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-Mahābhashya. 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\text{ asī dhṛtā manasaṃ jūṣṭā viṣṇave tasyāṃ te satyasavasa iti evam vede strīlingena pathitah / tasmād yadā sādyaśkrīṣu sāndas trivatsah somakrayaṇo bhavati
tadā stryarthavṛttītām anapeksyaiva padānām pumarthābhhidhāyinam adṛṣṭām
vede pumāśabdam ūhante / jūr\text{ asī dhṛto manasaṃ jūṣto viṣṇave tasya te satya-
savasa iti} /

"In the Veda the following is read thus with feminine gender: jūr\text{ asī dhṛtā manasaṃ jūṣṭā viṣṇave tasyāṃ te satyasavasaḥ. Therefore, when at the sacrifices to be per-
formed 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 de-
noted by the words, they modify [each feminine word] into a masculine word, un-
seen in the Veda, expressive of a male object, as follows: jūr\text{ asī dhṛto ma-
nasaṃ jūṣto viṣṇave tasya te satyasavasaḥ."

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 7.1-7\(^1\) deals with the question if modified mantras are themselves mantras\(^2\). The problem is if, in modifying mantras, Vedic rules of grammar must be applied. This problem could obviously not arise is 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 śūtra 2.1.34.
asmai prativedaya, which occurs MāṇŚŚ 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):

haritākāyām tu "ye yajāmahe samidhaḥ samidho’ gne’ gna ājyasya vyantu, narāśamso ājyasya vyantu, karhir agnir agna ājyasya vyantu" iti pradarśitam/tatra tanūnapātsthāne narāśamsah pravarabhedena vyavasthitah. The part samidhah ... veytu occurs verbatim ĀsvŚŚ 2, 8, 6, with only this difference that Bhartṛhari (as here quoted) has narāśamso for ĀsvŚŚ tanūnapād. Both Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī and the commentator Gārgya Nārāyaṇa to ĀsvŚŚ 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 MāṇŚŚ 1, 8, 3, 1 and ĀsvŚŚ 2, 8, 6 respectively.

This result does not conflict with, even strengthens, Rau’s conclusion that Bhartṛhari was more familiar with the Maitrāyaniya-texts than with the texts of any other Vedic school.
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3. Vaidyanātha Pāyagunda claims in his Chāyā (NSP, I, p. 36) that in Bhartṛhari’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 Śamaveda. Should we conclude that this part of Bhartṛhari’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?