

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE VĀKYAPADIYA-VṚTTI*

By Ashok Aklujkar, Vancouver

1.1 It has been a long tradition in India to ascribe the Vṛtti (V in abbreviation) of the first two kāṇḍas of the Trikāṇḍī to Bhartṛhari and to accept it as an integral part of the Vākyapadiya¹. This tradition is

* I am grateful to Dr. MADELEINE BIARDEAU for promptly making available to me a copy of her edition of the Brahma-kāṇḍa, and to Dr. GEORGE L. HART, the authorities of the Adyar Library, Prof. K. V. ABHYANKAR, ĀCĀRYA LIMAYE, PANDITA V. B. BHAGWAT, Dr. S. D. JOSHI, and Prof. WILHELM RAU for making the Vākya-kāṇḍa-vṛtti available to me in micro-films and transcripts. The kernel of the present article constituted a paper read at the one hundred and seventy-ninth annual meeting of the American Oriental Society in New York (March 1969).

¹ (a) Vākyapadiya was originally the title of only the first two kāṇḍas of Bhartṛhari's magnum opus; the entire work consisting of three kāṇḍas was called Trikāṇḍī in the older tradition (AKLUJKAR 1969: 547—555).

(b) The V of the first two kāṇḍas only is available to us and it alone seems to have been accepted in the tradition as a genuine, inseparable constituent of the Vākyapadiya. See "The Extent of Bhartṛhari's Vṛtti" (AKLUJKAR, forthcoming).

(c) It has been convincingly shown by C. SHASTRI (1930: 636—644, 1934: Skt. Intro.: 18—26; cf. R. KAVI 1930: 235—241; KUNHAN RAJA 1936: 285—298) that the commentary on the first kāṇḍa published under the name of Puṇyārāja in the Benares Sanskrit Series by MĀNAVALLĪ (1887) is in fact an abridgement of Bhartṛhari's V of the same kāṇḍa. The unabridged V was edited for the first time by C. SHASTRI (1934), and it is his text that has essentially been followed in the editions by R. ŚARMĀ (1963), BIARDEAU (1964a), BHAGWAT (1965), and S. IYER (1966a). BIARDEAU and S. IYER (1964a, 1965) have translated the V into French and English respectively. But, as fns. 16, 19, 22—24, and 29 below indicate and as my forthcoming studies of the V and of BIARDEAU's interpretation will substantiate, much improvement is desirable both in the Sanskrit text and the translations.

(d) Two Sanskrit commentaries on the Brahma-kāṇḍa-vṛtti are available, an old one by Vṛṣabha and a modern one by R. ŚARMĀ (1963). The first has been edited by C. SHASTRI (1934) in excerpts and by S. IYER

preserved in the manuscripts² as well as in all the ancient commentaries of the Trikāṇḍī. It is also supported by the writings of Abhinava-gupta, Indu, Utpala(-deva), Kamala-śīla, Jayanta-bhaṭṭa, Jñānaśrī-bhadra,

(1966a) in full. In its former version it finds its way into most of R. ŚARMĀ's commentary Ambākartrī, the other—original—parts of the Ambākartrī being mostly unhelpful for an exact understanding of Bhartṛhari's position and for the solution of textual difficulties.

(e) For the state of the Vākya-kāṇḍa-vṛtti studies, see AKLUJKAR 1969: 555—561.

(f) That the Vs of both the kāṇḍas are written by one and the same author has found unanimous acceptance, although, as far as I know, no demonstration of the identity of the authors is available in print. I have noticed more than fifty instances of similarity of diction, style, views; and sources between the two Vs, which put their common authorship beyond doubt as far as I am concerned.

² (a) In the manuscripts containing both the kārikās and the V, the following colophon is found at the end of the Brahma-kāṇḍa with insignificant scribal variations: *iti śrī-hari-vṛṣabha-mahāvaiyākaraṇa-viracite vākya-padīye āgama-samuccayo nāma brahma-kāṇḍam samāptam* (C. SHĀSTRĪ 1930: 635; S. IYER 1965: xviii; and the concluding pages of the Sanskrit text in the editions referred to in fn. 1c above). In at least three manuscripts consisting only of the kārikās of the three kāṇḍas, the colophon is: *iti śrī-bhagavad-bhartṛhari-vṛṣabha-mahāvaiyākaraṇa-pāda-viracite vākya-padīye prakīrṇaka-nāmani pada-kāṇḍe vṛtti-samuddesaś caturdaśaḥ* (C. SHĀSTRĪ 1930: 635; S. IYER 1965: xviii; RĀU 1962: 387—388, 390, 392, 1964: 194). Now, there is no justification for supposing that the person designated by *hari-vṛṣabha-mahāvaiyākaraṇa* of the first colophon is different from the person designated by *bhagavad-bhartṛhari-vṛṣabha-mahāvaiyākaraṇa-pāda* of the second colophon, for (i) *hari* as a shorter form of *bhartṛhari* occurs quite frequently in later literature, and (ii) the terms *bhagavat* and *mahāvaiyākaraṇa-pāda* are merely more expressive of respect than the term *mahāvaiyākaraṇa*. Thus, the kārikās as well as the composition including both the kārikās and the V have been ascribed to one person Hari-vṛṣabha in the manuscripts. That this Hari-vṛṣabha is none other than Bhartṛhari or Hari is evident from the alternative form *Bhartṛhari-vṛṣabha* and also from (b) below.

(b) Two explanations have so far been put forward as to why Hari or Bhartṛhari is called Hari-vṛṣabha or Bhartṛhari-vṛṣabha in certain colophons. According to C. SHĀSTRĪ (1930: 635) and S. IYER (1965: xviii), the member *-vṛṣabha* has been placed in the compound designation merely as expressive of respect (*pūjā-vacana*), which is justified in the light of fairly common Sanskrit expressions like *puruṣa-vṛṣabha*. But R. KAVI (1930: 235 fn. 2) thinks that *-vṛṣabha* was appended to Bhartṛhari's name because he staunchly maintained the doctrine of *śabda-brahman* denoted by the word *śabda-vṛṣabha* in his work (1.123 and its V). Going against the first explanation is the fact that *-vṛṣabha* as expressive of respect is redundant in the light of *mahāvaiyākaraṇa* or *bhagavad-mahāvaiyākaraṇa-pāda*. Detrimental to the second explanation is the fact that the soul of human beings, which in its

Nāgeśa, Prabhā-candra, Bhaṭṭa-nārāyaṇa-kaṇṭha, Bhoja, Maṇḍana-miśra, Malla-vādin (senior), Rāma-kaṇṭha, Vādi-deva-sūri, Siṃha-sūri-gaṇin, Somānanda and Skandasvāmin-Maheśvara, and perhaps of Abhaya-deva, I-ching, Kaṇakagomin, Diṇnāga, Dharma-kīrti, Mamma-ṭa, and Sureśvara. Furthermore, overwhelming similarities of thought, diction, and sources can be shown to exist between the V and the Tripādī³ on the one hand, and the V and the verses of the Trikāṇḍī on the other⁴.

purest essential aspect is *śabda-brahman* of Bhartṛhari (see AKLUJKAR 1970), was described as *vr̥ṣabha* from at least as early a time as that of the Mahābhāṣya (KIELHORN's edition, Vol. I p. 3.20—22), and hence the idea of applying the term *vr̥ṣabha* to the supreme reality in the philosophy of the grammarians could not have been considered to be original with Bhartṛhari. Besides, no reference to Bhartṛhari as Hari-*vr̥ṣabha* has so far been found in the grammatical and philosophical works of the later period. There is room, therefore, for a third explanation: (i) Among the manuscripts which contain only the kārikās of the Trikāṇḍī, the term *-vr̥ṣabha* is found in the manuscripts of the southern recension only (RAU 1962: 387—388, 390, 392, 396, 1964: 194—195). (ii) A study of the known kārikā-vṛtti manuscripts, which invariably contain the term *-vr̥ṣabha* in their colophons, reveals that all those manuscripts must have had a common (most probably, south Indian) origin (see my forthcoming textual study of the V). Thus, the use of *Hari-vr̥ṣabha* for Bhartṛhari can be said to be a peculiarity of the southern recension only. Now, all the available manuscripts of *Vṛṣabha*'s commentary on the kārikās and V of the first kāṇḍa are also found to belong to a common south Indian source (S. I. 1966a: ix, xv—xvi), which indicates that *Vṛṣabha*'s *Tikā* was once widely used in south India. Moreover, there are some readings in the *Brahma-kāṇḍa-vṛtti* which could not have been a result of any factor other than the use of *Vṛṣabha*'s commentary to understand the V (e. g. *ātma-tattvam* in V 1.5; see my forthcoming textual study of the V for more on this point). We can, therefore, assume that, in the past, there were some manuscripts of the V with *Vṛṣabha*'s commentary in south India. A common colophon of such manuscripts must have contained the words *hari* (or *bhartṛhari*) and *vr̥ṣabha* which may be said to have found their way together through some inadvertence on the part of the scribes, first, in those manuscripts which consist of the kārikās and the V, and next, in those manuscripts of the southern recension which contain only the kārikās.

³ Bhartṛhari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, published under the inaccurate title *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā*. See AKLUJKAR, "Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā or Tripādī?" to be published in the Adyar Library Bulletin, Madras.

⁴ The evidence in favor of Bhartṛhari's authorship of the V that I have collected from Bhartṛhari's ancient commentators and the authors mentioned in this section is too extensive to be included here without obscuring the main lines of my argument. Also, the parallels that I have noticed between (a) the V and the Tripādī, and (b) the V and the Trikāṇḍī are so numerous as to deserve separate treatments. I shall, therefore, reserve these

1.2 Under these circumstances, any doubt about Bhartṛhari's authorship of the V may seem highly improbable; but, today, all scholars who are interested in the Trikāṇḍī, as far as I know, entertain such a doubt. Their uncertainty of opinion usually begins when they realize that the V occasionally gives two or more interpretations of one verse (kārikā). Then this uncertainty is deepened either by the occurrence in the V of the word *tatra-bhavat*, which, in the usage of some ancient authors, serves as Bhartṛhari's epithet, in a manner indicating reference to a person other than the author (S. IYER 1965: xxxi—xxxii), or by a feeling that some divergence of views exists between the V and the kārikā-text (BIARDEAU 1964a: 5—21 (summarized by S. IYER 1965: xxxiii—xxxiv), 1964b: 260). But doubtful as they may be, no scholar except MADELEINE BIARDEAU is known to me who has declared the traditional authorship of the V to be illfounded and incorrect. BIARDEAU has gone beyond the range of uncertainty about the validity of the tradition and reached the conclusion that the V cannot be a work of Bhartṛhari, that it must have been written by Hari-vṛṣabha sometime after Kumārila, and that the tradition accepted it as Bhartṛhari's work through a confusion of names.

1.3 The purpose of the present article is to refute this conclusion. Not only do I uphold the validity of the traditional ascription, but I also maintain that the V is an inseparable part of the Vākyapadīya and that it is wrong to think of the Vākyapadīya as a work consisting of kārikās only. Now, there are two ways of establishing this thesis, one negative

matters for exhaustive presentations in the near future and, in the meantime, merely draw the attention of scholars to some of my published sources where the relevant pieces of evidence are already pointed out to some extent: C. SHASTRI 1930: 634—638, 644—645, 1934: fns. to various V passages (especially, pp. 3, 5, 87, 103, 115, 126, 128), 1941 (?): fns. to various V passages (especially, V 2.28—29); FRAUWALLNER 1933: 237 (Although the parallel noticed in this article remains valid, FRAUWALLNER, for good reasons, changes his view on the relative chronology of Bhartṛhari and Dinnāga in his 1959 and 1961 publications); K. M. SARMA 1940: 2—4, 1942: 405—409; NAKAMURA 1955: 130; SWAMINATHAN 1963: 66—70; Y. MĪMĀṂSAKA *saṃvat* 2020: 347; BIARDEAU 1964b: 260 fn. 4 conclusion; S. IYER 1965: xvii—xxix, 1966b: 28—30; ABHYANKAR-LIMAYE 1965: 210—216, 240, 297—301 (cp. NAKAMURA 1955: 125, V 1.1), 312 (cp. NAKAMURA 1955: 126, V 1.1 verse *tha*), 328—329 (cp. V 2.315—316), 333 (cp. V 2.64), 352—357; LIMAYE 1966: 228—229; JAMBŪVIJAYA 1966: 40 (V 1.52), 128, *ṭippanāni* p. 57 (cp. V 1.140) 192, *ṭippanāni* p. 68 (V 1.8), 197 (V 1.2), 239, *ṭippanāni* p. 77 (V 1.9), 241, *ṭippanāni* pp. 76—77 fns. 3—5 (V 1.1); AKLUJKAR 1969: 557—561.

and another positive. The negative way consists in challenging BIAUDEAU's method of solving the problem of authorship, in pointing out the difficulties to which her conclusion leads, and in demonstrating that the divergences which she notices between the views and use of terms in the V on the one hand, and in the kārīkās on the other, are superfluous and that some of her interpretations are inaccurate. I have followed this way in a forthcoming sequel article, and hence it would be proper to devote the present article to a positive demonstration of Bhartṛhari's authorship of the V.

2.1 It would not be out of place, however, to preface this presentation of new positive evidence by a consideration of two really relevant facts noticed by S. IYER (1965: xxx—xxxii) as going against the thesis of identical authorship for the kārīkās and the V. The first is that of the alternative explanations in the V of the expressions in the kārīkās. The instances falling in this category, as far as I could find out, are the following: V 1.10, 12, 13, 44; 2.20—21, 39. In the case of all these instances, a careful reading of the Trikāṇḍī and its ancient commentaries will reveal that what seem to be different explanations are also statements of different theses and thoughts acceptable to Bhartṛhari on different levels and in different contexts⁵; there is no question of prefer-

⁵ (a) With *jñānātmakatvād vā puruṣasyaiva saṃskāra-hetavaḥ (vidyā-bhedāḥ)* of V 1.10, compare *atha vā ātma-saṃskārārthaṃ cādhyeṣyaṃ vyākaraṇam* of Tripāḍī p. 5.17; cf. AKLUJKAR 1970: §§ 1.37—38.

(b) V 1.12 clarifies the ways in which *vāk* can become differentiated. For Bhartṛhari's acceptance of those ways from different points of view, see AKLUJKAR 1970: §§ 4.1—10, 21, 5.21—28.

(c) For Bhartṛhari's acceptance of the theses expressed in V 1.13, see (i) AKLUJKAR 1970: §§ 5.15—17, 22; V 1.129 p. 209.1—2; Trikāṇḍī 2.429 and V, 2.434 and V, 3.14.197, 570; (ii) AKLUJKAR 1970: § 1.4, n 1.5, § 6.4, n 6.21—25; (iii) AKLUJKAR 1970: §§ 4.22, 5.3; (iv) AKLUJKAR 1970: § 6.4; (v) AKLUJKAR 1970: § 5.19; (vi) AKLUJKAR 1970: § 5.15.

(d) That there is no incompatibility in the different meanings of the word *upādāna* is clear from V 1.44 itself, where the conditions of the acceptance of each meaning are specified with such words as *vyutpatti-pakṣa* and *sva-rūpa-padārthakeṣu*. See also V 1.47 p. 105.3—5, V 1.50 p. 109.3—4, Trikāṇḍī 2.128, BSS p. 136, Trikāṇḍī 2.175, BSS p. 151, V 2.262.

(e) V 2.20—21 interprets the two kārīkās in the light of both the *śabda-vyakti-pakṣa* and the *śabdākṛti-pakṣa*. For Bhartṛhari's acceptance of these *pakṣas*, see AKLUJKAR 1970: § 4.18.

(f) V 2.39 first explains the kārīkā as stating that the primacy of the sentence is noticed even in the explanatory remarks (*vigraha-vākya*) of grammarians and then as stating that, whether there is one word or more, it is only the sentence which is used for communication. That both these interpretations of the kārīkā express points acceptable to Bhartṛhari is evident from AKLUJKAR 1970: §§ 4.22, 5.3.

ring one explanation or statement to the exclusion of the other, for there is no contradiction between them, the differences between them being more apparent than real. Thus, the verses under consideration can be said to have been deliberately and ingeniously composed in a sufficiently vague or general manner, and the V can be said to have been given the task of clarifying how the statement in a verse holds good on more than one level and in more than one context. In other words, the instances of alternative explanations are also the instances of skilful and careful composition in verse, of welding into one a number of statements. Another fact to be noticed in this connection is that quite frequently the alternative explanations are introduced by the word *apara*. One can show with unmistakable evidence that *apara* does not always mean simply "someone else" or "different"; it is often connotative of approval⁶, as if it is intended to be dissolved as *na vidyate paro yasmāt*. Moreover, Bhartṛhari's zest for, and skill in, varied interpretation are apparent to anyone who reads his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya. Those two aspects of his genius are perfectly understandable in the light of what we learn from Trikaṇḍī 2.478—487. Bhartṛhari's works, it seems, marked the culmination of a movement that was devoted to the revival of Mahābhāṣya studies, in particular, to the unraveling of the various *nyāya-bījas*, *śākhās*, *nyāya-prasthāna-mārgas*, *vartmans*, and *āgamas* that were hidden in the apparently simple statements of the Mahābhāṣya. Therefore, the alternative explanations in the V and the multifaceted composition of certain kārīkās should not come as a surprise to us. The alternative explanations do not indicate that the author of the V is uncertain about the meaning of a verse; he is, in fact, pre-equipped to deal with a verse in more than one way, for he himself has invested certain verses with convenient ambiguity and has thus made them amenable to different interpretations⁷.

2.2 The objection to Bhartṛhari's authorship of the V based on the epithet *tatra-bhavat* can also be easily answered. It is true that Abhinavagupta (see S. IYER 1965: xxii; ABHYANKAR-LIMAYE 1965: 211—213,

⁶ THIEME 1956: 15; AKLUJKAR 1970: § 0.7; Śaṅkara's bhāṣya on the Brahma-sūtras 1.1.25, 27, 1.2.12, 1.3.1, 13.

⁷ It should be noted that my treatment of the objection based on the alternative interpretations is different from that of S. IYER (1965: xxxv), who, in fact, does not offer any satisfactory reply in the comment: "What looks like two different ways of explaining the same text may be nothing more than the recording of the opinion of another on the the [*sic*; same?] subject, unconnected with the text." The alternative explanations are, on S. IYER's (1965: xxx) own admission, connected with the kārīkā-text.

271—272, 274), Indu (see ABHYANKAR-LIMAYE 1965: 329), Bhaṭṭa-nārāyaṇa-kaṇṭha (see NAKAMURA 1955: 130), and Helārāja (3.1.1 p. 7.3, 3.9.62 p. 72.7) seem to associate the epithet rather closely with Bhartṛhari. But, as S. IYER (1965: xxxvi), who first noticed the possible objection to Bhartṛhari's authorship of the V arising out of the occurrence of the epithet in the V, himself observes, *tatra-bhavat* can very well be a reference to a person other than Bhartṛhari. Afterall, *tatra-bhavat* is a very general honorific in Sanskrit at least from the time of the Mahābhāṣya (KIELHORN's edition, Vol. 1 p. 3.5, 11.12, 22.23, 117.23; Vol. 2 p. 233.13, 254.17—19, 265.23—24, 275.21, 314.13, 405.16—18; Vol. 3 p. 174.10). Candrānanda (see JAMBŪVIJAYA 1961: 68) uses it in what is obviously not a reference to Bhartṛhari. Even Abhinava-gupta does not restrict its usage to Bhartṛhari; he uses it also to refer to the authors of the Sāṃkhya-kārikās and the Yoga-sūtras (see MASSON-PATWARDHAN 1969: 114, 125 fns. 1—2). The Vākya-kāṇḍa commentary⁸ (p. 284.19—20, possibly p. 286.3) applies it also to Bhartṛhari's teacher Vasurāta. Moreover, *tatra-bhavat* does not occur only once in the V (2.42) as S. IYER (1965: xxxi, xxxvi) seems to think; it occurs twice (V 2.444), and possibly thrice (V 2.450)⁹. A close study of those occurrences reveals that it refers to an author (or a group of authors; see fn. 9b above) later than Patañjali¹⁰ whose views lend support to, or agree with,

⁸ This commentary, published in the Benares Sanskrit Series (MĀNA-VALLI 1887), is usually ascribed to Puṇyārāja. In a forthcoming article, I wish to point out that a good case can be made for Helārāja's authorship of it. If my guess is correct, then it follows that Helārāja, like Abhinava-gupta, does not restrict the application of the honorific *tatra-bhavat* to Bhartṛhari, that he uses it also in referring to Vasurāta.

⁹ (a) There is a gap in the manuscript before *nto manyante* of V 2.450. A comparison with V 2.444, where the expression *tatra-bhavanto manyante* occurs, shows that the gap can be best filled by supplying the letters *tatra-bhava*. One does not have any justification to supply the letters *iha-bhava* in this instance for two reasons: (i) The expression *iha-bhavantaḥ* does not occur anywhere in the extant portions of the V. (ii) All occurrences of the expression *iha-bhavantaḥ* in the Tripādī are immediately followed by *tv āhuḥ*, and not by *maṇyante*.

(b) The honorific *tatra-bhavat* is used in the singular number in V 2.42, whereas it is used in the plural in V 2.444 and V 2.450. The available evidence is not sufficient to determine if the singular number had a specific connotation in the use of this honorific.

¹⁰ (a) Note *ataḥ* "therefore" in V 2.42: *sa cāyaṃ vākya-padayor ādhi-kyayor bhedo bhāṣya* (Patañjali on Pāṇini 2.3.46, 50) *evopavyākhyātaḥ. ataś ca tatra-bhavān āha* . . . Also note that in V 2.444 *tatra-bhavat* is used only after a reference is made to Patañjali's Bhāṣya on Pāṇini 8.1.28 and 3.1.67.

(b) From the evidence recorded in (a) above it is clear that the guesses of Y. MĪMĀNSAKA (*saṃvat* 2020: 334) and ABHYANKAR-LIMAYE (1965: 440)

Bhartṛhari's views¹¹. In the latter aspect it can be said to contrast with the expression *iha-bhavat*, which occurs five times in the Tripāḍī (ABHYANKAR-LIMAYE edition 1967—70: 51.22, 58.4, 86.2, 204.24, 207.3) in the statements of those views about which Bhartṛhari does not seem to be enthusiastic¹². Its presence in the V, therefore, cannot be thought of as a definite indication of the V not having been written by Bhartṛhari, and our solution of the problem of authorship must not depend on it alone, especially in the light of the facts pointed out above (1.1, 2.1) and below (3.1—8).

3.1 As was indicated in 1.3, it is not my objective in the present article to point out only the weaknesses of the arguments advanced either by BIAUDEAU or by any other scholar. Instead of offering a negative defence of the traditional evidence, I propose to bring to light a new kind of evidence that will clinch the issue in favor of the tradition. So far those scholars who are inclined to accept Bhartṛhari's authorship of the V have concentrated only on the external evidence such as the testimony of authors later than Bhartṛhari. Strangely enough, no serious effort¹³ has been made to examine the internal evidence. My principal objective in this paper, therefore, is to present this latter kind of evidence. However, I shall not here make a case out of the overwhelming similarities of diction, thought, and sources that are noticed in the V, kārikās, and Tripāḍī, for, although it may seem strange to a man of my view to overlook such an impressive body of parallels, BIAUDEAU and those who share her view will always be logically free to accept the possible alternative that the parallels are a result either of borrowings from, or of an

that *tatra-bhavat* of V 2.42 is a reference either to Patañjali or to Vyāḍi cannot be correct. Moreover, Bhartṛhari's explicit references to Patañjali and Vyāḍi are characterized respectively by the words *bhāṣya* (or *cūrṇi*) and *saṃgraha*, not by *tatra-bhavat*.

¹¹ (a) With the view of *tatra-bhavat* in V 2.42, compare V 1.24—26 p. 77, Vṛṣabha pp. 78.25—79.22, Trikāṇḍī 3.14.6 and Helārāja thereon pp. 4—5.

(b) From BSS pp. 70—71 and Trikāṇḍī 2.112 (which answers the objection raised in 2.76), it is evident that the view ascribed to *tatra-bhavat* in V 2.444 meets Bhartṛhari's approval.

(c) Confirmation of the view expressed in V 2.450 is found in 2.68 and its V, and in Helārāja 3.1.5 p. 15.12—13. See also AKLUJKAR 1970: § 6.4, n 6.24.

¹² For the occurrences of *iha-bhavat* in other works, see Y. MĪMĀṢAKA *saṃvat* 2020: 304 and OBERHAMMER 1960: 80 fn. 22.

¹³ C. SHASTRI (1930: 636) and K. M. SARMA (1942: 408) offer some inconclusive internal evidence, while the internal evidence recorded by R. KAVI (1930: 238) is inaccurate.

intensive study of Bhartṛhari on the part of the author of the V. I shall, therefore, mainly focus on what may be described as syntactical and compositional kind of internal evidence. It alone will serve to disprove BIARDEAU's (1964b: 260.10—12) contention that neither the first nor the second kāṇḍa evinces any need for the V in between the kārīkās, that the kārīkā-text is complete in itself¹⁴.

3.2 First of all, let me point out that the author of the V, at one place, clearly indicated that he wrote the kārīkās too. The passage I have in mind is as follows¹⁵:

*ajasra-vṛttir yaḥ śabdaḥ sūkṣmatvān nopalabhyate /
vyajanād vāyur iva sa sva-nimittāt pracīyate || 1.108 ||
athāpara āgamo 'nugamyate. sūkṣmo vāyu-saṁnicaya ivāntar bahiś ca
sarva-mūrtinām dhvanir avasthitaḥ. sa caiṣām ākāśa iti pratipadyate.
sa, yathaiva tu sarvatra paramāṇu-sambhave saṁhatatvād vyajanā-
bhighātena vāyur āśraya-sthānāt pravibhajyamānaḥ kriyābhir āviśyate
tathaiva, dhvaniḥ sva-nimittair abhividyakta-pracita-vikriyā-rūpaḥ
śrotra-pradeśaṁ prāpta upalabhyate saṁskaroti ca.
tasya prāṇe ca yā śaktir yā ca buddhau vyavasthitā /
vivartamānā sthāneṣu saiṣā bhedaṁ prapadyate || 1.109 ||
darśana-bhedā¹⁶ evaite. nāyam anantaraḥ pracaya-dharmā dhvanir iha*

¹⁴ It is important to remember in this connection that the Trikāṇḍi kārīkās do not belong to the sūtra-form of literature. Syntactical incompleteness cannot, therefore, be a regular feature of them. Hence, if it is shown, as has been attempted in the following pages, that the V brings about a syntactical completion of certain kārīkās, then it follows that the kārīkās anticipate the V, that Bhartṛhari expects his reader to read the kārīkās in conjunction with the V.

¹⁵ To understand the difficult Sanskrit passages quoted in this and the following sections, the existing translations of the Brahma-kāṇḍa, however unsatisfactory they may be at places, should be utilized, those of BIARDEAU (1964a) and S. IYER (1965) for the kārīkās and the V, and that of Śānti-bhikṣu Śāstri (1963) for the kārīkās only. It is regrettable that a good edition and translation of the Vākyapadīya are even now the great desiderata of Bhartṛhari studies. To keep my presentation uncomplicated, I have refrained from introducing any translations in the present article, although all ideas and expressions that are of vital importance for the topic under discussion have been invariably clarified.

¹⁶ All the editions of the Brahma-kāṇḍa-vṛtti read *pakṣa-bhedā*; but commentator Vṛṣabha (p. 179.6—7) preserves the reading accepted here. His is a more appropriate reading, for while *pakṣa* usually means "alternative" *darśana* means "point of view, theory, view of reality," and verses 1.107—109 are definitely not a statement of alternatives. Also, see V 1.45 p. 103.6, Tripādī p. 19.1.

*śloke nirdiśyate. śabdā tu pūrva-prakṛtaḥ pravāda-bhedair anvā-
khyāyate. . . .*

The last two sentences of this passage mean: "It is not this immediately preceding *dhvani*, having the property of growth (= becoming gross), which is mentioned in this verse; but the *śabda* which was formerly taken up for discussion with reference to various views is being explained (or subsequently mentioned)." Now, the immediately preceding verse, 1.108, does not contain the word *dhvani*. Only the V on that verse mentions *dhvani*. But the author of the V evidently suspected that some reader may misunderstand *tasya* in verse 1.109 as a pronoun standing for *dhvaniḥ* in V 1.108¹⁷. Obviously, he looked upon both the V and the *kārikā* to be his own words intended to be read consecutively.

3.3 My first piece of the syntactical kind of evidence reveals that, at least once¹⁸ in the first *kāṇḍa*, a *kārikā* is incomplete without the V and vice versa. Thus, we read in the case of verse 1.92:

*sphoṭeṣu*¹⁹

*bhāgavatsv api teṣv eva rūpa-bhedo dhvaneḥ kramāt /
nirbhāgeṣv abhyupāyo vā bhāga-bheda-prakalpanam //*

¹⁷ *tasyeti sarva-nāmnānantarasya dhvaneḥ pracaya-dharmināḥ pratyava-
marśāsāṅkā na karaṇīyā [ity āha] . . . kasya tarhi tasya ity anena saṁbandha
ity āha śabdā tu iti.* (Vṛṣabha pp. 178.26—179.6)

¹⁸ It is possible that the V supplied *padāni* to verse 2.55. Unfortunately, however, the guess cannot be confirmed, for the V of that verse is missing in the only available, incomplete, and highly corrupt manuscript of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-vṛtti* (AKLUJKAR 1969: 555—556).

¹⁹ In all the editions of the *Brahma-kāṇḍa-vṛtti*, *sphoṭeṣu* is printed as the last word in the V of verse 1.91: . . . *tathaiṣām arvāg-darśanānām
pratipattiṇām vākya-sva-rūpa-grahaṇa-pūrvakeṇa vākyaṛtha-grahanena pra-
dhānena prayuktānām niyatopāye sādhye tasminn arthe niyata-krama-
pariṇāma-bhāgākāra-pratyavabhāsa-mātrā-yuktā buddhayaḥ pravartante spho-
teṣu //* 91 //. This is an error on the part of the editors not only for the reasons mentioned in 3.3 but also for some additional ones. If the cited sentence or clause is read in this manner, its interpreter must understand that there are two loci or objects for the cognitions (*buddhi*) of which it speaks; one locus is expressed by *niyatopāye sādhye tasminn arthe* and the other is expressed by *sphoṭeṣu*. The interpreter then fails to understand why the first expression should be in the singular and the second in the plural or why there should be a long intervening phrase between the two. In fact, he fails to understand why there should be two loci at all. Furthermore, a sentence ending with *pravartante sphoṭeṣu* goes against the stylistic peculiarity of the V that a verb form usually occurs at the end of a sentence. Failure to realize this editorial mistake of C. SHASTRI (1934: 91) has led BIARDEAU (1964a: 133) and S. IYER (1965: 90) to offer confusing translations, and R. ŚARMĀ (1963: 167) to paraphrase the words of the original in an irritatingly superfluous manner.

Here *sphoṭeṣu* in the V will clearly remain dangling if it is not understood to be a part of what follows. The *kārikā* will also be incomplete and out of step with the preceding *kārikā* (see fn. 19 above) if *sphoṭeṣu* is not read into it. Thus, here we have one phrase with a locative absolute construction *teṣv eva sphoṭeṣu bhāgavatsv api* which spreads over both the V and the verse, the subject of which appears only in the V, and the pronoun in which will have no antecedent if the V is missing.

3.4 The third piece of internal evidence is found in verse 1.65 and its V:

evaṃ ca kṛtvoccāryamāṇasya
tasyābhidheya-bhāvena yaḥ śabdāḥ samavasthitaḥ /
tasyāpy uccāraṇe rūpam anyat tasmād vivicyate //,

Here the syntactical relation between *uccāryamāṇasya* and *tasya* if too obvious to need any comment. What is more important is that, if the phrase *evaṃ ca kṛtvoccāryamāṇasya* were missing, we would not have either understood the relation of the present *kārikā* with the preceding *kārikā* or we would have done so only by overlooking a grave syntactic anomaly nowhere to be noticed in the well-preserved portions of Bhartṛhari's writings. In the preceding *kārikā*, which is

guṇaḥ prakarṣa-hetur yaḥ svātantreṇopadiśyate /
tasyāśritād guṇād eva prakṛṣṭatvaṃ pratiyate // 1.64 //,

the pronoun *tasya* stands for *guṇaḥ*. In the absence of the V phrase connecting the two *kārikās*, *tasya* in the present *kārikā* would also have referred back to *guṇaḥ* and the *kārikā* would not have conveyed any consistent meaning whatsoever.

3.5 This leads us to the next finding that, in about ten²⁰ instances, the V is joined to the following *kārikā* in a manner which is different from the manner in which Sanskrit commentators, while commenting on somebody else's work, introduce the words of that work. The instances I have in mind are as follows:

(a) . . . *tatra vṛddhyādayaḥ śabdāḥ sva-rūpādhiṣṭhānāḥ svenārthenārthavantaḥ sva-rūpeṇa śabdāntara-sva-rūpāṇy upajighṛkṣantaḥ svarānunaśikya-bhinnair ākārādibhir, ādaicchabdādibhiḥ pratyāyitaiḥ, sam-*

²⁰ I am not sure whether one should include V 2.28—29 in this group.

*bandham yena prakāreṇa pratipadyante, tenaiva prakāreṇa*²¹ *durava-*
*dhāratve 'pi bhedasya*²²

agni-śabdas tathaivāyam agni-śabda-nibandhanah /
agni-śrutyai sambandham agni-śabdābhidheyayā || 1.60 ||

(b) 1.65 and its V. See 3.4.

(c) *yathā viśayendriya-dharma evāyam prākṛta-cakṣuṣām, dūrād*
*ārūpa-mātropalabdharu*²³ *vṛkṣādīn hastyādivat pratipadyante, tad-*
deśāvasthitā eva prañidhānābhyāsāt krameṇa punar yathāvayavam
[yathāvad?] upalabhante, vyaktālokāc ca deśāt sahasā manda-
saṁniviṣṭa-prakāśān apavarakādīn pravīṣya rajjvādīn sarpādivat
pratipadya tathaiva prañidhānābhyāsāc cakṣuṣi prakṛtiṣthe yathāvad
*upalabhante*²⁴

*vyajyamāne tathā*²⁵ *vākye vakyābhivvyakti-hetubhiḥ /*
bhāgāvagraha-rūpeṇa pūrvam buddhiḥ pravartate || 1.90 ||

(d) 1.92 and its V. See 3.3.

(e) *devadattādīnām ca [vi]bhāgābhimatānām artha-yogābhyupagame,*

²¹ There is no indication of the phrase *tenaiva prakāreṇa* in Vṛṣabha's commentary. In view of *tathaiva* in the kārikā that follows, it does introduce redundancy in the construction proposed by me. But this fact does not indicate that the author of the V is not the same as that of the kārikā-text. In all well-known works of the kārikā-vṛtti type, an effort is made to give as much syntactical independence as is possible to each type of text. This is most probably so because the ancient writers were aware of the tendency of (and convenience in) singling out the metrical kārikā-text for the purposes of study and memorisation. Connecting the *dṛṣṭānta* with the *dārṣṭāntika* separately in verse and prose portions is a result of such considerations. Compare the V on kārikās 1.89—90; 2.20—21, 185—186, 216—217, 275—278, 298—299, 300—301, 420—421, 462—463. Unfortunately the V on the kārikās 2.8—9, 90—92, 93—94, in which also the *dṛṣṭānta* and the *dārṣṭāntika* spread over more than one verse, is lost in the manuscript.

²² All editions indicate the end of V 1.59 after *bhedasya*. Overlooking the fact that the preceding words do not form a complete sentence. As a consequence, BIARDEAU (1964a: 101) and S. IYER (1965: 64) are forced to supply some words in their translations. R. ŚARMĀ (1963: 121) seems to have sensed the syntactical difficulty; but he does not point it out explicitly.

²³ The editions read *ākṛti-mātropalabdharu*; but Vṛṣabha's (p. 155 fn. 3) reading, which is adopted here, is more appropriate both contextually and stylistically. See V 1.81 p. 148.1; V 1.102 p. 168.2 (Vṛṣabha p. 168.14); V 1.116 p. 191.1.

²⁴ According to the editors of the available editions, *upalabhante* marks the end of a syntactically complete sentence. That is why they put a full stop after it. As a result, both BIARDEAU (1964a: 131) and S. IYER (1965: 89) overlook the initial word *yathā* in their translations.

²⁵ The word *tathā* is primarily connected with *yathaiva* in verse 1.89 and only secondarily with *yathā* in V 1.89. See fn. 21 above.

*sāmānye 'vasthitānām padānām viśeṣe 'vasthānam ity etasmin
satyatāmśena*²⁶ *parigṛhyamāṇe*

*sāmānyārthas tīrobhūto na viśeṣe 'vatiṣṭhate |
upāttasya kutas tyāgo, nivr̥ttaḥ kvāvatiṣṭhatām || 2.15 ||*

(f) *nitya-vādinām tv*²⁷ *anāgantukam anatīkrāntam anupacayāpa-
cayam*

*prakāśaka-prakāśyatvaṃ kārya-kāraṇa-rūpatā |
antarmātrātmanas tasya śabda-tattvasya sarvadā || 2.32 ||*

(g) *tatraivaṃ śāstreṇāparyudaste viśeṣāntara-sahacārīṇi dravyatve
asamīdhau pratinidhir mā bhūn nityasya kārmaṇaḥ |
kāmyasya vā pravṛttasya lopa ity upapadyate || 2.70 ||*

(h) *nirjñāte ca bhede*

*prasiddhārtha-viparyāsa-nimittam yac ca dṛśyate |
yas tasmāl lakṣyate bhedas tam asatyam pracakṣate || 2.289 ||*

(i) *ye tūtsargāpavādayor eka-vākyatvaṃ icchanti teṣāṃ*

*niyamaḥ pratiśedhaś ca vidhi-śeṣas tathā sati |
dvitīye yo lug ākhyātas taccheṣam alukaṃ viduḥ || 2.350 ||*

It should be noted that in these instances the introductory words of the V are not simply of the form *tasmāt*, *api ca*, *apara āha*, etc. as they are in some other portions of the V. Nor do they simply explain the background of a verse, although they are found to play that role in other introductions of the V (see 3.8). What we have here are words which are syntactically connected with the verses, which are absolutely essential to understand the connections between verses, and which, in most cases, supplement the statements in the verses significantly. The author of the V clearly does not follow the path which Sanskrit commentators commenting on somebody else's work follow.

3.6 Now we come to the compositional kind of evidence. In verses 1.24—26, eight topics which form the subject matter of the Vākyapadīya are enumerated. They are: (a) meanings determined through analysis; (b) meanings of stable character; (c) linguistic forms or units that are to be analyzed; (d) linguistic forms or units that figure in grammatical derivations; (e) cause-and-effect relation; (f) fitness or capability relation; (g) relation that leads to merit; and (h) relation that causes cognition:

²⁶ My transcript of the Vākya-kāṇḍa-vṛtti manuscript reads *satya-
tomśena*. C. SHASTRI (1941 [?]) reads *satyekāntena*.

²⁷ I do not understand the significance of *nitya-vādinām tu* in this specific context. The preceding verse or portion of the V does not seem to be a statement of the view of the *anītya-vādin*.

*apoddhāra-padārthā ye, ye cārthāḥ sthita-lakṣaṇāḥ /
 anvākhyaeyāś ca ye śabdā, ye cāpi pratipādakāḥ // 24 //*
*kārya-kāraṇa-bhāvena yogya-bhāvena ca sthitāḥ /
 dharme ye pratyaye cāṅgaṃ sambandhāḥ sādhasādhuṣu // 25 //*
*te liṅgaiś ca sva-śabदैś ca śāstre 'sminn upavarṇitāḥ /
 smrtyartham anugamyante kecid eva yathāgamam // 26 //*

After this enumeration, one would naturally expect verse 27 to begin a discussion of the first topic, namely the *apoddhāra-padārtha*. Instead, one finds it initiating the discussion of the seventh topic which is the *dharma-sambandha* and *adharma-sambandha* respectively of the *sādhu* and *asādhu* linguistic forms. The only satisfactory reason for skipping over the first six topics in the *kārikās* is that those, and only those, are mainly covered in the V of verses 1.24—26. The seventh topic alone remains to be explained²⁸ and the twenty-seventh verse takes it up for discussion.

3.7 The next piece of evidence indicates even more strongly that the *kārikās* anticipate the V. It is as follows:

*vitarkitāḥ purā buddhyā kvacid arthe niveśitāḥ /
 karanebhyo vivṛttena dhvaninā so 'nugṛhyate // 1.47 //*
*... avikriyā-dharmakam hi śabda-tattvaṃ dhvaniṃ vikriyā-dharmā-
 ṇam anu vikriyate. tac ca sūkṣme vyāpini dhvanau karaṇa-vyāpāreṇa
 pracīyamāne, sthūlenābhra-saṃghātavad upalabhyena nādātmanā
 prāpta-vivarte²⁹ tad-vivartānukāreṇātyantam avivartamānam vivarta-
 mānam iva gṛhyate.*

²⁸ That there is cognition of meaning because *śabda* and *artha* are related is such a basic, common sense fact (Vṛṣabha, p. 81.18—19) that Bhartṛhari has not been forced to devote much space to discuss it. Also, the discussions of the three remaining relations are indirectly a discussion of the *pratyayāṅga* relation.

²⁹ The editions read *prāpta-vivartena*. But then the sentence seems to be syntactically anomalous; the relation of the locative absolute construction *sūkṣme* ... *pracīyamāne* to the succeeding portion of the sentence is not clear; further, what is ambiguity as to what the component *tad-* in the compound *tad-vivartānukāreṇa* refers to—to *dhvani* or to *nādātman*. Most probably it refers to *dhvani*, for the segment *nādātmanā prāpta-vivartena tad-vivartānukāreṇa* with *tad-* referring to *nādātman* would be a very awkward way of saying what could be said simply with *nādātma-vivartānukāreṇa*. Moreover, in the very preceding sentence, Bhartṛhari says ... *dhvaniṃ vikriyā-dharmāṇam anu vikriyate*. It is almost certain then that *tad-* refers to *dhvani*. This point aids us further in guessing what the original text of the V could have been. The *vivarta* mentioned in the compound *prāpta-vivarta* must then be the *vivarta* of *dhvani* and the compound as a whole must qualify *dhvani*; that is, its form must have been *prāpta-vivarte* which

*nādasya krama-janmatvān na pūrvo na paraś ca saḥ /
akramaḥ krama-rūpeṇa bhedaṁ iva jāyate || 1.48 ||
kramavatā hi vyāpāreṇopasaṁhriyamāṇa-pracaya-rūpo nādaḥ saprati-
bandhābhyānujñayā vṛttyā sphoṭaṁ avadyotayati. . . .
pratibimbaṁ yathānyatra sthitaṁ toya-kriyā-vaśāt /
tat-pravṛttim ivānveti sa dharmāḥ sphoṭa-nādayoḥ || 1.49 ||*

In this passage, we observe a transfer from *dhvani* in verse 1.47 to *nāda* in verse 1.48. These two words are not synonymous for the *śabda-vyakti-vādin*, whose view is put forward in this passage and in verses 1.94—101. According to him, *dhvani* is subtle and pervading, whereas *nāda* is the gross and perceptible form of *dhvani*. He maintains that *dhvani* manifests the *sphoṭa* through the intermediacy or instrumentality of *nāda*. In switching over to *nāda*, verse 1.48 must be said to assume an indication of this theoretical subtlety in the V of verse 1.47. Otherwise, Bhartṛhari's choice of terms becomes pointless; the juxtaposition of *sphoṭa* and *nāda* in verses 1.48—49, 97 and, rather indirectly, in 1.101 does not contrast significantly with the juxtaposition of *sphoṭa* and *dhvani* in verses 1.75, 77, 81, and 93³⁰ which seem to put forward the view of the *śabdākṛti-vādin*. The second transfer that we notice in the passage cited above is from *saḥ* in verses 1.47 and 48 (= *buddhisthaḥ śabdaḥ* in verse 1.46) to *sphoṭa-* in verse 1.49. It also cannot be accounted for unless V 1.48 introduces the term *sphoṭa* which is not found in any of the preceding *kārikās*.

3.8 Furthermore, the first two *kāṇḍas* contain many instances in which a plausible and straight-forward interpretation of a *kārikā* is made possible only by the V. In about thirty-six cases, the fact that the *kārikā* considers and answers an objection or a query, and the nature of that objection or query are known only from the V: 1.76, 95—100, 132, 142; 2.14, 23, 25, 36—37, 46, 48, 51, 62, 68, 159, 193—196, 200—201, 221—226, 333, 340, 363, 365. That the *kārikā* switches over to the consideration of an alternative or a different view is made known only by

agrees with *dhvanau*. This emendation extends the locative absolute construction up to *prāpta-vivarte* and the syntactiḥ anomaly is removed. It seems that the copyists were led to add *-na* after *-vivarte* by the frequent occurrence of *n* and *na* in this sentence.

³⁰ In verse 1.84, which forms a part of the group of verses (1.75—93) mainly stating the process of *sphoṭa*-manifestation according to the *śabdākṛti-vādins*, *nāda* and *dhvani* occur side by side. This is probably due to the exigency of the meter. Vṛṣabha (p. 150.7, 9), who usually does not explain the meanings of common expressions, comments specifically in this case: *nādayoḥ iti dhvanibhiḥ*.

the V in about forty-two cases: 1.73, 94, 104, 108—109, 137; 2.19—22, 41—42, 49, 60—61, 66, 183—184, 256, 261—262, 269, 285—286, 315—316, 328—329, 331, 350—352, 360, 395, 409, 415, 438, 440—441, 445—446, 455, 459, 461—463, 473. Moreover, the relevance, background, role in a particular context (say, as analogy or example), and serving as the starting point of a new topic would never be known exactly, if the V were not available to guide us, in the case of at least 25 kārīkās: 1.28, 63—64, 76, 78—80, 84; 2.15—16, 41, 59, 64, 70, 76—87, 164—165, 197—198, 205, 239, 272, 298—299, 304—313, 353, 372, 417. It is the responsibility of those who hold that the available V is not an integral part of the Vākyapadīya, to demonstrate that each and every verse mentioned above can be interpreted satisfactorily without the aid of the V or of any commentary following the V. In my opinion, the kārīkās obviously need supplementation to be understood properly and hence clearly evince the author's plan to write a gloss on them³¹. As the present V accomplishes the desired supplementation and as it is unanimously held to be an integral part of the Vākyapadīya in a continuous, old, and impressively documented tradition, it must be the gloss written by Bhartṛhari. To say that the original gloss of Bhartṛhari was lost and a new one written by some later author took its place is unwarranted, is not borne out by any reliable piece of evidence, and amounts to nothing but a desperate attempt to seek refuge in the subterfuge of a remote possibility.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABHYANKAR, K. V. and LIMAYE, V. P. 1965. (Eds.) Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari. University of Poona Sanskrit and Prakrit Series Vol. II. Poona.
- 1967. (Eds.) Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā of Bhartṛhari. Part I. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Post-graduate and Research Department Series No. 8. Poona.
- 1969/70. Part II of the same. My references are to the printed forms kindly supplied by the editors.
- AKLUJKAR, ASHOK. 1969. "Two Textual Studies of Bhartṛhari." JAOS 89. 547—563. New Haven.
- 1970. The Philosophy of Bhartṛhari's Trikāṇḍī. Ph. D. dissertation. Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass. [Unpublished].
- BHAGWAT, V. B. 1965. (Ed. and transl.) Śrīmad-Bhartṛhari-viracitaṃ Svopajña-ṭīkā-samanvitaṃ Vākyapadīyam (Brahma-Kāṇḍam). Grantha Saṃśodhana Prakāśana Maṇḍala, publication no. 2. Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth. Poona. [Marathi].

³¹ In a future article, I shall consider the verses of the third kāṇḍa from this point of view.

- BIARDEAU, MADELEINE. 1964a. (Ed. and transl.) Vākyapadiya Brahma-kāṇḍa avec la Vṛtti de Harivṛṣabha. Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne. Série IN-8°. Fascicule 24. Paris.
- 1964b. Théorie de la Connaissance et Philosophie de la Parole dans le Brahmanisme classique. Mouton and Co. The Hague.
- BSS. See MĀNAVALĪ.
- CHARUDEVA SHASTRI. 1930. "Bhartṛhari: a Critical Study with Special Reference to the Vākyapadiya and its Commentaries." Proceedings and Transactions of the Fifth Indian Oriental Conference. Vol. I. Pp. 630—665. Lahore.
- 1934. (Ed.) Vākyapadiyam Prathamam Kāṇḍam. Ramlal Kapoor Trust. Lahore.
- 1941 (?). (Ed.) Vākyapadiyam Dvitiyam Kāṇḍam. Ramlal Kapoor Trust. Lahore. [Incomplete; see AKLUJKAR 1969: 555].
- FRAUWALLNER, ERICH. 1933. "Dignāga und anderes." Festschrift Moriz Winternitz. Leipzig.
- 1959. "Dignāga, sein Werk und seine Entwicklung." WZKSO 3.83—164. Vienna.
- 1961. "Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic." WZKSO 5.125—148. Vienna.
- Helārāja. Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa: (a) Samuddeśas 1—7: (Ed.) SUBRAMANIA IYER, K. A. Deccan College Monograph Series No. 21. 1963. Poona. (b) Samuddeśas 8—13: (Ed.) SĀMBA-ŚIVA ŚĀSTRĪ, K. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. CXVI. 1935. Trivandrum. (c) Samuddeśa 14: (Ed.) RAVI VARMA, L. A. University of Travancore Sanskrit Series No. CXLVIII. 1942. Trivandrum.
- JAMBŪVIJAYA, MUNI. 1961. (Ed.) Vaiśeṣika-sūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda. Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. 136. Baroda.
- 1966. (Ed.) Dvādaśāra-naya-cakra of Malla-vādin with the Commentary of Siṃha-sūri-gaṇin. Jain Ātmānanda Sabhā. Bhavnagar.
- K. M. SARMA. 1940. "Bhartṛhari Not a Buddhist: Evidence from Nearer Home." PO 5.1—5. Poona.
- 1942. "Gleanings from the Commentaries on the Vākyapadiya." ABORI 23.405—412. Poona.
- KIELHORN, F. 1880. (Ed.) The Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. 3 Vols. Department of Public Instruction, Government of Bombay. Second edition 1892. Third edition 1962—1970: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- KUNHAN RAJA, C. 1936. "I-ting and Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadiya." S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume. Pp. 285—298. Madras.
- LIMAYE, V. P. 1966. "Dhyānagraha-kāra or Dhyāna-kāra: a Pre-Bhartṛhari Grammarian." VIJ 4.228—229. Hoshiarpur.
- MĀNAVALĪ, GAṄGĀDHARA ŚĀSTRĪ. 1887. (Ed.) Vākyapadiyam ... Śrī-Bhartṛhari-... viracitam Śrī-Puṇyarāja-kṛta-prakāśākhya-ṭikā-yutam. Benares Sanskrit Series Nos. 11, 19, and 24. Benares.
- MASSON, J. L. and PATWARDHAN, M. V. 1969. Śāntarasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetics. Bhandarkar Oriental Series No. 9. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- NAKAMURA, HAJIME. 1955. "Tibetan Citations of Bhartṛhari's Verses and

- the Problem of His Date." Studies in Indology and Buddhology Presented in Honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday. Pp. 122—136. Kyoto.
- OBERHAMMER, G. 1960. "The Authorship of the *Ṣaṣṭitantram*." WZKSO 4.71—89. Vienna.
- RAGHUNĀTHA ŚARMĀ. 1963. (Ed. and comment.) *Vākyapadiya* [Brahmakāṇḍa] with the Commentary Ambākartri. Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā No. 91. Varanasi.
- RAMAKRISHNA KAVI, M. 1930. "The Discovery of the Author's *Vṛtti* on the *Vākyapadiya*." JAHRS 4.235—241. Rajahmundry.
- RAU, WILHELM. 1962. "Über sechs Handschriften des *Vākyapadiya*." Oriens, 15.374—398. Wiesbaden.
- 1964. "Handschriften des *Vākyapadiya*." Oriens, 17.182—198. Wiesbaden.
- SADHU RAM. 1952. "Bhartṛhari's Date." JGJhRI 9.135—151. Allahabad.
- ŚĀNTI-BHIKṢU ŚĀSTRĪ. 1963. (Ed. and transl.) "Āgamasamuccaya. Alias *Vākyapadiya-Brahmakāṇḍa* of Bhartṛhari." Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig 12.191—228. Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe. Heft 1. Leipzig.
- SUBRAMANIA IYER, K. A. 1965. (Transl.) *The Vākyapadiya of Bhartṛhari with the Vṛtti*. Chapter I. Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series No. 26. Poona.
- 1966a. (Ed.) *Vākyapadiya of Bhartṛhari with the Vṛtti, and the Paddhati of Vṛṣabhadeva*. Deccan College Monograph Series No. 32. Poona.
- 1966b. (Ed. and transl.) *The Sphoṭa-siddhi of Maṇḍana Miśra*. Deccan College Building Centenary Series No. 25. Poona.
- SWAMINATHAN, V. 1963. "Bhartṛhari's Authorship of the Commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*." ALB 27.59—70. Madras.
- THIEME, PAUL. 1956. "Pāṇini and the Pāṇinīyas." JAOS 76.1—23. New Haven.
- Trikāṇḍī. (a) Kāṇḍa 1: see S. IYER 1966a. (b) Kāṇḍa 2: see MĀNAVALLĪ 1887. The numbering of the *Vākyapadiya* verses in this edition is quite often inaccurate. My references to the second kāṇḍa assume a correction of those inaccuracies. Unfortunately the V of the second kāṇḍa is yet to be published in its entirety. I have, therefore, been forced to refer to my hand-written copy of that V. See AKLUJKAR 1969: 555—556.
- (c) Kāṇḍa 3: see Helārāja.
- Tripādī. See ABHYANKAR-LIMAYE 1967—1970.
- Vṛṣabha. See S. IYER 1966a.
- Vṛtti. See S. IYER 1966a, C. SHASTRI 1941 (?), and Trikāṇḍī.
- YUDHIṢṬHIRA MĪMĀNSAKA. *saṃvat* 2020. *Saṃskṛta Vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā Itihāsa*. Vol. I. Revised edition. Bhāratīya Prācya-vidyā Pratiṣṭhāna. Ajmer.