

Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 47 (1993)

Heft: 1: Proceedings of the first international conference on Bhartrhari : University of Poona, January 6 - 8, 1992

Artikel: An introduction to the study of Bhartr-hari

Autor: Aklujkar, Ashok

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-146998>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 01.07.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF BHARTR-HARI*

Ashok Aklujkar, University of British Columbia

*kāle varṣatu parjanyaḥ, pṛthivī stācchasya-śālīnī/
deśo 'stu kṣobha-rahitaḥ, sajjanāḥ santu nirbhayāḥ //*¹

1.1 Professor S.D. Joshi, Pandit Bhagavat, my other respected teachers in the audience, Dr. Gaurinath Sastri, other fellow members of the Bhartr-hari scholarly community, students present in the audience whose work in the future I hope will soon overtake what we achieve in the conference, ladies and gentlemen: I am grateful to the main organizers of this conference, Professors Saroja Bhate and Johannes Bronkhorst, for the opportunity they have given me of making the first and relatively more extensive presentation of the conference. I hope it leads to well-informed and well-defined, and hence mutually rewarding, discussions in the sessions to follow, as was my intention in suggesting that such an introductory presentation be arranged.

1.2 I would like to dedicate the presentation to the memory of Professor Bimal Krishna Matilal. Professor Matilal's untimely death has removed from among us one of those rare scholars who could combine excellent philological skills with comparative work on the broadest scale possible at present, who had a remarkable talent for discovering the essence behind overwhelming detail, and who, above all, would have very much enjoyed

* I was able to study many of the sources used in the preparation of this lecture because of financial assistance provided at various times since 1969 by the University of British Columbia Humanities and Social Sciences Research Committee, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The oral style of the lecture given on 6 January 1992 has deliberately been retained to a significant extent. The references given in the appendix were then made available to the audience in the form of a handout.

1 I have changed the quarters 'b' and 'c' of this purāṇic *maṅgala* from *pṛthivī śasya-śālīnī* and *deśo 'yaṁ kṣobha-rahitaḥ*. My reason for accommodating the verbs *stāt* and *astu* is that without them the quarters fall out of step with 'a' and 'd,' which contain *varṣatu* and *santu*, and thus lack the force that benedictive utterances should have. In a period of ecological concerns, regional disturbances, and fundamentalist pressures being exerted on historians, the vision of the *maṅgala* is something that we should cherish.

participating in a conference like this, dedicated as he was throughout his scholarly life to establishing that India did have a rich and rewarding tradition of philosophy, even if philosophy were to be sharply distinguished from religion and theology and taken in the relatively recent narrow sense of analytical or linguistic philosophy. I shall miss Bimal as a friend and a thinker.

1.3 My lecture has been described as introductory and to some extent it *will* be introductory. However, please note that it will not be introductory in the sense of a presentation proceeding on the assumption that the audience knows nothing or little about Bhartr-hari (hereafter abbreviated to “B”) and the works associated with him and hence the principle goal should be to give to the audience some very basic or preliminary information in that regard. Rather, I am principally going to talk about what research has achieved so far, what parameters are emerging, and what we could expect in the future. From the observations made along these lines and the information given in the appendix, it should be possible for you to infer, if you do not already know, what basic factual information and surmises made by scholars there are regarding B, his works, and his commentators.

1.4 Secondly, while trying to reach the goal I have set for myself, I am going to inject, wherever appropriate, observations regarding Sanskrit or Indological research in general. The more these observations, strictly speaking ‘asides’ or ‘side-glances’, provoke you, like the asides of the jester in Sanskrit plays or like the side-glances of the heroine in classical Sanskrit poetry – which imagery to use I shall leave for you to decide – the happier I shall be. However, I shall not deliberately try to provoke you. My intention will still be to give an honest expression to the situation as I see it, and I shall be as careful as I can be to ensure that one-sided treatment and distortion are avoided. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that there is an unavoidable element of subjectivity in a presentation like this. One scholar’s nectar of facts can sometimes indeed make another scholar a victim of food-poisoning. But, while noting this, I must also point out that B research is a part of many larger circles of research activity and that unless its relationship with at least the immediately next larger circle, the one of Indological research in general, is explored, we will not know how it is faring and how it is likely to fare.

2.1 I hope you will excuse me if there appears a personal dimension in a part of my presentation. Even if I exclude the year 1962-63, when Professor Bhate and I read the *Vākyapadīya* with Professor Arjunwadkar as a part of our Junior M.A. curriculum, my serious engagement with B is now about twenty-five years old. It was in 1967 that I, rather suddenly, decided to work on B for my Ph.D. dissertation. My decision was principally due to the realization that the time available to me for completing the Ph.D. degree program would not have been sufficient to prepare myself in Vedic or Indo-European studies, and that I always internally suffered much if I had to write on something about which I could not either think clearly or think with a sense of having something new to say. But, in retrospect, it seems that my decision to revisit B was due also to the discussions in philosophy of language, philosophy of grammar, and philosophy approached linguistically that were taking place around me through the writings of Willard van Orman Quine, Roman Jakobson, Noam Chomsky, etc. The relevance of ancient Indian *śāstra* statements to these discussions could not be missed even by my mind which seems to have a special knack for unsystematic and erratic reading of Indological literature.

2.2 Having embarked upon a study of B – this time largely voluntary and not occasioned by textbooks – and having read whatever I could find to read upon him, it somehow occurred to me that what I needed to do first was to determine the parameters of his thought – to come up with a set of theoretical positions with which any interpretation of a piece of his philosophy must agree in order to be acceptable as *his* view. Thus, I set aside a comparative approach with respect to modern Western theoreticians as well as with respect to ancient and medieval Indian thinkers such as Maṇḍana, Śaṅkara, Kaṇḍa-bhaṭṭa, or Nāgeśa. I also decided not to concentrate on placing B historically – to *pretend* ignorance of wider issues of history, particularly of the history of ideas. Furthermore, I resolved to separate at each step the evidence available in ancient commentators from the evidence available in B's own words to the extent I could reasonably be sure about what his own words were. And, although I was being confronted by textual problems practically on every page of printed B works, I decided temporarily to push all such problems under the rug. This is not to say that I denied the usefulness of the comparative approach, played down the importance of historical or philological research, distrusted the traditional commentators, and glossed over textual difficulties. In fact, I used everything that I found relevant, justifiable, and

reliable in all activities of the indicated kind. However, I used those things the way Pāṇini uses meaning in his grammar: implicit as background but not applied as a major criterion of presentation.

2.3 In writing a dissertation that focused on determining the basic or fundamental ideas attributable to B, it was possible to follow two paths. One was to let an overarching structure of presentation emerge out of the specific individual observations collected as a result of a careful and comprehensive consultation of primary sources, that is, to figure out what the broad categories were into which the particular determinations of B's views fell and to turn those categories into major sections or chapters of the dissertation. The second possible path was to follow the major concepts the ancient and medieval Indian tradition and the preceding generations of modern scholars seemed to associate with B and to investigate each of them or the more important among them from the point of view of determining, accurately and thoroughly, their nature and scope, as understood by B. Among such concepts, the ones that rather readily come to mind are: *brahman* (*śabda-tattva-brahman*, *śabda-brahman*), *vākya*, *pada*, *āgama*, *jāti* (*ākṛti*, *sāmānya*), *dravya*, *saṁbandha*, *guṇa*, *diś*, *sādhana* or *kāraka*, *kriyā*, *kāla*, *puruṣa* or grammatical person, *saṁkhyā*, *upagraha* or the '*parasmai-pada:ātmane-pada*' kind of verbal aspect, *vṛtti* or the grammatical phenomenon of composition or compounding, *Veda*, *śabda-pūrva yoga*, forms or levels or phases of *vāc* such as *vaikharī*, *sphoṭa*, *dhvani* and *nāda* with their *prākṛta* and *vaikṛta* divisions, *pratibhā*, *śabda-bodha*, *śabda* (*anvākhyeya* and *pratipādaka*), *artha* with its divisions such as *apoddhāra-padārtha* and *sthita-lakṣaṇārtha* or as *bāhyārtha* (*vastvartha*) and *śabdārtha*, *avidyā*, *vivarta*, *pariṇāma*, *vikāra*, *prakṛti*, etc.²

2.4 In the end, I decided to follow the first path, that of letting a new structure emerge, in the main body of my dissertation. However, in the introduction to the dissertation, I briefly clarified my understanding of those concepts (*sphoṭa*, *prākṛta dhvani*, *vaikṛta dhvani*, *āgama*, *pratibhā*, *śabda-tattva*, *śabda*, *Veda*, *avidyā*, *vivarta*, *vikāra*, *prakṛti*, *jāti*, *ākṛti*, and

2 As can be seen from this listing, the concepts indicated by the division of B's *magnum opus*, the *Trikāṇḍī* or the *Vākyapadīya*, and by those technical expressions in his *Mahābhāṣya-tikā* or *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā* which are not found in the earlier grammatical or philosophical works, such as Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, form a subset of the set of concepts I have in mind.

sāmānya) which were intimately connected with the content of my main chapters and which I could ignore only at the risk of giving the reader the impression that I was unaware of what other scholars had perceived as major topics in interpreting B.

2.5 My reasons for following the first path were mainly two at that time: (a) In scores of research writings, Indologists, particularly the late Professor K.A. Subramania Iyer – who must occupy a place of high honor among those who have worked on B – had already followed the line of inquiry based on Sanskrit concepts,³ and, although I had some contribution to make to the elucidation of the concepts, there was not that much benefit for me in retaining the old overall framework of approaching B. (b) If I allowed what were traditionally felt to be prominent concepts associated with B to dictate the selection and sequence of my items of investigation, I would not be able to present the investigation as a logically integrated whole. I would be suppressing what arose internally with what someone else saw as his or her agenda. In particular, I would be presupposing that B wrote his magnum opus, the *Trikāṇḍī* (abbreviated hereafter to “TK”) or the *Vākyapadīya*, primarily as a work of general linguistics, philosophy, or philosophy approached linguistically, so that its division of content could be my division of content. However, clearly the TK is not written primarily as a work in general linguistics, philosophy, or philosophy with a linguistic turn. Its immediate context and concern are Pāṇinian grammar and that grammar’s immediate (*Mahā-bhāṣya*, etc.) and larger (especially Vedic) tradition (as expressed, for example, in the notions of Veda, *pranava*, and *vāc*). Because B achieves so much in so few words and because there is an amazing wealth of linguistic and philosophical observations in his work, it does not follow that general explorations in linguistics and philosophy constitute the major purpose of his work. And if I had to isolate precisely that general linguistics and philosophy from his work, there could be a serious spill between what flowed from his lip and what the cup of my dissertation sought to catch. B’s clothes may be fine and attractive, but I must wear the coarse ones that fit me.

3 Recall his numerous papers beginning with “Who are the *anītya-spota-vādinah*” in 1935/37 and his massive 1969 monograph: *Bhartr-hari*[:] a study of the *Vākyapadīya* in the light of the ancient commentaries.

2.6 With these considerations, I organized my findings on B's fundamental thought in six chapters: "The epistemological point of view," "The nature of cognition," "The cognizer," "Language," "Meaning," and "What there is." Only after this organization emerged did I realise that it corresponded to what B had himself indicated as the very basic modes of his theoretical reflections: *jñāna*, *śabda*, and *artha*.⁴ The most ancient accessible commentator of the TK, Vṛṣabha or Vṛṣabha-deva (p. 181; cf. p. 182 line 8), provided further support: *etaddhi tat sarvaṁ yad uta jñānaṁ vāg arthaś ceti* 'This is all that there is: cognition, language, entities.' A little later, I realised that the organization corresponded to the distinctions (a) epistemic or epistemological, (b) linguistic, and (c) ontic or ontological that were explicit or implicit in most of modern Western philosophy understood in the narrow sense of analytical philosophy or linguistic philosophy. However, it was not until I began to think about the histories of the rise of linguistically oriented philosophies in India and in the West, particularly in the context of Nāgārjuna and B, that it occurred to me that the organization which had emerged had a larger significance. Not only were the antecedents of language-based philosophies generally similar in the two regions,⁵ the modes, angles, or approaches that assumed prominence once the language-based philosophies came into existence were also surprisingly similar. Thus, the Sanskrit tradition may not have words corresponding to epistemology and ontology and it may not have branches of knowledge explicitly recognized with those words and having precisely the same scope, but it came pretty close to having them *de facto* in *jñāna* and *artha* as understood by B.

2.7 My completed dissertation could have been published in Professor Matilal's then newly established Journal of Indian Philosophy. However, Professor Matilal did not think he could publish the whole dissertation together in one issue, and, in my view, on the other hand, the chapters of the dissertation were too interdependent to withstand segmented publication. Thus, it remained unpublished. I did not make any effort to have it published elsewhere either, for by that time almost every

4 (a) *śabdādi-bhedah* ... TK 1.123, *jñāna-śabdārtha-viśayāḥ* ... TK 3.1.103, *evam arthasya śabdasya jñānasya ca* ... TK 3.3.59.

(b) A variant reading *śadjādi-bhedah* is found for the first citation given in (a), but it is clear from Vṛṣabha's explanation that the original reading must have been *śabdādi*°.

5 This is expanded upon in an old lecture of mine on Nāgārjuna and B, which I am now readying for publication.

established scholar who was known to be interested in B had either read it or had acquired a photocopy of it and I had moved on to (or returned to) an activity I had deliberately suspended to complete the dissertation, namely the activity of settling the TK text. Recently, I have once again been advised by kind colleagues in the field that I should do the minimally necessary revision and have the dissertation published. But now it seems wasteful to publish it without coordinating the textual references with the better or more convenient editions I think I will be able to finish in the next few years.

2.8 A word of explanation about these editions, I believe, is in order, not in order to blow my own trumpet, but in order to submit a kind of progress report to co-workers in the field and to avoid the possibility of work being needlessly duplicated. Since about 1973 I have accomplished much work toward preparing a critical edition of the entire TK. Such an edition has been considerably facilitated but has not been made unnecessary either by Professor Rau's edition of the TK *kārikās* executed with informed and perceptive hard work and amazing care or by Professor Iyer's editions of all *kāndas* with all known ancient commentaries completed with great dedication to learning in defiance of indifferent health and practical difficulties. For one thing, it can be proven that the *kārikā* manuscript (abbreviated to 'ms.' hereafter) tradition (from this point on, please refer to the appendix at all appropriate points) to which Rau devoted his highly disciplined scholarship originated out of the *kārikāvṛtti* ms. tradition. The need to integrate the results achieved by him with the results one could achieve by a truly critical edition of the *kārikāvṛtti* mss., therefore, remains. Without taking that step, we cannot claim to have made all possible effort to reach the most ancient determinable form of the TK, a text of unparalleled importance in its area.⁶ Secondly, although Iyer's editions and translations contain much valuable information and have contributed greatly to the progress of B studies, they cannot be said to have been prepared with full application of the principles of textual criticism. Not only was Iyer hampered by the fact that

6 In the present state of our sources, the principal physical feature of the most ancient determinable form would be this division: (a) *kārikās* of the two *kāndas* accompanied by the *Vṛtti* to the extent it is available and (b) *kārikās* of the third *kānda*. It is interesting to note that in the more than one hundred years of TK printing (the first edition appeared in 1884/1887) not a single complete edition with this kind of text division has appeared.

in most cases he had to rely on transcripts instead of original mss. or photocopies, he did not in most instances try to establish genealogies of mss. or to follow them consistently - a very important part of the procedure of textual criticism, for it is not the number of mss. having a particular reading that counts but the number of versions or recensions to which the mss. supporting a particular reading belong. Furthermore, rarely did Iyer try to check if the reading he selected for a *kārikā* was the reading presupposed by the ancient commentator of that *kārikā*. As individuals closer to B by several centuries than our earliest available mss., the commentators frequently provide clues as to older and, therefore, probably genuine readings. Moreover, either because he began the text-critical and translational work late in his life or because he simply wanted to take the first step of giving a general sense of the contents of the TK, Iyer did not spend much time on problematic passages or try very hard to think of emendations - emendations that would be supported by testimonia or by transcriptional probability, so that such passages would make contextually acceptable sense. He was also unfortunate in not having conscientious printing presses for his early editions. The actual number of printing errors far exceeds the ones for which there are corrections in his errata. If this is the case with his constituted main texts, one cannot have much confidence that the variant readings given in footnotes are printed exactly according to his press copy. Since such variants are frequently meaningless, the errors committed in their printing, one feels, could have often gone undetected and uncorrected.

2.9 Having briefly established the need for a new edition, let me state what the main physical features of this edition will be. Its first volume will contain a critically constituted TK text divided into two main sections: (a) the *kārikās* and *Vṛtti* (abbreviated to “V” hereafter) of the first two *kāṇḍas* and (b) the *kārikās* of the third *kāṇḍa* divided into fourteen *samuddeśas* or chapters. Regardless of what view one holds of the authorship of the V, it makes sense to replicate in an edition the text associations as they are evidenced in the most ancient line of mss. and in the writings of all *śāstra* authors, beginning with Maṇḍana and probably as early as Dignāga. The numbers assigned to *kārikās* in this volume will correspond to those in Rau’s edition, not because all the verses included in Rau’s edition belong to the original *kārikā* text but (a) because Rau’s is the only flawless enumeration based on actual ms. evidence that we have, (b) because there is no realistic hope at present of our being able to recover the entire *kārikā* text, and (c) because readers wishing to compare

both the editions would find it convenient to have the *kārikās* identically numbered in them.

2.10 The second volume of the edition will contain text-critical notes, getting into (a) a discussion of why a reading is to be preferred or rejected, wherever the established objective criteria are insufficient to decide the issue, and (b) a discussion of what the problems presented by available readings are when no definite decision can be made. This volume will also have a register of references to TK passages made in other Sanskrit works. The ground for such a register was prepared by Charudeva Shastri in the footnotes to his painstakingly produced editions of the first two *kāndas*⁷ and by Professor K.V. Abhyankar and Ācārya V.P. Limaye in the highly informative appendices to their edition of the TK *kārikās*. However, these notices of later references to B by Charudeva Shastri and Abhyankar and Limaye are scattered and hence cannot be very efficiently used. Also, they do not consistently concentrate on highlighting the differences of readings found between their constituted TK text and the work in which a TK segment is quoted. Furthermore, there are numerous other references to TK passages which have understandably escaped even the formidable memories of Charudeva Shastri and Abhyankar-Limaye or which can be noticed only now because new texts have been published or because we have better indices available now. A fresh attempt, therefore, will be made in the second volume of my edition to collect conveniently and systematically as much of these testimonia as may be possible.

2.11 The third and final volume of the edition will contain a *pāda* index and word indices to both the *kārikās* and the V. Rau has published a *pāda* index and also a word index for the *kārikās*. Mine, like the text in the first volume of the edition and the record of variants in the second volume, will be in the Nāgarī script and will be based on the text as constituted by Rau as well as the text as constituted by me.

2.12 As some of you know, this major textual project of mine has been hybernating for some years due to my other professional responsibilities. However, not all has been quiet on my B front. I have published several articles on textual issues concerning the TK and on concepts such as Veda and *prāmānya* which I had only briefly touched upon or deliberately side-

7 The second *kānda* edition remained incomplete and only a few printed formes of it were somehow circulated, probably as a book.

tracked in writing my Ph.D. dissertation. I have also used the intervening years to achieve computer input of the TK commentaries of Vṛṣabha, Puṇya-rāja (this name should be followed by a question mark, as in the appendix), and Helā-rāja and of the Mahābhāṣya-ṭīkā of B. The accuracy of these texts typed by student assistants is yet to be checked, and, except for the Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā ascribed to Puṇya-rāja and Helā-rāja's commentary on the Saṁbandha-samuddeśa, none of the computerized commentary texts yet incorporates my critical observations. But having them available on the computer would facilitate future work considerably. At present my plan is to publish critical editions of Vṛṣabha's commentary and of the Vākya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā and a semi-critical edition⁸ of Helārāja's commentary, after or while I complete the work on the three-volume critical edition of the TK outlined earlier.

3.1 I realise that I have taken you on a rather long trip of personal narration. I hope it would not be seen as a display of self-centrism. In addition to capturing a part of the history of B research and stating what you can expect from me in the future, I have incidentally given in this *ātmopākhyāna* an indication of the major directions that B research can take. These directions are happily well reflected in the first international conference on B which was inaugurated a short time ago. We have here papers comparing B with modern linguists and philosophers, relating B's views to predecessors and successors in Indian *darśanas*, elucidating concepts such as *pratibhā* and *vivakṣā*, and exploring relationships between texts. I look forward to learning more about B from the paper presenters in all of these areas. However, it may not be inappropriate if I first touched upon some general issues that concern the areas and summarised what I consider to be definite achievements of B research so far.

3.2 Several Indologists are quite uneasy about comparing an ancient Indian philosopher with a non-Indian philosopher or with a modern philosopher. They feel that such attempts invariably result in distortions or inattention to specific contexts of an individual philosopher's thinking or amount to expressions of nationalistic pride ('see, our philosopher said so many centuries ago what your philosopher could say only recently' or 'see, our philosopher had a solution for that which baffled your

8 What is mainly meant by a semi-critical edition is that mss. will be selectively consulted and the edition will not be held up for a comprehensive consultation of all mss. The evidence collected by Iyer will be put to better use.

philosopher'). Now, nationalistic pride is clearly inappropriate in pure research, and distortion is obviously to be avoided by any researcher worth his salt. I would even concede that Indians may be showing a particularly aggressive interest in pointing out the achievements of their medieval and ancient philosophers because their present offers them few springboards for self-elevation at the international level. But it is worth asking: Who planted 'being first in something' as a wide-spread value on the Indian soil? And, is it fair to deny Indians the opportunity of asserting themselves on the basis of being first in something when they are being put down in other spheres precisely by pointing out in one way or the other that they are not first there - that they are underdeveloped, that they are lagging behind? Secondly, the validity of comparativist conclusions is frequently a matter of temperamental difference. It depends on whether one is a person concentrating on the trees or on the forest. Thirdly, while it is true that many comparativists work through secondary literature and display a very shaky grasp of the literature in one or both the sides of comparison, it does not follow that sound philological interpretation and comparative study are necessarily mutually exclusive. There is no logical reason why they should be. Most important of all, it is important to bear in mind that one can never tell which thought, insight, or approach seen in a particular tradition will be useful in making sense of, or in making a better sense of, something baffling in another tradition. Frequently, one needs to compare in order to be able to understand - to complete the philological endeavour. The opposition or incompatibility seen between a philological approach and a comparative approach is thus a phoney issue. The two approaches can clash only in individual instances of practice, not as principles in methodology.

3.3 If this is acceptable, the comparative dimension seen in the study of B should be welcomed. It should also be all right if those of us who value Sanskrit as a treasure of knowledge and human experience pointed out to the rest of the world that B, a writer in our Sanskrit, distinguished between meaning and reference (*śabdārtha* and *vastvartha*) a long time before Gottlieb Frege did, argued for sentence as the primary unit of language at least fifteen centuries ahead of Willard van Orman Quine, anticipated Bertrand Russell's and A.N. Whitehead's *Principia Mathematica* in noting that a number is a class of classes (*saṁkhyeya-saṁgha-saṁkhyāna-saṁghaḥ saṁkhyeti kathyate* 3.11.19), came close to realising the possibility of propositional calculus when he declared *so 'yam ity abhisambandho*

buddhyā prakramyate yadā / vākyārthasya tadaiko 'pi varṇaḥ pratyāyakaḥ kvacit // 2.40), gave a linguistic turn to philosophy, and so on.

3.4 You will have noticed that under the pretext of discussing a methodological issue I have already stated one reason for B's importance. Only because we do not know how much was original to him – the traditional *śāstra* style would not let him preface his original observations with “I propose” or “I think” – we cannot determine if in the number of insights of fundamental importance he, as an individual philosopher, surpassed the Russells and Quines of the modern world, but it cannot be doubted that even the relatively little that survives of his work contains many more fundamental insights than the works of several modern language philosophers put together (cf. Sadhu Ram 1956:51-52).

3.5 B's position in the Sanskrit tradition itself gives him high importance of another sort. Not only does he combine in his philosophy the insights we tend to associate with Sāṃkhya, Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta, Yoga, Kashmir Śaivism, and Mādhyamika-Yogācāra Buddhism, he preserves for us precious pieces of information from the otherwise inaccessible periods of these as well as other systems like the Vaiśeṣika. It is perhaps only the *Yukti-dīpikā* that can rightly be compared with his works in this respect. Furthermore, B is our oldest available and so far clearest link to the tradition of *vāc* mysticism that has obviously survived in India right down from the Vedic period, albeit without receiving recognition in literature as a *darśana* in itself.

3.6 Within *Vyākaraṇa* itself, with which the relationship of B's surviving *śāstra* works is most explicit, B's standing seems to be next only to that of the *muni-traya*. I have not yet come across a statement in the work of any old grammarian to the effect that, although such and such form is sanctioned, employed, or cited by B, it is *asādhū* or incorrect. In the present state of our sources, B's works are chronologically the first that combine in them clearly and systematically the elements of what later became the traditions of *śabda-* or *prakriyā-granthas* and *artha-* or *darśana-granthas* written by *Vaiyākaraṇas*.⁹

⁹ Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* is of course the first available work that goes beyond formal grammar. But the place occupied by *artha* or *darśana* discussions in it is clearly secondary and incidental. The same applies to the *Vārttika* text which, at present, is accessible to us only through the *Mahābhāṣya*.

4.1 There is much that can be said about interpreting B, both in terms of the general direction of interpretation one should take (e.g., whether he does really take a linguistic approach to typically philosophical problems and thus try to dissolve rather than solve epistemological and ontological issues) as well as in terms of the interpretation of individual passages and words. The available time makes it clearly impossible for me to say all that I would like to say. However, it seems that I must make time for the following few observations.

4.2 Considerable progress has recently been registered in interpreting B. Particularly the achievement of the team of scholars organized by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute for the purpose of re-editing and translating the *Mahābhāṣya-tīkā* is a cause for celebration. The concentrated attention that this text received at the hands of several capable and widely informed scholars has served to clarify many passages. It has also resulted in most specific and minute problems being flushed out into the open. Our explicit awareness of them and their possible solutions was the first thing needed for further progress. Congratulations, I am sure, are in order for Pandit Bhagavat and Drs. Palsule, Saroja Bhate, and Johannes Bronkhorst. A grateful tribute also to the departed scholars Professors Abhyankar and Devasthali and Ācārya Limaye. The pioneering work of V. Swaminathan should also be acknowledged in this context. One wishes that the unpublished part of his edition would still be published, but with greater accuracy of printing. The printing of the first part, he told me in a 1977 meeting, did injustice to his effort and press copy.

4.3 As for the TK, Iyer was the first to render the whole of it into English – an outstanding example of dedication. It is, on the whole, a very useful translation, but its intention was to make the original Sanskrit generally accessible (cf. Iyer 1965:xi, 1971:ix, 1974:11), not to push for making sense of knotty passages. As a result, Iyer rarely comes to the rescue of an informed Sanskritist. Where such a Sanskritist has problems with the text, Iyer usually has nothing to offer by way of solution. Being neither consistently literal nor completely geared to the needs of a non-Indologist or non-Sanskritist, the translation is unfortunately like most other translations of Sanskrit *śāstra* works.¹⁰ If the perception that India has

10 One can easily see from Karl H. Potter's massive bibliography that there is no dearth of translations of Sanskrit philosophical texts. But can we name ten translations that we would give in the hands of an intelligent non-specialist with the confidence that he would

only religion and no philosophy is still widespread, as I think it is, our translations of Sanskrit philosophical texts must be to some extent responsible for it. The important lesson to draw is that Sanskritists must better define the readerships for their philosophical translations. We need both literal translations attentive to and explicit with regard to philological detail as well as explanatory essays ultimately based on such translations but pretending that the translations do not exist and the reader knows no Sanskrit. Any translation that is not consistent in either activity, literal translation and straight-forward exposition, will satisfy neither the Sanskritists nor the non-Sanskritists.

4.4 Dr. Madeleine Biardeau's (French) translation of the first *kāṇḍa* *kārikās* and V, in contrast to Iyer's, is on the whole more helpful to Sanskritists wishing to approach B. It tries to account for all words in the original and thus a Sanskritist can easily ascertain how she construes and interprets the sentences of the original. It displays a sharper sense of who its reader is supposed to be.

4.5 In recent years, a trend to take up parts of the more extensive third *kāṇḍa* for close study is developing. Dr. Peri Sarveswara Sharma's work on *Kāla-samuddeśa* and Giovanni Bandini's work on the *Kriyā-* and *Puruṣa-samuddeśas* paved the way. Dr. Roland R. Bergdahl, Jr., has worked on a part of the *Sādhana-samuddeśa* and intends to continue working on it and the *Kriyā-samuddeśa*. Messers Jan Houben and Yves Ramseier have selected the *Sambandha-samuddeśa* and the *Jāti-and-Dravya-samuddeśas*, respectively, for their dissertations. Dr. Peter Scharf also intends to work on the *Jāti-samuddeśa*. Helā-rāja's commentary on the third *kāṇḍa*, which matches in maturity the classics like Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Śārīraka-mīmāṃsā* (popularly known as *Brahma-sūtras*), finally seems to be receiving the attention it deserves.

4.6 Telugu and Gujarati translations of the TK *kārikās* have appeared. Substantial Hindi elucidations, if not translations, seem to have been undertaken by Dr. Shiv Shankar Awasthi. I understand that a Japanese translation is being planned or is already in progress.

understand them without knowing the original Sanskrit? I teach a course on Indian analytical philosophy for undergraduates who are not expected to have any knowledge of Sanskrit. It is my experience that I am hard-pressed to find adequate translations for the students in that course.

4.7 Thus, the prognosis for understanding B and making his works accessible is good. It is obviously not possible to mention or review here all interpretational activity. Its extent can be gathered from the bibliographies on B. However, while thus feeling on the whole optimistic, we have to protect the field from the publications of those who pay little or no attention to the research, particularly the textual research, accomplished and who cannot judge the accuracy of translations on which they depend. Although we cannot do much to stop such publications, we should do everything possible to discourage them. Otherwise, the field of B studies will soon resemble that of Saṅkarite Advaita Vedānta - hundreds of books and articles to read but very few which really add to knowledge.

5.1 There is much that could be said on the content of B's works and on the larger issues such as his date (definitely not later than 425-450 A.D.), his religious affiliation, his identity with or difference from B the poet, from B the follower of Gorakhnath, from B the author of the Bhāga-vṛtti, and from Bhaṭṭi the author of the Rāvaṇa-vadha, the sequence of his works, his relationship with other philosophers and grammarians like Vasurāta, Dignāga, and Candra, his intellectual antecedents, and the impact of his work on the later tradition. However, the time available would not allow me to do justice to any of these exciting and challenging themes. Nor am I qualified or prepared to speak on them. Therefore, instead of touching on them in a half-hearted or rushed manner, I would, in the remaining time, like to quickly run through some conclusions on the external or textual aspects of B's studies and their implications.

5.2 It is probably an indirect consequence of the loss of importance that Sanskrit studies suffered under the British Raj that the texts of many or most important Sanskrit works first appear in poorly published editions based solely on locally available mss. Another contributing factor to this sorry state could be that a Sanskrit pandit has as little interest in preparing critical editions as a devout Christian has in historical studies of the Bible. Both are primarily interested in content or message, and not in wording or problems of ascription, etc. Anyway, whatever the causes may be, scholars are frequently forced to depend on such editions, and research is misled for several generations to come. B studies have had more than their fair share of wrong leads.

5.3 The first edition that began to appear in 1884 and was published in a separate volume in 1887 or 1888 contained the *kārikās* of the first two *kāṇḍas* and a commentary on each of those *kāṇḍas*. The title page simply announced *vākyapadīyaṃ ... puṇya-rāja-kṛta-prakāśākhyā-ṭīkā-yutam*. That in the very same edition the colophon at the end of the first *kāṇḍa* read *iti śrī-mahāvaiyākaraṇa-hari-vṛṣabha-viracita-vākyapadīya-prakāśe* and the colophon of the second *kāṇḍa* read *iti śrī-puṇya-rāja-kṛtā vākyapadīya-dvītiya-kāṇḍa-ṭīkā samāptā* was not at all reflected in the editor's title page. Nor did he feel compelled to explain the discrepancy in his brief Sanskrit introduction. It was not realised until the 1930s, that is, for nearly fifty years after the publication of the edition, that the first *kāṇḍa* commentary had nothing to do with Puṇya-rāja, that its name was not Prakāśa, and that it was in fact an abridgement of a larger commentary which should be called V and which could be ascribed to B himself. Because the abridgement was not intelligible at places and it was the first to receive circulation, progress in B research was held up. Some traditional scholars like Dravyeśa Jhā, Nārāyaṇa-datta Tripāthī, and Sūrya-nārāyaṇa Śukla wrote new commentaries on the *kārikās* without taking the position that their interpretations must conform to the wording of the *kārikās* as well as of the commentary published in 1888, for they had no way of suspecting that there could be a common author for both the compositions. At present the commentaries of Jhā, Tripāthī, and Śukla are useful only to a scholar who does not accept B's authorship of the V commentary or to a scholar who wishes to go through the 'academic' exercise of checking how someone would interpret the *kārikās* if not given the benefit of the V. Even if it were held that the V is not authored by B, it is abundantly clear that the V is so close to B in time and thought that there is very little, if any, gain in trying to interpret the *kārikās* by ignoring what it has to say. In my view, much precious scholarly energy has been wasted because of the wrong lead supplied by the first edition.¹¹

5.4 Nor was the first edition right in calling the second *kāṇḍa* *ṭīkā* Prakāśa or, as I have argued elsewhere (Aklujkar 1974), in ascribing it to Puṇya-rāja. One should here, in fairness to the editor, hasten to add that the ascription to Puṇya-rāja did not originate with him. The ms.(s) accessible to him could have given the name of the author as Puṇya-rāja, for there

11 Even after 1934, several scholars like Gaurinath Sastri (1959) wrote on B as if the V and Charu Deva Shastri's edition of it did not exist.

are many mss. which so ascribe the work. But all these mss. are later than the mss. which either do not contain the line of ascription or ascribe the commentary to Helā-rāja.¹² The second *kāṇḍa tīkā* available at present should be held to be a shortened version of Helā-rāja's as yet unrecovered commentary on that *kāṇḍa*.¹³ I have recently come to the further conclusion that Puṇya-rāja is identical with Phulla-rāja, who filled two gaps in Helā-rāja's commentary on the third *kāṇḍa*, since the variation 'Puṇya:Phulla' is attested elsewhere also and is probably due to a misreading of the Śāradā script.

5.5 Despite a suggestion to the contrary in its brief Sanskrit introduction, the 1888 edition, continued in 1905, was partly instrumental also in giving rise to the wrong view that the comprehensive title for B's three *kāṇḍas* was Vākyapadīya. I have pointed out at length elsewhere that at least until the time of Helā-rāja and Vardhamāna, the author of the Gaṇa-ratna-

- 12 I am aware that Dr. Peri Sarveswara Sharma (1983) has argued against my position. Some of his observations are indeed good and valid. However, I am sure I can answer his really relevant objections and will do so at the time of a revised publication of my article. The only change needed in my position, as I have indicated in my contribution to The Philosophy of the Grammarians (volume 5 of the Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies), is that the extant *tīkā* of the second *kāṇḍa* is not in its original form but is a short recast of what Helā-rāja must have composed.
- 13 It should be noted that I am not proposing that Puṇya-rāja/Phulla-rāja did not write the summary verses found toward the end of the Vākyā-kāṇḍa-tīkā mss. or that Puṇya-rāja/Phulla-rāja could not have made the abridgement himself. All I am saying is that the work is not his original composition and is essentially taken over from Helā-rāja. As the summary verses conclude with *śaśāṅka-śisyaścchrutvāitad vākyā-kāṇḍam samāsataḥ / puṇya-rājena tasyoktā saṁgatih kārīkāśritā //*, it is possible (if *samāsataḥ* 'briefly' is intended to go with *śrutvā* and not with *uktā*) that the shorter version was available to Śaśāṅka-śisya, Puṇya-rāja's guru for the Vākyā-kāṇḍa, who has been on very probable grounds identified with Sahadeva, the author of the earliest known commentary on Vāmana's Kāvya-lamkāra-sūtra-vṛtti (Aklujkar 1974:182-83), about whose time the only definite thing is that he lived after Mukula-bhaṭṭa (900-925 A.D.). Such an early existence of the shorter version would agree with the guess that Helā-rāja's original commentary could probably have not made it to the north Indian heartland and that even Helā-rāja's Prakīra-prakāśa seems to have left his residence or family only after the damage its ms. had suffered in two places was repaired by Phulla-rāja/Puṇya-rāja (see below 5.4, 12-15). It should be added, however, that a Śūra-varman could also be held to be the author of the summary verses. There are difficulties in taking *śūra-varmanāmnā* as simply an adjective of *puṇya-rājena* (Aklujkar 1974:169). As a change of metre usually indicates conclusion of a composition, Śūra-varman mentioned in the preceding *āryā* metre verse would be the author of the summary verses and Puṇya-rāja the fashioner of the abridgement. Puṇya-rāja's very probable identification with Phulla-rāja, based on independent transcriptional grounds, indicates that he was capable of such work.

mahodadhi, and most probably in the time of Vṛṣabha, Vākyapadīya was understood to cover only the first two of the three *kāṇḍas* and that we should use the title *Trikāṇḍī* when we wish to refer to the entirety of the three *kāṇḍas*. A significant modification I have recently made in my view is that Yudhisthira Mīmāṃsaka (samvat 2019:349-50, revised edn. samvat 2030:400) was right when he suggested that Vākyapadīya was originally the title of only the second *kāṇḍa*.¹⁴ Thus, it needs to be added by way of clarification that the range of Vākyapadīya understood by Vṛṣabha, Helā-rāja and Vardhamāna does not represent the first but the second stage in the use of the title.

5.6 How the first edition, without meaning to have that effect, got TK studies started on a wrong foot is, I suppose, amply illustrated by what I have said so far. The second volume of that edition, begun in 1905 and finished in 1937, proved to be a further impediment in the development of TK studies. It printed the text of the only extensive and generally undamaged commentary on the TK, namely the *Prakīrṇa-prakāśa* or the *Prakīrṇaka-prakāśa* of Helā-rāja, in such a perfunctory and incorrect (not to mention unattractive) manner¹⁵ that it is not surprising that the first international conference on B could not take place until the year 1992. Between 1935 and 1942, the deficiencies of this second volume of the *editio princeps* were partly made up for by the carefully printed editions of Sāmba-śiva Śāstrī and Ravi Varma. But it was not until 1963 that the real rescue of the invaluable *Prakīrṇa-prakāśa* began at the hands of Iyer.

5.7 It is obvious that, however important B may be, his study cannot progress unless we have reliable and easy access to the contents of what he wrote.¹⁶ As I have indicated so far, after making a bad start, which was perhaps inevitable, we have recently seen considerable progress in providing good access to his works. However, we are still nowhere near that level of tools which are available for the study of important authors of European Classical heritage. In addition to Iyer's work, which I think will be useful in years to come primarily for the third *kāṇḍa*, we have

14 However, Yudhisthira Mīmāṃsaka's reasoning in arriving at this conclusion is not correct.

15 Cf. Sadhu Ram 1956:52-53, Satyavrat Śāstrī 1963/1966:42-45, Iyer 1963:vii, xiii-xiv.

16 Thus, in the preceding paragraphs lies a partial explanation of the paradox that, on the one hand, B is a remarkable linguist-philosopher, perhaps the most interesting of all Indian philosophers to modern linguists and philosophers, and yet, on the other hand, he has not been extensively studied. The paragraphs also provide a partial explanation of why some have found B to be a difficult philosopher to follow.

Charudeva Shastri's edition of the first *kāṇḍa* and partly of the second *kāṇḍa* as an important landmark in B studies.

Rau's accounts of mss., critical edition of the *kārikās*, edition of the *Vākyapadīya-prameya-saṁgraha*, *kārikā pāda* index, *kārikā* word index, and painstaking tracing of Vedic quotations exemplify a down-to-earth, largely non-speculative scholarship of a high order. The work on the *Mahābhāṣya-tīkā* recently completed in Pune has been a substantial addition to scholarship. Better editions of the V (particularly of the second *kāṇḍa*), of the *Tīkā* on the second *kāṇḍa*, and of Vṛṣabha's commentary on the *kārikās* and V of the first *kāṇḍa* are what we need somewhat urgently. Iyer's work in these areas is not adequate.¹⁷

5.8 I mentioned our author's major work getting currency under a wrong name. The same is happening to his *Mahābhāṣya-tīkā*. The first incomplete edition by Brāhma-datta Jijñāsu (= Jigyāsu) carried the objectively indefensible (cf. Akujkar 1971) component °*dīpikā* in its title. Swaminathan correctly opted for °*tīkā*. Abhyankar and Limaye reverted to °*dīpikā*. I would have been happier if at the time of revising the Abhyankar-Limaye edition the scholars associated with the otherwise very valuable recent Pune edition had revised the title also. By way of reaction to my remark, the well-known Shakespearean adage "What's in a name" may be thrown at me and it may be protested that I am making too much of names. Let me, therefore, clarify that I too am aware of the tolerant attitude implicit in *nāma-mātre vivādaḥ*. But that tolerance is all right when it has some practical purpose to serve, such as reducing the level of social friction, or when the available evidence does not allow a choice between two or more names. Scholarship concerned with reconstructing history must aim at being precise, as far as possible. More importantly, in the present case, inattention to the histories of the titles *Vākyapadīya* and *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā* results in some valuable historical insights being obscured. These are: (a) The three books of what we call *Vākyapadīya* or TK seem to have been originally conceived as relatively independent treatises. (b) When the thought to combine them in a unified work occurred, it could not be carried to completion. The author probably did not live to complete the V of the third *kāṇḍa*. (c) Hence the first two *kāṇḍas* which had the V gained currency together. (d) The third *kāṇḍa*

17 As stated earlier, these are my priorities, plus an index to the V, although while meeting these priorities I shall be reworking the other sections of the TK as well, for I believe that there is still scope to bring about much improvement of detail.

had to be supplemented with a V by Dharmapāla. (e) The extending of the Mahābhāṣya commentary to only three *pādas*¹⁸ of the Mahābhāṣya¹⁹ was also probably a consequence of the uncertainties of life.²⁰ It is not likely that the work was planned to be complete with a treatment of three *pādas*, but that the author could not for some reason take it beyond three *pādas*.²¹ Thus, the rather colourless names Trikāṇḍī and Tripāḍī,²² conveyed in the oldest available unambiguous statements of two specialists of the Pāṇinian system, namely Helāraja and Vardhamāna, do not arise out of the author's choice. To name one's work as TK or Tripāḍī, without at least one content-indicating word preceding, would be like naming one's child "Two-eyed" or "Two-nostrilled." Nor are TK and Tripāḍī to be preferred because they were coined by some ancient specialist of the field as titles capable of reflecting the contents of the works. We should prefer them only because their very mechanicalness, their being based on nothing but enumeration pure and simple, distorts historical reality the least.

5.9 My remark that the three *kāṇḍas* or books of the TK could have originally been conceived as practically independent may have come to some of you as a surprise. Please note that I am not saying that their earliest circulation was necessarily as separate works. What I am saying minimally amounts to asserting that the three books were not intended to develop one argument progressively. They obviously have many links of detail with each other and they do present one thinker's philosophy consistently as far as I can judge. But it is not the case that the first book establishes a central thesis on which the central thesis of the second book logically depends, and the second book, in turn, provides logical underpinnings for the third book, or that the principal statement of the first book is explained, elaborated upon, and defended in the second book, and the main contention of the second book is similarly served in the third book. The content-based titles, Āgama-samuccaya, Vākyapadīya, and

18 Probably the first three *pādas*.

19 And, indirectly, those of the Aṣṭādhyāyī too.

20 At present the commentary is available only for a part of the first *pāda*. In the time of Helā-rāja and Vardhamāna it was known as a work covering three *pādas*. See Aklujkar 1969:555 and 1971.

21 This too must not necessarily be taken as a precise statement on the extent. The commentary could have covered only a part of the third *pāda*.

22 Helā-rāja's brilliant pun (see Aklujkar 1969:555) *trailokyagāmini yena trikāṇḍī tripadī-kṛtā* at the conclusion of his Prakīma-prakāśa notwithstanding, there is nothing particularly suggestive about the names Trikāṇḍī and Tripāḍī/Tripadī.

Prakīrṇa/Prakīrṇaka, of the three books indicate this fact. Of these, Āgama-samuccaya 'Collection of traditionally received knowledge' and Prakīrṇa 'Miscellany' are transparent enough. For the middle one, the oldest known references that also go beyond mere recording of the title and throw some light on the nature of the work are those by Prabhākara²³ and Jayāditya-Vāmana.²⁴ Both indicate very strongly that Vākyapadīya is not simply a text that deals with *vākya* and *pada* but is particularly a text that tries to determine whether *vākya* is the primary unit of language or whether it is *pada* that should be accorded linguistic primacy.²⁵ This connotation fits only the second book of the TK.²⁶

5.10 There is a tendency among TK specialists to view the alternative nomenclature of the three books, Brahma-kāṇḍa, Vākya-kāṇḍa, and Pada-kāṇḍa, as based on content.²⁷ A little reflection, however, will reveal that *brahma*, *vākya*, and *pada* do not capture the contents of the three books fully or precisely. The first book is largely devoted to matters other than

23 Brhatī, part I, p. 389: *te ete 'nvitāḥ padārthāḥ. eṣāṃ abhidhānāni padāni. tad idaṃ vākyapadīyam.*

24 (a) Kāśikā 4.3.88: *śabdārtha-saribandhīyaṃ prakaraṇaṃ vākyapadīyam.*

(b) A third reference revealing the nature of Vākyapadīya is in Helā-rāja's introduction to *kārikā* 3.1.1: *iha padārthāṣṭaka-vicāra-paratvād vākyapadīyasya.* The eight *padārthas* to which this remark refers are listed in TK 1.24-26. Being divisible under *śabda* 'expression,' *artha* 'meaning,' and *saribandha* 'relation (between *śabda* and *artha*),' the eight can be subsumed under the Kāśikā's *śabdārtha-saribandha*. Of them, only the relation conducive to *dharma* (*dharmāṅga saribandha*) and perhaps the rather obvious communicating relation (*pratyayāṅga saribandha*) can be said not to have found place or explicit discussion in the second book. They are, however, definitely discussed in the first book. Thus, Helā-rāja's remark on the nature of the Vākyapadīya would seem to imply inclusion of the first book as well in the Vākyapadīya. This, however, should not be viewed as invalidating what I assert here. It is quite consistent with the way Helā-rāja uses the word Vākyapadīya elsewhere. There can be no doubt that in his understanding, or by his time, Vākyapadīya meant the first two books. What I am concerned with here is not this second stage in the reference of the title but a stage preceding it.

25 Prabhākara's statement, as Śālika-nātha's explanation suggest, should be viewed as sarcastic. He is in effect saying to the Vaiyākaranas (with probably principally B in mind): 'I have shown you what the real vākyapadīya is. You fellows got it wrong.'

26 In the light of the foregoing discussion, the first part of my 1969 article needs to be revised.

27 Thus, relying on this understanding, some scholars have argued that restricting the name Vākyapadīya to the first two books (as Helā-rāja does and as I initially did) would be inappropriate; the Pada-kāṇḍa must be a part of the Vākyapadīya if the *pada* in the *dvandva* basis *vākya-pada* were to be fully significant (see Aklujkar 1969:550 for names of the scholars). Presumably, these scholars would argue similarly against the view that Vākyapadīya originally stood for only the second *kāṇḍa*.

brahman. The third is said to have once contained a Bādhā-samuddeśa and a Lakṣaṇa-samuddeśa,²⁸ which can only arbitrarily be held as discussions confined to *pada*. The second, as I have been stating, is not merely a discussion of *vākya*, but of *vākya* vis-à-vis *pada* with the intention of determining which of the two is more fundamental to language. On the other hand, a disarmingly simple explanation of the origin of the nomenclature Brahma-, Vākya-, and Pada- can be given once it is understood as not intended for expressing the entire contents of the books: *brahman* is the most important or central notion of the first statement of the first book, *vākya* of the first statement of the second book, and *pada* of the first statement of the third book.²⁹ The titles Brahma-kāṇḍa, Vākya-kāṇḍa, and Pada-kāṇḍa are as mechanically coined as the title TK and must have either given rise to it or must have been occasioned by it. Just like it, they seem not to originate from the author.

5.11 I believe I have done justice to my point about the importance of being careful about names, an otherwise innocuous matter regarding which one should normally not be insistent.

The question of the authorship of the V has had and will probably continue to have a considerable bearing on how we interpret B and what historical conclusions we accept regarding him and his works. I have something to say on it specifically in my second presentation. Therefore, I shall at present leave it aside, and come to some interesting facts that a careful textual study can reveal about the commentaries in general.

5.12 One unusual feature of the TK textual tradition is the existence of abbreviated versions of commentaries. Scholars of course know that having

28 (a) Sadhu Ram (1956:71-79) puts forward the view that the *samuddeśas* mentioned here were parts of B's commentary on the Mīmāṃsā-sūtras. Like Iyer (1969:8), I find Sadhu Ram's arguments unconvincing.

(b) Iyer (1969:7-8) speaks also of the loss of an Upamā-samuddeśa. The evidence he adduces from Puṇya-rāja in support of this assertion is not as clear as he assumes it to be. Most probably, it is only that part of the extant Vrtti-samuddeśa which discusses compounds based on similitude that Puṇya-rāja had in mind in employing the expression *upamā-samuddeśa*.

29 Respectively, (a) *anādi-nidhanam brahma śabda-tattvaṃ yad aksaram / vivartate 'rtha-bhāvena prakriyā jagato yataḥ //*, (b) *ākhyātaṃ śabda-saṃghāto jātih saṃghāta-vartinī / eko 'navayavah śabdah kramo buddhyanusāhrtih // padam ādyam prthak sarvaṃ padam sākāṅkṣam ity api / vākyam prati matir bhinnā bahudhā nyāya-darśinām*, and (c) *dvidhā kaiścit padam bhinnam caturdhā pañcadhāpi vā / apoddhṛtyaiva vākyebhyaḥ prakṛti-pratyayādivat //*

a shorter and a longer version is not uncommon in the case of Sanskrit works. What is remarkable in this case is the relative profusion. I have already noted that the so-called Prakāśa commentary on the first *kāṇḍa* in the first edition turned out to be an abridgement of the V. The commentary on the second *kāṇḍa* in the same edition, usually ascribed to Puṇya-rāja, can, with a great deal of certainty, be viewed as an abridged version of Helā-rāja's as yet undiscovered and hence probably lost Vākya-kāṇḍa commentary. The summary verses of Śūra-varman or Puṇya-rāja and the Vākyapadīya-prameya-saṁgraha (the latter published by Rau) are further abridgements of that commentary.³⁰

5.13 Noting the irony that a complex of texts which contains a mild rebuke of *saṁkṣepa-ruci vaiyākaraṇas* (TK 2.481) itself underwent *saṁkṣepa*, we should ask ourselves: What is it that could have prompted the abridgements? The original being too extensive or the original being in such a corrupt state that its significant parts became unintelligible and its essence needed to be preserved in a different form (*sarva-nāśe samutpanne ardham tyajati panditah*) are the possibilities that come to mind. I am inclined to think that in the case of the first two abridgements I listed, the shorter version of the V of the first book and the shorter version of Helā-rāja's commentary that passes under the name of Puṇya-rāja, corruption is the probable cause. For the latter two, the summary verses and the Vākyapadīya-prameya-saṁgraha, convenience was in all likelihood the motive behind making an abridgement.

5.14 It is quite revealing, I think, that all the abridged versions belong only to north India and there too overwhelmingly to the Varanasi area. North India suffered from heavy disruption of its lines of ms. transmission in the period of Muslim aggression, and Varanasi tried for a long time to save whatever it could of traditional learning in the midst of an ocean of unfavorable conditions. Of the abridged V, two mss. have been noticed in Calcutta and five in Varanasi. One of the Calcutta mss. is dated in Kāśī-saṁvat, and the remaining, upon examination, may also turn out to be a

30 It need not be supposed that these shorter versions were created strictly by dropping parts of the original – that no expression of his own was added by the adapter. Some connecting words, phrases, and remarks could easily be added by anyone reasonably familiar with the system. The presence of such elements, seen when, for example, the Vākya-kāṇḍa-tīkā is compared with the Vākyapadīya-prameya-saṁgraha, does not prove that the shorter commentaries are not abridgements or essentially abridgements.

copy made in Kashi-Varanasi or from a ms. in the Kashi-Varanasi area. Of the Vākya-kāṇḍa-tīkā, the so-called Puṇyarājīya, no south Indian ms. has come to light.³¹ The Vākya-padīya-prameya-saṁgraha does not exist out of the Sarasvatī-bhavana Library at the Sampurnanand Sanskrit University in Varanasi. On the other hand, there is no genuine ms. of the longer version of the V coming from the north Indian heartland.³² The only available north Indian mss. of the longer V belong to the southeastern and southwestern extremities of north India, Rau's B1-B3 to Calcutta and a ms. that became available to me in Ahmedabad obviously to Gujarat. Also, no ms. of Vṛṣabha's commentary, which explains the longer V, has been located in north India. The message is clear. The longer V and Helā-rāja's original commentary on the second book (if the latter ever went beyond Helā-rāja's family or Kashmir) have disappeared from most of north India for a long time.³³ The intellectual giants such as Bhaṭṭoji-dīkṣita and Nāgeśa must have been forced either to rely on the abridgements or to give second-hand references. The complete absence in their writings of any reference to Vṛṣabha's commentary also reveals their relative impoverishment.³⁴

5.15 With proper attention to the objective evidence that mss., etc. provide, one can progress even further in determining the vicissitudes that B's works and the commentaries thereon have gone through. It can be proved that even the Vṛtti-samuddeśa, the last chapter of the third book,

31 E[15] listed as preserved at Trivandrum in Rau's (1971:34) account is a Devanāgarī transcript made as late as 1782-83 A.D. evidently from a north Indian original.

32 Rau's B[9], preserved at Varanasi, is a transcript made in 1936 (at least as far as folios 7A-49 go), that is, two years after Charudeva Shastri's edition was published, but apparently written without a knowledge of that edition. Most of it appears to have been based on an exemplar in a script that the copyist could not properly read.

33 (a) For the unreliability of Nāgeśa's references to Helārājīya on the second *kāṇḍa*, see Aklujkar 1974:176-77.

(b) A ms. containing fragments of Hari-vṛṣabha's commentary on the first and the second books is mentioned under no. 116 on p. 437 of the 1878/1889 anonymous Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Sanskrit College Library at Benares (for the details of the catalogue, see Janert 1965:27, no. 14). Normally, a ms. with such a description should be a ms. of the longer version of the V. However, in reality, no. 116 (= no. 38,025 in the new catalogue of mss. belonging to the Sarasvatī-bhavana Library) contains a fragment of the Vākya-kāṇḍa-tīkā ascribed to Puṇya-rāja.

34 It should be borne in mind that although Vṛṣabha's commentary is simple in wording, it displays much well-digested and well-concealed learning. Some of the details he preserves are so important that it is extremely implausible that a mind like Bhaṭṭoji's or Nāgeśa's would not have invoked them.

is incomplete and that we should not suppose that only the Bādhā and Lakṣaṇa samuddeśas have been lost. Rāma-bhadra-dīkṣita's Patañjali-carita, probably composed in the seventeenth or eighteenth century, contains a 'prediction' that is borne out by the present state of the Mahābhāṣya-tīkā; that is, like the Bhaviṣya-purāṇa, the Patañjali-carita states a fact as a future event. While preparing my draft critical edition of the first kāṇḍa V, I have come to the conclusion that some relatively short parts of the first kāṇḍa V were missing as early as Vṛṣabha's time, a commentator who could have flourished before the time of Kumārila and Prabhākara. The full text of the second kāṇḍa V was not accessible to the author of the available Vākya-kāṇḍa-tīkā.³⁵ What was missing in the north and south (Gujarat and Kerala) were different sections. The few available mss. indicate a very bad line of transmission for the Vākya-kāṇḍa V, probably from very early days, perhaps going back to B's own time. As for Helā-rāja's commentary, it could have left his family or place of residence³⁶ and begun to circulate a long time after it was completed – when it had reached a stage in which a few parts were already missing or had become hopelessly damaged and had to be replaced by Phulla-rāja (most probably identical with Puṇya-rāja, as suggested above).

6.1 Finally, I would like to touch very briefly upon the larger implications of B textual research. Perhaps because it was so neatly presented and because it was given the benefit of a very useful word-index by Chitrao and Pathak, we have tended to look upon Kielhorn's edition³⁷ of the Mahābhāṣya as definitive. We should now recognise that the manuscript base of that edition was not sufficiently wide. We badly need to check, at first selectively, the oldest available non-Devanāgarī mss., particularly from South India, and, if they indicate the desirability of preparing a new edition of the Mahābhāṣya, then plan for such an edition. The work to be done being highly demanding, we will probably need the services of young

35 Hence Helā-rāja's (who, I think, wrote the original of this *tīkā*) phrase *kāṇḍa-dvaye yathā-vṛtti* appearing at the beginning of his commentary on the third *kāṇḍa* may not mean only 'in accordance with the V of the two *kāṇḍas*' but probably also 'as far as the V of the two *kāṇḍas* was available.'

36 I mention the second possibility because Helā-rāja could have been a *mahāvratin* living away from his family if he is the same as the Helā-rāja mentioned by Kalhaṇa in the *Rāja-taraṅgiṇī*.

37 How far Kielhorn was helped by local pandits is a consideration that might become relevant in writing an accurate history of Indology.

scholars who are very much at home in Pāṇinian prakriyā³⁸ – services of scholars to whom the words *mīmāṃsaka*, *yūvan*, and *medhāvi-saṁmata* of the *śloka*s quoted in Mahabhāṣya 3.2.123 would apply (in a non-sarcastic sense).

6.2 Secondly, we will need to extend a similar textual treatment to the *bhāṣya*, usually ascribed to Vyāsa, on the Yoga-sūtras. As has already been felt by some scholars, this *bhāṣya* has many links with B's TK (and, I may add, with the Mahabhāṣya-tīkā). A critical edition of it will probably throw new light on its authorship as I have suggested in another paper.

6.3 I realise that I may have been too specific and may have tried the patience of some of you. Manuscript work is usually very time-consuming, largely boring, and frequently quite discouraging. But unless the text is presented in a dependable form and is studied well, scholarship progresses no faster than in a three-legged race. I hope I have conveyed to at least some of you a sense of how exciting, like a detective's work, textual criticism can be. There is an Indian folktale in which a king's favorite old minister correctly guesses merely from a camel's footprints and grazing pattern a number of things about the animal, right down to (or, perhaps I should say, right up to) the camel's being blind in the left eye. We should do well if we recalled that story.

Thank you.

38 The preceding detail regarding what is needed is based on a comment of Professor George Cardona.

Appendix

1. The works of Bhartr-hari, the linguist-philosopher:

Available (but in an incomplete form):

- (a) Trikāṇḍī 'Three Books,' printed under the title Vākyapadīya and nowadays commonly known with that inaccurate title
- (b) Mahābhāṣya-tīkā or Tripādī, edited, except by V. Swaminathan, under the title Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā and gaining currency under that inaccurate title

Unavailable at present:

- (a) Śabda-dhātu-samīksā
- (b) A commentary on Jaimini's Mīmāṃsāsūtras?

2. Arrangement and titles of the sections of the Trikāṇḍī:

Book1: Āgama-samuccaya or Brahma-kāṇḍa

Book2: Vākyapadīya or Vākya-kāṇḍa

Book3: Prakīrṇa(ka) or Pada-kāṇḍa, divided into chapters called samuddeśas

3. Available ancient commentaries of the Trikāṇḍī (tentatively understood as a text consisting of kārikās only, not as a composite of kārikā and Vṛtti)

Book 1: Vṛtti	longer or original version	Hari-vṛṣabha → (Bhartr-)hari ³⁹
Vṛtti	shorter or later version	redactor unknown
tīkā	called Paddhati or Sphuṭākṣarā explanation of kārikā + (longer) Vṛtti	Vṛṣabha or Vṛṣabha-deva
Book 2: Vṛtti		Hari-vṛṣabha → (Bhartr-)hari
tīkā	called Vākya-pradīpa? explanation of kārikās only	Punya-rāja (= Phulla-rāja?) or Rājānaka-śūra-varman ⁴⁰
	a summary in verses of the tīkā	Punya-rāja (= Phulla-rāja?) or Rājānaka-śūra-varman
	Vākyapadīya-prameya-saṁgraha, a summary of the tīkā	redactor unknown
Book 3: tīkā	called Prakīrṇa(ka)-prakāśa explanation of kārikās only	Helā-rāja (two gaps filled by Phulla-rāja)

39 The 'kārikā + Vṛtti' work is ascribed to Hari-vṛṣabha in those manuscripts from 4 (a) below which contain colophons. The name Hari-vṛṣabha must be due to a conflation of the names (Bhartr-)hari and Vṛṣabha. There is overwhelming evidence favouring (Bhartr-)hari's authorship of both the kārikās and the vṛtti. No evidence that really serves even to cast a serious doubt on this authorship – evidence that is objective and factually or logically sound – has *so far* been offered, although doubts have been expressed more than once.

40 Most probably only as a summarizer of Helā-rāja's unavailable commentary, not as an original commentator.

4. Available manuscript traditions of the Trikāṇḍi (in the order of their origin):

(a) 'kārikā + longer Vṛtti' manuscripts	first two books ⁴¹
(b) manuscripts of Vṛṣabha's tīkā of the 'kārikā + Vṛtti' text	first book ⁴²
(c) 'kārikā' manuscripts	all three books
(d) 'kārikā + Prakīrṇa-prakāśa tīkā' manuscripts	third book
(e) 'kārikā' + (shortened) tīkā' manuscripts	second book
(f) Vākyapadiya-prameya-saṅgraha	second book
(g) 'kārikā + shorter Vṛtti' manuscripts	first book

5. The Mahābhāṣya-tīkā in its present form covers only (parts of) the first seven āhnikas of the first pāda in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya. Up to the 11th/12th century A.D., it could have extended to at least three pādas (probably corresponding to the first three pādas of Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī). It survives in only one late, fragmentary, and corrupt manuscript written in north India.

6. Significant achievements in making the Trikāṇḍi accessible:

1887	Gaṅgādhara-śāstrī Mānavallī's edn. (a) of the kārikās and shorter Vṛtti of the first book and (b) of the kārikās and tīkā of the second book
1934	Chāru-deva Śāstrī's edn. (a) of the kārikās and (longer) Vṛtti of the first book and (b) of excerpts from Vṛṣabha's tīkā
1935	K. Sāmba-śiva-śāstrī's edn. of chapters 8-13 of the third book and Helārāja's tīkā thereto
1941?	Chāru-deva Śāstrī's incomplete edn. of the kārikās and Vṛtti of the second book
1942	L.A. Ravi Varma's edn. of chapter 14 of the third book and Helā-rāja's tīkā thereto
1963	K.A. Subramania Iyer's edn. of chapters 1-7 of the third book and Helā-rāja's tīkā thereto

41 A tradition of third book (or Prakīrṇa) kārikā manuscripts may have existed between the times of Bhartr-hari and Dharmapāla. With Dharmapāla, who wrote a Prakīrṇa-vṛtti, this manuscript line may have been turned into a 'kārikā + vṛtti' manuscript line or allowed to continue as it was at least until the time of Helā-rāja. The tradition of Dharmapāla-vṛtti manuscripts or 'third book kārikās + Dharmapāla-vṛtti' manuscripts seems to have become defunct sometime after the days of Durveka-miśra and Helā-rāja (10th-11th century A.D.).

42 (a) If any commentary explaining the 'second book kārikās + vṛtti' text was ever written is not known.

(b) Some commentaries explaining the kārikās of the third book and distinct from Dharma-pāla's vṛtti could have been written prior to the tīkā in (b), but we cannot determine if they are intended in Helā-rāja's references with *kecit*, *anye*, etc. to those who preceded him in the explanation of the third book.

- 1966 K.A. Subramania Iyer's edn. of the complete text of Vṛṣabha's tīkā to the first book
 1973 K.A. Subramania Iyer's edn. of chapters 8-14 of the third book and Helā-rāja's tīkā thereto
 1977 Wilhelm Rau's edn. of the kārīkās of the three books on the basis of kārīkā manuscripts

7. Major attempts at elucidation of Trikāṇḍī thought or Vaiyākaraṇa-darśana *in general*:

Prabhat-chandra Chakravarti 1930, 1933, David Seyfort Ruegg 1958, Gaurinath Shastri 1959, K. Kunjunni Raja 1963, Madeleine Biardeau 1964, K. A. Subramania Iyer 1965, 1969, etc., Aklujkar 1970 (unpublished Ph. D. thesis).

8. Significant achievements in making the Mahābhāṣya-tīkā accessible:

V. Swaminathan 1964, K.V. Abhyankar and V.P. Limaye 1967-70, G.B. Palsule 1983, V.P. Limaye, G.B. Palsule, V.B. Bhagavat 1984, V.B. Bhagavat, Saroja Bhate 1986, Johannes Bronkhorst 1987, G.B. Palsule 1988, G.V. Devasthali, G.B. Palsule 1989, V.B. Bhagavat, Saroja Bhate 1990, G.B. Palsule 1991.

*A list of monographs and articles
 specifically referred to in the lecture*

Details of other publications referred to indirectly can be gathered with the help of the appendix and the bibliographies on Bhartr-hari.

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1969. "Two Textual Studies of Bhartrhari." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 89.547-63.

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1970. *The Philosophy of Bhartr-hari's Trikāṇḍī*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University. Unpublished.

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1971. "Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā or Tripāḍī?" *Adyar Library Bulletin* 35: 159-71.

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1974. "The authorship of the Vākya-kāṇḍa-tīkā." *Pandit Charu Deva Shastri Felicitation Volume*, pp. 165-88. New Delhi: Charu Deva Shastri Felicitation Committee.

Aklujkar, Ashok. 1991. "Vākyapadīya" summary in the *Grammarians volume of the Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies*, pp. 121-174; 179. Princeton University Press. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. With Karl H. Potter.

Gaurinath Sastri. See Sastri, Gaurinath.

Iyer. See Subramania Iyer.

Janert, Klaus Ludwig. 1965. *An annotated bibliography of the catalogues of Indian manuscripts*. Part 1. Wiesbaden.

Peri Sarveswara Sharma. See Sharma.

Rau, Wilhelm. 1971. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vākyapadīya und seiner Kommentare*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag. *Abhandlungen der Marburger Gesellschaft* no. 1.

Sadhu Ram. 1956. "Authorship of some kārīkās and fragments ascribed to Bhartrhari." *Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute*. 13.57-79.

- Sastri, Gaurinath. 1959. *The Philosophy of Word and Meaning*. Calcutta: Sanskrit College. Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series. No. 5. Studies No. 2.
- Sastri, Satyavrat. 1963/1966. *Essays on Indology*. Delhi: Meharchand Lachmandass.
- Satyavrat Sastri. See Sastri, Satyavrat.
- Sharma, Peri Sarveswara. 1983. "Punyarāja's tīkā on the Vākya-kāṇḍa of the Vākyapadīya of Bhartrhari." *Bhāratīya Vidyā* 42:1-21.
- Subramania Iyer, K.A. 1935/1937. "Who Are the Anitya-sphoṭa-vādinah." *Proceedings of the VIIIth All India Oriental Conference*, pp. 258-263. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Subramania Iyer, K.A. 1963. (Ed.) *Vākyapadīya of Bhartrhari with the Commentary of Helārāja. Kāṇḍa III, Part 1 [samuddeśas 1-7]*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute. Deccan College Monograph Series no. 21.
- Subramania Iyer, K.A. 1965. (Tr.) *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartrhari with the Vṛtti. Chapter I*. Poona: Deccan College. Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series. No. 26.
- Subramania Iyer, K.A. 1969. *Bhartrhari[:] a study of the Vākyapadīya in the light of the ancient commentaries*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute. [Deccan College] Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series no. 68.
- Subramania Iyer, K.A. 1971. (Tr.) *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartrhari, chapter III, pt. i, English translation*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute. Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series no. 71.
- Subramania Iyer, K.A. 1974. (Tr.) *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartrhari, chapter III, pt. ii, English translation with exegetical notes*. Delhi, etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Yudhisthira Mīmāṃsaka. 1961. [saṁvat 2019]. *Saṁskṛta Vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā Itihāsa. Dvitiya Bhāga [= vol. II]*. Ajmer: Bhāratīya Prācya-vidyā Pratisthāna. Revised edition 1972 [saṁvat 2030]. *Saṁskṛta Vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā Itihāsa*. Sonapat: Ram Lal Kapur Trust. Hindi.