

ON THE GRAMMARIAN BHARTṚIHARI.

By PROF. F. KIELHOEN, PH. D., GÖTTINGEN.

Whatever may be the opinions of scholars regarding the dates generally which Professor Müller in his *Note* on the "Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature"¹ has assigned to the chief works of the so-called classical Sanskrit, there can be no doubt that Professor Müller is right in placing the grammarian Bhartṛihari and the *Kāśikā-vṛtti* before the middle of the 7th century A.D. This date is fixed by that of the Chinese pilgrim I-tsing, who has left us an interesting account of the course of study pursued in the grammatical schools of India at the time of his visit to that country.² I propose to compare I-tsing's statements regarding the works of Bhartṛihari with what we know of them from existing MSS. or commentaries, and to inquire if those works furnish any data that may help to fix the time of other authors.

According to Professor Müller, I-tsing's account of Bhartṛihari's works, so far as it is necessary to mention it here, is as follows:—

'Next, there is the Bhartṛihari-discourse, a commentary on the . . . *Chūrṇi*, the work of the great scholar Bhartṛihari. It contains 25,000 ślokas.'

'There is, besides, the Vākya-discourse (*Vākya-dīpa*), which contains 700 ślokas.'

'Next, there is the *Pīṇa* or *Pīḍa* or *Vīṇa*. It contains 3,000 verses of Bhartṛihari.'

In the first of these works Professor Müller recognizes Bhartṛihari's commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*, and in the second the *Vākya-pāṭya*; as regards the last work he inclines to believe that I-tsing is speaking of the *Bhāṭṭi-kāṇya*, 'supposing that Bhāṭṭi could in Chinese have been represented by Pīḍa.'

From existing MSS. we know that Bhartṛihari has written a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*, and a work in three chapters (*kāṇḍa*)

commonly called *Vākya-pāṭya*. The commentators and later grammarians generally inform us that his commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* did not extend over more than three Pādas, and, so far as I know, they do not ascribe to him any works besides that commentary and the *Vākya-pāṭya*.³ In proof of this I may quote Helārāja, who, towards the end of his own commentary, thus speaks of Bhartṛihari:—

त्रैलोक्यगामिनी येन त्रिकाण्डी त्रिपदी कृता ।

तस्मै समस्तविद्याश्रकान्ताय हरये नमः ॥

Whether the whole of Bhartṛihari's commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* is still in existence, it is impossible to say. I have never heard of any MS. of it except the Berlin one which does not go beyond the 7th Āhnika of the first Pāda; it is incomplete at the beginning and defective in the middle, and altogether very incorrect. But even from this imperfect and faulty MS. it is clear that Bhartṛihari's was a very full and elaborate commentary, that its author knew more than one gloss on the *Mahābhāṣya* of which we know nothing, that his MSS. exhibited readings not to be met with in any of the MSS. which have hitherto become accessible, and that Kaiyaṭa's commentary—at least for the first seven Āhnikas—is but a very meagre extract from the work of Bhartṛihari. Considering that Bhartṛihari's commentary is at least four times as extensive as Kaiyaṭa's, and that Kaiyaṭa's comment on the first three Pādas contains about 6,000 ślokas, we may well believe that the *Tripadī* contained 25,000 ślokas, which is the figure given by I-tsing. I-tsing is right too in calling Bhartṛihari's work a commentary on the *Chūrṇi*, for Bhartṛihari himself calls the author of the *Mahābhāṣya* the *Chūrṇikāra*, or author of the *Chūrṇi*. (Berlin MS. pp. 92a, 102b, 121a.)

same auspicious term at the end of the last Vārttika in every one of the eight Adhyāyas. Curious it is that the author of the *Vājasaneyi-pratīśikha* should have wound up every one of his eight Adhyāyas with the similarly auspicious expression इहं इति:—I-tsing's statement about the so-called *Khilas* appears to me to contain some mistake. *Khilapāṭha* occurs *Kāśikā*, 1, 3, 2, and is explained there by Haradatta to comprise the 'Dhātupāṭha, Prātipadika (i.e., *Gaṇa*)-pāṭha and *Vākya-pāṭha*.'

³ The *Harī-kṛīḥ* are no separate work, *Harī-līlā* being merely another expression for 'a verse from the *Vākya-pāṭya*.'

¹ India, What can it teach us? pp. 281-306.

² Loc. cit. pp. 343-349. In the first work mentioned by I-tsing, the elementary *Sūdhānta*, I would recognize a kind of *Lipi* or *Mālikā-vṛtta*, similar to the one of Kāśikāśāstrin, which teaches the letters, their combinations, the organs with which they are pronounced, &c. I think I am right in stating that both in Brāhmanical and Jaina indigenous schools, the first thing children learn is the phrase ओ नमः सिद्धम्.—For the use of the auspicious word सिद्धम् at the commencement of literary works I need refer only e.g. to the first of Kātyāyana's Vārttikas and I would draw attention to the fact that Kātyāyana has employed the

The work usually called *Vākya-padīya* has long ceased to be studied in India. MSS. of it are rare, and generally incorrect. In all of them the work is divided into three *Kāṇḍas*, and the whole is therefore also named *Trikaṇḍī*. The first of the three chapters which is called *Brahmakāṇḍa* or *Āgama-samucchaya* contains in most MSS. 183, the second or *Vākya-kāṇḍa* 487 ślokas. The third or *Paḍa-kāṇḍa* consists of 14 sections (*Samuddeśa*), with a total of 1315 ślokas. The *Vākya-padīya* then, such as we have it, contains altogether 1985, or in round numbers 2000 ślokas, and this is the figure given at the end of Colebrooke's MS. (together with the additional remark Rupees 2½).

Such being the case, it appears to me that I-tsing's statement, according to which the *Vākya*-discourse contained 700 ślokas, cannot refer to the work to which our MSS. give the title *Vākya-padīya*; for I see no reason to believe that a writer who gives correctly the extent of Pāṇini's grammar, of the *Kāśīkā-vṛtti*, of the *Mahābhāṣya*, and, so far as we can judge, of Bhartṛihari's commentary, should have made a mistake or been misinformed in this case. On the contrary, I hope to show that I-tsing's account is as accurate here as it is in the case of the other works which he describes, and I believe that I can at the same time suggest the Sanskrit title of the last work mentioned by him, the '*Pina* or *Pida* or *Vina*' which Professor Müller hesitatingly understands to be the *Bhāṭṭikārya*.

Vardhamāna describes Bhartṛihari, whom he mentions in his *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi*, as वाक्यपदीयपरीक्षकयोः कर्ता महाभाष्यनिपत्या व्याख्याता च 'the author of the *Vākya-padīya* and *Prakīrṇaka*, and commentator of three *Pādas* of the *Mahābhāṣya*.' The expression '*Vākya-padīya* and *Prakīrṇaka*,' is here equivalent to the term *Trikaṇḍī* in the verse cited from Helārāja, and must be understood to denote the work which the MSS. call simply *Vākya-padīya*. As a South-Indian MS. uses *Prakīrṇaka* synonymously with *Paḍa-kāṇḍa*, and as moreover Helārāja calls his commentary on the *Paḍa-kāṇḍa*—*Prakīrṇa-prakāśa*, it is clear that *Prakīrṇa* or *Prakīrṇaka* was a name for what is now considered the third chapter of the *Vākya-padīya*, and it follows that as late as the 12th century the term *Vākya-padīya* was

employed to denote the first and second chapters only of Bhartṛihari's work.

After this it is hardly necessary to say that I understand I-tsing's statement about the *Vākya* discourse to refer to the *Vākya-padīya* in this restricted sense, which would contain 670 or, roughly speaking, 700 ślokas, and that I would recognize in the '*Pina*' the *Prakīrṇa* or *Paḍa-kāṇḍa*. I am aware that the number of ślokas which I-tsing assigns to the *Pina* does not agree with the actual number of ślokas of the *Prakīrṇa*, but am inclined to think that this very discrepancy speaks rather in favour of than against my identification. Not to mention my own views on the subject, we have Puṇyārāja's distinct testimony, that already in his time the *Paḍa-kāṇḍa* was no longer complete, 'either because it had ceased to be studied, or through the carelessness of copyists, or through other causes.' I-tsing's statement is the more valuable as suggesting how much of Bhartṛihari's work may really have been lost.

Excepting the well-known verses at the end of the *Vākya-kāṇḍa*, Bhartṛihari refers to other literary works, both in the *Vākya-padīya* and the *Prakīrṇa*, only in such general terms as *Smṛityantara* and *Vyākaraṇāntara*, by which the commentators understand the grammars of Āpiśali and Kāśakṛitsna. In his commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* he cites of writers on grammar by name the Āpiśalāḥ and Kuṇi, the commentator of the *Aśhādhyāyī*. Besides he mentions or quotes:—the *Taittirīyāḥ* and *Vājasaneyinaḥ*; the *Āvalāyana*- and *Āpastamba*-(*śrauta*)-*sūtras*, and a *Bahvrīcha*-(*śrauta*)-*sūtra*-*bhāṣya*; the *Nirukta*, *Prātiśākhya*, *Śikṣhā* in general, and a verse from the *Pāṇīnya-śikṣhā* in particular; *Dharmasūtrakārāḥ*; the *Mīmāṃsaka-darśana*, *Sāṅkhya-darśana*, *Vaiśeṣika-darśana* and the *Naiyāyikāḥ*. But what I would call particular attention to, is the fact that Bhartṛihari also mentions and quotes three times from the *Vaidyaka* and *Charaka*, and that it is therefore certain that of Indian writers on medicine *Charaka* at any rate must be placed before the middle of the 7th century.

I hope to prove elsewhere by the help of Bhartṛihari's commentary, that later grammarians are wrong in identifying *Gonardīya* with *Patanjali*.