

Johannes Bronkhorst

On some Vedic quotations in Bhartrhari's works

In an earlier volume of this journal Wilhelm Rau (1980) listed and, as far as possible, traced the Vedic quotations in Bhartrhari's Vākyapadīya and his commentary to the Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Some improvements seem called for.

1. Rau has overlooked the fact that AL 5.18-8.17 deals with ūha "modification". Modified mantras cannot be expected to be found in the Veda. This follows from the following passage (AL 6.12-15) :

jūr asi dhṛtā manasā juṣṭā viṣṇave tasyāste satyasavasa iti evaṃ vede strīṅgena pathitah / tasmād yadā sādyaskrīṣu sāṇḍas trivatsah somakrayaṇo bhavati tadā stryarthavṛttitām anapeksyaiva padānām pumarthābhidhāyinam adṛṣṭam vede pumśabdam ūhante / jūr asi dhṛto manasā juṣṭo viṣṇave tasya te satyasavasa iti /

"In the Veda the following is read thus with feminine gender : jūr asi dhṛtā manasā juṣṭā viṣṇave tasyāste satyasavasah. Therefore, when at the sacrifices to be performed on the day the soma is bought, a three year old uncastrated [bull] is the price to be paid for the soma, then, completely disregarding that female objects are denoted by the words, they modify [each feminine word] into a masculine word, unseen in the Veda, expressive of a male object, as follows : jūr asi dhṛto manasā juṣṭo viṣṇave tasya te satyasavasah."

Clearly the first, unmodified, sentence is said to occur in the Veda, the second, modified, one is said not to occur there. This is confirmed by Rau (no. 40 and 41).

Again, AL 7.1-7¹ deals with the question if modified mantras are themselves mantras². The problem is if, in modifying mantras, Vedic rules of grammar must be applied. This problem could obviously not arise if the modified mantras were simply quoted from the Veda.

In view of the above, the following numbers must be dropped from Rau's list : 38, 41, 50, 83, 94, 107. None of these had been satisfactorily traced. Number 44, which clearly concerns a modified sentence, can be connected with an original tā

-
1. For a partial elucidation of this difficult passage see Bronkhorst, forthcoming.
 2. Cf. Śābarabhāṣya to sūtra 2.1.34.

asmai pratedaya, which occurs MānŚS 1, 8, 3, 1.

2. Number 97 concerns AL 13.5 f. This passage appears to be corrupt. A partial reconstruction may be possible on the basis of Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī's Ratnaprakāśa (MPV, I, p. 57) :

haritīkāyām tu "ye yajāmahe samidhah samidho' gne' gna ājyasya vyantu, narāśamsa
'gnim agna ājyasya vetu, idō' gnināgna ājyasya vyantu, barhir agnir agna ājyasya
vetu" iti pradarśitam/ tatra tanūnapātsthāne narāśamsah pravārabhedena vyavasthi-
tah/³. The part samidhah ... vetu occurs verbatim ĀśvŚS 2, 8, 6, with only this
difference that Bhartrhari (as here quoted) has narāśamsa for ĀśvŚS tanūnapād.
Both Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī and the commentator Gārgya Nārāyaṇa to ĀśvŚS 2, 8, 6
account for this (as does, perhaps, AL 13, 3-4).

Summing up : the numbers 38, 41, 50, 83, 94, 107 must be dropped from Rau's
list; the numbers 44 and 97 can be satisfactorily traced, to MānŚS 1, 8, 3, 1 and ĀśvŚS
2, 8, 6 respectively.

This result does not conflict with, even strengthens, Rau's conclusion that
Bhartrhari was more familiar with the Maitrāyaṇīya-texts than with the texts of any
other Vedic school.

References

- Bronkhorst, Johannes. forthcoming. "Meaning Entries in Pāṇini's Dhātupāṭha".
JIP.
Rau, Wilhelm. 1980. "Bhartrhari und der Veda." StII 5/6 (Festschrift Paul Thieme),
167-80.

-
3. Vaidyanātha Pāyagūṇḍa claims in his Chāyā (NSP, I, p. 36) that in Bhartrhari's
commentary a passage closely similar to this one is ascribed to the Chāndogya-
Brāhmaṇa. This is mysterious, the more so since nothing like it can be found
in that Brāhmaṇa, nor in any other Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda. Should we con-
clude that this part of Bhartrhari's commentary was already highly corrupt
in Vaidyanātha's days (18th century)? Or did Vaidyanātha - who knew the
Ratnaprakāśa (MPV, I, p. XIX; NSP, I, p. 195 n. 16) - wrongly quote from
that work ?