1.1. Both Bhartṛhari and Śabara pay a good deal of attention to the subject of uḥa 'modification, adjustment'. Bhartṛhari discusses it in the first Āhnikā of his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya (AL 5.18-8.17, Sw 6.17-9.27, Ms 2b9-3c1), while parts of Adhyāya 9 of Śabara's Bhāṣya deal with it. Two cases in particular are treated by both the authors and allow of a detailed comparison.

The first case is most easily introduced with the help of Śabara's Bhāṣya on Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 9.3.10:

> astī paśuḥ agniṣṭomaḥ, yo dīkṣito yad agniṣṭomaṁ paśuṁ ālabbha iti / tatra pāśaikataabhīdhiḥ mantraḥ, aditiḥ pāśaḥ pramumoktv etam iti / tathā pāśabahutvābhīdhīṣy, aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktv etān iti / ...
> astī dvipaśuḥ vikṛtīḥ / maitraṁ śvetam ālabbha, vāruṇaṁ kṛṣṇam aparṇo cauṣadāhīnam ca saṃdāhavanyakāma iti / tatra codakena pāśabhidhāyi-nau mantrau prāptau / tayoḥ saṃśayaḥ / kim bahuvacanānto'vikāreṇa pravartate, ekacanāntasya nirvṛttih, uta bahuvacanānto nirvartate, ekacanānta uhitavyāḥ, uτobhayor api pravṛttir abhidhānavipratipattis ca, utakacanānta uhitavyaḥ bahuvacanānto'pi na nirvarteta / kim prāptam /

"There is the Agniṣṭomāya animal [sacrifice] laid down in the text yo dīkṣito yad agniṣṭomāyaṁ paśuṁ ālabbha ('When one, being initiated, sacrifices the animal dedicated to Agni-Soma'). In connection with this there is a mantra, speaking of the singleness of the noose (pāśa): aditiḥ pāśaṁ pramumoktv etam ('May Aditi loosen this noose'); also [there is another mantra] speaking of the plurality of the noose: aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktv etān. ...

[Then again,] there is a modificatory sacrifice (vikṛtī) [of the Agniṣṭomāya] at which two animals [are killed], laid down in the text
maitraṃ svetam ālabheta, varuṇaṃ krṣyam etc. ('The white [goat] should be sacrificed to Mitra and the black [goat] to Varuṇa'). In accordance with the General Law, both the mantras that mention a noose come to be regarded as to be used at this [sacrifice of two animals].

In regard to [the use of] these two [mantras at this last sacrifice of two goats, there arise] the following questions: (a) Is [the word] in the plural form to be used in its unmodified form and that in the singular form to be excluded? Or (b) should the plural form be excluded and the singular form be modified [into a dual form]? Or (c) should both [the plural and the singular forms] be used, there being a diversity of expression (i.e. option) [regarding the one to be actually used in any particular case]? Or (d) should the singular form be modified; the plural form also [in its modified form (?)] not being excluded?" (tr. Gāgānātha Jhā, vol. III p. 1561; modified)

The problem here raised is subsequently discussed in the Bhāṣya. Four solutions are proposed, the fourth one of which is finally accepted. For our present purposes it is however interesting to study the first solution, which is not accepted by Śabara. It reads (on PMS 9.3.10):

anyāyas tv avikāreṇa / anyāyanigado bahuvacanānto'vikāreṇa pravartate / ekavacanānto nivartitum arhati / kutaḥ / nāsyaiṣāmin pāse pravartamānasya ḍṛṣṭaḥ pratighātaḥ / yathaivaikāsaṃ pāse pravartate, tatāh dvayor api pravartitum arhati / nāsāv ekasya vācakaḥ, na dvayoh / evam ārṣaḥ codako'anyagṛhīto bhaviṣyati / itarathā hi uhyamāne yathāprakṛtī mantra na kṛtaḥ syāt / na dvayoh pāsayaḥ, ekaṃ eva pāse kaścid viṣeṣo'asti / taṃmad avikāreṇa bahuvacanāntaḥ pravijyate, ekavacanāntasya nivṛttir iti /

"'That which is incompatible [should be used] in its unmodified form'; [i.e.] the plural form, which is incompatible [with the primary sacrifice at which there is only one animal], is used [at the sacrifice of two animals] in its unmodified form, and the singular form should be excluded. Why so? [Because] we find no obstacle to its being used in the case of there being [only one animal and] one noose; [so that] just as it is used in the case of [one animal and] one noose, so should it be used also in the case of there being [two animals] and two [nooses; especially as the plural form] is expressive of neither one nor two. In thus [using the plural form in its unmodified form,]
the scriptural injunction of the General Law becomes honoured; while in
the other case, if [the words] were modified, then the mantra would
not be used in the form in which it is used at the primary sacrifice.
Nor is there any difference between one noose and two nooses [so far
as the applicability of the plural form is concerned]. From all this
it follows that the plural form is used in its unmodified form and the
singular form is excluded." (tr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, p. 1562; modified)

As said before, Śabarā does not accept this position. He comes to the con-
clusion, under sūtra 9.3.13, that both the plural form and the singular
form must be modified into a dual form. But this rejected position is rath-
er close to the one adopted by Bhartṛhari, where he says in his commentary
on the Mahābhāṣya (AL 6.8-12; Sw 7.9-13; Ms 2c7-10; CE I 5.14-17):

\[
tathaikṣaṁminēva prakṛtipāse pāśān iti bahvaacanāntaḥ śrūyate / aditiḥ
\]
\[
pāśān pramumoktv iti / tatrāpi vikṛtvā uho nāsti / vājaśaneyināṁ tu
ekvaacanāntaḥ paṭhyate aditiḥ pāśām iti / tēgām uhaḥ prāpnoti / ...;
\]
\[
athavā pāśeṣu noha ity anena tu naigamavibhāga / bahvaacane sati
yatheṣṭaṁ prayogo bhavati /
\]

The Ms. is very corrupt, but this reconstruction seems to be essentially
correct. I translate:

"... The plural pāśān is heard in aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktu even though
there is but one single noose (pāśa) in the primary sacrifice. Here
... there is no modification in the modificatory sacrifice. But among
the Vājaśaneyins [the mantra] is read in the singular, aditiḥ pāśām
... For them modification applies. ...

Or the statement that there is no modification in the case of nooses
(pl.!) expresses a Vedic option: where there is a plural number [of
pāśa] one uses [the word] as one wishes (i.e. either in the plural or
adjusted to the situation)."

Bhartṛhari here represents the point of view of a particular Vedic school
different from the Vājaśaneyins. His Vedic school had laid down the rule
that no modification takes place in the case of the word pāśa used in the
plural, and Bhartṛhari interprets this rule in two ways. Interestingly, the
line aditiḥ pāśaṁ pramumoktv etam does not occur in the scriptures of the
Vājaśaneyins, but in TS 3.1.4.4. Bhartṛhari’s mistake (what else could it
be?) allows us to conclude that he was not a Tāttvīrya either. The
presence of aditiḥ pāśāṇ pramumoktv etān in MS 1.2.15, KS 30.8 suggests that Bhartṛhari belonged to one of these two Vedic schools. Other evidence (see Rau, 1980; Bronkhorst, 1981; 1987) supports the view that he was a Maitrāyaṇīya.

The conclusion must be that Bhartṛhari's description of uḥa, or rather of the absence of uḥa, in aditiḥ pāśāṇ pramumoktu does not represent the position of any group of Mīmāṃsakas, but rather the position of the Maitrāyaṇīya branch of the Yajurveda. The Mīmāṃsakas on the other hand, or at any rate Śabara, did not confine their attention to one Vedic school. Only thus could they be confronted with the situation in which both the mantras aditiḥ pāśāṇ pramumoktv etān and aditiḥ pāśāṇ pramumoktv etām apply. The question that remains is how the similarity between the point of view accepted by Bhartṛhari and the one rejected by Śabara is to be explained.

This question gains interest in view of the fact that Śabara too may have been a Maitrāyaṇīya. It is true that the Taittirīya texts are more often quoted in his Bhāṣya, but Garge (1952:19f) has shown that Śabara's Bhāṣya nonetheless shows a clear preference for Maitrāyaṇīya readings wherever possible. Garge's data are perhaps most easily understood by assuming that Śabara, a Maitrāyaṇīya, continued and codified the Mīmāṃsaka tradition which by itself had no particular predilection for Maitrāyaṇīya texts.

1.2. Both Bhartṛhari (AL 7.10-8.8; Sw 8.16-9.17; Ms 3a2-b6; CE I 6.11-7.7) and Śabara (on Purva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 9.3.22 and 9.3.27-4.27) deal in detail with the adhirigū mantra, a passage that occurs in but slightly differing form in a number of texts.¹ Nothing in Bhartṛhari's discussion shows any influence from Śabara. Indeed it appears that the two authors disagree on how to deal with the part saṅātimatraḥ asya vaṅkṛtyas 'it has twenty-six ribs'. Śabara winds up a long discussion on this matter by stating (on sūtra 9.4.16) that the total number of ribs must be mentioned where two or more animals are involved, not a repetition of the numeral 'twenty-six' (iṣṭā vaṅkṛtyām prakṛtām vaktavyā / iḥāpi sa caddena pradīpyate / tena nābhūdāḥ / sa hi paśuṇimitaḥāḥ / taṁmāt samasya vacanaṁ vaṅkṛtyāṁ kartavyam iti /). Bhartṛhari makes an enigmatic remark after

¹ MS 4.13.4; KS 16.21; AśvŚŚ 3.3; ŚŚŚ 5.17.
citing the sentence that precedes  śrovimśatir. This remark - tathānyayam anekaśmin paśau dvir abhyasyate - can be interpreted with the help of MŚS 5.2.9.5 yāny avayayāṇy anekāni tāni dvir abhyasyante ... śrovimśatiḥ śrovimśatiḥ. It thus comes to mean: "Then, in case there is more than one animal, the indeclinable [that follows, viz. śrovimśatiḥ] is repeated."

Unlike Śabara, parts of Bhartṛhari's treatment of uha show the influence of the Māṇava Śrauta Sūtra. We saw how MŚS 5.2.9.5 was needed to understand one of Bhartṛhari's remarks. At two other occasions he makes a direct reference to 'the section on modification' (uha-prakaraṇa) of the Māṇava Śrauta Sūtra. Once (AL 7.5–6; Sw 8.11–12; Ms 2d10–11; CE I 6.6–8) he says:

aghasad aghastām aghasanagrhabhisur aksanītya uhayaprakaraṇe paṭhyate

"In the section on modification the forms aghasat, aghastām, aghasan, agrabhīṣuḥ and aksan are read."

This must refer to MŚS 5.2.9.6:

haviśī praiṣe sūktavāke ca adat adatām adan, ghasat ghasatām ghasan, aghasat aghastām aghasan, karat karatām karan, aghrabhit aghrabhīṣṭām aghrabhīṣuḥ, aksan

Then again (AL 7.20–21; Sw 9.3–4; Ms 3a8–9; CE I 6.21–22):

tatroha-prakaraṇa evaśaḥ mātā pitā bhratā saṁbhīṣaṁśargaśabdā ity evamādīny anūhyāni paṭhyate

"... in the same section on modification it is read that of the [words mentioned earlier] the words indicative of siblings and kin mātā, pitā, bhratā and the like should not be modified."

This reflects MŚS 5.2.9.7:

mātā pitā bhratā sāgarbhya('nu) sakhā sayāthyo nābhīruṇaṁ āsāṁśargaśabdā saṁbhīṣaṁś aksaḥ śrotāṁ vaṁ manas tvan medo havir bhratīḥ svenaṁ vakṣa ity anūhyum

"'His mother, his father, his brother from the same womb, his friend in the herd'; the form of nābhī joined with (the ending) ā; the words 'eye, ear, voice, mind, skin, fat, oblation (?), sacrificial grass, eagle-shaped breast', all these are not to be modified." (tr. Van Gelder, p. 174)
Not all of Bhartṛhari’s examples regarding ūha can be traced to the Mānavav Śrāuta Sūtra, nor to any other Śrāuta Sūtra. Of particular interest is the stanza which introduces his discussion of ūha in the adhrigau mantra, and which has not been traced in any earlier work (AL 7.10-11; Sw 8.16-17; Ms 3a2-3; CE I 6.11-12):

anōgāni jñātināmāṃśy upamāt cendriyāṇi ca
etāni nohaṃ gacchanti adhrigau viṣamaṃ hi tat //

"Limbs of the body, names of relatives, comparison and organs of sense, these do not undergo modification; for it (?) is irregular in the case of adhrigu."

This stanza, which governs Bhartṛhari’s ensuing discussion, must be assumed to have belonged to the ritualistic tradition of some Vedic school, probably the Maitrāyāṇyīyas. Bhartṛhari based his discussion of ūha not on some preexisting works of Mīmāṃsā but on ritual works which had no, or little, connection with Mīmāṃsā.

This situation allows us to understand how Śabara could describe and reject an opinion (on aditṭh pāśām pramuktu etc., see section 1.1 above) which is so close to Bhartṛhari’s. The Mīmāṃsakas, who took a broader view of the sacrificial rites than those adhering to the traditions of particular Vedic schools, would nonetheless borrow ideas from individual Vedic schools, either to accept or to reject them. All we have to assume is that Śabara was acquainted with at least some of these ritual books.

It seems that the works which Bhartṛhari used did not survive him for long. The above stanza (anōgāni ...) is quoted by Kumārila in his Tantrāvārttika on Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 1.3.24 (p. 197) and ascribed to a tiṅkākāra who is also credited (p. 209) with the authorship of the stanza that we know as Vākyapadīya 2.14 (Swaminathan, 1963:69), i.e., apparently to Bhartṛhari. That is to say, Bhartṛhari is here quoted as an authority on ūha in his own right.

-------------------------------
2. Bhartṛhari’s independence from the influence of Mīmāṃsā when dealing with ritual details makes this a more likely assumption than that this stanza belonged to the Mīmāṃsā work in verse with which he appears to have been acquainted. See section 2, below.

3. Helārāja on Vākyapadīya 3.14.591 (590), p. 413 l. 24-25, quotes the same stanza and calls it ‘tradition of the knowers of ūha’ (ūhavidāṃ āmāyaḥ).
1.3. Another instance where Bhartṛhari gives evidence of drawing upon a
tradition quite independent of the Mīmāṃsakas occurs on P. 1.1.5 and
consists of an illustration with the help of the Śunaskarpastoma sacrifice
(AL 118.3; Sw 137.26-138.1; Ms 39a7-8):

śunaskarpastomayajñavād etat syat, yathā pradhānasya maraṇenārthina
iṣṭāṁ pravartayanti 4

"This is like the Śunaskarpastoma sacrifice: desirous of the main
thing by means of death, they cause the sacrifice to proceed."

The Śunaskarpa Agniṣṭoma sacrifice is discussed in Śabara's Bhāṣya om PMS
10.2.57-61. This sacrifice is enjoined by the injunction "Desiring one's
own death one should perform this sacrifice, if he wishes that he should
reach the Heavenly Region without any disease" (maraṇakāmo hy etena yaje-
ta, yathā kāmayetānāmayāḥ svargaṁ lokam iyāṁ iti; tr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, p.
1721). The question raised under PMS 10.2.57-58 is whether or not the sacri-
fice should be continued after the sacrificer has taken his life by throw-
ing himself into the fire. The answer is that the sacrifice must be com-
pleted. A number of reasons is given for this, none of them even resembling
Bhartṛhari's. This is true to the extent that Pārthasārathi Miśra in his
Śastraḍipīkā on PMS 10.2.57-58 (adhikaraṇa 23, vol. II, p. 334f.) quotes
Bhartṛhari as authority when accepting that point of view (cf. Swaminathan,
1961:315-16):

svarga evātra maraṇenārthinaḥ phalam na maraṇam / maraṇakāma īty an-
gıkṛtamaraṇa īty arthaḥ / tena yo hy evam jñātvā svargaṁ prāpravānīti
kāmayate, tasyāyaṁ kratuḥ / tathā ca haribhir uktaṁ 'pradhānasya
maraṇenārthina īyaṁ pravartayanti iti /

"Heaven is here the fruit he wishes [to attain] by means of death, not
death [itself]. The words 'desiring [one's own] death' (maraṇakāma)
mean 'accepting [one's own] death'. Therefore, this sacrifice is
[meant] for him who, knowing this, wishes to attain to heaven. This
has been expressed by [Bhartṛ]hari with the words 'desirous of the
main thing (i.e. heaven) by means of death they cause the sacrifice to
proceed'."

4. The Ms reading has been emended with the help of the quotation by
Pārthasārathi Miśra; see below.
Pārthaśārathi’s quotation does not only cast light on the form and meaning of Bhartṛhari’s remark; it also indicates that Pārthaśārathi (10th century A.D. according to Ramaswami Sastri, 1937) had no (longer?) access to the sources from which Bhartṛhari drew his example.

1.4. We turn to another passage where Bhartṛhari to all appearances draws upon the tradition of the Maitrāyaṇīyas. It occurs in his comments on the line prayājāh savibhaktikāh kāryāh of the Mahābhāṣya (I.3.10). Bhartṛhari is here clearly influenced by the Māṇava Śrauta Sūtra (5.1.2.6) which reads:

punar ādheyē prayājānuyājānām purastād vopariṣṭād va vibhaktih, kuryāt / ye yajōmahe 'samidāḥ samidho’gnā ājyasya vyantv' agnir agnir ‘tānūnapād agnā ājyasya vetv' agnim agnim ‘ido’gnā ājyasya vyantv' agner agner ‘barhirti agnā ājyasya vetv' agner agner iti /

"When [fire] is to be lit again one should recite the vibhaktis before or after the preliminary and final offerings, as follows: ye yajōmahe etc."

The first and introductory sentence of this passage is included in Bhartṛhari’s remarks on the subject, which however go beyond the Māṇava Śrauta Sūtra in giving some kind of justification for the choice of ‘vibhaktis’ (i.e. agnir agnir etc.) and even lead to an outcome that is different in one point; he also gives an alternative. Bhartṛhari’s Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā reads (AL 12.25-13.4; Sw 15.21-16.1; Ms 5a2-5; CE I 11.10-14):

vibhaktiṇām api sarvāṇām prayoge prāpte yā dyakṣārā vā satyaś ocatu-rakṣarā vā bhavantīti vacanād agnināgninēti na prayujyate / tathā na ṣabdajāmi kuryāt / ṣabdajāmi hi tad bhavati yat pānōṣamyantam / tasmād agner agner ity anena rūpeṇa gaṣṭhyantam prayujyate / punarādhyeyē prayājānuyājānām purastād vopariṣṭād va vibhaktih kuryāt / narāṣamṣo agnim agnim iti vā ubhayathā dṛṣṭatvāt /

"Although it would follow (from what precedes in Bhartṛhari’s commentary) that all case-endings be used, the form agnināgninā is not used because it has been stated ‘which have two syllables or four syllables’. Similarly one should not use ṣabdajāmi. ṣabdajāmi is that which has an ablative ending. Therefore it is the genitive which is used in the form agner agnir, [not the ablative]. When [fire] is to
be lit again one should recite the vibhaktis before or after the preliminary offerings. Or narāṃśo ... agnim agnim [is used instead of tanūnapād ... agnim agnim] because it is seen both ways."

This shows that according to Bhartṛhari the following four 'vibhaktis' are to be used: agniṛ agniḥ (nom.), agnim agnim (acc.), agner agneḥ (gen.), agnāv agnau (loc.).

The essential correctness of the above reading of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā is confirmed by Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī's Ratnaprakāśa, a subcommentary on the Mahābhāṣya. It says in this connection (p. 56-57):

tatrāpi sambuddhiṇīne ntānām na prayogah, 'āvṛttyā dvayakṣarāh santaś caturakṣarā bhavanti' iti vacanāt / sambuddhyantasya dvayakṣaratvā'pi dvirvacanotārām pūrvarūpe sati 'agnegne' iti tryakṣaratvat / ṭāhe'ntayor ēdita eva dvayakṣaratvābhāvāc ca / tathā ēṃsyantam api na prayoktavyam, 'na śabdajāmi kuryāt, śabdajāmi hi tad bhavati yat paṇḍamyantam' iti vacanāt / ... / evam ca caturuṣa avaśiṣṭaprājāman-treṣu yathākramam prathamādvitiyāśaṣṭhisaptamasyakavayacakāntānām agniśadapraṇākānām padānāḥ prayogah kartavyāḥ / ... / tathā cāyaṃ purastātrapragah: 'ye yajāmehe agnir agniḥ samidhaḥ samidho'gna ājya-asya vyantu vausat' / 'ye yajāmehe agnim agnim tanūnapād agna ājya-sya vetu vausat' / 'ye yajāmehe agner agner ido'gna ājya-sya vyantu vausat' / 'ye yajāmehe agnāv agnau barhir agna ājya-sya vetu vausat' iti / paścātprayogas tu 'ye yajāmehe samidhaḥ samidho'gna ājya-sya vyantu agnir agniḥ vausat' ityādiḥ /

It is true that Śivarāmendra refers immediately after this to Viśṇumīśra's Kṣīroda, a now lost commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, for further elucidation. It is also true that he then mentions Bhartṛhari's commentary (harīṭikā) and quotes from it a passage which clearly belongs to Bhartṛhari's subsequent treatment of 'vibhaktis' in accordance with the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra (see Bronkhorst, 1981:174). Yet there can be no doubt that also the above passage was composed under the direct or indirect influence of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā.

We return to Bhartṛhari's passage. It shows relationship with the Māṇava Śrauta Sūtra, as we have seen. It further quotes a line that has close affinity with MS 1.7.3, KS 9.1, KapS 8.45 in order to justify that

5. All these texts have yad dvayakṣarāh satiḥ caturakṣarāh kriyante[æ].
only 'vibhaktis' with two or four syllables are acceptable. Then however it
deviates from any known text by quoting a remarkable rule: One should not
use šabdajāmi; šabdajāmi is that which has an ablative ending. Subsequent-
ly Bhārtṛhari observes that tanūnapād is sometimes replaced by naraśaṃsa.
Something similar was noted by the commentator Gārgya Nārāyaṇa on Āśvās
2.8.6 (see Rau, 1980: 176) and by Śivarāmendra Sarasvati (see Bronkhorst,
1981:174), both in connection with the Āśvalāyana version of the
'vibhaktis'.

1.5. What is the source from which Bhārtṛhari derived his detailed know-
ledge on ritual matters? The most likely answer is that he used Pra-
yoga manuals belonging to the Maitrāyaṇīyas. Few old Prayogas have survived
and their study has hardly begun. Yet the suspicion could be voiced that
"some sort of Prayogas must have been in vogue even before the composition
of the Śrautasūtras proper" (Śrātakoṣa Vol. I, English section, Part I,
Preface, p. 7; see already Hillebrandt, 1879: XV; 1897:38). Bhide
(1979:15cf.) studied two extant Prayogas of the Cāturmāsyas sacrifices and
compared them with the Hiranyakeśī Śrauta Sūtra, under which they resort.
Interestingly, the older of these two Prayogas, by Mahādeva Somayājin,
deviates a number of times from the Hiranyakeśī Śrauta Sūtra. This shows
that Bhārtṛhari may indeed have used Prayoga manuals belonging to his Vedic
school, and that the few deviations from the Māṇava Śrauta Sūtra which we
noticed above do not prove that these manuals belonged to another school
than that of the Māṇavas.

2.1. We conclude from the above that Bhārtṛhari was not a Mīmāṃsaka. Yet he
was acquainted with Mīmāṃsā. He uses the word 'Mīmāṃsaka' several
times in his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya. The line siddhā dyauḥ siddhā
prthivi siddham ākāśam iti (Mbh I.6.18-19) is elucidated by Bhārtṛhari's
remark (AL 22.23; Sw 27,19; Ms Sa4; CE I 19.11): ārhatāṇāṃ mīmāṃsakāṇāṃ
cā naivāsti vināśaḥ eṣām "According to the Jainas and Mīmāṃsakas there is
no destruction of these", i.e., of sky, earth and ether. At another place
(AL 29.10-11; Sw 35.2; Ms 9d7; CE I 24.15) Bhārtṛhari quotes the words
darśanasya parārthaḥvāt in a discussion concerning the eternality of
words. This must be a reflection of PMS 1.1.18 nītyas tu syād darśana-
sya parārthaḥvāt. Note however that Bhārtṛhari's quote does not only lack
the initial words of the sūtra, it also has an additional word at the end,
probably viprapraṇvṛttatvāt which is absent from the sūtra.

The following quotation in the Dipikā seems to throw more light on Bhartṛhari's relationship with Mīmāṃsā. In the third Āhṇika Bhartṛhari proclaims (AL 96.3-4; Sw 113.14-15; Ms 31b4-5; CE III.3.19-2o):

nānāntaryam sambandhahetuḥ / evaṁ hy ucayate / arthato hy asamarthānām ānāntaryam akāraṇam /

"[Mere] contiguity is no cause of relationship. Thus, verily, it is said: 'contiguity is no cause of relationship between [words] which are not semantically connected'."

The quotation in this passage had to be reconstructed to some extent, and this could be done with the help of PMS 4.3.11 (api vāmnānasāmartyād ca daṅerthena gamyērthānām hy arthavattvena vacanānī pratiyante'rthato hy asamarthānām ānāntarye'py asambandhas tasmāc chrutye kadesaḥ saḥ), as pointed out by Palsule (Notes p. 66 of his edition; cf. Swaminathan, 1961:314). What is more, the quoted line occurs in precisely that form in a verse cited in Vaidyanātha's Chāyā (p. 160, 162) and which reads:

yasya yenābhīṣambandaḥ/ārthasambandaḥ dvārasthāṣyaṁ tena saḥ / arthato hy asamarthānām ānāntaryam akāraṇam //

This suggests that Bhartṛhari knew a Mīmāṃsā work which contained verse.

This impression is strengthened by another quotation in the Mahābhāṣya Dipikā, on P. 1.1.46, in the context of sequential order. Here Bhartṛhari cites the following verse (AL 274.1-2; Ms 95b1-2):

ēruter arthāc ca pāṭhāc ca pravṛttam ca maniṣīṇaḥ /
sthānān mukhyāc ca dharmānām āhuḥ kramavidaḥ kramān //

"Those sages who know about sequential order say that the sequential order of things (?) is determined] on the basis of scriptural assertion, meaning, [order of] text, commencement, place and [order of] the principal."

This verse is close to PMS 5.1.1-15, as already observed by Swaminathan (1961:317). All its elements occur there: śruti in PMS 5.1.1 (śrūtīlakṣaṇaṁ ānupūrvyaṁ tatpramāṇatvāt), artha in 5.1.2 (arthāc ca), pāṭha is the

6. Bhartṛhari's example of śruti is hydayasyāgre 'vadyati, atha jihvāyāḥ, atha vakṣaṣaḥ. The same example is given by Śabara under PMS 5.1.5.
subject-matter of 5.1.4, even though not called by this name, *pravṛtti* appears in 5.1.8 (*pravṛttyā tulyakālandṝṃ tadupakramāt*), *sthāna* in 5.1.13 (*sthānāc cotpattisanyogāt*), *mukhyakrama* finally in 5.1.14 (*mukhyakramena vā’ngāṇāṃ tadarrhatvāt*). Again we are left with the impression that Bhartṛhari was acquainted with a work on Mīmāṃsā which contained verse.

2.2. The fact that the work on Mīmāṃsā used by Bhartṛhari appears to have contained verses may help us in identifying its author. Only one author on Mīmāṃsā is thought to have written an early work on this subject which contained verses; this is Bhavadāsa. Sucaritamiśra’s commentary Kāśi-kā on Kumārilā’s Ślokavārttika quotes a half verse from Bhavadāsa7 (Kane, 1929: esp. 153 fn. 3). It seems clear that Bhavadāsa preceded Śabara (Kane, 1929; Mishra, 1942:16-17; Frauwallner, 1968:10of., 107, 112f.)8

The assumption that Bhartṛhari used Bhavadāsa’s work does not conflict with anything in the Mahābhāṣyadīpikā, nor in the Vākyapadīya, as far as I know. It may be noted that on one occasion, where we seem to know the definition used by Bhavadāsa, Bhartṛhari does not quote Bhavadāsa but gives a definition of his own. Śabara on PMS 12.1.1 quotes a definition of the word *prasaṅga*: *prasaṅgaśabdartho ‘nyair uktah, evam eva prasaṅgaḥ syād vidyamāne svake vidhāv iti*. The quoted line is half a śloka, the whole of which is given on PMS 11.1.1; it is plausible that it derives from Bhavadāsa. Bhartṛhari gives an own definition of this technical Mīmāṃsā term in his commentary (AL 45.4-5; Sw 54.2-3; Ms 14b4-5; CE I 37.11-12): *yadv arthī prayojako anyadvāreṇārtham pratipadyate sa prasaṅga ity ucyate*. A closer investigation shows however that Bhartṛhari’s definition agrees contentwise with Bhavadāsa’s śloka, whereas Śabara has changed the interpretation of the verse so as to make it suit his own ideas. See Bronkhorst, 1986.

2.3. If indeed we can accept that Bhartṛhari used a text on Mīmāṃsā different from Śabara’s Bhāṣya we may be in a position to understand a passage that occupied Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1973:1:385 fn. 1). It reads (AL 31.2-3; Sw 36.19-21; Ms 1ob7-8; CE I 25.24-26):

7. bhavadāsena coktam: athāta ity ayaṃ śabda ānantarīye prayuṣyate.
dharmaprayojana vetti mīmāṃsakadārśanam / avasthita eva dharmah / sa tv
agnihostrādibhir abhivyajyate / tatpreritas tu phalado bhavati /

"[The words in the Mahābhāṣya (I.8.5-6)] dharmaprajñāno vā ... 'bring-
ing about dharma'⁹ [express] the view of the Mīmāṃsakas. [According to
them] dharma is eternal. It is however manifested by [such sacrifices
as] Agnihotra etc. Institged by these [dharma] produces result."

Mīmāṃsaka contrasts this statement with a passage from Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's
Nyāyamaṇjarī which reads (p. 664):

vṛddhamāṃsakāḥ yāgādicarmanirvartyaṃ apūrvam nāma dharmam abhiva-
danti yāgādicarmanāma śābara bruvate

"The old Mīmāṃsakas declare dharma, [also] called apūrva, to be pro-
duced by ritual activities such as sacrifices. The followers of Śābara
say that the ritual activities such as sacrifices are themselves [dharma]."¹⁰

The two passages combined seem to indicate that the Mīmāṃsakas known to
Bhartṛhari were older than Śābara. Mīmāṃsaka goes further and concludes
that Bhartṛhari himself is much earlier than Śābara. This need not be true.
In fact, Bhartṛhari's commentary contains an indication that its author
knew a view according to which the constituents of the sacrifice are dhar-

---

⁹. We must assume that Bhartṛhari considers prayojana here synonymous
with prajñāko 'bringing about' for the following reasons: (i) oth-
erwise tatpreritas makes no sense; (ii) a few lines further down we
find the explanation dharmasya ... prajñākoḥḥ. Joshi and Roodber-
gen (1973:82 fn. 326) explain this meaning as follows: "The word pra-
yojana is formed by adding the suffix Lyuṭ (i.e. ana, P. 7.1.1) to the
stem prayuj, in the sense of karaṇa: 'instrument' (P. 3.3. 117). Thus
the meaning of prayojana can be analyzed as prayujyate anena tat
prayojananam: 'that by which something is regulated is (called) prayoj-
ana'. Taken in this sense, prayojana comes to mean prajñāko: 'regula-
tor'." It seems however more correct to account for prayojana in this
sense by P. 3.3.113 (kptyaluyto baḥulam). This is done, e.g., by
Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita in his Śabdakaustubha (vol. I, p. 11): atra prayuj-
yyate pravartyate'neneti karaṇaluyudantaḥ prayojayatīti kartṛvyātṛtya
bāhulakāt kartṛvyūdantō vā ubhayathāpi pravartakavidhiparāḥ puṃślingaḥ
prajñānaśabda ēkāḥ / phalaparāḥ klībo'parāḥ /.

¹⁰. Cf. Śābara's Bhāṣya on PMS 1.1.2: yo ho yāgam anutiṣṭhati tam dharmi-
ka iti samācakṣate / yaś ca yasya kartā sa tena vyapadiṣṭyate / yathā
pācako lāvaka iti /.
ma. This indication consists in the twice quoted phrase *dadhimadhvādayo dharmaḥ* 'curds, honey, etc. constitute dharma'. The phrase is quoted (twice) in a difficult and corrupt passage, which may however be reconstituted as follows (Ms 11b3-5; AL 34.8-12; Sw 40.21-25; CE I 28.17-20):

\[
yathā pūrvakālam prayuktāṁ dīrghasattrāṇī idānīṁ aprayujyamānāṇy api dadhimadhvādayo dharma īti karmatādiviṣayāḥ sidhyata evam anyaiḥ prayuktām samvakālaṁ idānīṁ aprayujyamānāṁ api anuvidyānaṁ yuktam / ye tu dadhimadhvādayo dharma īti teṣām vyākaraṇe 'yam artho na sambhavati / na hi ēka Śabdaocāraṇāt dharma īti /
\]

This may tentatively be translated:

Just as long Soma sacrifices were used formerly, and even though they are not used now, the aim of sacrificial activity is attained since curds, honey etc. constitute dharma; so the laying down of rules for things which have been used by others all the time is proper, even though these things are not used now. But this is not possible in grammar for those who [hold] that curds, honey etc. constitute dharma. For no dharma comes forth from uttering sound.

Much is unclear in this passage. But it shows that we do not have to conclude that Bhartṛhari lived much before Śabara. It seems more appropriate to conjecture that Bhartṛhari used a text on Mīmāṃsā older than Śabara's Bhāṣya, most probably Bhavādāsa's Vṛtti. We are however fully justified in thinking that Bhartṛhari cannot have lived long after Śabara.

3. The above observations, if correct, allow us to draw the following conclusions. Bhartṛhari was acquainted with Mīmāṃsā, but did not use it where we would expect him to use it. In the context of ritual details he rather draws upon another tradition, most probably on the traditional manuals current in his Vedic school, that of the Maitrāyaṇīyas. And where he makes references to Mīmāṃsā, it is never to Śabara's Bhāṣya, but rather to a Mīmāṃsā work in verse, or containing verse, which has not survived, but may have been Bhavādāsa's Vṛtti. He may have known the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra, or a part of it, but this is not certain.
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