

Johannes Bronkhorst

Studies on Bhartṛhari, 2.

Bhartṛhari and Mīmāṃsā*

1.1. Both Bhartṛhari and Śabara pay a good deal of attention to the subject of *ūha* 'modification, adjustment'. Bhartṛhari discusses it in the first Ahnika 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:

asti paśur agniṣomīyaḥ, yo dīkṣito yad agniṣomīyaṃ paśum ālabhata iti / tatra pāśaikatvābhīdhāyī mantrāḥ, aditiḥ pāśaṃ pramumoktv etam iti / tathā pāśabahutvābhīdhāyī, aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktv etān iti / ... / asti dvipaśur vikṛtiḥ / maitraṃ śvetam ālabheta, vāruṇaṃ kṛṣṇaṃ apāṃ cauṣadhīnāṃ ca saṃdhāvannakāma iti / tatra codakena pāśābhīdhāyīnau mantrau prāptau / tayoḥ saṃśayaḥ / kiṃ bahuvacanānto 'vikāreṇa pravartate, ekavacanāntasya nivṛttiḥ, uta bahuvacanānto nivartate, ekavacanānta ūhitavyaḥ, utobhayor api pravṛttir abhīdhānavipratipattiś ca, utaikavacanānta ūhitavyo bahuvacanānto 'pi na nivarteta / kiṃ prāptam /

"There is the Agniṣomīya animal [sacrifice] laid down in the text *yo dīkṣito yad agniṣomīyaṃ paśum ālabhata* ('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 pāśaṃ 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 (*vikṛti*) [of the Agniṣomīya] at which two animals [are killed], laid down in the text

* This article was written with the financial assistance of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (N.W.O.).

maitraṃ śvetam ālabheta, vāruṇaṃ kṛṣṇam 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. Gaṅgānātha 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 pravartāte / ekavacanānto nivartitum arhati / kutaḥ / nāsyaikaśmin pāṣe pravartamānasya dṛṣṭaḥ pratighātaḥ / yathaivaikaśmin pāṣe pravartate, tathā dvayor api pravartitum arhati / nāsāv ekasya vācakaḥ, na dvayoḥ / evam ārṣaś codako'anugṛhīto bhaviṣyati / itarathā hi ūhyamāne yathāprakṛti mantro na kṛtaḥ syāt / na dvayoḥ pāṣayoḥ, ekasmiṃś ca pāṣe kaścid viśeṣo'sti / tasmād avikāreṇa bahuvacanāntaḥ prayujyate, 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, Śabara does not accept this position. He comes to the conclusion, 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 rather 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):

tathaikasminneva prakṛtipāṣe pāśān iti bahuvacanāntaṃ śrūyate / aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktv iti / tatrāpi vikṛtāv ūho nāsti / vājasaneyināṃ tv ekavacanāntaḥ paṭhyate aditiḥ pāśam iti / teṣāṃ ūhaḥ prāpnoti / ... athavā pāṣeṣu noha ity anena tu naigamavibhāṣā / bahuvacane sati yatheṣṭaṃ 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 Vājasaneyins [the mantra] is read in the singular, *aditiḥ pāśam* ... 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 Vājasaneyins. 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 pāśaṃ pramumoktv etam* does not occur in the scriptures of the Vājasaneyins, but in TS 3.1.4.4. Bhartṛhari's mistake (what else could it be?) allows us to conclude that he was not a Taittirīya either. The

presence of *aditiḥ pāśān 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 *ūha*, or rather of the absence of *ūha*, in *aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktv* 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 pāśān pramumoktv etān* and *aditiḥ pāśaṃ pramumoktv etam* 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 Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 9.3.22 and 9.3.27-4.27) deal in detail with the *adhriḡu* 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 *ṣaḍviṃśatir asya vaṅkrayas* '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' (*iyattā vaṅkrīṇāṃ prakṛtau vaktavyā / ihāpi sā codakena pra-diśyate / tena nābhyāsaḥ / sa hi paśunimittakaḥ / tasmāt samasya vacanaṃ vaṅkrīṇāṃ kartavyam iti* /). Bhartṛhari makes an enigmatic remark after

1. MS 4.13.4; KS 16.21; AiB 6.6-7 (2.6-7); TB 3.6.6; AśvŚS 3.3; ŚŚS 5.17.

citing the sentence that precedes *ṣaḍviṃśatir*. This remark - *tathāvyayam anekasmin paśau dvir abhyasyate* - can be interpreted with the help of MŚS 5.2.9.5 *yāny avyayāny anekāni tāni dvir abhyasyante ... ṣaḍviṃśatiḥ ṣaḍviṃśatiḥ*. It thus comes to mean: "Then, in case there is more than one animal, the indeclinable [that follows, viz. *ṣaḍviṃśatiḥ*] is repeated."

Unlike Śabara, parts of Bhartṛhari's treatment of *ūha* show the influence of the Mānava 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' (*ūhaprakaraṇa*) of the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra. Once (AL 7.5-6; Sw 8.11-12; Ms 2d10-11; CE I 6.6-8) he says:

aghasat aghastām aghasannagrabhīṣur akṣannity ūhaprakaraṇe paṭhyate

"In the section on modification the forms *aghasat*, *aghasatām*, *aghasan*, *agrabhīṣuḥ* and *akṣan* are read."

This must refer to MŚS 5.2.9.6:

haviṣi praiṣe sūktavāke ca adat adatām adan, ghasat ghasatām ghasan, aghasat aghastām aghasan, karat karatām karan, aghrabhīt aghrabhīṣṭām agrabhīṣuḥ, akṣan

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

tatrohaprakaraṇa evaiṣaṃ mātā pitā bhrātā sanābhisamsargiśabdā ity evamādīny anūhyānity 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*, *bhrātā* and the like should not be modified."

This reflects MŚS 5.2.9.7:

mātā pitā bhrātā sagarbhyo('nu) sakhā sayūthyo nābhirūpam āsamsargi śabdāś cakṣuḥ śrotraṃ vāñ manas tvañ medo havir barhiḥ śyenaṃ vakṣa ity anūhyam

"His mother, his father, his brother from the same womb, his friend in the herd'; the form of *nābhi* 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 Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, nor to any other Śrauta Sūtra. Of particular interest is the stanza which introduces his discussion of *ūha* in the *adhriḡu* 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):

*aṅgāni jñātināmā[ny upamā] cendriyāṇi ca /
etāni nohaṃ gacchanti adhriḡau 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 *adhriḡu*."

This stanza, which governs Bhartṛhari's ensuing discussion, must be assumed to have belonged to the ritualistic tradition of some Vedic school, probably the Maitrāyāṇīyas.² 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 *aditiḥ pāśān pramumoktu* 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 (*aṅgāni* ...) is quoted by Kumārila in his *Tantravārttika* on Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 1.3.24 (p. 197) and ascribed to a *ṭīkākāra* 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.³

-
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*' (*ūhavidām āmnāyaḥ*).

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 Śunaskarṇastoma sacrifice (AL 118.3; Sw 137.26-138.1; Ms 39a7-8):

*śunaskarṇastomayajñavad etat syāt, yathā pradhānasya maraṇenārthina iṣṭiṃ pravartayanti*⁴

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

The Śunaskarṇa Agniṣṭoma sacrifice is discussed in Śabara's Bhāṣya on 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 yajeta, yaḥ kāmayetānāmayaḥ svargaṃ lokam iṣṭiṃ iti*; tr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā, p. 1721). The question raised under PMS 10.2.57-58 is whether or not the sacrifice should be continued after the sacrificer has taken his life by throwing himself into the fire. The answer is that the sacrifice must be completed. 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 Śāstradīpikā 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 phalaṃ na maraṇam / maraṇakāma ity aṅgikṛtamaraṇa ity arthaḥ / tena yo hy evaṃ jñātvā svargaṃ prāpnavānīti kāmāyate, tasyāyaṃ kratuḥ / tathā ca haribhir uktaṃ 'pradhānasya maraṇenārthina iṣṭiṃ 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.

Pārthasārathi's quotation does not only cast light on the form and meaning of Bhartṛhari's remark; it also indicates that Pārthasārathi (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 *prayājāḥ savibhaktikāḥ kāryāḥ* of the Mahābhāṣya (I.3.10). Bhartṛhari is here clearly influenced by the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra (5.1.2.6) which reads:

punar ādheye prayājānuyājānām purastād vopariṣṭād vā vibhaktiḥ kuryāt / ye yajāmahe 'samidhaḥ samidho'gnā ājyasya vyantv' agnir agnis 'tanūnapād agnā ājyasya vetv' agnim agnim 'ido'gnā ājyasya vyantv' agner agner 'barhir 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 yajāmahe* etc."

The first and introductory sentence of this passage is included in Bhartṛhari's remarks on the subject, which however go beyond the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra in giving some kind of justification for the choice of 'vibhaktis' (i.e. *agnir agniḥ* 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):

vibhaktinām api sarvāsām prayoge prāpte yā dvyakṣarā vā satyaś catu-rakṣarā vā bhavantīti vacanād agnināgnineti na prayujyate / tathā na śabda jāmi kuryāt / śabda jāmi hi tad bhavati yat pañcamyantaṃ / tasmād agner agner ity anena rūpeṇa ṣaṣṭhyantaṃ prayujyate / punarādheye prayājānuyājānām purastād vopariṣṭād vā vibhaktiḥ kuryāt / narāśaṃso 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 *śabda jāmi*. *Śabda jāmi* is that which has an ablative ending. Therefore it is the genitive which is used in the form *agner agneḥ*, [not the ablative]. When [fire] is to

be lit again one should recite the vibhaktis before or after the preliminary offerings. Or *narāśaṃso ... 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: *agnir 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 Śivarāmeṇdra Sarasvatī's Ratnaprakāśa, a subcommentary on the Mahābhāṣya. It says in this connection (p. 56-57):

tatrāpi sambuddhiṭāṇe 'ntānām na prayogaḥ, 'āvṛtṭyā dvyakṣarāḥ santaś caturakṣarā bhavanti' iti vacanāt / sambuddhyantasya dvyakṣaratve 'pi dvirvacanottaram pūrvarūpe sati 'agne'gne' iti tryakṣaratvāt / ṭāṇe 'ntayor ādita eva dvyakṣaratvābhāvāc ca / tathā nasyantam api na prayoktavyam, 'na śabdajāmi kuryāt, śabdajāmi hi tad bhavati yat pañcamyantam' iti vacanāt / ... / evaṃ ca caturṣv avaśiṣṭaprayājaman-treṣu yathākramam prathamādvitīyāśaṣṭhīsapṭamyekavacanāntānām agni-śabdaprakṛtikānām padānām prayogaḥ kartavyaḥ / ... / tathā cāyam purastātprayogaḥ: 'ye yajāmahe agnir agniḥ samidhaḥ samidho' gna ājya-sya vyantu vauṣaṭ' / 'ye yajāmahe agnim agnim tanūnapād agna ājyasya vetu vauṣaṭ' / 'ye yajāmahe agner agner iḍo' gna ājyasya vyantu vauṣaṭ' / 'ye yajāmahe agnāv agnau barhir agna ājyasya vetu vauṣaṭ' iti / paścātprayogas tu 'ye yajāmahe samidhaḥ samidho' gna ājyasya vyantu agnir agniḥ vauṣaṭ' ityādiḥ /

It is true that Śivarāmeṇdra refers immediately after this to Viṣṇuśra's Kṣīroḍa, a now lost commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, for further elucidation. It is also true that he then mentions Bhartṛhari's commentary (*haritṭikā*) and quotes from it a passage which clearly belongs to Bhartṛhari's subsequent treatment of 'vibhaktis' in accordance with the Aśvalāyana 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 Mānava 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 dvyakṣarāḥ satīś caturakṣarāḥ kriyant[e]*.

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 *śabda-jāmi*; *śabda-jāmi* is that which has an ablative ending. Subsequently Bhartṛhari observes that *tanūnapād* is sometimes replaced by *narāśaṃso*. Something similar was noted by the commentator Gārgya Nārāyaṇa on AśvŚS 2.8.6 (see Rau, 1980: 176) and by Śivarāmeṇdra Sarasvatī (see Bronkhorst, 1981:174), both in connection with the Aśvalāyana version of the 'vibhaktis'.

1.5. What is the source from which Bhartṛhari derived his detailed knowledge on ritual matters? The most likely answer is that he used Prayoga 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" (Śrautakośa Vol. I, English section, Part I, Preface, p. 7; see already Hillebrandt, 1879: XV; 1897:38). Bhide (1979:15of.) studied two extant Prayogas of the Cāturmāsya sacrifices and compared them with the Hiranyakeśi Śrauta Sūtra, under which they resort. Interestingly, the older of these two Prayogas, by Mahādeva Somayājīn, deviates a number of times from the Hiranyakeśi Śrauta Sūtra. This shows that Bhartṛhari may indeed have used Prayoga manuals belonging to his Vedic school, and that the few deviations from the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra which we noticed above do not prove that these manuals belonged to another school than that of the Mānavas.

2.1. We conclude from the above that Bhartṛhari 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 pṛthivī siddham ākāśam iti* (Mbh I.6.18-19) is elucidated by Bhartṛhari's remark (AL 22.23; Sw 27,19; Ms 8a4; CE I 19.11): *ārhatānāṃ mīmāṃsakānāṃ ca 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) Bhartṛhari quotes the words *darśanasya parārthatvāt* in a discussion concerning the eternality of words. This must be a reflection of PMS 1.1.18 *nityas tu syād darśanasya parārthatvāt*. Note however that Bhartṛhari's quote does not only lack the initial words of the sūtra, it also has an additional word at the end,

probably *viprapravṛttatvāt* which is absent from the sūtra.

The following quotation in the *Dīpikā* seems to throw more light on Bhartṛhari's relationship with Mīmāṃsā. In the third Ahnika Bhartṛhari proclaims (AL 96.3-4; Sw 113.14-15; Ms 31b4-5; CE III.3.19-20):

*nānantaryam sambandhaheṭuḥ / evaṃ hy ucyate / arthato hy asamarthānām
ānantaryam 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 vāmmānasāmarthyāc
codanārthena gamyetārthānām hy arthavattvena vacanāni pratīyante 'rthato hy
asamarthānām ānantarye'py asambandhas tasmācchrutyekadeśaḥ 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 yenābhisambandho/-ārthasambandho dūrasthasyāpi tena saḥ / artha-
to hy asamarthānām ānantaryam akāraṇam //*

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

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

*śruter arthāc ca pāṭhāc ca pravṛtteś ca manīṣiṇaḥ /
sthānān mukhyāc ca dharmānām āhuḥ kramavidāḥ 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 (*śrutilakṣa-
ṇam ānupūrvyaṃ tatpramāṇatvāt*),⁶ *artha* in 5.1.2 (*arthāc ca*), *pāṭha* is the

6. Bhartṛhari's example of *śruti* is *hṛdayasyāgre'vadyati, atha jihvāyāḥ, atha vakṣasaḥ*. The same example is given by Śābara under PMS 5.1.5.

subject-matter of 5.1.4, even though not called by this name, *pravṛtti* appears in 5.1.8 (*pravṛtṭyā tulyakālānām tadupakramāt*), *sthāna* in 5.1.13 (*sthānāc cotpattisaṃyogāt*), *mukhyakrama* finally in 5.1.14 (*mukhyakrameṇa vā'ṅgānām tadarthatvāt*). 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. Sucaritamīśra's commentary Kāśīkā on Kumārila'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, 1968:100f., 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*: *prasaṅgaśabdārtho 'nyair uktaḥ, 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): *yady arthi prayojako anyadvāreṇārthaṃ 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:I:385 fn. 1). It reads (AL 31.2-3; Sw 36.19-21; Ms 10b7-8; CE I 25.24-26):

7. *bhavadāsena cōktam: athāta ity ayaṃ śabda ānantarye prayujyate*.

8. Frauwallner (1968:101) places him in the first half of the 5th century.

*dharmaprayojano veti mīmāṃsakadarśanam / avasthita eva dharmah / sa tv
agnihotrādibhir abhivyaajyate / tatpreritas tu phalado bhavati /*

"[The words in the Mahābhāṣya (I.8.5-6)] *dharmaprayojano vā* ... 'bringing 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. Instigated by these [dharma] produces result."

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

*vṛddhamīmāṃsakāḥ yāgādikarmanirvartyam apūrvam nāma dharmam abhiva-
danti yāgādikarmaiva śābarā bruvate*

"The old Mīmāṃsakas declare dharma, [also] called apūrvā, to be produced 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 Bhartr̥hari were older than Śābara. Mīmāṃsaka goes further and concludes that Bhartr̥hari himself is much earlier than Śābara. This need not be true. In fact, Bhartr̥hari'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 Bhartr̥hari considers *prayojana* here synonymous with *prayojaka* 'bringing about' for the following reasons: (i) otherwise *tatpreritas* makes no sense; (ii) a few lines further down we find the explanation *dharmasya ... prayojaka/ḥ/*. Joshi and Roodbergen (1973:82 fn. 326) explain this meaning as follows: "The word *prayojana* 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 prayojanam*: 'that by which something is regulated is (called) *prayojana*'. Taken in this sense, *prayojana* comes to mean *prayojaka*: 'regulator'." It seems however more correct to account for *prayojana* in this sense by P. 3.3.113 (*kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam*). This is done, e.g., by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita in his *Śabdakaustubha* (vol. I, p. 11): *atra prayujyate pravartyate 'neneti karaṇalyuḍantaḥ prayojayatīti kartr̥vyutpattyā bāhulakāt kartr̥lyuḍanto vā ubhayathāpi pravartakavidhiparaḥ puṃliṅgaḥ prayojanaśabda ekaḥ / phalaparaḥ klībo'paraḥ /*.

10. Cf. Śābara's Bhāṣya on PMS 1.1.2: *yo ho yāgam anutiṣṭhati taṃ dhārmika iti samācakṣate / yaś ca yasya kartā sa tena vyapadiṣyate / yathā pācako lāvaka iti /*.

ma. This indication consists in the twice quoted phrase *dadhimadhvādayo dharmāḥ* '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 prayuktāni dīrghasattrāṇi idānīm aprayujyamānāny api dadhimadhvādayo dharma iti karmatādiviṣayaḥ sidhyata evam anyaiḥ prayuktānām sarvakālam idānīm aprayujyamānānām apy anuvidhānam yuktam / ye tu dadhimadhvādayo dharma iti teṣāṃ vyākaraṇe'yam artho na sambhava-ti / na hi iha śabdoccāraṇāt dharma iti /

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 Bhavadāsa'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 Bhavadāsa's Vṛtti. He may have known the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra, or a part of it, but this is not certain.

References

Bhartr̥hari: *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*.

1) Edited by K. V. Abhyankar and V. P. Limaye. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1970. (Post-Graduate and Research Department Series No. 8.)

2) Partly edited by V. Swaminathan under the title *Mahābhāṣya Tīkā*. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University. 1965. (Hindu Vishvavidyalaya Nepal Rajya Sanskrit Series Vol. 11.)

3) Manuscript reproduced. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1980.

4) 'Critical edition'. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. At this moment four volumes have been published: Ahnika I by Johannes Bronkhorst (1987), Ahnika 3 by G. B. Palsule (1983), Ahnika 5 by V. P. Limaye, G. B. Palsule and V. B. Bhagavat, and Ahnika 6 part 1 by V. B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhate.

Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: *Śabdakaustubha*. Vol. I, Fasc. I to IV. Edited by Pandit Sri Mukund Sastri Puṇtamkar. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1933.

Bhide, V. V. (1979): *The Cāturmāsya Sacrifices*. With special reference to the Hiranyakeśi Śrautasūtra. Pune: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class B, No. 5)

Bronkhorst, Johannes (1981): "On some Vedic quotations in Bhartr̥hari's works." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7, 173-75.

Bronkhorst, Johannes (1986): "Tantra and Prasāṅga." *Aligarh Journal of Oriental Studies* 3, 77-80.

Bronkhorst, Johannes (1987): "Further remarks on Bhartr̥hari's Vedic affiliation." *Studies in Indian culture*. S. Ramachandra Rao Felicitation Volume. Bangalore, pp. 216-223.

Frauwallner, Erich (1968): *Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karmamīmāṃsā* Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 259. Band, 2. Abhandlung; Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens, Heft 6).

Garge, Damodar Vishnu (1952): *Citations in Śabara-Bhāṣya*. Poona: Deccan College. (Deccan College Dissertation Series, 8.).

Helārāja: *Prakīrṇaparakāṣa*. In: *Vākyapadīya of Bhartr̥hari with the commentary of Helārāja*, edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer. 2 parts. Poona: Deccan College. 1963-73.

Hillebrandt, Alfred (1879): *Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer*. Jena: Gustav Fischer.

Hillebrandt, Alfred (1897): *Ritual-Litteratur. Vedische Opfer und Zauber*. Straßburg: Karl J. Trübner. (Grundriß der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, III. Band, 2. Heft.)

Jayanta Bhaṭṭa: *Nyāyamañjarī*. Vol. I. Edited by K. S. Varadacharya. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute.

- Jha, Ganganatha (tr.) (1933-36): *Shabara-Bhāṣya*. 3 vol. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Jha, Ganganatha (1942): *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*. Benares: Benares Hindu University.
- Joshi, S. D., and Roodbergen, J. A. F. (1973): *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Tatpuruṣāhnikā* (P. 2.2.2-2.2.23). Poona: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 7)
- Kane, P. V. (1929): "Bhavadāsa and Śabarasvāmin." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 10, 153-54.
- Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: *Tantravārttika*. See under 'Śabara'.
- Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira (1973): *Samskṛta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa*. Parts I-III. Sonipat: Rāma Lāl Kapūr Trust. Saṃvat 2030.
- Mishra, Umesha (1942): "Critical bibliography." Appendix to Jha 1942.
- Pārthasārathi Miśra: *Śāstradīpikā*. Edited by P. N. Pattabhirama Sastri. New Delhi: Śrī Lāla Bahādura Śāstri Kendriya Samskṛta Vidyāpīṭham. Part II. 1980-81. (Samskṛta Vidyāpīṭha Granthamālā 38.)
- Patañjali: *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962-72.
- Ramaswami Sastri, K. S. (1937): "Date of Pārthasārathimiśra and sequence of his works." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 13, 488-97.
- Rau, Wilhelm (1980): "Bhartṛhari und der Veda". *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 5/6 (Festschrift Paul Thieme), 167-80.
- Śabara: *Mīmāṃsā Bhāṣya*. In: *Mīmāṃsādarśana*. Edited by Kāśīnātha Vāsu-devaśāstri Abhyankara and Pt. Gaṇeśaśāstri Jośī. Poona: Anandāśrama. 1973-84. (Anandāśrama Samskṛtagranthāvali 97.)
- Śrautakośa. Vol. I, English section, Part I. By R. N. Dandekar; preface by C. G. Kashikar. Poona: Vaidika Samśodhana Maṇḍala. 1958.
- Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī: *Ratnaprakāśa*. In: *Mahābhāṣya Pradīpa Vyākhyānāni*. Adhyāya 1 Pāda 1 Ahnika 1-4. Edited by M. S. Narasimhacharya. Pondicherry: Institut Francais d'Indologie. 1973. (Publications de l'Institut Francais d'Indologie No. 51,1.)
- Swaminathan, V. (1961): "Bhartṛhari and Mīmāṃsā." *Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference* 20 (1959), vol. II, part 1, pp. 309-17.
- Swaminathan, V. (1963): "Bhartṛhari's authorship of the commentary on the Mahābhāṣya." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 27, 59-70.
- Vaidyanātha: *Chāyā*. In: *Patanjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya*, edited by Raghunath Kāśhīnāth Shāstri and Sivadatta D. Kudāla. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sāgar Press. 1932.

van Gelder, Jeanette M. (tr.) (1963): *The Mānava Śrautasūtra*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture. (Śata-Piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures, Vol. 27.)

ABBREVIATIONS

AiB	<i>Aitareya Brāhmaṇa</i>
AL	Abhyankar and Limaye's edition of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā</i>
AśvŚS	<i>Aśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra</i>
CE	'Critical Edition' of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā</i>
KS	<i>Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā</i>
KapS	<i>Kapiṣṭhala Saṃhitā</i>
Mbh	<i>Mahābhāṣya</i>
Ms	Manuscript of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā</i>
MS	<i>Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā</i>
MŚS	<i>Mānava Śrauta Sūtra</i>
PMS	<i>Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra</i>
ŚŚŚ	<i>Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra</i>
Sw	Swaminathan's edition of Bhartṛhari's <i>Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā</i>
TB	<i>Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa</i>
TS	<i>Taittirīya Saṃhitā</i>