Literary Elements in Rāvaṇa's Grammatical Speech*

Yūto Kawamura

1 Introduction

The Bhaṭṭikāvya of Bhaṭṭi (ca. 7th c. CE) is known as a poetic work (*kāvya*) of the type called *kāvyaśātra*. 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 Bhaṭṭikāvya, see Kawamura 2016: 154.

[2] See Kawamura 2017: §3 (209–248).

1.4.55: *tatprayojako hetuś ca*: *apādāna* 'point of departure', *sampradāna* 'recipient', *karaṇa* 'instrument', *adhikaraṇa* 'locus', *karman* 'object', *kartṛ* 'agent', in this order. There is a subtype of agents, a causal agent (*hetu*).

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

BhK 8.70–72 → A 1.4.24–31 (*apādāna*)

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 Bhaṭṭikāvya.

2.1 BhK 8.76

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

BhK 8.76: $_{(a)}$*saṅkrudhyasi* ***m****ṛṣā kiṃ tvaṃ didṛ****kṣ****uṃ* ***māṃ m****ṛge****kṣ****aṇe* |

$_{(b)}$***īkṣ****itavya****ṃ*** *parastrībhyaḥ svadhar****m****o ra****kṣ****asā****m*** *aya****m*** ||

"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 upasṛṣṭayoḥ karma* and A 1.4.39: *rādhīkṣyor yasya vipraśnaḥ* respectively.

A 1.4.38: *krudhadruhor upasṛṣṭayoḥ karma* ||

"When related with [the actions denoted by] the verbs *krudh* 'be angry' and *druh* 'wish harm to' preceded by preverbs, that kāraka towards whom anger is felt is called *karman*."

A 1.4.39: *rādhīkṣyor yasya vipraśnaḥ* ||

"When related with [the actions denoted by] the verbs *rādh* 'succeed' and *īkṣ* 'observe', that kāraka as to whom various inquiries are carried out is called *sampradāna*."[3]

[3]KV on A 1.4.39 (I.83.6–8): *vividhaḥ praśnaḥ vipraśnaḥ | sa kasya bhavati | yasya śubhāśubhaṃ pṛcchyate | devadattāya rādhyati | devadattāya īkṣate | naimittikaḥ pṛṣṭaḥ san devadattasya daivaṃ paryālocayatīty arthaḥ |* ("*vipraśna* means 'various inquiries'. [Question] As to whom are these [inquiries] carried out? [Answer] To those whose good or bad lack is inquired. [Examples] *devadattāya rādhyati*, *devadattāya īkṣate*. What is meant by these examples is that an astrologer, when asked, reads Devadatta's fortune.")

In (a) *saṅkrudhyasi . . . mām* 'you are furious at me', Rāvaṇa 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: *karmaṇi dvitīyā*). By (b) *īkṣitavyaṃ parastrībhyaḥ* '[I] must read the fortune of the women of others', the situation is conveyed that Rāvaṇa conducts various inquiries (*vipraśna*) as to the women of others in order to read their omens. A 1.4.39 assigns the name *sampradāna* to these women. Thus the plural form *parastrībhyaḥ* has the fourth-triplet ending *bhyas* introduced by A 2.3.13: *caturthī sampradāne* 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, ṃ*). One may be justified in stating that this repetition functions as a device to convey softness in Rāvaṇa's speech: here he tries to soothe Sītā. On the other hand, the repetitive use of the harsh sound *kṣ* would serve to express some irritation he feels with her.[4] This striking contrast between these two kinds of sounds creates the pulsating rhythm of the verse.[5]

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

> BhK 8.79: $_{(c)}$*āssva sākaṃ mayā saudhe* $_{(d1)}$*mādhiṣṭhā nirjanaṃ vanam* |
>
> $_{(e)}$*mādhivātsīr bhuvaṃ* $_{(d2)}$*śayyām adhiśeṣva smarotsukā* ||[6]
>
> "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* |
>
> *sandṛṣṭe mayi kākutsthaṃ adhanyaṃ 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: *adhiśīṅsthāsāṁ 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: *upānvadhyāṅvasaḥ* ||

[4]For 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.

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

[6]The 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 *āṄ* (*upa-vas* 'live near'; *anu-vas* 'live along'; *adhi-vas* 'live on'; *ā-vas* 'live in, stay') is called *karman*."[7]

A locus (*ādhāra*) contributes to the accomplishment of an action by means of holding (*dhāraṇakriyā*) an agent (*kartṛ*) or an object (*karman*) wherein the action resides (*kriyāśraya*):[8] The locus indirectly supports the action through the intermediary of the agent or the object.

In (c) *āssva . . . 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) *mādhiṣṭhā . . . 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-śī* 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) *mādhivātsīr 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: $_{(f)}$*śr̥ṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśr̥ṇvanti madhyamā bhīru nottamāḥ* |
>
> $_{(g)}$*gr̥ṇadbhyo 'nugr̥ṇanty anye 'kr̥tārthā naiva madvidhāḥ* ||
>
> [Interpretation 1] "Mediocre ones make a promise to their subjects (*śr̥ṇvadbhyaḥ*), O frightened lady, [but] not the best ones. Others, not having attained their objects (*akr̥tārthāḥ*), urge praisers (*gr̥ṇadbhyaḥ*), [but] not those like me."
>
> [Interpretation 2] "Mediocre ones make a promise to those possessed of knowledge (*śr̥ṇvadbhyaḥ*), O frightened lady, [but] not the best ones since they have attained their objects (*kr̥tārthāḥ*). Others urge flatterers (*gr̥ṇadbhyaḥ*), [but] not those like me."[9]

2.2.1 Illustrations of A 1.4.40–41

(f) *śr̥ṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśr̥ṇvanti* '[Mediocre ones] make a promise to śr̥ṇvat people' aims at illustrating A 1.4.40: *pratyāṅbhyāṁ śruvaḥ pūrvasya kartā*:

> A 1.4.40: *pratyāṅbhyāṁ śruvaḥ pūrvasya kartā* ||
>
> "When related with [the action denoted by] the verb *śru* preceded by *prati* or *āṄ* (*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 (I.84.9–10): *ādhriyante 'smin kriyā ity ādhāraḥ | kartr̥karmaṇoḥ kriyāśrayabhūtayoḥ dhāraṇakriyāṃ prati ya ādhāraḥ tat kārakam adhikaraṇasañjñaṃ bhavati |*

[9] Mallinātha reads *anye kr̥tārthā* and Jayamaṅgala *anye 'kr̥tārthā*. See notes 12 and 14.

The Kāśikāvṛtti and the Siddhāntakaumudī make the following explanations of this rule:

> KV on A 1.4.40 (I.83.10–12): *pratipūrva āṅpūrvaś ca śṛṇotir abhyupagame pratijñāne vartate | sa cābhyupagamaḥ pareṇa prayuktasya sato bhavati | tatra prayoktā pūrvasyāḥ kriyāyā kartā sampradānasañjño bhavati |*
>
> "The verb *śru* preceded by *prati* or *āṄ* 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 gāṃ pratiśṛṇoti āśṛṇoti vā | vipreṇa mahyaṃ dehīti pravartitas taṃ pratijānīta ity arthaḥ ||*
>
> "[Example] *viprāya gāṃ pratiśṛṇoti/āśṛṇoti* '. . . 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 gāṃ pratiśṛṇoti/āśṛṇoti* '. . . 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) *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśṛṇvanti*, A 1.4.40 assigns the name *sampradāna* to the śṛṇvat people. The commentators Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha present different interpretations of this phrase. In the first place, these śṛṇvat people are the agents of a previous action to be presupposed in (f). According to Jayamaṅgala, it is the act of asking (*prārthanakriyā*)—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 hitaṃ pratipadyante*).[10] Although Jayamaṅgala does not make clear in what sense the present participle *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ* 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' (*śrutaśālibhyaḥ*), that is to say, 'those who teach what is beneficial and unbeneficial' (*hitāhitam upadiśadbhyaḥ*), and advances the view that a previous action to be presupposed in (f) is their teaching (*upadeśakriyā*):

> 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): *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ prārthayamānebhyaḥ svāminn idaṃ kriyatām iti | madhyamāḥ prabhavaḥ pratiśṛṇvanti om ity upagacchanti | he bhīru nottamā mādṛśāḥ | te hi svātantryāt svayam eva hitaṃ pratipadyanta iti bhāvaḥ | pratyāṅbhyāṃ śruvaḥ pūrvasya karteti sampradānasañjñā | pūrvasyāḥ prārthanakriyāyāḥ prārthayituḥ kartṛtvāt |*

[11] In the context of politics, the present participle of the verb *śru* is sometimes used in the sense 'obedient, attentive'. From this meaning, the sense 'subjects' could be derived. AŚ 2.1.25: *dāsāhitakabandhūn aśṛṇvato rājā vinayaṃ grāhayet ||* (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 paropadeśāpekṣāḥ*) because they know what is to be done and not to be done (*kāryākāryajñāḥ*).[12]

What is illustrated with (g) *gṛ̥ṇadbhyaḥ anugṛ̥ṇanti* 'others urge gṛ̥ṇat people' is A 1.4.41: *anupratigṛ̥ṇaś ca*:

> A 1.4.41: *anupratigṛ̥ṇaś ca* ||
>
> "When related with [the actions denoted by] the verb *gṛ̥* preceded by *anu* or *prati* (*anu-gṛ̥* 'inspire'; *prati-gṛ̥* 'respond, instigate'), that kāraka which serves as agent of a previous act is called *sampradāna*."[13]

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

Jayamaṅgala says that in the first instance ministers (*mantrin*) praise a good servant (*anugrāhyasya bhṛ̥tyasya*) 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 (*stutikriyā*). 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 bhavati*).[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 sycophants the possibility of giving a reward, cause the latter to keep praising them (*ditsāsūcakālāpaiḥ protsāhayanti*).

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

On the other hand, the best ones, even without being praised (*stutiṃ 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.

---

[12]SP on BhK 8.77 (I.286.6–13): *anye madvyatiriktāḥ madhyamāḥ śṛṇvadbhyaḥ śrutaśālibhyaḥ | idaṃ kāryam idam akāryam iti hitāhitam upadiśadbhya ity arthaḥ | pratiśṛṇvanti abhyupagacchanti | tathaiva kurma iti pratijānata ity arthaḥ | . . . pratyāṅbhyāṃ śruvaḥ pūrvasya karteti śṛṇvatāṃ sampradānatvam | teṣāṃ pratiśravāpekṣayā pūrvasyām upadeśakriyāyāṃ kartṛtvād iti | kṛtārthāḥ kṛtakṛtyāḥ svayam eva kāryākāryajñā madvidhā uttamās tu naivaṃ | na paropadeśāpekṣā ity arthaḥ |*

[13]KV on A 1.4.41 (I.83.16–17): *hotre 'nugṛ̥ṇāti | hotā prathamaṃ śaṁsati tam anyaḥ protsāhayati | anugaraḥ pratigara iti hi śaṁsituḥ protsāhane vartate | hotre 'nugṛ̥ṇāti hotāraṃ śaṁsantam protsāhayatīty arthaḥ |* ("[Example] *hotre 'nugṛ̥ṇāti* '[the Adhvaryu] inspires the Hotṛ̥'. [This means that] the Hotṛ̥ 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 'recitor-inspiring [fomula]' (*śaṁsituḥ protsāhane*). What is meant by the instance *hotre 'nugṛ̥ṇāti* is: '[the Adhvaryu] inspires the Hotṛ̥ when the latter is reciting' (*hotāraṃ śaṁsantam protsāhayati*)") SK 579 (I.649.5): *hotā prathamaṃ śaṁsati tam adhvaryuḥ protsāhayatīty arthaḥ |*

[14]JM on BhK 8.77 (186.11–14): *anye prabhavo 'kṛ̥tārthā alabdhalābhā gṛ̥ṇadbhyo 'nugrāhyasya bhṛ̥tyasya kasyacin *stutiṃ karvadbhyo* [read: *kurvadbhyo*] *mantribhyaḥ anugṛ̥ṇanti tān protsāhayanti | anugṛ̥ṇīta anugṛ̥ṇīteti* [*gṛ̥ṇīta gṛ̥ṇīteti*?] *mamānugato bhavatīti | naiva madvidhā anugṛ̥ṇanti kṛtārthatvāt | gṛ̥ śabda ity asya prayoge anupratigṛ̥ṇaś ceti sampradānasañjñā | gṛ̥ṇāteḥ stutikriyāpekṣayā kartṛtvāt |* *I have emended the reading *na stutiṃ* to *stutiṃ*: there is no negative particle in BhK 8.77 and hence the former reading is inconsistent with the verse.

[15]SP on BhK 8.77 (I.286.13–15): *kiñca pūrvoktā madhyamāḥ gṛ̥ṇadbhyaḥ śaṁsadbhyaḥ stāvakebhyaḥ anugṛ̥ṇanti ditsāsūcakālāpaiḥ protsāhayanti | madvidhās tūttamāḥ stutiṃ vinaivārthibhyaḥ prayacchantīty arthaḥ |*

2.2.2 Wurzel-Yamaka

Utterances (f) *śr̥ṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśr̥ṇvanti* and (g) *gr̥ṇadbhyo 'nugr̥ṇanti* serve a literary purpose also. The present participle *śr̥ṇvadbhyaḥ* construed with the verbal form *pratiśr̥ṇvanti* is derived from the same verb as the latter, *śru*. The same is true of the present participle *gr̥ṇadbhyaḥ* construed with the verbal form *anugr̥ṇanti*: both are derived from the same verb *gr̥*. 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: $_{(h)}$*māvamaṁsthā namasyantam akāryajñe jagatpatim* |

sandr̥ṣṭe mayi $_{(i)}$*kākutstham adhanyaṃ kāmayeta kā* ||

"Do not despise [me,] (*māvamaṁsthāḥ*) the lord of the world (*jagatpatim*), when he bows [to you] (*namasyantam*), O you ignorant of what is to be done (*akāryajñe*).[17] Can any woman desire (*kāmayeta kā*) the wretched offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma, *kākutstham adhanyam*) when they see me properly (*sandr̥ṣṭe mayi*)?"

2.3.1 Illustrations of A 1.4.49–50

(h) *māvamaṁsthā . . . 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 īpsitatamaṅ karma* and A 1.4.50: *tathāyuktañ cānīpsitam*, respectively.

A 1.4.49: *kartur īpsitatamaṅ karma* ||

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

[Examples from the Kāśikāvr̥tti (I.85.6)]

[1] *kaṭaṃ karoti* '. . . is making a mat.'

[2] *grāmaṃ gacchati* '. . . is going to the village.'

A 1.4.50: *tathāyuktañ 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 Kāśikāvr̥tti (I.85.14–15)]

---

[16] See this article for further details. Note, in passing, that this sort of device is already found in the earliest poetry of India, the Ṛgveda. For example: ṚV VI.18.15: *ánu dyā́vāpr̥thivī́ tát ta ójo ₐmartyā́ jihata indra devā́ḥ* | ***kr̥ṣvá kr̥tno ákr̥tam*** *yát te ástᵢ ukthā́ṃ návīyo janayasva yajñaíḥ* || (Jamison and Brereton 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.")

[17] Rāvaṇa is the lord of the world and hence for him people should show respect. Such a great person now bows to Sītā (*jagannamasyo 'py 'haṃ tvāṃ namasyāmi*). It is therefore inappropriate for her to disrespect him (*iti nāvajñā yuktā*). MB on BhK 8.81 (I.579.4–6): *he akāryajñe 'viśeṣajñe namasyantaṃ praṇamantaṃ jagatpatiṃ māṃ tvaṃ māvamaṁsthā nāvajānīhi* | *jagannamasyo 'py 'haṃ tvāṃ namasyāmīti nāvajñā yukteti bhāvaḥ* |

[3] *viṣam bhakṣayati* '. . . eats poison.'

[4] *caurān paśyati* '. . . sees the thieves.'

[5] *grāmaṃ gacchan vṛkṣamūlāny upasarpati* '. . . [happens to] come near to the roots of a tree while going to the village.'

According to Pāṇinīyas, 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]).[18] 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 (*dveṣya*, examples [3]–[4]) and (b) that to which an agent is indifferent (*upekṣya*, example [5]). The function of the negative particle *naÑ* in the term *anīpsita* of A 1.4.50 is traditionally taken as 'exclusion' (*paryudāsa*), so that this term covers both these types of karman.[19] 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 (*īpsitatama*), 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 (*anīpsita, dveṣya*) from Rāvaṇa's viewpoint.[20] 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.[21]

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: *māvamaṁsthā namasyantam akāryajñe jagatpatim* |

sandṛṣṭe mayi kākutstham adhanyaṃ kāmayeta kā ||

"Do not despise (*māvamaṁsthāḥ*) the offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma, *kākutstham*), the lord of the world (*jagatpatim*). Can any woman desire [me] (*kāmayeta kā*) who is wretched (*adhanyam*) and bows to [him] (*namasyantam*) when they properly see me (*sandṛṣṭe mayi*) ignorant of what is to be done (*akāryajñe*)?"

---

[18] See Cardona 1974: 279–280, note 1; 281, note 7a. KV on A 3.2.1 (I.211.1): *trividhaṃ karma nirvartyaṃ vikāryaṃ prāpyaṃ ceti* |

[19] TB on SK 538 (I.603.24–26): *īpsitād anyad anīpsitam iti paryudāso 'yam* | *tena yad upekṣyaṃ yac ca dveṣyaṃ tad dvayam apīha gṛhyata ity āśayenādyam udāharati—grāmaṃ gacchaṁs tṛṇaṃ spṛśatīti* || KV on A 1.4.50 (I.85.13–14): *yena prakāreṇa kartur īpsitatamaṃ kriyayā yujyate tenaiva cet prakāreṇa yad anīpsitaṃ yuktaṃ bhavati tasya karmasañjñā vidhīyate* | *īpsitād anyat sarvam anīpsitam dveṣyam itarac ca* |

[20] JM on BhK 8.81 (187.10–13): *kartur īpsitatamam iti karmasañjñā* | *avamānakriyayā kartṛsambandhinyā jagatpater āptum iṣṭatvāt* | *sandṛṣṭe mayi kākutstham adhanyaṃ mandabhāgyaṃ kā kāmayeta kā icchet* | *naivety arthaḥ* | *tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam iti karmasañjñā* | *yenaiva prakāreṇa kartur īpsitatamaṃ kriyayā yuktaṃ tenaivepsitād anyasya rāmasya prayujyamānatvāt*; SP on BhK 8.81 (I.288.3–7): *jagatpatiṃ jagadvandyaṃ māṃ māvamaṁsthā māvamanyasva* | *manyateḥ kartari luṅi thās* | *kartur īpsitatamaṃ karmeti jagatpateḥ karmatvam* | *mayi sandṛṣṭe saty adhanyam abhāgyaṃ kākutsthaṃ rāmam* | *tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam iti rāmasyānīpsitakarmatvam* || *kā strī kāmayeta* | *na kāpīty arthaḥ* ||

[21] See Kawamura 2017: §3.1 (411–412).

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 Kr̥ṣṇa (ŚV 15.14–47). This version contains two simultaneous registers of meaning: one denounces Kr̥ṣṇa 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 Pāṇinian 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

A: Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. See Appendix III (Aṣṭādhyāyīsūtrapāṭha) in Cardona 1997.

AŚ: Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*. See Kangle 1969.

BhK: Bhaṭṭi's *Bhaṭṭikāvya*. See (1) Bāpata 1887; (2) Trivedī 1898.

JM: Jayamaṅgala's *Jayamaṅgalā*. See Bāpata 1887.

KV: Jayāditya and Vāmana's *Kāśikāvr̥tti*. See Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D. G. Padhye 1969–1970.

MB: Bharatamallika's *Mugdhabodhinī. Bhaṭṭikāvya: A Poem on the Actions of Rama.* With the commentaries of Jayamangala and Bharatamallika. Published for the use of the Sanskrit College. Under the authority of the committee of public instruction. 2 vols. Calcutta: Education Press, 1828.

ṚV: *Ṛgveda*. See Aufrecht 1877.

SP: Mallinātha's *Sarvapathīnā*. See Trivedī 1898.

ŚV: Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*. See Kak and Shastri 1990.

TB: Jñānendrasarasvatī's *Tattvabodhinī*. See Caturveda and Bhāskara 1958–1961.

Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D. G. Padhye
1969–1970 *Kāśikā: A Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar by Vāmana & Jayāditya*. Sanskrit Academy Series 17, 20. 2 vols. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy.

Aufrecht, Theodor
1877 *Die Hymnen des Ṛigveda*. 2 vols. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.

Bāpata, Govinda Shankara Shāstrī
1887 *The Bhattikâvyam of Bhatti with the Commentary (Jayamangalâ) of Jayamangala*. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press.

Bronner, Yigal and Lawrence McCrea
2012 "To Be or Not to Be Śiśupāla: Which Version of the Key Speech in Māgha's Great Poem Did He Really Write." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 132-3: 427–455.

Cardona, George
1974 "Pāṇini's kārakas: Agency, Animation, and Identity." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2: 231–306.
1997 *Pāṇini: His Work and its Traditions. Volume One. Background and Introduction.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988. Second edition, revised and enlarged, 1997.
2012 "On the Construction type *naṭasya śr̥ṇoti*." *Saṃskr̥tavimarśaḥ* 6: 65–84.

[22] See Bronner and McCrea 2012 for details.

Caturveda, Giridhara Śarmā, and Parameśvarānanda Śarmā Bhāskara
1958–1961 *Śrīmadbhaṭṭojidīkṣitaviracitā vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī śrīmadvāsudevadīkṣitapraṇītayā bālamanoramākhyavyākhyayā śrīmajjñānendrasarasvatīviracitayā tattvabodhinyākhyavyākhyayā ca sanāthitā.* 4 vols. Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Fallon, Oliver
2009 *Bhaṭṭi's Poem: The Death of Rāvaṇa by Bhaṭṭi*. The Clay Sanskrit Library 45. New York: New York University Press and the JJC Foundation.

Hahn, Michael
2007 "Unnütze Spielereien?: Zur Frage des Sinnes der figurativen Dichtung in der Sanskritliteratur." Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik 24: 67–89.

Jamison, Stephanie W. and Joel P. Brereton
2014 *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. 3 vols. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kak, Ram Chandra and Harabhatta Shastri
1990 *Māghabhaṭṭa's Śiśupālavadha: The Commentary (Sandeha-Viṣauṣadhi) of Vallabhadeva (Complete)*. Shrinagar: Kashmir Mercantile Press, 1935 (but with preface dated to 1941). Reprint, Delhi: Bharatiya Book Corporation, 1990.

Kangle, R. P.
1969 *The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*. Part I. A critical edition with a glossary. University of Bombay Studies Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali, No. 1. Bombay: University of Bombay, 1960. Second edition, 1969.

Kawamura, Yūto
2016 "Illustrations of Aṣṭādhyāyī 1.3.29 in the Mahābhāṣya and the Bhaṭṭikāvya." In *Vyākaraṇaparipṛcchā*: Proceedings of the Vyākaraṇa Section of the 16th World Sanskrit Conference, ed. George Cardona and Hideyo Ogawa, 153–174. New Delhi: DK Publishers Distributors.
2017 *The Decryption of the Bhaṭṭikāvya: Sanskrit Court Poetry and Pāṇinian Grammar*. Kyoto: Hozōkan. [In Japanese with English summary (401–423).]

Lienhard, Siegfried
1984 *A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit—Pāli—Prakrit*. A History of Indian Literature Volume. III, Fasc. 1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Olivelle, Patrick
2013 *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India: Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra*. A new annotated translation. New York: Oxford University Press.

Trivedī, Kamalāśaṅkara Prāṇaśaṅkara
1898 *The Bhaṭṭi-Kāvya or Rāvaṇavadha Composed by Śrī Bhaṭṭi: Edited with the Commentary of Mallinātha and with Critical and Explanatory Notes*. Bombay Sanskrit Series 56–57. 2 vols. Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt.

Yokochi Yūko (横地優子)
2008 "Sansukuritto shi no rikai ni mukete." サンスクリット詩の理解に向けて. 'Tagengo shakai ni okeru bungaku no rekishi teki tenkai to genzai: Indo bungaku o zirei toshite' Heisei 17 nendo∼heisei 19 nendo kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kiban kenkyū (A) kenkyū seika hōkoku sho (kenkyū daihyōsha: Mizuno Yoshihumi)『多言語社会における文学の歴史的展開と現在：インド文学を事例として』平成 17 年度〜平成 19 年度科学研究費補助金基盤研究 (A) 研究成果報告書 (研究代表者：水野善文), pp. 101–114.

(Yūto Kawamura, JSPS Research Fellow [Indian Philosophy])

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 Bhaṭṭikāvya は、詩文論書（kāvyaśāstra）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ーニニの文法規則を、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。以下に論じる文学技巧は、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 upasṛṣṭayoḥ karma と (b) A 1.4.39: rādhīkṣyor yasya vipraśnaḥ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: $_{(a)}$saṅkrudhyasi **m**ṛṣā ki**ṃ** tva**ṃ** didṛ**kṣ**u**ṃ** **m**ā**ṃ** **m**ṛge**kṣ**a**ṇ**e |

$_{(b)}$**ī**k**ṣ**itavya**ṃ** parastrībhyaḥ svadhar**m**o ra**kṣ**asā**m** aya**m** ||

「お前（シーター）はどうして無意味に腹を立てるのか、［お前に］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］吟味せねばならない、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（ṅ、ṇ、m、ṃ）の反復はシーターをなだ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 kṣ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: ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam と (d) A 1.4.46: adhiśīṅsthāsāṅ karma 並びに (e) A 1.4.48: upānvadhyāṅvasaḥを例証する BhK 8.79 と、(f) A 1.4.49: kartur īpsitatamaṅ karma と (g) A 1.4.50: tathāyuktañ cānīpsitam を例証する BhK 8.81 にも観察される。

BhK 8.79: $_{(c)}$ā**ss**va **s**ākam**ṃ** **m**ayā saudhe $_{(d1)}$**m**ādhiṣṭhā **n**irja**n**a**ṃ** va**n**a**m** |

$_{(e)}$**m**ādhivātsīr bhuva**ṃ** $_{(d2)}$**ś**ayyā**m** adhiśe**ṣ**va **sm**arotsukā ||

「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: $_{(f)}$**m**āva**m**a**ṁ**sthā **n**a**m**asya**n**ta**m** a**k**āryaj**ñ**e jagatpati**m** |

sa**n**dṛṣṭe **m**ayi $_{(g)}$**k**ā**k**utsth**am** adha**n**ya**ṃ** **k**ā**m**ayeta **k**ā ||

［自身の賞賛とラーマの非難］「お前は見下してはならない、頭を垂れる世界の主を。なすべきことが分からない女よ。俺をしかと目にしたならば、不幸なラーマをどの女が望むだろうか」

［意図せぬ自身の卑下とラーマの賞賛］「お前は見下してはならない、世界の主ラーマを。なすべきことが分からない俺をしかと目にしたならば、不幸で［彼に］頭を垂れる［俺］をどの女が望むだろうか」

BhK 8.79 では柔らかい鼻音（n、m、ṃ）ときつい歯擦音（ś、ṣ、s）の繰り返しが、BhK 8.81 は柔らかい鼻音（ñ、n、m、ṃ、ṁ）と強く響く k 音の繰り返しが対照をなす。加えて、後者の詩節は、語順を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: pratyāṅbhyāṁ śruvaḥ pūrvasya kartā と (i) A 1.4.41: anupratigṛṇaś ca を例証する表現には Hahn 2007 が Wurzel-Yamaka と名付けた技巧（同一の動詞語基から派生する諸語を繰り返す技巧）が見られる。

BhK 8.77: $_{(h)}$śr̥ṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśr̥ṇvanti madhyamā bhīru nottamāḥ |

$_{(i)}$gr̥ṇadbhyo 'nugr̥ṇanty anye 'kr̥tārthā naiva madvidhāḥ ||

［解釈 1］「部下たちに中位の者たちは約束するが、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（akr̥tārthāḥ）他の者たちは賞賛者を煽動するが、俺のような者たちは決してそんなことはしない」

［解釈 2］「学識豊かな者たちに中位の者たちは約束するが、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（kr̥tārthāḥ）。他の者たちは賞賛者を煽動するが、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śr̥ṇvadbhyaḥと定動詞形 pratiśr̥ṇvanti はともに動詞語基śru から、現在分詞 gr̥ṇadbhyaḥと定動詞形 anugr̥ṇanti はともに動詞語基 gr̥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。彼は種々の文学技巧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。まずもって、Bhaṭṭikāvya 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。

『比較論理学研究』第 14 号 (2017): 91–102.
email: ykawamura0619@gmail.com