very difficult. In my reading,

7 On 1.1.114 (NAK 4/311 fol. 93v5): *yato 'nauvasata ity ādyudāttatve prāpte svāminepy antodāttavañ ca nipātyate*. On 1.1.138 (NAK 4/311 fol. 110v5): *kyapaś ca pitvāt supittayainam ity anudāttatvaṃ mā bhūd ity āha antodāttatvaṃ ceti*.

8 *Candragomī bhāṣāsūtrakāraḥ yaño veti sūtritavān* (7.3.94). Translation: Candragomin, an author of the *sūtras* of the *Bhāṣā* (i.e. classical, not Vedic Sanskrit), composed the *sūtra* as *yaño vā*.

9 In the commentary on *sūtra* no. 200 (see in Saini 1995: 73) he writes: *candreṇāpi bhāṣābhāge noktam*. The statement 'nor has Candra stated in the *Bhāṣā* chapter' presupposes that he was aware of the Vedic chapter composed by Candra.

there always had been greater fluidity and exchange among scholars from different traditions; there was no need to wait for modern institutions to cut across traditions.

The above leads to the notion that one could read the Vedas without consideration of one of its underlying premises: that Vedic speech has an additional function than that of common language, namely to activate the ritual world through its mantric force. Indian philosophers from different schools have differing views regarding the meaning of ‘word’ and the use made of words in, for instance, ordinary speech and in Vedic language. Some opined that words remained the same within these two contexts,¹⁰ while others considered that *laukika* and *vaidika* words are different. In his *Mahābhāṣya*, Patañjali raises the question: ‘Which words are treated in this (Pāṇini’s) grammar?’ and replies: ‘Words belonging to ordinary speech and Vedic [words].’ He goes on to provide examples of both types.¹¹ A distinction appears thereby: for *laukika* words he gives separate words, while *vaidika* words appear in whole phrases or sentences. As Bhartṛhari (c. 5th century CE) notes in his commentary upon the *Bhāṣya*, this is because *vaidika* words, being not of human origin, are not used in isolation.¹²

10 In his commentary on *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 1.3.30, Sābara writes: *ya eva laukikās ta eva vaidikās ta eva ca teṣāṃ arthāḥ*: ‘Words in the Veda are the same as those in common parlance, and the things expressed by them are also the same’ (Bhattacharyya 1933: 116).

11 *Keṣāṃ śabdānāṃ laukikānāṃ vaidikānāṃ ca. tatra laukikās tāvat gaur aśvaḥ puruṣo hastī śakunir mṛgo brāhmaṇa iti. vaidikā khalv api. śaṃ no devīr abhiṣṭaye, iṣe tvorje tvā, agnim ilē purōhitam, āgna ā yāhi vītāye iti* (Joshi and Roodbergen 1986: 3–4). Of [words] belonging to ordinary speech and of Vedic [words]. Among these, to start with, [the words] belonging to ordinary language, [like] *gauḥ* ‘cow’, *aśvaḥ* ‘horse’, *pūruṣaḥ* ‘man’, *hastī* ‘elephant’, *śakuniḥ* ‘bird’, *mṛgaḥ* ‘deer’ *brāhmaṇaḥ* ‘brahmin’. [Then] certainly, Vedic [words] also [like] *śaṃ no devīr abhiṣṭaye* ‘happily the goddess for our protection’, *iṣe tvorje tvā* ‘for strength, you for vigour’, *agnim ilē purōhitam* ‘I praise Agni, the family-priest’, [and] *āgna ā yāhi vītāye* ‘come o Agni, for feasting’. (Translated in Joshi and Roodbergen 1986: 9)

12 *loke cānīyatapaurvāparyāṇi vākyeṣv arthapradhānāni padāny eva anvākyāyanta iti laukikāḥ padabhūta eva nirdiśyante. apauruṣeyavaidikānāṃ samādāyo na kevalāḥ prayujyanta iti vākyāny eva nirdiśyante* (Bhartṛhari on *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* 1.3, as reproduced in Bronkhorst 1987: 1). With respect to the world, only words which have no fixed order in sentences and in which the meaning is most important are explained; and therefore only single words from worldly usage are pointed out. In the case of Vedic [words], they being not of human origin, *sam* etc. are not used in isolation, and therefore only sentences are referred to. The exposition relates only to [Vedic words] in sentences, not to the sentences themselves. (Translated in Bronkhorst 1987: 40)

As for grammarians from the Cāndra school, it appears that they held a different opinion regarding *vaidika* words. Commenting on the *pratīka* (head-word) *śabdalakṣaṇam* of Candragomin's benedictory verse, Sumati provides examples of *laukika* and *vaidika* words being used similarly, and states that the grammar in question only deals with words in common day-to-day use.¹³

Buddhists were hardly likely to be interested in performing the Agnihotra and other sacrifices (*yāgas*) to produce a desired result (*apūrva*), as directed by the Vedas. They were, however, interested in understanding the meaning of the Vedic stanzas, for which purpose grammarians from the Buddhist tradition wrote separate sections dealing with Vedic words and accents. Buddhist scholars of later periods seemingly became less interested in these chapters, which therefore ceased to be copied and were eventually lost.

No manuscript containing the Vedic and Svāra sections of Cāndra grammar has been found to date. Nor do identified manuscripts containing commentaries or sub-commentaries of that grammar contain these chapters. Most of the available Cāndra grammar texts were copied in the Kathmandu Valley, where the practice of copying them decreased after the 14th century and was completely discontinued in the 17th century (Timalsina 2022: 15–17). We may still find manuscripts containing these sections, though, given that in the Valley there are many private and public collections that have still not been catalogued. Moreover, in different parts of India and Tibet there are numerous Sanskrit manuscripts that are not well catalogued and so waiting to be discovered.

13 *śabdā laukikā vṛkṣakhaṭvādayaḥ | vaidikā ahaṃ devebhyo 'karavan namaḥ samudriyāṇām nadīnām ityādayaḥ tatra lokavyavahārāntahpātīnām śabdānām iha grahaṇam* (as reproduced in Timalsina 2022: 106). Translation: *Vṛkṣa, khaṭva* etc. are, *laukika* words. *Ahaṃ devebhyāḥ, akaravam, namaḥ, samudriyāṇām, nadīnām* etc. are *vaidika* [words]. Among these words, only such words as are in common use are taken here.

Bibliography

- Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev & J.M. Shukla 1986. *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. Third edition (Gaekwad's Oriental Series 134). Baroda: Maharaja Sayajirao University.
- Belvalkar, S.K. 1915. *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*. Poona: Deccan College.
- Bhattacharyya, B. 1933. *Shabara-Bhāṣya*. Vol. I. Trans. Ganganath Jha. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (ed.) 1987. *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bharṭṛhari*. Fascicule IV: Āhnika I. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Cardona, George 1978. "Still Again on the History of the Mahābhāṣya", in: *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 58 and 59: 79–99.
- 1997. *Pāṇini: A Survey of Research*. Reprint [1976]. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Chatterji, Kshitish Chandra 1953. *Cāndravyākaraṇa of Candragomin*. Part I (Chapters 1–3). Poona: Deccan College.
- Dash, Prafulla Chandra 1986. *A Comparative Study of the Pāṇinian and Cāndra Systems of Grammar: Kṛdanta Portion*. Delhi: Ramanand Vidya Bhawan.
- De, S.K. 1938. "Candra-Gomin", in: *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 14 (1): 256–260.
- Dwivedi, Janaki Prasad 1987. *Samskṛta ke bauddha vaiyākaraṇa*. Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- Gombrich, Richard F. 2006. *Theravada Buddhism*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Joshi, Shivram Dattatray & J.A.F. Roodbergen (ed., tr.). 1986. *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Paspāśāhnika*. Pune: University of Poona.
- Liebich, Bruno 1903. "Das Datum Candragomin's und Kalidasa's", in: *Jahresbericht der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Kultur (Sitzung der orientalischsprach-wissenschaftlichen Sektion)*: 1–11.
- 1928. *Konkordanz Panini-Candra*. Indische Forschungen 6. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus.
- Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira 1994. *Samskṛta vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā itihāsa*. Prathama bhāga. 5th ed. [1950]. Bahālagadhā: Rāmalāla Kapūra Trast.
- Mishra, Harshanath 1974. *Cāndravyākaraṇavṛtteḥ samālocanātmakam adhyayanam*. New Delhi: Lal Bahadur Shastri Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth.
- Oberlies, Thomas. 1989. *Studie zum Cāndravyākaraṇa: Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV.4.52–148 und V.2*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 38. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

- Olivelle, Patrick (ed.) 2005. *Manu's Code of Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Saini, Raṇajīta Siṃha (ed.) 1995. *Samkṣiptasāravāyākaraṇa of Vādīndra-
cakracūḍāmaṇi-Mahāpaṇḍita Kramadīśvara with Rasavatī Vṛtti by
Mahārājādhirāja Jumarnandī and Vivaraṇī-Ṭīkā by Vivaraṇī-Ṭīkā by
Autthāsanika Pt. Goyīcandra* (Vol. 1). Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.
- Timalsina, Ramhari 2022. *The Sumatipañjikā: A Commentary on Cāndra-
vāyākaraṇavṛtti 1.1 and 1.4*. Poona: Institut Français de Pondichéry.

