1.1. Both Bhartṛhari and Śabara pay a good deal of attention to the subject of uḥa ‘modification, adjustment’. Bhartṛhari discusses it in the first Āhnika of his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya (CE I.5.1-7.15; AL 5.18-8.17; Sw 6.17-9.27; Ms 2b9-3c1), while parts of Adhyāya 9 of Śabara’s Bhāṣya deal with it. Two cases in particular are treated by both the authors and allow of a detailed comparison.

The first case is most easily introduced with the help of Śabara’s Bhāṣya on Pūrva Mīmāṁsā Sūtra 9.3.10:

\[
\text{asti paśur agnīṣomtyah, yo dīkṣito yad agnīṣomyaṁ paśum ālabhata iti / tatra pāśaikatvābhidhāyit mantrāḥ, adityāḥ pāśaṁ pramumokty etam iti / tathā pāśabahutvābhidhāyit, adityāḥ pāśān pramumokty etān iti / ... / asti dvipaśur vikṛtyāḥ / maitraṁ śvetam ālabheta, vṛśacam kṛṣṇam apāṁ cauṣadhināṁ ca saṁdhāvanakāma iti / tatra cokakena pāśābhidhāyanāv mantrā prāptau / tayoḥ saviśayaḥ / kīṁ bahuvacanānto vikāreṇa pratvartate, ekavacanāntasya nivṛttiḥ, uta bahuvacanānto nivartate, ekavacanānta uḥitavyaḥ, utobhayor api pravṛttir abhidhāna-vipratpatiḥ ca, utaikavacanānta uḥitavyo bahuvacanānto 'pi na nivarteta / kīṁ prāptam}.
\]

"There is the Agniṣomtīya animal [sacrifice] laid down in the text yo dīkṣito yad agnīṣomtīyaṁ paśum ālabhate (‘When one, being initiated, sacrifices the animal dedicated to Agni-Soma’).

In connection with this there is a mantra, speaking of the

* This article was written with the financial assistance of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (N.W.O.). Reprint from “Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik”, vol. 15, pp. 101-117, Reinbek 1989.
singleness of the noose (pāśa): aditiḥ pāśan pramumoktv etam
('May Aditi loosen this noose'); also [there is another mantra]
speaking of the plurality of the noose: aditiḥ pāśaṁ pramum-
oktv etān. ...

[Then again,] there is a modificatory sacrifice (vikṛtī) [of the
Agniṣṭomīya] at which two animals [are killed], laid down in the
text maitraśaṁ śvetam ālaheta, vāraṇaṁ kṛṣṇam etc. ('The
white [goat] should be sacrificed to Mitra and the black [goat]
to Varuṇa') In accordance with the General Law, both the
mantras that mention a noose come to be regarded as to be
used at this [sacrifice of two animals].

In regard to [the use of] these two [mantras at this last sacrifice
of two goats, there arise] the following questions: (a) Is [the
word] in the plural form to be used in its unmodified form and
that in the singular form to be excluded? Or (b) should the
plural form be excluded and the singular form be modified
into a dual form? Or (c) should both [the plural and the
singular forms] be used, there being a diversity of expression
(i.e. option) [regarding the one to be actually used in any
particular case]? Or (d) should the singular form be modified,
the plural form also [in its modified form (?)] not being ex-
cluded?" (tr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, vol. III p. 1561; modified)

The problem here raised is subsequently discussed in the Bhāṣya.
Four solutions are proposed, the fourth one of which is finally
accepted. For our present purposes it is however interesting to
study the first solution, which is not accepted by Śābara. It
reads (on PMS 9.3.10):

anyāyasya tv avikāreṇa | anyāyaṇigado bahuvacanāntaḥ vikāreṇa
pravartate | ekavacanāntaḥ nivartitum arhati | kutaḥ | nāsyai-
kasmin pāśe pravartamānasya dṛṣṭaḥ pratighātaḥ | yathāvaik-
kasmin pāśe pravartate, tathā dvayor api pravartitum arhati |
nāśa eva kasya vācakaḥ, na dvayoḥ | evam dṛṣṭā svatokocanu-
ghito bhavayati | itarathā hi ubhayanāṃ yathāprakṛti mantri na
kṛtaḥ svyāt | na dvayoḥ pāśayeḥ, ekasminā ca pāśe kaścid viṣṇo-
śīl | tasmād avikāreṇa bahuvacanāntaḥ pravijayaḥ, ekacacan-
āntasya nivṛttir iti |

"That which is incompatible [should be used] in its unmodified
form'; [i.e.] the plural form, which is incompatible [with
the primary sacrifice at which there is only one animal], is
used [at the sacrifice of two animals] in its unmodified form,
and the singular form should be excluded. Why so? [Because]
we find no obstacle to its being used in the case of there being
[only one animal and] one noose; [so that] just as it is used in
the case of [one animal and] one noose, so should it be used
also in the case of there being [two animals] and two [nooses;
especially as the plural form] is expressive of neither one nor
two. In thus [using the plural form in its unmodified form,]
the scriptural injunction of the General Law becomes honoured;
while in the other case, if [the words] were modified, then the
mantra would not be used in the form in which it is used at
the primary sacrifice. Nor is there any difference between
one noose and two nooses [so far as the applicability of the plural
form is concerned]. From all this it follows that the plural
form is used in its unmodified form and the singular form is
excluded." (tr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, p. 1562; modified)

As said before, Śābara does not accept this position. He comes
to the conclusion, under sūtra 9.3.13, that both the plural form
and the singular form must be modified into a dual form. But
this rejected position is rather close to the one adopted by
Bhartṛhari, where he says in his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya
(AL 6.8-12; Sw 7.9-13; Ms 2c7-10; CE I 5.14-17):

tathaikasinneva prakṛtipāṣe pāś śrīyate | aditiḥ pāśan pramumoktv iti |
tatāpi vikṛtāḥ tāḥ nāsi | vājasanyayāṇām tv ekacacanāntaḥ pāthayate aditiḥ pāśam
iti | teṣām uhaḥ prāpnoti | . . . athavā pāṣeṣu noha ity anena tu
daigamavibhāṣāḥ bahuvacane sati yatheṣṭāṁ prayogya bhavati |

The Ms is very corrupt, but this reconstruction seems to be
essentially correct. I translate:

"... The plural pāśan is heard in aditiḥ pāśan pramumoktu
even though there is but one single noose (pāśa) in the primary
sacrifice. Here ... there is no modification in the modifi-

...
ecatory sacrifice. But among the Vajasaneyins [the mantra] is read in the singular, aditiḥ pāṣaṃ ... For them modification applies. ...

Or the statement that there is no modification in the case of nooses (pl.) expresses a Vedic option: where there is a plural number [of pāṣa] one uses [the word] as one wishes (i.e. either in the plural or adjusted to the situation)".

Bhartrhari here represents the point of view of a particular Vedic school different from the Vajasaneyins. His Vedic school had laid down the rule that no modification takes place in the case of the word pāṣa used in the plural, and Bhartrhari interprets this rule in two ways. Interestingly, the line aditiḥ pāṣaṃ pramumoktv etam does not occur in the scriptures of the Vajasaneyins, but in TS 3.1.4.4. Bhartrhari’s mistake (what else could it be?) allows us to conclude that he was not a Taittirīya either. The presence of aditiḥ pāṣaṃ pramumoktv etam in MS 1.2.15, KS 30.8 suggests that Bhartrhari belonged to one of these two Vedic schools. Other evidence (see Rau, 1980; Bronkhorst, 1981; 1987) supports the view that he was a Maitrāyaṇīya.

The conclusion must be that Bhartrhari’s description of uḥa, or rather the absence of uḥa, in aditiḥ pāṣaṃ pramumoktv does not represent the position of any group of Mīmāṁsakas, but rather the position of the Maitrāyaṇīya branch of the Yajurveda. The Mīmāṁsakas on the other hand, or at any rate Śabara, did not confine their attention to one Vedic school. Only thus could they be confronted with the situation in which both the mantras aditiḥ pāṣaṃ pramumoktv etam and aditiḥ pāṣaṃ pramumoktv etam apply. The question that remains is how the similarity between the point of view accepted by Bhartrhari and the one rejected by Śabara is to be explained.

This question gains interest in view of the fact that Śabara too may have been a Maitrāyaṇīya. It is true that the Taittirīya texts are more often quoted in his Bhāṣya, but Garge (1952:19f) has shown that Śabara’s Bhāṣya nonetheless shows a clear preference for Maitrāyaṇīya readings wherever possible. Garge’s data are perhaps most easily understood by assuming that Śabara, a Maitrāyaṇīya, continued and codified the Mīmāṁsaka tradition which by itself had no particular predilection for Maitrāyaṇīya texts.

1.2. Both Bhartrhari (AL 7.10-8.8; Sw 8.16-9.17; MS 3a2-b6; CE I 6.11-7.7) and Śabara (on Pūrva Mīmāṁsā Sūtra 9.3.22 and 9.3.27-4.27) deal in detail with the adhirigū mantra, a passage that occurs in but slightly differing form in a number of texts. Nothing in Bhartrhari’s discussion shows any influence from Śabara. Indeed it appears that the two authors disagree on how to deal with the part ṣaḍviniḥsatīr asya vākṛtayats ‘it has twenty-six ribs’. Śabara winds up a long discussion on this matter by stating (on sūtra 9.4.16) that the total number of ribs must be mentioned where two or more animals are involved, not a repetition of the numeral ‘twenty-six’ (vyayām vākṛtāḥ prakṛtāv vaktavyāḥ ihāpi sa codakena pradāyate | tena nābhīṣayā | sa hi paśunimitakaḥ | tasmāt samasya vacanāḥ vākṛtāḥ kartavyaṁ iti). Bhartrhari makes an enigmatic remark after citing the sentence that precedes ṣaḍviniḥsatiḥ. This remark—tathāyāyam anekasmin paśu dvir abhyasyate—can be interpreted with the help of MSS 5.2.9.5 yāny avyayāny anekānī tati dvir abhyasyante ... ṣaḍviniḥsatiḥ ṣaḍviniḥsatiḥ. It thus comes to mean: “Then, in case there is more than one animal, the indeclinable [that follows, viz. ṣaḍviniḥsatiḥ] is repeated”.

Unlike Śabara, parts of Bhartrhari’s treatment of uḥa show the influence of the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra. We saw how MSS 5.2.9.5 was needed to understand one of Bhartrhari’s remarks. At two other occasions he makes a direct reference to ‘the section on modification’ (uḥapraKarāṇa) of the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra. Once (AL 7.5-6; Sw 8.11-12; MS 2d10-11; CE I 6.6-8) he says:

aghasad aghastām aghasannagrağunā aksaṇītya uḥapraKarāṇe paṭhaya

“In the section on modification the forms aghasat, aghastām, aghan, agraṅtāḥ and aksān are read”.

This must refer to MSS 5.2.9.6:

haviṣa prāṣe sūktavāke ca adat adatām adan, ghasat ghaṣṭān
Then again (AL 7.20-21; Sw 9.3-4; Ms 3a8-9; CE I 6.21-22):

tatropakaraṇa evaiṣoṁ mātā pītā bhrātā sanābhiṣamsargi-
sabdā ity evamādhyānāṁ añātyānti paṭhyate/

"... in the same section on modification it is read that of the
[words mentioned earlier] the words indicative of siblings and
kin mātā, pītā, bhrātā and the like should not be modified".

This reflects MSS 5.2.9.7:

mātā pītā bhrātā sāgarbhya ('nu) saṁkā śāyāthyo nābhīrāpan
āsanāsargi sābdās caṣṭuḥ ṛōtraṁ vāh manas tvanuḥ medic havir
barhiḥ svaṁyaḥ vakṣa ity anūhyam/

"His mother, his father, his brother from the same womb,
his friend in the herd'; the form of nābhī joined with (the
ending) ā; the words ‘eye, ear, voice, mind, skin, fat, oblation
(?), sacrificial grass, eagle-shaped breast’, all these are not to
be modified." (Tr. Van Gelder, p. 174)

Not all of Bhāṛṭhari's examples regarding āha can be traced to
the Mānava Śrauta Śūtra, nor to any other Śrauta Śūtra. Of
particular interest is the stanza which introduces his discussion
of āha in the adhīrgu mantra, and which has not been traced in
any earlier work (AL 7.10-11; Sw 8.16-17; Ms 3a2-3; CE I
6.11-12):

āngāni jhāṭaṁā [ny upamā] cendraṭāni ca/
etāni nohaṁ gacchanti adhīrgau viṣamāṁ hi tat //

"Limbs of the body, names of relatives, comparison and
organs of sense, these do not undergo modification; for it (?) is
irregular in the case of adhīrgu".

This stanza, which governs Bhāṛṭhari's ensuing discussion, must
be assumed to have belonged to the ritualistic tradition of some
Vedic school, probably the Māitrāyanīyas. Bhāṛṭhari based his
discussion of āha not on some preexisting works of Māṁsā but
on ritual works which had no, or little, connection with
Māṁsā.

This situation allows us to understand how Śābara could
describe and reject an opinion (on adīṭhū pāśū pramukto etc., see
section 1.1 above) which is so close to Bhāṛṭhari's. The Māṁsā-
sakas, who took a broader view of the sacrificial rites than those
adhering to the traditions of particular Vedic schools, would
nonetheless borrow ideas from individual Vedic schools, either
to accept or to reject them. All we have to assume is that Śābara
was acquainted with at least some of these ritual books.

It seems that the works which Bhāṛṭhari used did not survive
him for long. The above stanza (aṅgāni ...) is quoted by Kumā-
rila in his Tantra-vārttika on Pūrva Māṁsā Śūtra 1.3.24
(p. 197) and ascribed to a ṭīkākāra who is also credited (p. 209)
with the authorship of the stanza that we know as Vākapadiya
2.14 (Swaminathan, 1963:69), i.e., apparently to Bhāṛṭhari.
That is to say, Bhāṛṭhari is here quoted as an authority on āha
in his own right.

1.3. Another instance where Bhāṛṭhari gives evidence of
drawing upon a tradition quite independent of the Māṁsāsakas
occurs on P. 1.1.5 and consists of an illustration with the help of
the Śūnaskarnastama sacrifice (AL 118.3; Sw 137.26-138.1; Ms
39a 7-8; CE IV 6.11-12):

śūnaskarnastomaṣṭyaṁ yat śyāt, yathā pradhānasya marane-
nāṁthina uṣṭhaṁ pravartayaṁti]

"This is like the Śūnaskarṇāstama sacrifice: desirous of the
main thing by means of death, they cause the sacrifice to
proceed".

The Śūnaskarṇā Agniṣṭoma sacrifice is discussed in Śābara's
Bhāṣya om PMS 10.2.57-61. This sacrifice is enjoined by the in-
junction "Desiring one's own death one should perform this
sacrifice, if he wishes that he should reach the Heavenly Region
without any disease" (marṣaṁkāmo hy etena yajeta, yah īma-
yetāṁānaṁ svargam lokam iyām iti; tr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, p.
1721). The question raised under PMS 10.2.57-58 is whether or not the sacrifice should be continued after the sacrificer has taken his life by throwing himself into the fire. The answer is that the sacrifice must be completed. A number of reasons is given for this, none of them even resembling Bhartrhari’s. This is true to the extent that Pârthasârathi Mîra in his Śāstradipikā on PMS 10.2.57-58 (adhyātmanasŚaMK 23, Vol. II, p. 334f.) quotes Bhartrhari as authority when accepting that point of view (cf. Swaminathan, 1961:315-16):

svarga evâtra maraṇânârthinhaḥ phalam na maraqam / maraṇâkâma ity âhâktmaratara ity arthâḥ tena yo hy evam jîdvâ svargaṁ prânapânti kâmyata, tasyâyaṁ kruṭâḥ / tathâ ca haribhir uktaṁ ‘pradhânasya maraṇânârthina iyāṁ pravarta-

“Heaven is here the fruit he wishes [to attain] by means of death, not death [itself]. The words ‘desiring [one’s own] death’ (maraṇâkâma) mean ‘accepting [one’s own] death’. Therefore, this sacrifice is [meant] for him who, knowing this, wishes to attain to heaven. This has been expressed by [Bhartrhari with the words ‘desirous of the main thing (i.e. heaven) by means of death they cause the sacrifice to proceed’.”

Pârthasârathi’s quotation does not only cast light on the form and meaning of Bhartrhari’s remark; it also indicates that Pârthasârathi (10th century C.E. according to Ramaswami Sastri, 1937) had no (longer?) access to the sources from which Bhartrhari drew his example.

1.4. We turn to another passage where Bhartrhari to all appearances draws upon the tradition of the Maitrâyaṇya. It occurs in his comments on the line prayâjâḥ savibhaktikâḥ kâryâḥ of the Mahâbhâṣya (I.3.10). Bhartrhari is here clearly influenced by the Mânavâ Śrauta Sûtra (5.1.2) which reads:

punar âdheye prayâjânyâdâh prâstâd vaparîṣṭâd vâ vibhaktiṁ kuryât / ye yaṭâmahe ‘samanâh samidho’gnâ âjyasya vyantvâ agnir agnir ‘tanûnapâd agnâ âjyasya vetrâ’ agnir agnir ‘tûgo’gnâ

“When [fire] is to be lit again one should recite the vibhaktis before or after the preliminary and final offerings, as follows: ye yaṭâmahe etc.”

The first and introductory sentence of this passage is included in Bhartrhari’s remarks on the subject, which however go beyond the Mânavâ Śrauta Sûtra in giving some kind of justification for the choice of ‘vibhaktis’ (i.e. agnir agnir etc.) and even lead to an outcome that is different in one point; he also gives an alternative. Bhartrhari’s Mahâbhâṣya Dipikâ reads (AL 12.25-13.4; Sw I 511.16-16.1; Ms I 5a2-5; CE I 11.10-14):

vibhaktinâm api sarvâsâm prayoge prâpte vâ dyakṣarâ vâ sat-

“Although it would follow (from what precedes in Bhartrhari’s commentary) that all case-endings be used, the form agnir agnir is not used because it has been stated ‘which have two syllables or four syllables’. Similarly one should not use sabdajâmi. Sabdajâmi is that which has an ablative ending. Therefore it is the genitive which is used in the form agnir agnir, [not the ablative]. When [fire] is to be lit again one should recite the vibhaktis before or after the preliminary offerings. Or naraṣanâso . . . agnir agnir [is used instead of tanûnapâd . . . agnir agnir] because it is seen both ways”.

This shows that according to Bhartrhari the following four ‘vibhaktis’ are to be used: agnir agnir (nom.), agnir agnir (acc.), agnir agnir (gen.), agnir agnir (loc.).

The essential correctness of the above reading of Bhartrhari’s Mahâbhâṣya Dipikâ is confirmed by Śivarâmendra Sarasvati’s
1.5. What is the source from which Bhattarhāri derived his detailed knowledge on ritual matters? The most likely answer is that he used Prayoga manuals belonging to the Maitrāyanīyas. Few old Prayogas have survived and their study has hardly begun. Yet the suspicion could be voiced that “some sort of Prayogas must have been in vogue even before the composition of the Śrautasūtras proper” (Śrautsakosa Vol. I, English section, Part I, Preface, p. 7; see also Hillebrandt, 1879: XV, 1897: 38). Bhide (1979:150f.) studied two extant Prayogas of the Cāturmāsa sacrifices and compared these with the Hiranyakeshī Śrauta Sūtra, under which they resort. Interestingly, the older of these two Prayogas, by Mahādeva Somayājin, deviates a number of times from the Hiranyakeshī Śrauta Sūtra. This shows that Bhattarhāri may indeed have used Prayoga manuals belonging to his Vedic school, and further details from the Mānavā Śrauta Sūtra which we noticed above do not prove that these manuals belonged to another school than that of the Mānasas.

2.1. We conclude from the above that Bhattarhāri was not a Mānavāsaka. Yet he was acquainted with Mānavās. He uses the word ‘Māivasaka’ several times in his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya. The line śiddhā dhyaṇ śiddhā pravat śiddham akṣari iti (MbI I.6.18-19) is elucidated by Bhattarhāri’s remark (AL 22.23; Sw 27.19; Ms 8a4; CE I 19.11): ārhatanāṁ māṁśakān ca naivāśa līnāśa eṣām “According to the Jainas and Mānavasakas there is no destruction of these”, i.e. of sky, earth and ether. At another place (AL 29.10-11; Sw 53.2; Ms 9d7; CE I 24.15) Bhattarhāri quotes the words darṣanasya parārthaṁ vā in a discussion concerning the eternity of words. This must be a reflection of PMS 1.1.18 nītās tu syād darṣanasya parārthaṁ vā. Note however that Bhattarhāri’s quote does not only lack the initial words of the sūtra, it also has an additional word at the end, probably vipraṇaśvatāṃ which is absent from the sūtra.

The following quotation in the Dipikā seems to throw more light on Bhattarhāri’s relationship with Mānavas. In the third Aṅnika Bhattarhāri proclaims (AL 96.3-4; Sw 113.14-15; Ms 31b4-5; CE III.3.19-20):

nāmāntaryāṁ sambhādhaṇaḥ | evaḥ hy ucyate | arthato hy asamarthānāṁ ānāntarāṃ akāraṇam |
"[Mere] contiguity is no cause of relationship. Thus, verily, it is said: ‘contiguity is no cause of relationship between [words] which are not semantically connected.’"

The quotation in this passage had to be reconstructed to some extent, and this could be done with the help of PMS 4.3.11 (api vāmānāsāmarthyāc codaṇārthaṇa gamyētārthāṇāṁ hy arthavattena vacanāṁ prattyante’rthato hy asamarthānām ānantarye’py asambandhas tasmācchryakadesaḥ sah), as pointed out by Fal- sude (Notes p. 66 of his edition; cf. Swaminathan, 1961:314). What is more, the quoted line occurs in precisely that form in a verse cited in Vaidyanatha’s Chāḍyā (p. 160, 162) and which reads:

yasya yenaḥsambandho | -ārthaḥsambandho dūrasthasyāpi tena saḥ | arthato hy asamarthānām ānantaryam akāraṇam ||

This suggests that Bhattṛhari knew a Mīmāṃsā work which contained this verse.

This impression is strengthened by another quotation in the Mahābhāṣya Dipikā, on P. 1.1.46, in the context of sequential order. Here Bhattṛhari cites the following verse (AL 274.1-2; Ms 95b1-2 CE VII 5.16-17):

śruter arthaḥ ca pāṭhāḥ ca pravrtyat ca manṭṭiṇāḥ / sthāṇāḥ mukhyāḥ ca dharmaṇāṁ āhuḥ kramavādaḥ kramān ||

"Those sages who know about sequential order say that the sequential order of things (?) [is determined] on the basis of scriptural assertion, meaning, [order of] text, commencement, place and [order of] the principal".

This verse is close to PMS 5.1.1-15, as already observed by Swaminathan (1961:317). All its elements occur there: śruti in PMS 5.1.1 (śrutālaṁśanāndupārtyam tatpramaṇatvād),* artha in PMS 5.1.2 (arthāc ca), pāthā is the subject-matter of 5.1.4, even though not called by that name, pravrtyt appears in PMS 5.1.8 (pravrtytā tulyakālāndam tadupakramāt), sthāna in PMS 5.1.13 (sthāṇāḥ cotpattisanyogāt), mukhyakrama finally in PMS 5.1.14 (mukhyakramapa vāṅgānām tadarthavāt). Again we are left with the impression that Bhattṛhari was acquainted with a work on Mīmāṃsā which contained verse.

2.2. The fact that the work on Mīmāṃsā used by Bhattṛhari appears to have contained verses may help us in identifying its author. Only one author on Mīmāṃsā is thought to have written an early work on this subject which contained verses; this is Bhavādāsa. Sucusitamiśra’s commentary Kāśikā on Kumārila’s Sūkavārttika quotes a half verse from Bhavādāsa (Kane, 1929: 153 fn. 3). It seems clear that Bhavādāsa preceded Śābara (Kane, 1929; Mīshra, 1942:16-17; Frauwallner, 1968: 100f., 107, 112f.)

The assumption that Bhattṛhari used Bhavādāsa’s work does not conflict with anything in the Mahābhāṣyadipikā, nor in the Vākyapadiya, as far as I know. It may be noted that on one occasion, where we seem to know the definition used by Bhavādāsa, Bhattṛhari does not quote Bhavādāsa but gives a definition of his own. Śābara on PMS 12.1.1 quotes a definition of the word praṣaṅga: praṣaṅgaśabdārtho ‘nyair uktaḥ, evam eva praṣaṅgaḥ syād vidyāmāne svake vidhā́v iti. The quoted line is half a śloka, the whole of which is given on PMS 11.1.1; it is plausible that it derives from Bhavādāsa. Bhattṛhari gives an own definition of this technical Mīmāṃsā term in his commentary (AL 45.4-5; Sw 54.2-3; Ms 14b4-5; CE I 37.11-12): yady arth pravajyaganto anyadvāvārthāṁ pratipadyet sa praṣaṅga ity ucyatē. A closer investigation shows however that Bhattṛhari’s definition agrees contentwise with Bhavādāsa’s śloka, whereas Śābara has changed the interpretation of the verse so as to make it suit his own ideas. See Bronkhorst, 1986.

2.3. If indeed we can accept that Bhattṛhari used a text on Mīmāṃsā different from Śābara’s Bhāṣya we may be in a position to understand a passage that occupied Yuddhīṣṭhīra, Mīmāṃsaka (1973:385 fn. 1). It reads (AL 31.2-3; Sw 36.19-21; Ms 10b7-8; CE I 25.24-26):

dharmapravajjanaḥ yevi mīmāṃsakadarśanaṁ | avasthita eva / / dharmah / sa tv aghinotradhir abhivyayate | tātpreyas tu phalado bhave / /
"The words in the Mahābhāṣya (I.8.5-6) dharmaprayojana vā... bringing about dharma" [express] the view of the Mimāṃsakas. [According to them] dharma is eternal. It is however manifested by [such sacrifices as] Agnihotra etc. Instigated by these [dharma] produces result."

Mimāṃsaka contrasts this statement with a passage from Jayanta Bhaṭṭa’s Nyāyamañjari which reads (p. 664):

vrddhatmimāṃsakāḥ yūgādkarmanirvartyam apūrvam nāma dharmam abhiśacchanti yūgādkarmalvā sabarā bruvate /

"The old Mimāṃsakas declare dharma, [also] called apūrva, to be produced by ritual activities such as sacrifices. The followers of Śabara say that the ritual activities such as sacrifices are themselves [dharma]."^{10}

The two passages combined seem to indicate that the Mimāṃsakas known to Bhartṛhari were older than Śabara. Mimāṃsaka goes further and concludes that Bhartṛhari himself is much earlier than Śabara. This need not be true. In fact, Bhartṛhari’s commentary contains an indication that its author knew a view according to which the constituents of the sacrifice are dharma. This indication consists in the twice quoted phrase dādhamadhvādayo dharmah ‘curds, honey, etc. constitute dharma’. The phrase is quoted (twice) in a difficult and corrupt passage, which may however be reconstituted as follows (Ms 11b3-5; AL: 34.8-12; Sw 40.21-25; CE I 28.17-20):

yathā pūrvakālaṁ prayuktāṁ dirghasattrōṣṭāḥ idāṁ nam apramūjāyamānayo api dādhamadhvādayo dharma iti karmatādiviśayaḥ sidhayata evam anyaaḥ prayuktānāṁ sarvakālaṁ idāṁ nam apramūjāyamānāṁ api anuvidhānāṁ yuktāṁ / ye tu dādhamadhvādayo dharma iti teṣāṁ vyākaraṇyam artha na sambhavati / na hi tha śabdācāraṇāṁ dharma iti /

This may tentatively be translated:

Just as long Soma sacrifices were used formerly, and even

though they are not used now, the aim of sacrificial activity is attained since curds, honey etc. constitute dharma; so the laying down of rules for things which have been used by others all the time is proper, even though these things are not used now. But this is not possible in grammar for those who [hold] that curds, honey etc. constitute dharma. For no dharma comes forth from uttering sound.

Much is unclear in this passage. But it shows that we do not have to conclude that Bhartṛhari lived much before Śabara. It seems more appropriate to conjecture that Bhartṛhari used a text on Mimāṃsā older than Śabara’s Bhāṣya, most probably Bhavadāsa’s Vṛtti. We are however fully justified in thinking that Bhartṛhari cannot have lived long after Śabara.

3. The above observations, if correct, allow us to draw the following conclusions. Bhartṛhari was acquainted with Mimāṃsā, but did not use it where we would expect him to use it. In the context of ritual details he rather draws upon another tradition, most probably on the traditional manuals current in his Vedic school, that of the Maitrāyaniyas. And where he makes references to Mimāṃsā, it is never to Śabara’s Bhāṣya, but rather to a Mimāṃsā work in verse, or containing verse, which has not survived, but may have been Bhavadāsa’s Vṛtti. He may have known the Pūrva Mimāṃsā Śūtra, or a part of it, but this is not certain.

ABBREVIATIONS

AiB Aitareya Brāhmaṇa
AL Abhyankar and Limaye’s edition of Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dipikā
ĀsvSS Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra
CE ‘Critical Edition’ of Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dipikā
KS Kāṭhaka Sāhhitā
KapS Kapiṭhala Sāhhitā
Mbh Mahābhāṣya
Ms Manuscript of Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dipikā
MS Maitrāyani Sāhhitā
MSS Māṇava Śrauta Sūtra
NOTES

1. MS 4.13.4; KS 16.21; AiB 6.6–7 (2.6–7); TB 3.6.6; AśvŚS 3.3; ŚSS 5.17.
2. Bhārtrāhari’s independence from the influence of Mīmāṃsā when dealing with ritual details makes this a more likely assumption than that this stanza belonged to the Mīmāṃsā work in verse with which he appears to have been acquainted. See section 2, below.
3. Hārara on Vākyapādiya 3.14.591 (590), p. 413 1. 24-25, quotes the same stanza and calls it ‘tradition of knowing of āha’ (āhavādāmānamāyō).”
4. The MS reading has been emended with the help of the quotation by Pṛthūśrātri Miśra; see below.
5. All these texts have yad dvayakṣarāḥ sattā caturakṣarāḥ kriyant [e].
6. Bhārtrāhari’s example of āra is hrdayayāgreśvadvāti, atha jihvāyāḥ, atha vakṣakoḥ. The same example is given by Śabara under PMS 5.1.5.
7. bhavādānena oktām: athādī ity ayaṁ sābā ānantarye pravyayate.
9. We must assume that Bhārtrāhari considers pravyajana here synonymous with pravyajaka ‘bringing about’ for the following reasons: (i) otherwise tattvāthā makes no sense; (ii) a few lines further down we find the explanation dharmasya...pravyajakaḥ. Joshi and Roodbergen (1973: 82 fn. 326) explain this meaning as follows: “The word pravyajana is formed by adding the suffix Lyukt (i.e. ana, p. 7.1.1) to the stem pravu, in the sense of karaṇa: ‘instrument’ (P. 3.3.117). Thus the meaning of pravyajana can be analyzed as pravyajata anena sat pravyajanam: ‘that by which something is regulated is (called) pravyajana’. Taken in this sense, pravyajana comes to mean pravyajaka: ‘regulator’. “ It seems however more correct to account for pravyajana in this sense by P. 3.3.113 (kriyāyuga bhāyal). This is done, e.g., by Bhaṭṭaja Dīkṣita in his Śabādakastubha (vol. 1, p. 11): atra pravyajaya pravartitam na nemic karaṇayuṣmayataḥ pravyajayatitā karītyupatyā bhūkalakāt karītyupanāto vā abhyayahāpi pravartikāvādīpahā pravyajanasabda ekoḥ | phala-paraḥ kilio paraḥ |.
10. Cf. Śabara’s Bhāṣya on PMS 1.1.2: yo hi yugam anuṣṭhitāḥ tathā dhammikā iti saṁcākṣaye | yasya ca yaśya kartā sa tena vyapādyate | yathā pācako lāvaka iti |.
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