THE CONCLUDING VERSES OF BHARTṛHARI'S VĀKYA-KĀṇḍA*

By

ASHOK AKLUJKAR

1.1 In this paper I wish to offer some observations on verses 481–490 appearing at the end of the second book of Bhartṛhari’s Trikāṇḍi or Vākyapadiya. The verses have been studied, primarily or incidentally, directly or indirectly, in a number of publications: Goldsticke (1861), Weber (1862), Kielhorn (1874, 1875, 1876, 1885), Peterson (1885), Thieme (1956), Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka (sāṃvat 2020), Sharma (1968), Upādhyāya (1968), S. Iyer (1969), Scharfe (1976), Joshi (1976), and Cardona (1977; in this volume). My objective here is neither to review what has been said about them, nor to pronounce judgements on all the controversies they have given rise to. I wish rather to put forward a few considerations that have not so far appeared in print and to refute a few interpretations that have so far gone unrefuted.

1.2 In order to reach the goal I have set for myself, I shall naturally need a critically established text of verses 481–490. Hence I shall proceed

* This is an enlarged and significantly revised version of a paper I read at the 1972 annual meeting of the American Oriental Society. I am very grateful to Professor Wilhelm Rau for the access I had to the typescript and proofs of his critical edition of the Vākyapadiya / Trikāṇḍi-kārikās and for the copies of Ṭīkā manuscripts that he so promptly provided. Professors K. A. Subramania Iyer and M. A. Mehandeit exercised themselves considerably to make available to me a copy of the Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṛṛtī manuscript at Patan. I am greatly indebted to them. To Professor D. H. H. Ingalls goes the credit of making me think more about verse 487. The financial support necessary for the acquisition of manuscript copies etc., so vital to research of the present type, was given by the University of British Columbia, the Canada Council, and the American Council of Learned Societies at various stages during 1969–1975.

1. (a) In the present and following publications I shall follow Rau's (1977) enumeration of the Trikāṇḍi kārikās. It is the only flawless enumeration we have at present that enables us to refer to a tradition of the Trikāṇḍi text (the kārika manuscript tradition) in a form determined by objective textual criticism. It will be highly convenient if the Trikāṇḍi text as preserved in the other (Vṛtti and Ṭīkā) traditions is critically established by following Rau's enumeration. This I advocate simply as a procedure that will facilitate future text-critical research concerning Bhartṛhari. I do not hold that the kārika manuscripts give us the oldest accessible form of the Trikāṇḍi text. See Aklujar 1971, 1978.

(b) The text of verses 481–490 given below is based on a consideration of all known manuscript traditions. In the case of kārika manuscripts I have simply followed Rau's lead. It is only the collection and evaluation of the evidence of the Vṛtti and Ṭīkā manuscripts that I have freshly attempted.

2 Annals [D.J.]
by presenting those verses as they will appear in my proposed edition of the Trikāndī text. For the sake of simplicity of presentation, however, I shall not refer to all the variant readings and their sources. Another clarification in order is that my choice of readings is based on a consultation of all available manuscript traditions: kārikā, Vṛtti, and Tīkā. Although such a consultation does not yield any startlingly new readings in the present case, it serves to establish the original as objectively as possible:

prāyena sanākṣepa-rucīn alpa-vidyā-parigrāhān /
samprāpya vaiyākaranān saṅgraha’stam upāgatē [481] /
kṛte’tha patañjalinā guruṇā tīrthadarśinā /
sarvesāṁ nyāya-bījānāṁ mahābhāṣye nibandhane [482] /
alabdha-gādhe gāmbhiryād uttāna iva sauṣṭhavāt /
tasminn akṛta-buddhānā naivāvāsthita niścayāḥ [483] /
vaijī-saubhava-haryakṣaiṁ śuṣka-tarkānasārībhī /
ārse viplāvite granthe saṅgraha-pratikaṁcuke [484] /
ḥaḥ patañjalī-śisyebhyo bhrasṭo vyākaraṇāgamaḥ /
kāle sā dākṣinātyeṣu graṇthāmatre vyavasthitaḥ [485] /
parvatād āgamaṁ labdhvā bhāṣya-bījānusārībhī /
sa nīto bahu-sākhatvām caṇḍeacāryādibhiṁ punaḥ [486] /

2. Although pātaṭi is attested in all manuscripts of the kārikā tradition and in some important manuscripts of the Vṛtti and Tīkā traditions, I have decided to accept the reading pātaṭi. This is in view of the following facts: (a) There is no other reliable occurrence of patañjali as the name of the author of the Mahābhāṣya. (b) The relatively more reliable manuscripts of the Vṛtti and the Tīkā read pātaṭi. These are also the manuscripts far removed from each other in terms of location of writing. (c) Even those Tīkā manuscripts which read pātaṭi in the kārikā portion almost always read pataṭi in the Tīkā pertaining to the kārikā, indicating thereby that the author of the Tīkā knew the reading to be pataṭi.

3. vaiji is found in the place of vaiji in one Vṛtti manuscript, and baidri in one Tīkā manuscript. The reading vaiji, although attested in only two usually reliable sources, can be accepted instead of vaiji, as manuscript writers do not always distinguish v and ṣ; it should also be noted that whereas vaiji can be easily derived from bīja and thus given some etymological significance, no straightforward etymology seems possible for vaiji.

4. See 5.1 and footnotes 27 and 31 below.

5. Since the best manuscripts of the kārikā tradition read pātaṭi, at one point I was uncertain about the reading adopted here. Hence the reference in Scharfe 1976: 276 footnote 20 to a letter from me. An examination of the Vṛtti and Tīkā manuscripts has now convinced me that the reading pataṭi is clearly preferable on objective criteria. Contextually too, there is no reason why a taddhita formation like patañjali should be employed.

6. This reading of Vṛtti and Tīkā manuscripts has an objectively stronger claim to being genuine than kālena of kārikā manuscripts. If the latter reading is accepted, one must either understand saḥ in 485cd or assume that 485 and 486 together constitute one sentence. The second alternative is rather difficult to justify in view of the intervening 486ab.

7. The reading mātre of the generally better kārikā manuscripts is not corroborated by the Vṛtti and Tīkā manuscripts.
nyāya-prasthāna-mārgānāṁ tāṁ abhyasya svāṁ ca darśanam
prāṇito gurūṇāśmākam ayam āgama-saṁgrahah [487]
vartmanaṁ atra keśāṁcid vastu-mātram udāhṛtam
kānde trīye nyākṣeṇa bhaviṣyatī vicāraṇā [488]
prajñā vivekaṁ labhate bhinnair āgama-darśanaiḥ
kiyad vā sākyam unnetuṁ sva-tarkam anudhāvatā [489]
tat tad utprekṣaṁāṇāṁ purāṇair āgaman vinā
anupāsita-vyuddhānāṁ vidyā nātīprasādīati [490]

2.1 It has so far been assumed that these verses are a composition
of Bhārtṛhari. I wish to question this assumption. The natural meaning
of verse 487 is: “Having frequently reflected upon those nyāya-prasthāna-
mārgas8 and his own view, our teacher composed this compendium of tradi-
tional knowledge”. If we suppose that it was Bhārtṛhari who made this
statement, it follows that his teacher, and not he, composed the kārikās and
Vṛtti up to 480. However, such a conclusion would go against all the evi-
dence we have in the manuscripts and the impressively long and consistent
tradition of Bhārtṛhari’s authorship. On the other hand, if we suppose that
it was some student of Bhārtṛhari who wrote 487 and the group of verses to
which 487 belongs, we shall have shown due regard for the available evidence
regarding the authorship of the portion up to 480. To be taken into account
in this connection is also the thesis I wish to put forward in a forthcoming
article with what I hope to be adequate justification. It is that Bhārtṛhari
planned to write a vṛtti for the third kānda, but could not write it for some
reason—that he either died or was incapacitated before he could turn to
writing it. Now, if that is what actually happened, we should not at all be
surprised to find a student of Bhārtṛhari writing a few appropriate verses at
the end of the Vṛtti of the second kānda to mark the point where Bhārtṛhari

8. In the writings of Bhārtṛhari and those close to him, the word nyāya commonly
stands for ‘principle helpful in arriving at a logical or contextually justifiable view’ (cf.
Cardona’s paper in this volume). I take prasthāna to mean ‘foundation, basis, source’
(compare the usage prasthāna-trayi). A literal translation of the compound expression
nyāya-prasthāna-mārga will, therefore, be ‘the ways of the source of principles helpful in
arriving at justifiable views’. In the light of sarveśaṁ nyāya-biṁbāṁ mahābhāṣya nibandhane
in 482 and bhāṣya-bijamāṇāṁ sa nīlo bahu-sākhataṁ in 486, this amounts to saying ‘the
ways of the Mahābhāṣya’. Thus, I am essentially in agreement with Raghunātha Sharmā’s
(1968 : 575) explanation tāṁ mūla-bhāṣya-cyakaraṇa-gamato jñātāṁ bhāṣye 'vasthitān nyāya-
prasthāna-mārgam. I do not object also to the interpretation ‘ways of the nyāya-prasthānas
such as Mīmāṁsā and Vyākaraṇa-gama’. While Weber’s (1862 : 161) translation ‘der
Schluss, Vorgang, und Weg’ seems incorrect to me, I find the translations ‘the ways of
logical discussion’ (Goldstücker 1861 : 282) and ‘the various other systems’ (Raghavan
Pillai 1971 : 146) less than exact.
stopped. In fact, the relevance of the mention of the third kāṇḍa in verse 488 and of the description of that kāṇḍa (devoted to a detailed examination of various relevant varṇams or āgamas) in verses 489-490 can be explained most straightforwardly if we ascribe the verses 481-490 to a student of Bharṭṛhari. The student, writing epilogue-type verses as he was, must have been anxious to avoid giving the impression that Bharṭṛhari's work came to an end with the kārikās and Vṛtti of the second kāṇḍa, and must have felt the need to connect the first two kāṇḍas with the third kāṇḍa. Perhaps the plural form asmākam in verse 487 is also significant from this point of view. It is a form that would naturally occur to anyone writing as a representative of a number of students. Furthermore, there is nothing in verse 487 that applies only to Bharṭṛhari's teacher Vasuṣrāta and not to Bharṭṛhari. The latter also had obviously studied the nyāya-prasthāna-mārgas11 and had a view, a philosophy, of his own. Therefore, I tend to believe that verses 481-490 are not a composition of Bharṭṛhari.13

9. What I say here entails: (a) Bharṭṛhari composed first the kārikās and then most of the available Vṛtti, i.e., those portions of the Vṛtti which are not syntactically related to the kārikās (Aklujkar 1972: 190-193); or, Bharṭṛhari first finalized the kārikā text and then proceeded to give final form to the Vṛtti, which latter activity he could carry out only to the end of the second kāṇḍa. (b) The kārikās were separated from a kārikā+Vṛtti composition and a tradition of kārikā manuscripts was begun after Bharṭṛhari's time. Otherwise, one would not have found in the kārikā manuscripts verses 481-490 written by a different hand.

10. The Tīkā explains the use of the plural in two ways: asmākam iti bahu-vacanād anyeyām api sahādyāyaṃ graham, atha vā mayā tu tad-anwchedāyam upanibandhaḥ kṛta īty ātmano bahu-mānaḥ prakaṭitaḥ. The second of these explanations is misunderstood by Raghunāthā Sharmā (1968: 575) when he comments: atha vasmakam ayam āgama-saṅgrahah = mathartha- katvam prasiddho 'yam āgama-saṅgraha vākyapadāyakhyā guruva praṇīto na tu mayā: mayā tu tad-anwchedāyakhyān grantha-rūpeṇopaniṣadbāḥ kṛta īty ātmano gauru bahu-mānaḥ prakaṭita iti. The intention of the Tīkā is clearly to say that Bharṭṛhari attaches bahu-māna to himself, for he, among all students of Vasuṣrāta, gave a lasting, written form to the collection of traditions that Vasuṣrāta had imparted; the Tīkā does not speak of attaching bahu-māna to Bharṭṛhari's guru, at least in the particular remark under consideration. Secondly, it is precisely a statement to the effect that Bharṭṛhari's teacher composed the Vākyapadīya that the Tīkā avoids making. I also fail to understand what the written composition (grantha-rūpa upaniṣadbanda) authored by Bharṭṛhari would be, once the composition commonly ascribed to him, the Vākyapadīya, is attributed to his teacher.

11. The statement holds true under any sensible interpretation of nyāya-prasthāna-mārga. Bharṭṛhari's knowledge of such systems as the Māmaṁśa and Vaśeṣika is evident from his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya as well as from scores of passages in the Trikaṇḍi.

12. The most eloquent testimony to Bharṭṛhari's intellectual independence is provided by as early an author as Mallā-vādin (pp. 581, 594-595):... iti bharṭṛhariyādi- matam. vasurātasya bharṭṛhariyādiyāhyasya maññatu... evath tātad bharṭṛhariyādi-darśanam ayuktam, yat tu vasurātō bharṭṛharer upādyāyaḥ... ity āhā...

13. (a) The importance of 481-490 for the history of Sanskrit grammar is in no way diminished if they are not ascribed to Bharṭṛhari. As the work of a junior contemporary of Bharṭṛhari they remain almost as ancient and as reliable as they have so far been held to be.

(Continued on the next page)
2.2 Is it the case that the difficulty I perceive with regard to 487 has not occurred to others who studied it? I find it hard to suppose so. The very fact that attempts have been made to assign secondary, non-literal meanings to the verse indicates that some uneasiness has been felt regarding what it literally says. Let us now examine whether these attempts are justified. If they are justified, the assumption behind them that Bhartrhari is the author of 481-490 must be deemed acceptable; on the other hand, if they lack justification, the assumption must be set aside.

2.3 The Tīkā offers the following comment on 487: atha kadācid yogato vicārya¹⁴ tatra[ bhavatā ]¹⁵ bhagavatā vasuvāta-gurunā mamāyam āgamaḥ samjñāya¹⁶ vātsalyāt pranīta iti sva-racitāsāya granthāsa guru-pūrva-kramam abhidhātum āha. (At this point, the text of 487 as given above is found.) . . . anena gurunā samjñāya¹⁶ na tathā mamāyam āgama-samgrahah pranīto yena sarvāh bhave aprī tu sāvadhānenetu uktāṃ bhavati. Here the intention is clearly to make the verse say, not “my teacher composed this”, but “I composed this because of the affectionate personal attention (note vātsalyāt, sāvadhānena) that my teacher gave to me”.¹⁷ However, there is

(Continued from the last page)

(b) In the light of what I have argued here, point 2.1 (a) on p. 548 of my 1969 article on the title Vākyapadīya should be dropped. If the verses at the end of the second kōśa are not written by the author of the Vākyapadīya, I cannot use their existence as a proof of his intention to divide the Tīkā into two parts. However, my view regarding the title stands as it is on the basis of the other considerations recorded in the same article.

14. I do not know what precisely is meant by yogato vicārya.

15. The constituent bhavatā seems to have been dropped through haplography in the Tīkā manuscripts. That one must supply it is clear from the lack of connection between tatra and bhagavatā and from the fact that the honorific tatra-bhavat was rather closely associated with the line of scholars to which Bhartrhari and Vasuvāta belonged (Aklujkar 1972: 186-188).

16. One gets the impression that the author of the Tīkā glosses samjñāya with vātsalyāt and sāvadhānena. However, if that is the case, two difficulties arise: (a) How does one derive the meanings vātsalyāt and sāvadhānena from samjñāya ‘having known together/completely, having ascertained’? (b) Where can the expression samjñāya be accommodated in the verse? Obviously the author of the Tīkā would not gloss his own words in this manner, and he leaves no doubt that he reads the verse precisely as we do. In view of these considerations, I conclude that samjñāya has not in fact been glossed. It is simply a short expression for tān nyāya-prasthānā-mārgān svām darśanāh ca abhyasa. The expressions that follow it, vātsalyāt and na tathā . . . api tu sāvadhānena, are meant to bring out the spirit of the verse as the Tīkā understands it to be. They provide more details concerning how Vasuvāta imparted the āgama or āgama-samgraha to Bhartrhari. For this as well as other reasons I find Raghunātha Sharmā’s change of the second samjñāya to asamjñāya quite unnecessary.

17. The summary verses of Punya-raja appearing at the end of the Tīkā add one detail (guru-nirdeśad bhāṣyān nyāya-vivutātaye, which is probably to be read as guru-nirdeśad bhāṣyān-mārgān vivutātaye) to this interpretation: dhārīya-vasuvātēna nyāya-mārgān vicintya eva [pranītā](Continued on the next page)
not a single word in the verse that would justify the addition of the element “because of the affectionate personal attention” so crucial to this interpretation. Furthermore, it is apparent from the clauses guruṇā mama ayam āgamaḥ pranītaḥ and guruṇā mama ayam āgama-saṅgrahaḥ pranītaḥ that the author of the Titā construes asmākaṁ in the verse with pranītaḥ, understands pranītaḥ in the sense of some such word as pratipādaṁ (‘stated, explained, delivered, given’), and interprets asmākaṁ as a genitive substitute for asmabhyaṁ (=mahaṁ, in this instance). However, the natural connection of asmākaṁ is with guruṇā. If the guru is not related to the author of the verse, i.e., to the person referred to by asmāt, there is no justification at all for bringing him in; the expectancy ‘whose teacher?’ must be satisfied. Secondly, the word pranītaḥ, at least in the writings of Bhartrhari and his near contemporaries, does not ever seem to have been used in the sense the author of the Titā seems to assign to it. And even if we assign that sense to pranītaḥ, we do not get past difficulties. If we say asmākaṁ guruṇā ayam āgamaḥ pratipādaṁ, we are guilty of overlooking the constituent saṅgrahaḥ and the obvious reference of ayam to the work Vākyapādiya. On the other hand, if we say asmākaṁ guruṇā ayam āgama-saṅgrahaḥ pratipādaṁ, we make a statement that goes against the massive evidence favouring Bhartrhari’s, and not his teacher’s, authorship of the āgama-saṅgraha called Vākyapādiya. Thus, the Titā explanation is far from satisfactory.

2.4 Raghunātha Sharmā (1968: 575) mostly follows the Titā. If he is aware of any of the difficulties pointed out above, he does not say so. The only significant addition made by him, ayam āgama-saṅgraha guruṇā-asmākaṁ kṛte pranīta iti vā yojanā, suffers from lack of evidence; neither the manuscripts of the Vākyapādiya nor any of the known medieval works attribute the authorship of the āgama-saṅgraha called Vākyapādiya to Bhartrhari’s teacher. Besides, there is no justification for supplying kṛte.

(Continued from the last page)

vidhitvā ceyam mama vyākaranāgamaḥ // mayēpi guru-nirādāvd bhāṣyān naśyāviltupaye lokad-traya-kramenāyath nibandhaḥ parikāritāh ||. In my view, S. Iyer (1969: 3) offers an unjustifyably specific meaning (see 2.5 below) to these verses in his remark: “...Vasurāta gathered together the traditions in a composition for the sake of his disciple Bhartrhari and instructed him to write his own work on the basis of that.”


19. I shall leave out of consideration the translations by Goldsticke 1861: 238 (“...my Guru...taught me the compendium of this grammatical work”) and Weber 1862: 161 (“Von meinem Lehrer...ward mir gelehrt hier dieser saṅgraha des Texts”). They are more arbitrary than some of the interpretations rejected here.
2.5 While the Tilā explains 487cd by saying, in effect, that Bhartṛhari was very much indebted to his teacher for the contents of the Vākyapadīya and for inspiration and guidance in writing the Vākyapadīya, Baladeva Upādhyāya (1968: kha) and S. Iyer (1969: 3, 69) go a step further. Instead of tracing Bhartṛhari’s indebtedness to Vasurāta’s oral instruction, they trace it to a book by Vasurāta, and offer that rather specific indebtedness as the basis for the apparent attribution of the Vākyapadīya to Bhartṛhari’s teacher (‘Since this compendium draws upon the book of my teacher so heavily, you may say that it is actually my teacher who has composed it’). Their interpretation thus abandons the clever and, I am sure, deliberate ambiguity of the Tilā interpretation and does more violence to the text of 487. It is quite evident that that verse does not contain a statement on the authorship of two works by two individuals (Bhartṛhari and his teacher Vasurāta). Contextually it can refer to the genesis only of the work that precedes it and is before us, namely, the Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari. The word ayam in it cannot refer to any other work. This is clear also from the immediately following verse. There we find atra, related to ayam, and that characterization of the āgama-saṅgraha which entirely fits the Vākyapadīya.

2.6 At this point it may be said that there exists another way of understanding 487cd which is free from problematic construing, retention of ambiguity in the case of pranītaḥ etc., and unjustifiable bifurcation of the reference of ayam. Take pranīto guruṇāśmākam ayam āgama-saṅgrahah to be an expression of Bhartṛhari’s reverence and humility; conclude that, out of gratitude, Bhartṛhari offered the authorship of his work to his teacher; the remark ‘my teacher composed this’ is simply an hyperbolic expression for ‘I could not have composed this without the help of my teacher and hence this really belongs to him.’ True, this alternative has the merit of not doing any violence to the syntax and literal meaning of 487cd; but it nevertheless forces one to accept something of which there is no corroboration in the tradition, namely that Bhartṛhari ascribed his own work to his

---

20. The Tilā (see the passage cited in 2.3 above) does not explain pranīta. It also seems to pretend that the constituent saṅgraha in āgama-saṅgraha does not exist.

21. (a) I do not wish to deny the possibility of Bhartṛhari’s teacher having composed an āgama-saṅgraha or of Bhartṛhari’s being indebted to that āgama-saṅgraha. What I object to is the inference of either possibility on the basis of verse 487.

(b) It is not surprising that the author of the Tilā and Viśabha (p. 1. 19–22), not being aware of all the ways in which autographs change, could not see the possibility of there being another hand behind 481–490, and that they consequently read them as a continuation of what precedes. That modern scholars equipped with the science of textual criticism did not realise or explore the possibility is puzzling.
teacher. Moreover, a figurative or secondary meaning should be resorted to, especially in historical research, only when the literal meaning cannot be accommodated. As shown in 2.1 above, this is not the case with the passage under consideration.

2. 7 Another possible way of circumventing the conclusion that it was Bharṭṛhari’s student who authored verses 481–490 would be as follows: There is no reason why 481–490 must be taken as marking the conclusion of both the kārikā text and the Vṛtti text; it is possible that they indicate the end of only the Vṛtti text and constitute a statement of the author of the Vṛtti alone. If that is so, then verse 487 can easily be understood as a remark by the author of the Vṛtti, Bharṭṛhari, to the effect that it was his teacher who composed the āgama-saṅgraha in the form of the Vākyapadīya kārikās. However, as I have argued elsewhere (Aklujkar 1972), the kārikās and the Vṛtti must be thought of as coming from the pen of one and the same person. Besides, we have no evidence to credit Bharṭṛhari’s teacher, whether he is Vasurāta or anyone else, with the authorship of (at least most of) the kārikās.

3. 1 As for verses 481–482, two possibilities need to be considered. Are we to read 481 as giving the context of 482, or are we to read 481 and 482 together as jointly providing the context of 483? In the former alternative, atha ‘then, subsequently’ will retain its most common meaning and need not be understood in the sense ‘and, moreover’, but the implication will be that the Saṅgraha was unavailable or was mostly unavailable (the latter if one construes prāyenā, not with saṅkṣepa-rucin, but with astam upāgata) to the author of the Mahābhāṣya. This implication is contradicted by the description saṅgraha-pratikañcukē (see 5.4–6 below) of the Mahā-

22. (a) This alternative leads to, but does not require an answer to, the question: Who composed the kārikās of the third kānda?

(b) It is possible to phrase the alternative by assuming Hari-vṛṣabha to be the author of the Vṛtti and Bharṭṛhari to be the author of the kārikās. However, as I have suggested elsewhere (Aklujkar 1972: 182–183 footnote 2), Hari-vṛṣabha does not really exist in the context of the Vākyopadīya. Besides, saying Hari-vṛṣabha wrote 481–490 implies acceptance of the view that someone other than Bharṭṛhari wrote 481–490.

23. The Tīkā and Raghuṇātha Sarma’s Ambākarti accept the first possibility (note . . . saṅgrahabhidhānāṁ nibhandhanam . . . astam upāgatam . . . astath yātah saṅgrahaḥ). Thieme (1956: 18–19), while entertaining the first possibility (“the Saṅgraha had perished”), is quick to realise that 481d can also be taken to mean: “the Saṅgraha had ceased to be studied”. Yudhiṣṭhira Māmālaya (sattvat 2020: 278) clearly distinguishes between the loss of the text of the Saṅgraha and a break in the tradition of studying the Saṅgraha. He takes 481–482 as indicating the latter. So does S. Iyer (1969: 3).

24. Use of atha in the sense of ca cannot be said to be uncommon, especially in metrical compositions.
bhāṣya and also by Patañjali’s statements concerning the Sarṅgraha;\textsuperscript{26} it does not seem to be the case that the Sarṅgraha was lost or was substantially lost at the time of Patañjali. Thus, the only interpretation justifiable in view of the available evidence will be the one in which 481–482 are understood as jointly stating the context of 483. In other words, what the verses precisely state is the following: (a) Men of immature intellect could not determine the nature of the views expressed in the Mahābhāṣya or could not determine the views acceptable to the author of the Sarṅgraha once the Sarṅgraha went into oblivion. (b) This was due, in part, to the fact that the Mahābhāṣya took so much of the Sarṅgraha for granted. Its apparently simple statements were based on discussions of great depth and length that were carried out in the Sarṅgraha. (c) The imprecise understanding of the Mahābhāṣya on the part of students with unseasoned intellects\textsuperscript{26} was also due to the fact that Patañjali, as a person well-versed in different branches of learning (ṭīrtha-darśin), used all principles of interpretation and thus placed the grammarians to follow in the not too comfortable position of being required to comprehend the principles of interpretation that existed in seed-form in his work. (d) The passing of the Sarṅgraha into oblivion, in turn, was due to the fact that it encountered grammarians who failed to appreciate its worth. There was no proper appreciation of the discussions from the points of view of many systems which the Sarṅgraha contained;

25. (a) satāṁgraha etat prādhānyena parākṣetāṁ nityo va nyo kṛṣṇo veti. tatrotā dosaḥ prayojanādy abhy ukṛtāṁ. tatra tu esa nīrṇayo yady esa nītī ’thāpi kṛṣṇa ubhayathāpi lakṣaṇayath pravartam iti. (Mahābhāṣya 1.1.1 p. I.6)
   (b) satāṁgraha tattat kṛṣṇa-pratidvandvī-bhāvāṁ manyamāhe nitya-paryāya-vacino grahanam iti. (Mahābhāṣya 1.1.1 p. I.6)
   (c) sobhām khalu dākṣaṇyasya satāṁgrahaśya kṛtiḥ. sobhām khalu dākṣaṇyena satāṁgrahaśya kṛti iti. (Mahābhāṣya 2.3.66 p. I.468)
   (d) Possibly: kiraśīṁ cakrītītāntāṁ pacalitī atra yo nayet | prāptīnām tam aham
   manya prārabdhāṁ tena satāṁgrahaḥ || (Mahābhāṣya 7.4.92 p. III.359)

26. Thieme translates akṛta-buddhi’ñāṁ as “not exercising their intellect”. I think a translation like “those whose intellect is not sharpened or made mature by the study of sāstras” will be closer to the original. It is repeatedly indicated by the author of 481–490 that only a person having a background in several vidyās / agamas / agama-darśanas can understand the apparently simple statements of the Mahābhāṣya in a satisfactory way. Besides this contextual indication of the thrust of the adjective, we have its use in Gītā 18.16 (‘akṛta-buddhitom na sa pasyati durmatiḥ’), which is explained by Śaṅkara with the expression asatāḥ-skṛta-buddhiḥ. The compound kṛta-buddhi is evidently analogous to kṛta-hasta (Trīkādi 3.14.558) ‘one of trained hand’ and kṛta-man (Gītā 15.11, which, in fact, has the negative akrāta) ‘one of cultivated self’. The root kṛ in it signifies modification or perfection (compare the use of “do” in English sentences such as “Have you done your hair?”). The ‘tīkā glosses it accurately as kṛta-nuyutpatā prakṛtā prāptā mahāiḥ buddhiḥ yeṣāṁ te. Of course, one cannot be a kṛta-buddhi unless one exercises one’s intellect first. To that extent, Thieme’s translation, although not contextually exact, is indeed justified.
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there was also a demand for works that would provide an overview or gist of the system of grammar.

4.1 The above analysis was prompted mainly by the consideration that the interpretation of 481–482 given in footnote 23 should not be accepted uncritically—that it should be recognised that there are two possibilities of interpretation leading to two significantly different depictions of the history of the Pāṇinian tradition. The analysis is motivated also by a desire to determine the sense of verse 484. Thieme (1956: 19 footnotes 45–46) has expressed the view that 484c, ārṣe viplāvite grante, refers to the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini. My analysis of 481–483 should serve to indicate that this cannot be the case. The relationship mentioned in these verses is between the Mahābhāṣya and the Saṅgraha. There is no reason why their author should suddenly switch from a consideration of the Mahābhāṣya to that of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Thieme's interpretation creates a problem also for what follows 484. If we go along with it, the logical link between 483 and 485 is lost. The former tells us that the grammarians who flourished after Patañjali did not exhibit either the patience or the intellectual ability needed for determining the acceptable views in a work like the Mahābhāṣya. From the latter we learn that the traditional (interpretive) lore of grammar slipped from the hands of the disciples of Patañjali. In between we need a statement saying in effect that the understanding of the Mahābhāṣya became distorted as a result of the variety of interpretations and that the confusing variety of interpretations discouraged prospective students. Only verse 484 can provide that link, and that too only if it is interpreted as speaking of the Mahābhāṣya.

4.2 Every expression that occurs with ārṣe viplāvite grante in 484 indicates, directly or indirectly, that the reference of the verse cannot be to the Aṣṭādhyāyī: (a) From the place at which the names of Vaiji, etc. occur it is clear that those grammarians, pseudo-grammarians, or anti-grammarians lived after Patañjali. The target of their activity, or at least the primary target of their activity, therefore, is more likely to be Patañjali's work than Pāṇini's work. (b) śuṣka tarka is characterized in the Vṛtti of 1.153 as śabdāśakti-rūpāparighitah. śādharmya-vaiddharmya-mātrānusāri sarvāgamopaghāta-hetutvād anibandhanaḥ and in the Tīkā on 2.484 as anya-śāstra-parimalarañitaḥ. Thus, the expression śuṣka-tarkāṇusāribhiḥ specifically points out the failure of Vaiji and others to take into consideration the related branches of knowledge and to realise that the words employed in the tradition of grammar are to be understood in a contextually sensible way. Now, I think it is evident that the Aṣṭādhyāyī does not so directly demand of its readers a knowledge of the principles employed in other systems as does the Mahā-
bhāṣya. Contextually too, it is in the case of the Mahābhāṣya that proper understanding is indicated to be dependent on a knowledge of other branches of learning; cf. tīrtha-darśinā, sarveśāṁ nyāya-bijānām, alabdha-gāḍhe gāmbhiṛyāt, and akṛta-buddhīnām. (c) Even if we go along with Thieme and understand saṁgraha-pratikaṇcuke as meaning “of which the defensive armour was the Saṁgraha”, the word does not seem to be so appropriate as a description of the Aśṭādhyāyī as of the Mahābhāṣya. From the indications provided in 481 (saṁkṣepa-rucī, alpa-vidyā-parigrahaṇ) and from the known references to the Saṁgraha (Yudhiṣṭhira Mimāṁsaka saṁvataḥ 2020: 270–277) one can easily conclude that the Saṁgraha was very ambitiously planned, that it involved study of many vidyās, and that it was predominantly a work on grammatical theory and linguistic philosophy. It does not seem to have been a commentary to the Aśṭādhyāyī in the usual sense or a defense of the Aśṭādhyāyī per se. On the other hand, as shown in 3.1 above, the Mahābhāṣya drew heavily upon the Saṁgraha and could be misinterpreted in its absence.

5.1 So far four (see footnote 29 below) different explanations of the expression saṁgraha-pratikaṇcuka have been proposed. The Tīkā seems to be unsure about it, as it neither cites the expression as a pratiṁka, nor provides any explicit gloss. However, there is room to believe that its author decided to read 484d as saṁgraha-pratikaṇcukaiḥ and to understand it as meaning saṁgraha-pratipakṣa-bhūtaiḥ.27 Goldstücker (1861: 257–258) adopted the same reading, but assigned it the exactly opposite meaning “who were partisans of the Saṁgraha”. Among those who are aware of the reading saṁgraha-pratikaṇcuke as an adjective of granthe, we have Kielhorn (1876: 244), who provisionally takes it to be a tat-puruṣa (saṁgrahaśya pratikaṇcuke) meaning “preserving the (contents of the) Saṁgraha”, and Thieme, who takes it to be a bahu-vṛhi (saṁgrahāḥ pratikaṇcukaiḥ yasya tasmin) meaning “of which the defensive armour was the Saṁgraha” or “whose counter-armour is (was) the Saṁgraha”.

5.2 Goldstücker’s rendering is clearly inappropriate. We have no reason to suppose that there was a group of Saṁgraha partisans in existence after the Mahābhāṣya had gained currency or to suppose that that group was interested in making a case against the Mahābhāṣya. The high regard for the Saṁgraha shown by Patañjali and by the followers of Patañjali such as Bhartṛhari indicates that the followers of the Mahābhāṣya were also followers of the Saṁgraha, not a rival group. Secondly, there does not seem to be any

27. Note the introduction to 484: tathā ca saṁgraha-pratipakṣa-bhūtair deśyais tarka-vidyāmātra-vedibhiḥ.
satisfactory way of arriving at the meaning ‘partisan’ from the basic meanings of prati and kañcuka. The same difficulty exists in the case of the Tīkā explanation. Thieme (1956: 19 footnote 46) suggests that the author of the Tīkā “understands pratikañcuka as a bahu-vṛihi, to be analyzed: pratinaddhaṁ kañcukatāṁ yena’, ‘he who has fastened his armour, he who is ready for battle’. However, such a compound would be unique in two ways. The root nah is not known to have been used with the prefix prati, not at least in a sense useful for the Tīkā author’s derivation. Secondly, the bahu-vṛihi compounds with a suppressed participle, praparna etc. (Trikāṇḍī 3.14.52), are always explained with gata, krānta or a synonym thereof; naddha is unparalleled as an implicit or latent member of a bahu-vṛihi. Another difficulty with the Tīkā interpretation is that it does not explain how the Saṁgraha could produce hostile reaction even after Patañjali’s time or why the opponents of the Saṁgraha were interested in expressing opposition to the Mahābhāṣya. It is, of course, possible that the Mahābhāṣya was viewed unkindly because it was based on the Saṁgraha. But even then it is puzzling that the Saṁgraha should have given rise to a long line of opponents so dead set against it that even a work based on it was a target for vehement attacks. Finally, one must note as a problem common to the explanations given by both Goldstücker and the author of the Tīkā that the instrumental reading saṁgraha-pratikañcukālh is not attested in any of the manuscripts known so far.

5.3 The sense ‘counter-armour, defensive armour’ attributed by Thieme to the word pratikañcuka is etymologically plausible and, when accepted as a part of a reference to the Mahābhāṣya, contextually suitable (see 4.1–2 above). However, one wonders whether prati is really called for if that is what the compound word means. As kañcuka or armour is meant to be a protective, defensive covering, prati adds nothing of significance when taken in the sense ‘counter–, defensive’. Secondly, the meaning given by Thieme proves to be partially or entirely unsuitable in the other contexts known so far. As Thieme notes, pratikañcuka occurs in Āryabhaṭiya, Gola-pāda verse 50 as suktāyuṣoḥ pranāśāṁ kurute pratikañcukāṁ yo ‘syā. In this concluding verse of his work, Āryabhaṭa clearly wishes to warn the reader that a certain type of activity should not be undertaken with


29. The commentary on the Āryabhaṭiya explains this as asya tāstraya yaḥ pratikañcukath kurute, dosotpādaṇena tirakṣarāṇam ity arthah, tasya suktāyuṣoḥ pranāśaḥ syāḥ. Thus, ‘making something obscure by finding faults in it’ is the fifth meaning proposed for pratikañcuka. Since it fails to be applicable in 484 and in the passage from Kumārila cited in 5.4, it must be rejected.
respect to his work; if undertaken, it would lead to the destruction or waste (pranāśa) of the reader’s good karman (sukṛta) and life (āyus). Now, this activity cannot certainly be the making of a ‘defensive armour’ or protective covering; there is no reason why the possibility of anyone’s attempting to provide more protection (in a literal sense or in the figurative sense of justification, bolstering with arguments, etc.) to Āryabhaṭa’s work should disturb Āryabhaṭa to the extent of uttering an imprecation. Realising this, Thieme proposes that we should read apratikaṅcukām, i.e. supply an avagraha after kurute, in the Āryabhaṭīya verse, take apratikaṅcukām as an adverb, and translate the line as follows: “He causes perdition of his good deeds and his life so that there can be no defense (counter-armour), who (causes perdition) of this (work, the Āryabhaṭīya).” However, such a translation is possible only if we repeat the phrase pranāśam kurute as yaḥ asya āryabhaṭīyasya pranāśam kurute [saḥ] suktāyuṣoḥ apratikaṅcukām pranāśam kurute. It does not seem likely from the placing of pranāśam and pratikaṅcukām/apratikaṅcukām in the verse line that Āryabhaṭa had in mind the connection of pranāśam with yaḥ asya and of pratikaṅcukām/apratikaṅcukām with pranāśam kurute. Secondly, although a statement like ‘He causes perdition of his good deeds, so that there can be no defense’ is sensible, a statement like ‘He causes perdition of his life, so that there can be no defense’ is hardly sensible; when life is gone, there is no need for defense.

5.4 Recently I have come across an occurrence of pratikaṅcukā that seems to have eluded all those who previously discussed the problem of 484d. It is in the Tantra-vārttika (on 1. 3. 7, p. 122 of the Ānandāśrama edition of 1970) of Kumārila: pratikaṅcukā-rūpeṇa pūrva-śāstrārtha-gocaram/ yad anyat kriyate tasya dharmāṁ praty apramāṇatā // tathā ca prāyaścitādīdāna-kāle yo vākyam ātmāyam anya-kavikṛtāṁ vā ślokaṁ voccārya mānavādī-prāyaścittaṁ dadyān na kaścid [?kaṃcid] api dharmārthain pratipadyeta. This passage, especially in the gloss it contains, serves to establish that pratikaṅcukā cannot mean what Thieme thinks it means. What is more important is that, of all the relevant passages known so far, it provides the clearest indication as to what pratikaṅcukā must mean. Kumārila’s point is as follows: If one were to replace the scriptural sentences employed in religious activities with newly composed sentences of similar import, one would not acquire dharma by performing those activities; it is the scriptural sentences that are a valid means of dharma, not their recasts. Thus, the Tantra-vārttika passage leaves no doubt that pratikaṅcukā stands, in the context of literature, for ‘incorporating contents, expressing the same matter in another composition’. It can be easily seen that this meaning fits the other two contexts in which the word occurs. What Āryabhaṭa is really con-
cerned about is the possibility of plagiarism. He does not wish that anyone (probably, from among his contemporaries) should expropriate his thought—his findings. Therefore, he seeks to deter prospective plagiarists by writing the stern words: “He who prepares a pratikaṇčuka (work having the same contents) in the case of this (Āryabhaṭīya) causes perdition of [his] good deeds and life”.30 As for the Vākyā-kāṇḍa passage with which we are immediately concerned here, the suitability of the sense of pratikaṇčuka gathered from the Tantra-vārttika is even easier to see. The Mahābhāṣya, as a recast or adaptation of the Saṁgraha, made use of the contents of the Saṁgraha (see footnote 28 above). Hence it has been described as saṁgraha-pratikaṇčuka. Thus, Kielhorn showed a remarkable sensitivity to the drift of 481–490 when he suggested that 484d be translated as “preserving the (contents of the) Saṁgraha”.

5.5 How did pratikaṇčuka acquire this figurative sense of ‘old wine in a new bottle’? I think pratikaṇčuka is a compound of the type of pratikṛti ‘replica’, praticchāyā ‘reflection, mirror-image’, pratinidhi ‘substitute, representative’, pratibimba ‘reflection, mirror-image’, and pratirūpa ‘counterpart’. The prati in it carries the sense ‘another similar, the one on that side which agrees with what we have on this side’. In other words, there is an implication in it of bodily difference (physical distinctness) as well as of inner or substantial correspondence. Its remaining constituent, kaṇčuka, is most probably intended in the commonly noticed meaning ‘cloak, robe’. Thus, the etymological meaning of pratikaṇčuka seems to me to have been ‘another dress, another garb, disguise’, the implication being that the substance is the same in spite of the change in appearance. I think that the figurative sense given above emerges naturally when this etymological sense is restricted to the context of literature—to the context of composing works or passages.

30. This interpretation requires a repetition of kurute. However, the repetition is not strained as in the case of Thieme’s interpretation, for kurute is placed in the verse between prapātam and pratikaṇčukam with which it is connected. There is also the possibility that the original wording of the Āryabhaṭīya line was suktāyutah pranāśatah kurute kurute pratikaṇčukath yo ’ṣya, and that one kurute has been lost through haplography. The āryā metre is not disturbed in either reading.

31. Since it involved a major change in the reading furnished by all accessible manuscripts, I did not give the benefit of the following possibility to the author of the Tīkā in writing 5.2. It is possible that his remark introducing 484 (see footnote 27 above) is a result of corruption through haplography—that it was intended to be read as: taṅka ca saṁgrahaḥ saṁkṣepa-bhāṣaḥ pratipakṣa-bhāṣā acaryais tāraka-vidyomitra-vadibhūḥ. See the Tīkā passage quoted in footnote 28 above. If my guess is correct, the meaning pratipakṣa or pratipakṣa-bhāṣā assigned to the word pratikaṇčuka by the compilers of dictionaries on the authority of the Tīkā must be said to be the result of an unfortunate error.
5.6 That the word kañcuka had transcended the meaning ‘cloak, dress’ and was capable of extended use can be seen from a number of texts. In the fifth act of the Abhijñāna-śākuntala, we come across the expression dharma-kañcuka. One of the lines (1.843cd) in Abhinava-gupta’s Mālinī(-vijaya-)vārttika runs thus: ittham ke ’py abhimanyante sāmkhya-kañcuka-samaśrayāt. According to Vidyabhusana (1921:519 footnote 4), paṇḍita-kañcuka is found in the Brhat-svayambhū-purāṇa (Hara Prasad Sastri’s edition, vi. 321). Several texts of the Kashmir Śaiva tradition (Śiva-sūtra 3.42; Kṣema-rāja’s Śiva-sūtra-vimarśini on 3.3, 3.42; Abhinava-gupta’s Mālinī(-vijaya-)vārttika 1.652, 1.836, 2.215, for example) regularly employ kañcuka in the sense of the covering of the true self or soul that the senses etc. form.

6.1 As we saw above in 2.1–7, the problem that verse 487 gives rise to has not been squarely faced in the literature on the Vākyapadīya. The treatment accorded to 486 has been even more superficial in one sense. Although attempts have been made to identify the parvata mentioned in it and although the precise nature of what Candrācārya and others did has been frequently discussed (see George Cardona’s paper in this volume), no modern scholar seems to have realized that the verse contains a textual problem. The construction āgamaṁ labdhvā saḥ bahu-śākhatvam nītaḥ is as strange as maniṁ labdhvā saḥ bahudhā bhinnah. Normally one would say in such cases either āgamaḥ labdhvā bahu-śākhatvam nītaḥ (compare viṣa-vṛkṣaḥ saṁvardhyā chinnṛḥ) or āgamaṁ labdhvā taṁ bahu-śākhatvam nītavantaḥ. That is, either the accusative āgamaṁ or the nominative saḥ must be given up if 486 is to contain a construction worthy of a grammarian author. Now, it is obvious that changing saḥ and thereby opting for a reading like taṁ bahuśākhatvam nītavantaḥ would amount to a complete rewriting of the verse; any attempt to introduce a standard construction in the present text of the verse must be made without disturbing the passive phrasing candrācāryādibhiḥ...nītaḥ. Thus the only course open to a text critic is the one of altering āgamaṁ to āgamaḥ (that is, to āgamo in the given phonetic situation). But such an emendation, although metrically possible, is incapable of removing a further problem. The āgama of 486 can be either the vyākaraṇāgama mentioned in 485 or the mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama ascribed to Rāvana as the Tīkā says. If it is the former, there is no need to use the word āgama; it can be easily and simply referred to by a demonstrative

32. I am aware that the sentence the Sanskrit grammarians actually discuss is viṣa-vṛkṣaḥ ’pi saṁvardhyā svayam chettum aṣāṃpratam (Kālidāsa, Kumāra-saṃbhava 2.55). I have simplified that sentence in order to bring into sharp focus the considerations involved in discussing 486.
pronoun. Re-employment of the word āgama hardly fits the elegantly tight style of 481–490. Besides, if a Sanskrit author repeats a substantive at all in such a context, he introduces the corresponding form of the demonstrative pronoun before it; that is, if the author had intended to use the word āgama again by overlooking the possibility that it could be easily understood from 485, he would have fitted in 486a the phrase saḥ āgamaḥ (or the phrase tam āgamaṃ, to assume, for a moment, that the accusative is permissible). It is perhaps an awareness of these considerations that prompted the author of the Tīkā to distinguish, rather obliquely, the āgama referred to by āgamaṃ from the āgama referred to by saḥ, i.e. to speak of a mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama distinct from the vyākaraṇāgama that the successors of Patañjali lost. He seems to have reasoned that if such a distinction is made the construction will not be ungrammatical (vajraṁ labdhvā maṇiḥ bahudhā bhimnāḥ and viṣa-vṛksaṁ sarivardhya āmra-vṛksaḥ chinnāḥ are acceptable constructions), and the recurrence of the word āgama can also be explained. However, there is no justification in the given context to make the verse say parvatāt rāvaṇa-viracitaṁ mūla-bhūta-vyākaraṇāgamaṁ labdhvā candrācāryādibhiḥ saḥ patañjali-śiśyebhyaḥ bhrasṭaḥ. vyākaraṇāgamaḥ bahu-sākhataṁ nītaḥ. Any author who can write as perspicuously as the rest of the verses bear out is not likely to use the general word āgama for a contextually absent and unexpectedly specific thing, especially when that word can be easily (mis-)understood as referring to vyākaraṇāgama. If the author of 481–490 had the mysterious rāvaṇa-viracita mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama in mind, he would have either written an additional verse or used a distinct expression indicating the distinction of two āgamas. Thus, āgamaṁ does not appear to be the original reading in 486a. It is also possible that not only āgamaṁ but the entire phrase parvatād agamaḥ is a result of textual corruption. Of what it could be a corruption I am unable to determine at present.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ÅKLUJKAR : The Concluding Verses of Bhartṛhari's Vākya-Kāṇḍa 25


The preceding four are reprinted in Franz Kielhorn Kleine Schriften. (Ed.) Rau, Wilhelm. Wiesbaden : Franz Steiner Verlag.


Peterson, P. 1885. “Note on the date of Patañjali”. Journal of the Bombay 4 Annals (D. J.)
Ṭīkā. Usually ascribed to Punya-rāja. Available in Mānavalli’s (see under Bhartṛhari above) and Raghunatha Sharma’s editions. See Aklujkar 1974 for the view that Helā-rāja is probably the real author.
Trikāṇḍī. See Bhartṛhari.
Vṛṣabha. See Bhartṛhari (a).
Yṛtti. See Bhartṛhari (a).