JOHANNES BRONKHORST

VĀRTTIKA[*]

1.1.   In an interesting article (1974) the following theory was launched about the Yuktidīpikā by A. Wezler.[1] This text has a peculiar method of presentation "so striking that the reader cannot fail to observe it" (p. 440 f.). It consists in "[t]he juxtaposition of a detailed verbal paraphrase and a preceding, most concise nominal expression or sentence" which "can be observed (…) throughout it" (p. 438). The result is "that the text of the YD on the respective kārikās is not a sequence of arguments for and against, each being put forward only once, that, on the contrary , the train of thought is permanently interrupted by restatements of the opponent's objections and defender's rejoinders" (p. 440). Wezler thinks that "this stylistic peculiarity stands in need of (…) a convincing explanation" (p. 441). Such an explanation is suggested by Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, "which aims at a critical discussion — not of the sūtras of Pāṇini, in the first place — but of Kātyāyana's vārttikas on the sūtras of Pāṇini" (p. 443). The Mahābhāṣya "presents itself to the reader unaware of its containing the work of Kātyāyana, as a sequence of very short, epigrammatic nominal expressions, often difficult to understand, and comparatively longer verbal phrases meant to expound them" (p. 444). The surmise seems justified "that the kernel sentences regularly met with in the YD belong likewise to an author other than that of the YD, that accordingly one has to distinguish between the laconic Vārttika of an author X on the [Sāṅkhyakārikā] and the true YD of an author Y, an extensive work written in normal Sanskrit prose that aims first of all at expounding this Vārttika" (p. 444).

    "[C]onclusive evidence" (p. 446) in support of the correctness of this surmise is found, according to Wezler, in the fact that at least in the case of one such *vārttika* (*arthāpattisaṃbhavābhāvaceṣṭānām anumānasiddheḥ* [p. 32, l. 30]) a word (*avacanam*) must be supplied from an [124] earlier *vārttika* (*upamaitihyāvacanam āptopadeśasiddheḥ* [p. 32, l. 3]) by way of *anuvṛtti* "the still being valid [of a term mentioned previously in one or many subsequent parts of the text]" (p. 445). Moreover, only on the assumption of the Yuktidīpikā's "containing an older vārttika text that belongs to another author (…) can one, e.g., account also for the — otherwise illogical — fact that in the passage YD p. 56.15-16 (…) there is raised an objection by the opponent that is based on the assumption that *hetumat* means 'characterized by a [logical] reason' although in the foregoing it had already been stated that

[1] Prof. Wezler informs me in a letter that he changed his views a number of years ago and came to conclusions regarding the Yuktidīpikā which agree with those presented in the present article. I thank Prof. Wezler for some further critical remarks.

hetu is here synonymous with *kāraṇa*, 'cause' (p. 56.11: *tatra hetuḥ kāraṇam ity anarthāntaram*)" (p. 446).

The name of the older *vārttika* text must have been — as appears from a quotation by Vācaspatimiśra I — "Rājavārttika" (p. 450).

1.2.   No one can deny that Wezler's theory represents a possibility. I doubt however whether the evidence provided proves the theory as conclusively as Wezler maintained.

There can be no doubt that the text of the Yuktidīpikā contains concise nominal expressions or sentences which we may safely call *vārttika*s. The question is whether these *vārttika*s were composed by an author other than the one of the Yuktidīpikā. The use of *anuvṛtti* among the *vārttika*s cannot be used as an argument, as little as the use of *anuvṛtti* in, say, the *sūtra*s of Candra's grammar is an argument against Candra's authorship of the Vṛtti on that grammar. It is at least conceivable that one single author wrote both the short expressions and their explanation, perhaps for mnemonic purposes and clarity respectively, or simply because he admired the style of the Mahābhāṣya (more on this below).

Wezler's second argument, concerning the interpretation of *hetumat*, must be studied somewhat more closely. The word *hetumat* 'characterized by a *hetu*' occurs in Sāṅkhyakārikā 10, as a qualification of *vyaktam* 'the manifest'. The Yuktidīpikā first explains the word *hetu* (p. 56, l. 11): *tatra hetuḥ kāraṇam ity anarthāntaram*. This word is here said to have been used in one of its senses, viz., as synonymous with *kāraṇa* 'cause'. Soon after this a *vārttika* voices the opinion of the opponent (p. 56, l. 15-16): *hetumad ity aviśeṣaḥ sarvatra sadbhāvāt* "'characterized by a *hetu*' is a non-distinction (i.e. is not a distinctive property of the manifest) since it exists everywhere" (Wezler, p. 440). On p. 446 Wezler tells us that it is "illogical" that an objection is raised "that is based on the assumption that *hetumat* means 'characterized by a [logical] reason' although in the foregoing it had already been stated that *hetu* is here synonymous with *kāraṇa* 'cause'". However, this objection is directed not only against the use of *hetumat* in the *kārikā* [125] but also against the interpretation proposed in the commentary. This becomes clear where the reply that *hetu* here refers to a causal factor (*kāraka*) is rejected on the ground that the general word *hetu* does not take a special meaning without an instigating factor to that effect (p. 56, l. 19-21: *āha — tadanupapattiḥ viśeṣānupādānāt | hetur iti sāmānyaśabdo 'yam | sāmānyaśabdāś ca nārthaprakaraṇaśabdāntarābhisaṃbandham antareṇa viśeṣe 'vatiṣṭhanta iti viśeṣa upādeyaḥ syāt | sa tu nopādīyate | tasmāt te aviśeṣā eveti /*).

Since now Wezler's two arguments appear to be less strong than they seemed, we are back at the situation where his theory represents a possibility, and no more than that.

1.3.   What is needed is, of course, some crucial evidence. Crucial evidence in support of Wezler's theory would be, for example, the discovery that the Yuktidīpikā misinterprets a

vārttika, or expresses an opinion different from the one expressed in a *vārttika*. I am not aware of any such case.

Strong evidence against Wezler's theory would be, for example, the discovery that roughly contemporaneously with the Yuktidīpikā other works were composed in the same style — i.e. *vārttika*s plus discussions —, works the single authorship of which is none-the-less not in doubt. Such evidence would gain in strength if such a work — the whole of it, including the comments on the *vārttika*s — were to call itself a 'Vārttika'. Such a work exists.

1.4.   The Tattvārthavārttika of Akalaṅka comments on the Tattvārthasūtra, an early Jaina work in Sanskrit. Akalaṅka must have lived in the 7th or 8th century A.D.[2] His Tattvārthavārttika, which is also known by the name Rājavārttika, is written precisely in the way also the Yuktidīpikā was written, viz. in a style which alternates between short nominal sentences and their detailed verbal paraphrase, as well as occasional further discussions in normal prose. The editor of this text, Mahendra Kumar Jain, has taken the trouble of having the nominal phrases printed in heavier type and providing (?) them with a serial number (the counting starts afresh with each new *sūtra*, as in Kielhorn's edition of the Mahābhāṣya), so that the style and structure of the text become visible at first sight.

The Tattvārthavārttika has never been doubted to be the work of a single author, as far as I know. And indeed, at some places it can easily be seen that the nominal sentences do not by themselves constitute an independent work. Some examples are the following.
[126]

TS 1.15 gives four subdivisions of the kind of knowledge called *mati*. They are: *avagraha*, *īhā*, *avāya* and *dhāraṇā*. Sūtra 1.18 (*vyañjanasyāvagrahaḥ*) states that the variety called *avagraha* concerns an object (*artha*, TS 1.17) which is *vyañjana*. This is explained by Devanandin, the author of the commentary Sarvārthasiddhi, and following him by Akalaṅka, as *avyakta* 'indistinct'. I reproduce the beginning of Akalaṅka's commentary on this *sūtra*, including the first nominal sentence which is contained in it (I p. 66, l. 27 - p. 67, l. 2):

> *vyañjanam avyaktaṃ śabdādijātaṃ tasyāvagraho bhavati | kimartham idam |*
> *niyamārtham —avagraha eva nehādaya iti | sa tarhy evakāraḥ kartavyaḥ | **na vā***
> ***sāmarthyād avadhāraṇapratīteḥ abbhakṣavat | 1 |** na vā kartavyaḥ | kiṃ*
> *kāraṇam | sāmarthyād avadhāraṇapratīteḥ | katham | abbhakṣavat | yathā na kaścid apo*
> *na bhakṣayatīti tathā sarveṣām avagrahādīnāṃ prasiddhāv avagrahavacanam*
> *avadhāraṇārthaṃ vijñāyate |*

This passage shows, incidentally, the way in which nominal sentences are dealt with in the Tattvārthavārttika. As in the Yuktidīpikā and in the Mahābhāṣya, the content of this sentence is repeated in a verbal style.

What interests us at this moment is that the nominal sentence contained in this passage cannot stand alone. It offers an alternative to something which must have been said earlier.

But no such nominal sentence precedes it. None of the preceding sentences has the required form, nor is any of them commented upon in the manner usual for such sentences. In other words, the nominal sentence beginning with *na vā* is a reaction upon the preceding commentary and must therefore itself be part of the commentary.

Another example occurs on TS 3.4. This *sūtra* tells us that the inhabitants of hell (*nāraka* [3.3]) "suffer mutually inflicted pains" (*parasparodīritaduḥkhāḥ*). The Tattvārthavārttika comments (I p. 164, l. 35 - p. 165, l. 5):

> *kathaṃ parasparodīritaduḥkhatvam* | **nirdayatvāt parasparadarśane sati kopotpatteḥ śvavat** | **1** | *yathā śvānaḥ śāśvatikākāraṇānādikālapravṛttajātikṛtavairāpāditanirdayatvāt parasparabhakṣaṇabhedanachedanādyudīritaduḥkhā bhavanti tathā nārakā api bhavapratyayenāvadhijñānena mithyādarśanodayād vibhaṅgavyapadeśabhājā [?] ca dūrād eva duḥkhahetūn avagamyotpannaduḥkhāḥ pratyāsattau parasparālokanāc ca prajvalitakopāgnayaḥ svavikṛtāsivāsīparaśubhiṇḍivālādibhiḥ parasparadehatakṣaṇabhedanachedanapīḍanādibhir udīritaduḥkhā bhavanti* |

The nominal sentence is, as usual, followed by an extensive explanation. The problem is that this nominal sentence, too, requires another one which precedes it. The preceding question does not qualify since these [127] nominal sentences never ask questions. Had the nominal sentences constituted a separate work, the present sentence would have read *parasparodīritaduḥkhatvaṃ nirdayatvāt parasparadarśane sati kopotpatteḥ śvavat* or the like. The fact that it does not, shows that the nominal sentences are an integral part of the commentary.

It is interesting to see that also in the Tattvārthavārttika — as in the Yuktidīpikā (see §§ 1.1 and 1.2) — words are understood from an earlier nominal sentence into a later one. An example is provided by the numbered sentences 9 and 10 on TS 4.12. Together with their explanations they read (I p. 218, l. 28-31):

> **sūryasyādau grahaṇam alpāctaratvād abhyarhitatvāc ca** | **9** | *sūryaśabda ādau prayujyate* | *kutaḥ* | *alpāctaratvād abhyarhitatvāc ca* | *sarvābhibhavasamarthatvād dhy abhyarhitaḥ sūryaḥ* | **grahādiṣu ca** | **10** | *kim* | *alpāctaratvād abhyarhitatvāc ca pūrvanipāta iti vākyaśeṣaḥ* | *grahaśabdas tāvad alpāctaro 'bhyarhitaś ca tārakāśabdāt* | *nakṣatraśabdo 'bhyarhitaḥ* |

Here the words *alpāctaratvād abhyarhitatvāc cādau grahaṇam* (paraphrased as … *pūrvanipātaḥ*) must be understood in sentence 10 from 9.

The nominal sentences are sometimes referred to in the Tattvārthavārttika itself. In the last quoted passage the compound *vākyaśeṣa* is used to designate what must be supplied to the nominal sentence under consideration. The same word *vākya* 'sentence' is seen to refer to nominal sentences elsewhere as well. The purpose of numbered sentence 8 on TS 2.49 is

---

[2] For a survey of the evidence see Jain 1964: 171 f.

described as *uktānuktārthasaṃgrahārtham idaṃ vākyam*[3] (I p. 153, l. 11 f.). And numbered sentence 8 on TS 3.5 proposes itself that a *vākya* must be made, which proposal is then rejected, in the following passage (I p. 165, l. 28 f.):

> *vākyavacanam iti cen na — udīraṇahetuprakārapradarśanārthatvāt / 8 / syād etat —*
> *vākyam eva vaktavyaṃ paraspareṇodīritaduḥkhāḥ saṃkliṣṭāsuraiś ca prāk caturthyā iti*
> */ tan na…* etc.

It may further be noted that nominal sentences do not accompany all of the *sūtras*. They are absent, e.g., in the case of TS 2.45, 46; 3.12, 15, 16, 17; etc. In this the Tattvārthavārttika resembles the Mahābhāṣya.

Numerous quotations from the Mahābhāṣya show that Akalaṅka was well acquainted with that work. He does not however mention its [128] name or the name of its author on any occasion, as far as I have been able to ascertain.

2.1.   The preceding considerations give rise to an intriguing question. If at one time authors could use the name 'Vārttika' for a unitary work consisting of both short nominal phrases (*vārttika*s) and their discussion, could it be that they looked upon the prototype of this style, the Mahābhāṣya together with Kātyāyana's *vārttika*s, as a single composition of one author as well?

The question need not be asked in this extreme form. After all, there are passages in the Mahābhāṣya where even a superficial reader can see that *vārttika*s are ascribed to other persons, e.g. where *vārttikakāra*s are named, or where two interpretations are given of one *vārttika*.[4] However, the bulk of the Mahābhāṣya is not like this. Kielhorn (1876a: 7) rightly observed: "(…) the commentators on the Mahâbhâshya, or other scholars who have written on Pâṇini, (…) only occasionally contrast the views of Patanjali with those of the Vârttikakâra, and they tell us only incidentally that a particular statement is a Vârttika or belongs to Kâtyâyana. And Patanjali himself, the author of the Great Commentary, is even more reticent." Kielhorn seems to have been the first to separate *vārttika*s from *bhāṣya* in a systematic manner.[5] Over a thousand years before Kielhorn far fewer *vārttika*s may have been ascribed to Kātyāyana and other authors different from Patañjali. As a result much of the Mahābhāṣya may have been looked upon as written in precisely the style which also characterizes the Yuktidīpikā and the Tattvārthavārttika.

A study of the use of the word *vārttika* in the Yuktidīpikā seems to support this supposition. This word is used only once in YD, in a passage which occurs on p. 10 f. The discussion is about Sāṅkhyakārikā 1ab: *duḥkhatrayābhighātāj jijñāsā tadapaghātake hetau /*

---

[3] Cf. the late definition of *vārttikatva*: *sūtre 'nuktaduruktacintākaratvaṃ vārttikatvam* (Nāgojībhaṭṭa's Mahābhāṣyapradīpoddyota on P. 1.1.1, vt. 1). A similar definition is given in Hemacandra's Abhidhānacintāmaṇi, cited in Böhtlingk - Roth 1855-75: VI/947 s.v. *vārttika*, and in the Parāśaropapurāṇa, cited in Bali 1976: 103 n. 1.

[4] See Kielhorn 1876a.

[5] Even against this procedure doubts have been voiced. See Rocher 1971: 315; Joshi -Roodbergen 1981: 140 f. n. 452.

"Since there is affliction by the three [kinds of] suffering (*duḥkha*), there is inquiry into the cause which removes them (*tad-*)".

On p. 10 the discussion centers on the relation between *duḥkha-* and *tad-* in this line. The opponent thinks there can be no connection between these two words, because several words intervene. Two replies are given. The first one is, briefly stated, that connection is made by meaning, not by proximity. The second reply deserves to be quoted in full (p. 10, l. 29 - p. 11, l. 6):

[129]

> *kiñ cānyat — śāstre darśanāt | śāstre ca vyavahitānām api sarvanāmnām*
> *abhisambandho dṛśyate yasya guṇasya hi bhāvād dravye śabdaniveśas tadabhidhāne*
> *tvatalāv ity atrārthakṛtaś ca sambandhaḥ śabdānām abhyupagataḥ | ṅyāpprātipadikād*
> *bahuṣu bahuvacanam supo dhātuprātipadikayor alug uttarapada ity evamādīnāṃ*
> *sambandhābhyupagamaḥ | tathānaḍvāham udahāriṇi bhagini vahasi yā tvaṃ śirasi*
> *kumbham avācīnam abhidhāvantam adrākṣīr iti vārttike dṛṣṭāntaḥ | na hy atra saty*
> *ānantarye śirasānaḍuho vahanaṃ kumbhasya vā saraṇam upapadyate | yathā cātra*
> *vyavahitānām abhisambandhas tathehāpi draṣṭavyaḥ |*

"Moreover: [Connection between words which are not in immediate proximity is possible] because this is seen to be the case in the science [of grammar].[6] Also in the science [of grammar] there is seen to be connection between pronouns even though they are separated. And in *yasya guṇasya hi bhāvād dravye śabdaniveśas tadabhidhāne tvatalau* (P. 5.1.119 vt. 5)[7] the connection between the words [*yasya* and *tad-*, even though] made by meaning, is accepted. Connection is accepted between [the *sūtras*] P. 4.1.1 and 1.4.21, and between 2.4.71 and 6.3.1, etc.[8] Similarly, an example in the Vārttika is *anaḍvāham udahāriṇi bhagini vahasi yā tvaṃ śirasi kumbham avācīnam abhidhāvantam adrākṣīḥ* (Mbh I p. 152-53).[9] Not indeed is in this [sentence], in spite of the proximity [of the words concerned], 'carrying a bull on one's head' (*śirasānaḍuho vahanam*) or 'running of the jar' (*kumbhasya saraṇam*) the proper [connection]. And just as in these [grammatical examples] separated [words] are connected, so the connection [between *duḥkha-* and *tad-* in Sāṅkhyakārikā 1] must be seen."

---

[6] This is an instance of a *vārttika* in the text of the Yuktidīpikā.

[7] This *vārttika* reads in Kielhorn's edition (II p. 366, l. 10): *siddhaṃ tu yasya guṇasya bhāvād dravye śabdaniveśas tadabhidhāne tvatalau.*

[8] This must be the intended meaning, as follows from two passages in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā. Ms 31c9-10 (AL 96.10-11; Sw 113.21-23; CE III.3.26-27) reads: (…) *vyākaraṇe 'py arthalakṣaṇaḥ sambandho nārthakṛto yathā bahuṣu bahuvacanam ṅyāpprātipadikād iti*; Ms 32d7-8 (AL 99.21-22; Sw 117.3-4; CE III.6.20-22) has: *iha kathaṃ supo* (…) *lug alug uttarapada iti | atrāpīdam vākyam uttarapadād anyatra supo lug iti |.*

[9] Kielhorn's edition has: *anaḍvāham udahāri yā tvaṃ harasi śirasā kumbhaṃ bhagini sācīnam abhidhāvantam adrākṣīr iti.* The Bhāṣya 'explains' this passage as follows (p. 153, l. 2 f.): *udahāri bhagini yā tvaṃ kumbham harasi śirasānaḍvāham sācīnam abhidhāvantam adrākṣīr iti.* Note that Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā (Ms 35b5-6; AL 96.5-6; Sw 113.16-17; CE III.3.21-22) has this example in a form closer to the Yuktidīpikā's: *anaḍvāham udahāri yā tvaṃ vahasi śirasā bhagini kumbhaṃ sācīnam abhidhāvantam adrākṣīr it[i]* (…) *nāsti anaḍuhaḥ śirasā vahanaṃ kumbhasya ca saraṇam iti.*

[130]

The crucial sentence in this passage concerns the "example in the Vārttika". The phrase *vārttike dṛṣṭāntaḥ* can, to be sure, mean more than alone 'example in the Vārttika'. It can also mean 'example with respect to, i.e., of a *vārttika*', and the like. The fact is that none of the acceptable interpretations of this phrase fits the example under consideration. This example occurs in a part of the Mahābhāṣya where a *vārttika* has been rejected and where it is shown that the aim of that *vārttika* can be obtained without it.

The *sūtra* under which the example occurs is P. 1.1.58: *na padāntadvirvacanavareyalopasvarasavarṇānusvāradīrghajaścarvidhiṣu*. This *sūtra* is an exception to the preceding one (P. 1.1.57) and states that the substitute for a vowel is not like that what it replaces in the case of rules which concern 1) the end of a word; 2) the doubling of a sound; 3) the elision of *ya* before *vara*; 4) the accent; 5) a homogeneous sound; 6) an *anusvāra*; 7) a long vowel; 8) *j*, *b*, *g*, *ḍ*, *d*; 9) *c*, *ṭ*, *t*, *k*, *p*, *ś*, *ṣ*, *s*.

The first *vārttika* under this *sūtra* gives a further specification: *pratiṣedhe svaradīrghayalopeṣu lopājādeśo na sthānivat* "In this prohibition [it must be stated that only] the substitute for a vowel which consists in elision (*lopa*) is not like what it replaces (*na sthānivat*) in the case of accent, long vowel, elision of *ya*". In other words, in these cases the substitute for a vowel which is anything else than elision is like that what it replaces (Mbh I p. 152, l. 18 f.: *yo hy anya ādeśaḥ sthānivad evāsau bhavati*).

The Mahābhāṣya rejects this *vārttika* in the following passage (I p. 152, l. 22 - p. 153, l. 3):

> *na vaktavyam | iha hi lopo 'pi prakṛta ādeśo 'pi vidhigrahaṇam api prakṛtam anuvartate dīrghādayo 'pi prakṛta ādeśo 'pi nirdiśyante | kevalaṃ tatrābhisambandhamātraṃ kartavyam | svaradīrghayalopavidhiṣu lopājādeśo na sthānivad iti | ānupūrvyeṇa saṃniviṣṭanāṃ yatheṣṭam abhisambandhaḥ śakyate kartum na caitāny ānupūrvyeṇa saṃniviṣṭāni | anānupūrvyeṇāpi saṃniviṣṭānāṃ yatheṣṭam abhisambandho bhavati | tad yathā | anaḍvāham udahāri yā tvaṃ harasi śirasā kumbhaṃ bhagini sācīnam abhidhāvantam adrākṣīr iti | tasya yatheṣṭam abhisambandho bhavati |*
>
> "[This *vārttika*] should not be uttered; because in this [*vārttika*] elision (*lopa*), substitute (*ādeśa*) as well as the word *vidhi* 'rule'[10] are valid [from P. 1.1.58] since they are the subject-matter [of this *sūtra*], and also long [131] (vowels) are mentioned [in P. 1.1.58]. Only the correct connection [between the words of P. 1.1.58] must be made in that [*sūtra*, in order to obtain the meaning expressed by the *vārttika*:] *svaradīrghayalopavidhiṣu lopājādeśo na sthānivat*. [Objection:] of [words] which are arranged in the [right] order, [such] a connection can be made as desired; these [words] however are not arranged in the [right] order. [Reply:] the connection also of [words] which are not arranged in the [right] order is as desired. For example:

---

[10] The Mahābhāṣya paraphrases vt. 1 with the help of the word *vidhi* (I p. 152, l. 17): *pratiṣedhe svaradīrghayalopavidhiṣu lopājādeśo na sthānivad bhavatīti vaktavyam.*

> *anaḍvāham udahāri yā tvaṃ harasi śirasā kumbhaṃ bhagini sācīnam abhidhāvantam*
> *adrākṣīḥ.* The connection [between the words] of this [sentence] is as desired."

This passage is meant to show that vt. 1 is superfluous. The information which the *vārttika* was intended to convey is already contained in the *sūtra*. The order of terms in the *sūtra* seems hard to reconcile with the information thus to be conveyed, but an example shows that this can be no objection. This example therefore does not occur in a *vārttika*, nor does it illustrate a *vārttika*. We must conclude that the Yuktidīpikā used the word *vārttika* to denote more than just the nominal sentences which we ascribe to Kātyāyana.

The above does not imply that the author of the Yuktidīpikā was never aware of the difference in authorship between the short nominal sentences and at least parts of the Mahābhāṣya. In one passage about grammar (YD p. 6, l. 19 f.) a distinction is made between a *padakāra* and a *cūrṇikāra*. The *padakāra* is said to have used the compound *jātivācakatvāt*. Kielhorn's edition of the Mahābhāṣya has two *vārttika*s containing this compound: P. 1.2.10 vt. 1, and P. 4.1.14 vt. 7. To the *cūrṇikāra* is ascribed the sentence *kadācid guṇo guṇiviśeṣako bhavati kadācid guṇinā guṇo viśiṣyate*, which occurs in almost identical form at Mbh II p. 356, l. 8 f. (on P. 5.1.59). The term *padakāra* is rare as a name for the author of the *vārttika*s, but it occurs at least once more, viz. in Jinendrabuddhi's Nyāsa on the Kāśikā on P. 3.2.21 (II p. 558), where the reference is to P. 1.1.72 vt. 9. The word *cūrṇikāra* is used to designate the author of the Mahābhāṣya in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā (Ms 45c9, AL 139.18[!], Sw 161.21, CE IV.25.10; Ms 50d3, AL 155.16, CE V.1.15; Ms 60a11, AL 180.11, CE V.21.14), in Vṛṣabhadeva's Paddhati on Vākyapadīya 1.23 (p. 63, l. 12), in Helārāja's Prakīrṇakaprakāsa on Vākyapadīya 3.1148 (= 3.14.447; II p. 356, l. 20 and p. 357, l. 1 f.), 3.1186 (= 3.14.485; II p. 371, l. 24), by I-ching (see below), and elsewhere (Mīmāṃsaka 1973: I/331 f.).

This is all the evidence yielded by the Yuktidīpikā. The impression it creates is that in some cases its author distinguished between the nominal sentences and their immediate discussion on the one hand, and more independent passages of the Mahābhāṣya on the other. However, [132] the evidence is not sufficient to come to any clear and definite conclusions on the basis of the Yuktidīpikā alone.

2.2. The author of the Yuktidīpikā appears to have known the Mahābhāṣyadīpikā, Bhartṛhari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya.[11] How did Bhartṛhari look upon the Mahābhāṣya?

2.2.1.   (i) P. 1.1.38 (*taddhitaś cāsarvavibhaktiḥ*) prescribes that a word which is formed with a *taddhita* suffix and does not take all case-endings, is called *avyaya* 'indeclinable'. A number of *vārttika*s (in Kielhorn's edition) express dissatisfaction with the formulation of this *sūtra* and propose specifications. Then vt. 6 together with the following Bhāṣya offer a better solution which reads (I p. 95, l. 9-11):

siddhaṃ tu pāṭhāt || 6 ||

pāṭhād vā siddham etat | kathaṃ pāṭhaḥ kartavyaḥ | tasilādayaḥ prāk pāśapaḥ |
śasprabhṛtayaḥ prāk samāsāntebhyaḥ | māntaḥ | kṛtvo'rthaḥ | tasivatī | nānāñāv iti ||
"But [the desired result] is obtained by enumeration" (vt. 6).

"Or this [desired result] is obtained by enumeration. How must the enumeration be
made? From *tasIL* until *pāśaP* (i.e. the *taddhita* suffixes taught in P. 5.3.7-46), from
śas until the compound endings (taught in P. 5.4.42-67), [a suffix] which ends in *m*
(i.e. *ām* and *am*, P. 5.4.11-12), [a suffix] which has the meaning of *kṛtvas* (P. 5.4.17-
20), *tasI* and *vatI* (P. 4.3.113 and 5.1.115), *nā* and *nāÑ* (P. 5.2.27)."

One short passage in Bhartṛhari's comments on this enumeration uses the word *vārttika*
twice (Ms 76c3-4; AL 226.5-6): *vārttike tu taddhitāḥ prakṛtā iti āsir*[12] *na paṭhitaḥ | thāl*
viśvemāt thāl ity ayaṃ vārttike nopasaṃgṛhītaḥ | "Since *taddhita* [suffixes] are under
discussion in the Vārttika, *āsI* has not been enumerated.[13] [The suffix] *thāL* [prescribed] in P.
5.3.111 is not included in the Vārttika".
[133]
The first sentence of this passage does not contain unambiguous information regarding
what is meant by the word *vārttika*. The second sentence on the other hand does. This
sentence points at an oversight in the enumeration in the Bhāṣya of *taddhita* suffixes which
form indeclinables: the suffix *thāL* prescribed in P. 5.3.111 has been forgotten.[14] Since the
enumeration took place not in a nominal sentence but in the explanatory Bhāṣya, the word
vārttika has here been used to indicate the latter.

(ii)   Another passage on the same *sūtra* uses the word *vārttika*. P. 1.1.38 vt. 1 and its Bhāṣya
consist of the following remarks (I p. 94, l. 10 f.):

asarvavibhaktāv avibhaktinimittasyopasaṃkhyānam || 1 ||
asarvavibhaktāv avibhaktinimittasyopasaṃkhyānam kartavyam | nānā vinā |
"Regarding [the term] *asarvavibhakti* [in P. 1.1.38 *taddhitaś cāsarvavibhaktiḥ*],
addition of *avibhaktinimitta* 'not caused by a case-ending'" (vt. 1). "Regarding [the
term] *asarvavibhakti*: the addition must be made of *avibhaktinimitta* 'not caused by a
case-ending'. [Only thus can P. 1.1.38 cover the forms] *nānā vinā*."

---

[11] See Bronkhorst 1985: 93 f. and notes 8 and 9 above.
[12] The Kāśikā on P. 1.1.37 confirms that this must be the correct reading. In its list of indeclinables it
enumerates: *tasilādiḥ taddhita edhācparyantaḥ, śastasī, kṛtvasuc, suc, āsthālau, cvyarthās ca, am, ām, …*
Jinendrabuddhi's Nyāsa comments: *āsthālāv iti | iṇa āsir ity uṇādisūtreṇa iṇo dhātor āsipratyayaḥ | ayā ity*
udāharaṇam |. Uṇādi suffixes are *kṛt*, not therefore *taddhita*. The *sūtra: iṇa āsiḥ* (or *iṇaś cāsiḥ*) is present in the
surviving versions of the Uṇādi Sūtra, but not all commentaries mention that *ayās* is an indeclinable. An
exception is Mahādeva's Uṇādikośa 4.221.
[13] This remark presupposes that Bhartṛhari had before him a list of indeclinables much like the one in the Kāśikā
on P. 1.1.37 (see the preceding note). This supports the view put forth elsewhere (Bronkhorst: 1983: esp. section
3.4) that the Kāśikā was strongly influenced by earlier, pre-Bhartṛhari, commentaries.
[14] Bhartṛhari tries to make up for this in the following lines, where he proposes that the suffix *thāL* prescribed in
P. 5.3.111 is the same as *thāL* prescribed in P. 5.3.23 which is included in the row 'from *tasIL* until *pāśaP*' and
has therefore been included (*yatnas tu kriyate | ya eva prakāravacane thāl chandasi sa eva pratnādibhya ivārthe*
[?] *bhavatīti |*).

The words *nānā* and *vinā* are formed with the help of P. 5.2.27 (*vinañbhyāṃ nānāñau na saha*) in the sense 'not together' (*na saha*). The *taddhita* suffixes *nā* and *nāÑ* cannot be described as *asarvavibhakti*; they have no relation whatever to any case-ending and must be described as *avibhaktinimitta* 'not caused by a case-ending'. Yet the words *nānā* and *vinā* are indeclinables.

Bhartṛhari (Ms 74d4 f.; AL 221.19 f.) gives a long account of the ways in which earlier commentators (*vṛttikāra*) have explained the word *asarvavibhakti* and concludes his description of the last point of view as follows (Ms 75b1-2; AL 222.19-21): *asmiṃs tu yo doṣaḥ sa vārttika eva darśitaḥ / nānā vinā iti / asarvavibhaktāv avibhaktinimittam iti /* "What is wrong in this [point of view] has however been pointed out in the Vārttika itself [with the words:] 'For the sake of *nānā* and *vinā*, *avibhaktinimitta* [must be added] to *asarvavibhakti*'."

Note that Bhartṛhari has not yet made a reference to vt. 1, nor to any *vārttika* on P. 1.1.38 for that matter. His present remark therefore appears to quote what Bhartṛhari considered to be a or the 'Vārttika'. Something like *asarvavibhaktāv avibhaktinimittam* does occur in a [134] *vārttika* (vt. 1); *nānā* and *vinā* on the other hand are the illustrations given in the Bhāṣya.

(iii) A third passage in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā deals with P. 1.1.14 (*nipāta ekāj anāñ*). The interpretation of this *sūtra* offers some difficulties which are discussed in the Mahābhāṣya. At one stage the following paraphrase is given of the part *nipāta ekāc* of the *sūtra* (I p. 70, l. 16-17): *aj eva yo nipāta ity evaṃ vijñāsyate* "[This part of the *sūtra*] will be understood as 'the vowel which is a *nipāta*'".

Bhartṛhari's following remarks apparently pertain to this sentence (Ms 55d10 - 56a1; AL 168.11-12; CE V.12.4-6):

> *nipāta ity anenāci viśeṣyamāṇe tadantavidhyaprasaṅgād doṣaprasaṅgo nopatiṣṭhati /*
> *vārttikaviparīte tu viśeṣyatve uttiṣṭhati samudāyasyārthe prayogāt /*
> "When [the word] 'vowel' (*ac*) is qualified by [the designation] *nipāta* no fault results since there is no occasion for P. 1.1.72 to apply. In case the relation of qualified [to qualifier] is opposite to [what is said in] the Vārttika [such a fault] does result since a collection [of sounds] is used to [express a certain] meaning."

In order to understand these remarks we recall that P. 1.1.72 (*yena vidhis tadantasya*) is thus explained in the Kāśikā: *yena viśeṣaṇena vidhir vidhīyate sa tadantasya ātmāntasya samudāyasya grāhako bhavati svasya ca rūpasya* "With what as qualifier a rule is given, that denotes the collection [of sounds] which ends therewith, and itself". In other words, if *ac* were qualifier and *nipāta* qualified, all *nipāta*s which end in vowels would be denoted. Only by taking *ac* as qualified, *nipāta* as qualifier, can this contingency be avoided.

Our main interest lies of course with the remark about the or a *vārttika*. This is here particularly interesting since the Bhāṣya on P. 1.1.14 contains not a single *vārttika* in

Kielhorn's edition.[15] Bhartṛhari apparently assigns this name to the Bhāṣya sentence *aj eva yo nipāta[ḥ]*. This sentence is not commented upon in the Mahābhāṣya in the manner usual with 'real' *vārttika*s. The question is however raised in Mbh (l. 17) if this sentence should be 'uttered', i.e. accepted as a statement regarding the correct interpretation of P. 1.1.14 (*kiṃ vaktavyam etad / na hi / …*). It seems therefore that Bhartṛhari uses the word *vārttika* not only for Bhāṣya passages which deal in one way or another with 'real' *vārttika*s, but also for (accepted or rejected) statements which are an obvious and inseparable part of the Bhāṣya. [135]

(iv)   In another place (Ms 54c1, AL 164.17, CE V.9.3) Bhartṛhari uses the term *samarthavārttika* while apparently referring to a Bhāṣya passage on P. 2.1.1 *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ*. This Bhāṣya passage is quoted *in extenso* by Bhartṛhari, so that its identity is beyond doubt.

The Bhāṣya passage is Mbh I p. 362, l. 17-21. This occurs in the midst of a discussion on the difference between compounded and uncompounded words. Among the characteristics of non-compounded words some are enumerated in the following statement which Kielhorn does not number as a *vārttika* but which can easily be considered as one (I p. 362, l. 13): *saṃkhyāviśeṣo vyaktābhidhānam upasarjanaviśeṣaṇam cayogaḥ* "(indication of) particular number; clear indication of meaning; qualifier to the subordinate word; connection by means of (the particle) *ca*: 'and'" (tr. Joshi 1968: 58).

The first item of this list is illustrated as follows (l. 14 f.): *saṃkhyāviśeṣo bhavati vākye / rājñaḥ puruṣaḥ rājñoḥ puruṣaḥ rājñāṃ puruṣa iti / samāse na bhavati / rājapuruṣa iti //* "(Indication of) particular numbers occurs in an uncompounded word-group, as in *rājñaḥ puruṣaḥ* 'man of a king', *rājñoḥ puruṣaḥ* 'man of two kings', *rājñāṃ puruṣaḥ* 'man of many kings'. In a compound it does not occur, as in *rājapuruṣaḥ* 'king-man'." (tr. Joshi, p. 58).

The Bhāṣya then gives, by way of objection, an explanation why no particular number is understood in a compound (l. 15-17): *asti kāraṇam yenaitad evaṃ bhavati / kiṃ kāraṇam / yo 'sau viśeṣavācī śabdas tadasāṃnidhyāt / aṅga hi bhavāṃs tam uccārayatu gaṃsyate sa viśeṣaḥ //* "There is a reason why this happens to be so. What is that reason? Because that word (i.e. inflectional suffix) which expresses the specific (number), that (inflectional suffix) is not there (in a compound). You better pronounce it (i.e. the inflectional suffix in the compound), sir, (and then you will see that) this specific (number) will be understood [even from a compound]." (tr. Joshi, p. 60).

This objection is then answered by the passage which is quoted by Bhartṛhari, and which closes this discussion (I p. 362, l. 17-21):

> *nanu ca naitenaivaṃ bhavitavyam / na hi śabdakṛtena nāmārthena bhavitavyam /*
> *arthakṛtena nāma śabdena bhavitavyam / tad etad evaṃ dṛśyatām artharūpam evaitad*
> *evaṃjātīyakaṃ yenātra viśeṣo na gamyata iti / avaśyaṃ caitad evaṃ vijñeyam / yo hi*

---

[15] Limaye, Palsule and Bhagavat (CE V Notes p. 104) observe: "In the MS … there is a word *vārttike* before *viparīte* which we have dropped as there is no Vār. on this Sū.".

manyate yo 'sau viśeṣavācī śabdas tadasāṃnidhyād atra viśeṣo na gamyata itīha tasya
viśeṣo gamyeta | apsucaraḥ goṣucaraḥ varṣāsuja iti ||

"But it cannot be like this; for meaning cannot be made by word, word must [rather]
be made by meaning. It must be seen like this that the meaning here is such that no
specific [number] is understood. And this must necessarily be understood in this way;
for he who thinks that no [136] specific [number] is understood here (i.e., in a
compound) because there is nothing that is expressive of a specific [number], he
would understand a specific [number] in [words like] *apsucara, goṣucara, varṣāsuja*
(which are not expressive of a plural number in spite of the plural endings of their first
constituents)."

Note that this passage is not a *vārttika*, nor is it a direct explanation of a *vārttika*. At best it is
the last part of a discussion which arose in connection with a *vārttika*.

Bhartṛhari quotes this passage (with insignificant variations) in order to drive home the
point that "the presence or absence of a [particular] number is not the result of a particular
expressive unit (*śabda*); the specific [number] is [rather] the result of the single integrated
meaning" (*tasmān na śabdaviśeṣakṛte saṃkhyāyāḥ parityāgopādāne ekārthībhāvakṛta evāyaṃ
viśeṣaḥ*). Immediately following this Bhartṛhari remarks: *tad etat samarthavārttika eva
nirṇeṣyate*. This apparently means: "This will be determined [in our commentary] on this
same (*eva*) Vārttika connected with [P. 2.1.1] *samarthaḥ [padavidhiḥ]*".[16] This same Vārttika
cannot but refer to the Bhāṣya passage quoted by Bhartṛhari. There certainly is no reason to
think, and very little likelihood, that Bhartṛhari refers here to any *vārttika* in the present sense
of that term, since no such *vārttika* deals with Bhartṛhari's problem.

2.2.2.   One more passage remains which uses the term *vārttika*. This one (Ms 73a8-9; AL
217.12-13; CE VI(1).29.13-15) cannot however be looked upon as evidence how Bhartṛhari
used this word. The reason is that in this case the Mahābhāṣyadīpikā merely echoes the
Mahābhāṣya. The latter work quotes a *vārttika* (P. 8.3.13 vt. 2) saying (I p. 93, l. 5 f.):
vārttikakāraś ca paṭhati jaśbhāvād iti ced uttaratrābhāvād apavādaprasaṅga iti. Bhartṛhari
follows, saying: *pūrvatrāsiddham iti liṅgasya tadviṣayatānivṛttyarthaṃ vārttike
śabdāntaraviṣayaṃ liṅgāntaram upādatte jaśbhāvād iti ced uttaratra iti*.

Nor are the two occurrences of the word *vārttikakāra* of much use for our present
purpose. In the first one (Ms 39a1; AL 117.14; Sw 137.15; CE IV.5.27) passages are under
discussion where *vārttika*s and Bhāṣya agree; we cannot therefore draw any conclusion here
regarding what is ascribed to the *vārttikakāra*. In the second occurrence (Ms 50d3; AL 155.6;
CE V.1.15) the *vārttikakāra* is mentioned soon after the *cūrṇikāra*, and two *vārttika*s (in
Kielhorn's sense) are ascribed to him. Here again we can say no more than that also *vārttika*s
in our sense are [137] attributed to the *vārttikakāra* by Bhartṛhari. Little can also be inferred

---

[16] On the original extent of Bhartṛhari's commentary, see Bronkhorst 1987: 33 f.

from the one occurrence of the name 'Kātyāyana' in Bhartṛhari's commentary (Ms 60b9; AL 181.9; CE V.22.7); it refers to the author of P. 1.1.20 vt. 1.

Bhartṛhari uses the word *bhāṣyasūtra* three times, in two places of his commentary (Ms 12d2; AL 39.18; Sw 47.10, CE I.32.27 and Ms 71b10-c1; AL 213.15-17; CE VI(1).26.4-5). On both occasions the context is a sentence of Patañjali *na cedānīm ācāryāḥ sūtrāṇi kṛtvā nivartayanti*, in which, according to Bhartṛhari, the word *sūtra* refers to what he would call *vākya*, i.e. to *vārttika*s of Kātyāyana. The first time he uses *bhāṣyasūtra* while commenting on a Bhāṣya passage which contains this sentence (see Ojihara 1978: esp. pp. 222 f.). And immediately following his second and preceding his third use of the word *bhāṣyasūtra* Bhartṛhari actually cites the sentence *na cedānīm* (…). We must conclude that we cannot infer more from Bhartṛhari's use of the word *bhāṣyasūtra* than that he wanted to make clear that *sūtra* in Patañjali's sentence did not denote *sūtra*s of Pāṇini.

Bhartṛhari distinguishes a number of times in his Mahābhāṣyadīpikā between a *vākyakāra* and a *bhāṣyakāra*. He does so explicitly at Ms 16b11-12 (AL 53.9-10, Sw 63.10, CE II.6.25-26); Ms 41b9 (AL 123.23, Sw 144.18, CE IV.11.11); Ms 65c11 (AL 197.8-9, CE VI[1].9.23-24); Ms 104b5-6 (AL 298.6-7). It is clear that *vākya* is used to designate what we are wont to call *vārttika*. For example, Ms 29d9 (AL 92.9-10, Sw 108.6, CE II.39.19-20) reads: *yad evoktaṃ vākyakāreṇa vṛttisamavāyārtha upadeśa iti*. The phrase *vṛttisamavāyārtha upadeśaḥ* here ascribed to the *vākyakāra* is vt. 15 of the first Āhnika of the Mahābhāṣya (I p. 13, l. 2). Similarly, Ms 35c3-4 (AL 107.13-14, Sw 125.12, CE III.12.8-9) has *vākyakārasya vṛddhigrahaṇam uttarārtham iti vacanād* (…). Here P. 1.1.3 vt. 7 (I p. 47, l. 20) is quoted and ascribed to the *vākyakāra*. Sometimes the word *vākya* alone refers to a *vārttika*. So Ms 76a3-4 (AL 225.1-3), which proposes to connect two *vākya*s which turn out to be vt. 4 and 5 on P. 1.1.38 (*vākyasya vākyena sambandhād adoṣaḥ | idam eva sambandham upanīyate | avibhaktāv itaretarāśrayatvād aprasiddhiḥ* [= vt. 4] *aliṅgam asaṅkhyam iti vā* [= vt. 5]…). Similarly, Ms 68c2 (AL 205.6, CE VI[1].17.25-26) summarizes the contents of P. 1.1.27 vt. 7 (*ubhayasya sarvanāmatve 'kaj arthaḥ*) in the words: *akac prayojanam iti samāpto vākyārthaḥ*; this is then contrasted with the opinion of the *bhāṣyakāra*: *bhāṣyakāras tu naivaṃ vākyārthaṃ varṇayati | kevalaṃ pāṭhaprayojanāny upanyasyati*.

On one occasion Bhartṛhari ascribes something to the Bhāṣya which at least one later author considers written by Kātyāyana. Mbh II.44.17-18 (on P. 3.1.35 vt. 1) has: *evaṃ tarhi kāsyanekāca iti vaktavyam | kim* [138] *prayojanam | culumpādyartham | culumpāṃ cakāra daridrāṃ cakāra*. Neither this nor any part of it is considered a *vārttika* in Kielhorn's edition. Also Bhartṛhari seems to consider the whole of this part of the Bhāṣya, for he says (Ms 14c5; AL 46.6; Sw 55.2; CE I.38.4): *culumpādayo 'pi bhāṣya evoccāryante*. But Jinendrabuddhi, the author of the commentary Nyāsa on the Kāśikā on P. 3.1.35 (II.415.25-26) is of a different opinion: *culumpater dhātuṣv aparipaṭhitasyāpi kāsyanekājgrahaṇaṃ culumpādyartham iti kātyāyanavacanaprāmāṇyāt dhātutvaṃ veditavyam*.

2.2.3 The above observations leave us with the impression that in Bhartṛhari's opinion the Mahābhāṣya as a whole consisted of at least four distinguishable parts: (1) the *sūtras* of Pāṇini; (2) the *vākya*s; (3) certain Bhāṣya portions, mainly explanatory of *vākya*s, referred to as *vārttika*; (4) the remaining Bhāṣya portions, composed by a different author. This enumeration is no doubt not complete — Bhartṛhari mentions e.g. once a separate *ślokavārttikakāra* (Ms 29d9; AL 92.10; Sw 108.7; CE II.39.20) — but it accounts for most of the Mahābhāṣya.

A confirmation of the correctness of this fourfold division is found in Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya 1.23 and the Vṛtti thereon. VP 1.23 reads:

> *nityāḥ śabdārthasaṃbandhās tatrāmnātā maharṣibhiḥ* |
> *sūtrāṇaṃ sānutantrāṇāṃ bhāṣyāṇāṃ ca praṇetṛbhiḥ* ||

This verse distinguishes between *sūtra*s, *anutantra*s[17] and *bhāṣya*s (note the plural). The Vṛtti however makes a fourfold division: *sūtra*, *anutantra*, *bhāṣya* and *anutantrabhāṣya* (pp. 61-63). Examples of these four categories are given, as follows:

(1) *sūtra* — P. 1.2.53

(2) *anutantra* — (a) vt. 1 in Āhnika 1; (b) P. 1.1.1 vt. 9 = P. 1.3.1 vt. 10; (c) an unknown quotation (*sphoṭaḥ śabdo dhvanis tasya vyāyāma upajāyate*); (d) part of a verse quoted (?) at Mbh I p. 75, l. 13

(3) *bhāṣya* — a (distorted) sentence from the Bhāṣya preceding the first *vārttika* of Āhnika 1 (*saṃgrahe etat prādhānyena parīkṣitaṃ nityaḥ śabdaḥ*)

(4) *anutantrabhāṣya* (a) Mbh I p. 18, l. 14-15, which is part of the commentary on vt. 12 on Śivasūtra 1[18]; (b) Mbh I p. 113, l. 13-14, which occurs in the Bhāṣya that precedes the first *vārttika* on P. 1.1.46; (c) Mbh I p. 137, l. 19-20, which illustrates P. 1.1.56 vt. 14.

[139]

The only puzzling quotation is 4b. Since however 4b and 4c clearly belong together — both consist of two parts which are connected in the Bhāṣya with the words *tataḥ paścād āha* — and 4c belongs to a *vārttika*, we may not be troubled overmuch by 4b.[19]

It should be clear by now that the division of the Mahābhāṣya which came to be generally accepted was not taken for granted by Bhartṛhari. Where we see in the short sentences which are commented upon in the Bhāṣya (the 'Vārttikas') the work of one author (or perhaps several of them), in the Bhāṣya the work of another, Bhartṛhari's idea on this

---

[17] It is not impossible that Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā makes a reference to *anutantra*s at Ms 13b7 (AL 41.17, Sw 49.18, CE I.34.19). The Ms reading *etannārthataṃtrāṇaṃ bhāṣyasyā brūyāt* is obviously corrupt and may have to be amended into *etan nānutantrāṇāṃ bhāṣyasya vā brūyāt*.

[18] The same phrase occurs Mbh I p. 75, l. 8-9 (on P. 1.1.20 vt. 5); p. 112, l. 24-25 (on P. 1.1.46); III p. 420, l. 21 - p. 421, l. 1 (on P. 8.2.106 vt. 1).

[19] The Vṛtti has a puzzling reference to a 'Vārttika' on VP 2.207, a passage which Prof. A. N. Aklujkar was kind enough to send me after the completion of this article, and which can now also be found in K. A. Subramania Iyer's recent edition (p. 241): *syā... vārttike 'bhihitāny udāharaṇāny jugupsate gopāyitā brāhmaṇādhīnaṃ yāvaka iti*. The context shows that the topic of discussion is meaningless (*svārthika*) suffixes, and indeed all the words enumerated are formed with such an affix: *jugupsate* by P. 3.1.5, *gopāyitā* by P. 3.1.28, *brāhmaṇādhīnam* by P. 5.4.7 and *yāvakaḥ* by P. 5.4.29. But these words are not given as illustrations in either Bhāṣya or *vārttika*s. Perhaps we must conclude that the Vṛtti referred to another work called 'Vārttika', the precise name of which (*syā... vārttika*) has become unrecognizable.

matter was different. He too distinguished between at least two authors, but he drew the boundaries differently. We may not be able to say regarding each portion of the Mahābhāṣya to which author Bhartṛhari ascribed it.[20] It seems however clear that in his opinion many Bhāṣya portions and many, or most, *vārttika*s belonged together and had one single author. These parts of the Mahābhāṣya were called 'Vārttika' by Bhartṛhari.

2.3.   Little is known about the history of Pāṇinian grammar from Patañjali until Bhartṛhari (about 150 B.C. — 450 A.D.). Yet there is one surviving work which probably belongs to this period and which refers to the Mahābhāṣya and the *vārttika*s therein: Vyāḍi's Paribhāṣāvṛtti (see Bronkhorst 1983: section 6). This work leaves no doubt that its author was well acquainted with the Mahābhāṣya (Abhyankar 1967: Intr. p. 11, 13-14). But it does not mention the Mahābhāṣya or its author Patañjali by name. It does however refer by name to the author of the *vārttika*s. Vyāḍi mentions the (or a) 'Vārttikakāra' twice, viz. on Paribhāṣās 6 (p. 6, l. 7) and 32 (p. 16, l. 16). The *vārttika*s referred to are P. 5.4.69 vt. 1 and P. 3.1.13 vt. 1 and 2 respectively. The non-mention of Patañjali and his Mahābhāṣya may indicate that these were not yet conceived of as different from 'Vārttikakāra' and 'Vārttika'.

A separate position is occupied by Śabara's Mīmāṃsābhāṣya. On *sūtra* 10.8.4 this work quotes a *vārttika* (P. 2.1.1 vt. 2), ascribes it to the [140] (or a) 'Vārttikakāra' who is then named 'Kātyāyana' (*nityo hy asya naśabdasya subantasaṃbandhena samāsa iti vārttikāro bhagavān kātyāyano manyate sma / vāvacanānarthakyañ ca svabhāvasiddhatvād iti* [P. 2.1.1 vt. 2]). The information that the Vārttikakāra was called 'Kātyāyana' can be derived from the Bhāṣya on P. 3.2.118 (cf. Kielhorn 1876a: 26), with the implication that the author of the Bhāṣya was someone else. The Mahābhāṣya is repeatedly quoted in the Mīmāṃsābhāṣya (Garge 1952: 23-25), but never mentioned by name; its author is usually not mentioned either, but the words *ācārya* and *abhiyukta* are used once each in this connection. The impression is here created that neither the work nor its author had a generally accepted name.

This brings us to the remarkable fact that the names 'Patañjali'[21] and Mahābhāṣya do not seem to have been used in connection with grammar in any work older than the Vṛtti on Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya. They occur for the first time in VP 2.482 and 485, verses which are really part of the Vṛtti (Bronkhorst 1988: 123 f.). Were these names invented in order to fill the lacuna which came about when it was discovered that more than one author had composed the Mahābhāṣya as it was known, viz., with *vārttika*s?

3.1.   The striking agreement between the use of the word *vārttika* in the Yuktidīpikā and in Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā, and the agreement which must consequently have existed

---

[20] Bhartṛhari may not have been certain about this himself in all cases.
[21] Note that VP 2.482 and 485 have *pātañjali*, not 'Patañjali'; see Bronkhorst 1983: section 7.3. Another early mention of the name, possibly designating the author of the Mahābhāṣya there as well, occurs in the Pāli Cūlavaṃsa 37.217; here the spelling is *pātañjali*. The Yuktidīpikā refers to a Sāṅkhya philosopher of this name

between their views on the Mahābhāṣya,[22] explain how 'Vārttika' could for some time come to denote a category of literary compositions in which short nominal sentences alternate with their explanations in a more verbal style, as exemplified in the Yuktidīpikā and the Tattvārthavārttika (both of which are also called Rājavārttika). It may also explain something else which has long puzzled modern students.

I-ching, the Chinese pilgrim who visited India at the end of the 7th century, mentions in his chapter on the Sanskrit grammarians a work which he calls 'Vṛttisūtra' and ascribes to Jayāditya (Brough 1973: [141] 255 f.; cf. Takakusu 1896: 175 f.). This work consists of 18,000 *śloka*s and "supplements its *sūtra*-text, and discusses in detail numerous (possible) interpretations. (…) It discusses fully the (grammatical) usages current in the world, and investigates the rules of (the language addressed to) the gods".[23] The Vṛttisūtra is commented upon in the Cūrṇi. The Cūrṇi, which contains 24,000 *ślokas*, "is a work of the learned Pātañjala.[24] This, again, cites the former Sūtras". The Cūrṇi is again commented upon in the 'Bhartṛhariśāstra'.

At an earlier occasion (1983: App. I) I tentatively proposed that Jayāditya collected the *vārttika*s and *vārttika*-like statements found in the Kāśikā, and perhaps composed some of them. In this way, I suggested, I-ching's obvious confusion of Kātyāyana and Jayāditya would become understandable. 'Vṛttisūtra' would then be a name both for Kātyāyana's *vārttika*s and for the *vārttika*-like statements in the Kāśikā.

The present investigation has made another interpretation far more probable. Since we have now come to think that at this early date Kātyāyana's *vārttika*s were not looked upon as a separate work by themselves, I-ching cannot have heard about this as a separate work and then made a mistake about its authorship. Rather, he may have heard of the twofold division of the Mahābhāṣya which we now think was current at that time, viz. the division between a 'Vārttika' which contained far more than just nominal sentences, and the remainder of the Bhāṣya.

It appears that I-ching knew just this division, and used the names *vṛttisūtra* and *cūrṇi* for them. The first of these two names is peculiar in this context, but I-ching's account leaves us no choice. The name *cūrṇi* for the Mahābhāṣya, or much of it, is already familiar to us.

We see that according to I-ching's testimony the Vṛttisūtra is smaller, but not much smaller, than the Cūrṇi. Together they count 42,000 *śloka*s, a number which may be less than

on a few occasions. Normally it has 'Patañjali', once (p. 121, l. 9 [with fn. 2] *pātañjal^O*, it seems. The Yoga Bhāṣya (3.44) has 'Patañjali'. See further Weber 1862: 147n.

[22] The modern view is already present in Jinendrabuddhi's Nyāsa where it explains (I p. 4): *bhāṣyaṃ kātyāyanapraṇītānāṃ vākyānāṃ vivaraṇaṃ patañjalipraṇītam*. Similarly Haradatta's Padamañjarī.

[23] The translation is Brough's (1973: 257), who points at the similarity of the second sentence with the opening lines of the Mahābhāṣya; see below.

[24] Brough (1973: 257) suggests that the Chinese transcription "has apparently arisen from a confusion between the name of the author, Patañjali, and a designation of his work: I-ching must have heard some such form as *Pātañjala-bhāṣya*". If I-ching heard 'Pātañjali' rather than 'Patañjali' (see note 20 above), the confusion becomes even more intelligible.

half the real total number of the Mahābhāṣya,[25] but which is at any rate far closer to the truth than the number of 24,000 *sloka*s said to be contained in the Cūrṇi. [142] I-ching's description of the Vṛttisūtra ("It discusses fully the (grammatical) usages current in the world, and investigates the rules of (the language addressed to) the gods"; see above) may reflect the opening lines of the Mahābhāṣya (*keṣāṃ śabdānām / laukikānāṃ vaidikānāṃ ca*), as Brough (1973: 257) has pointed out. In this case the conclusion seems justified that these lines were considered part of the 'Vārttika' at that time.

The objection that the name 'Jayāditya' points toward the Kāśikā as being meant by 'Vṛttisūtra' is not strong. The opinion that the Kāśikā had two authors, Jayāditya and Vāmana, is almost certainly wrong and probably due to Jinendrabuddhi's Nyāsa (Bronkhorst 1983: App. I). This means that we know little about who wrote the Kāśikā, and few conclusions can be drawn from the name 'Jayāditya'.

It must here be conceded that Brough was able to draw what appear to be correct conclusions merely from I-ching's statements, without the information which we now think we possess on the ideas which existed regarding the Mahābhāṣya in I-ching's time. He observed (1973: 257): "It seems likely, however, that I-ching was unable to discriminate between the *Vārttikas* and the *Mahābhāṣya*: witness his statement that the '*vṛtti-sūtra*' consists of 18,000 *ślokas*; and the second part of the Chinese passage quoted makes sense if I-ching is basing it on the opening lines of the Mahābhāṣya (…)". This lack of discrimination, we now think, was not confined to I-ching.

3.2.   The name 'Vārttika' did not only come to denote works like the Yuktidīpikā and the Tattvārthavārttika. In fact, among the early works called 'Vārttika'[26] there are far more which are of a different type altogether. Most seem to follow the example of the verses quoted in the Mahābhāṣya, often called *ślokavārttika* by the commentators (see Kielhorn 1886: 229 [215]). Indeed, several works are called 'Ślokavārttika'. The most famous among them was composed by the Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. Another Ślokavārttika was written by Vidyānanda and comments on the Tattvārtha Sūtra. There is also a Niruktaślokavārttika.

Besides the self-styled 'Ślokavārttikas' there are many 'Vārttikas' which consist of verse. From among the many instances may be mentioned Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika, Sureśvara's Brahmasūtra-, Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad- and Taittirīyopaniṣad-vārttika, two Śivasūtravārttikas (one by Bhāskara, one by Varadarāja), and others.
[143]

It is clear from this enumeration that 'Vārttika' came to designate primarily a commentary in verse-form. Prose Vārttikas like the Yuktidīpikā and the Tattvārthavārttika are few in number. Besides these two works there is Uddyotakara's Nyāyavārttika which

---

[25] I-ching does not seem to have had much idea of what a *śloka* was; see Brough 1973: 249 n. 8.

[26] The original Vārttika of Kātyāyana was, in accordance with its derivation, 'dealing with the procedure of the grammar [of Pāṇini]' (Thieme 1955: 429 [697] n. 1). The later authors of Vārttikas may or may not have had a similar purpose in view.

however contains only some passages in 'Vārttika' style (see Wezler 1974: 441 f.). Other prose Vārttikas like Kumārila's Tantravārttika, Vijñānabhikṣu's Yogabhāṣyavārttika and Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka's Daivavārttika do not seem to preserve a trace of it. Moreover, the 'Vārttika' style is used once in Jayantabhaṭṭa's Nyāyamañjarī (Wezler 1974: 442 f.), a work which does not seem to have been considered a 'Vārttika' at any time. The same is true of the Nyāya Bhāṣya, in which this style was already noticed by Windisch (1888: 15 f.). Something closely resembling this style is found in other works as well, e.g., in Śaṅkara's Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad Bhāṣya.[27] This means that the style of the Yuktidīpikā and of the Tattvārthavārttika stopped being looked upon as typical for prose Vārttikas rather soon. We may suspect that this was not unconnected with the changing ideas regarding the Mahābhāṣya.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abhyankar, K. V. (ed.) 1967: Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Post-graduate and Research Department Series, no. 7).

Akalaṅka: Tattvārthavārttika. Edited by Mahendra Kumar Jain. Banaras: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Kāshi, 1953 (Jñāna-Pīṭha Mūrtidevi Jaina Granthamālā, Saṃskrit Grantha no. 10). [Only one volume, covering four Adhyāyas, was accessible to me].

Bali, Suryakant 1976: Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: His Contribution to Sanskrit Grammar. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Bhartṛhari: 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 Ṭīkā. 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, 1983 ff.

[144]

Bhartṛhari: Vākyapadīya. Edited by Wilhelm Rau. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1977 (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XLII, 4).

Bhartṛhari: Vākyapadīya Kāṇḍa I with the Vṛtti and the Paddhati of Vṛṣabhadeva. Edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer. Poona: Deccan College 1966 (Deccan College Monograph Series 32).

Bhartṛhari: Vākyapadīya Kāṇḍa II. Containing the Ṭīkā of Puṇyarāja and the Ancient Vṛtti. Edited by K. A. Subramanian Iyer. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

---

[27] This was pointed out to me by Prof. T. E. Vetter.

Bhartṛhari: Vākyapadīya Kāṇḍa III with the Prakīrṇakaprakāśa of Helārāja. 2 volumes. Edited by K. A. Subramanian Iyer. Poona: Deccan College, 1963-73.

Böhtlingk, Otto - Roth, Rudolph 1855-75: Sanskrit-Wörterbuch. 7 volumes. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Bronkhorst, Johannes 1983: On the History of Pāṇinian Grammar in the Early Centuries following Patañjali. Journal of Indian Philosophy 11, pp. 357-412.

Bronkhorst, Johannes 1985: A possible quotation from the Niruktavārttika known to Durga in the Yuktidīpikā. In: Proceedings of the Fifth World Sanskrit Conference. Edited by R. N. Dandekar - P. D. Navathe. New Delhi: Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, pp. 90-100.

Bronkhorst, Johannes 1987: Three Problems Pertaining to the Mahābhāṣya. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Bronkhorst, Johannes 1988: Études sur Bhartṛhari, 1. L'auteur et la date de la Vṛtti. Bulletin d'Études Indiennes 6, pp. 105-143.

Brough, John 1973: I-ching on the Sanskrit Grammarians. Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 36, pp. 248-60.

Cūlavaṃsa. Edited by Wilhelm Geiger. Vol. I. London: Pali Text Society, 1925.

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

Helārāja: Prakīrṇakaprakāśa. See under Bhartṛhari.

Iyer, K. A. Subramania (tr.) 1977: The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari. Kāṇḍa II. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

Jain, Jyoti Prasad 1964: The Jain Sources of the History of Ancient India (100 B.C. - A.D. 900). Delhi: Munshi Ram Manoharlal.

Jinendrabuddhi: Nyāsa. See Kāśikā 2.

Joshi, S. D. 1968: Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Samarthāhnika (P. 2.1.1). Poona: University of Poona (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, no. 3).

Joshi, S. D. - Roodbergen, J. A. F. 1981: Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Prātipadikārthaśeṣāhnika (P. 2.3.46 - 2.3.71). Pune: University of Poona (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, no. 14).

[145]

Kāśikā. 1) Edited by Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande and D. G. Padhye. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University, 1969-70. 2) Edited, with the Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi and the Padamañjarī of Haradatta, by Swami Dwarika Das Shastri and Pt. Kalika Prasad Shukla. 6 volumes. Varanasi: Prachya Bharati Prakashan, 1965-67 (Prachya Bharati Series 2-7).

Kielhorn, Franz 1876a: Kātyāyana and Patañjali: Their Relation to Each Other and to Pāṇini. Bombay (= Kleine Schriften, hrsg. v. W. Rau. Wiesbaden, 1969, I/1-64).

Kielhorn, Franz 1876b: On the Mahâbhâshya. Indian Antiquary 5, pp. 241-51 (= Kleine Schriften I/169-79).

Kielhorn, Franz (ed.) 1880-85: The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. 3 volumes. Third edition revised by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962-72.

Kielhorn, Franz 1886: Notes on the Mahabhasya. 4. Some suggestions regarding the verses (Karikas) in the Mahabhashya. Indian Antiquary 15, pp. 228-33 (= Kleine Schriften I/214-19).

Mahādeva: Uṇādikośa. Edited by K. Kunjunni Raja. University of Madras, 1956 (Madras University Sanskrit Series 21).

Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira 1973: Saṃskṛta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa. 3 volumes. Sonipat: Rāma Lāl Kapūr Trust. Saṃvat 2030.

Nyāsa. In: Nyāsa or Pañcikā Commentary of Åcārya Jinendrabuddhipāda and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra on the Kāśikāvṛtti of Vāmana-Jayāditya. Edited by Dwarikadas Shastri and Kalikaprasad Shukla. Parts I-VI. Varanasi: Tara Publications, 1965-67 (Prāchya Bhāratī Series 2-7).

Ojihara, Yutaka 1978: Sur une formule patañjalienne: "*na cedānīm ācāryāḥ sūtrāṇi kṛtvā nivartayanti*". In: Proceedings of the Third World Sanskrit Conference (Paris, 20-25 June 1977). Torino (Indologica Taurinensia 6), pp. 219-234.

Padamañjarī. See under Nyāsa.

Patañjali: Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Volumes I-III. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962-72.

Rocher, Rosane 1971: Review of A. Wezler's Paribhāṣā IV, V und XV. Journal of the American Oriental Society 91, pp. 314 f.

Śabara: Mīmāṃsā Bhāṣya. In: Mīmāṃsādarśana. Edited by Kāśīnātha Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyaṃkara and Pt. Gaṇeśaśāstrī Jośī. Poona: Ånandāśrama, 1973-84 (Ånandāśrama Saṃskṛtagranthāvali 97).

Takakusu, J. (tr.) 1896: A Record of the Buddhist Religion as practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695), by I-tsing. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Thieme, Paul 1955: Review of The Sanskrit Language by T. Burrow. Language 31, pp. 428-48 (= Kleine Schriften, hrsg. v. G. Buddruss. Wiesbaden 1971, II/696-716).

Vṛṣabhadeva: Paddhati. See under Bhartṛhari.

[146]

Vyāḍi: Paribhāṣāvṛtti = Abhyankar 1967: 1-38.

Weber, Albrecht 1862: Zur Frage über das Zeitalter Pâṇini's. Mit specieller Beziehung auf Th. Goldstücker's "preface" zum "Mânavakalpasūtra". Indische Studien 5, pp. 1-176.

Wezler, Albrecht 1974: Some Observations on the Yuktidīpikā. In: XVIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag. Vorträge hrsg. von W. Voigt. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Suppl. II), pp. 434-455.

Windisch, Ernst 1888: Ueber das Nyāyabhāshya. Leipzig.

Yuktidīpikā. Edited by Ram Chandra Pandeya. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967.

ABBREVIATIONS

AL	Abhyankar and Limaye's edition of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
Bh	Bhartṛhari
CE	'Critical edition' of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
Mbh	Mahābhāṣya
Ms	Manuscript of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
P.	Pāṇinian Sūtra
Sw	Swaminathan's edition of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
TS	Tattvārthasūtra
VP	Vākyapadīya
YD	Yuktidīpikā