

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

On some Vedic quotations in Bhartrhari's works

(Published in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7 (1981), pp. 173-175)

In an earlier volume of this journal Wilhelm Rau (1980) listed and, as far as possible, traced the Vedic quotations in Bhartrhari's *Vākyapadīya* and his commentary to the *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*. Some improvements seem called for.

1. Rau has overlooked the fact that AL 5.18-8.17 deals with *ūha* "modification". Modified mantras cannot be expected to be found in the Veda. This follows from the following passage (AL 6.12-15):

jūr asi manasā juṣṭā viṣṇave tasyās te satyasavasa iti evaṃ vede strīlingena paṭhitāḥ / tasmād yadā sādyaskriṣu sāṅdas trivatsaḥ somakrayaṇo bhavati tadā stryarthavṛttitām anapekṣyaiva padānām pumarthābhidhāyinam adṛṣṭaṃ vede puṃśabdān ūhante / jūr asi dhṛto manasā juṣṭo viṣṇave tasya te satyasavasa iti /
 "In the Veda the following is read thus with feminine gender: *jūr asi dhṛtā manasā juṣṭā viṣṇave tasyās te satyasavasaḥ*. Therefore, when at the sacrifices to be performed on the day the soma is bought, a three year old uncastrated [bull] is the price to be paid for the soma, then, completely disregarding that female objects are denoted by the words, they modify [each feminine word] into a masculine word, unseen in the Veda, expressive of a male object, as follows: *jūr asi dhṛto manasā juṣṭo viṣṇave tasya te satyasavasaḥ*."

Clearly the first, unmodified sentence is said to occur in the Veda, the second, modified one is said not to occur there. This is confirmed by Rau (n° 40 and 41).

Again, AL 7.1-7¹ deals with the question if modified mantras are themselves mantras.² The problem is if, in modifying mantras, Vedic rules of grammar must be applied. This problem could obviously not arise if the modified mantras were simply quoted from the Veda.

In view of the above, the following numbers must be dropped from Rau's list: 38, 41, 50, 83, 94, 107. None of these had been satisfactorily traced. Number 44, which clearly concerns a modified sentence, can be connected with an original *tā* [174] *asmai prativeḍaya*, which occurs *MānŚS* 1, 8, 3, 1.

¹ For a partial elucidation of this difficult passage see Bronkhorst, 1981.

² Cf. Śābarabhāṣya to sūtra 2.1.34.

2. Number 97 concerns AL 13.5 f. This passage appears to be corrupt. A partial reconstruction may be possible on the basis of Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī's Ratnaprakāśa (MPV, I, p. 57):

haritīkāyāṃ tu "ye yajāmahe samidhaḥ samidho 'gne 'gna ājyasya vyantu, narāśaṃso 'gnim agnā ājyasya vetu, iḍo 'gnināgna ājyasya vyantu, barhir agnir agna ājyasya vetu" itī pradarsītam / tatra tanūnapātsthāne narāśaṃsaḥ pravaraḥhedena vyavasthitaḥ /³

The part *samidhaḥ... vetu* occurs verbatim ÅśvŚS 2, 8, 6, with only this difference that Bhartrhari (as here quoted) has *narāśaṃso* for ÅśvŚS *tanūnapād*. Both Śivarāmendra Sarasvatī and the commentator Gārgya Nārāyaṇa to ÅśvŚS 2, 8, 6 account for this (as does, perhaps, AL 13, 3-4).

Summing up: the numbers 38, 41, 50, 83, 94, 107 must be dropped from Rau's list; the numbers 44 and 97 can be satisfactorily traced, to MānŚS 1, 8, 3, 1 and ÅśvŚS 2, 8, 6 respectively.

This result does not conflict with, even strengthens, Rau's conclusion that Bhartrhari was more familiar with the Maitrāyaṇīya-texts than with the texts of any other Vedic school.

REFERENCES

- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1981. "Meaning Entries in Pāṇini's Dhātupāṭha". *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 9 (1981), pp. 335-357.
 Rau, Wilhelm. 1980. "Bhartrhari und der Veda". StII 5/6 (Festschrift Paul Thieme), 167-180.

³ Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍa claims in his Chāyā (NSP, I, p. 36) that in Bhartrhari's commentary a passage closely similar to this one is ascribed to the Chāndogya-Brāhmaṇa. This is mysterious, the more so since nothing like it can be found in that Brāhmaṇa, nor in any other Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda. Should we conclude that this part of Bhartrhari's commentary was already highly corrupt in Vaidyanātha's days (18th century)? Or did Vaidyanātha — who knew the Ratnaprakāśa (MPV, I, p. XIX; NSP, I, p. 195 n. 16) — wrongly quote from that work?