THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE VĀKYAPADĪYA-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 Trikāṇḍi to Bhartṛhari and to accept it as an integral part of the Vākyapadīya.¹ 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 Vākyā-kāṇḍa-vṛtti available to me in microfilms 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) Vākyapadīya was originally the title of only the first two kāṇḍas of Bhartṛhari’s magnum opus; the entire work consisting of three kāṇḍas was called Trikāṇḍi 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 Vākyapadīya. See “The Extent of Bhartṛhari’s Vṛtti” (Aklujkar, forthcoming).

(c) It has been convincingly shown by C. Shastri (1930: 636—644, 1934: Skt. Introd.: 18—26; cf. R. Kavi 1930: 235—241; Kunhān 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 manuscripts\textsuperscript{2} 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-śila, Jayanta-bhaṭṭa, Jñānaśrī-bhadra, (1966a) in full. In its former version it finds its way into most of R. Śarma’s commentary Ambākarṭī, the other—original—parts of the Ambākarṭī being mostly unhelpful for an exact understanding of Bhartṛhari’s position and for the solution of textual difficulties.

(e) For the state of the Vākyā-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.

\textsuperscript{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: \textit{iti śrī-hari-vṛṣabha-mahāvaiyākaraṇa-viracite vākyapadiye āgama-samuccayo nāma brahma-kāṇḍaṃ samāptam} (C. Shastri 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: \textit{iti śrī-bhaṅgavad-bhartṛhari-vṛṣabha-mahāvaiyākaraṇa-pāda-viracite vākyapadiye prakīrṇaka-nāmanī pada-kāṇḍe vṛtti-samuddeśas caturdaśaḥ} (C. Shastri 1930: 635; S. Iyer 1965: xviii; Rau 1962: 387—388, 390, 392, 1964: 194). Now, there is no justification for the person designated by \textit{hari-vṛṣabha-mahāvaiyākaraṇa} of the first colophon is different from the person designated by \textit{bhaṅgavad-bhartṛhari-vṛṣabha-mahāvaiyākaraṇa-pāda} of the second colophon, for (i) hari as a shorter form of \textit{bhartṛhari} occurs quite frequently in later literature, and (ii) the terms \textit{bhaṅgava}t and \textit{mahāvaiyākaraṇa-pāda} are merely more expressive of respect than the term \textit{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 \textit{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. Shastri (1930: 635) and S. Iyer (1965: xviii), the member \textit{-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 \textit{puruṣa-vṛṣabha}. But R. Kavi (1930: 235 fn. 2) thinks that \textit{-vṛṣabha} was appended to Bhartṛhari’s name because he staunchly maintained the doctrine of \textit{śabda-brahman} denoted by the word \textit{śabda-vṛṣabha} in his work (1.123 and its V). Going against the first explanation is the fact that \textit{-vṛṣabha} as expressive of respect is redundant in the light of \textit{mahāvaiyākaraṇa} or \textit{bhaṅgavad-mahāvaiyākaraṇa-pāda}. Detrimental to the second explanation is the fact that the soul of human beings, which in its
The purest essential aspect is śabda-brahman of Bhartṛhari (see AKLJUJKAR 1970), was described as vrśabha 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 vrśabha 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-vṛṣabha 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 -vrśabha 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 -vrśabha 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-vṛṣabha 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 kānda are also found to belong to a common south Indian source (S. IGU 1966a: ix, xv—xvi), which indicates that Vṛṣabha’s Tīkā 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. atma-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 vrśabha 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-dipīka. See AKLJUJKAR, “Mahābhāṣya-dipīka or Tripādi?” 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 Tripādi, 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
and another positive. The negative way consists in challenging Biard'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 kārikās 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 Bhartrhari'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 kārikās and the V. The first is that of the alternative explanations in the V of the expressions in the kārikās. 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 Trikāṇḍi and its ancient commentaries will reveal that what seem to be different explanations are also statements of different theses and thoughts acceptable to Bhartrhari on different levels and in different contexts; there is no question of prefer-


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


(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-paḍārthakaśu. See also V 1.47 p. 190.3—5, V 1.50 p. 109.3—4, Trikāṇḍi 2.128, BSS p. 138, Trikāṇḍi 2.175, BSS p. 151, V 2.262.

(e) V 2.20—21 interprets the two kārikās in the light of both the sābda-vyakti-pakṣa and the sābdākṛti-pakṣa. For Bhartrhari's acceptance of these pakṣas, see Akūjar 1970: § 4.18.

(f) V 2.39 first explains the kārikā as stating that the primacy of the sentence is noticed even in the explanatory remarks (vīgraha-vākyya) 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 kārikā express points acceptable to Bhartrhari is evident from Akūjar 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 aparā. One can show with unmistakable evidence that aparā 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 Trikāṇḍi 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-bijas, 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 kārikās 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 Abhinava-gupta (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 kārikā-text.
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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 Mahā-
bhāṣya (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). Candrāṇanda (see Jambūvidyā 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 Śāmkhya-kārikās and the Yoga-sūtras (see Masson-Patwardhan
1969: 114, 125 fns. 1—2). The Vākya-kāṇḍa commentary\(^8\) (p. 284.19—
20, possibly p. 286.3) applies it also to Bhartṛhari’s teacher Vasūrāta.
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 Patañjali\(^{10}\) whose views lend support to, or agree with,

---

\(^{8}\) This commentary, published in the Benares Sanskrit Series (Māna-
vallī 1887), is usually ascribed to Pūnyarāja. 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 Vasūrāta.

\(^{9}\) (a) There is a gap in the manuscript before nito manyante of V 2.450.
A comparison with V 2.444, where the expression tatra-bhavanto manyante
occurs, shows that the gap can be 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 Tripāṭī are immediately followed by tv
ādhuh, and not by manyante.

(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 atah “therefore” in V 2.42: sa cāyaṃ vākya-padayor ādhī-
kṣayor bheda bhāṣya (Patañjali on Pāṇini 2.3.46, 50) evopavākyhātah. atah
ca tatra-bhavān ādha . . . 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. Mīmāṁsaka (saṃvat 2020: 334) and Abhyankar-Limaye (1965: 440)
Bhartṛhari’s views. In the latter aspect it can be said to contrast with the expression *iha-bhavat*, which occurs five times in the *Tripādi* (*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 enthusiastic. 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 Biardeau 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 effort 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 *Tripādi*, for, although it may seem strange to a man of my view to overlook such an impressive body of parallels, Biardeau 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 Vyādi cannot be correct. Moreover, Bhartṛhari’s explicit references to Patañjali and Vyādi are characterized respectively by the words *bhāṣya* (or *cārṇi*) and *sangraha*, not by *tatra-bhavat*.


(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. *Mīmāṃsaka saṃvart* 2020: 304 and *Oberhammer* 1960: 80 fn. 22.

13 C. Shahtri (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.
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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 kārikās, that the kārikā-text is complete in itself

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

\[ ajasa-vṛttir yaḥ śabdāḥ sūkṣmatvān nopalabhyate / vyajanād vāyur iva sa sva-nimittā praciṣṭaye // 1.108 // \]
\[ athāpara āgamo 'nugamyate. sūkṣmo vāyu-saṃnicaya ivāntar bahiś ca sarva-mūrtināṁ dhvanir avasthitāḥ. sa caiṣām ākāśa iti pratipadyate. sa, yathāiva tu sarvatra paramānu-saṃbhave saṃhatatvād vyajanābhīghātena vāyur āśraya-sthānāt pravihbhayamānaḥ kriyābhir āvibhyate tathāvai, dhvanih sva-nimittair abhivyaktā-pracita-vikriyā-rūpaḥ śrotra-pradeśam prāpta upalabhyate saṃskaroti ca. \]
\[ tasya prāne ca yā saktir yā ca buddhau vyavasthitā / vivartamāna sthāneṣu saīṣā bhedam prapadyate // 1.109 // \]
\[ darśana-bhedā evaite. nāyam anantaraḥ pracaya-dharmā dhvanir iha \]

14 It is important to remember in this connection that the Trikāṇḍi kārikās 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 kārikās, then it follows that the kārikās anticipate the V, that Bhartṛhari expects his reader to read the kārikās 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 kārikās and the V, and that of Śānti-bhikṣu Śāstrī (1963) for the kārikās only. It is regrettable that a good edition and translation of the Vākyā-kāṇḍa 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-vṛttī read pakṣa-bhedā; but commentator Vṛṣabhā (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, Tripādi p. 19.1.
śloke nirdiśyate. śabdas tu pūrva-prakṛtaḥ pravāda-bhedair anvā-
khāyaṇe [. . .]

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 1.108. 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 kānda, a kārikā is incomplete without the V and vice versa. Thus, we read in the case of verse 1.92:
sphoṭesu19
bhāgavateva api teṣā eva rūpa-bheda dhvaneḥ kramāt /
nirbhāgesv abhyupāyo vā bhāga-bheda-prakalpanam //

17 tasyey sarva-nāmnāntarasya dhvaneḥ pracaya-dharmināḥ pratyaya-
marṣāśaṅkā na kāraṇīyā [ity āha] . . . kasya tarhi tasya ity anena saṁbhandha
ity āha śabdas 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
19 In all the editions of the Brahma-kānda-vṛtti, sphoṭesu is printed
as the last word in the V of verse 1.91: . . . tathāiṣāṃ arūḍa-darśanānāṁ
pratiṣṭhāṇāṁ vākya-sva-rūpa-grahana-pārakṛta vākyārtha-grahanena prā-
dhāmesh pratyakṣāṇāṁ niyātopāye sādhya tasmin arthe niyādā-krama-
parināma-bhāgākāra-pratyavabhāṣā-mātrā-yuktā buddhayā pravartante spho-
tesu // 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 niyātopāye sādhya tasmin arthe and the other is
expressed by sphoṭesu. 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 sphoṭesu 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. ŠARMA
(1963: 167) to paraphrase the words of the original in an irritatingly super-
fluous manner.
Here *sphoṭesu* 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 *sphoṭesu* is not read into it. Thus, here we have one phrase with a locative absolute construction *teśv eva sphoṭesu bhāgavatuṣv 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:

```
evam ca kṛtvacāryamāṇasya
tasyābhidheya-bhāvena yaḥ śabdaḥ samavasthitah/
tasyāpy uccāraṇe rūpaṃ anyat tasmād vivicyate //
```

Here the syntactical relation between *uccāryamāṇasya* and *tasya* is too obvious to need any comment. What is more important is that, if the phrase *nevam ca kṛtvacāryamāṇasya* 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

```
guṇah prakaraṇa-hetur yaḥ svātanteṇopadīṣyate/
tasyāśritaḥ guṇād eva prakṛṣṭatvam pratiyate // 1.64 //
```

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

3.5 This leads us to the next finding that, in about ten 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 vrddhyādayah sābdāḥ sva-rūpādhiśthānāḥ svenārthenārtha-
vantaḥ sva-rūpaya śabdāntara-sva-rūpāny upajīghrāntaḥ svarānu-
nāsikya-bhinnair ākārādibhir, ādaicchabdādibhiḥ pratyāyitaḥ, sam-

---

20 I am not sure whether one should include V 2.28—29 in this group.
bandham yena prakareṇa pratipadyante, tenaiva prakareṇa²¹ duravādhārāte 'pi bhedaśya²²
gni-sabdas tathāvāyam agni-sabda-nibandhahanah /
agni-srutiyaite sambandham agni-sabdābhidheyañ // 1.60 //
(b) 1.65 and its V. See 3.4.
(c) yathā visayendriya-dharma evāyam prakṛti-caṅkṣusāṁ, dūrād ārūpa-mātropalabdhaṁ²³ vṛksadāṁ hastayādi pratipadyante, tad-desāvasthitit eva prāṇidhānābhīṣāt krameṇa punar yathāvayavam [yathāvad ?] upalabhante, vyāktālokāc ca dēśāt sahasā manda-
samnīvīṣṭa-prakāsān apavaraṇādāṁ praviṣya rajjvādāṁ sarpādāvā
pratipadya tathaiva prāṇidhānābhīṣāc cakṣusā prakrtisthe yathāvad
upalabhante²⁴
vyājyamāne tathā²⁵ vākye vakyābhīvyakti-hetubhiḥ /
bhāgavagraha-rūpena pūrvam buddhiḥ pravartate // 1.90 //
(d) 1.92 and its V. See 3.3.
(e) devadattādināṁ ca [vi]bhāgābhimaṇāṁ artha-yogābhīyupagame,

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 dāṛśṭāntika 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 dāṛśṭāntika spread over more than one verse, is lost in the manuscript.
²² All editions indicate the end of V 1.59 after bhedaśya. 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. ŚARMA (1963: 121) seems to have sensed the syntactical difficulty; but he does not point it out explicitly.
²³ The editions read ākṛti-mātropalabdhaḥ; 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 yathāiva in verse 1.89 and only secondarily with yathā in V 1.89. See fn. 21 above.
sāmānye 'vasthitānāṁ padānāṁ viśeṣe 'vasthānām ity etasmin satyatāṁśena26 parigṛhyamāṇe
dhāraṇāḥ pārthas tirobhūto na viśeṣe 'vatsīṣhate /
upātasya kutas tyāgo, nivṛttāṁ kvāvatīṣhhatām || 2.15 ||
(f) nitya-vādināṁ tu27 anāgantukam anatikrāntam anupacayāpa-
cayam
prakīṣaka-prakāśyatvam kārya-kāraṇa-rūpatā /
antarmātrāmanas tasya śabda-tattvasya sarvadā || 2.32 ||
(g) tatraivaṁ śāśtreṇāparyudaste viśeṣāntara-sahacārini dravyatve
asamnīdhaṃ pratirūdhir mā bhūn nityasya karmanāḥ /
kāmyasya vā pravrātasya lopa ity upapadyate || 2.70 ||
(h) nirjñāte ca bhede
prasiddhārtha-viparyāsa-nimittāṁ yac ca drśyate /
yas tasmāl lakṣyate bhedaś tam asatyam pracaṅkate || 2.289 ||
(i) ye, tūtsargāpavādayor eka-vākyatvam icchanti teṣāṁ
nityamah pratiśedhaḥ ca vidhi-śeṣas tatāḥ sati /
dvitiye yo lug ākhyātas taccheṣam alukām 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, aparā 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-vādināṁ 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 anitva-vādin.
apoddhāra-padārtha ye, ye cārthāḥ sthita-lakṣanāḥ /
anvākhyeyās ca ye śabdā, ye cāpi pratipādakāḥ /// 24 ///
kārya-kāraṇa-bhāvena yogyā-bhāvena ca sthītāḥ /
dharme ye pratayaye vāṅgam sambandhāḥ sādhvasādhuṣu /// 25 ///
te lingais ca sva-sabdāis ca sāstre śminn upavartānitāḥ /
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-sambandhā 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 explained 28 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:

vitarkitaḥ purā buddhyā kvacid arthe nivesitaḥ /
karaṇēbhya vīrttena dhvaninā so 'nugṛhyate /// 1.47 ///
... avikriyā-dharmakaṃ hi śabda-tattvakām dhvanināṃ vikriyā-dharmā- 
ṇām anu vikriyate. tasc ca sūkṣme vyāpīni dhvanau karaṇa-vyāpāreṇa 
pracyamāne, shūlenābhra-saṅghātavad upalabhyaena nādātmānā 
prāpta-vivarte 29 tad-vivartānukārenātyantam avivartamānaṃ vivarta- 
mānān ieva 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 pratayāṅga relation.

29 The editions read prāpta-vivartena. But then the sentence seems to be syntactically anomalous; the relation of the locative absolute construction sūkṣme ... pracyamāne to the succeeding portion of the sentence is not clear; further, there is ambiguity as to what the component tad- in the compound tad-vivartānukārena refers to—to dhvanī or to nādātman. Most probably it refers to dhvani, for the segment nādātmanā prāpta-vivartena tad-vivartānukārena with tad- referring to nādātman would be a very awkward way of saying what could be said simply with nādātma-vivartānukārena. Moreover, in the very preceding sentence, Bhartṛhari says ... dhvanināṃ vikriyā-dharmānam 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-rūpena bhedavān iva jāyate // 1.48 //
kramavatā hi vyāpāreṇopasaṁhriyamāṇa-pracaya-rūpo nādaḥ saprati-
bhandhābhyanujñayā vṛttā śphoṭam avadyotayati. . .
pratibimbam yathānyatra sthitam toya-kriyā-vaśāt /
tat-pravṛttim svānveti sa dharmaḥ śphoṭa-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 śphoṭa through the intermediacy or instrument-
tality 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, Bhattārthari’s choice of terms becomes pointless; the juxta-
position of śphoṭa and nāda in verses 1.48—49, 97 and, rather indirectly,
in 1.101 does not contrast significantly with the juxtaposition of śphoṭa
and dhvani in verses 1.75, 77, 81, and 93 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 (= buddhistaḥ
śabdāḥ in verse 1.46) to śphoṭa- in verse 1.49. It also cannot be accounted
for unless V 1.48 introduces the term śphoṭa 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 con-
sideration of an alternative or a different view is made known only by

agrees with dhvananau. This emendation extends the locative absolute con-
struction up to prāpta-vivarte and the syntactic 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 śphoṭa-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: nādaṁ iti dhvanidhiḥ.
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 kārikās: 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 Vākyapadiya, 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 kārikās obviously need supplementation to be understood properly and hence clearly evince the author’s plan to write a gloss on them. As the present V accomplishes the desired supplementation and as it is unanymously held to be an integral part of the Vākyapadiya 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 desparate attempt to seek refuge in the subterfuge of a remote possibility.
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