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Yūto Kawamura

1 Introduction

The Bhaṭṭikāvyā of Bhaṭṭi (ca. 7th c. CE) is known as a poetic work (kāvya) of the type called kāvyasātra. This work, telling the story of Rāma in the kāvya style, is meant for illustrating Pāṇini’s grammatical rules in the grammatical sections and poetic issues in the poetic section.1 Dasgupta and De 1943 make a quite negative valuation of the poetic aspects of the work:

. . . the difficult medium of a consciously laboured language is indeed a serious obstacle to their appreciation. What is a more serious drawback is that the poet has hardly any freedom of phraseology, which is conditioned strictly by the necessity of employing only those words whose grammatical forms have to be illustrated methodically in each stanza; and all thought, feeling, idea or expression becomes only a slave to this exacting purpose. . . . If one can labour through its hard and damaging crust of erudition, one will doubtless find a glimmering of fine and interesting things. But Bhaṭṭi is a writer of much less original inspiration than his contemporaries, and his inspiration comes from a direction other than the purely poetic. The work is a great triumph of artifice, and perhaps more reasonably accomplished than such later triumphs of artifice as proceed even to greater excesses; but that is a different thing from poetry. Bhaṭṭi’s scholarliness has justly propitiated scholars, but the self-imposed curse of artificiality neutralises whatever poetic gifts he really possesses. Few read his worst, but even his best is seriously flawed by his unfortunate outlook; and, unless the delectable pursuit of poetry is regarded as a strenuous intellectual exercise, few can speak Bhaṭṭi’s work with positive enthusiasm. (Dasgupta and De 1943: 184.4–185.5, emphasis mine)

I have shown in Kawamura 2017 that this estimation becomes open to doubt when one carefully examines poetic devices Bhaṭṭi plants in the grammatical sections.2 The purpose of the present paper is to afford further evidence to support this point, focusing on BhK 8.70–84, a set of verses intended to illustrate the kāraka rules.

2 BhK 8.70–84 and the kāraka rules

The Aṣṭādhyāyī contains a section of rules introducing kāraka class names. These rules come under the heading (adhikāra) of A 1.4.23: kārake ‘if . . . is a kāraka’ that establishes the domain in which the class names are assigned by subsequent rules: these names apply to things when they are kārakas, direct participants in actions. Six kāraka names are defined by A 1.4.24: dhruvam apāye ‘pādānam–A

---

*I have benefited much from productive discussions with Professor Yūko Yokochi, Professor Andrey Klebanov, Dr. Lidia Szczepanik-Wojtczak, and Dr. Kiyokazu Okita on several points concerning Bhaṭṭi’s expressions. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15J06976.

1 On the structure of the Bhaṭṭikāvyā, see Kawamura 2016: 154.


In BhK 8.70–84 all the kāraka rules are illustrated. The commentators Jayamangala and Mallinātha call the section constituted by these verses the kārakādhyāka. These verses depict the scene where the demon king Rāvana carries out a seduction of Sītā, who is confined in Lāṅkā. The correspondence between the verses and the rules illustrated is as follows:

- BhK 8.70–72 → A 1.4.24–31 (apādāṇa)
- BhK 8.73–77 → A 1.4.32–41 (sampradāna)
- BhK 8.78 → A 1.4.42–44 (karaṇa)
- BhK 8.79–80 → A 1.4.45–48 (adhikaraṇa)
- BhK 8.81–84 → A 1.4.49–53 (karman)
- BhK 8.84 → A 1.4.54–55 (kartṛ, hetu)

In the following I will discuss some literary devices observed in this kāraka section, which have been overlooked not only by previous scholarship but also by traditional commentators on the Bhaṭṭīkāvyā.

2.1 BhK 8.76

As a beginning, let us consider BhK 8.76. The verse runs as follows:

BhK 8.76: (a) saṅkrudhyasi mṛṣā kīṃ tvam didṛksaṃ māṃ mṛgekṣane
(b) ikṣitavyaṃ parastrībhyaḥ svadharmo rakṣasāṃ ayaṃ

“O doe-eyed lady, why are you needlessly furious at me when I seek to gaze at [you]? [I] must read the fortune of the women of others. This is demons’ own duty.”

2.1.1 Illustrations of A 1.4.38–39

(a) and (b) are to illustrate A 1.4.38: krudhadruhor upasṛṣṭayoh karma and A 1.4.39: rādhikṣyor yasya vipraśnah respectively.

A 1.4.38: krudhadruhor upasṛṣṭayoh karma

“When related with [the actions denoted by] the verbs krudh ‘be angry’ and druḥ ‘wish harm to’ preceded by preverbs, that kāraka towards whom anger is felt is called karman.”

A 1.4.39: rādhikṣyor yasya vipraśnah

“When related with [the actions denoted by] the verbs rāḍh ‘succeed’ and īkṣ. ‘observe’, that kāraka as to whom various inquiries are carried out is called sampradāna.”

---

3KV on A 1.4.39 (I.83.6–8): vividhah prāśnah vipraśnah | sa kasya bhuvati | yasya śubhāsubham prcchyate | devadatātva rādhyaṭ | devadatātva īkṣate | naimittikah prṣṭah | san devadattasya daivam paryālocayatity arthah | (“vipraśna means ‘various inquiries’. [Question] As to whom are these [inquiries] carried out? [Answer] To those whose good or bad lack is inquired. [Examples] devadatātva rādhyati, devadatātva īkṣate. What is meant by these examples is that an astrologer, when asked, reads Devadatta’s fortune.”
In (a) sankrudhyasi . . . mām ‘you are furious at me’, Rāvana referred to by the personal pronoun asmad is spoken of as the one against whom Sītā directs her anger, so that the former belongs to the karman class by dint of A 1.4.38. The word mām is derived by introducing the accusative ending am after asmad to denote a karman (A 2.3.2: karmani dvitiyā). By (b) ikṣitavyaṇa parastrībhyaḥ ‘[I] must read the fortune of the women of others’, the situation is conveyed that Rāvana conducts various inquiries (vipra´sna) as to the women of others in order to read their omens. A 1.4.39 assigns the name sampradāṇa to these women. Thus the plural form parastrībhyaḥ has the fourth-triplet ending bhyas introduced by A 2.3.13: caturthī sampradāṇe to signify a sampradāna.

2.1.2 Sound Arrangement

For our purpose it is important to note that soft nasals are frequently repeated in the verse (ṅ, ṇ, m, ṇ). One may be justified in stating that this repetition functions as a device to convey softness in Rāvana’s speech: here he tries to soothe Sītā. On the other hand, the repetitive use of the harsh sound ks would serve to express some irritation he feels with her. This striking contrast between these two kinds of sounds creates the pulsating rhythm of the verse.

The same device is found in BhK 8.79 and BhK 8.81. The continued repetition of soft nasals (ṅ, m, ṇ) and harsh sibilants (š, s, s) in the former and that of nasal sounds (ṅ, n, m, ṇ, m.) and the voiceless strong sound k in the latter stand in open contrast, respectively.

BhK 8.79: (c)āssva sākaṁ mayā saudhe (d1)mādhīṣṭhā nirjanam vanam |
(c)mādhivāṣṭīr bhuvam (d2)ṣayyāṁ adhiśeyva smarotsukā ||

“Stay with me in my palace. Do not stay in the deserted forest. Do not rest on the ground. Lie on the bed eager to make love.”

BhK 8.81: māvamaṁsthā namasyantam akāryajñe jagatpatim |
sandṛṣte mayi kākustham adhanyam kāmayeta kā ||

“Do not despise [me,] the lord of the world, when he bows [to you], O you ignorant of what is to be done. Can any woman desire the wretched offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma,) when they see me properly?”

For the illustration of A 1.4.49–50 in BhK 8.81, see §2.3.1. In BhK 8.79 (c)–(e) illustrate the following rules:

A 1.4.45: ādhāro ‘dhikaraṇam ||

“That kāraka which serves as locus is called adhikaraṇa.”

A 1.4.46: adhiśiṣṭhāsāṁ karma ||

“That kāraka which serves as locus of the actions denoted by the verbs śī, sthā, and ās used with adhi (adhi-śī ‘lie on’; adhi-sthā ‘stand on, remain at’; adhi-ās ‘sit on, sit in, inhabit’) is called karman.”

A 1.4.48: upānvadhyāṁvasaḥ ||

4For similar types of poetic effects produced by sound arrangement and some concrete examples, see Yokochi 2008 and Lienhard 1984: 11.3–22; 182.33–183.22.

5Note that the sound r is also repeated in the verse. This sound can be considered either soft or harsh.

6The repetition of the aspirate dh is also noticeable.
“That kāraka which serves as locus of the actions denoted by the verb vas used with upa, anu, adhi, or āN (upa-vas ‘live near’; anu-vas ‘live along’; adhi-vas ‘live on’; ā-vas ‘live in, stay’) is called karman.”

A locus (ādhāra) contributes to the accomplishment of an action by means of holding (dhāraṇākriyā) an agent (kartr) or an object (karman) wherein the action resides (kriyāśraya): The locus indirectly supports the action through the intermediary of the agent or the object.

In (c) āssa . . . saudhe ‘Stay [with me] in the palace’, the palace (saudha) serves as locus of the action of staying by means of holding Sītā, the agent of this action. It is therefore called adhikaraṇa by A 1.4.45. A 2.3.36: saptamy adhikaraṇe ca lets seventh-triplet endings occur to denote a locus (adhikaraṇa).

(d1) mādhīṣṭa . . . vanam ‘Do not stay in the [deserted] forest’ and (d2) śayyām adhiśeṣva ‘Lie on the bed’ illustrate A 1.4.46. By supporting Sītā in whom reside the acts of staying and lying denoted by adhi-sthā and adhi-sī respectively, here the forest (vana) and the bed (śayyā) function as loci of these acts, so that they bear the class name karman by the rule in question.

A 1.4.48 is illustrated with (e) mādhivāṭsīr bhuvam ‘Do not rest on the ground’. The ground (bhū) is classed as adhikaraṇa by virtue of indirectly supporting the action of living (adhi-vas) performed by Sītā.

### 2.2 BhK 8.77

Let us next take up BhK 8.77:

BhK 8.77: (f) śṛṇvadbhyāh pratiśṛṇvanti madhyamā bhūra nattamāḥ |
(g) gr̄nadbhyaḥ nugṛṇanty anye ‘kṛtārthā naiva madvidhāḥ ||

[Interpretation 1] “Mediocre ones make a promise to their subjects (śṛṇvadbhyāḥ), O frightened lady, [but] not the best ones. Others, not having attained their objects (akṛtārthāḥ), urge praisers (gr̄nadbhyaḥ), [but] not those like me.”

[Interpretation 2] “Mediocre ones make a promise to those possessed of knowledge (śṛṇvadbhyāḥ), O frightened lady, [but] not the best ones since they have attained their objects (kṛtārthāḥ). Others urge flatterers (gr̄nadbhyaḥ), [but] not those like me.”

### 2.2.1 Illustrations of A 1.4.40–41

(f) śṛṇvadbhyāḥ pratiśṛṇvanti ‘[Mediocre ones] make a promise to śṛṇvat people’ aims at illustrating A 1.4.40: pratyāṅbhyaṁ śruvaḥ pūrvasya kartā:

A 1.4.40: pratyāṅbhyaṁ śruvaḥ pūrvasya kartā ||

“When related with [the action denoted by] the verb śru preceded by prati or āN (prati-śru/ā-śru ‘promise’), that kāraka which serves as agent of a previous act is called sampradāna.”

---

7 It is to be noted that the original meaning of the verb vas lies in the area of ‘stay overnight’.

8 KV on A 1.4.45 (L.84.9–10): ādhriyante ‘śmin kriyā ity ādhāraḥ | kartākarmaḥ kriyāśrayahūtasyaḥ dhāraṇākriyāṁ prati ya ādhāraḥ tat kārakaṃ adhikaraṇaśaṅ jáñan bhavati |

9 Mallinātha reads anye kṛtārthā and Jayamaṅgala anye ‘kṛtārthā. See notes 12 and 14.
The Kāśīkārvṛtti and the Siddhāntakaumudi make the following explanations of this rule:

KV on A 1.4.40 (I.83.10–12): pratiśūraḥ aṇīrūsā ca śrṇotir abhyupagame pratiţiḥāne vartate | sa cābhupagamaḥ pareṇa prayuktasya sato bhavati | tatra prayoktaḥ pūrvasyaḥ kriyāyā kartā sa-mpradānasānīṇyo bhavati |

“The verb śrṇu preceded by prati or aṇ occurs in the sense ‘agree’, that is, ‘promise’. And the action of agreeing takes place with respect to X when X is urged by Y. Here the one who urges (Y), the agent of the previous action, bears the name sampradāna.”

SK 578 (I.649.2–3): viprāya gāṁ pratiśrṇoti āśrṇoti vā | viprṇa mahyaṇaḥ dehī pravartitas taṁ pratiţiṁta ity arthaḥ |

“[Example] viprāya gāṁ pratiśrṇotīlāśrṇoti ‘... promises the Brahmin [to give] a cow.’ What is meant is: urged by a Brahmin with the order “Give me [a cow]”, X promises him [to give it].”

In the utterance viprāya gāṁ pratiśrṇotīlāśrṇoti ‘... promises the Brahmin [to give] a cow’, the Brahmin serves as agent of the previous action, the action of urging, so that he belongs to the sampradāna class by A 1.4.40.

In (f) śrṇvadbhayaḥ pratiśrṇvanti, A 1.4.40 assigns the name sampradāna to the śrṇvat people. The commentators Jayamangala and Mallinātha present different interpretations of this phrase. In the first place, these śrṇvat people are the agents of a previous action to be presupposed in (f). According to Jayamangala, it is the act of asking (prarthanakriyā)—probably performed by subjects—their ordinary rulers (madhyamāḥ prabhavaḥ) to do something beneficial.

Subjects ask their rulers to do something beneficial → The rulers promise them to do it

Under this view, the underlying idea of the first half of BhK 8.77 is that, whilst ordinary rulers set to work only when asked by their subject to do something beneficial, the best ones take action voluntarily to gain benefits (svayam eva hitam pratipadyante). Although Jayamangala does not make clear in what sense the present participle śrṇvadbhayaḥ is employed, he seems to take this word as meaning ‘subjects’.11

Mallinātha, on the other hand, interprets this participle as meaning ‘those possessed of knowledge’ (śrutaśālībhayaḥ), that is to say, ‘those who teach what is beneficial and unbeneﬁcial’ (hitāhitam upadīsā-dbhayaḥ), and advances the view that a previous action to be presupposed in (f) is their teaching (upadesākriyā):

Those possessed of knowledge teach rulers what is beneficial and unbeneﬁcial → The rulers promise them to behave in conformity with the instructions

Accordingly, the first half of BhK 8.77 comes to indicate the idea that while ordinary rulers can behave appropriately only with the help of instruction received from the learned, the best ones can do

---

10 JM on BhK 8.77 (186.7–10): śrṇvadbhayaḥ prarthe(yamānē)bhayaḥ svāmīn indaṁ kriyātāṁ iti | madhyamāḥ prabhavaḥ pratiśrṇvanti om ity upagacchantū | he bhūrā no tamā mādṛśāḥ | te hi svatāntrayāḥ svayam eva hitam pratiśrṇvanta iti bhāvāḥ | pratyābhīyāṁ śrṇvāḥ pūrvasya karteti sampradānasānīṇāḥ | pūrvasyaḥ prarthe(yamānē)bhayaḥ prarthe(yamānē)kriyāyāḥ prarthe(yamānē) kartṛtvāḥ |

11 In the context of politics, the present participle of the verb śrṇu is sometimes used in the sense ‘obedient, attentive’. From this meaning, the sense ‘subjects’ could be derived. AS 2.1.25: dāśāhitakabandhūn aśrṇvato rājā vinayaṃ grāhavet | (Olivelle 2013: 100.27–28: “The king should enforce discipline on slaves, persons given as pledges, and relatives, when they fail to obey.”)
so by themselves (na paropadesāpekṣāḥ) because they know what is to be done and not to be done (kāryākāryajñāḥ).12

What is illustrated with (g) grnadbhyāḥ anuṃgṛnti ‘others urge grnata people’ is A 1.4.41: anupratiṃgaṇaḥ ca:

A 1.4.41: anupratiṃgaṇaḥ ca ||

“When related with [the actions denoted by] the verb gr preceded by anu or prati (anu-gr ‘inspire’; prati-gr ‘respond, instigate’), that kāraka which serves as agent of a previous act is called sampradāṇa.”13

The grnata people who serve as agents of a previous action to be assumed in (g) are classed as sampradāṇa by this rule. Again, Jayamaṅgala’s and Mallinātha’s interpretations are not in accord.

Jayamaṅgala says that in the first instance ministers (mantri) praise a good servant (anugrāhyasya bhṛtyasya) and then the ordinary rulers urge the former to keep doing so (protsāhayanti). Thus, according to Jayamaṅgala, the previous action is the act of praising performed by the ministers (stūkriyā). Even though I have failed to grasp the point in this view, he seems to consider that the ordinary rulers cause the ministers to praise the good servant so as to invite him to place himself under their orders (mamānugato bhavatī).14 In the light of Mallinātha’s interpretation, the gist of the second half of the verse is this. Ordinary rulers, by dangling before the syncophants the possibility of giving a reward, cause the latter to keep praising them (dītsācakālāpaiḥ prosāhayanti).

**Subjects eulogize their rulers → The rulers urge them to continue doing so**

On the other hand, the best ones, even without being praised (stutim vinā), makes offerings to others such as petitioners (arthibhyaḥ prayacchanti).15

In my opinion, both of Jayamaṅgala’s and Mallinātha’s interpretations are possible in each case.

---

12SP on BhK 8.77 (1.286.6–13): anye madvyatiriktāḥ madhyamāḥ śrṇadbhyāḥ śrutasālābhhyāḥ | idām kāryam idam akāryam iti hitāhitam upadīśadbhyā ity arthaḥ | pratiśrṣyanti abhyapagacchanti | tathaiva kurma iti prati-jānata ity arthaḥ | . . . pratyānyāḥyāṃ śravaḥ pārvasya karteti śravatām sampradāṇatvam | teṣām pratiśrṣvāpekṣāyā pārvasyām upadeśākriyāyām karttvād itī | kṛtārthāḥ kṛtakṛtyāḥ svayaṃ eva kāryākāryajñā madvidhā uttāmāḥ tu nāvam | na paropadesāpekṣāḥ ity arthaḥ |

13KV on A 1.4.41 (1.83.16–17): hotre ’nugrāti | hotā prathamāṇaṃ śāsantā tam anval prosāhayati | anugaraḥ pratigara iti hi śāṁsiṭāḥ prosāhane vartate | hotre ’nugrāti hotāraṃ śāṃsantam prosāhayatītī arthaḥ | (“[Example] hotre ’nugrāti’ ‘the Adhvaryu’ inspires the Hotṛ’.” [This means that] the Hotṛ recites first and then the other (the Adhvaryu) inspires him (protsāhayati). As is well known, the words anugara and pratigara occur in the sense of ‘rector-inspiring’ [formula] (śāṁsiṭāḥ prosāhane). What is meant by the instance hotre ’nugrāti is: ‘[the Adhvaryu] inspires the Hotṛ when the latter is reciting’ (hotāraṃ śāṃsantam prosāhayatītī)”) SK 579 (1.649.5): hotā prathamāṇaṃ śāsantā tam adhvaryuḥ prosāhayatītī arthaḥ |

14JM on BhK 8.77 (186.11–14): anye prabhavo ‘kṛtārthā alabdhalabhā grnadbhyo ’nugrāhyasya bhṛtyasya kasyacin *stutim karvadbhyo [read: kurvadbhyo] mantri bhṛtyāḥ anugṛnti tam prosāhayanti | anugṛnta anu-gṛnteti [grnadbhyo] mamānugato bhavatīti | naiva madvidhā anugṛnti kṛtārthatvāt | gr ‘sabda iti asya prayoge anupratiṃgaṇaḥ ceti sampradāṇasañjñāḥ | grnāteḥ stūkriyāpekṣāyā karttvāt | “I have emended the reading na stūtim to stūtim: there is no negative particle in BhK 8.77 and hence the former reading in BhK 8.77 is inconsistent with the verse.

15SP on BhK 8.77 (1.286.13–15): kičca parvokta madhyamāḥ grnadbhyāḥ śamsadbhyāḥ stāvakebhyaḥ anuṃgṛnti dītsācakālāpaiḥ prosāhayanti | madvidhās tattāmāḥ stutiṃ vinaivārthibhyaḥ prayacchanti arthaḥ |
2.2.2 Wurzel-Yamaka

Utterances (f) śrṇavadbhyah pratiśṛṇvanti and (g) grṇadhbhyo 'nugṛṇanti serve a literary purpose also. The present participle śrṇavadbhyah construed with the verbal form pratiśṛṇvanti is derived from the same verb as the latter, śru. The same is true of the present participle grṇadhbhyah construed with the verbal form anugṛṇanti: both are derived from the same verb gr. This is a poetic device of the type which Hahn 2007 calls “Wurzel-Yamaka” (dhātuyamaka).16

2.3 BhK 8.81

Finally, let us look into BhK 8.81.

BhK 8.81: (h)māvamanīsthā namasyantam akāryajñe jagatpatim |
sandrṣte mayī (i)kākutstham adhanyam kāmayeta kā ||

“Do not despise [me,] the lord of the world (jagatpatim), when he bows [to you] (namasyantam). O you ignorant of what is to be done (akāryajñe).” Can any woman desire (kāmayeta kā) the wretched offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma, kākutstham adhanyam) when they see me properly (sandrṣte mayī)?”

2.3.1 Illustrations of A 1.4.49–50

(h) māvamanīsthā . . . jagatpatim ‘Do not despise [me,] the lord of the world’ and (i) kākutstham . . . kāmayeta ‘Can [any woman] desire the [wretched] offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma)?’ are intended to illustrate A 1.4.49: kartur īpsitataṁ karman and A 1.4.50: tathāyuktaṁ cānīpsitam, respectively.

A 1.4.49: kartur īpsitataṁ karman ||

“That kāraka which an agent of an action most wishes to reach/obtain through the action is called karman.”

[Examples from the Kāśikāvṛtti (I.85.6)]

[1] kaṭam karoti ‘. . . is making a mat.’

[2] grāmam gacchati ‘. . . is going to the village.’

A 1.4.50: tathāyuktaṁ cānīpsitam ||

“That kāraka which is related to an action in the same way as a thing classed as karman by 1.4.49 but is either hateful or indifferent is called karman.”

[Examples from the Kāśikāvṛtti (I.85.14–15)]

16See this article for further details. Note, in passing, that this sort of device is already found in the earliest poetry of India, the Rgveda. For example: RV VI.18.15: ānu dyāvāprthivī tā ta ojo martyā jihata indra devāh  | kṛṣvā kṛtno ākṛtam yat te āsti uktāhām nāvyo janavasva yaṁnāiḥ || (Jamison and Breton 2014: 798.21–24: “Heaven and Earth and the immortal gods give way to your might, Indra. Do, o doer, what undone (deed) exists for you (to do). Generate a newer hymn for yourself along with sacrifices.”)

17Rāvana is the lord of the world and hence for him people should show respect. Such a great person now bows to Śītā (jaṇgamasya ‘py ‘ham tvām namasyāmi). It is therefore inappropriate for her to disrespect him (iti nāvajñā yuktā). MB on BhK 8.81 (1.579.4–6): he akāryajñe ‘viśeṣajñe namasyantam pranamantam jagatpatiṁ māṁ tvāṁ māvamanīsthā nāvajānīhi | jaṇgamasya ‘py ‘ham tvām namasyāmīti nāvajñā yuktett bhāvāḥ |
According to Pāṇiniya, a kāraka-entity to be assigned to the karman category by A 1.4.49 has three subtypes: that which is to be (a) made (nirvartya, example [1]), (b) modified (vikārya), and (c) reached/obtained (prāpya, example [2]). Furthermore, a kāraka-entity to be termed karman by A 1.4.50 has two subtypes: (a) that which is not desired by, hateful to, an agent (dvesya, examples [3]–[4]) and (b) that to which an agent is indifferent (upeksya, example [5]). The function of the negative particle nā in the term anūśita of A 1.4.50 is traditionally taken as ‘exclusion’ (paryudāsa), so that this term covers both these types of karman. Consequently, in examples [3]–[5] the poison and the thieves, which are hateful to the agent, and the tree roots, towards which he is neutral, bear the name karman by the rule at issue.

Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha put forward the same view that A 1.4.49 is illustrated by (h) and A 1.4.50 by (i): in the former Rāvaṇa (jagatpati) is spoken of as the one whom Sītā wishes to reach through the act of despising (īpsitata), that is, it is he who is the target for her scorn; and in the latter Rāma (kākutstha) is spoken of as hateful to women (anūśita, dvesya) from Rāvaṇa’s viewpoint. This interpretation is harmonious with Bhaṭṭi’s general principle in illustrating grammatical rules: he arranges words illustrating the rules in the order they are formulated in the Aṣṭādhyāyī.

2.3.2 Doubled Speech

It is worth pointing out that the verse under consideration can be also interpreted in such a way that Rāvaṇa praises Rāma and puts himself down unintentionally:

BhK 8.81: māvamānsthā namasyantam akāryajñe jagatpatim |
sandṛṣṭe mayi kākutsthān adhānyam kāmāyeta kā ||

“Do not despise (māvamānsthāḥ) the offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma, kākutsthām), the lord of the world (jagatpatim). Can any woman desire [me] (kāmāyeta kā) who is wretched (adhānyam) and bows to [him] (namasyantam) when they properly see me (sandṛṣṭe mayi) ignorant of what is to be done (akāryajñe)?”

---


19 TB on SK 538 (I.603.24–26): īpsitād anyad anūśitam iti paryudāso ‘yam | tena yad upekyām yac ca dvesyaṃ tadbhavam apiha ghyata ity āśayendyām udāharati—grāmāṃ gacchaṃs tṛṇam spratīti || KV on A 1.4.50 (I.85.13–14): yena prakāreṇa kartur īpsitataṃ kriyāya yujyate tenaiva cet prakāreṇa yad anūśitam yuktam bhavati tasya karmapaññāḥ vidhiyate īpsitād anyat sarvam anūśitaṃ dvesyaṃ itarac ca |

20 JM on BhK 8.81 (187.10–13): kartur īpsitataṃ iti karmasaṅājñāḥ | avamānakriyāyā kartṛsambhandhinyā jagatpatraptum īṣṭatvat | sandṛṣṭe mayi kākutsthān adhānyam mandabhāgyam kā kāmāyeta kā icchēt | naivety arthaḥ | tathāyuktam cūṇātpītaṃ iti karmasaṅājñāḥ | yenaiva prakāreṇa kartur īpsitataṃ kriyāya yuktam tenevpeśitād anasya rāmasya pratyuyamānātvāt | SP on BhK 8.81 (I.288.3–7): jagatpatim jagadvandvam māṃ māvamānsthāḥ māvamanyasaṃva | manyaśe kartari luni thās | kartur īpsitataṃ karmeti jagatpataraḥ karmatvam | mayi sandṛṣṭe saty adhānyam abhāgyam kākutsthān rāmam | tathāyuktam cūṇīśitam iti rāmasyānipitakarmatvam || kā sā kāmāyeta | na kāpīty arthaḥ ||

Thus Rāvaṇa’s speech in this verse can be read to convey either scorn or praise. A typical example of this bitextual device is found in Vallabhadeva’s (ca. beginning of 10th c. CE) version of Śiśupāla’s denunciation of Kṛṣṇa (ŚV 15.14–47). This version contains two simultaneous registers of meaning: one denounces Kṛṣṇa who has humble social origins; the other praises him as the Supreme God.22

3 Concluding Remarks

In the grammatical sections of his work, Bhaṭṭi does not devote all his energies to illustrating Pāñjinian rules, but occasionally also interweaves literary devices with his illustrations, as we have seen above: Bhaṭṭi is sensitive to the poetic aspects of even the most grammatically oriented section.

It seems to me that, in dealing with the grammatical sections, few scholars have paid due attention to Bhaṭṭi’s poetic strategies applied therein. First and foremost, the Bhaṭṭikāvya is composed in the kāvya style; and this work is traditionally viewed as belonging to the category called mahākāvya ‘grand poem’. One should not miss the significance of this fact.

Abbreviations and References

AŚ: Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra. See Kangle 1969.
BhK: Bhaṭṭi’s Bhaṭṭikāvya. See (1) Bāpata 1887; (2) Trivedī 1898.
JM: Jayāmāṅgala’s Jayamangalā. See Bāpata 1887.

RV: Rgveda. See Aufrecht 1877.
SP: Mallinātha’s Sarvapatiḥ. See Trivedī 1898.
ŚV: Māgha’s Śiśupālavadha. See Kak and Shastri 1990.


22See Bronner and McCrea 2012 for details.
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ラーヴァナの言葉に織り込まれた文学技巧

川村 悠人

バッティ作 Bhāṭīkāva は、詩文論書（kāvyavāstra）と呼ばれる範疇に属する作品として知られる。同書は、ラーマ物語を美文体で語りつつ、その文法学部門においてパニニの文法規則を、詩学部門において詩学の諸規定を、それぞれ例証することを企図したものである。Dasgupta and De 1943: 184.4–185.5 は同作品の詩的価値を極めて否定的に評するが、川村 2017: 209–248 で示したように、そのような評価は、文法学部門の至る所に仕掛けられた詩的技巧を詳細に検討するとき、不適切であることが判明する。本稿は、kāraka 術語規則が例証される BhK 8.70–84 に焦点をあて、この点を支持するさらなる証拠を提供しようとするものである。以下に論じた文学技巧は、現代の研究者だけでなく伝統的注釈者たちによっても見落とされているものである。

まず、(a) A 1.4.38: krudhadruhor upasrṭayoh karma と (b) A 1.4.39: rādhikṣyor yasya vipraśnāḥを例証する BhK 8.76 において、特定の音が意図的に反復されている。

BhK 8.76: (a)sānkṛdhyaśi mṛṣā kīṁ tvam dīrksuṁ māṁ mṛgeśaṇe
(b)īkṣitavyaṁ parastrībhyaḥ svadharmo rakṣasāṁ ayam

「前（シーター）はどうして無意味に腹を立てるのか、[前に] 目をやろうとする俺（ラー・ヴァナ）に。鹿のような眼の女よ。[俺は] 口をせばならない、他人の妻らの吉凶を、これは悪魔の本務である」

柔らかい鼻音（n, n, m, m）の反復はシーターをなめようとするラーヴァナの言葉の穏やかさを伝える点に、荒いks音の反復はそこに潜む苛立ちを伝える点に、詩的効果をあげている。これら二種の音の明確な対照は詩に律動を生む。

同種の詩的技巧は、(c) A 1.4.45: ādāho 'dhikaṇānam と (d) A 1.4.46: adhiśīṅsthānānam 並びに (e) A 1.4.48: upāṇadvāṁvāsahを例証する BhK 8.79 と、(f) A 1.4.49: kartur īpsitaṁ라 karma と (g) A 1.4.50: tathāyuṭuṁ cânīpsitam を例証する BhK 8.81 にも観察される。

BhK 8.79: (c)āssva sākaṁ mayā saudhe (d)āḥdiśīṁhā nirjanaṁ yamānē
(e)mādiḥvāśiṁ bhuvām (d)āśyaṁ adhiśēvā smarotsūkā

「お前は俺と一緒に宮殿に住め。人のいない森にいてはならない。地の上で暮らしてはならない。寝床の上に横たわれ、愛を熱望して」

BhK 8.81: (f)māvamanīsthā namasyantām akāryajñē jagatpatim
(sandrṣte mayi (g)kākutsatham adhanyāṁ kāmayeta kā

[自身の賞賛とラーマの非難]「お前は見たしてはならない、頭を垂れる世界の主を。なすべきことが分からない女よ。俺をしかた目にしてならず、不幸なラーマをどの女が愛むだろうか」

[意図せぬ自身の卑下とラーマの賞賛]「お前は見たしてはならない、世界の主ラーマを。なすべきことが分からない俺をしかた目にしてならず、不幸で[彼に]頭を垂れる[俺]をどの女が愛むだろうか」

BhK 8.79 では柔らかい鼻音（n, m, m）とときつめ歯擦音（s, ś, s）の繰り返しが、BhK 8.81 では柔らかい鼻音（n, n, m, m, m）と強く響く k の繰り返しが対照をなす。加えて、後の詩節は、語順に入れ替えることによりラーヴァナの言葉に二つの意味が現れるよう構成されている（bitextual speech）。

(h) A 1.4.40: pratyāṁbhṛyāṁ śruvaṁ pūrvasya kartā と (i) A 1.4.41: anupratigṛṇācça を例証する表現には Hahn 2007 が Wurzel-Yamaka と名付けた技巧（同一の動詞語素から派生する諸語を繰り返す技巧）が見られる。
BhK 8.77: (b) śṛṇvadbhyah pratiśṛṇvanti madhyamā bhīru nottamāḥ |  
(i) grṇadbhyo ’nugṛṇnty anye ’kṛtārthā naiva madvidhāḥ ||

[解釈1] 「部下たちは中位の者は絶対するが、怯える女よ、上位の者たちはそんなことはしない。目的をとげていない（akṛtārthā）他の者たちは賞賛を煽動するが、俺のような者たちは決してそんなことはしない」

[解釈2] 「学識豊かな者たちは中位の者たちは絶対するが、怯える女よ、上位の者たちはそんなことはしない。目的をとげているから（kṛtārthā）。他の者たちは賞賛を煽動するが、俺のような者たちは決してそんなことはしない」

現在分詞śṛṇvadbhyahと定動詞形pratiśṛṇvanti とともに動詞語尾śru から、現在分詞grṇadbhyaḥと定動詞形anugṛṇanti としては動詞語尾grから、それぞれ派生する語である。

以上のように、バッティは文法学部門において規則例証のみに専心しているわけではない。彼は様々な文学技法をときおり規則例証表現の中に織り交ぜている。バッティのこのような詩的戦略はこれまで看過されてきた。まずあって、Bhattikāvya は詩文（kāvya）であり、伝統的に大詩文（mahākāvya）の称号を与えられている作品である。この事実の意義を軽視してはならない。