

INTERPRETING VĀKYAPADĪYA 2.486 HISTORICALLY (PART 1)*

1.1 The verse I propose to discuss (*parvatād āgamam labdhvā bhāṣya-bījānusāribhiḥ/ sa nīto bahu-śākhatvaṃ candrācāryādibhiḥ punaḥ*||) is a part of the ten epilogue type verses found at the end of the Vākya-kāṇḍa or second book of Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* or *Trikāṇḍī*.¹

* (a) A part of this article was presented as a paper at the 188th meeting of the American Oriental Society held in Toronto in April 1978. The financial support necessary for gathering the relevant textual materials was given at various stages by the University of British Columbia, the Canada Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute.

(b) In referring to the *Vākyapadīya/Trikāṇḍī* verses I have followed the enumeration in Rau 1977.

¹ Eight of these verses are directly or indirectly relevant to the following discussion. They are given below for easy reference:

*prāyeṇa saṃkṣepa-rucīn alpā-vidyā-parigrahān/
saṃprāpya vaiyākaraṇān saṃgrāhe 'stam upāgate*||481||
*krte 'tha patañjalīnā guruṇā tīrtha-darśinā/
sarveṣāṃ nyāya-bījānāṃ mahābhāṣye nibandhane*||482||
*alabdha-gādhe gāmbhīryād uttāna iva sauṣṭhavāt/
tasminn akṛta-buddhīnāṃ naivāvāsthita niścayaḥ*||483||
*vaiji-saubhava-haryakṣaiḥ śuṣka-tarkānusāribhiḥ/
ārṣe viplāvite granthe saṃgraha-pratikañcuke*||484||
*yaḥ patañjali-śiṣyebhyo bhraṣṭo vyākaraṇāgamah/
kāle sa dākṣiṇātyeṣu granthamātre vyavasthitaḥ*||485||
*parvatād āgamam labdhvā bhāṣya-bījānusāribhiḥ/
sa nīto bahu-śākhatvaṃ candrācāryādibhiḥ punaḥ*||486||
*nyāya-prasthāna-mārgāṃs tān abhyasya svam ca darśanam/
praṇīto guruṇāsmākam ayam āgama-saṃgrahaḥ*||487||
*vartmanām atra keśāmcid vastumātram udāhṛtam/
kāṇḍe trītye nyakṣeṇa bhaviṣyati vicāraṇā*||488||

I have argued elsewhere (Aklujkar 1978:9-26) that the ten verses were not written by Bhartṛhari but by a student of his. However, this does not diminish the historical importance of the verses, for they remain almost as ancient as they have been thought to be. Secondly, acceptance of my view on the authorship of the verses is not a presupposition underlying the points I wish to make in this article. As far as I can see, the observations I offer below are logically independent of the problem of authorship.

1.2 I should also clarify what I mean by a historical interpretation of 2.486. Such an interpretation is primarily an attempt to dissociate the verse from the interpretation, mythological and based on superstition, assigned to it in the *Ṭikā* and echoed elsewhere.² It is an exploration of the possibility of attributing a commonsensical and contextually defensible meaning to 2.486. Secondly, I do not wish to claim that such a meaning reflects historical events—that it informs us regarding what *actually* took place. Although I shall write a portion of this article as if in my view the verse

² (a) The *Vākya-kāṇḍa-Ṭikā* published in the Benares Sanskrit Series (nos. 11, 19, 24 in 1887) is usually ascribed to Puṇya-rāja. However, as is argued in Aklujkar 1974, it could be from the pen of Helā-rāja.

(b) As far as I am aware, it has not as yet been demonstrated that the *Ṭikā* comment on 2.486 is largely mythical in nature. I intend to analyze the comment as a myth in part 2 of this article (see fn. 5 below).

(c) Even those scholars working on Bhartṛhari who have referred to or reproduced the *Ṭikā* comment on 2.486 have not noted that similar accounts are found in the Tibetan tradition and in the late Sanskrit epic poem *Paṭāñjali-carita*.

contains unquestionable history, this is not a matter of conviction to me. The value of 2.486 and the group to which it belongs lies primarily in informing us about what was viewed as history by a learned individual fifteen hundred years ago. It is as an ancient historical statement that the verses are important. Although because of their age they are likely to be closer to historical reality than our more recent sources and guesses, it is not imperative that we view them as giving us *the* historical truth. In other words, there is a need to separate our perspective from that of the author of the verses.³

1.3 A comprehensive historical interpretation of 2.486 should attempt to answer the following questions: (a) What was the nature of the activity referred to by *āgamam labdhvā*? In other words, what was the manner of the acquisition of *āgama*? (b) What was the source or location of the acquisition of *āgama*? How does one identify *parvata*? (c) What is meant by *bhāṣya-bīja-s* and how were they utilized? (d) What is the precise meaning of *bahu-śākhatvaṃ nītaḥ*? How exactly did Candrācārya and others make the *āgama* many-branched?⁴ (e) Who are Candrācāryādi? Can we

³ Regrettably, such a separation is missing in the discussions of 481-90 that have so far appeared in print. Scholars have written as if an unalloyed piece of historical information regarding the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition is to be found in these verses.

⁴ In a literal interpretation of 486 the component *ādi* in *candrācāryādibhiḥ* must be connected with *āgamam labh* as well as *bahu-śākhatvaṃ nī*; that is, the associates or followers of Candrācārya must be understood as agents in the act of acquisition and the act of making the *vyākaraṇāgama* many-branched. However, it is

assign a personality to the designation Candrācārya? My intention in the present article is to answer only the first question. The remaining questions must be left out for treatment in separate publications.⁵

2.1 Prior to addressing myself directly to question (a), I should draw attention to a grammatical-textual problem I have pointed out without offering a solution in Akujkar 1978:23-4. How we answer question (a) will depend on our resolution of that problem. The construction *āgamaṃ labdhvā sa bahu-śākhatvaṃ nītaḥ* in 2.486 seems as strange to me as *maṇiṃ labdhvā sa bahu-bhedatvaṃ nītaḥ* or *viśavṛkṣaṃ saṃvardhya sa bahu-khaṇḍatvaṃ nītaḥ*. Normally, the demonstrative pronoun *saḥ* should not be necessary, and there should be nominative forms in the place of *maṇiṃ* and *viśa-vṛkṣaṃ*;

possible that the author did not want us to interpret his remark with such grammatical exactitude; in his view Candrācārya could have been the lone agent of the act of acquiring and others could have joined or followed Candrācārya only in furthering the *āgama*. The same can be said about the parallel statement in *Rāja-taraṅgiṇī* 1.176. In the Tibetan tradition Candra-gomin, who is a functional equivalent of Candrācārya, is not accompanied by anyone when he comes across the *Mahābhāṣya* exposition.

⁵ See 'Interpreting *Vākyapadīya* 2.486 historically (part 2)' to be published in *Indological and Buddhist Studies in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong* and 'Interpreting *Vākyapadīya* 2.486 historically (part 3)' forthcoming. The former will constitute a negative sequel to the present article in that it will demonstrate that the *Ṭikā* answer to question (a) is not historical and has features typical of myths. The latter will seek to answer question (b). My thoughts on questions (c)-(e) are far from reaching a publishable form.

that is, the sentences should be: *mañir labdhvā bahu-bhedatvaṃ nītaḥ*, *viṣa-vṛkṣaḥ saṃvardhya bahu-khaṇḍatvaṃ nītaḥ*, and *āgamo labdhvā bahu-śākhatvaṃ nītaḥ*.⁶

2.2 Now, there is no easy textual way of reducing *āgamam labdhvā sa bahu-śākhatvaṃ nītaḥ* to *āgamo labdhvā bahu-śākhatvaṃ nītaḥ*. All known manuscripts, especially those which are most reliable in instances of divergence in reading, agree in reading *āgamam* and in containing *saḥ*. Besides, *saḥ* is needed to refer to *vyākaraṇāgama* mentioned in verse 485. This leaves only one textual solution available to us: emendation of the reading *āgamam* or *parvatād āgamam*. Such a course of action is especially inviting if one notes that the word *āgamam* is not really necessary; *vyākaraṇāgama* has been referred to unambiguously in 485. Use of an unwarranted substantive hardly agrees with the meticulousness of expression evident in 2.481-90. Secondly, if the substantive *āgama* were to be repeated at all, it would have been repeated most probably after employing an appropriate form of the demonstrative pronoun; that is, *āgamo vyavasthitaḥ/ tam āgamam labdhvā . . .* does not seem strange, but *āgamo vyavasthitaḥ/ āgamam labdhvā*

⁶ Cf. Vāmana, *Kāvya-lamkāra-sūtra-vṛtti* 5.2.21 (p. 77-8 of the Nirṇaya Sāgara edition of 1953): *anabhihite* [Pāṇini 2.3.1] *ity atra sūtre tiṅ-kṛt-taddhita-samāsaiḥ* [Vārttika 5] *iti parigaṇanam kṛtam. tasya prāyikatvān nipātenāpy abhihite karmani na karma-vibhaktir bhavati, yathā viṣa-vṛkṣo 'pi saṃvardhya svayaṃ chettum asāṃpratam* [Kumāra-saṃbhava 2.55] *iti*. Also, *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 2.3.1-2 in *Kāraka-prakaraṇa* 537. Note the construction *rājñā sa mahīpatiḥ nigṛhya tulyāvasthaḥ vyadhīyata* in *Rāja-taraṅgiṇī*, 4.305.

... does seem strange; the two sentences do not join smoothly in the latter case.⁷

2.3 The above considerations, however, do not seem so strong to me as to force an emendation on us; their strength extends only to making a *prima facie* case that the wording available to us may not be the original one. The argument they build up is essentially stylistic. That words are used in a measured, considered manner in verses 2.481-90 does not necessarily mean that their author will not repeat a substantive for the sake of the metre or for the sake of emphasizing some aspect.⁸ Similarly, the absence of a *tam* is a matter of stylistic sensitivity; it is an expression that would have made the reference of *āgama* more pointed, but it is not absolutely required by the context. Being aware of these counter-arguments and of at least one other plausible way of explaining the construction *āgamaṃ labdhvā sa bahu-śākhatvaṃ nītaḥ*, I do not wish to propose that the text of 486a be emended.

2.4 If it is decided that the text as handed down in manuscripts should not be tampered with, then the grammatical problem seen in *āgamaṃ labdhvā sa*

⁷ One would get a similar feeling if someone decided to avoid using pronouns in constructing English sentences and repeated the related nouns whenever necessary. Why this happens is an interesting question, but it need not be answered here.

⁸ For example, the intention could be to say: 'one does not expect that a culturally less active area like a mountain would preserve knowledge that is lost elsewhere, but it is at a mountain that Candrācārya acquired the *āgama* which the successors of Patañjali had lost.'

bahuśākhatvaṃ nītaḥ must be solved by probing deeper into syntax. Two syntactic solutions are possible:

(a) One could assume that the author of 486 feels like referring to the *vyākaraṇāgama* by *saḥ* once again after he has referred to it by *āgamam* because an expression like *bhāṣyabījānusāribhiḥ* actually intervenes and an expression like *bhāṣya-bījānusāribhiḥ candrācāryādibhiḥ* mentally intervenes. A sentence like *mārgaṃ labdhvā śrāntais trṣitaiḥ kṣudhitai rāja-putraiḥ sa punar hāpitaḥ* ('After having found the path, the exhausted, thirsty, and hungry princes lost it again') does not seem strange. Only when the expressions between *mārgaṃ labdhvā* and *saḥ* are removed and the sentence is shortened to *mārgaṃ labdhvā sa hāpitaḥ* do we get the feeling that some deviation from standard Sanskrit has taken place; we feel like asking, 'If this is what the author has in mind, why did he not write *labdho mārgaḥ punar hāpitaḥ* or *mārgaṃ labdhvā te taṃ punar hāpitavantah?*'

(b) If one assumes that the reference of *āgamam* and *saḥ* is to different entities then *āgamam labdhvā sa bahuśākhatvaṃ nītaḥ* is not a strange or ungrammatical construction. For example, *vajraṃ labdhvā maṇir bahu-bhedatvaṃ nītaḥ* and *viṣavṛkṣaṃ saṃvardhya āmra-vṛkṣo bahu-khaṇdatvaṃ nītaḥ* are acceptable sentences.

2.5 The *Ṭikā* ascribed to Puṇya-rāja or Helā-rāja (see fn. 2 above) accepts the second possibility and does not seem to be aware of the first.⁹ It understands

⁹ The *Ṭikā* introduces and explains 486 as follows: *atha kālāntareṇa candrācāryādibhir āgamam labdhvā tena copāya-bhūtena sakalāni bhāṣyāvasthitāni yāni nyāya-bījāni tāny anusṛtya vyākaraṇāgamaḥ punar api sphītatāṃ nīta ity abhidhātum āha . . . parvatāt tri-kūṭaika-deśa-varti-*

āgamaṃ as referring to a *mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama* and *saḥ* as referring to the *vyākaraṇāgama* that the students of Patañjali lost. According to it, what happened in the history of Pāṇinian grammar was essentially this: Because of the peculiar style of the *Mahābhāṣya* and because of the insensitive interpretations advanced by Vaiji and others, the successors of Patañjali lost the knowledge of what Patañjali actually wished to say and what Patañjali accepted as *siddhānta*. This knowledge was no longer a part of their living tradition of study and was preserved only in manuscripts among the Southerners. Candrācārya and others again gave it currency in a much developed form, once they came in possession of the *mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama*. In other words, although the *Ṭikā* seems hesitant and hazy,¹⁰

tiliṅgaika-deśad iti. tatra hy upala-tale rāvaṇa-viracito mūla-bhūta-vyākaraṇāgamas tiṣṭhati. kenacic ca brahma-rakṣasāniya [sa?] candrācārya-vasurāta-guru-prabhṛtīnāṃ datta iti. taiḥ khalu yathāvad vyākaraṇasya sva-rūpaṃ tata upalabhya, satataṃ ca śiṣyāṇāṃ vyākhyāya [vyākaraṇāgamo?] bahu-sākhitvaṃ nīto vistāraṃ prāpita ity anuśrūyate.

¹⁰ Note that in the *Ṭikā* comment *āgama/ mūla-bhūta-vyākaraṇāgama* and *vyākaraṇāgama* are nowhere placed near each other in such a manner as to make their distinction readily intelligible. In the passage introducing 486, one cannot immediately determine whether the *āgama* referred to by *āgamaṃ labdhvā tena copāya-bhūtena* is the same as the *vyākaraṇāgama* referred to by *vyākaraṇāgamaḥ punar api sphītatāṃ nītaḥ*, and thus identical with the *vyākaraṇāgama* spoken of in verse 485. It is also not clear if that *āgama* is a means (*upāya*) with respect to following the intimations in the *Mahābhāṣya* (*bhāṣyāvasthitāni yāni nyāya-bījāni tāny anusṛtya*) or with respect to making the obscure *vyākaraṇāgama* easily noticeable (*vyākaraṇāgamaḥ punar api sphītatāṃ nītaḥ*). As for the passage following the text of 486 in the *Ṭikā*, there seems to have been a studied effort not to state explicitly the object of *satataṃ ca śiṣyāṇāṃ vyākhyāya bahu-sākhitvaṃ nītaḥ* and thus to play down the presence of *vyākaraṇāgamaḥ* and *saḥ* in verses 485 and 486.

it probably visualizes the relevant happenings as follows: Candrācārya and others got hold of the essential, most fundamental, body of Vaiyākaraṇa doctrines. They studied the intimations in the *Mahābhāṣya* on the background of these doctrines; they used the principles implicit in Patañjali's statements to provide flesh to the skeleton they had received. This activity enabled them to make current once again a multifaceted, robust tradition of Vaiyākaraṇa views.

2.6 There are several problems associated with the reconstruction of events given in the *Ṭīkā*. First of all, no author is likely to use a very general word like *āgama* for a very specific *mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama* without adding the necessary qualifications. Such an unqualified use is especially unlikely when the word *āgama* could be mistaken as referring to the general *vyākaraṇāgama* or the *Mahābhāṣya*-related *vyākaraṇāgama* (see fn. 18 below) mentioned in the immediately preceding verse. Besides, the verses 481-90 have been written with such a clear awareness of sequence that it seems highly improbable that their author would suddenly switch the reference of *āgama* from *vyākaraṇāgama* to *mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama*. If he had such a switch in mind he would have in all likelihood written a verse between present 485 and 486 making the transition possible. As matters stand, even the *Ṭīkā* does not give any hint of a verse missing in between. Moreover, nowhere else in Sanskrit literature, as far as I am aware, is the notion of an eternal but ordinarily inaccessible *mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama* corroborated. To be noted

in this connection is also the fact that the *Ṭikā* explanation does not clarify what the relation of the activities of Candrācārya and others was 'to the *vyākaraṇāgama-grantha*¹¹ preserved among the Southerners. Did Candrācārya and others get hold of this *grantha* or was the furthering of *vyākaraṇāgama* achieved by them independently of the *grantha*—achieved only through the *mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama* and study of the *Mahābhāṣya*? It is obviously the first alternative that is more likely to have been intended by the author of 486, for if Candrācārya and others are not said to have known the *grantha*, the mention of *grantha* in verse 485 becomes vacuous, and Candrācārya and others cannot be said to have made the *vyākaraṇāgama* many-branched; they cannot make many-branched something they do not possess, and verse 485 tells us that *vyākaraṇāgama* was preserved only in *grantha* form (note *grantha-mātre*). But if Candrācārya and others did get hold of the *grantha* and the *vyākaraṇāgama* contained in it, how do we get a statement to that effect from 486a, should we decide to follow the *Ṭikā* explanation? Under that explanation, once 486a is made to state that Candrācārya and others got hold of the *mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama* we have no space to accommodate a statement to the effect that Candrācārya and others got hold of the *vyākaraṇāgama*

¹¹ I retain the expression *grantha* in order to be able to preserve the ambiguity of the original; verse 485 does not specify whether the *vyākaraṇāgama* was preserved in one *grantha* (manuscript, composition, written form of a work, manuscript bundle) or several *grantha-s*.

that the successors of Patañjali had lost.¹² Thus, the *Ṭikā* explanation is untenable for more than one reason.¹³

2.7 The outcome of the discussion so far is that, in the present state of our resources, alternative (a) mentioned in **2.4** above is the best solution available. True, it implies acceptance of a certain laxity in the composition of 486, with part of that laxity attributable to intervening expressions. However, it does not at

¹² It may be said by way of objection that I am putting too specific an interpretation on the word *mūla-bhūta*—that what the author of the *Ṭikā* means is nothing more than *vyākaraṇāgama*; he characterizes it as *mūla-bhūta* because it was vital to the understanding of the *Mahābhāṣya* and the doctrines of the *Vaiyākaraṇa-s*; his intention is not to set *mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama* apart from *vyākaraṇāgama* (see fn. 10 above). In other words, *mūla-bhūta* is an adjective that describes, not one that distinguishes. However, it seems extremely unlikely to me that *mūla-bhūta* is intended as a simple descriptive, emphatic, adjective. The author of the summary verses appearing at the end of the *Ṭikā* manuscripts, who was most probably a junior contemporary of, if not identical with, the author of the *Ṭikā* (Aklujkar 1974:181-4), certainly did not take it that way. The relevant verse in his composition is: *bhraṣṭasyāmnāya-sārasya vaiyākaraṇa-gāminah/ mūla-bhūtam avāpyātha parvatād āgamam svayam/*. Here the *vaiyākaraṇa-gāmin āmnāyasāra* (that is, the *vyākaraṇāgama*) is clearly distinguished from the *mūla-bhūta āgama*. Thus, the *Ṭikā* words have been understood as I understand them almost from the time of its author. Secondly, if *vyākaraṇāgama* and *mūla-bhūta vyākaraṇāgama* are deemed identical, the *Ṭikā* must be understood as implying that the successors of Patañjali mentioned in 485 were initially in possession of a *rāvaṇa-viracita āgama* and that *grantha* in 485 means ‘inscribed on stone (*upala-tala*)’. However, these implications are not at all supported by the *Ṭikā* comment on 485.

¹³ Note also that there is no suggestion of two *āgama-s* in the *Rāja-taraṅgiṇī* (1.176) passage reminiscent of 486: *candrācāryādibhir labdhvādeśam* [v. 1. *labdhvā deśāt*] *tasmāt tadāgamam* [read *sahāgamam*?] */ pravartitam mahā-bhāṣyam svam ca vyākaraṇam kṛtam/*.

least force us into any intellectual acrobatics or assumption of unexpressed distinctions. Besides, although I have so far been able to find only one,¹⁴ many sentences showing the influence of intervening expressions on constructions of the type *āgama labdhvā bahu-śākhatvaṃ nītaḥ* may be found in Sanskrit literature. If they are found, then the only problem with the wording of 486 will be the use of the word *āgama* when it could have been contextually understood. As pointed out in 2.3 above, this is hardly a serious problem. The greatest merit of solution (a), however, is that it leaves room for answering question (a) in 1.2 above in a commonsensical way.

3.1 Given the background that verses 481-485 provide and the result (*bahu-śākhatvaṃ nītaḥ*) that 486 speaks of, what could Candrācārya and others be understood as having done or gone through? It is quite clear that in their days the *Mahābhāṣya*-related *vyākaraṇā-gama* had ceased to be a true *āgama* and was, at least according to the text we have, preserved only in a remote

¹⁴ This is Śaṅkara, *Tattvopadeśa* verse 66 (*Minor Works of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya*, Poona Oriental Series No. 8, ed. H.R. Bhagavat, 2nd edn., 1952, p. 24): *advayānanda-rūpāt tvāṃ pratyāvyātīva dhūrtakaiḥ/ dūra-nīto 'si deheṣu saṃsārāranya-bhūmiṣu*|| 'Having dislodged you thoroughly (*atīva*) from a form consisting of bliss of non-duality, the rogues have led you far in [the region of] bodies, the jungle land of transmigration.' Here the construction *dhūrtakais tvāṃ pratyāvya* [tvam] *dūra-nīto 'si* is similar to *candrācāryādibhir āgamam labdhvā sa bahu-śākhatvaṃ nītaḥ*, unless, of course, the reading *tvāṃ* can be proved to be a corruption of *tvam*. As an instance of the need felt that a pronoun be used to refer to an intervened subject or object, note Patañjali on *Pratyāhāra-sūtra* 1 (Kielhorn's edn., vol. I, p. 18): *loka ṛṣi-sahasraṃ ekāṃ kapilāṃ ekaikaśaḥ sahasrakṛtvo dattvā tayā sarve te sahasra-dakṣiṇāḥ sampannāḥ*.

or relatively remote written source or body of sources. Therefore, the first possibility is that Candrācārya and others would try to make the source or sources not so remote, that is, to make the Southern *grantha* available in the North. The second possibility is that they would try to collect the scattered written record; a reconstruction of the *āgama* would have been impossible without a systematic exploration of the sources in which it was preserved. The third possibility is that Candrācārya and others would try to interpret what they found in the South.¹⁵

3.2 Of these three possibilities—reintroduction of manuscripts in the North, piecing together of the *āgama* preserved in the Southern sources, and making sense of the relevant enlightening works in the South, the first possibility is not likely to have been intended for expression in 486a. The words *bhāṣya-bījānusāribhiḥ* and *bahu-śākhaṭvaṃ nītaḥ* indicate that the initial achievement registered by Candrācārya and others is likely to be intellectual and unlikely to be a simple transcription of manuscripts. Besides, if Candrācārya and others had been responsible for giving wider currency to a work or body of works, details such as title, etc. of that work

¹⁵ Theoretically, this interpretation could have been two-fold: (a) reading the Southern record by mastering its script, and (b) making sense of the sentences or remarks seen in the record. The first type of interpretation, however, is not likely to be meant here. Since Sanskrit manuscripts were commonly written in the local scripts, decipherment was probably not considered to be such a rare achievement as to deserve a special mention. Secondly, the accompanying qualification *bhāṣya-bījānusāribhiḥ* indicates that the achievement of Candrācārya and others was interpretative in the sense of understanding, comprehension, or making sense.

or body of works would probably have been provided. Nor does the first possibility agree with the general and primary sense of *āgama* ('traditionally handed down knowledge' as explained in Aklujkar 1971:169-70).

3.3 Thus, if we are to follow the indications that 485 and 486 give, the initial achievement of Candrācārya and others can be narrowed down to (a) culling of the *vyākaraṇāgama* bearing on the *Mahābhāṣya* from various works preserved in the South and (b) interpretation of the works surviving in the South that contained information crucial to a proper understanding of the *Mahābhāṣya* which had ceased to be properly studied. Now, these two activities are mutually complementary in practice. Mere collection of relevant passages or works is useless without interpretation, and no satisfactory interpretation of texts which have gone out of currency is possible unless passages of similar or related import are put near each other. Therefore, what Candrācārya and his associates or successors did was probably both collation and exegesis.

3.4 I thus understand recovery of as much *vyākaraṇāgama* as was available in a book-bound, moribund form to be the nature of the activity referred to by *āgamaṃ labdhvā*. I do not think that the *āgama* referred to in this phrase is different from the *vyākaraṇāgama* mentioned in 485 or is one, specific, work. I view Candrācārya and others as having in their possession the *Mahābhāṣya*¹⁶ and some other texts of the Pāṇinian

¹⁶ Attempts have been made, most notably by Albrecht Weber and S. D. Joshi, to infer from verses 481-90 that the text of

system (including the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*¹⁷ and *vārttika*) but no reliable interpretation of the *Mahābhāṣya*¹⁸ and no precise knowledge of what the *Mahābhāṣya* had implicitly taken from the *Samgraha* and related works. Generally, it was the pre-Patañjali scholarship in theories about language, grammar, and related topics and the knowledge of the influence of that scholarship on Patañjali's own thinking that had become elusive by the time of Candrācārya and his associates. The inability of their predecessors to cope with a work that demanded knowledge of several branches of learning and the prevalence of *Mahābhāṣya* interpretations based on uninformed guess-work (*śuṣka tarka*; see Aklujkar 1978: 18; Cardona 1978: 95-6) authored by Vaiji, Saubhava, the *Mahābhāṣya* survived precariously before Candrācārya established it again. Kielhorn (1876) and Cardona (1978) have pointed out that the verses do not support any such inference.

¹⁷ Remarks by Thieme (1956: 19 fn. 45-6) and Cardona (1978: 97, lines 6-10) leave the impression that in their view the understanding and use of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* had suffered a decline before Candrācārya recovered the *āgama*. As indicated in Aklujkar 1978:16-9, the evidence before us does not warrant this conclusion. Although a *Mahābhāṣya*-related *āgama* would include at least some knowledge contained in or inspired by the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and although improper understanding of the *Mahābhāṣya* may in some cases result in an improper understanding of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, we have no indications in the available evidence that the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as such was eclipsed—either as a body of knowledge or as a generally accessible text.

¹⁸ It should be borne in mind that *bhraṣṭaḥ* in 485b is an attributive (qualifying or delimiting) adjective, not a predicate adjective. The author's intention is not to assert loss of the entire *vyākaraṇāgama* or the entire Pāṇinian grammatical tradition, but to speak of the lost portion of the *vyākaraṇāgama*. That this *vyākaraṇāgama* is one which has a bearing on the *Mahābhāṣya* is something we know from the context (*patañjalīnā, mahābhāṣye, patañjali-śiṣyebhyaḥ*).

and Haryakṣa had deprived them of information necessary for a proper understanding of the *Mahābhāṣya* (not necessarily of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*; see Aklujkar 1978: 18-9). It is this information they must have tried to get, and their success in getting it or a significant part of it must constitute the *āgama-lābha*. Since they could not have got the information unless they searched for pre-Patañjali works, works incorporating contents of pre-Patañjali works, and works directly (as commentaries) or indirectly relevant in the study of the *Mahābhāṣya*, and studied whatever materials became available to them, *āgama-lābha* amounts to search and understanding of nearly-lost relevant works and fragments thereof.¹⁹

¹⁹ (a) If *mūla-bhūta* in the *Ṭikā* explanation (fn. 9) is taken as a simple descriptive or emphatic adjective (fns. 10, 12 and 13), my interpretation may be said to agree with the *Ṭikā* interpretation in spirit, although certainly not in details. Both the interpretations would then converge to the extent of describing the recovered *āgama* as fundamental, as basic, to the understanding of the Pāṇinian tradition in general and of the *Mahābhāṣya* in particular, as one having general relevance as well as immediate specific application. The details of the *Ṭikā* explanation I would eschew would then be *upala-tale*, *rāvaṇa-viracitaḥ*, and *brahma-rakṣasāṇīya dattaḥ*.

(b) My interpretation agrees with Kielhorn's (1876:245) in that he too attempts (although implicitly) to divest verse 486 of the supernatural elements associated with it. We differ in our understanding of what Candrācārya and others discovered in the South. According to Kielhorn, the discovered matter was 'written ... commentaries which gave the traditional interpretation [of the *Mahābhāṣya*]'. I find this interpretation too specific to be reconciled with the primary sense of *āgama* and the drift of 481-7. The author of 481-7 is evidently concerned with some knowledge which was common to the *Samgraha* and the *Mahābhāṣya*, which could be used for understanding (or in conjunction with) the principles implicit in the *Mahābhāṣya* (note *bhāṣya-bījānusāribhiḥ*), and

3.5 Since I was so far concerned with discussing the most probable interpretation of only *āgamaṃ labdhvā*, I have ignored the presence of the word *parvatāt* and have used expressions that leave room for the inference that Candrācārya and others acquired the *āgama* portions at a number of distant places in the South. Hence it needs to be clarified that this inference is not an unavoidable aspect of my exposition of *āgamaṃ labdhvā*. What is necessary if my interpretation is to stand is that Candrācārya and his associates be thought of as having visited a number of places in the South and as having made as thorough an effort as was possible in the then prevailing conditions; it is not necessary that they be thought of as having *acquired* the *āgama* at a number of places removed from each other. Therefore, the word *parvatāt* which indicates that the acquisition of *āgama* took place in one region or took place mostly in one region does not conflict with my interpretation. It merely implies that even the written sources for the *āgama* had become scarce and were not found, as far as the search by Candrācārya and others was concerned, outside a region identifiable as *parvata*.

which had the potential for development into a variety of views or principles (note *bahu-~~ś~~ākhatvaṃ nītaḥ . . . nyāya-prasthāna-mārgāms tāt*). Such knowledge could be gathered from the commentaries on the *Mahābhāṣya*, but it need not be viewed as exclusively available in them. Besides, if the uncertainty of interpretation evident in Bhartṛhari's *Mahābhāṣya-ṭīkā* is any indication, a definite or mostly definite traditional interpretation such as the one commentaries would provide does not seem to have been available in Bhartṛhari's time. It is, therefore, unlikely to have been acquired by Candrācārya who does not seem to be far removed from Bhartṛhari in time.

3.6 I prefer the interpretation given in the last five paragraphs to the one found in the *Ṭikā* for a number of reasons:

(a) It arises out of and agrees with the context of 486. According to it, Candrācārya and his followers carry out what we would expect them to carry out in the situation described in 481-5.

(b) It appeals to no supernatural event or person.

(c) It does not necessitate the assumption of an unsubstantiated, permanent but almost inaccessible, *āgama*.

(d) We are not required to admit a sudden shift in the use of the word *āgama*—from *vyākaraṇāgama* to *mūlabhūta vyākaraṇāgama* or from ‘knowledge handed down in a tradition’ to ‘a specific text’.

(e) Conflict with the *Rāja-taraṅgiṇī* passage echoing 486 (see fn. 13 above) is avoided. That passage seems to speak of an *āgama* whose immediate usefulness was in bringing the *Mahābhāṣya* into academic currency, in making the *Mahābhāṣya* a respectable and hence attractive text for serious students. My interpretation presupposes precisely such an *āgama*.

(f) The nature of the *āgama* that Candrācārya and others managed to salvage should be reflected in the *Vākyapadīya/Trikāṇḍī*, for as verse 487 tells us, the *Vākyapadīya/Trikāṇḍī* is based on Bhartṛhari’s²⁰ own view as well as the many-branched *āgama* or *nyāya-prasthāna-mārga-s* that Candrācārya and others succeeded in developing after they got the *āgama*. Now, even a rapid reading of Bhartṛhari’s

²⁰ Or Vasurāta’s, if the *Ṭikā* explanation is followed.

work will bring home the fact that the *āgama* it contains is almost always related to the *Mahābhāṣya*. More often than not the pattern is one of stating some theses in the area of language and grammar and then mentioning or discussing some *Mahābhāṣya* statements that could be associated with those theses. This pattern is particularly obvious in the third *Kāṇḍa* but is not missing in the first two *kāṇḍa*-s particularly in the *Vṛtti* portion.²¹ Traditional scholars have not been oblivious to it.²² Thus, there can be no doubt that *āgama* as it related to the *Mahābhāṣya* was something that Bhartrhari valued greatly. The interpretation I have proposed agrees with this observation, as it does not rest on the notion of an *āgama* distantly or indirectly related to the *Mahābhāṣya*.

(g) We know it as a fact, especially after the discovery of Kauṭilya's *Artha-śāstra* and the Bhāsa plays, that many Sanskrit works which would throw a flood of light on dark periods and serve to link later works to earlier works survived in manuscript form in the South long after they ceased to be available in the North. This was but natural in view of the relatively

²¹ Bhartrhari's commentary to the *Mahābhāṣya* retains the thrust of this pattern, but naturally, since it must follow the order of *Mahābhāṣya* statements, reverses the sequence of the constituents of the pattern; wherever the *Mahābhāṣya* statements can be related to the general theses of the *Vaiyākaraṇa*-s it cites or utilizes those general theses.

²² In concluding the *Prakīrṇa-prakāśa*, Helā-rāja observes: *sūkti-śrīyaḥ . . . etāḥ . . . hārer bhāṣyābdhi-pīyūṣa-cchaṭācchurita-vigrahāḥ*. One of the introductory verses of Tārānātha Tarka-vācaspati's *Śabdārtha-ratna* is as follows: *mahābhāṣyārtha-tātparya-jñāpikāḥ kārikāḥ svayam/ kṛtvā vākyapadīyākhyam nibandham kṛtavān hariḥ||*.

greater freedom the South enjoyed from aggression, the more durable writing material it abundantly had, the financial support its scholars received, and the tradition it created of bestowing filial care on manuscripts. Distant regions tend to preserve older language forms as well as works. Hence an interpretation of 486a which mainly argues that the situation concerning Sanskrit works was essentially the same in the days of Candrācārya as we have witnessed it to be in the twentieth century should not come as a surprise.

3.7 To sum up, just as we need to distinguish our perspective from that of the author of 486 (1.2 above), we should distinguish the *Ṭīkā* author's perspective from that of the author of 486. The *Ṭīkā* interpretation, particularly because of its twofold understanding of *āgama*, is not the one we should view as intended in *parvatād āgamaṃ labdhvā*. The supernatural element in it *may* go back to the author of 481-90, for the possibility of that author having believed that Candrācārya and others were guided to the lost *vyākaraṇāgama* through some extraordinary encounter cannot be logically ruled out. However, we can be certain that the possibility is not *expressed* in 486 and that, for this reason, it should be treated as non-existent. It seems more than likely that in the days of Bhartṛhari and his disciples the story of Candrācārya's acquisition of the *āgama* was a simple tale of intelligent guesses and determined search, in which the only miracle was that Candrācārya succeeded in the face of overwhelming odds. The simple tale seems to have been gradually mythologized

in the Vaiyākaraṇa tradition in the following period of five or more centuries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aklujkar, Ashok. 1971. Nakamura on Bhartrhari *Indo-Iranian Journal* **13**: 161-75.
- 1974. The authorship of the Vākya-kāṇḍa-tīkā. *Charu Deva Shastri Felicitation Volume*, pp. 165-88. New Delhi.
- 1978. The concluding verses of Bhartrhari's Vākya-kāṇḍa. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Diamond Jubilee Volume, pp. 9-26.
- Cardona, George. 1978. Still again on the history of the *Mahābhāṣya*. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Diamond Jubilee Volume, pp. 79-99.
- Kielhorn, Franz. 1876. On the *Mahābhāṣya*. *Indian Antiquary* 5:241-51. Reprinted in *Franz Kielhorn Kleine-Schriften*, ed. by Wilhelm Rau, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1969.
- Rau, Wilhelm. 1977. (Ed.) *Bhartrhari's Vākyapadīya (mūla-kārikās)*. Monograph Series of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, no. **42**, 4. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Thieme, Paul. 1956. Pāṇini and the Pāṇinīyas. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76: 1-23. Reprinted in *Paul Thieme Kleine Schriften*, vol. 2, pp. 573-95, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1971.