

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

## FURTHER REMARKS ON BHARTRHARI'S VEDIC AFFILIATION

(published in: *Studies in Indian Culture*. S. Ramachandra Rao Felicitation Volume. Bangalore: Professor S. Ramachandra Rao Felicitation Committee. 1987. Pp. 216-223)

Not long ago Wilhelm Rau (1980) surveyed the Vedic quotations in Bhartrhari's works and showed that Bhartrhari may have been a Maitrāyaṇīya. The evidence which Rau presented was strong indeed, and subsequent research strengthened it still further (Bronkhorst, 1981). It now seems that Rau's case can be made even stronger.

1.1. Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya on P. 1.1.6 raises the question how the form *dīdhyat* is to be accounted for without sūtra 1.1.6.<sup>1</sup> Bhartrhari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya explains (Ms 42b10-11; AL 127.8-10; Sw 148.24-26):

*kathaṃ dīdhyad iti / ekadeśa udāharaṇatvenopanyastāḥ / kvacit tu nīpūrvasya  
prayogaḥ 'aindraḥ prāṇo aṅge aṅge nidīdhyat' iti / asati yoge guṇaḥ prāpnoti dīdhyad  
iti /*

With regard to [the phrase in the Bhāṣya] 'how [do we account for the form] *dīdhyat*' [we say:] A part is [only] mentioned by way of example. Somewhere [this form] is used preceded by *nī*, as follows: *aindraḥ prāṇo aṅge aṅge nidīdhyat*. Without the rule (P. 1.6.6) there would be [substitution of] *guṇa*, as follows: *dīdhyat*.

There can be little doubt that this is the correct reading. The single Ms differs from this reconstructed text in two major points. It has, at the end, *letavyam iti dīdhyad iti* for our *dīdhyad iti*. The fact that sūtra 1.1.6 deals with the prevention of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* of final *ī* in *dīdhī* ensures that our emended reading is correct.

[217]

A far more significant deviation occurs in the quotation which reads in the Ms: *aindraḥ prāṇo śragre aṅge ni dedhyad*. Here *śragre* for *aṅge* is but one of the numerous mistakes in which the Ms abounds (the two forms look similar in Devanāgarī). But *dedhyat* for *dīdhyat* may be more than an orthographic error. The context clearly allows of *nidīdhyat* only, but there may have been a good reason for writing *nidedhyat*. The fact is that *aindraḥ prāṇo aṅge*

---

<sup>1</sup> Mbh I.56.8: *yadī tarhy ayaṃ yogo nārabhyate kathaṃ dīdhyad iti*.

*aṅge nidīdhyat* is a quotation from MS 1.2.17 (p. 27 l. 6-7),<sup>2</sup> whereas the same with *nidedhyat* stems from TS 1.3.10.1 and 6.3.11.2.

This suggests that one of the scribes in the chain that led to the one incomplete and corrupt Ms of Bhartrhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā which remains, was a Taittirīya who 'corrected' Vedic quotations where they seemed to him incorrectly written quotations from the Taittirīya texts.

If this is true, some Vedic quotations may appear in the Taittirīya version in our Ms and editions, where the Maitrāyaṇīya version was intended by Bhartrhari. One example would be this very quotation *aindraḥ prāṇo* etc., which appears with *nidedhyat* in both the existing editions of this part of Bhartrhari's Mahābhāṣyadīpikā, and which was consequently classified as a Taittirīya quotation by Rau.

1.2. The above conjecture finds support in the *adhriḡu* passage quoted in the Mahābhāṣyadīpikā (Ms 3a10-b6; AL 7.22-8.7; Sw 9.5-17; Rau, 1980: 172-73). The *adhriḡu* passage occurs in one form or another in various Vedic texts, but Bhartrhari's version derives from the Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā. This is clear from the fact that the final lines as quoted by Bhartrhari occur only in the Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā. Those lines read, both in the slightly emended Mahābhāṣyadīpikā and in MS 4.13.4 (p. 204 l. 5-6):

*adhriḡuś ca vipāpaś ca devānāṃ śamitārau |*  
*tā enam pravidvāmsau śrapayatam yathāsya śrapaṇam tathā |*

There are however some deviations between the *adhriḡu* passage in the Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā and as quoted by Bhartrhari; they are enumerated by Rau (1980: 172). In all these cases [218] Bhartrhari's text agrees with the Taittirīya version of the *adhriḡu* passage (TB 3.6.6).

Referring the reader to Rau's article for further details, I shall merely list the differences here:

MS	Bh	TB
<i>medhapataye</i>	<i>medhapatibhyām</i>	<i>medhapatibhyām</i>
—	<i>antarikṣam asum</i>	<i>diśaḥ śrotram</i>
	<i>diśaḥ śrotram</i>	<i>antarikṣam asum</i>
<i>vārayadhvāt</i>	<i>vārayatāt</i>	<i>vārayatāt</i>
(all mss but one)		
<i>anuṣṭhuyo-</i>	<i>anuṣṭhyo-</i>	<i>anuṣṭhyo</i>
—	<i>śamitāraḥ</i>	<i>śamitāraḥ</i>

<sup>2</sup> Also VS 6.20; ŚB 3.8.3.37; KS 3.7; KapS 2.14.

Rau hesitates to ascribe Bhartrhari's quotation to either the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā or the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa. It now seems clear that a Taittirīya scribe 'corrected' a Maitrāyaṇīya passage.

2.1. It follows from the above that all quotations from the Taittirīya Saṃhitā in the surviving Ms of the Mahābhāṣyadīpikā are suspect whenever there is but a slightly deviating version in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. An example is found in the following passage (Ms 11b6-7; AL 34.15-16; Sw 41.4-5):

*vākovākyaṃ uktipratyuktigranthaḥ kiṃsvid āvapaṇaṃ mahad ityevamādiḥ.* [A *vākovākya* (mentioned Mbh 1.9.22) is a passage in the form of statement and counterstatement, such as *kiṃsvid āvapaṇaṃ mahad.*]

The passage is very corrupt and had to be reconstructed with the help of Kaiyaṭa (*uktipratyukti*) and TS 7.4.18.1 and TB 3.9.5.4 (*kiṃsvid āvapaṇaṃ mahad*). Only the word *kiṃsvid* is clear.

It is however the word *kiṃsvid* which characterizes this quoted line as Taittirīya. The Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā has the same line as *kim av āvapaṇaṃ mahat* or perhaps *kim v āvapaṇaṃ mahat* (3.12.19; p. 166, l. 1). This last form occurs furthermore in the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā (23.9 and 45), and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (13.2.6.13); in this form it is also quoted at [219] Mbh III.430.5. In the Taittirīya Saṃhitā as well as in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā and the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā this line is part of 'a passage in the form of statement and counterstatement', i.e. of question and answer.

Since there is no clear reason why Bhartrhari should quote the Taittirīya version of this line, we may suspect that he didn't. It seems likely that here too a quotation was changed into its Taittirīya form by the very scribe whose influence was demonstrated above. The original quotation may have been from the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā or, but then probably through the Mahābhāṣya, from the White Yajurveda.

2.2. The following case is more interesting. A quotation is given at Ms 3a4-5, AL 7.14, Sw 8.20-21: *yat paśur māyūm akṛtoro vā padbhir āhate / agnir mā tasmād enaso viśvān muñcatv aṃhasaḥ /*. This occurs at TS 2.1.4.3 and KŚS 25.9.12.

This quotation occurs in the context of 'modification' (*ūha*) and Bhartrhari shows in the immediate sequel how it is modified to suit the situation where two or more sacrificial animals are used; it then becomes *yat paśū māyūm akṛṣātām uro vā padbhir āhasātām* and *yat*

*paśavo māyūm akṛṣata uro vā padbhir āhasata* respectively. This shows that the last word of the first part of the quotation should be *āhata*, not *āhate*.<sup>3</sup>

This suggests that a Maitrāyaṇīya text that contained the same two lines, but with *āhata*, was known to Bhartrhari. The Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, which belongs to the Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā, has at 1.8.3.34, in all the Mss inspected by its editor Jeanette M. van Gelder, the two lines in its following form: *yat paśur māyūm akṛta uro vā padbhir āhutaḥ / agnir nas tasmād enaso viśvān muñcatv aṃhasaḥ /*. It is clear that *āhutaḥ* makes no sense, and van Gelder 'corrected' it to *āhate*, presumably under the influence of the Taittirīya reading.

It is obvious, however, that an emendation into *āhata* would have remained closer to the Mss, besides agreeing better with the other verb *akṛta*. It seems safe to conclude that Bhartrhari quoted the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra in its correct form, i.e., with *āhata* and *nas*. We may then assume that the [220] Taittirīya readings *āhate* and *mā* were subsequently inserted in the text by the same Taittirīya scribe.

3.1. Not all quotations from the Taittirīya Samhitā can be considered 'corrected' by our scribe. More often than once the quotation is not directly from the Taittirīya Samhitā but through the intermediary of another text.

The clearest examples of this type are the quotations which also occur in the Mahābhāṣya. Mbh II.148.9 (on P. 3.3.36 vt. 3) and III.404.11 (on P. 8.2.32 vt. 1) cite the line *udgrābhaṃ ca nirgrābhaṃ ca brahma devā avīṛdhan*, the second time to illustrate the vārttika *hṛgrahor bhaś chandasi hasya*. Bhartrhari quotes this vārttika and the line *udgrābhaṃ ca (...)* at Ms 2b3-4, AL 5.9-11, Sw 6.6-8. Here Bhartrhari quotes the line as it is found in the Mahābhāṣya and in the Taittirīya Samhitā<sup>4</sup>. The Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā<sup>5</sup> has this line in the form *udgrābhaś ca nirgrābhaś ca brahma devam* (or *devām/devān*) *avīṛdhat*, but there is no reason to think that Bhartrhari substituted the Maitrāyaṇī reading for what he found in the Mahābhāṣya.

Mbh I.17.24 (on Śivasūtra 1 vt. 10) cites TS 2.5.7.1 *triḥ prathamām anvāha trir uttamām*. Bhartrhari quotes this line at Ms 67d9, AL 203.20.

3.2. In some cases we get the impression that Bhartrhari quoted a line from the Taittirīya Samhitā through a work on Mīmāṃsā. It seems clear that Bhartrhari did not know Śabara's Bhāṣya on the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra, but it is equally clear that he did know one or more

<sup>3</sup> Ms 60c7 (AL 181.21; CE V.22.18) has part of the quotation in the form *uro vā padbhir āhāta* which must be emended to (...) *āhata* in view of its context. The context deals with the view that a plural need not be used in cases where the remainder of the sentence leaves no doubt that a plurality of things is discussed. Two examples are given to illustrate this: *sūryaṃ cakṣur gamāyatāt* and *uro vā padbhir āhata*. Both these examples had been discussed earlier by Bhartrhari as instances where *cakṣuḥ* and *uraḥ* keep a singular ending even where the remainder of the sentence becomes plural on account of *ūha* 'modification'. It seems obvious that in the present context too a reference is made to the behaviour of these sentences in 'modification'.

<sup>4</sup> 1.1.13.1; 1.6.4.2; 4.6.3.4. Also VS 17.64; ŚB 9.2.3.22.

<sup>5</sup> 1.1.13 (p. 8, l. 15). Also KS 1.12; 18.3; cf. MŚS 1.4.3.7.

works on Mīmāṃsā which by and large dealt with the same subjects (see Bronkhorst, 1989). It is therefore sufficient for our purposes to point at Bhartrhari's quotations from the Taittirīya Saṃhitā which also occur in Śabara's Bhāṣya.

Ms 10c12, AL 32.9, Sw 38.6 quotes TS 6.1.3.8 *kṛṣṇaviṣāṇayā kaṇḍūyati*.<sup>6</sup> This also occurs in Śabara's Bhāṣya on PMS 6.2.6 (p. 228, l. 6) and 11.3.13 (p. 86, l. 25).

TS 2.1.1.1 *vāyavyaṃ śvetam ālabheta* is quoted by Bhartrhari (Ms 57a6; AL 171.15; CE V.14.17-18) as *śvetam vāyavyam ālabheta*, and in its correct order by Śabara on PMS 1.2.7 [221] (p. 10, l. 2), 2.3.12 (p. 174, l. 13), 4.2.25 (p. 55, l. 3), 10.2.69 (p. 307, l. 16), 10.3.1 (p. 313, l. 10), 10.3.13 (p. 318, l. 10), 10.4.42 (p. 392, l. 7).

TS 2.4.6.1 *sārasvatau bhavataḥ* is quoted by Bhartrhari (Ms 43c1; AL 131.5; Sw 153.7-8) and also by Śabara on PMS 5.1.14 (p. 118, l. 5).

TS 6.3.10.4 *hr̥dayasyāgre 'vadyaty atha jihvāyā atha vakṣasaḥ* is quoted by Bhartrhari (Ms 95b2-3; AL 274.3) and by Śabara on PMS 2.1.32 (p. 420, l. 12), 2.2.17 (p. 64, l. 10), 5.1.5 (p. 111, l. 22 - p. 112, l. 1).

4. Other evidence agrees with the assumption that Bhartrhari may not have had a direct acquaintance with the texts of the Taittirīyas. At one point Bhartrhari ascribes something to the Vājasaneyins which clearly belongs to the Taittirīyas (Bronkhorst, 1989: § 1.1). And the one time he ascribes a quotation to the Taittirīyakas it cannot be traced (Rau, 1980: 174 no. 76).

The above permits the following consideration, namely that all the Taittirīya quotations in the Mahābhāṣyadīpikā may (i) partly derive from other works which acted as intermediaries, primarily the Mahābhāṣya and a work on Mīmāṃsā; and (ii) partly be due to the 'corrections' by a Taittirīyaka scribe who made the copy of which the one surviving Ms of the Mahābhāṣyadīpikā is a descendant.

[222]

### Bibliography

Bhartrhari: 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 Ṭikā. 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.

<sup>6</sup> More accurate would be (...) *kaṇḍūyate*, but both Bhartrhari and Śabara have (...) *kaṇḍūyati*.

- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1981): "On some Vedic quotations in Bhartṛhari's works". *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7, pp. 173-75.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1989): "Studies on Bhartṛhari, 2: Bhartṛhari and Mīmāṃsā." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 15, 101-117.
- Mānava Śrauta Sūtra. Edited by Jeanette M. van Gelder. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture. 1961.
- Patañjali: Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Edited by F. Kielhorn. [223] Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962-72.
- Rau, Wilhelm (1980): "Bhartṛhari und der Veda". *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 5/6 (Festschrift Paul Thieme), pp. 167-80.
- Śabara: Mīmāṃsā Bhāṣya. In: *Mīmāṃsādarśana*. Edited by Kāśīnātha Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyankara and Pt. Gaṇeśaśāstrī Joṣī. Poona: Ānandāśrama. 1973-84. (Ānandāśrama Saṃskṛtagranthāvali 97.)

### Abbreviations

AL	Abhyankar and Limaye's edition of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
Bh	Bhartṛhari
CE	'Critical edition' of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
KapS	Kaṣiṭhala Saṃhitā
KS	Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā
KŚS	Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra
Mbh	Mahābhāṣya
Ms	Manuscript of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
MS	Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā (ed. L. V. Schroeder)
MŚS	Mānava Śrauta Sūtra
P.	Pāṇinian sūtra
PMS	Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtra
ŚB	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa
Sw	Swaminathan's edition of Bhartṛhari's Mahābhāṣya Dīpikā
TB	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa
TS	Taittirīya Saṃhitā
VS	Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā