

# 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<sup>1</sup> appearing at the end of the second book of Bhartṛhari's *Trikāṇḍī* or *Vākyapadīya*. The verses have been studied, primarily or incidentally, directly or indirectly, in a number of publications: Goldstücker (1861), Weber (1862), Kielhorn (1874, 1875, 1876, 1885), Peterson (1885), Thieme (1956), Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (*saṃvat* 2020), Sharmā (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 *Vākyapadīya* / *Trikāṇḍī-kārikās* and for the copies of *Ṭīka* manuscripts that he so promptly provided. Professors K. A. Subramania Iyer and M. A. Mehendale exerted themselves considerably to make available to me a copy of the *Vākyā-kāṇḍa-vṛtti* 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 *Trikāṇḍī kārikās*. It is the only flawless enumeration we have at present that enables us to refer to a tradition of the *Trikāṇḍī* text (the *kārikā* manuscript tradition) in a form determined by objective textual criticism. It will be highly convenient if the *Trikāṇḍī* text as preserved in the other (*Vṛtti* and *Ṭīka*) 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 *kārikā* manuscripts give us the oldest accessible form of the *Trikāṇḍī* text. See Aklujkar 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 *kārikā* manuscripts I have simply followed Rau's lead. It is only the collection and evaluation of the evidence of the *Vṛtti* and *Ṭīka* manuscripts that I have freshly attempted.

2 Annals [D. J.]

by presenting those verses as they will appear in my proposed edition of the *Trikāṇḍī* 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 *Ṭikā*. 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 :

*prāyeṇa saṁkṣepa-rucīn alpā-vidyā-parigrahān |*  
*saṁprāpya vaiyākaraṇān saṁgrāhe 'stam upāgate ||481||*  
*kr̥te 'tha patañjalīnā<sup>2</sup> guruṇā tīrthadarśinā |*  
*sarveśāṁ nyāya-bījānāṁ mahābhāṣye nibandhane ||482||*  
*alabdha-gādhe gāmbhīryād uttāna iva sauṣṭhāvāt |*  
*tasminn akṛta-buddhīnāṁ naivāvāsthita niścayaḥ ||483||*  
*vaiji-saubhava-haryakṣaiḥ<sup>3</sup> śuṣka-tarkānusāribhiḥ |*  
*ārṣe viplāvite granthe saṁgraha-pratikañcuke<sup>4</sup> ||484||*  
*yaḥ patañjali-śiṣyebhyo<sup>5</sup> bhraṣṭo vyākaraṇāgamah |*  
*kāle sa<sup>6</sup> dākṣiṇātyeṣu granthamātre<sup>7</sup> vyavasthitah ||485||*  
*parvatād āgamaṁ labdhvā bhāṣya-bījānusāribhiḥ |*  
*sa nīto bahu-śākhatvaṁ candrācāryādibhiḥ punaḥ ||486||*

2. Although *pāta*<sup>o</sup> is attested in all manuscripts of the *kārikā* tradition and in some important manuscripts of the *Vṛtti* and *Ṭikā* traditions, I have decided to accept the reading *pata*<sup>o</sup>. 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 *Ṭikā* read *pata*<sup>o</sup>. These are also the manuscripts far removed from each other in terms of location of writing. (c) Even those *Ṭikā* manuscripts which read *pāta*<sup>o</sup> in the *kārikā* portion almost always read *pata*<sup>o</sup> in the *Ṭikā* pertaining to the *kārikā*, indicating thereby that the author of the *Ṭikā* knew the reading to be *pata*<sup>o</sup>.

3. *vaiji* is found in the place of *vaiji* in one *Vṛtti* manuscript, and *baidri* in one *Ṭikā* manuscript. The reading *baiji*, although attested in only two usually reliable sources, can be accepted instead of *vaiji*, as manuscript writers do not always distinguish *v* and *b*. It should also be noted that whereas *baiji* can be easily derived from *bija* 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 *pāta*<sup>o</sup>, 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 *Ṭikā* manuscripts has now convinced me that the reading *pata*<sup>o</sup> 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 *Ṭikā* manuscripts has an objectively stronger claim to being genuine than *kālena* of *kārikā* manuscripts. If the latter reading is accepted, one must either understand *sah* 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 *mātro* of the generally better *kārikā* manuscripts is not corroborated by the *Vṛtti* and *Ṭikā* manuscripts.

nyāya-prasthāna-mārgāṁś tān abhyasya svam ca darśanam |  
 praṇīto guruṇāsmākam ayam āgama-saṁgrahaḥ ||487||  
 vartmanām atra keśāmcid vastu-mātram udāhṛtam |  
 kāṇḍe tṛtiye nyakṣeṇa bhaviṣyati vicāraṇā ||488||  
 prajñā vivekaṁ labhate bhinnair āgama-darśanaiḥ |  
 kiyad vā śakyam unnetuṁ sva-tarkam anudhāvatā ||489||  
 tat tad utprekṣamāṇānām purāṇair āgamair vinā |  
 anupāsita-vṛddhānām vidyā nātiprasīdati ||490||

2.1 It has so far been assumed that these verses are a composition of Bhartṛhari. I wish to question this assumption. The natural meaning of verse 487 is : “ Having frequently reflected upon those *nyāya-prasthāna-mārgas*<sup>8</sup> and his own view, our teacher composed this compendium of traditional knowledge ”. If we suppose that it was Bhartṛhari 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 evidence we have in the manuscripts and the impressively long and consistent tradition of Bhartṛhari's authorship. On the other hand, if we suppose that it was some student of Bhartṛhari 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 Bhartṛhari planned to write a *vṛtti* for the third *kāṇḍa*, 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 Bhartṛhari writing a few appropriate verses at the end of the *Vṛtti* of the second *kāṇḍa* to mark the point where Bhartṛhari

8. In the writings of Bhartṛhari and those close to him, the word *nyāya* commonly stands for ‘principle helpful in arriving at a logical or contextually justifiable view’ (cf. Gardona's paper in this Volume). I take *prasthāna* to mean ‘foundation, basis, source’ (compare the usage *prasthāna-trayī*). 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 *sarveṣāṁ nyāya-bījaṇām mahābhāṣye nibandhane* in 482 and *bhaṣya-bījaṇusāribhiḥ sa nīto bahu-śākhatvam* in 486, this amounts to saying ‘the ways of the *Mahābhāṣya*’. Thus, I am essentially in agreement with Raghunātha Sharmā's (1968 : 575) explanation *tān mūla-bhūta-vyākaraṇāgamato jñātān bhāṣye 'vasthātān nyāya-prasthāna-mārgān*. I do not object also to the interpretation ‘ways of the *nyāya-prasthānas* such as *Mīmāṃsā* and *Vyākaraṇāgama*’. 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 : 238) and ‘the various other systems’ (Raghavan Pillai 1971 : 146) less than exact.

stopped.<sup>9</sup> 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 *vartmans* or *āgamas*) in verses 489–490 can be explained most straightforwardly if we ascribe the verses 481–490 to a student of Bhartṛhari. The student, writing epilogue-type verses as he was, must have been anxious to avoid giving the impression that Bhartṛhari'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.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, there is nothing in verse 487 that applies only to Bhartṛhari's teacher Vasurāta and not to Bhartṛhari. The latter also had obviously studied the *nyāya-prasthāna-mārgas*<sup>11</sup> and had a view, a philosophy, of his own.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, I tend to believe that verses 481–490 are not a composition of Bhartṛhari.<sup>13</sup>

9. What I say here entails : (a) Bhartṛhari 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, Bhartṛhari 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 Bhartṛhari's time. Otherwise, one would not have found in the *kārikā* manuscripts verses 481–490 written by a different hand.

10. The *Ṭīkā* explains the use of the plural in two ways : *asmākam iti bahu-vacanād anyeṣāṃ api sahadhyāyināṃ grahanam. alha vā mayā tu tad-anucchedāyāṃ upanibandhaḥ kṛta ity ātmano bahu-mānaḥ prakāṣitaḥ*. The second of these explanations is misunderstood by Raghunātha Sharmā (1968 : 575) when he comments : *alha vāsmākam ayam āgama-saṃgrahaḥ = matkarty-katvena prasiddho 'yam āgama-saṃgraho vākya-pādīyākhyo guruṇā prayāto na tu mayā: mayā tu tad-anucchedāyāṃ grantha-rūpeṇopānibandhaḥ kṛta ity ātmano gurau bahu-mānaḥ prakāṣita iti*. The intention of the *Ṭīkā* is clearly to say that Bhartṛhari attaches *bahu-māna* to himself, for he, among all students of Vasurāta, gave a lasting, written form to the collection of traditions that Vasurāta had imparted; the *Ṭīkā* does not speak of attaching *bahu-māna* to Bhartṛhari's guru, at least in the particular remark under consideration. Secondly, it is precisely a statement to the effect that Bhartṛhari's teacher composed the *Vākya-pādīya* that the *Ṭīkā* avoids making. I also fail to understand what the written composition (*grantha-rūpa upanibandha*) authored by Bhartṛhari would be, once the composition commonly ascribed to him, the *Vākya-pādīya*, is attributed to his teacher.

11. The statement holds true under any sensible interpretation of *nyāya-prasthāna-mārga*. Bhartṛhari's knowledge of such systems as the *Mīmāṃsā* and *Vaiśeṣika* is evident from his commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* as well as from scores of passages in the *Trikaṇḍī*.

12. The most eloquent testimony to Bhartṛhari's intellectual independence is provided by as early an author as Malla-vādin (pp. 581, 594–595) : *... iti bhartṛharyādi-matam. vasurātasya bhartṛharyupādhyāyasya mataḥ tu ... evaṃ tavad bhartṛharyādi-darśanam ayuktam. yat tu vasurāto bhartṛharer upādhyāyaḥ ... ity āha...*

13. (a) The importance of 481–490 for the history of Sanskrit grammar is in no way diminished if they are not ascribed to Bhartṛhari. As the work of a junior contemporary of Bhartṛhari 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 Bhartṛhari 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 *Ṭīkā* offers the following comment on 487: *atha kadācid yogato vicārya*<sup>14</sup> *tatra[ bhavatā ]*<sup>15</sup> *bhagavatā vasurāta-guruṇā mamāyam āgamaḥ saṁjñāya*<sup>16</sup> *vātsalyāt praṇīta iti sva-racitasyāsyā granthāsya guru-pūrva-kramam abhidhātum āha.* (At this point, the text of 487 as given above is found.) . . . *anena guruṇā saṁjñāya*<sup>16</sup> *na tathā mamāyam āgama-saṁgrahaḥ praṇīto yena saṁdeho bhaved api tu sāvadhānenety uktam 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”.<sup>17</sup> 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 *kāṇḍa* are not written by the author of the *Vākyapadīya*, I cannot use their existence as a proof of his intention to divide the *Trikaṇḍī* 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 *Ṭīkā* 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 Bhartṛhari and Vasurāta belonged (Aklujkar 1972 : 186-188).

16. One gets the impression that the author of the *Ṭīkā* glosses *saṁjñāya* with *vātsalyāt* and *sāvadhānena*. However, if that is the case, two difficulties arise : (a) How does one derive the meanings *vātsalyāt* and *sāvadhānena* from *saṁjñāya* ‘having known together/completely, having ascertained’? (b) Where can the expression *saṁjñāya* be accommodated in the verse? Obviously the author of the *Ṭīkā* 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 *saṁjñāya* has not in fact been glossed. It is simply a short expression for *tān nyāya-prasthāna-mārgān svāth darśanāth ca abhyasya*. The expressions that follow it, *vātsalyāt* and *na tathā . . . api tu sāvadhānena*, are meant to bring out the spirit of the verse as the *Ṭīkā* understands it to be. They provide more details concerning how Vasurāta imparted the *āgama* or *āgama-saṁgraha* to Bhartṛhari. For this as well as other reasons I find Raghunātha Sharmā’s change of the second *saṁjñāya* to *asaṁjñāya* quite unnecessary.

17. The summary verses of Puṇya-raja appearing at the end of the *Ṭīkā* add one detail (*guru-nirdiṣṭad bhāṣyaṇ nyāyāvilūptaye*, which is probably to be read as *guru-nirdiṣṭad bhāṣyaṇnyāyāvilūptaye*) to this interpretation : *ācārya-vasurātena nyāya-mārgān vicintya ca | praṇīto*

(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 praṇītaḥ* and *guruṇā mama ayam āgama-saṅgrahaḥ praṇītaḥ* that the author of the *Ṭikā* construes *asmākam* in the verse with *praṇītaḥ*, understands *praṇītaḥ* in the sense of some such word as *pratipāditaḥ* ( 'stated, explained, delivered, given' ), and interprets *asmākam* as a genitive substitute for *asmabhyam* (= *mahyam*, in this instance ). However, the natural connection of *asmākam* is with *guruṇā*. If the guru is not related to the author of the verse, i. e. to the person referred to by *asmat*, there is no justification at all for bringing him in; the expectancy 'whose teacher?' must be satisfied. Secondly, the word *praṇīta*, at least in the writings of Bhartṛhari and his near contemporaries, does not ever seem to have been used in the sense the author of the *Ṭikā* seems to assign to it.<sup>18</sup> And even if we assign that sense to *praṇīta*, we do not get past difficulties. If we say *asmākam guruṇā ayam āgamaḥ pratipāditaḥ*, we are guilty of overlooking the constituent *saṅgraha* and the obvious reference of *ayam* to the work *Vākyapadīya*. On the other hand, if we say *asmākam guruṇā ayam āgama-saṅgrahaḥ pratipāditaḥ*, we make a statement that goes against the massive evidence favouring Bhartṛhari's, and not his teacher's, authorship of the *āgama-saṅgraha* called *Vākyapadīya*. Thus, the *Ṭikā* explanation is far from satisfactory.

2.4 Raghunātha Sharmā (1968 : 575) mostly follows the *Ṭikā*. 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-saṅgraho guruṇā-smākaṇ kṛte praṇīta iti vā yojanā*, suffers from lack of evidence; neither the manuscripts of the *Vākyapadīya* nor any of the known medieval works attribute the authorship of the *āgama-saṅgraha* called *Vākyapadīya* to Bhartṛhari's teacher. Besides, there is no justification for supplying *kṛte*.<sup>19</sup>

( Continued from the last page )

*vidhivac cōyam mama vyākaraṇāgamaḥ || mayāpi guru-nirदिष्टād bhāṣyaṇ nyāyavilūptaye | kanda-traya-kramenāyam nibandhaḥ parikīrtitaḥ ||*. In my view, S. Iyer (1969: 3) offers an unjustifiably 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 Bhartṛhari and instructed him to write his own work on the basis of that."

18. Cf. ... *yaiḥ pratyakṣa-dharmabhis tatra tatra pravacane sūtrānutantra-bhāṣyaṇi praṇītaṇi tair eva śiṣṭaiḥ* ... ( *Vṛtti* 1.23d. p. 63.9 ). Note also the use of *praṇetṛ* in 1.23d, *Vṛtti* 1.148-150 pp. 203-205, and *Tripadī* p. 214.4, and of *praṇayana* in *Tripadī* p. 37.17-18.

19. I shall leave out of consideration the translations by Goldstücker 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 *Tīkā* explains 487cd by saying, in effect, that Bhartṛhari was very much indebted to his teacher for the contents of the *Vākya-padīya* and for inspiration and guidance in writing the *Vākya-padīya*, 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 *Vākya-padīya* 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 *Tīkā* interpretation<sup>20</sup> 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 *Vākya-padīya* 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-saṃgraha* which entirely fits the *Vākya-padīya*.<sup>21</sup>

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 *praṇītaḥ* etc., and unjustifiable bifurcation of the reference of *ayam*. Take *praṇīto guruṇāsmākam ayam āgama-saṃgrahaḥ* 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 *Tīkā* ( see the passage cited in 2.3 above ) does not explain *praṇīta*. It also seems to pretend that the constituent *saṃgraha* in *āgama-saṃgraha* does not exist.

21. ( a ) I do not wish to deny the possibility of Bhartṛhari's teacher having composed an *āgama-saṃgraha* or of Bhartṛhari's being indebted to that *āgama-saṃgraha*. 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 *Tīkā* and Viṣabha ( 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 Bhartṛhari'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*, Bhartṛhari, to the effect that it was his teacher who composed the *āgama-saṅgraha* in the form of the *Vākyapadīya kārikās*.<sup>22</sup> 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 Bhartṛhari'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?<sup>23</sup> In the former alternative, *atha* 'then, subsequently' will retain its most common meaning and need not be understood in the sense 'and, moreover',<sup>24</sup> but the implication will be that the *Saṅgraha* was unavailable or was mostly unavailable (the latter if one construes *prāyeṇa*, not with *saṅkṣepa-rucīn*, but with *astam upāgate*) to the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*. This implication is contradicted by the description *saṅgraha-pratikañcuke* (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 *kāṇḍa*?

(b) It is possible to phrase the alternative by assuming Hari-vṛṣabha to be the author of the *Vṛtti* and Bhartṛhari 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 *Vākyapadīya*. Besides, saying Hari-vṛṣabha wrote 481–490 implies acceptance of the view that someone other than Bhartṛhari wrote 481–490.

23. The *Tīka* and Raghunātha Sharmā's *Ambākarī* accept the first possibility (note .. *saṅgrahābhidhānaṁ nibandhanam .. astam upāgatam. .. astath yataḥ 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 Mīmāṃsaka (*saṁvat* 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 *Samgraha*;<sup>25</sup> it does not seem to be the case that the *Samgraha* 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 *Mahābhāṣya* once the *Samgraha* went into oblivion. (b) This was due, in part, to the fact that the *Mahābhāṣya* took so much of the *Samgraha* for granted. Its apparently simple statements were based on discussions of great depth and length that were carried out in the *Samgraha*. (c) The imprecise understanding of the *Mahābhāṣya* on the part of students with unseasoned intellects<sup>26</sup> was also due to the fact that Patañjali, as a person well-versed in different branches of learning (*tīrtha-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 *Samgraha* 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 *Samgraha* contained ;

25. (a) *saṁgrahaḥ etat prādhānyena parīkṣitān nityo vā syāt kāryo veti. tatrokta doṣaḥ prayojanāny apy uktāni. tatra tv eṣa nirṇayo yady eva nityo 'thāpi kārya ubhayathāpi lakṣaṇaṁ pravartayam iti.* ( *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 1 p. I. 6 )

(b) *saṁgrahē tāvat kārya-pratidvandvi-bhāvan manyāmahe nitya-paryāya-vācino grahaṇam iti.* ( *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 1 p. I. 6 )

(c) *śobhanā khalu dākṣāyaṇasya saṁgrahasya kṛtiḥ. śobhanā khalu dākṣāyaṇena saṁgrahasya kṛtir iti.* ( *Mahābhāṣya* 2. 3. 66 p. I. 468 )

(d) Possibly: *kiratīn carkarīṣṭān pacatīty atra yo nayet | prāptijñān tam ahaṁ manye prārābhas tena saṁgrahaḥ ||* ( *Mahābhāṣya* 7. 4. 92 p. III. 359 )

26. Thieme translates *akṛta-buddhīnām* as “not exercising their intellect”. I think a translation like “those whose intellect is not sharpened or made mature by the study of *śāstras*” 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* / *āgamas* / *āgama-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-buddhitvān na sa pasyati durmatīḥ* ), which is explained by Śaṅkara with the expression *asaṁskṛta-buddhitvāt*. The compound *kṛta-buddhi* is evidently analogous to *kṛta-hasta* ( *Trikāṇḍī* 3. 14. 558 ) ‘one of trained hand’ and *kṛtāman* ( *Gītā* 15. 11, which, in fact, has the negative *akṛtāman* ) ‘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 *kṛtā vyutpattyā prakarsaṁ prāpta mahatī buddhir 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.

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 granthe*, 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 them is that 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 granthe* 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 *śabda-śakti-rūpāparigrhītaḥ...sādharmya-vaidharmya-mātrānusārī sarvāgamopaghāta-hetutvād anibandhanaḥ* and in the *Ṭīkā* on 2. 484 as *anya-śāstra-parimala-rahitaḥ*. Thus, the expression *śuṣka-tarkānusāribhiḥ* 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*, *sarveśāṃ nyāya-bījānām*, *alabdha-gādhe gāmbhīryāt*, and *akṛta-buddhīnām*. (c) Even if we go along with Thieme and understand *saṃgraha-pratikañcuke* as meaning “of which the defensive armour was the *Samgraha*”, the word does not seem to be so appropriate as a description of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as of the *Mahābhāṣya*. From the indications provided in 481 (*saṃkṣepa-ruṣin*, *alpa-vidyā-parigrahān*) and from the known references to the *Samgraha* (Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka *saṃvat* 2020 : 270–277) one can easily conclude that the *Samgraha* 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 *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in the usual sense or a defense of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* per se. On the other hand, as shown in 3.1 above, the *Mahābhāṣya* drew heavily upon the *Samgraha* and could be misinterpreted in its absence.

5.1 So far four (see footnote 29 below) different explanations of the expression *saṃgraha-pratikañcuka* have been proposed. The *Ṭīkā* seems to be unsure about it, as it neither cites the expression as a *pratīka*, nor provides any explicit gloss. However, there is room to believe that its author decided to read 484d as *saṃgraha-pratikañcukaiḥ* and to understand it as meaning *saṃgraha-pratipakṣa-bhūtaiḥ*.<sup>27</sup> Goldstücker (1861 : 257–258) adopted the same reading, but assigned it the exactly opposite meaning “who were partisans of the *Samgraha*”. Among those who are aware of the reading *saṃgraha-pratikañcuke* as an adjective of *grantho*, we have Kielhorn (1876 : 244), who provisionally takes it to be a *tat-puruṣa* (*saṃgrahasya pratikañcuke*) meaning “preserving the (contents of the) *Samgraha*”, and Thieme, who takes it to be a *bahu-vrīhi* (*saṃgrahaḥ pratikañcukaṃ yasya tasmīn*) meaning “of which the defensive armour was the *Samgraha*” or “whose counter-armour is (was) the *Samgraha*”.

5.2 Goldstücker's rendering is clearly inappropriate. We have no reason to suppose that there was a group of *Samgraha* 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 *Samgraha* shown by Patañjali and by the followers of Patañjali such as Bhartṛhari indicates that the followers of the *Mahābhāṣya* were also followers of the *Samgraha*, not a rival group. Secondly, there does not seem to be any

---

27. Note the introduction to 484: *tathā ca saṃgraha-pratipakṣa-bhūtair ācāryais 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 *Ṭikā* explanation. Thieme (1956: 19 footnote 46) suggests that the author of the *Ṭikā* "understands *pratikañcuka* as a *bahu-vrīhi*, to be analyzed : *pratinaddham kañcukam 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 *Ṭikā* author's derivation. Secondly, the *bahu-vrīhi* compounds with a suppressed participle, *praparṇa* 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-vrīhi*. Another difficulty with the *Ṭikā* interpretation is that it does not explain how the *Samgraha* could produce hostile reaction even after Patañjali's time or why the opponents of the *Samgraha* 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 *Samgraha*.<sup>28</sup> But even then it is puzzling that the *Samgraha* 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 *Ṭikā* that the instrumental reading *saṃgraha-pratikañcukaiḥ* 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 *Āryabhaṭīya*, Gola-pāda verse 50 as *sukṛtāyusoḥ praṇāśam kurute pratikañcukam yo 'sya*.<sup>29</sup> 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

28. Cf. *Ṭikā* on 483: *etena saṃgrahānusāreṇa bhagavatā patañjalina saṃgraha-saṃkṣepa-bhūtam eva prayaśo bhāṣyam upanibaddham ity uktam veditavyam*.

29. The commentary on the *Āryabhaṭīya* explains this as *asya śāstrasya yaḥ pratikañcukam kurute, doṣotpādanena tiraskaranam ity arthaḥ, tasya sukṛtāyusoḥ praṇāśaḥ syāt*. 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 (*praṇāśa*) 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 *apratikañcukam*, i. e. supply an avagraha after *kurute*, in the *Āryabhaṭīya* verse, take *apratikañcukam* 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 *praṇāśam kurute* as *yaḥ asya* (*āryabhaṭīyasya*) *praṇāśam kurute* [*saḥ*] *sukṛtāyusoḥ apratikañcukam praṇāśam kurute*. It does not seem likely from the placing of *praṇāśam* and *pratikañcukam* / *apratikañcukam* in the verse line that Āryabhaṭa had in mind the connection of *praṇāśam* with *yaḥ asya* and of *pratikañcukam* / *apratikañcukam* with *praṇāśam 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 *pratikañcuka* 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 : *pratikañcuka-rūpeṇa pūrva-sāstrārtha-gocaram/ yad anyat kriyate tasya dharmaṁ praty apramāṇatā || tathā ca prāyaścittādi-dāna-kāle yo vākyam ātmīyam anya-kavikṛtaṁ vā ślokaṁ voccārya mānavādi-prāyaścittam dadyān na kaścid* [*?kañcid*] *api dharmārthaṁ pratipadyeta*. This passage, especially in the gloss it contains, serves to establish that *pratikañcuka* 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 *pratikañcuka* 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 *pratikañcuka* 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 *pratikañcuka* (work having the same contents) in the case of this (*Āryabhaṭīya*) causes perdition of [his] good deeds and life”.<sup>30</sup> As for the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* passage with which we are immediately concerned here, the suitability of the sense of *pratikañcuka* gathered from the *Tantra-vārttika* is even easier to see. The *Mahābhāṣya*, as a recast or adaptation of the *Samgraha*, made use of the contents of the *Samgraha* (see footnote 28 above). Hence it has been described as *saṁgraha-pratikañcuka*. 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) *Samgraha*”.<sup>31</sup>

5.5 How did *pratikañcuka* acquire this figurative sense of ‘old wine in a new bottle’? I think *pratikañcuka* 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, *kañcuka*, is most probably intended in the commonly noticed meaning ‘cloak, robe’. Thus, the etymological meaning of *pratikañcuka* 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 as strained as in the case of Thieme’s interpretation, for *kurute* is placed in the verse between *praṇāsaṁ* and *pratikañcukam* with which it is connected. There is also the possibility that the original wording of the *Āryabhaṭīya* line was *sukṛtāyusōḥ praṇāsaṁ kurute kurute pratikañcukam yo ’sya*, 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 *Ṭīkā* 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: *tathā ca saṁgraha[-saṁkṣepa-bhūtaṁ] pratipakṣa-bhūtaṁ acāryais tarka-vidyāmātra-vedibhiḥ*... See the *Ṭīkā* passage quoted in footnote 28 above. If my guess is correct, the meaning *pratipakṣa* or *pratipakṣa-bhūta* assigned to the word *pratikañcuka* by the compilers of dictionaries on the authority of the *Ṭīkā* 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 : *itthaṁ ke'py abhimanyante sārṅkhyā-kañcuka-saṁśrayāt*. 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-vimarśinī* 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 *Vākya-padīya*. 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 realised that the verse contains a textual problem. The construction *āgamam labdhvā saḥ bahu-śākhatvaṁ nītaḥ* is as strange as *maṇim labdhvā saḥ bahudhā bhinnah*. Normally one would say in such cases either *āgamah labdhvā bahu-śākhatvaṁ nītaḥ* (compare *viṣa-vrkṣaḥ saṁvardhya chinnaḥ*)<sup>32</sup> or *āgamam labdhvā tam bahu-śākhatvaṁ nītavantaḥ*. That is, either the accusative *āgamam* 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 *tam bahuśākhatvaṁ 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 *āgamam* to *āgamah* (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 Rāvaṇa 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-vrkṣo 'pi saṁvardhya svayaṁ chettum asāmpratam* (Kālidāsa, *Kumāra-saṁbhava* 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 āgamam*, 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 *āgamam* 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 bhinnaḥ* and *viṣa-vṛkṣaṁ saṁvardhya āmra-vṛkṣaḥ chinnaḥ* 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-śiṣyebhyaḥ bhraṣṭaḥ . vyākaraṇāgamaḥ bahu-sākhatvaṁ 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, *āgamaḥ* does not appear to be the original reading in 486a. It is also possible that not only *āgamaḥ* but the entire phrase *parvatād āgamaḥ* is a result of textual corruption. Of what it could be a corruption I am unable to determine at present.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abhinava-gupta. *Śrī-Mālinī-vijaya-vārttika*. (Ed.) Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, no. XXXI. Srinagar. 1921.
- Aklujkar, Ashok. 1969. "Two textual studies of Bhartṛhari". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 89 : 547–563.
- ..... 1971. "The number of kārīkās in Trikaṇḍī, book I". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 91 : 510–513.
- ..... 1972. "The authorship of the Vākyapadīya-vṛtti". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Sudasiens*, 16 : 181–198.



- ..... 1974. "The authorship of the Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā". *Charu Deva Shastri Felicitation Volume*, pp. 165–188. New Delhi.
- ..... 1978. "The number of kārīkās in Trikāṇḍī, book II" To be published in the *Adyar Library Bulletin*.
- Āryabhaṭa. *The Āryabhaṭīya with the commentary Bhaṭa-dīpikā of Paramā-dīśvara*. (Ed.) Kern, H. Leiden : E. J. Brill. 1874.
- Bhartṛhari. *Trikāṇḍī* : (a) *kāṇḍa* 1. (Ed.) Subramania Iyer, K. A. *Vākya-padiya of Bhartṛhari with the Vṛtti, and the Paddhati of Vṛṣabha-deva*. Deccan College Monograph Series, no. 32. Poona : Deccan College. 1966. (b) *kāṇḍa* 2. (Ed.) Mānavallī, Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī. *Vākya-padiyaṁ... Śrī-Bhartṛhari ... -viracitaṁ Śrī-Puṇyarāja-kṛta-prakāśākhyā-ṭīkā-yutam*. Benares Sanskrit Series, nos. 11, 19, 24. Benares : Braj B. Das & Co. 1887. (c) *kāṇḍa* 3 : (Ed.) Subramania Iyer, K. A. *Vākya-padiya... with the commentary of Helārāja*. Deccan College Monograph Series, no. 21. Poona : Deccan College. 1963. *Vākya-padiya... with the Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa of Helārāja*. Poona : Deccan College. 1973. See footnote 1 above.
- Goldstücker, Theodor. 1861. *Pāṇini : his place in Sanskrit literature*. London. Reprint : Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, vol. XLVIII. Varanasi : Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. Also, Osnabrück : Otto Zeller.
- Joshi, S. D. 1976. "Sanskrit grammar". *Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar as an Indologist, a symposium*. (Ed.) Dandekar, R. N. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kielhorn, F. 1874. "The concluding verses of the second or Vākya-kāṇḍa of Bhartṛhari's Vākya-padiya". *Indian Antiquary*, 3 : 285–287.
- ..... 1875. "Note on Rājatarāṅgiṇī I 176". *Indian Antiquary*, 4 : 107–108.
- ..... 1876. "On the Mahābhāṣya". *Indian Antiquary*, 5 : 241–251.
- ..... 1885. "Der Grammatiker Pāṇini". *Göttinger Nachrichten*, pp. 185–199.
- The preceding four are reprinted in *Franz Kielhorn Kleine Schriften*. (Ed.) Rau, Wilhelm. Wiesbaden : Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Kṣema-rāja. *Vimarśinī* on Vasu-gupta's *Śiva-sūtras*. (Ed.) Chatterji, J. C. Kashmir Series of Sanskrit Texts and Studies, no. 1. Srinagar. 1911.
- Malla-vādin. *Dvādaśāra-naya-caakra*. (Ed.) Jambū-vijaya, Muni. Bhavnagar : Jain Ātmānanda Sabhā. 2 volumes. 1966, 1977.
- Patañjali. *Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya* (Ed.) Kielhorn, F. Bombay. 1878–1885. 3 volumes. Third edition. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962–1972
- Peterson, P. 1885. "Note on the date of Patañjali". *Journal of the Bombay 4 Annals* (D. J.)

- Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, no. XLIII, vol. XVI : 181-189.
- Raghavan Pillai, K. 1971. (Ed., tr.) *The Vākyapadīya [Books 1-2]*. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass.
- Rau, Wilhelm. 1977. (Ed.) *Bhartrhari's Vākyapadīya (mūla-kārikās)*. Monograph Series of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, no. XLII, 4. Wiesbaden : Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Scharfe, Hartmut. 1976. "A second index fossil of Sanskrit grammarians". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 96 : 274-278.
- Sharmā, Raghunātha. 1968. (Ed., comm.) *Vākyapadīyam Part II (Vākyakāṇḍam)*. Sarasvatī Bhavana Grantha-mālā, no. 91. Varanasi : Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya.
- Śubramania Iyer, K. A. 1969. *Bhartrhari : a study of the Vākyapadīya in the light of the ancient commentaries*. Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series, no. 68. Poona : Deccan College.
- Thieme, Paul. 1956. "Pāṇini and the Pāṇiniyas". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 76 : 1-23. Reprinted in *Paul Thieme Kleine Schriften*, vol. 2, pp. 573-595. Wiesbaden : Franz Steiner Verlag. 1971.
- Tīkā*. Usually ascribed to Puṇya-rāja. Available in Mānavallī's (see under Bhartrhari above) and Raghunatha Sharma's editions. See Aklujkar 1974 for the view that Helā-rāja is probably the real author.
- Trikāṇḍī*. See Bhartrhari.
- Tripādī*. (Eds.) Abhyankar, K. V. and Limaye, V. P. *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā of Bhartrhari*. Post-graduate and Research Department Series, no. 8. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1967-1970.
- Upādhyāya, Baladeva. 1968. See introduction of Raghunātha Sharmā 1968.
- Vidyabhusana, Satis Chandra. 1921. *A history of Indian Logic*. Calcutta. Reprint 1971. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass.
- Vṛṣabha. See Bhartrhari (a).
- Yrtti*. See Bhartrhari (a).
- Weber, Albrecht. 1862. "Zur Frage über Zeitalter Pāṇini's" *Indische Studien*, 5 : 1-176. Berlin : Ferd. Dümmler's Verlagsbuchhandlung. Harrwitz und Gossmann.
- Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka. samvat 2020. *Saṃskṛta vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā itihāsa*. Revised edition of volume one. Ajmer : Bhāratiya-prācyavidyā-pratiṣṭhāna.