

TWO TEXTUAL STUDIES OF BHARTṚHARI*

ASHOK AKLUJKAR

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The first half of the article discusses the range of reference and the significance of the title *Vākyapadīya*. It is argued that the title was originally given to the first two books only of Bhartṛhari's monumental work and that the word "*Vākyapadīya*" has been explained more precisely by ancient writers than is generally supposed. In the second half, the article points out how the published parts of Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* contain a number of borrowings from Bhartṛhari's partly *vr̥tti* of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* and how the discovery is significant for a textual study of both the works, the manuscript material for which is extremely insufficient.

published

I. THE TITLE VĀKYAPADĪYA

1.1. It is generally believed that the title *Vākyapadīya* refers to all the three *kāṇḍas* of Bhartṛhari's *magnum opus*.¹ Even most of those scholars who have shown interest in the text of this work and hence have come to know some references in literature that are contrary to the belief, have preferred to stick to it.² They think

* I thank Prof. Daniel H. H. Ingalls for suggesting stylistic improvements in the present article and Prof. V. Raghavan for drawing attention to the complete and revised edition of his *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*.

¹ There is only negligible evidence in support of the titles *Hari-kārikā* and *Vākya-pradīpa*, recorded respectively by Oppert (1880: no. 4267) and Rājendralāla Mitra (1877: 63, 64, 113). Hence those have not been taken up for consideration in the present article. See, however, footnote 26 for the latter. Belvalkar (1938: 252-254) notices a work called *Vākyapadīya* written by one Gaṅgādāsa. He has probably mistaken *Vākyapadī* for *Vākyapadīya*. See Kielhorn (1880/1881: 71) and Rājendralāla Mitra (1886: 10).

² Charudeva Shastri (1930, 1934) explicitly accepts the view that the title *Vākyapadīya* was given to all the three books in the older tradition. Sadhu Ram (1952: 136 fn. 5) accepts it in less clear terms, for he says that the tradition of referring to the first two books by the name *Vākyapadīya* had come into vogue by I-ching's time, and uses that name throughout in his 1956 article on the text of Bhartṛhari's work. It is difficult to ascertain the views of Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī (1935), Ravi Varmā (1942), Ruegg (1959), Rau (1962, 1964), Biardeau (1964), Subramania Iyer (1963, 1965, 1966) and Abhyankar-Limaye (1965) with any exactitude; but from the fact that these scholars use the term *Vākyapadīya* for the third *kāṇḍa*, without saying that they use it just because they find it more convenient as a generally known term, one may infer that these scholars too are inclined to ac-

cept that *Vākyapadīya* was a designation of all the three books in the older tradition and that it came to be restricted to the first two books only later.³ The purpose of the first part of the present article is to argue against this generally held view. It seeks to establish that the available evidence, if carefully and collectively considered, leads us to no other conclusion than the following: Bhartṛhari himself (the oldest tradition imaginable) had divided his monumental work in two ways. According to the first division, the work consisted of two parts—the *Vākyapadīya* (the first two books) and the *Prakīrṇaka* (the third book). The first part included the *vr̥tti*, the author's own explanatory and supplementary gloss. Divided into the *Vākyapadīya* and the *Prakīrṇaka*, the entire work had no distinctive common name as

cept Charudeva Shastri's view. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (*saṃvat* 2019: 349) advocates the view that the term *Vākyapadīya* originally designated only the second *kāṇḍa*. As this view goes against all the evidence noted in this article and as it is based on a misunderstanding of the verse "*trailokyagāminī . . .*" (footnote 29), I have refrained from giving it a prominent place in this article. It should also be noted that Mānavallī (1887: 1), Kunhan Raja (1936: 297-298) and Rāma-govinda Śukla (1961: 6) express the view accepted by me. However, they expose only bits of the total evidence and do not point out the significance of the title.

³ According to Charudeva Shastri (1930: 636, 1934: 8), the cause of the restriction was the relative independence that the third *kāṇḍa* gained because of its importance and voluminous commentary (see 3.2c and 3.3d below). Subramania Iyer (1963a: ga) thinks that the independent status given to the third *kāṇḍa* was a result of the fact that it had no auto-commentary.

such. The second way of dividing the work was relatively superficial, even mechanical. It had a colorless name *Trikāṇḍī* for the whole and named each *kāṇḍa* after the most important word in the first statement of that *kāṇḍa*.

1.2. In the course of the discussion concerning the conclusion given above about the exact range of reference of the term *Vākyapadīya*, the present article clarifies also the meaning of the term. It points out that an explanation of the formation *Vākyapadīya* should not stop with "*vākyam ca padaṃ ca; vākyā-pade adhikṛtya kṛtaḥ granthaḥ Vākyapadīyam.*" Our sources are more specific on this point than scholars have heretofore noticed.

2.1. There are a number of indications in support of the view that the division of the *Trikāṇḍī* into two parts—one consisting of the first two books and the other of the third book—was intended by the author.

(a) Verses 478–487 of the second *kāṇḍa* are like the concluding verses which one so often comes across at the end of Sanskrit compositions (Mānavallī, p. 1; Kunhan Raja, p. 291).

(b) They are also meant to connect the third *kāṇḍa* with the first two *kāṇḍas*. According to those verses, the first two *kāṇḍas* contain a brief yet comprehensive statement of the views of the grammarians, while the third *kāṇḍa* discusses these views in minute detail and also in the light of other systems of philosophy ("*vyākaraṇā-gamaḥ*" and "*āgamaṃ*" in 2.482–483 whereas "*āgama-darśanaḥ*" and "*āgamaḥ*" in 2.486–487).⁴ Thus, conciseness was the main principle followed in the composition of the first two; but the latter was planned to be very extensive in length, in details, and in its scope; "*saprapaṇce svarūpataḥ*" as the third introductory verse of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* says. It discussed the philosophical problems from the point of view of the grammarian, studied the use of important philosophical terms in different schools of phi-

losophy, elucidated a number of grammatical views in the *Mahābhāṣya*, and explained the important *vākyā-nyāyas*.⁵ Thus, there is a clear difference of setting and point of view in the composition of the first two *kāṇḍas* on the one hand and the third *kāṇḍa* on the other.

(c) Moreover, while the former are not divided into *samuddeśas*, the latter has no less than fourteen *samuddeśas* and there is reason to believe that it once had at least sixteen (footnote 5). It shows a way of sectioning the discussion that is absent from the first two books.

(d) At the end of the commentary on the second *kāṇḍa*⁶ (BSS p. 291) we find the following verse: "*gurave Bhartṛharaye śabda-brahma-vide namaḥ / sarva-siddhānta-sandoha-sārāmṛta-mayāya ca //*" That the verse is meant to mark the conclusion of a work or of a relatively independent part of a work, is obvious.

(e) The third *kāṇḍa* is referred to as *Prakīrṇaka*, 'book or section devoted to miscellaneous matters' or 'supplement', in some manuscripts containing Bhartṛhari's *kārikās* only, in all the known manuscripts of Helārāja's commentary on the third *kāṇḍa*, and in the works of Vardhamāna and I-ching (3.1 below). This points to the fact that the book was not considered to be a part of

⁵ "*tatra dvādaśa, ṣaṭ (ṣaḍ, dvādaśa ?), caturviṃśatir vā lakṣaṇāntī Lakṣaṇa-samuddeśe śāpadeśaṃ savirodhaṃ vistareṇa vyākhyāsyate.*"—*vṛtti* 2.77; "*tatra ṣaḍ, dvādaśa, caturviṃśatir vaitāni lakṣaṇāni tāvad iha pradarśyante. eteṣāṃ ca vitatya sopapattikaṃ sanidarśanaṃ sva-rūpaṃ Pada-kāṇḍe Lakṣaṇa-samuddeśe vinirdiṣṭam iti grantha-kṛtaiva sva-vṛttau pratipāditam. āgama-bhramśāl lek-haka-pramādādīnā vā Lakṣaṇa-samuddeśaś ca Pada-kāṇḍa-madhye na prasiddhaḥ.*"—*ṭīkā* 2.77, BSS p. 101 (see footnote 6); "*eṣā ca Ṭīkā-kṛtā sva-vṛttau sā ca tulya-baleṣv asambhavād ityādinā bahu-prakārā darśitā. na ceyattā prakārāṇāṃ asyās tenāpi tatra darśitā. yasmād uktaṃ seyam aparimāṇa-vikalpā bādhā vistareṇa Bādhā-samuddeśe samarthayīṣyata iti.*"—*ṭīkā* 2.77, BSS p. 106. Sadhu Ram's (1956: 71–79) contention that the *Lakṣaṇa-samuddeśa* and the *Bādhā-samuddeśa* were not chapters of the *Pada-kāṇḍa* but parts of Bhartṛhari's commentary on the *Mīmāṃsā-sūtras*, does not seem to rest on a sound basis of evidence.

⁶ The second *kāṇḍa* commentary printed in the Benares Sanskrit Series is usually ascribed to Puṇyārāja. In a forthcoming article, I wish to point out that a good case can be made for Helārāja's authorship of it.

⁴ Kunhan Raja's (p. 292 fn. 25) remark that the mention of three *kāṇḍas* at the end of the second *kāṇḍa* is slightly puzzling, is proved to be incorrect by the significance of the concluding verses pointed out in these lines.

the main body of the work and that it enjoyed relative independence.

(f) I-ching (p. 180) records a commentary by Dharmapāla on the *Prakīrṇaka*⁷ only, thus testifying that the *Prakīrṇaka* was considered to be a relatively independent book in his time.

(g) On the basis of the information given in various catalogues of manuscripts, one can say that there are about 25 manuscripts (mostly incomplete) of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*, Helārāja's commentary on the third *kāṇḍa*, in existence. It is significant that a commentary on either the first or the second *kāṇḍa* is not found in any of these manuscripts. They contain only the commentary on the third *kāṇḍa*⁸ although Helārāja states in no unclear terms at the very beginning that he commented on the first two books as well. This independence unanimously given to a commentary on the third book is satisfactorily explained only if an old tradition of regarding that book as a composition mostly complete in itself is presumed.

(h) Introductory verses (including one benedictory verse) which usually indicate the beginning of a commentary either on an independent work or on a relatively independent book of a voluminous work, are found at the beginning of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*. They are not found at the beginning of the commentary on the second *kāṇḍa* (see footnote 6).

⁷ So far I-ching's has been the only known reference to Dharmapāla's commentary on the *Prakīrṇaka*. Recently, I have come across one more reference to that work. Durvekamiśra, in his *Dharmottara-pradīpa*, says: "tathā hi *Prakīrṇa-vṛttikṛd-Dharmapālenāpi vidha-śabdaḥ prakāravācī pradarśitaḥ. na punar asyāyam abhiprāyaḥ vidhā(dha)-śabdo jāti-vācivāt prakāra-vācī na bhavattīti. anekārthatvāt tasya prakāra-vācino 'pi prayogasya 'catasṛṣu caivaṃvidhāsu tattvaṃ parisamāpyate' (Nyāya-bhā., p. 2) ityādāv anena prāyśo dṛṣṭatvāt."* Compare Helārāja 3.1.1, p. 2.10-14.

⁸ Raghavan Nambiar's catalogue of manuscripts in the library of the Oriental Institute at Baroda (1942: 718-719) says that MS 319/1987 contains commentaries of the second and the third *kāṇḍas*; but this seems to be an error from the fact that the manuscript is described as having only 66 leaves and an extent of only 4,800 *granthas* or *ślokas*. Moreover, it is, most probably, the

3.1. Considerations introduced in points (a) to (h) of the last section should be sufficient to show that the division of Bhartṛhari's monumental work into two main parts dates from as far back as the author's time. What remains to be proved is the thesis that the first part was called *Vākyapadīya*. Some facts which are in favor of this view are noted below, followed by a discussion of possible objections.

(a) A number of manuscripts of the *Trikāṇḍī* contain the words "*samāptā Vākyapadīya-kārikā*" at the end of the second *kāṇḍa*.⁹

(b) Helārāja refers to the first two books by the title *Vākyapadīya* not less than nine times¹⁰:

"*vistareṇāgama-prāmāṇyam Vākyapadīye 'smābhīḥ prathama-kāṇḍe Śabda-prabhāyām nirṇītam...*" 3.1.46, p. 54: Compare 1.27-43, pp. 81-100.

"*tasya cid-rūpasya cicchaktir aparīṇāminīti vikārābhāvān nedaṃ Sāṅkhya-nayavat pariṇāma-darśanam api tu vivarta-pakṣaḥ. viśeṣaś cānayoṛ Vākyapadīye 'smābhīḥ vyākhyāta iti...*" 3.2.15, p. 119: Compare 1.1, pp. 8-9.

"*śrotāpi ca tathaiḥ va-sa-vāsanā-vikāśānusāreṇa pratipādyate samāviṣṭa-śabda-bhāvanāḥ, tena cod-bodhita-śabda-bhāvanāḥ pravartata iti nirṇītam Vākyapadīye.*" 3.3.32, p. 146: Compare 1.53, p. 113.

"*tantreṇa hi śakti-dvayam apy abhidadhāti pratyaya iti Vākyapadīye nirṇītam.*" 3.7.84, p. 300: Compare 2.98-102, 455-477, BSS pp. 124-126, 281-283. Most probably Helārāja has in mind a portion of the *vṛtti* that is missing in the only available manuscript (6.2 below).

"*ata eva svātantrya-śaktiḥ kāla iti Vākyapadīye siddhāntitam adhyāhita-kalām yasya kāla-śaktim upāśritāḥ (1.3ab, p. 18) ity atra.*" 3.9.14, p. 54.

same as manuscript *ā* used by Abhyankar-Limaye (1965: II) which they describe as containing only the first and the second *kāṇḍa* with commentary.

⁹ Mānavallī, p. 1.16-17; Charudeva Shastri 1930: 631, 1934: 8; Sadhu Ram 1952: 136 fn. 5; Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka *saṃvat* 2019: 349; Abhyankar-Limaye 1965: 57 fn. 6; Rau 1962: 378, 380, 382, 1964: 184, 189, 191.

¹⁰ One more occurrence of the word *Vākyapadīya* in Helārāja's commentary is taken up for consideration in 3.2d below.

"*svatantrasya cid-ātmana eva jīvātma-gateyaṃ śaktiḥ kālākhyā yuktā, tathā hy uktam Vākya-pādīye 'smābhiḥ.*" 3.9.62, p. 72: Compare 1.3, p. 18.

"... *saṃvit ... cakāstīti kṛta-nirṇayaṃ Vākya-pādīye Śabda-prabhāyām asmābhis ...*" 3.9.62, pp. 72-73: Compare 1.134, pp. 213-221.

"*sarvā hi saṃvit ... ātanute. etac ca Vākya-pādīye vistareṇāsmābhir nirṇītam.*" 3.9.70, p. 76: Compare 1.134, pp. 213-221.

"*puruṣa-dharmeṣv api hi śāstram adhikṛtam iti vicāritam Vākya-pādīye.*" 3.9.105, p. 93: Compare 2.79c, BSS p. 109, 111.

Thus, Helārāja uses the term *Vākya-pādīya* with reference to the first two *kāṇḍas* only.¹¹

(c) Vardhamāna follows Helārāja. In the *Gaṇa-ratna-mahodadhi*, he writes: "*Bhartr̥harir Vākya-pādīya-Prakīrṇakayoḥ kartā Mahābhāṣya-tripādīyā vyākhyātā ca.*"¹²

(d) If the work *Peina* mentioned by I-ching is identified with the *Prakīrṇaka*, the term *Vākya-pādīya* has to be understood as the name of the first two *kāṇḍas*.¹³

¹¹ No one has heretofore collected all the occurrences of the term *Vākya-pādīya* in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*. The peculiarity of Helārāja's use of the term, however, has often been remarked on. In 1883, Kielhorn (p. 227) drew the attention of scholars to the fact that Helārāja uses the term *Prakīrṇaka* for the third *kāṇḍa*. He did not point out, however, that Helārāja reserves the term *Vākya-pādīya* for the first two *kāṇḍas*, although he identified the *Vākya-pādīka* mentioned by I-ching with the first two *kāṇḍas*. In 1894, Pathak (p. 213 fn. 3) accepted Kielhorn's conclusion in this matter, as was done later by Kunhan Raja (pp. 291-293), Rangaswamy Iyengar (p. 147) and Sadhu Ram (1952: 136 fn. 5); but these scholars made no significant addition to the evidence. It was Charudeva Shastri, in 1930 (p. 631) and 1934 (p. 8), who first used the evidence from the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* in discussing the title *Vākya-pādīya*. He referred to only two passages in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*. In 1938, Hiriyanna (p. 263 fn. 9) referred to three more passages. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (*saṃvat* 2019: 348-349) followed Charudeva Shastri.

¹² Charudeva Shastri 1930: 631, 1934: 8; Kunhan Raja, p. 291; Ravi Varmā, p. 1; Sadhu Ram 1952: 136 fn. 5; Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka *saṃvat* 2019: 349, *saṃvat* 2020: 353; Abhyankar-Limaye 1965: V fn. 2.

¹³ Kielhorn, p. 227; Pathak, p. 213 fn. 3; Charudeva Shastri 1930: 631, 1934: 8; Kunhan Raja, p. 291-293; Rangaswamy Iyengar, p. 147; Sadhu Ram 1952: 136 fn. 5.

3.2. In view of sections 2.1 and 3.1, the case that the title *Vākya-pādīya* originally referred only to the first two *kāṇḍas*, is indeed very strong. Yet most of the scholars interested in Bhartr̥hari's work have, with good reasons, been rather hesitant to accept it as an indisputable historical truth (footnote 2). The objections that have been voiced and that are likely to be raised are as follows:

(a) "All manuscripts of the text include the third *kāṇḍa* in the *Vākya-pādīya*." (Charudeva Shastri 1930: 636, 1934: 8).

(b) The word *Vākya-pādīya* is unquestionably derived from *vākya* and *pada* (see the citations from *Kāśikā*, *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* and *R̥ju-vimalā pañcīkā* in 3.3b below). The names of the second and the third book are respectively *Vākya-kāṇḍa* and *Pada-kāṇḍa* as far as our oldest sources inform us. Therefore, *Vākya-pādīya* would not be a significant title if it did not cover the third *kāṇḍa* (Charudeva Shastri 1930: 636, 1934: 7-8; Kunhan Raja, p. 291).

(c) If it had been Helārāja's understanding that the *Vākya-pādīya* does not include the *Prakīrṇaka*, he would not have referred to the whole work as one consisting of three *kāṇḍas* in the fourth concluding verse of his commentary.¹⁴ The real implication of his references that apply the title *Vākya-pādīya* to the first two books only, must, therefore, be that in his day the *Prakīrṇaka* was a well-known and important, voluminous work. His references are not meant to give the impression that *Vākya-pādīya* was *actually* the title of only the first two books (Charudeva Shastri 1930: 636, 1934: 8).

(d) There remains one occurrence of the word *Vākya-pādīya* in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* that was not included in the nine passages quoted in 3.1b above. In his introduction to verse 3.1.1 (p. 1), Helārāja says: "*iha padārthāṣṭaka-vicārapara-tvād Vākya-pādīyasya,*"¹⁵ ... Thus, according to him,

¹⁴ The lack of logical implication between the if-clause and the then-clause of this remark should be tolerated until 3.3d below.

¹⁵ "*Vākya-pādīyasya*" cannot be construed with "*prathamakāṇḍena ...*" which follows. If it were so construed, the ablative phrase "*padārthāṣṭaka-vicāra-para-tvād*" would remain dangling in the sentence.

the *Vākyapadīya* consists of eight topics. This view is supported by Vṛṣabha (p. 2.2–6, p. 64.19–25) and by Bhartṛhari himself, who, after enumerating the eight topics in verses 1.24–26, says in the *vṛtti*: “*triṣv apy eṣu ślokeṣu prastutasya parīsamāptih*”. Now, the first two *kāṇḍas* do not seem to cover all those eight topics (see 3.3b, c below for their names). In particular, they leave out the *apoddhāra-padārtha* which is covered by the third *kāṇḍa*. It may, therefore, be argued that the latter must be part of the *Vākyapadīya*.

(e) Verses from the third *kāṇḍa* are found quoted as coming from the *Vākyapadīya*.

3.3. I think that a satisfactory reply can be given to these five objections. I shall try to point out their weaknesses, though not necessarily in the order in which they have been given above.

(a) Two types of manuscripts exist, one declaring the end of the *Vākyapadīya* at the close of the second *kāṇḍa* and the other declaring the same at the conclusion of the third *kāṇḍa*. Which is more likely to point to historical truth? I think that that colophon in whose case an origin through confusion cannot be assumed, is more likely to represent the genuine tradition. Now, as the second and the third *kāṇḍas* are named respectively the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* and the *Pada-kāṇḍa*, as the title *Vākyapadīya* is formed by adding the suffix *īya* to the *dvandva* compound *vākya-pade*, and as the third *kāṇḍa* is thought to be a supplement, a copyist could have been easily led to suppose that the title *Vākyapadīya* applied to all the three *kāṇḍas*,¹⁶ but what could have led a copyist to suppose that it referred to only the first two books? To maintain that he was aware of all or some points discussed under sections 2.1 and 3.1 would be to assume too much. The copyist class of India is not known to have been so historically oriented as to justify such an assumption. Copyists, therefore, must have written “*samāptā Vākapadīya-kārikā*” at the end of the second *kāṇḍa* only because they found

that line at that place in the manuscripts which they copied.

(b) It would be difficult to advocate that the title *Vākyapadīya* was coextensive with the title *Trikāṇḍī* even if it were accepted that Bhartṛhari named his work after the second and the third *kāṇḍa*. One does not then get any satisfactory answer to the question, “Why did Bhartṛhari leave out the first *kāṇḍa* when he named the work?” (Kunhan Raja, p. 292). The first *kāṇḍa* is obviously as important as the other two *kāṇḍas*. If at all Bhartṛhari wished to name his *magnum opus* after the principal subject matter of each *kāṇḍa*, the omission from the title of a word that would indicate the subject matter of the first *kāṇḍa*—which contains a part of the statement of his unique philosophy—indeed seems to be very strange. Charudeva Shastri’s (1934: 8) explanation that the component *vākya* is indicative of the subject matters of both the first and the second *kāṇḍa*, for *sphoṭa*, the principal topic of the first *kāṇḍa*, is identical with *mahāvākya*, the principal topic of the second *kāṇḍa*, does not stand the test of facts. Neither are *sphoṭa* and *mahāvākya* the same entity, as is obvious from the terms *varṇa-sphoṭa* etc., nor are they the principal topics respectively of the first *kāṇḍa*, described as *āgama-samuccaya*, and the second *kāṇḍa*, called simply *vākya-kāṇḍa* (see the commentator’s introductions to 2.1–2, BSS p. 63 and 3.1.1, p. 1). Thus, it does not seem to be the case that Bhartṛhari named his work after the main contents of its individual books.

Secondly, one fails to understand how the second and the third *kāṇḍas* could be grouped together in a common title in view of the concluding verses of the second *kāṇḍa*, the division of the third *kāṇḍa* alone into *samuddeśas*, its *Prakīrṇaka* character (2.1 above) and the availability of Bhartṛhari’s own commentary on the first two *kāṇḍas* only.¹⁷ The second *kāṇḍa* seems to have stronger connections with the first *kāṇḍa* than with the third *kāṇḍa*.

¹⁶ Kunhan Raja’s (p. 293) explanation of the later extension of the title *Vākyapadīya* is different from the one given here. As I do not hold that Bhartṛhari and Puṇyārāja wrote commentaries on all the three *kāṇḍas* (see footnotes 6 and 17), I cannot accept his explanation.

¹⁷ In a future article, I shall discuss the extent of the *vṛtti*. I shall point out that we have no evidence to suppose that Bhartṛhari *actually* wrote a prose gloss on the *Prakīrṇaka*.

It is highly unlikely that ancient writers like Helārāja and Vardhamāna could never think of connecting the title *Vākyapadīya* with the titles of the second and the third books. Yet this is precisely what they have unanimously avoided. In the works of Jayāditya,¹⁸ Śālikanātha and Bhoja, we read:

Kāśikā on Pāṇini 4.3.88 "... śīśukrandādibhyo dvitīyā-samarthebhyāś chaḥ pratyayo bhavaty adhikṛtya kṛte granthe. aṇo 'pavādaḥ. śīśūnām kranda-nam śīśukrandaḥ, tam adhikṛtya kṛto granthaḥ, śīśukrandīyaḥ. Yamasya sabhā Yamasabhaṃ, yamasabhīyaḥ. dvandvāt—agnikāśyapīyaḥ. śyenakapotiyaḥ. śabdārthasambandhīyaṃ prakaraṇam"¹⁹ *Vākyapadīyam*. . . ."

Bṛhatī (part I. p. 389) "ta ete 'nvitāḥ padārthāḥ. eṣām abhidhānāni padāni. tad idaṃ vākyapadīyam."²⁰ Śālikanātha's *Rju-vimalā pañcikā* (pp. 389–390) comments "... vaiyākaraṇa-matam nirākurvaṇn āha ta ete 'nvitāḥ padārthāḥ, eṣām abhidhānāni padāni, tad idaṃ vākyapadīyam.

¹⁸ The first five *adhyāyas* of the *Kāśikā* seem to have been written by Jayāditya. See Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (*saṃvat* 2020: 424–425, 428–429).

¹⁹ Abhyankar-Limaye (1965: VIII fn. 5, 409) understand "*śabdārthasambandhīyaṃ prakaraṇam*" as a separate sentence containing one more illustration of the formations covered by Pāṇini 4.3.88. According to them, it is a reference to the first *vārttika* in the *Mahābhāṣya*, "*siddhe śabdārtha-sambandhe*". I do not know if any later grammarian has used the term *śabdārthasambandhīya prakaraṇa* to refer to the discussion under this *vārttika*. I think that the word *prakaraṇa* would be redundant in such an expression as the suffix *īya* signifies '*adhikṛtya kṛte granthe*' according to the explanation and the illustrations given by the *Kāśikā*. Moreover, it is not customary to refer to the *Mahābhāṣya* discussions as *prakaraṇas*. Such use of that term goes against the following definition: "*śāstraika-deśa-sambaddham śāstrakāryāntare sthītam / āhuḥ prakaraṇam nāma granthabhedaṃ vipaścitaḥ //*" On the other hand, the definition perfectly suits the *Vākyapadīya* which is unambiguously described as *prakaraṇa* by Vṛṣabha (pp. 1, 2, 51). Kunhan Raja (p. 293 fn. 28) seems to understand "*śabdārthasambandhīyaṃ prakaraṇam Vākyapadīyam*" as I do—as one sentence.

²⁰ It should be noted that Prabhākara does not use the word *vākyapadīya* as a title of a particular work and that the alert commentator Śālikanātha refrains from using any such expression as "*prakaraṇam*" or "*granthaḥ*" in his explanation of the word.

sūtram-anvitārthābhīdhāyīni padāni, na punar arthāvaccheda-śūnyāni; padāny eva ca vākyam, na padā-tirekīti. vākyapade adhikṛtya kṛtam vākyapadīyam. śīśukranda-yamasabha-dvandva iti chaḥ."

Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa (p. 50) "*karmanah sambandhinā (yogo) yathā—vākyapade adhikṛtya kṛto granthaḥ, vākyapadīyaḥ.*"²¹

It is worth noting that none of these works says that the title *Vākyapadīya* has been formed from the titles of the individual books of Bhartṛhari's composition. All that they say is that the word *Vākyapadīya* is a name of a *grantha* (see footnote 20) and as such it is to be derived from the compound *vākyapade*.

One may now ask: If Bhartṛhari did not name his work either after the titles of the second and the third *kāṇḍa* or after the principal subject matter of each *kāṇḍa* and if the name *Vākyapadīya* was originally given only to the first two books, what is the significance of that term?

It seems to me that the title *Vākyapadīya* has been coined or chosen by taking into consideration the principal concern of the first two books as a whole. As will be shown below, these two books are mainly devoted to eight topics. Hence the statements of Vṛṣabha and Helārāja to the effect that the *Vākyapadīya* is *padārthāṣṭaka-vicārapara*. The topics can further be grouped under three heads:

śabda—*anvākyeya* and *pratipādaka*,
artha—*apoddhāra-padārtha* and *sthita-lakṣaṇa*,
sambandha—*kārya-kāraṇa-bhāva*, *yogya-bhāva*,
pratyayāṅga and *pratyaya-dharmāṅga*.

From this follows the *Kāśikā* description "*śabdārtha-sambandhīyaṃ prakaraṇam Vākyapadīyam*." Now, it is possible to refer to the three heads by using words denotative of the categories of meaningful linguistic units, namely *vākyā* and *pada*, for any such category is bound to be a class

²¹ Kunhan Raja (p. 292 fn. 24) noticed the occurrence of the word *vākyapadīya* in the *Bṛhatī* and the *Rju-vimalā pañcikā*; but he did not explain its significance. The *Kāśikā* reference and explanation have been known for years; Mānavallī (p. 1), the first editor of the *Vākyapadīya*, refers to it. The *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* passage is noticed in this article for the first time.

of linguistic units (*śabda*)²² related to (*sambandha*) meaning (*artha*). This paves the way for the common content of the explanations of the term *Vākya-padīya* given by Jayāditya, Śālikanātha and Bhoja: “*vākya-pade adhikṛtya . . .*”

I may put the point in reverse order as well. In most general terms, the first two books of Bhartṛhari's work principally deal with the sentence and its meaningful constituents. As any such discussion is impossible without the consideration (i) of the nature of these entities (especially with respect to each other), (ii) of what they possess and (iii) how they possess what they possess, the books are about (meaningful) linguistic units, meaning and the mutual relation of the two as well. In particular, Bhartṛhari had two types of linguistic units and meanings, and four types of their relations in mind. So the books *specifically* discuss eight topics.

Does Prabhākara's usage in the *Bṛhatī* go against the interpretation of the title *Vākya-padīya* given above? I do not think so. The purport of his remark, judged in the light of Śālikanātha's commentary, seems to be this: ‘The real *vākya-padīya* (see footnote 20) is that which declares the *padas* to be the signifiers of the connected (sentential) meaning and which, by accepting this thesis, does not admit a sentence meaning over and above the meaning of the constituents, and hence advocates the view that the sentence is nothing but the *padas*. On the other hand, the grammarians have accepted a *vākya-padīya* which declares that the sentence and the sentence meaning alone are real, and that the *padas* and the *padārthas* have a place only in grammatical analysis.’ In other words, Prabhākara suggests that *vākya-padīya*—a study of *vākya* and *pada*—should logically conclude “*padāny eva vākyaṃ*” instead of “*vākyaṃ eva, na padāni*.” He is not trying to give a new meaning to the word

vākya-padīya; he is only exploiting its general meaning.

(c) One may ask if the first two *kāṇḍas* cover all the eight topics briefly indicated in 3.3b above. In my opinion, they deal with these topics in a nut-shell and leave it to the third *kāṇḍa* to return to these topics whenever necessary. I notice the following scheme of discussion²³ in the *Brahma-kāṇḍa* and the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*:

apoddhāra-pādārtha—*vṛtti* 1.23 p. 58; *vṛtti* 1.24–26 pp. 65–67, 72–76; 2.12–18, 34–37, 41–56, 60–63, 119–142, 153–169, 187–197, 199–201, 204–231, 235–319, 325, 411, 417–442, 450–454, 459–460.

sthita-lakṣaṇa artha—*vṛtti* 1.24–26 pp. 67–68, 77; 2.7, 13–18, 31, 34, 40–48, 55, 60–61, 64–118, 143–152, 216–217, 239–249, 319, 324–325, 328–352, 410–429, 437–442, 449.

anvākhyeya śabda—*vṛtti* 1.23 pp. 52–58; *vṛtti* 1.24–26 pp. 68–71, 78; 1.44–51, 55, 70–122, 134; 2.1–6, 19–33, 50, 52, 57–59, 341–345.

pratipādaka śabda—*vṛtti* 1.24–26 p. 71, 78; 2.10–12, 164–182, 229–234.

kārya-kāraṇa-bhāva śabdārtha-sambandha—*vṛtti* 1.12 p. 42; *vṛtti* 1.23 pp. 60–61; *vṛtti* 1.24–26 p. 71, 78–79; 1.44–47, 51–57.

yogya-bhāva śabdārtha-sambandha—*vṛtti* 1.23 p. 60; *vṛtti* 1.24–26 p. 71, 79–81; *vṛtti* 2.16 “*. . . śabdo 'py apareṇa yogyatākhyena sambandha-kalpeno paghātārtha-rūpo . . .*”.

pratyayāṅga śabdārtha-sambandha—*vṛtti* 1.24–26 p. 72.²⁴

²² (a) Actually, as he states in 1.26 cd, Bhartṛhari does not promise us a discussion of each topic. (b) As the topics are interconnected, some overlapping in the listing given, is inevitable. Even Bhartṛhari experiences some difficulty in arranging the discussions. This is indicated by the gaps that are noticed in the above listing of each individual topic. (c) I give the numbers roughly in two senses: I mention even those verses which only indirectly deal with the indicated topic; I do not exclude the statements of those views which Bhartṛhari does not accept. (d) The *kārikā* number includes the *vṛtti* wherever it is available. (e) For *padārtha* as *sthita-lakṣaṇa artha*, see those verses in the *apoddhāra-pādārtha* listing which point out the unitary character of *padārtha*. (f) For a discussion of *pada* as *anvākhyeya śabda*, from the point of view of primary and secondary usage, see 2.250–297.

²⁴ That there is cognition of meaning because *śabda*

²² In the *Trikāṇḍī*, *śabda* does not mean only ‘word’. It has a variety of meanings each of which is to be determined by a careful study of the context. Unfortunately this point has been lost sight of in the available translations. In the present context, *śabda* denotes any linguistic unit with which meaning is associated either in ordinary life or in grammatical analysis.

pratyaṃyā-dharmāṅga śabdārtha-sambandha—vṛtti 1.12 pp. 42–43; *vṛtti* 1.13 p. 47; *vṛtti* 1.24–26 p. 72; 1.27–43, 123–147; 2.108–110, 361–363; *vṛtti* 2.59 “*loke 'py arithena prayukteṣu śabdeṣu śāstreṇa dharma-niyama-mātram eva kriyate.*”

(d) The attempt in 3.2c above to explain away the evidence that is available in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* is fallacious. In the first place, there is no contradiction in maintaining that Bhartṛhari's work is divided in two ways—that there is one arrangement by *kāṇḍas* forming the *Trikāṇḍī*, and one arrangement by the significant titles *Vākyapadīya-Prakīrṇaka*. Secondly, the interpretation given of Helārāja's references is baseless. There is no reason to suspect that he meant anything other than what his sentences literally convey. Not even once does he use the term *Vākyapadīya* to refer to the three *kāṇḍas*. Thirdly, the imposed interpretation implicitly assumes that *Vākyapadīya* was the title of all the three books before Helārāja—a thesis that is meant to be proved. Finally, it is unclear why the importance and fame of the *Pada-kāṇḍa* should restrict the reference of the term *Vākyapadīya*.

(e) Abhyankar and Limaye (1965:197–357, 409–422) have given us the largest collection of *Trikāṇḍī* verses that are quoted in the works of later writers. I have been able to add some more to this collection. After a study of these quotations I find that most of them are given either without specifying the source or with some such indication of the source as “*tad uktam Hariṇā,*” “*yad āha tatrabhavan*” and “*tathā ca Hariḥ.*” Among those quotations which have been mentioned in early works as coming from the *Vākyapadīya*, I have but found a single verse from the third *kāṇḍa*; Medhātithi whose date Abhyankar and Limaye (1965: 245) give as 825–900 A.D., cites 3.2.12 as coming from the *Vākyapadīya* in his *bhāṣya* on *Manusmṛti* 12.118. Among later writers, Gokulānāthamiśra, Kaṇḍa-bhaṭṭa and Hari Bhāskara have together quoted five verses from the third

kāṇḍa with the remark that they belong to the *Vākyapadīya* (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965: 259, 269, 332, 340, 344).²⁵ Only Parvatīya Viśveśvara-sūri (pp. 36, 648, 660, 661, 727, 741, 750, 808, 810–811, 829, 830, 848–849, 905, 908, 985, 1041, 1044, 1045, 1228, 1284, 1285, 1503) who is definitely later than Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, constantly cites the verses from the *Pada-kāṇḍa* as coming from the *Vākyapadīya* and seems to be unaware of the *Vākyapadīya-Trikāṇḍī* distinction.

Such scanty evidence is hardly capable of dislodging a view that is based on the consideration of many pieces of evidence. It is conceivable that Medhātithi and others are quoting from memory and hence making a mistake (with the exception of Parvatīya Viśveśvara-sūri), or that they, thinking of the *Prakīrṇaka* status of the third *kāṇḍa*, are extending the term *Vākyapadīya* to include that *kāṇḍa*, too.

4.1. Having thus proved that the title *Vākyapadīya* was originally given to the first two books only, let me add that I consider the *vṛtti* on these books to be by Bhartṛhari and to be an integral part of the *Vākyapadīya*. I am aware that my view differs from that of Dr. Biarreau (pp. 2–21) who thinks that Hari-vṛṣabha, a person other than Bhartṛhari, wrote the *Vākyapadīya vṛtti*. I must, however, leave a demonstration of my view to some later occasion as it would lead me too far afield. At present, I prefer merely to draw attention to the fact that Prof. Subramania Iyer (1965: xviii–xxxvii) has already refuted some of Dr. Biarreau's arguments.

5.1. The fact that the *Vākyapadīya* and the *Prakīrṇaka* are two relatively independent parts, should not lead one to suppose that Bhartṛhari's *magnum opus* was not conceived to be one unified work. Such a supposition would go against the facts noted in 2.1b, e, 3.2a and 3.3c, e above, the references in the *vṛtti* (see footnote 5 and *vṛtti* 1.3 p. 20, *vṛtti* 2.71), Vṛṣabha's *ṭikā* (p. 4, 196) and

and *artha* are related, is such a basic, common sense fact (Vṛṣabha, p. 81.18–19) that Bhartṛhari has not been forced to devote much space to discuss it. Also, the discussions of the three remaining relations are indirectly a discussion of the *pratyaṃyāṅga* relation.

²⁵ Kaṇḍa-bhaṭṭa (Abhyankar-Limaye 1965:359) quotes one more verse with the remark “*uktam ca Vākyapadīye.*” To judge from its context, it should belong to the third *kāṇḍa*; but it is not found in that *kāṇḍa*. Verses quoted by Parvatīya Viśveśvara-sūri on pp. 68 and 1273 of his work are also missing from the extant *Vākyapadīya*.

ṭikā on the second *kāṇḍa* (p. 98, 140, 145, 146, 162, 163, 164, 167, 176, 208, 213, 240) to the discussions in the third *kāṇḍa*, and the references in the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* (e.g., those which are collected in 3.1b above) to the discussions in the earlier *kāṇḍas*.²⁶

Thought of as one composition consisting of three books, the work was called *Trikāṇḍī*, a name going well with the names of other works of Bhartṛhari—*Tripādī*, the commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*,²⁷ and possibly *Subhāṣita-triśatī* or *śataka-traya*, the famous collection of three centuries of poems.²⁸ Thus we read at the end of the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*:

trailokyagāminī yena Trikāṇḍī Tripādī-kṛtā /
tasmai sāmasta-vidyā-śrī-kantāya
*Haraye namah //*²⁹

Under the *Trikāṇḍī* arrangement, each *kāṇḍa* was named after the most important word in the first statement of that *kāṇḍa*.³⁰

²⁶ Most probably, Helārāja named his commentaries by *kāṇḍa* as *Śabda-prabhā*, *Vākya-pradīpa* (Ramakrishna Kavi, p. 236) and *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa*. If this guess is correct, one more indication of the unity of the *Trikāṇḍī* is furnished.

²⁷ Modern scholars generally give the name of this commentary as *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā*. See Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (*saṃvat* 2020: 344–363) and the three incomplete editions by Brahmadatta Jijñāsu (Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka *saṃvat* 2020: 356), Swaminathan (1965) and Abhyankar-Limaye (1967). In a forthcoming article, I wish to argue that the evidence for this name is very scanty and that the commentary should be referred to by the name *Tripādī*.

²⁸ The possibility that Bhartṛhari, the grammarian, and Bhartṛhari, the poet, could be the same person is not so slight as is generally assumed. I must, however, reserve a detailed consideration of this problem for some future occasion.

²⁹ The verse has been misunderstood by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (*saṃvat* 2019: 349–350; 2020: 353). Through three double-meaning expressions and two metaphors, it suggests the similarity of Bhartṛhari with Viṣṇu. It is to be construed thus: “*yena Tripādī-kṛtā trailokyagāminī Trikāṇḍī-tripādī kṛtā . . .*” It means: ‘I pay my reverence to Hari, the author of the *Tripādī*, who took three steps in the form of the *Trikāṇḍī* that covered the three worlds, and who is the lord of Śrī in the form of all lores.’ The expressions *Tripādī-kṛtā*, *Śrī-kānta* and *Hari* are paranomastic, while *Trikāṇḍī-tripādī* and *vidyā-śrī* are metaphors.

³⁰ Point suggested by Abhyankar-Limaye (1965: VII).

BHOJA’S ŚRĠṄĀRA-PRAKĀŚA AND THE VĀKYA-KĀṆḌA-VṚTTI

6.1. Bhartṛhari’s *vṛtti* of the *Brahma-kāṇḍa* and the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* (4.1 above) is still to be satisfactorily edited.³¹ In the case of the latter it is not even printed in its entirety. Sometime about 1941, the first ninety-six pages of Charudeva Shastri’s planned critical edition of the *kārikās*, the *vṛtti* and the *ṭikā* of the second *kāṇḍa* (footnote 6) were made available to the book-sellers.³² Those included the *vṛtti*, wherever it was extant, only up to the verse “*kāryāṇām antaraṅgatvam . . .*”³³ In 1965, Abhyankar and Limaye presented it in excerpts as a part of the seventh appendix of their edition of the *kārikā* text. Thus, an important work in the grammatical tradition of India has not even been entirely printed and published, not to mention a critical edition complete with study-aids.³⁴

6.2. So far only one manuscript of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-vṛtti* has furnished transcripts to the editors of the *Trikāṇḍī*. This incomplete and often corrupt manuscript in Malayalam characters once belonged to Bhavadāsa Nambudiri of Mundanathu Mana, Ottappalam, Malabar, Kerala (Subra-

³¹ The *vṛtti* of the *Brahma-kāṇḍa* has been printed five times and translated twice. Yet it is replete with wrong and problematic readings. A number of alternative readings have not even been recorded. I shall set forth these facts in a textual study which is, at present, under preparation.

³² Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka *saṃvat* 2019: 352. In his letter of July 11, 1968, Charudeva Shastri informs me: “A fragment of the *vṛtti* edited by me was issued for circulation without my knowledge, sometime before or after the Partition. It carried no Introduction, not even a Prefatory Note. I saw this fragment in the Bookstall of the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Banaras.”

³³ No. 184 (p. 154) of Mānavallī’s and Charudeva Shastri’s editions; no. 182 of the Abhyankar-Limaye edition.

³⁴ It is expected that the Deccan College Monograph Series, Poona, will publish a critically edited text of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* (*kārikā* + *vṛtti*) with the commentary that is usually ascribed to Puṇyārāja (footnote 6). Prof. Subramania Iyer is at present working on it. Another critical edition, most probably only of the *kārikās*, is expected from Prof. Wilhelm Rau, Marburg, Federal Republic of Germany.

mania Iyer 1966: viii). Its present location has not been explicitly stated.³⁵ One of its transcripts is preserved in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras (No. 5543); the other (possibly made from the Madras transcript) is in the Adyar Library, Madras (No. 547 or 38.I.3 or TR 430). Charudeva Shastri and Abhyankar-Limaye used copies (most probably, hand-written) of the Madras transcript for their editions. Scholars at present working on the text of the *Trikāṇḍī* (footnote 34), are using copies (most probably, photo-copies) of the same.

6.3. As a part of my study of Bhartṛhari's thought, I am preparing a text of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-vṛtti* that will be more intelligible than the one found in the transcripts. In this activity, I am utilising not only the editions mentioned above but also the commentaries on the *Trikāṇḍī*, the literature that has derived its inspiration, in part or in full, from the *Trikāṇḍī*, and Bhartṛhari's commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*. By comparing the discussions of the common points and by studying the style of the *vṛtti* and the *Tripādī* (footnote 27), I am trying my best to make up for the corruption of the only available manuscript.

6.4. Recently unexpected help came from the published parts of Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* (*ŚP*). It has been known to scholars for years that the *ŚP* quotes a number of verses from the *Trikāṇḍī*. Editors of the published incomplete editions, P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri and Yadugiri Svāmī, have occasionally (e.g., p. 19 of the former and Vol. I, p. 17 of the latter) pointed this out. Raghavan who has studied the entire *ŚP* critically, has drawn attention to this fact (1940: 17, 21, 22, 23; 1963: 724–728, 731–734, 738, 747, 752). Quite recently Abhyankar and Limaye (1965: 319–351) have listed the verses that Bhoja quotes from the *Trikāṇḍī*; but the fact that Bhoja borrows a number of passages literally from the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-vṛtti* has not been pointed out. The

following part of the present article proposes to do so.

7.1. The discovery is significant in more than one way. Not only does it help in reconstructing some portions of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-vṛtti*, but it also offers additional material for a critical study of the text of the *ŚP*, the manuscripts of which are very few (Raghavan 1940: 1; Subrahmanya Sastri, p. 1; Josyer, p. 2). An indication of the principles followed in composing (writing and compiling) the *ŚP* is also given. It becomes evident that the author planned to exploit the works available in his time as literally as he could and to weld them together as far as the theme of his work, or better, the themes of the chapters of his work, permitted. Even in a cursory reading one notices that Bhoja borrows verbatim quite a few passages from such works as the *Mahābhāṣya* (e.g., Vol. I, pp. 123–124 of Yadugiri Svāmī's edition). Raghavan (1940: 17; 1963: 724–725, 728, 733, 756, 901) points out that the discussions such as that of the *padārtha* are mostly reproduced from the *Nyāya-mañjarī* of Jayanta-bhaṭṭa. As will be seen below, the case of Bhoja's borrowings from the *vṛtti* is the same; in most of the instances, he borrows word for word. Thus, the *ŚP* is not only intended to be an encyclopaedic work but follows the principle of making select passages from standard works carry the burden of discussion as far as they can.³⁶ One more important fact emerges out of this point and the borrowings noticed below. In all probability, the author of the *ŚP* regarded the *vṛtti* as an integral part of the *Vākya-padīya*. His testimony, therefore, seems to be against those who dispute Bhartṛhari's authorship of the *vṛtti* (see 4.1 above).

8.1. The following procedure has been adopted in giving the texts of the common passages: (a) The *vṛtti* passages are cited in their critically edited form, that is, as they are, at present, written

³⁵ Kunhan Raja (1936: 287) spells the name and the address of the owner as Bhavadasan Namboodirippad of Mundanat Mana, Ottapalam, S. Malabar. According to his statement, the manuscript was returned to the owner. Whether it is still with the same man or family is not known.

³⁶ Bhoja borrows a few passages from the *Brahma-kāṇḍa vṛtti* too; but as the text of that part of the *vṛtti* is in a better shape (see, however, footnote 31), I have not pointed out the parallels there. Moreover, to judge from style and content, there is the important possibility that Bhoja quotes from the *Tripādī* (footnote 27) as well.

in my more intelligible version of the *vṛtti* transcript (see 6.3 above). Variant readings are noted in the footnotes. These are the readings that appear in Charudeva Shastri's edition of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* (Charu.), the Adyar Library transcript (AT) and a typescript of the Madras transcript (MTT). As stated in 6.2 above, all this 'critical apparatus' is based on one Malayalam manuscript. Hence, the variant readings are useful only as a check on my emendations. It will be seen that the *ŚP* is as important for establishing the text of the *Vākya-pāṇīya* as a fragmentary *vṛtti* manuscript of independent origin would have been. (b) Numbers of the *kārikās* of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa* do not always agree in the editions of Mānavallī, Charudeva Shastri and Abhyankar-Limaye. I have adopted the numbering of the last-named edition although, in my opinion, it makes a mistake in accepting some quotations in the *vṛtti* as *kārikās* of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*. (c) I have cited the *kārikās* in their critically edited form when they precede the *vṛtti*; but I have not recorded the variant readings of the *kārikās* as this article concentrates only on the *vṛtti*. (d) The *ŚP* passages from Vol. I are given *exactly* as they appear in Yadugiri Svāmī's edition published by Josyer. Passages marked as coming from Vol. II are reproduced from the supplement to appendix III (pp. 297–351) of the Abhyankar-Limaye edition (AL). The editors do not give any particulars about this edition of the *ŚP*. Consequently, I have no access to it and am forced to borrow citations from Abhyankar-Limaye.

8.2. The common passages:

vṛtti—

sarva-bhedānugūṇyaṃ tu sāmānyam
apare viduḥ /
tad arthāntara-samsargād bhajate
bheda-rūpatām //44//
bhedān ākāṅkṣatas tasya yā pari-
plavamānatā /
avacchinatti sambandhas tām viśeṣe
niveśayan //45//

apare tu manyante—svārtha-mātropādāyinaḥ sarva-
bhedān prati yā yogyatā tad evānugūṇya-mātraṃ sāmān-

yam.³⁷ na hi tathānyathā sarvathā ceti³⁸ sāmānyam avasthita-
rūpaṃ³⁹ kiñcid asti. sarva ete viśeṣā eva. tasyāṃ tu sāmānyā-
vasthāyāṃ bhedasya kasyacid anirūpaṇād atyāgāc⁴⁰ ca yā
sarva-bhedopagraha-yogyatayā pariplavamānārtha-kal-
pana tām⁴¹ sambandho viśayāntarād avacchidya viśiṣṭe
viśaye niyamayati.⁴²

ŚP Vol. I, p. 294; AL pp. 320–321.

yady api cātra kriyā-kāraka-mātrānvayābhidhāne
kriyā-kāraka-mātra-sambandhitvaṃ kriyā-kāraka-sāmān-
yābhiprāyam. tathāhi; svārtha-mātropādāyinaḥ sarva-
bhedān prati yogyatā; tad evānugūṇya-mātraṃ sāmānyam,
na hi tathānyathā sarvathā veti sāmānyam avasthita-rūpaṃ
kiñcid asti, sarva eva te viśeṣā eva. tasyāḥ tu sāmānyāvas-
thāyāṃ bhedasya kasyacid anirūpaṇād atyāgāc ca yā
sarva-bhedopagraha-yogyatayā pariplavamānārtha-kal-
panā tām sambandho viśayāntarād avacchidya viśiṣṭe
viśaye niyamayati. tad uktam—sarva-bhedānugūṇyaṃ tu
sāmānyam apare viduḥ / tad arthāntara-samsargād
bhajate bheda-rūpatām // bhedān ākāṅkṣatas tasya sā
pariplavamānatā / avacchinatti sambandham tām
viśeṣe niveśayan //

vṛtti—

sāmarthya-prāpitam yac ca vyakty-
artham anuśajyate /
śrutir evānuśaṅge sā bādhikā līṅga-
vākyaayoḥ //73//
aprāpto yas tu śuklādīḥ samnidhānena
gamyate /
sa yatna-prāpito vākye śruti-dharma-
vilakṣaṇaḥ //74//

itaś cāvibhāga-pakṣo na yuktaḥ. śruti-vākya-samavāye
śrutitvāviśeṣeṇa pāradaurbalyāsambhavāt. iha śrutir
nāmaika-śabda-viśayaika-pada-nibandhanārtha.⁴³

³⁷ Charu., AT, MTT *sāmānādhikarāṇyamātram*.

³⁸ AT, MTT *cet*. The phrase *tathānyathā sarvathā ca* is found in 3.3.22, 3.14.501.

³⁹ Charu., AT, MTT *sāmānyāvasthārūpaṃ*.

⁴⁰ Charu. *ānugūṇyāc*; AT *anyāgrāc*; MTT *anyāyāc*. The reading accepted here is also not very satisfactory.

⁴¹ Charu., *-yogyatāpariplavamānakalpanārthasya tām*; the reading of AT and MTT is the same except for *tāsām* in the place of *tām*. In the reading accepted here, I am not sure whether *pariplavamāna* is an adjective of *artha* or of *artha-kalpanā*.

⁴² Charu. has one more sentence in the *vṛtti* of verses 44–45. In my opinion, that sentence is a part of the introduction to verse 46.

⁴³ The *vṛtti* on verses 73–74 does not come to an end with this sentence; it is much more extensive; but I have

ŚP Vol. II, p. 330; AL p. 321.

*śrutir hi nāmāneka-pada-nibandhana eva śabda-
viśayaḥ vidhyādir arthaḥ. . .⁴⁴ tad uktam—sāmarthyā-
prāpitam yac ca vākyaartham anuśajyate / śrutir evānu-
śaṅge sā bādhikā līṅga-vākyaayoḥ //*

vṛtti—

yathā sāsnaḍimān piṇḍo go-śabdenā-
bhidhiyate /

tathā sa eva go-śabdo vāhike 'pi vyava-
sthitaḥ //252//

sarva-śaktes tu tasyaiva śabdasyāneka-
dharmanāḥ /

prasiddhi-bhedād gaṇatvaṁ mukhya-
tvaṁ copavarṇyate //253//

*eka evāyaṁ go-śabdo vākya⁴⁵ kvacij jāti-viśeṣābhidhāyī.
tad yathā gaur anubandhya iti. kvacij jātyupasarjane
dravyamātre vartate. tad yathā gaur ānīyatām, gaur duhya-
tām iti. kecid atra jāti-mātrābhidhāyitvaṁ manyante.⁴⁶
kvacid go-śabdaḥ paricchinna eva dravya-viśeṣe vartate.
tad yathā asty atra kañcid gām paśyasīti mahati go-
maṇḍala āśinaṁ yadā go-pālakaṁ prcchati.⁴⁷ kvacit tu
rūḍha-sambandheṣu⁴⁸ kriyā-guṇeṣu go-śabdaḥ prayujya-
māno dṛśyate. tad yathā jāḍyād aucchiṣṭyāt sarvasahat-
vān⁴⁹ mahāśanatvaḥ vā gaur vāhika iti. tasya sarva-śakter
go-śabdasya nimittāntarād avacchidyamāna-sāmarthyasya
prasiddhyaprasiddhibhyāṁ mukhyatvaṁ gaṇatvaṁ ca⁵⁰
vijñāyate. yatrārthe śruti-mātreṇāvarudhyate śabdaḥ, na
cārthāntaram abhyāntarīkaroti śabdāntarābhidheyatvena
prasiddhaṁ, tatra mukhya-vyapadeśaṁ labhate. yatra tu
śabdāntarādibhir upanīyate, prasiddhaṁ ca śabdānt-
arābhidheyam arthāntaram avalambate tatra gaṇa⁵¹ iti
vyapadiśyate.*

not reproduced it here in its entirety, for it does not offer any parallel to the ŚP passage and hence is irrelevant in the present context.

⁴⁴ Here I have dropped one sentence that summarises the *vṛtti* explaining verse 73.

⁴⁵ AT, MTT *vācye*.

⁴⁶ The word *manyante* is followed by *tad yathā* in AT and by *tad yathā . . .* (indicating a gap in the manuscript) in MTT.

⁴⁷ AT *tadā gopālakaṁ prcchasi*; MTT reads the same, with *yadā* in the place of *tadā*.

⁴⁸ AT, MTT *rūḍhisambandheṣu*.

⁴⁹ AT *jātyākhyādaucchaṣṇyāṁ sarvamahatvān*; MTT *jātyākhyādaucchaṣṇyāṁ sarvasahatvān*.

⁵⁰ AT and MTT omit the words *mukhyatvaṁ* and *ca* which I have supplied on the strength of the context.

⁵¹ AT *avalambamāno loke 'rthagrahaṇa*; MTT *avalambamāno loke 'rtha loke 'rthagrahaṇam*.

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 358–359; AL pp. 323–324.

*nanu ca gaṇa-mukhyayor viveko yujyate. tathāhi eka
evāyaṁ go-śabdo vākya na kvacit jāti-viśeṣābhidhāyī gaur
anubandhya iti kvacit jātyupasarjana-dravya-mātra-vācī
gaur ānīyatam iti kvacit paricchinna eva dravya-viśeṣe
vartate anyatra kañcit gām paśyasīti, kvacit tu rūḍha-
sambandheṣu kriyā-guṇeṣu go-śabdaḥ prayujyamāno
dṛśyate yathā jāḍyād aucchiṣṭyāt sarvasahatvāt mahāśanat-
vāt vā gaur vāhika iti. evaṁ sarva-śakter go-śabdasya artha-
prakaraṇādibhir avacchidyamāna-sāmarthyasya prthivy-
ādav iva vāhike 'pi vartamānasya gaṇatvaṁ upapadyate.
tad āha—sarva-śaktes tu tasyaiva śabdasyāneka-
karmanāḥ / vṛttyabhāvān na gaṇatvaṁ mukhyatvaṁ
vā prakalpyate // tathā hi—yathā sāsnaḍimān piṇḍo go-
śabdenābhidhiyate / tathā jāḍyādi-guṇavān vāhiko 'py
abhidhiyate //*

vṛtti—

anekārthatvaṁ ekasya yaīḥ śabda-
syānugamyate /

siddhyasiddhi-kṛtā teṣāṁ gaṇa-mukh-
ya-prakalpanā //263//

*iha keṣāñcid anekārthatvaṁ yaugapadyena vyavasthi-
taṁ⁵² nimittāntarād avacchedenā⁵³ vatiṣṭhate. keṣāñcit
paryāyenaiva sāmarthyād ekasyāpi nitya-pravibhaktam
eva⁵⁴ nānārthatvaṁ. tatra yaugapadye⁵⁵ yadā prasiddhe-
nārthenāvacchidyate⁵⁶ śabdas tadā⁵⁷ mukhya-vyapadeśaṁ
labhate. aprasiddhena tv arthena praptāvacchedasya⁵⁸
gaṇa-vyapadeśo bhavati. tathā paryāyena yasmin vākya
prasiddhārthaḥ śabdas tatra mukhyaḥ, anyatra tu gaṇaḥ.*

ŚP Vol. II, p. 361; AL p. 324.

*tasmāt eka eva śabdo 'nekam arthaṁ yaugapadyena
paryāyena vābhidhatte na tu svārtham utsrjyārthāntare
pravartate. prasiddheya-prasiddhibhyāṁ ca tasya mukhya-
gaṇa-vyapadeśo jāyate. tatra yaugapadye 'pi yadā
prasiddhenārthenāvacchidyate śabdas tadā mukhya-vya-
padeśaṁ labhate. aprasiddhena tv arthena praptāvac-
chedasya gaṇa-vyapadeśo bhavati. paryāyenaṁpi yasmin
vākya prasiddhārthaḥ śabdas tatra mukhyo 'nyatra tu
gaṇaḥ.⁵⁹*

⁵² AT, MTT *vyavasthita*.

⁵³ AT, MTT *apyavacchedenā*.

⁵⁴ AT, MTT *evaṁ*.

⁵⁵ AT, MTT *yaugapadyena*.

⁵⁶ MTT *vacchidyante*.

⁵⁷ AT *śabdaṁ tu na*; MTT *śabdantu na*.

⁵⁸ AT, MTT *praptāvacchedasya*.

⁵⁹ After this passage, strangely enough, Bhoja quotes verse 274 instead of verse 263.

vr̥tti—

go-yuṣman-mahatām evyarthē svār-
thād arthāntare sthitau /
arthāntarasya tad-bhāvas tatra mukh-
yo 'pi dṛśyate //279//
mahattvaṃ śukla-bhāvaṃ ca prakṛtiḥ
pratipadyate /
bhedenāpekṣitā sā tu gaṇatvasya pra-
yojikā //280//

*ihāśrīta-rūpasārthavato nipātasya pragṛhya-sañjñā
vidhīyate. caurādikāntādi paratā-mukhya-vṛttayas san-
tīva⁶⁰ prasiddhārtha⁶¹—tirobhāvenārthāntare vartamānā
gaṇa-vyapadeśa-yuktāḥ. tatra mukhyārthānām grahaṇam
vijñāyate. agaur gaur abhavat, go 'bhavad iti pragṛhya-
sañjñā na bhavati. atvaṃ tvaṃ sampadyate, tvadbhavatīti
madhyamo na bhavati. amahān mahān sampanno, mahad-
bhūtaś candramā ity ātvaṃ na bhavati. atra tu kācid
upacarita-vikāra-rūpā prakṛtiḥ. yathā indra-sthūnā upen-
dro grāva iti.⁶² kācit pariṇāminī. yathā dugdham dadhi-
bhavati, hema kuṇḍalībhavati.⁶³ tatra pariṇāminīṣu
prakṛtiṣu śukla-mahattvādibhir mukhyair api yoge satī,
pūrvasyā avasthāyāḥ⁶⁴ pracyutasyottarām avasthām prāp-
tasya⁶⁵ pūrvottarayor avasthayor āśritayoḥ⁶⁶ savyāpārat-
vāt pūrvasyā avasthāyā vivakṣāyām⁶⁷ satyām vikāra-
śabdasya tad-upagrāhiṇo⁶⁸ gaṇatvaṃ vijñāyate.*

ŚP Vol. I, p. 159; AL p. 327.

*prakṛtir hi kācid upacarita-vikāra-rūpā, yathā indra-
sthūnā upendro grāva iti. kācit pariṇāminī yathā—dug-
dham dadhi bhavati, hema kuṇḍalībhavati. tatra vipari-
ṇāminīṣu prakṛtiṣu saṅgha-mahattvādibhir mukhyair api
yoge pūrvasyā avasthāyāḥ pracyutasyottarām avasthām
prāptasya pūrvottarayor avasthayor āśritayoḥ savyāpārat-
vāt pūrvasyām avasthāyām kartṛtva-vivakṣāyāḥ saṅgha-
mahad-ādeḥ vikāra-śabdasya prakṛtyupagrāhiṇo gaṇat-
vaṃ vijñāyate. tad uktam—mahattvaṃ saṅgha-bhāvaṃ
ca prakṛtiḥ pratipadyate / bhedenāpekṣitā sā tu gaṇat-
vasya prasādhikā //*

⁶⁰ I do not understand the preceding part of the sentence. As no emendation has so far occurred to me, I have retained the manuscript reading.

⁶¹ AT, MTT *prasiddhārtham*.

⁶² AT, MTT *indrasthūneti*. I have supplied the two words in between from the quotation in the ŚP.

⁶³ AT, MTT *pariṇāminīti*. The rest is supplied from the ŚP.

⁶⁴ AT, MTT *pūrvasyām avasthāyām*.

⁶⁵ AT, MTT *aprāptasya*.

⁶⁶ MTT *āśritayāḥ*.

⁶⁷ AT *vivakṣāyām*; the ŚP reading *kartṛtva-vivakṣāyām* seems as probable as the reading accepted here.

⁶⁸ AT, MTT *tadupagrāhi*.

vr̥tti—

atyanta-viparīto 'pi yathā yo 'rtho va-
dhāryate /
tathā-sampratyayaḥ śabdasya tatra mukh-
yaḥ prayujyate //285//

*iha kecid ācāryā⁶⁹ buddhi-pratyavabhāsa-mātreṇa
sarvatra tulyā hi śabda-pravṛttir iti pratyavatiṣṭhante.⁷⁰
jala-nirbhāsāyām hi mṛgatṛṣṇikāyām buddhāv utpannāyām
mukhya eva jala-śabdaḥ prayoktavya iti tulyam hi pravṛtti-
nimittam sarvatra śabdasya prayojakam bhavitum arhati.*

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 364–366; AL p. 326.

atyanta-viparīto 'pi yathā yo 'rtho 'vadhāryate /
yathāsampratyayaḥ śabdasya tatra mukhyaḥ prayujyate //
ācāryāś ca pūrve 'pi sarvatra tulyam eva śabdasya pravṛtti-
nimittam bhavitum arhatīti manyamānā buddhi-pratyava-
bhāsa-mātreṇaiva śabdasyārtheṣu pravṛttiṃ manyante.

vr̥tti—

yady api pratyayādhīnam artha-tattvā-
vadhāraṇam /
na sarvaḥ pratyayas tasmin prasiddha
iva jāyate //286//

*gaṇa-mukhya-vyavasthā-pravibhāga-vādinas tu many-
ante—pratyayādhīne 'py artha-rūpasādvadhāraṇe kvacit
tad-viśayānām pratyayānām vyabhicāreṇa⁷¹ yā pravṛttir
loke saiva gaṇa-bhāvaṃ vyavasthāpayati.⁷²*

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 364–366; AL p. 325.

*śuktikāyām tu pratyayādhīne 'pi rajata-rūpādvadhāraṇe
kvacit tad-viśayānām pratyayānām vyabhicāreṇa yā
pravṛttiḥ saiva amukhya-bhāvaṃ vyavasthāpayati. yad āha—
yady api pratyayādhīnam artha-tattvādvadhāraṇam /
na sarvaḥ pratyayas tasmin prasiddha iva jāyate //*

vr̥tti—

katham?

darśanam salile tulyam mṛgatṛṣṇādi-
darśanaiḥ /

⁶⁹ AT, MTT *anācāryā*.

⁷⁰ AT, MTT *tulyādiśabdapravṛttiṃ vyavacchidyante*. I am not very sure of the emendation that I have introduced here.

⁷¹ AT, MTT *avyabhicāreṇa*. See the following foot-note.

⁷² AT, MTT *loke gaṇamukhyabhāvaṃ vyavasthāpay-
anti*. The original reading of the sentence, which prob-
ably suffered through haplography, might have been as
follows: . . . *pratyayānām vyabhicāreṇa, kvacit cāvyabhi-
cāreṇa yā pravṛttir loke saiva gaṇa-mukhya-bhāvaṃ
vyavasthāpayati*.

bhedāt tu sparśanādīnām na jalam mṛga-
trṣṇikā //287//

yady api salila-rūpa-nirbhāsā cakṣur-dvārikā tathā-
bhūtaiva buddhir mṛgatṛṣṇikāsu jāyate tathāpi prasid-
dhānām⁷³ sparśana-snāna-pānādīnām abhāvāt, tad-deśa-
prāptau cādarśanān nedaṃ salilam iti tāsu mṛgatṛṣṇikāsu
nāsti mukhyasya śabdasya pravṛttiḥ.

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 364–366; AL p. 325.

mṛgatṛṣṇāyāṃ punar yady api salila-nirbhāsā cakṣur-
dvārikā tathā-bhūtaiva buddhir utpadyate. tathāpi sparśana-
snāna-pānādīnām abhāvāt tad-deśa-prāptau cādarśanāt
nedaṃ salilam iti pratyayaena bādhyate. āhuś ca—darśanam
salile tulyam mṛgatṛṣṇādi-darśaniḥ / bhedāt tu spar-
śanādīnām na jalam mṛgatṛṣṇikā //

vṛtti—

yad asādhāraṇam kāryam prasiddham
rajju-sarpayoh /
tena bhedāḥ paricchedyas tayos tulye
'pi darśane //288//

yady api rajju-dravye kadācid varṇa-saṃsthāna-
dvāreṇa⁷⁴ sarpa-buddhiḥ punaḥ⁷⁵ punar utpadyate tathāpi
yat⁷⁶ sādharmaṇam darśanādi kāryam tad apāsya śvāsa-
gamana-daṃśādibhir⁷⁷ asādhāraṇaiḥ kāryair⁷⁸ mukhya-
śabda-viśayaḥ paricchidyā vyavasthāpyate.

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 364–366; AL p. 325.

rajju-dravye yady api varṇa-saṃsthāna-dvāreṇa sarpa-
buddhiḥ punaḥ punar utpadyate tathāpi yat sādharmaṇam
kāraṇyadairghyādi tad apāsya śvāsa-daṃśādibhir asā-
dhāraṇa-dharmair mukhya-viśayaḥ paricchidyā gauṇatvam
avadhāryate. uktam ca—yad asādhāraṇam kāryam
prasiddham rajju-sarpayoh / tena bhedāḥ paricchedyas
tayoh svalpe 'pi darśane //

vṛtti—

nirjñāte ca bhede—

prasiddhārtha-viparyāsa-nimittam yac
ca dṛśyate /
yas tasmāl lakṣyate bhedas tam asatyam
pracakṣate //289//

⁷³ AT and MTT read this word after *tāsu* in the con-
cluding clause.

⁷⁴ MTT reads *saṃskāra* as well as *saṃsthāna*.

⁷⁵ This word is missing in AT and MTT.

⁷⁶ AT, MTT *tathāyam*.

⁷⁷ AT, MTT *-darśanādibhir*.

⁷⁸ AT, MTT *kāryam*.

iha prasiddhārtha-viparyāsa-hetubhyaḥ santamasā-
timīropaghāta-madya-viśa-pāna-maru-deśāvasthānādibhy-
aḥ⁷⁹ prasiddhākāreṣu artheṣu darśana-viparyāso vijñāyate.
santamase 'ṅkurākāra-mātram eva kevalam anyathopala-
bhyate. tat tu sparśanādibhir gathābhūtam avadhāryate.
tathā rātrau pradīpa-saṃnidhānān⁸⁰ nīlotpalādīnām varṇa-
bhedo lakṣyate.⁸¹

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 364–366; AL p. 325.

tathā rātrau pradīpa-dīpti-saṃnipātāt nīlotpalādīnām
varṇa-bhedo lakṣyate. tathā hi na sūrya-raśmi-samparkāt
ghanāraghāta-payaḥ-prṣatām iti mithyātvānga-mukhyat-
vam. tad āha—prasiddhārtha-viparyāsa-nimittam yac
ca dṛśyate / yas tasmāl lakṣyate bhedas tam asatyam
pracakṣate //

vṛtti—

sparśa-prabandho hastena yathā cak-
rasya santataḥ /
na tathā-lāta-cakrasya, vicchinnaṃ sprś-
yate hi tat //291//

alāta-cakre 'pi⁸² yā cakra-buddhir⁸³ utpadyate tatra
rūpa-prabandha-graheṇa⁸⁴ vastu-sparśa-prabandha-gra-
haṇam hastena notpadyate. avicchinnābhini-pātenaiva hi⁸⁵
jyotiṣā⁸⁶ nityāvaruddha iva⁸⁷ prāyeṇa tatra rūpa-graheṇa-
deśo rūpagrahaṇa-kālaś⁸⁸ ca vibhāvyate.⁸⁹ kriyā-virāme
tasya jyotiṣaś⁹⁰ cakravad ākāro nopalabhyate. tasmād
ayathārtham tad-graheṇam aviśayo mukhyasya śab-
dasyety avadhāryate.

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 364–366; AL p. 325.

alāta-cakre 'pi cakra-buddhau cakṣuṣā rūpa-prabandh-
āvagrahavat na hastena sparśa-prabandho 'vagrhyate.
kriyāvirāme ca tasya jyotiṣaś cakravad ākāro nopalabhyate.
avicchinnābhini-pātenaiva hi jyotiṣā nityāvaruddha iva

⁷⁹ AT, MTT *santamasantamivopaghātamanyaviśa-
yāpādānamatra deśāvasthānādibhyaḥ*.

⁸⁰ MTT *sannidhānām*.

⁸¹ The rest of the *vṛtti* of verse 289, being irrelevant, is
not reproduced here.

⁸² AT, MTT *hi*.

⁸³ MTT *yācakabuddhir*.

⁸⁴ AT, MTT *-grahaṇa-*.

⁸⁵ AT, MTT *avicchinnābhīghātena*.

⁸⁶ AT *jyotiṣam*; MTT *jyotiṣam*.

⁸⁷ AT, MTT *nitya eva*. I have accepted the ŚP reading
here; but I do not know its exact meaning in the present
context.

⁸⁸ AT, MTT *-grahāṇottarakālam*.

⁸⁹ AT, MTT *bhāvyate*. MTT reads *kijca* after this
word.

⁹⁰ AT, MTT *jyotiṣ*.

prāyeṇa tatra rūpa-grahaṇa-deśo rūpa-grahaṇa-kālaś ca vibhāvayate. tasmād apārthaṃ tad-grahaṇam aviśayo mukhyasya śabdasyeti. uktam ca—sparśa-prabandho hastena yathā cakrasya santataḥ / na tathā lāta-cakrasya vicchinnaṃ sprīyate hi tat //

vr̥tti—

vapra-prākāra-talpaiś ca sparśanāvarāṇe
yathā /
nagareṣu, na te tadvad gandharva-naga-
reṣv api //292//

yathā ca vapradībhir mukhyeṣu nagareṣu gacchatām pratighāto dasyu-bhaya-rakṣādīni⁹¹ ca kāryāṇi prakalpante na tathā⁹² gandharva-nagareṣu. tad-deśasthair⁹³ eva tāni na dr̥śyanta iti na⁹⁴ teṣāṃ mukhya-śabda-viśayatvaṃ vidyate.

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 364–366; AL p. 326.

tatra yathā vapradībhir mukhyeṣu nagareṣu gacchatām pratighāto dasyu-bhaya-rakṣādīni ca kāryāṇi ca prakalpante na tathā gandharva-nagareṣu tad-deśasthair eva ca tāni na dr̥śyante iti na teṣāṃ mukhya-śabda-viśayatvaṃ. tad āha—vapra-prākāra-talpaiś ca sparśanāvarāṇe yathā / nagareṣu tathā naivam gandharva-nagareṣu te //

vr̥tti—

mṛga-paśvādibhir yāvān mukhyair ar-
thaḥ prasādhyate /
tāvān na mṛnmayeṣv asti tasmāt te viṣa-
yaḥ kanaḥ //293//

iha mukhyā mṛga-paśvādayo dr̥ṣṭādr̥ṣṭa-phaleṣv artheṣv ārambhaṇā lambhana-prokṣaṇa-viśasanādīṣu⁹⁵ yathā sādhanatvena vyavatiṣṭhante na tathā mṛnmayā dārumayā vā. tasmāt kasyacid eva sadṛśasya dharmasya bhāvād upamānopameya-bhāva-sambandhe sati 'ive pratikṛtāv' (Pāṇini 5.3.96) ityetaṭ prakaraṇa-vihitānām pratyayānām utpattau nimittatvaṃ⁹⁶ labhante.

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 364–366; AL pp. 324–325.

tathāhi mṛga-paśvādayaḥ kasyacid eva sadṛśasya dharmasya bhāvāt upamānopameya-sambandhe sati 'ive

pratikṛtāv ityeva prakaraṇa-vihitānām pratyayānām utpattau nimittatvaṃ labhante. yuktam caitat. yataḥ—mṛga-paśvādibhir yāvān mukhyair arthaḥ prasādhyate / na tāvān mṛnmayeṣv asti tasmāt te viṣayāḥ kutaḥ // etena pratimādiṣu vāsudevādayo vyākhyātāḥ. yathā hi te mukhyā vara-pradāna-dānavocchedādi-karmasu sādhanatvena vyavatiṣṭhante na tathā grāvamayā vā dārumayā vā.

vr̥tti—

mahān āvriyate deśaḥ prasiddhaiḥ par-
vatādibhiḥ /
alpa-deśāntarāvastham pratibimbaṃ tu
dr̥śyate //294//

yeṣāṃ api pratibimbaṃ parvatādi-sarūpam ādarśādiṣu⁹⁷ jāyate teṣāṃ api dr̥śyamānām tat⁹⁸ pramāṇa-bhedena⁹⁹ yathārthatvenāvasthyate. tena hi prakṛṣṭa-deśa-vyāpinā¹⁰⁰ bhavitavyam. na cādarśasyāntarīyo deśaḥ¹⁰¹ sambhavati.

ŚP Vol. II, pp. 364–366; AL p. 326.

pratibimbaṃ tu hastyādi-sarūpam ādarśanādiṣu dr̥śyamānam api pramāṇa-bhedena ayathārtham avasthyate. hastyādi-pramāṇena prakṛṣṭa-deśa-vyāpinā bhavitavyam. na ca ādarśasyāntarīyo deśaḥ sambhavati. tad uktam—mahān āvriyate deśo mukhyaiḥ stamberamādibhiḥ / alpa-deśāntarāvastham pratibimbaṃ tu dr̥śyate //

8.3. In the preceding section, I have pointed out fourteen undeniable instances of borrowing by the author of the ŚP from the *Vākya-kāṇḍa-vr̥tti*. I may add that the *vr̥tti* on verse 152 is partly utilised in ŚP, Vol. I, pp. 213–214 (Raghavan 1963: 726–727). If one guesses by content and style, one may say that many more passages are likely to be borrowings; e.g. Vol. I, pp. 104.19–105.18; pp. 111.23–112.20; Vol. II, p. 333 (AL p. 321). In this connection, Raghavan's (1940: 23; 1963: 729–735) remark that the ninth chapter of the ŚP contains a long quotation from the *Vākya-padīya* and that it depends heavily on the *Vākya-padīya*, is very significant.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abhyankar, K. V. and V. P. Limaye. 1965. See Bhartṛhari (b). ——— 1967. (Eds.) *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā of Bhartṛhari*. Part I. Bhandarkar Oriental Research In-

⁹¹ AT, MTT *pratighātādyubhayarakṣādīni*.

⁹² MTT *yathā*. Both AT and MTT omit *na*, which is supplied here on the strength of the context and the ŚP reading.

⁹³ AT, MTT *tadetasthair*.

⁹⁴ AT and MTT omit this word.

⁹⁵ AT, MTT *artheṣveva viruddhabhākṣaṇaprokṣaṇaviśasanādīṣu*. For the reading adopted here, see the *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini 1.2.64 (Kielhorn, Vol. I, p. 244. 15–16) and Śabara on 1.3.9/30 (Ānandāśrama edition, p. 300).

⁹⁶ AT, MTT *nimittam*.

⁹⁷ AT, MTT *-sarūpadarśanādīṣu*.

⁹⁸ AT, MTT *dr̥śyamānatat*.

⁹⁹ AT, MTT *-bhedena*.

¹⁰⁰ AT, MTT *teṣāṃ hi sparśarūpaprakṛṣṭadeśavyāpī*.

¹⁰¹ AT, MTT *na yāntaradarśanaścādeśas*.

- stitute. Post-graduate and Research Department Series No. 8. Poona.
- Belvalkar, S. K. 1938. (Compiler) *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collections of Manuscripts deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. Vol. II. Grammar: Part I (Vedic and Pāṇiniya). Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- Bhartṛhari. (a) *kāṇḍa* 1. (Ed.) Subramania Iyer, K. A. *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the vṛtti, and the Paddhati of Vṛṣabhadeva*. Deccan College Monograph Series. No. 32. 1966. Poona.
- (b) *kāṇḍa* 2. *kārikās*: (Eds.) Abhyankar, K. V. and V. P. Limaye. *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari*. University of Poona Sanskrit and Prakrit Series. Vol. II. 1965. Poona. *vṛtti*: See sections 6.1–3 above. Charudeva Shastri's incomplete edition was published by the Ramlal Kapoor Trust, Lahore. *īkā*: See footnote 6. (Ed.) Mānavallī, Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī. *Vākyapadīyaṃ . . . Śrī-Bhartṛhari- . . . -vīracitāṃ Śrī-Puṇyārāja-kṛta-prakāśākhya-īkā-yutam*. Benares Sanskrit Series. Nos. 11, 19 and 24. 1887. Benares.
- (c) *kāṇḍa* 3. With Helārāja's commentary. *samuddeśas* 1–7: (Ed.) Subramania Iyer, K. A. Deccan College Monograph Series. No. 21. 1963. Poona. *samuddeśas* 8–13: (Ed.) Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī, K. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. No. CXVI. 1935. Trivandrum. *samuddeśa* 14: (Ed.) Ravi Varmā, L. A. University of Travancore Sanskrit Series. No. CXLVIII. 1942. Trivandrum.
- Biardeau, Madeleine. 1964 (Ed. and transl.) *Vākyapadīya Brahmakāṇḍa avec la vṛtti de Harivṛṣabha*. Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne. Série IN-8°. Fascicule 24. Paris.
- BSS. See Bhartṛhari (b).
- Charudeva Shastri. 1930. "Bhartṛhari: a critical study with special reference to the Vākyapadīya and its commentaries." *Proceedings of the All India Oriental Congress, fifth session*. Pp. 630–665. Lahore.
- 1934. (Ed.) *Vākyapadīyaṃ Prathamam Kāṇḍam*. Ramlal Kapoor Trust. Lahore.
- Durveka-miśra. *Dharmottara-pradīpa*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series No. 2. 1955. Patna.
- Helārāja. See Bhartṛhari (c).
- Hiriyanna, M. 1938. "Vyāḍi and Vājapyāyana." *Indian Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 14:261–266.
- I-ching. *A Record of Buddhist Religion as practised in India and the Malay Archipelago*. Translated by J. Takakusu. Reprint 1966. Delhi.
- Jayāditya. *Kāśikā*. (Ed.) Śobhita Miśra. Kāśī Saṃskṛta Granthamālā. No. 37. 1952. Banaras.
- Josyer. See Yadugiri Svāmī.
- Kielhorn, F. 1880/1881. *Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Presidency*. Bombay.
- 1883. "On the grammarian Bhartṛhari." *Indian Antiquary*. Vol. 12:226–227.
- Kunhan Raja, C. 1936. "I-tsing and Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya." *S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Comm. Vol.* Pp. 285–298. Madras.
- Mānavallī. See Bhartṛhari (b).
- Oppert, Gustav. 1880, 1885. *Lists of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries of Southern India*. Vol. I and II. Madras.
- Parvatīya Viśveśvara-sūri. *Vyākaraṇa-siddhānta-sudhānidhiḥ*. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series. Nos. 193, 194, 195, 215, 216, 218, 251, 252, 275, 276, 300, 306, 312, 321, 329. Edited by various scholars. 1914–1924.
- Pathak, K. B. 1894. "Bhartṛhari and Kumārila." *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*. Vol. XVIII:213–238.
- Prabhākara. *Bṛhatī of Prabhākara Miśra with the Rjūvimalāpañcikā of Śālikanātha*. (Ed.) Rāmanātha Śāstrī, S. K. Madras University Sanskrit Series. No. 3. 1934. Madras.
- Puṇyārāja. See Bhartṛhari (b).
- Raghavan Nambiar, Śiromaṇi Nyāya-bhūṣaṇa. 1942. *An Alphabetical List of Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute, Baroda*. Vol. I. Gaekwad's Oriental Series. No. XCVII. Baroda.
- Raghavan, V. 1940. *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*. Karnataka Publishing House, Bombay.
- 1963. *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*. Punarvasu. Madras.
- Rājendralāla Mitra. 1877. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*. Part I. Calcutta.
- 1886. *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts*. Vol. VIII. Calcutta.
- Rāmagovinda Śukla. 1961. Hindi introduction to the *Bhāvapradīpa* commentary on the *Brahma-kāṇḍa* of the *Vākyapadīya*. Kāśī Saṃskṛta Grantha-mālā. No. 124. Varanasi.
- Ramakrishna Kavi, M. 1930. "The discovery of the author's vṛtti on the Vākyapadīya." *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*. Vol. IV:235–241.
- Rangaswamy Iyengar, H. R. 1951. "Bhartṛhari and Dinnāga." *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*. New Series. No. 26:147–149.
- Rau, Wilhelm. 1962. "Über sechs Handschriften des Vākyapadīya." *Oriens*. Vol. 15:374–398.
- 1964. "Handschriften des Vākyapadīya." *Oriens*. Vol. 17:182–198.
- Ravi Varmā. See Bhartṛhari (c).
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1959. *Contributions à l'histoire de la philosophie linguistique indienne*. Paris.
- Sadhu Ram. 1952. "Bhartṛhari's date." *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Oriental Research Institute*. Vol. 9: 135–151.
- 1956. "Authorship of some kārikās and fragments ascribed to Bhartṛhari." *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Oriental Research Institute*. Vol. 13: 51–79.
- Śālikanātha. See Prabhākara.

- Subrahmanya Śāstrī, P. P. 1939/1942. (Ed.) *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*. Part I. *Prakāśas* 1 and 2. Śrīraṅgaṃ Śrī Śaṅkara-gurukula Series. No. 7. Śrī Vāṇī Vilās Press, Śrīraṅgaṃ.
- Subramania Iyer, K. A. 1963a. Sanskrit introduction to the *Ambākartrī* commentary on the *Brahma-kāṇḍa* of the *Vākyapadīya*. Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā. Vol. 91. Varanasi.
- 1963b. See Bhartṛhari (c).
- 1965. (Transl.) *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the vṛtti*. Chapter I. Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series. No. 26. Poona.
- 1966. See Bhartṛhari (a).
- Swaminathan, V. 1965. (Ed.) *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā*. Hindu Vishvavidyalaya Nepal Rajya Sanskrit Series. No. 11. Banaras.
- Vṛṣabha. See Bhartṛhari (a).
- Yadugiri Svāmī. 1955. (Ed.) *Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*. First eight chapters. Revised and edited by G. R. Josyer. Mysore.
- Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka. *Samvat* 2019. *Samskṛta Vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā Itihāsa*. Dvitiya bhāga. Ajmer.
- 2020. Revised edition of Vol. I of the same. Ajmer.