

A STUDY ON SANSKRIT SYNTAX (5):
ŚABDAKAUSTUBHA ON P.1.4.54-55
[Kartr̥ and Hetu]

Sanskrit Text and Annotated Translation

Noriyuki KUDO

Introductory Remark

In this part of the *ŚK*, only two rules are dealt with: P.1.4.54 and 55. In the definition of “*kartr̥*: an agent” as final member of *kāraka*-category, Patañjali starts his comment on P.1.4.54 by explaining the meaning of ‘*tantra*’ etymologically. He says: *kiṃ yasya svaṃ tantram sa svatantraḥ* (How is this interpretation of the word *svatantra*, i.e., the one who has own loom?) [*MBh* ad P.1.4.54, I.338, 17]. By this understanding, we have to come across the difficulty that the designation *kartr̥* would be applied only to *tantuvāya* (a weaver). Rejecting this *pūrvapakṣa*, Patañjali states the intended meaning in this rule, namely “*ayaṃ tantraśabdo 'sty eva vitāne vartate. ... asti prādhānye vartate. tadyathā. svatanthro 'sau brāhmaṇa ity ucyate svapradhāna iti gamyate*: Sometimes this word *tantra* stands for *vitāna* (extension, canopy).¹ ... But it is sometimes used in the sense of *prādhānya* (being prominent). For example, *svatanthro 'sau brāhmaṇaḥ* (This brahmin is independent). In this usage, we realize that he has his own independency” [*ibid.*, 18-20]. In this way, the word *svatantra*, which is *saṃjñin*, is defined: one who has himself as independent.

As for the predominancy of *kartr̥* over other members of *kāraka* — *apādāna*, *adhikaraṇa*, *saṃpradāna*, *karaṇa*, and *karman* —, Patañjali, after replying to the *Vārttika* XV: *na vā svatantra-*

¹ Kaiyaṭa explains this word as “*vitanyate*: it is expanded” [*Pradīpa* on do., II, 277r] and Nāgeśa further says “*sa ca sanniveśaviśiṣṭas tantusamūhaḥ*: it means an assemblage of threads regularly weaved” [*Uddyota*, II, 278l].

paratantrayoh paryāyeṇa vacanaṃ vacanāśrayā ca samjñā (It [= the difficulty given in the *Vt* XIV, namely that *apādāna* cannot be an agent], does not [arise] because of independency and dependency. Both are the notions being realized in turn. And the designation [such as *apādāna*, etc.] is used according to an expression), states his opinion that when the pot is closely affiliated with the chief one [i.e., main agent], it is dependent but it is independent when it separates from [the chief one] (*evaṃ tarhi pradhānena samavāye sthālī paratantrā vyavāye svatantrā* [MBh ad P.1.4.23, I.326, 7-8]). What is drawn from his statement is that the notion of independency/dependency is relative and that according to the wish of the speaker X (in this case “pot”) is independent and regarded as agent, and dependent in other expression. In this manner, the predominancy of *karṭṛ*, to be accurate, that to be expressed as agent takes highest priority over others, is asserted.

Bharṭṛhari further summarizes the notion of *svātantrya*² [VP III.7.101-102]:

*prāg anyataḥ śaktilābhān nyagbhāvāpādanād api |
tadadhīnapravṛttivāt pravṛttānāṃ nivartanāt ||
adr̥ṣṭatvāt pratinidheḥ praviveke 'pi darśanāt |
ārād apy upakāritvāt svātantryaṃ kartur iṣyate ||*

From above verses, we can extract following reasons why *karṭṛ* is regarded as independent comparing to other *kāraḥ*:

- 1) bringing to bear its capacity preceding to other *kāraḥ* (*prāg anyataḥ śaktilābhāt*);
 - 2) having a control of [other *kāraḥ*] (*nyagbhāvāpādanāt*);
 - 3) [others] depend on it for their performances (*tadadhīnapravṛttivāt*);
 - 4) having [others] stop performing (*pravṛttānāṃ nivartanāt*);
 - 5) no alternative for it (*adr̥ṣṭatvāt pratinidheḥ*);
- 1982 appearing without others (*praviveke 'pi darśanāt*);
- 1983 being helpful even from far place [= indirectly] (*ārād apy upakāritvāt*).

² Keeping this verses of the *VP* in his mind, Kaiyaṭa comments on the *MBh*'s passage (*kiṃ punaḥ pradhānam. kartā. katham punar jñāyate kartā pradhānam iti. yat sarveṣu sādhanēṣu samnihiṭeṣu kartā pravartayitā bhavati* [MBh ad P.1.4.23, I, 326, 9-10]): *kartā pravartayitēti. tadadhīnapravṛttinivṛttivāt karaṇādīnāṃ tasya ca prāg anyataḥ śaktilābhāt pratinidhyadarśanāt karaṇādyabhāve 'py "āste" "śete" ityādau kevalasya kartur darśanāt kartṛrahitānāṃ karaṇādīnāṃ adarśanāt pradhānyam kartur ity arthaḥ* [Pradīpa on do., II, 245r].

Among those reasons, 7) is a reason for admitting an accidental participant as the agent: the *PM*, quoting above verses, explains this phrase as “*ārād apy upakāritvād iti. yady apy asau taṭasthaḥ phalasiddhāv upakaroti* (even though this indifferent person becomes helpful in producing result, [he is regarded as agent])” [*PM* on P.1.4.54, I, 524].

Traditionally in the grammar, the agent is classified into three types,³ namely *śuddhakarṭṛ*, *prayojakakarṭṛ*, and *karmakarṭṛ*. Here is a passage from the *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra* of Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa [p. 243]:

ayañ ca trividhaḥ — śuddhaḥ, prayojako hetuḥ, karmmakarttā ca. “mayā hariḥ sevyate” “kāryate hariṇā” “gamayati kṛṣṇaṁ gokulam.” madabhinnāśrayako harikarmakasevanānukūlo vyāpāraḥ. haryabhinnāśrayaka utpādanānukūlo vyāpāraḥ. gokula-karmakagamanānukūlakṛṣṇāśrayakatādṛśavyāpārānukūlo vyāpāraḥ iti śābdabodhaḥ.

Tr.: There are three types of *karṭṛ*, namely, a direct agent (*śuddha-karṭṛ*), an instigator (*prayojaka*), i.e., a causal (*hetu*) [agent], and a reflexive agent (*karmakarṭṛ*). Examples for each types are “*mayā hariḥ sevyate*: Hari is worshipped by me” “*kāryate hariṇā*: X is led to make by Hari,” “*gamayati kṛṣṇaṁ gokulam*: Y lets Kṛṣṇa go to Gokula.” Verbal cognitions of each sentences are as follows: [from first sentence] the activity having I as its substratum which is conducive to the act of serving in which Hari is direct object; the activity having Hari as its substratum which is conducive to the act of promoting to make [something]; the activity which is conducive to the activity having Kṛṣṇa as its substratum and being conducive to the act of going wherein Gokula is its goal.

The notion of *karṭṛ* is denoted by several grammatical elements. P.2.3.18 prescribes that what is designated as *karṭṛ* or *karana* takes the third case ending (*karṭṛkaraṇayos tṛtīyā*) and by this rule the agent “I” in the first example takes the Instrumental case. In the second case, its underlying sentence is “*hariḥ kārayati*” which is a causative construction and then passivization is applied to it. The *prayojya-karṭṛ*, X, is denoted by the verbal ending *-te* which denotes the object of the

³ Cf. The *Mādhaviyadhātuvṛtti* of Mādhava quotes unknown verse which gives this classification [p. 10]: *karṭtā ca trividho jñeyah kārakāṇāṁ pravarttakah | kevalo hetukarṭtā ca karmakarṭtā tathāpapah ||*

instigation, so that Hari, *prayojaka-karṭṛ*,⁴ takes the Instrumental case which denotes the agent. The third one is a case of the causative: Kṛṣṇa is a *prayojya-karṭṛ* and Y is *prayojaka-karṭṛ*. In its underlying sentence, “*kṛṣṇo gacchati gokulam*,” Kṛṣṇa is the agent but in the causative it becomes the object of the instigation. Since it is called *karman* according to P.1.4.52: *gatibuddhipratyavasānārthaśabda-karmākarmakāṇām aṅikartā sa Nau*, it takes the second case by P.2.3.2: *karmaṇi dvitīyā*. This case, although Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa picks up as the example of *karmakarṭṛ*, shows the example of *karma-karṭṛ* in the sense that original agent in non-causative is termed *karman* in the causative. However, in the technical use, *karmakarṭṛ* means the agent which is turned from original *karman* and oft-used example is “*odanaḥ pacyate svayam eva*,” which is called “reflexive construction.”

Among these types of *karṭṛ*, second type is treated in § 33.0-1 of this study where P.1.4.55 is a subject and the third one, the agent of the reflexive construction, is treated in § 32.1-2.

It is to be noted in this part of the ŚK that in conceptualizing the *karṭṛtva*, not only Patañjali but Bhartṛhari stand on the point of view that how the agent functions in relation to the other *kāraṅkas*, in other words, they focus on the relativity of *kāraṅkas* although they admit the predominancy of agent over other *kāraṅkas*. However, Bhaṭṭoji, having their arguments as fundamental premise, introduces another scheme to define the *karṭṛtva*: the definition intrinsically correlating with the meaning of verbal root.

⁴ The *prayojaka-karṭṛ* is classified into two: *mukhya* (principal) and *itara* (other than principal). The Nyāsa says [on KV on P.1.4.55, I.585]: *prayojakatvaṃ dvidvidhaṃ — mukhyam, itarac ca. devadattaḥ kaṭam kārayatīty atra devadattasya mukhyam. bhikṣā vāsayaṭīty atra bhikṣāṇām vāsaḥetutvāt prayojakatvaṃ upacaritam, na mukhyam. na hi bhikṣā yūyam vasathety evaṃ prayuñjate. iha ca kāraṅkādhikāre tamaBgrahanena jñāpitam etat. tena yasyāpi prayojakatvaṃ upacaritam, na mukhyam, tasyāpi hetusaṃjñā bhavaty eva*. The example for the first type is “*devadattaḥ kaṭam kārayati*: Devadatta lets X to make a mat” and the latter is “*bhikṣā vāsayaṭi*: begging for alms makes him dwell.” The agency of the latter case is realized in this way: the act of begging for alms becomes a reason to stay here so that the agency is supposedly applied to *bhikṣā*.

Text, Translation and Notes

32. *svatantraḥ kartā* [P.1.4.54: SK. 559].

32.0 On the meaning of rule { 139, 10-11 }

Text: *kriyāyām svātantryeṇa vivakṣito 'rthaḥ kartā syāt. dhātūpāttavyāpārāśrayatvaṃ svātantryam.*

Translation: It is an agent (*karṭṛ*) who is intended to be independent when an action [is taken place]. The independency (*svātantrya*) means the state of being a substratum of the activity which is denoted by the verbal root.

Notes: The designation *karṭṛ* is defined as “*svatantra*” in the sense of “what is predominant/principle” (*pradhānabhūta*). According to the KV on P.1.4.54, this rule means that the one that/who is not subordinate is intended to express as something independent in the course of accomplishing an action, that is, being *kāraka*, called *karṭṛ* (*'svatantraḥ' iti pradhānabhūta ucyate. agunabhūto yaḥ kriyāsiddhau svātantryeṇa vivakṣyate tat kārakaṃ karṭṛsamjñam bhavati*) [I, 583-4].⁵ The qualification to the word *svatantra*, i.e., “*pradhānabhūta*” or “*agunabhūta*,” shows that this definition is given on the basis of the judgement of the relative importance of *karṭṛ*; other *kārakas* become operative only when the agent utilizes such and such auxiliary means and their participation into the action are dependent on the agent. Although each *kārakas* are independent in its role, for example, fire (*agni*) cannot stand proxy for the pot (*sthālī*) as far as the act of holding rice-grain is concerned, they are controlled and driven by the agent in the action as a whole. That is to say, other *kārakas* cannot be operative without the agent but not vice versa. In this respect, the agent is the chief participant in the action and has relative prominence

⁵ Cf. Nyāsa on do.: *asty ayam svatantraśabdo bahuvrīhiḥ. svaṃ tantram yasya sa svatantraḥ. asti ca samāsapratiṛūpako rūḍhiśabdah, pradhānārthavṛttiḥ, yathā — svatantra 'yam iha devadatta iti, pradhānabhūta iti, gamyate. tatra yadi pūrvo grhyate tadā tantuvāyasyaiva syāt; viśtrīṭa hi tantavas tantram, tac ca tantuvāyasyaivāsti. devadattaḥ pacatītyādau na syāt. itarasya tu grahaṇe sarvatra bhavati. tasmād vyāptē nyāyāt sa eva grhyata iti matvāha — svatantra iti pradhānabhūta iti. yady evam apradhānam apekṣya pradhānam ucyata iti yatrādhikaraṇādīny apradhānāni kārakāni santi, devadattaḥ kāsthair agninodanam sthālyāṃ pacatītyādau tatraiva syāt. yatra tu teṣāṃ avivakṣā — āste devadattaḥ, śete devadatta ityādau, tatra na syād iti yo deśayat taṃ praty āha — agunabhūta (584) iti. evaṃ manyate — pradhānēnāgunabhāva upalakṣyate. gunabhāvo yatra nāsti sa kartteti. kārakāntarāvivakṣāyām apy agunabhāvo 'sty eveti sarvatra bhavati. nanu ca sāmagryadhīnā hi kriyāsiddhiḥ, ekasyāpy abhāvo na sidhyati, tat kasyātra pradhānyam yat parigrahāya svatantragrahaṇam kriyate? ity āha — yaḥ kriyāsiddhāv ityādi. yady api kriyāsiddhau sarveṣāṃ vyāpārāḥ, tathāpi svātantryam yasya vivakṣyate sa eva svatantra ity ucyate, nānya iti. devadattaḥ pacatīty atra devadattaḥ karṭṛsamjñakatvāt karṭṛpratyayenocyate lakāreṇa.*

in the sense that others are under the supervision of it. This understanding is clearly presented in the above-quoted verses of Bhartṛhari.

However, the definition given by Bhaṭṭoji in this passage differs from his predecessors. While the traditional definition is based on the relative point of view that *karṭṛ* exercises control over other *kāra*kas, newly introduced definition apparently changes its standpoint: it is re-defined in relation to the denotation of verbal root. Needless to say, every designations which come under the *kāra*ka-category have certain relationship to the action, as is prescribed in P.1.4.23: *kāra*ke. Whatever related to the action, more precisely, to the accomplishment of the action is *kāra*ka and particularly called *apādāna*, *karṭṛ*, etc. The action is denoted by the verbal root and later grammarians analyze the meaning of verbal root into two aspects: *vyāpāra* (activity) and *phala* (result). It is their concern that how these aspects are linguistically represented in the sentences; by which grammatical elements they are expressed, and what semantic relation between the denotations and such grammatical form is. Hence, it is inevitable current of discussion for Bhaṭṭoji to re-define *karṭṛtva* by introducing new scheme which is based on the semantic investigation into the meaning of verbal root, namely *dhātūpāttavyāpārāśrayatva*.

Although action itself denoted by the verbal root is realized as a complex of subsidiary activities⁶ and, as for the relation of *kāra*ka to the action, Bhartṛhari also states that particular *kāra*ka is determined on the basis of to which action, i.e., main or subordinate action, it is tied (VP III.7.20-21: *guṇakriyāṇāṃ kartāraḥ karṭrā nyakkṛtaśaktayaḥ | nyaktāyām api sampūrṇaiḥ svair vyāpāraiḥ samanvitāḥ || karaṇatvādibhir jñātāḥ kriyābhedānupātibhiḥ | svātantryam uttaram labdhvā pradhāne yānti karṭṛtām ||*), it is Bhaṭṭoji who clearly distincts two aspects of the meaning of one verbal root and claims that specification of each *kāra*ka, in this case *karṭṛ* or *karman*, is determined by the relation of a participant to the aspects. Navya-vaiyākaraṇas — Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, Kaṇḍa Bhaṭṭa and Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa (it is probably enough to mention only three famous grammarians) — hold the same opinion that *karṭṛ* is a substratum of *vyāpāra* and *karman* is that of *phala*. However, since Bhaṭṭoji and Kaṇḍa Bhaṭṭa are generally known as the “*prthakśaktivādin*: one who has an opinion

⁶ VP III.8.4: *guṇabhūtair avayavaiḥ samūhaḥ kramajanmanām | buddhyā prakalpitābhedah kriyeti vyapadiśyate ||*

that a verbal root is capable of denoting activity (*vyāpāra*) and result (*phala*) separately” as is stated in the *VMM* k.2 (*phalavyāpārayor dhātur āśraye tu tiñṇaḥ smṛtāḥ* | *phale pradhānaṃ vyāpāras tiñṇarthas tu viśeṣaṇam* ||) and in the *VBh(S)* on do., both in the active sentence (*kartariprayoga*) and in the passive sentence (*karmaniprayoga*) they construe the verbal cognition (*śābdabodha*) wherein the activity is main constituent. See the *VBh* on *VMM* k.2 [p. 19]: “*taṇḍulaṃ pacati caitraḥ*” ity atra “*ekataṇḍulāśrayikā yā viklittiḥ, tadanukūlaika-caitrābhinnāśrayikā vartamānā bhāvanā,*” “*taṇḍulaḥ pacyate caitreṇa*” ity atra ca “*ekacaitrāśrayikā ekataṇḍulābhinnāśrayikā yā viklittiḥ, tad anukūlā sāmpratīkī bhāvanā*” iti bodhaḥ.

On the other hand, Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa is known as “*viśiṣṭaśaktivādin*”: one who has an opinion that a verbal root is capable of denoting activity (*vyāpāra*) and result (*phala*) in the form that one is qualified by the other.” In the active sentence, what is main constituent in *śābdabodha* is “activity limited by a result” (*phala-viśiṣṭa-vyāpāra*) and in the passive it is “result limited by an activity” (*vyāpāra-viśiṣṭa-phala*). See the *VSLM* [I, 543]: *tasmāt phalāvacchinne vyāpāre vyāpārāvacchinne phale ca dhātūnām śaktiḥ. kartṛkarmārthakatattat-pratyayasamabhivyāhāraś ca tattadbodhe niyāmakam* (Therefore, the verbal root is denotative of either an activity delimited by a result [in the active sentence] or a result delimited by an activity [in the passive]. The deciding factor is the use of the suffix expressive of either agent or object). Due to this divergency of opinions, he gives more qualified definition of *karṭṛ*. See his *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* on P.1.4.54 [I, 657-8]: *kāraḥkādhikārāt kriyājanane svatantra ity arthaḥ, tad āha — kriyāyām iti. svātantryaṇ ca karṭṛpratyayasamabhivyāhāre pradhānī-bhūtadhātvarthāśrayatvam* (Since this rule is under the heading of *kāraḥ*, [*karṭṛ*] is [the one] which is independent when an action is taken place. Thus said by [Bhaṭṭoji] such as “*kriyāyām*.” The independency is the state of being a substratum of the meaning of verbal root which is represented as predominant in case that the verbal ending denoting the agent is used).⁷

⁷ Cf. *VSM* [pp. 134-137]: *kāraḥkādhikārāt “kriyāyām svatantraḥ karṭṛsaṃjñakah” iti tasyārthaḥ. svātantryaṇ ca vyāpārātāvacchedakasambandhena taddhātvarthaniṣṭhaviśeṣyatā-nirūpitaparakāratānāśrayatve sati tannirūpitaviśeṣyatārūpamukhyaviśeṣyatāvaddhātvarthāśrayatvam. “taddhātvarthaniṣṭha” ity atra dhātvarthaś ca tātparyagrāhakānāpekṣadhātūśakya eva grāhyah.*

32.1 Authority quoted {139, 12-13}

Text: *āha ca* — “*dhātunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛteṣyate*” *iti*.

Translation: Thus said:

“In the action denoted by the verbal root the one which is always [principle] among the *kāraka*(s) is admitted as the agent.”

Notes: As is stated in the previous Notes, Bhaṭṭoji gives new definition of the *kartṛtva* on the basis of the meaning of verbal root. The attribution of the designation *kartṛ* is confirmed by the relation with respect to the activity which is denoted by the verbal root (*dhātunoktakriye*).

In this quotation, Bhaṭṭoji does not specify its source but this half verse is frequently attributed to Bharṭhari in spite of the fact that it is not found in the present *VP*. Several texts, including this *ŚK*, which mention the name of Bharṭhari or the *VP* as its source, are as follows:

ŚK on P.1.3.1 [II, 51, 25-28]: *yadi tu* — “*dhātunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛteṣyate*” *iti Bharṭharipratipāḍitarītyā prādhānyena dhātūpāttavyāpāratvarūpaṃ kartṛtvaṃ tavāpi sammatam, kas tarhīdānīm ākhyātārthah.*

Tr.: However, if the state of being an agent is defined as principle [i.e., the one having] the activity denoted by the verbal root on the basis of the opinion of Bharṭhari and you too admit this, then how is the meaning of the verb?;

VBhS on the *VMM* k.24 [244]: *kartṛṭīyāyā āśrayo 'rthah. tathāhi “svatantraḥ kartā”* [P.1.4.54]. *svātantryaṇ ca dhātv-arthavyāpārāśrayatvam. “dhātunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛteṣyate” iti Vākyapadīyāt. ata eva yadā yadiyo vyāpāro dhātunā'bhidhīyate tadā sa karteti, sthālī pacati, agniḥ pacati, edhāṃsi pacanti, taṇḍulaḥ pacyate svayam evetyādi saṅ-gacchate.*

Tr.: The meaning of third case denoting an agent is a substratum. Thus said [by Pāṇini], “*svatantraḥ kartā*.” The state of being independent means the state of being a substratum of the activity which is the meaning of verbal root. This is proved by the statement from the *Vākyapadīya*, namely “*dhātunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛteṣyate*.” Therefore, in case that one's activity is denoted by the verbal root, that one is the agent. This notion is realized in the following examples, “*sthālī pacati*,” “*agniḥ pacati*,” “*edhāṃsi pacanti*,” and “*taṇḍulaḥ pacyate svayam eva*,” etc.;⁸

⁸ The *VBh* also quotes this half verse and, furthermore, two verses (*VP* III.7.103-104) [pp. 106-107]. Cf. *Bālaṃanoramā* on *SK* No. 559 [I, 633]: *uktaṃ ca Harinā* — “*dhātunoktakriye*

PLM⁹ [p. 166-167]: *tatra prakṛtadhātuvācyavyāpārāśrayatvaṃ kartṛtvam. dhātunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛteṣyate | iti Haryukteḥ.*

This half verse is the part of *śloka* found in the *Ślokavārttika* of Kumārila, vākyādhikaraṇa [MS 1.1.24], *śloka* 71cd.¹⁰ The context wherein this half verse is stated is how other *kāra*kas can be regarded as *karṭṛ* in relation to the meaning of verbal root.

*kathaṃ tu pākavelāyāṃ upacāreṇa labhyate |
svavyāpāre ca kāṣṭhādeḥ karaṇatvādyasambhavaḥ || 66 ||
viklidyanti jvalantīti bibhratīti ca darśanāt |
na caiśāṃ pākavelāyāṃ vyāpārāntaram iṣyate || 67 ||
ekaprayogavat tena kartṛtaiva prasajyate |
pacinā cānupātteṣu jvalanādiṣv asaṅgatiḥ || 68 ||
na hi sadbhāvamātreṇa tāni sambandhakāraṇam |
na ca śabdāntarair eśāṃ upādānamataḥ pacih || 69 ||
devadattakriyāvācī na syāt kāṣṭhādisaṅgataḥ |
sarvavyāpāravācī cet pacir iṣṭas tathā sati || 70 ||
kartṛtvam eva kāṣṭhāder āpannam devadattavat |
dhātunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛteṣyate || 71 ||
sarveśāṃ bhāvanāsāmye na hy anyat kartṛlakṣaṇam |
kāṣṭhādīni pacantīti vivakṣā yā ca drīṣyate || 72 ||
sāpi naivopapadyeta yady anyat kartṛlakṣaṇam | 73ab |*

Tr.: Then, how can such instrument, etc. be an agent in case of the act of cooking in terms of secondary supposition? It is because fuel, etc. cannot be regarded as instrument, etc. inasmuch as their own activities <66>. And we can express their activities in the form of “*viklidyanti*: they [rice-grain] become soft,” “*jvalanti*: they [fuel] are burning,” and “*bibhrati*: it [pot] holds [rice-grain]” <67ab>. However, those are not expected to express other actions in case of the act of cooking <67cd> just as the usage which expresses one action. Thus, they are treated as agent <68ab>. It cannot be so when the act of burning, etc. are not denoted by the verbal root *√pac-* <68cd> because through mere coexistence they do not become the factor to show relationship [to the act of cooking] <69ab>. And their facilities are not be expressed by any other words <69cd>. [Therefore,

nityaṃ kārake kartṛteṣyate” *iti. dhātūpāttavyāpāravatīty arthaḥ*: *Tattvabodhinī* also refers to this half verse but does not mention its source (it simply says “*āha ca*”).

⁹ We cannot find this half verse in the *VLM* but in the *Kalā* commentary of Bālam Bhaṭṭa on *VLM* reads [p. 1249]: *ata eva — dhātunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛteṣyate || iti Hariḥ.*

¹⁰ Cf. Abhyankar-Limaye [1965], p. 361.

√*pac-*] denotes the action of Devadatta [in “*devadattaḥ pacati*”]¹¹ and cannot convey the relation to fuel, etc. <70ab>. If it denotes all activities contained in the act of cooking <70cd>, only in this case fuel, etc. are regarded as agent such as Devadatta <71ab> because it is admitted that *karṭṛ* is principle in the action denoted by the verbal root <71cd>. All [*kāra*kas] are related to the action (*bhāvanā*) and there is no other definition of *karṭṛ* <72ab>. Hence, we have usages such as “*kāṣṭhāni pacanti*,” etc. according to speaker’s intention <72cd>. Such usage would be impossible unless we accept above definition of *karṭṛ* <73ab>.

32.2.1 Reflexive Construction {139, 14-16}

Text: *karmakartary apy astīdam. phalavyāpārayor vaiyadhikarānya-mātrasya pacāv autsargikasya param tyāgaḥ. Viśakalitaśaktipakṣe viśiṣṭaśaktipakṣe cedam tulyam.*

Translation: This [definition of *karṭṛ*] is also [valid] in the case of the reflexive constructions. Since the result and the activity [which are denoted by the verbal root] reside in different loci in the case of √*pac-*, what is more general one [i.e., the activity of original/main agent] is abandoned. This holds good in the views that the verbal root has significative capacity [of two meanings, *vyāpāra* and *phala*] separately and that it has significative capacity wherein one is limited by the other.

Notes: Now, Bhaṭṭoji gets to the point whether above-mentioned definition of *karṭṛ* goes for the reflexive constructions (*karmakartari*).¹² It has been already stated by Kātyāyana that the agency is to be admitted to the [original] object in the case of reflexive construction because the speaker intends to express its independency (*Vt V* on P.3.1.87 [II, 67, 11]: *karmakartari karṭṛtvam svātantryasya vivakṣitatvāt*). In the reflexive constructions prescribed by P.3.1.87: *karmanā tulyakriyam karmavat*, an original object in an active voice is regarded as an agent which conducts by oneself. As far as grammatical operation is concerned, since this rule introduces the passive affix *yaK* to the verbal root, the verbal form to be made becomes the same as it of passive form. However, the subject of this

¹¹ In verse 57cd, the example given is “*ukhāyām odanam kāṣṭhair devadattaḥ pacet*.”

¹² As for the reflexive construction itself (derivational process, relation to other constructions, traditional interpretation and so on), see the following articles: Joshi [1982]; Bhate [1982]; Filliozat [1983]; Deshpande [1985]; Iwasaki [1993]; Kudo [1994], [1996, 45-46], [1997(b), 48-54].

rule is *karṭṛ* so that the introduced personal ending, although it is *Ātmanepada* ending, expresses the agent (*odanaḥ pacyate* [svayam eva]).

We must consider about two points of next at least to form the reflexive construction. The first is the attribution of the agency to the [original] object. Grammatically, it is a principle that what is appointed as direct object receives the operations that are to be applied to the item designated as *karman*. The difference in accordance with the types of constructions is that the role of object is expressed by the case ending in the active voice or the personal ending (*Ā*) in the passive. Then, how about in the reflexive construction? The direct object, rice (*odana*), gets two grammatical labels: as *karman* in the active and as *karṭṛ* in the reflexive. According to the definition given by Bhaṭṭoji, *karṭṛ* is the substratum of *vyāpāra* and *karman* is the substratum of *phala*. To form the reflexive we need to change the relation of *āśraya*.

The second point is, closely related to the first above, that it is to be guaranteed in the meaning of verbal root to have the contents which promote the shift of the labels: the meaning “activity” whose substratum is the original object must be denoted by the verbal root. In this way, by changing our (i.e., speakers’) point of view with respect to the denotation of verbal root, rice is regarded as *karṭṛ* because it is the substratum of the *vyāpāra*, otherwise it has no agency in so far as we accept the definition by Bhaṭṭoji. The *vyāpāra*, which is taken an active part by the original object, must be a constitutive part of the whole act of cooking, i.e., action (*kriyā*) and done a connotation in the meaning of verbal root surely. In this regard, although Kaiyaṭa does not explain, as might be expected, in terms of two aspects of the meaning of verbal root,¹³ Nāgeśa clearly states “activity of *karman*” (*Uddyota* on *MBh* ad P.3.1.87 [III, 119r]):

svātantryaṇ ca pradhānadhātvarthāśrayatvam. tac ca karma-vyāpāramātrasya dhātvarthatve sambhavaṭīty āha — pacyata iti.
Tr.: The independency is the state of being a substratum of the predominant meaning of verbal root. When the action belonging to the object alone is expressed by the verbal root, [*karmakartari*

¹³ *Pradīpa* on *MBh* ad P.3.1.87 [III, 119r]: *svātantryasyeti*. “*pacyate odanaḥ svayam eve*”ti viklittimāravācī paciḥ. tatra caudanasya karṭṛtvam eva (In case of “*pacyata odanaḥ svayam eva*,” √pac- denotes the act of becoming soft alone and, here, rice becomes the agent [of that action]).

construction] becomes possible. To illustrate [its formation], it is said “*pacyata [odanaḥ svayam eva]*”;

[ibid., 120]: *evaṃ ca saukaryātiśayavivakṣayā vidyamānopi karṭṛvyāpāro na vivakṣyate, kiṃ tu anekārthatvād dhātūnām karmaniṣṭhavyāpāramātraparatā. tadā karmaṇaḥ karṭṛtve “karmaṇā tulyakriya” ity atrāvasthāntariyakarmaṇā tulyakriyativam ity evārtho vivakṣyata iti dik.*

Tr.: In this way, according to the intention to express an extreme facility [of the object], the activity of the agent which is in fact present is not intended to express. Rather, since the verbal root denotes many meanings [namely, a group of subsidiary activities], only the activity residing in the object is intended. In this case that *karman* is admitted as *karṭṛ*, P.3.1.87 means that [agent] whose action is similar to that of the object which is treated in different phase.

Therefore, the verbal cognition of “*pacyate odanaḥ svayam eva*” is, according to Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa who is *prthakśaktivādin* as same as Bhaṭṭoji, “the activity conducive to the act of cooking whose agent is identical with rice expressed in singular number” (*VBhS on VMM k. 4 [p. 75]: “pacyate odanaḥ svayam eve” tyādaḥ. atra hy ekodanābhinnāśrayakaḥ pākānukūlo vyāpāra iti bodhaḥ*) and “*vyāpāra*” in this case is “contact with fire” (*agnisamyoga*).¹⁴

In the view of *viśiṣṭaśakti*, the exact verbal cognition of above example is not found but, as is quoted above, Nāgeśa admits that the verbal root denotes only the activity of the original object in the reflexive construction.

As for the verbal cognitions of the active voice sentence and the passive sentence given by the *prthakśaktivāda* and the *viśiṣṭaśaktivāda*, see the following extracted passages respectively:

“*taṇḍulam pacati caitraḥ*” ity atra “*ekataṇḍulāśrayikā yā viklittih, tad anukūlaikacaitrābhinnāśrayikā vartamānā bhāvanā,*” “*taṇḍulaḥ pacyate caitreṇa*” ity atra ca “*ekacaitrāśrayikā ekataṇḍulābhinnāśrayikā yā viklittih, tad anukūlā sāmpratiki bhāvanā*” iti bodhaḥ [*VBh on VMM k.2, p. 19*].

Tr.: In “*taṇḍulam pacati caitraḥ*” *Caitra* cooks rice-grain,” the verbal cognition is the activity conducive to the softening which

¹⁴ See *Darpaṇa* on do.: *saukaryyātiśayadyotanārthā ca tadvivakṣā taṇḍulādigatāgnisamyogādirūpavyāpārasyaiva phalajanakatayā dhātvarthatvavivakṣāyām ity arthaḥ. vastutas tu phalasyāpi janakavyāpāragatapaurvāparyyāropeṇa vyāpāratvena bhānād iti pūrvam uktatvāt taṇḍulagataphalasyaiva vyāpāratvena vivakṣāyām ity arthaḥ.*

resides in rice-grain [expressed] in singular number, whose substratum is identical with Caitra [expressed] in singular number, belonging to the present time. In “*taṇḍulaḥ pacyate caitreṇa*: rice-grain is cooked by Caitra,” it is the activity conducive to the softening whose substratum is identical with rice-grain [expressed] in singular number, whose substratum is Caitra [expressed] in singular number;

tathā ca “grāmaṃ gacchati caitraḥ” ity atraikatvāvacchinna-caitrābhinnakarṭṛko vartamānakāliko grāmābhinnakarmaniṣṭho yas saṃyogaḥ tad anukūlo vyāpāraḥ. “grāmo gamyate maitreṇa”ty atra tu maitrakarṭṛkavartamānakālikavyāpārajanyo grāmābhinnakarmaniṣṭhaḥ saṃyoga iti ca bodhaḥ [PLM, p. 140].

Tr.: In “*grāmaṃ gacchati caitraḥ*: Caitra goes to a village,” the verbal cognition is the activity which has the agent identical with Caitra delimited by the oneness, conducive to the contact which resides in the object identical with the village, belonging to the present time. In “*grāmo gamyate maitreṇa*: The village is reached by Maitra,” the cognition is the contact which resides in the object identical with the village, which is produced by the activity which is belonged to the present time and has the agent [identical with] Maitra.

32.2.2 Reflexive-Causative Construction {139, 16-17}

Text: *nivṛttapreṣaṇaṃ karma svakriyāvayave sthitam iti pakṣe tu pradhānabhūtadhātvartha eveha kriyā, dhātutvaṃ^{*1} tu bhūta-pūrvabhāvanārthatvāt.*

*1. MS110Ob5: *dhātubhūta*°

Translation: However, in the opinion that [original] direct object [in a simple sentence] of which instigation by an agent has been removed [still] remains [agent] on its role of the action, [what is referred as] action here is the meaning of verbal root regarded as dominant. However, originally the verbal root can denote the activity which was there before [but is not there now] (*bhūtapūrva*).¹⁵

¹⁵ The notion of “*bhūtapūrva*” is referred to in *MBh* ad P.1.1.56 (*sthānivad ādeśo 'naLvīdhau*) [I, 137, 7-26] where the replacement of the grammatical elements is discussed. The rule means that the substitute (*ādeśa*) is treated as the original (*sthānin*) except the case of the rule concerning to the sounds. Since *sthānin* and *ādeśa* are different entities, the grammatical operation(s) applied to the original cannot be valid to the substitute; by prescribing this rule which allows the extensional employment, it becomes possible to apply the rules, which are primarily operative to the original, to the substitute even though the original is replaced by the substitute. See in details, Joshi-Roodbergen [1990], pp. x-xi, and pp. 77-85 (Translation and Notes of above *MBh*'s passages).

Notes: In this passage, Bhaṭṭoji refers to one of two opinions concerning to the derivational stages of the reflexive causative construction, namely *nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa*, which is manifested by Bhartrhari [VP III.7.56].¹⁶ This is mainly taken up in the discussion on P.1.3.67 which prescribes that the *Ātmanepada* ending, denoting the agent, is introduced to the causative base, when the direct object in non-causative is regarded as agent in the causative (*Ṇer aṆau yat karma Ṇau cet sa kartānādhyāne*). On this rule itself, since there have been long tradition of discussion how many sentences it is to be divided into, I would like to decline to go into the interpretation of P.1.3.67 further. However, it is necessary to summarize the process of derivating the reflexive causative sentence in order to clarify the difference of two opinions, namely “*nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa*” and “*adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa*.”¹⁷

A. *Nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa*.

A-1. Bhartrhari.

The *nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa*, although Kātyāyana and Patañjali sow the seeds of discussion,¹⁸ is declared in the *VP*, namely, that [original] direct object [in the simple sentence] which has stopped being instigated by an agent [still] remains [agent] on its role of the action; when it desists from being object, it becomes agent in regard to its [activity] (*nivṛttapreṣaṇam karma svakriyāvayave sthitam |*

¹⁶ This verse is quoted by Bhaṭṭoji twice in the *ŚK*. One is treated in A-2 and B-2 (*ŚK* on P.1.3.67) and the other is the passage on P.3.1.87 [II, 393, 1-13]: *yaGātmanepadaCiṆ-CiṆvadbhāvāḥ prayojanam. “bhidyate kṣāṭham svayam eva.” “abhedi kṣāṭham svayam eva.” “kāriṣyate kaṭaḥ svayam eva.” ātmanepadasya triṇy api imāny udāharaṇāni. yaKCṆ-CiṆvadbhāvānām tu krameṇeti vivekaḥ.*

nivṛttapreṣaṇam karma svakriyāvayave sthitam |

nivarttamāne karmatve sve kartṛtve ‘vatiṣṭhate || [VP III.7.56]

asyāñ cāvasthāyām akarmakatvāt karttari bhāve ca lakārah. tatra yad vā kartari tadā śuddhe kartariva rūpeṣu prāpteṣu pūrvāvasthāyām bhideḥ karmibhūte kṣāṭhe yādṛśi kriyā dvidhā bhavanarūpā, karoteḥ karmaṇi ca kaṭe utpattirūpā, tayā tulyakriyā ‘yam bhidikṛṇoḥ karttā lakāravācyaś cety atideśād yaGādicatuṣṭayapravṛttiḥ. yathā nivṛttapreṣaṇasyākarmakatvaṁ, yathā ca kriyāyāḥ kvacit karmasthatvaṁ, kutracin na, tathā “Ṇer aṆau” [P.1.3.67] iti sūtre vyutpāditaṁ.

¹⁷ As for the reflexive causative construction, it has been discussed by several scholars, for example, Joshi [1982], Kiparsky [1982], Kiparsky-Staal [1969] and Deshpande [1985] (mainly in his *Lecture One* containing the references to above three articles). More recently, Joshi-Roodbergen [1994, pp. 109-132] gives detailed analysis on the formation of reflexive causative construction referring to the commentaries on P.1.3.67. The present writer owes a lot to this.

¹⁸ See *MBh* ad P.1.3.67 [I, 290-292] wherein Patañjali uses the example “*ārohayanti hastinaṁ hastipakāḥ*” (p. 290, 3).

nivartamāne karmatve sve kartṛtve 'vatiṣṭhate ॥).¹⁹ Bhartṛhari gives five stages of derivational process in forming the reflexive causative sentence.²⁰ These are sketched in the *VP* III.7.59-60:

nyagbhāvanam nyagbhavanam ruhau śuddhe pratīyate |
nyagbhāvanam nyagbhavanam Nyante 'pi pratipadyate ॥
avasthām pañcamīm āha Nyante tam karmakartari |
nivṛttapreṣaṇād dhātoḥ prākṛte 'rthe NiJ ucyate ॥

Tr.: In the meaning of bare verbal root *ruh-*, what is understood is “*nyagbhāvana*: to cause to bent down” and “*nyagbhavana*: to bent down.” [Both meanings] *nyagbhāvana* and *nyagbhavana* are realized in case of the causative. It is on the fifth stage [of the derivational process] when it [*√ruh-*] conjugates in the causative and the object [in the non-causative] is regarded as agent. The affix *NiC* is used in the original sense [of the verbal root] when it is [introduced] after the verbal root in which the instigation by [original] agent is removed.

His example is “*ārohani hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ*: elephant-drivers mount the elephant.” We cannot know how Bhartṛhari had made derivational sentences but with the help of the commentary of Helārāja the sentences supposed by Bhartṛhari are as follows²¹ (Mg. meaning):

¹⁹ See the *Prakīrṇakapraśā* of Helārāja on *VP* III.7.56 [273]: *dhātvarthāmukūlyena ceṣṭanam kartuḥ preṣanam svavyāpārah kārakāntaraviniyogalakṣaṇam. tadanabhidhiyamāne kartari pacyate odanaḥ svayam evetyādaḥ nivartate. kartrāśrayasya vyāpārasya kartari pratīyamānābhidhiyamāne dhātunā 'nabhidhiyamānatvāt. pratīyamānatvaṃ tu tasya dvārthaḥ pacir iti bhāṣyavirodhād asaṅgatam ity ākhyātam. “tāni dhātvarthāni” [VP III.7.57a] iti ca vakṣyamāṇatvād viṣayavibhāgena dhātvarthatā kartrvyāpārasya granthakṛto 'bhipretā. tasmin nivṛtte svasmin kriyāvayave pradhānakriyāpekṣayā guṇabhūte svavyāpāre karma sthitam, kartṛtayā bhūtapūrvagatyā tv asya karmavyapadeśaḥ. yady api ca kartrvyāpāre vivakṣite svakriyāyam evāvasthānam taddvāreṇa pradhānakriyānirvatanāt, kārakam karmeti sāmānādhikaranyāc ca, tathāpi sāmāthyād atra pradhānyenāvasthānam boddhavyam. ata eva kartrvyāpārepekṣasya karmatvasya nivṛttāv ātmīye sarvatra bhavati svakriyāviṣaye kartṛtve 'vatiṣṭhate iti kartrvyāpārepekṣayā pūrvam karma bhūtvā saukaryātiśayapratipādanaparatatayā tadavivakṣāyam kartā sampadyata iti bhavati karmakartā. ayam bhāvah. na kevalam kartrvyāpārasya vivakṣāmatre karmakartṛtā, api tu svavyāpāre svāntanryavivakṣāyam api satyām. tatas cāprāptāni yaGādīni karmakāryāni “karmavat karmaṇā tulyakriyāḥ” [P.3.1.87] iti śāstreṇa prāpyante. tad uktaṃ Vārttikakṛtā “karmakartari kartṛtvam svāntanryasya vivakṣitatvāt” [Vt V on P.3.1.87] iti.*

²⁰ This problem is also discussed in the *KV* on P.1.3.67 and its commentaries, *Nyāsa* and *PM*, [I, 463-474]. It is the *PM* which makes detailed discussion on the *nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa* in contrast with the *adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa* referred as “*aparah prakārah*” [ibid., 466]. See also the *Pradīpa* and *Uddyota* on *MBh* ad P.1.3.67 [II, 178-182].

²¹ These examples are actually taken from Helārāja's commentary on *VP* III.7.59-60 [276, 11-278, 4]. These are also explained by Joshi-Roodbergen [1994, p. 123] but the numbering is as A.1, A.2, B.1, B.2 and C in order. However, since third supposed sentence [B.2] is not found in the Helārāja's commentary, I follow Joshi-Roodbergen.

- a-1) *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* <simple, non-Caus., non-reflexive>
 Mg. (*nyagbhāvayanti*: to cause elephant to bent down)
 a-2) *āruhyate hastī svayam eva* <reflexive>
 Mg. (*nyagbhavati*: to bent down)
 a-3) *ārohayanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* <causative, original-agent-based>
 Mg. (*nyagbhāvayanti*: to cause elephant to bent down))
 a-4) *ārohayati hastī hastipakān* <causative, original-object-based>
 Mg. (*nyagbhavati*: to bent down)
 a-5) *ārohayate hastī svayam eva* <causative-reflexive>
 Mg. (*nyagbhavati*: to bent down)

In their sentence-denotations, a set of 1) and 3) are same and the other set of 2) and 4) are same.

A-2. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.

On the other hand, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita construes four stages, using not only above example but also his own example, “*paśyanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ*: the devotees see Bhava,” in his ŚK on P.1.3.67 [II, 81, 17-82, 10]:²²

*tatra dhātūpāttavyāpārāśrayaḥ karttā dhātvarthabhūtavyāpāra-
 vyadhikaraṇaphalaśāli karma. tathā ca “paśyanti bhavaṃ
 bhaktāḥ” iti prayogaḥ cākṣuṣajñānena viṣayīkurvantīty arthaḥ.
 yadā tu saukaryātiśayavivakṣayā preraṇāṃśas tyajyate tadā
 “paśyati bhavaḥ” iti prayogaḥ. viṣayībhavātīty arthaḥ. uktañ ca
 — nivr̥ttapreṣaṇaṃ karma svakriyāvayavaiḥ sthitam |
 nivr̥ttamāne karmatve sve kartṛtve ’vatiṣṭhate || iti
 [VP.III.7.56]*

*tataḥ paśyantam prerayantīty NiCi “darśayanti bhavaṃ
 bhaktāḥ” iti prayogaḥ. paśyantīty arthaḥ. uktañ ca —
 nivr̥ttapreṣaṇād dhātoḥ prākṛte ’rthe NiJ ucyate | iti.*

²² See also SK No. 2738 [= P.1.3.67, III, 573-577]: *tathāpi* — “*paśyanti bhavaṃ* (574) *bhaktāḥ*,” *cākṣuṣajñānaviṣayaṃ kurvantīty arthaḥ. preraṇāṃśatyāgo “paśyati bhavaḥ,” viṣayo* (575) *bhavatīty arthaḥ. tato hetumañ NiC, “darśayanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ,” paśyantīty arthaḥ. punar Nyarthasyāvivakṣāyām “darśayate bhavaḥ.” iha prathamatrīyor avasthāyor dvitīyacatu*(576)*rthyoś ca tulyo ’rthaḥ. tatra trītyakakṣyāyām na tañ. kriyāsāmye ’py aṇau karmakāraṇasya Nau kartṛtvābhāvāt. caturthyām tu tañ. dvitīyām ādāya kriyāsāmyāt. prathamāyām karmano bhavaty eva kartṛtvāc ca. evam “ārohayate hastī”ty udāharaṇam. (577) “ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ,” nyagbhāvayantīty arthaḥ. tata “ārohati hastī,” nyagbhavātīty arthaḥ. tato NiC “ārohayanti,” ārohanīty arthaḥ. tata “ārohayate,” nyagbhavātīty arthaḥ.*

tataḥ punar Nyarthasya saukaryadyotanārtham avivakṣāyāṃ
“darśayate bhavaḥ” viṣayībhavatīty arthaḥ. tad iha paśyati-
darśayatyoh samānārthatayā karṣṭhabhāvakatvāc ca karma-
vadbhāvavirahe prakṛtasūtreṇātmanepadam. iha hi NiCprakṛti-
bhūtena dṛṣinā ya evārtho dvitīyakakṣāyāṃ upāttaḥ sa evaṃ
caturthyāṃ iti sāmānakriyatvam asti aṆau yat karma
prathamakakṣāyāṃ tad eva karṣṭ.

evaṃ “ārohayate hasti” ity apy udāharaṇam. “arohanti
hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ.” nyagbhāvayantīty arthaḥ. “ārohati hasti”
nyagbhavat[ī]ty arthaḥ. tato nivṛtta(82)ṣaṇān NiCi “āroha-
yanti” ārohanīty arthaḥ. tataḥ punar Nyarthatyāgo “āroha-
yate” nyagbhavatīty arthaḥ. ihāpi prāgvat prathamatṛtīyor
dvitīyacaturthyos cārthasāmyāc caturthī kakṣā udāharaṇam. so
(')yam nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣaḥ. āha ca —

nyagbhāvanam nyagbhavanam ruhau śuddhe pratiyate |
nyagbhāvanam nyagbhavanam Nyante 'pi pratipadyate ||
avasthām pañcamīm āha Nyantatatmakarmakartari |
nivṛttapreṣaṇād dhātoḥ prakṛte 'rthe Nij ucyate || iti. [VP
III.7.59-60]

iha viśiṣṭavācakayoh śruddhaNyantayor vācyāv aṃsau
vācakabhedāt dvedhā ganayitvā pūrvoktaprathamatṛtīyakakṣā-
yāṃ avasthācatuṣṭayaṇ caturthakakṣāyān tu pañcamī avastheti
ślokartho 'bhipretāḥ.

Tr.: In this case, “karṣṭ” is a substratum of an activity denoted by a verbal root and “karman” is an abode of a result which resides in different locus of an activity and is denoted by a verbal root. That is to say, the usage “paśyati bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ” means that [the devotees] make [Bhava] be an object through the optical sense (*cākṣuṣajñānena viṣayīkurvanti*). However, when in terms of the intention to express an extreme facility [of the object] the instigation of the agent is removed, “paśyati bhavaḥ” is made in the sense that [Bhava] becomes the optical object [by himself] (*viṣayībhavati*). As for this [formation], it is said by Bhartṛhari. <translation omitted, see above>

Then, the causal affix NiC which express the meaning “to cause one who is seeing to do” (*paśyantam prerayanti*) is introduced to “paśyati” and the sentence “darśayanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ” is derived in the sense that [the devotees] see [Bhava] (*paśyanti*). Again as for this, [Bhartṛhari] said. <translation omitted, see above>

Then, in case that there is no intention to express the function of the causative conjugation, the sentence “darśayate bhavaḥ” is made in the sense that [Bhava] becomes the optical object [by himself] (*viṣayībhavati*). In above process, since the verbal forms

paśyati and *darśayati* denote same meaning and $\sqrt{drś}$ - itself is *kartrsthābhāvaka* verbal root, when it lacks the notion of “the agent having same function of the object”, the *Ātmanepada* ending is introduced by P.1.3.67. In the second stage, [desired] meaning is denoted by $\sqrt{drś}$ -, being the base of the affix *NiC*, and that meaning is also [expressed] in the fourth stage so that two sentences are same in their denotations. The agent is the one which is the object in the first stage, i.e., in the non-causative sentence.

Correspondingly, the example “*ārohayate hastī*” is well explained. [At first stage, we have the sentence] “*ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ*” in the sense of “*nyagbhāvayati*: to cause to bent down.” [At second stage, we have] “*ārohati hastī*” in the sense of “*nyagbhavati*: to bent down.” Then, since the instigating activity of the agent is removed, by introducing the affix *NiC* [we have] “*ārohayanti [hastinaṃ hastipakān]*” in the sense of “*ārohanti*.” At last stage, by removing the meaning of the affix *NiC*, [i.e., instigation, we have] “*ārohayate [hastī]*” in the sense of “*nyagbhavati*: to bent down.” In this [explanation of the derivational process], first and third sentences are of same meaning and second and fourth are the same. This is the *nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa*. <the rest omitted>

The sentences of each stages are as follows:

First example same as that of Bhartṛhari.

- b-1) *ārohanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* <simple, non-Caus., non-reflexive>
Mg. (*nyagbhāvayanti*: to cause elephant to bent down)
- b-2) *ārohati hastī* <non-Caus., with reflexive nuance>
Mg. (*nyagbhavati*: to bent down)
- b-3) *ārohayanti hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* <causative, original-agent-based>
Mg. (*nyagbhāvayanti*: to cause elephant to bent down)
- b-4) *ārohayate [hastī]* <reflexive-causative>
Mg. (*nyagbhavati*: to bent down)

Second Example of Bhaṭṭoji himself.

- c-1) *paśyanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ* <simple, non-Caus., non-reflexive>
Mg. (*paśyanti*: to see Bhava)
- c-2) *paśyati bhavaḥ* <non-Caus., with reflexive nuance>
Mg. (*viṣayībhavati*: to become an object by oneself)

- c-3) *darśayanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ* <causative, original-agent-based>
 Mg. (*paśyanti*: to see Bhava)
 c-4) *darśayate bhavaḥ* <reflexive-causative>
 Mg. (*viśayībhavati*: to become an object by oneself))

Comparing to the process of Bhartṛhari, a-4) stage is omitted, and a-2) is of the reflexive on one hand and b-2), also c-2), are not. The reason for the omission of a-4) seems that the sentence of this stage might be confused with the sentence formed by the other view (see below, d-2) and e-2)). The reason for the latter difference is simply that $\sqrt{drś}$ - is *kartṛsthabhāvaka*-root so that it cannot form the *karmakartari* construction.²³

The procedure in case of Bhaṭṭoji's examples is as follows (in order to simplify the explanation, his own example is taken):

From 1) to 2). $\sqrt{drś}$ - denotes "*cākṣuṣajñāna-anukūla-vyāpāra*" and the verbal form *paśyati* is paraphrased as "*cākṣuṣajñānena viśayīkurvanti* (or *cākṣuṣajñānaviśayaṃ kurvanti*)."²⁴ From this meaning, the instigating activity of agent, i.e., *vyāpāra* (paraphrased as "*kurvanti*"), is removed; then, only *phala*-meaning is to be expressed. In this case, Bhava is not only the substratum of *phala* but of *vyāpāra* in the sense of "becoming an optical object." Therefore, the sentence "*paśyati bhavaḥ*" is not simple active but has reflexive nuance;²⁴

From 2) to 3). Here, a *prayojaka* agent appears. The devotees (*bhaktāḥ*) becomes *hetu* and its activity is *hetumat*; then, the causal affix *ṆiC* is introduced by P.1.3.67 and the verbal form is "*darśayanti*" [3.pl.] but in this case the affix *ṆiC* is used in the sense of the original meaning of verbal root, "to see," as is stated in *VP* III.7.60. Therefore, the sentence is equal to c-1) in their denotations;²⁵

²³ MBh ad P.3.1.87 [II, 66, 16-17]: *kartṛsthabhāvakānām kartṛsthakriyānām vā kartā karmavan mā bhūd iti*.

²⁴ Bālaṃanoramā on SK. 2738 [III, 574-5]: *yadā cākṣuṣajñānaviśayatvāpatter eva drśer artho vivakṣitaḥ. na tu tadanukūlavāpārah kṛṇḍhātugamyah preṣaṇāṃśah. tadā "paśyati bhava" ity asya cākṣuṣajñānaviśayaḥ sampadyate ity arthaḥ. saukaryātiśayavivakṣayā anukūla-vyāpārāṃśasya avivakṣā bodhyā. tathā ca cākṣuṣajñānaviśayatvāpa(575)ter eva drśyarthatvāt tadāśrayasya bhavasya kartṛtvam eva, tad āha viśayo bhavatīty artha iti. lakṣaṇayā cākṣuṣajñānaviśayo bhavatīty artha iti arthaḥ.*

²⁵ Ibid. [III, 575]: *tata iti kṛṇḍhātugamyam preṣaṇāṃśam vihāya cākṣuṣajñānaviśayatvā-pattivṛtter drśer hetumaṃ ṆiJ ity arthaḥ. darśayanti bhavaṃ bhaktā iti. cākṣuṣajñānaviśayatvam*

From 3) to 4). Bhava is the *karman* in c-1) and treated as *prayojyakarṭṛ* in c-3). Since it is *karman* in non-causative and in its function it behaves as the agent. Thus, by applying P.1.3.67 the sentence “*darśayate hastī*” is composed. This means that Bhava makes himself become the optical object.

The point in this derivational process is that by removing the instigating activity of the original agent the activity of the original object (previously it is denoted by the verbal root as *phala*) is extracted. Since it is the substratum of the activity, it is possible to make the causative construction such as c-3) and to regard it as *karṭṛ* such as c-4).

B. *Adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa*.

B-1. Bhartṛhari.

The other view, *adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa*, is stated in *VP* III.7. 62-63 as is maintained by some grammarians:

keṣāṃcid devadattāder vyāpāro yaḥ sakarmake |
sa vinā devadattādeḥ kaṭādiṣu vivakṣyate ||
nivṛttapreṣaṇaṃ karma svasya kartuḥ prayojakam |
preṣaṇāntarasambandhe Nyante lenābhidhīyate ||

Tr.: According to some [grammarians' view], the activity of Devadatta, etc. [which is] denoted by a transitive verb, is expected to express on the side of [the object] such as mat, etc. without [the agent] such as Devadatta, etc. The object, which has removed the instigation by the agent, becomes an instigator of its [original] agent and this is expressed by *l-* when [the verbal root] ends in the causal affix *NiC* in the relation of another instigation.

Seemingly, the example that Bhartṛhari supposed is “*devadattaḥ kaṭaṃ karoti*” resulting in “*kārayate kaṭaḥ svayam eva*: the mat itself causes to make itself.” Between two stages we have the causative construction which is not attested even in the *Prakīrṇakaprakāśa* of Helārāja,²⁶ “*kārayati kaṭaḥ devadattena*.”

āpādayantīti Nīlantasya phalito 'rthaḥ, tad āha paśyantīty artha itī. cākṣuṣajñānaviṣayaṃ kurvantīty arthaḥ.

²⁶ Two sentences are found in the *Prakīrṇakaprakāśa* of Helārāja on *VP* III.7.62-63, p. 278. Joshi-Roodbergen [1994, pp 128-129] simulates this process by creating four more sentences:

(1) *devadattaḥ kaṭaṃ karoti*; (2) *yajñadattaḥ kaṭaṃ kārayati devadattena*; (3) *kaṭaḥ kaṭaṃ kārayati devadattena*; (4) *kaṭa ātmānaṃ kārayati devadattena*; (5) *kaṭa ātmānaṃ kārayati*; (6) *kārayate kaṭaḥ svayam eva*.

B-2. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.

Bhaṭṭoji uses above two examples to show the derivational stages [ŚK on P.1.3.67, II, 82, 10-21]:²⁷

yadvā — “paśyanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ.” “ārohani hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ” iti prāgvad eva prathamakakṣā. tataḥ saukaryadyotanārthaṃ karmanā eva preṣaṇam adhyāropya NiC kriyate. “darśayati bhavaḥ” “ārohayati hasti” iti paśyata ārohataś ca prerayaṭī arthaḥ. tato NiCprakṛtibhyāṃ NiJbhyāñ copāttayor dvayor api preṣaṇayor yugapat tyāge “darśayate” “ārohayate” ity udāharaṇam. viṣayībhavati nyagbhavati ca pūrvavad evārthaḥ. so 'yam adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa(m). ihādhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣe “darśayati bhavaḥ” “ārohayati hasti” iti dvitīyakakṣāyām ativyāptiṃ vārayitum samānakriyatvaparam dvitīyaṃ vākyam. tena preṣaṇādhikyān nātivyāptiḥ. nivr̥ttapreṣaṇapakṣe “darśayanti bhavaṃ” “ārohayanti hastinaṃ” ity evamrūpaṃ tṛtīyakakṣāyām ativyāptiṃ vārayitum “aṆau yat karma sa ceṇ Nau karte” ty evamrūpaṃ tṛtīyaṃ vākyam. iha tu aṆau karmanor bhavahastinoḥ karmatvam eva, na tu kartṛteti nātivyāptiḥ.

Tr.: Or rather, [some grammarians have different view]. To start from the two examples “paśyanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ” and “ārohani hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ” are same as before. Then, in order to express the easiness of [the act of mounting, the sentences using] the causative verbal form are made in terms of superimposition of the instigating activity on the object, namely “darśayati bhavaḥ” and “ārohayati hasti” in the sense respectively that [Bhava] causes those who are seeing to do so and that [elephant] causes those who are mounting to do so. Then, after removing two instigating activities expressed by the base of causal form on one hand and by the affix NiC itself on the other, we have the usages “darśayate [bhavaḥ]” and “ārohayate [hasti].” Their meanings are respectively “[Bhava] becomes the optical object [by himself]” and “[elephant] bents down [by himself]” completely same as the cases of previous process. This is the adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa. In this view, in order to prevent over-application [of P.1.3.67], the second portion of the rule [i.e., “aṆau yā kriyā Nau cet”]²⁸ is stated. By this reason, since the

²⁷ See also SK No. 2738 [III, 577-578]: yadvā paśyantiārohanṭīti prathamakakṣā prāgvat. tataḥ karmanā eva hetuvārohañ NiC. “darśayati bhavaḥ.” “ārohayati hasti.” paśyata ārohataś ca prerayaṭī arthaḥ. tato NiJbhyāṃ tatprakṛtibhyāṃ ca upāttayor dvayor api (578) preṣaṇayos tyāge “darśayate” “ārohayate” ity udāharaṇam arthaḥ prāgvat. asmin pakṣe dvitīyakakṣāyām na tañ. samānakriyātvābhāvāñ NiJarthasyādhikyāt.

²⁸ Traditionally, P.1.3.67 is divided into three portions: (1) Neh; (2) aṆau yat karma Nau cet; (3) sa kartā. See MBh ad P.1.3.67 [I, 291, 5-7]: evaṃ vakṣyāmi. Ner ātmanepadam bhavati. tato 'Nau yat karma Nau cet. aṆyante yat karma Nau ceṇ Nau yadi tad eva karma bhavati. tataḥ

instigating activity is added, [P.1.3.67] is not over-applied. In order to prevent over-application [of P.1.3.78] in the third stage of the *nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣa*, the third portion of the rule [*“aṆau yat karma sa ceṇ Ṇau kartā”*] is prescribed [so that the *Ātmanepada* ending is not added]. In this stage, the objects in the non-causative, the Bhava and the elephant, are treated as *karman* but not as *karṭṛ* so that the over-application is avoided.

As heretofore, the sentences of respective stages are arranged as follows:

- d-1) *ārohani hastinaṃ hastipakāḥ* <simple, non-Caus., non-reflexive>
Mg. (*nyagbhāvayanti*: to cause elephant to bent down)
- d-2) *ārohayati hastī [hastipakāṇ]* <causative, original-object-based>
Mg. (*ārohataḥ prerayati*: to cause those who are mounting to do so)
- d-3) *ārohayate [hastī]* <reflexive-causative>
Mg. (*nyagbhavati*: to bent down)

- e-1) *paśyanti bhavaṃ bhaktāḥ* <simple, non-Caus., non-reflexive>
Mg. (*paśyanti*: to see Bhava)
- e-2) *darśayati bhavaḥ [bhaktān]* <causative, original-object-based>
Mg. (*paśyataḥ prerayati*: to cause those who are seeing to do so)
- e-3) *darśayate bhavaḥ* <reflexive-causative>
Mg. (*viśayībhavati*: to become an object by oneself))

The procedure is as follows:

From 1) to 2). The instigating activity, which is primarily of the original agents, *bhaktas*, is superimposed to the original *karman*, Bhava. The Bhava now has the activity (*vyāpāra*) and it is called

sa kartā. kartā cet sa bhavati Nāv iti. Here, the condition *anādhyāne* is ignored. Bhaṭṭoji follows this division but substitutes the word *kriyā* for the word *karman*: *Nyantād ātmanepadam syād anādhyāne. aṆau yat karma Ṇau ced iti dvitīyaṃ vākyam. karmeha kriyā NiCprakṛtyupāttā yā saiva ceṇ Nyantenocyatety arthaḥ. sa karteti tṛtīyaṃ vākyam* (ŚK on P.1.3.26, I, 81, 4-6). This substitution is based on the MBh ad P.1.3.14 (*kartari karmavyatīhāre*) [I, 277, 22]: *kriyām hi loke karmety upacaranti kā kriyām kariṣyasi. kiṃ karma kariṣyasīti.* The idea that the action intended in the non-causative is the same as that intended in the causative has already been given in the KV on P.1.3.67 [I, 469]: *Ṇau ced grahaṇaṃ samānakriyārtham.* See also Joshi-Roodbergen [1994], pp. 124-125.

hetu. Thus, the causal affix *NiC* is introduced by P.3.1.26 and we have the verbal form “*darśayati*” [3.sg.]. This instigating activity is directed to the original agent, in other words, the Bhava becomes *prayojaka* agent.²⁹ In this second stage, we have two instigating activities: one is superimposed on the Bhava and involved in the meaning of $\sqrt{drś}$ - and the other is expressed by the affix *NiC*.³⁰ It is to be noted that in the second stage P.1.3.67 is not applicable because the action denoted by $\sqrt{drś}$ - is no longer the same for the instigating activity is added to it;

From 2) to 3). By the removal of two instigating activities, what still remains is the act of becoming the optical object. The Bhava is originally *karman* in the non-causative and becomes *kartr* in the causative so that P.1.3.67 is applied.³¹

In this way, two derivational processes based on different views concerning to how to recognize the instigating activity produce the same reflexive causative sentences. In this respect, viz., to produce desired sentence, both processes provide correct derivation; it is the number of stages which decides its validity in the grammar. However, it should be noted that in the Pāṇini’s grammar if we want the last desired sentence, we can compose it directly or, at least, immediately from the first sentence: we do not need such intermediate stages with the exception of the use for the purpose of technical demonstration.

Bhaṭṭoji explicitly borrows the passage from the *PM* in this TEXT of the *ŚK*. See *PM* on *KV* on P.3.1.87 [III, 470]:

*tatra yadā karmanāḥ saukaryātiśayapratipādanāya kartr-
vyāpāro na vivakṣyate, tadā nivṛttapreṣaṇaṁ karma svakriyā-
vayavasthitam nirvartamāne karmatve sve kartrtve ’vatiṣṭhate.
dhātur api tadvyāpāramātre vartate* (Tr.: Here, when the activity
of the agent is not intended to express in order to convey an

29 Cf. *Bāṣamanoramā* on *SK*. 2738 [III, 577-8]: *drśeḥ ruheś ca prathamakakṣyāyām karmibhūtasya bhavasya hastinaś ca prayojakakartrvarūpāhetutvāropād dhetumaṁ NiJ ity arthaḥ*. (578) *darśayati bhavaḥ iti bhaktān iti śeṣaḥ, tad āha paśyata ārohaṭas ca prerayati arthaḥ* iti. *cākṣuṣajñānaviṣayatvam āpādayato bhaktān bhavaḥ prerayati, nyagbhāvayato hastip(ak)ān hasti prerayati arthaḥ*.

30 Ibid. [578]: *ubhayatra hetumaṁ NiC. tatra prakṛtibhyām drśIruhlbhyām ekaikaṁ preraṇam. NiCā tu tadviṣayakam ekaikaṁ preraṇāntaram pratiyate iti sthitiḥ*.

31 Ibid.: *hetumaṁNiJbhyām tatprakṛtibhūtaḥdrśIruhlbhyām ca upāttayoh preraṇayos tyāge sati cākṣuṣajñānaviṣayo bhavati bhava iti, nyagbhavati hasti cārthaḥ paryavasyati tatra prakṛtasūtrenāmanepade darśayate bhavaḥ, ārohayate hasti ca siddham ity arthaḥ*.

extreme facility of the object, the object which removes the instigation by the agent remains agent on its role of the action; when it desists from being object, it becomes agent in regard to its [activity]. The verbal root also denotes its activity alone.)

32.2.3 Examples { 139, 17-21 }

Text: *etena kārakāṇām kriyānvayaniyamo 'pi dvedhā vyākhyātaḥ. "devadattaḥ pacati," "sthālī pacati." ananyalabhyasya śabdārthatvād āśrayo lakārārthaḥ. "devadattena pacyate."**¹ *devadattarūpo ya āśrayas tad viśiṣṭo viklittyanukūlavypāra ity arthaḥ. vaiśiṣṭyaṃ cādheyatārūpaṃ saṃsargamaryādayā bhāṣate.*

*1. MS omits this example.

Translation: Therefore, it is explained in twofold ways that *kārakas* are related to the action. E.x., "*devadattaḥ pacati*: Devadatta is cooking" and "*sthālī pacati*: a pan is cooking." Basing on the formula that if the meaning of the word is not understood otherwise, [since the notion of agent is not yet expressed,] *I*-denotes a substratum. "*devadattena pacyate*: it is cooked by Devadatta." [This example means that] the activity conducive to the softening [of rice], which is restricted by the substratum such as Devadatta. In these cases, the interrelation (*vaiśiṣṭya*) [of the meanings denoted by the words] appears as the superstratum-ness by the relational seam (*saṃsargamaryādā*) [which is not expressed in the sentence].

Notes: This passage treats with the intention of speaker. In the definition of *karṭṛtva*, Bhaṭṭoji, following to Patañjali and Vṛttikāras, gives qualification "*vivakṣita* (intended)." As far as X is related to the action denoted by the given verbal root in the form of constituting the part of the action and it is intended to express as independent, it would be regarded as agent.³² Therefore, although 'pan' is not the one which can set in motion by itself, if the speaker wants to express so, it is called *karṭṛ* because it is independent in its activity, i.e., holding something in it.³³ As for the discussions of the *ŚK* about how other

32 Cf. *VP* III.7.18: *niṣpattimātre karṭṛtvam sarvatraivāsti kārake | vyāpārabhedāpekṣāyām karaṇatvādisambhavaḥ ||* 20-21: *guṇakriyānām kartāraḥ kartrā nyakṛtsaktayaḥ | nyaktāyām api sampūrnaiḥ svair vyāpāraiḥ samanvitāḥ || karaṇatvādibhir jñātāḥ kriyābhedānupātibhiḥ | svātantryam uttarām labdhvā pradhāne yānti karṭṛtām ||* 103: *sarvair abhyuditaḥ śabdair niyamo na tu vastūni | karṭṛdharmaivivakṣāyām śabdāt kartā pratīyate ||*

33 Cf. *Bālaṃanoramā* on *SK* 559 [I, 633]: *nanu sthālī pacatītyādau katham sthālyādīnām karṭṛtvam, svātantryābhāvād ity ata āha — vivakṣito 'rtha ity; Tattvabodhinī [ibid.]: sthālyādīnām*

kārakas can be regarded as *kartr* and how the sentences whose agent is originally *karman*, *karāṇa*, or *adhikarāṇa* are formed, see Kudo [1996], § 2.7 (pp. 44-48).

That the verbal ending denotes the substratum of either *vyāpāra* or *phala* by using the formula, “*ananyalabhyaśabdārtha*,” which is originally innovated by the Mīmāṃsakas, especially the Bhāṭṭa school, is mentioned in the ŚK elsewhere: for example, on P.3.1.67 (*sārvadhātuke yaK*) [II, 384]: *pradhānabhūtadhātvarthāśrayaḥ kartā, phalāśrayaś ca karma. phalavyāpārayoś ca dhātunaivopāttatvāt. āśrayamātram lakārārthaḥ, ananyalabhyasyaiva śabdārthatvāt.*

As is seen in § 32.2.1, the verbal cognition of the passive sentence “*devadattena pacyate*” stated in this passage is apparently of the *prthakśaktivāda* which construes the activity as main constituent.

33. *tatprayojako hetuś ca* [P.1.4.55: SK. 2575]

33.0 On the meaning of rule { 139, 22-23 }

Text: *tasya kartuḥ prayojako hetusaṃjñāḥ syāc, cāt karṭṛsaṃjñāḥ. saṃjñāsamāveśārthaś cakārah.*

Translation: The term *hetu* is introduced to ‘*prayojaka*: instigator’ of that agent. Since the word *ca* is included [in this rule], it [= *prayojaka*] is also [called] *karṭṛ*. By this word *ca* the co-application of the terms is intended.

Notes: This passage follows the KV on P.1.4.55 [I, 584-5]: ‘*tat*’ *iti anantaraḥ kartā parāmṛśyate. tasya prayojakaḥ = tatprayojakaḥ. nipātanāt samāsaḥ. svatantrasya aprayojako yo ’rthaḥ tatprayojakaṃ hetusaṃjñam bhavati, cakārāt karṭṛsaṃjñam ca. saṃjñāsamāveśārthaś cakārah.* As is stated in this KV, the compound *tat-prayojaka* is analyzed as a genitive-*tatpuruṣa* compound: *tasya prayojakaḥ*. However, this type of compounding, usually based on P.2.2.8, is prohibited by P.2.2.16 saying that [a *pada* ending in the sixth case^{2.2.8} is not^{2.2.10} compounded with a *pada* ending in the affixes *ṭrC* or *aka*^{2.2.15}] which denotes agent [to form *tatpuruṣa*^{2.1.22}].³⁴ Then, the KV regards this form as *nipātana* (*ad hoc*, already derived form).³⁵

vastutaḥ svātantryābhāve ’pi sthālī pacati kāṣṭhāni pacantītyādiprayogo ’pi sādthur eveti dhvanayati — vivakṣito ’rthaḥ iti.

34 This explanation is based on that of the KV: *kartari ca yau ṭrJakau tābhyām saha ṣaṣṭhī na samasyate. sāmāthyād akasya viśeṣanārthaṃ karṭṛgrahanam, itaratra vyabhicārābhāvāt.* As for the discussion about P.2.2.15-16, see Kudo[1998], pp. 107-111 (sections 8.1.3-4).

35 Cf. Nyāsa on KV on P.1.4.55 [I, 584-5]: *nanu ca “kartari ca” [P.2.2.15] (585) ity anena ṣaṣṭhisamāsapratiśedhenātra bhavitavyam ity āha — nipātanāt samāsaḥ iti; PM on do.: tasya prayojakas tatprayojakaḥ iti. nanu “ṭrJakābhyām kartari” [P.2.2.15] “kartari ca” [P.2.2.16] iti*

Commentators on and after the *KV* construe the role of particle *ca* to indicate *saṁāveśa* (co-application) of two designations:³⁶ one is *hetu* and the other is *karṭṛ* prescribed in the previous rule. By introducing another *saṁjñā* in this rule, *tatprayojaka* become called *hetu* and *karṭṛ* as well. This treatment of the particle *ca* is, by designating X as *hetu* and *karṭṛ*, to afford facilities for introducing affix *ṆiC* by P.3.1.26 and suffix *l-* by P.3.4.69.

The word *prayojaka* literally means “one who prompts,” namely ‘instigator.’ The act of instigating needs, at least, three factors in its establishment: X as instigator, Y as instigated, and Z as act of instigated. X is *prayojaka-karṭṛ* because he is independent in his instigation; Y is *prayojya* but he is *karṭṛ* as far as his act, Z, is concerned because X leaves Y to the discretion of that action. The problem that Y is not independent has been already discussed by Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Unless Y is not independent X cannot be regarded as *tat-prayojaka*, the instigator of that (independent) agent. In this case, X cannot be qualified as *hetu* and the causative expression cannot be made. See the *MBh* ad P.1.4.55 [I, 339, 11-21]:

Praise 'svatantraprayojakatvād dhetusaṁjñāprasiddhiḥ || Vt I ||
praise 'svatantraprayojakatvād dhetusaṁjñāyā aprasiddhiḥ.
svatantraprayojako hetusaṁjño bhavātīty ucyate na cāsau
svatantram prayojayati. svatantratvāt siddham. siddham etat.
katham. svatantratvāt. svatantram asau prayojayati.
Svatantratvād siddham iti cet svatantraparatantratvam vipratī-
ṣiddham || Vt II ||
yadi svatanthro na prayojyo 'tha prayojyo na svatantraḥ pra-
yojyaḥ svatantraś ceti vipratīṣiddham.
Uktam vā || Vt III ||
kim uktam. ekaṁ tāvad uktam “na vā svātantryād itarathā hy
akurvaty api kārayatīti syād” [Vt II on P.1.4.54] iti. aparam

pratiśedhāt katham atra samāsa iti āha — nipātanāt samāsa iti. atra vicāryam asti samāsaprakaraṇa eva vicārayiṣyāmaḥ.

36 See the followings: *Nyāsa* on *KV* on P.1.4.55 [I, 586]: *saṁjñāsamāveśārthaś cakāra iti. asati tasminn ekasaṁjñādhikārād eva karṭṛsaṁjñā na syāt. ataḥ saṁjñāsamāveśārthaś cakāraḥ kriyate. hetuvād ityādinā saṁjñādvayasya prayojanaṁ darśayati. prayojakavyāpāre hi “hetumati ca” iti ṆiJ vidhīyate. tasya hetutvaṁ prayojakasya hetutve saty upapadyate. hetutvāt prayojako NiCo nimittam bhavati. karṭṛpratyayena ca lakāreṇābhidhānam karṭṛsaṁjñāyām satyām bhavātīti karṭṛtvāt karṭṛpratyayena lakārenocyata iti;* *Tattvabodhinī* on SK. 2575 = P.1.4.55 [III, 425]: *cakāra ekasaṁjñādhikārabādhānārthas tad āha hetusaṁjñāś ceti. hetusaṁjñāyāḥ prayojanaṁ “bhismyor hetubhaye” [P.1.3.68] “bhiyo hetubhaye ṣuK” [P.7.3.40] ityātau prayojakasya hetutvena vyavahāraḥ. karṭṛsaṁjñāyās tu “laḥ karmaṇi ca bhāve ca —” [P.3.4.69] iti sūtreṇa prayojake vācye lakārādayaḥ.*

uktaṃ “na vā sāmānyakṛtatvād dhetuto hy aviśiṣṭaṃ svatantra-prayojakatvād aprayojaka iti cen muktasaṃśayena tulyam” [Vt XII-XIII on P.3.1.26, II, 35, 16 and 21] iti.

Joshi-Roodbergen [1995, pp. 160-163] divide this rule into two: P.1.4.55(a) “*tatprayojakah*” and P.1.4.55(b) “*hetuś ca*.” They give two reasons for this division that the place of the particle *ca*, at the third position in this rule, is not natural and that “in the present context, *ca* serves as a boundary marker” (p. 160). See above reference in details.

33.1 Example and its explanation { 139, 23-25 }

Text: “*kurvantam prerayati kārayati hariḥ.*” *hetutvāt tadvyāpāre “hetumati ca”* [P.3.1.26] *iti NiC*.³⁷ *kartṛtvāt kartari lakārah.*

Translation: For example, “*kurvantam prerayati; kārayati hariḥ*: Hari prompts Y to do; makes Y do what Y is doing.” Since Hari is *hetu*, the causative affix *NiC* is introduced by P.3.1.26 in regard to his activity. In this case, since it is [also] the agent, the verbal ending *l-* represents the agent.

Notes: The prompting agent is called *kartṛ* as well as *hetu*. This co-application of the designations is confirmed by the word *ca*. In this example, Hari is called *hetu* and his activity is the act of prompting Y to do something; this activity (*tadvyāpāra*) is regarded as *hetumat*; then, P.3.1.26 becomes applicable. The causal affix *NiC* is introduced after the verbal root. On the other hand, since *kartṛ*, i.e., the prompting agent, is not yet expressed, *l*-suffix is introduced to denote the agent. Here is a *prakriyā* of the word *kārayati*.³⁸

<i>kr</i> + <i>NiC</i>	P.3.1.26 [<i>hetu</i> = Hari, <i>hetumat</i> = <i>tadvyāpāra</i>]
<i>kr</i> + <i>i</i> + <i>lAT</i>	P.3.2.123 [present tense selected]
<i>kr</i> + <i>i</i> + <i>tiP</i>	P.3.4.77, 78 [<i>l</i> -> <i>tiP</i> -replacement]
<i>kr</i> + <i>i</i> + <i>ŚaP</i> + <i>ti</i>	P.3.1.68 [<i>kartari</i>]
<i>kār-i-a-ti</i>	P.7.2.115, 1.1.51 [<i>r</i> > <i>ār</i>]
<i>kār-e-a-ti</i>	P.7.3.84 [<i>i</i> > <i>e</i>]
<i>kār-ay-a-ti</i>	P.6.1.78 [<i>e</i> > <i>ay</i>]

³⁷ ŚK on P.3.1.26 [II, 342]: *hetuḥ kartuḥ prayojakah, tadvyāpārah pravartanārūpo hetumān, tasmin vācye dhātor NiC syāt. “pācayati devadatto yajñadattena.” yajñadattaniṣṭhaviṣṭhavyanukūlavvyāpāraviṣayini pravartanā devadattāśrayety arthah. Cf. SK. 2576 [III, 425-6]: prayojakavyāpāre preṣanādau vācye dhātor NiC syāt. Tattvabodhini on do.: svaniṣṭhādhāratānirūpitādheyatāsambandhena hetur yatrāsti sa hetumān vyāpārah, tasmin vācye NiC ity āhuh. prayojakavyāpāra iti.*

³⁸ This *prakriyā* is based on Joshi-Roodbergen [1975], p. 275, footnote 911.

It is to be noted that the word *hetumat* means not only the person who is instigated by someone but also the activity. In the *Vts*³⁹ on P.1.4.54, the independency of the prompted is discussed. This problem that the prompted agent serves no longer as agent because he starts to do something by order of someone is resolved by Patañjali saying that “after checking that the prompted is doing or not doing, he [i.e., prompter] concludes that he [i.e., the prompted] is independent when he is doing and he is not when he is not doing. [On the other hand, if the prompted does not do it inspite of the order by [the prompter], he is independent [from the prompter].” (*MBh* ad P.1.4.55 [I. 339, 7-9]: *preṣite ca kilāyaṃ kriyāṃ cākriyāṃ ca dṛṣṭvādhyava-syati kurvan svatanthro 'kruvan neti. yadi ca preṣito 'sau na karoti svatanthro 'sau bhavatīti*). There is a difference between the independence of former case and of latter case: in the former case, it is the notion of independence in the action (this is the grammatical sense) and in the latter it is that in the personal relationship which is not to be treated in the science of grammar. What is *svatantra* is nothing but the agent according to the definition of previous rule. Thus, Kātyāyana and Patañjali thinks that the word *hetumat* discussed in the *Vts* and *bhāṣya* on P.1.4.54 means the agent of the action.

However, Patañjali rises a question about the word *hetumat* in the *MBh* ad on P.3.1.26 [II. 31, 7-8]:

katham idaṃ vijñāyate. hetumaty abhidheye NiJ bhavatīti. āhosvid dhetumati yo dhātur vartata iti.

Taking up this awareness of the issue, the *KV* clearly states [on P.3.1.26, II, 388]:

hetuḥ svatantrasya (kartuḥ) prayojakaḥ, tadīyo vyāpāraḥ preṣaṇādīlakṣaṇo hetumān, tasminn abhidheye dhātor NiC pratyayo bhavati (Tr.: *Hetu* means “a prompter of an agent who is independent.” The activity belonging to him such as instigation (*preṣaṇa*), etc. is called *hetumat*. When it [the activity] is expressed, the causal affix *NiC* is introduced after the verbal root).⁴⁰

³⁹ *Vt* I [I. 338, 21]: *svatantrasya kartṛsaṃjñāyām hetumaty upasaṃkhyānam asvatantratvāt; ViII* [ibid., 339, 1]: *na vā svātantryād itarathā hy akurvaty api kārayatīti syāt; Vt* III [ibid., 5]: *nākurvatīti cet svatantraḥ*.

⁴⁰ The *Nyāsa* comments [ibid.]: *tadīya iti. tatsambandhī kriyātmako vyāpāraḥ*. See also the *Pradīpa* on *MBh* ad P.3.1.26 [III, 57r]: *hetumati ca. kṛtrimasya pāribhāṣikasya prayojakasyeha*

In order to illustrate this interpretation, the *KV* gives examples: *kurvāṇaṃ prayuṅkte, kārayati. hārayati* [on P.1.4.55, I, 586]. In this way, the word *hetumat* in P.3.1.26 is explained to mean the activity of *hetu* but not the person who has *hetu*. Therefore, in deriving the causative form, since the causal affix *ṆiC* is introduced to express the activity of the prompter, the notion of agent of the prompter is not yet expressed so that *l-* is introduced. This passage of the *ŚK* follows established interpretation of the rule.

End of the *āhnika*.

Text: *iti Śrī Śabdakaustubhe prathamasya adhyāyasya caturthe pāde tṛtīyam āhnikam.*

(to be continued)

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

(A-1) Sanskrit Sources [Pāṇinian]

KV: *Kāśikāvṛtti* of Vāmana and Jayāditya.

(a) Eds. by Aryendra Sharma and Khanderao Deshpande, 2 Vols. Sanskrit Academy Series Nos. 17, 20. Hyderabad: Osmania University, 1969-70.

(b) — with Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa* (*Kāśikāvivarāṇapañjikā*) and Haradatta's *Padamañjarī*. Ed. by D.D. Shastri and K.P. Shukla, 6 Vols. Ratna Bharati Series Nos. 5-10. Varanasi: Ratna Publication, 1965-67 [Text referred by volume and page].

LŚ: *Laghuśadendūśekhara* of Nāgeśa (Nāgoji) Bhaṭṭa.

with a commentary *Chandrakalā* by Bhairava Miśra, Ed. by Narahari Śāstrī Pende (Re-ed. by Gopāla Śāstrī Nene), Vols. 2, Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 5, Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan, 2nd. 1987.

MBh: Patañjali's *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*.

(a) Ed. by F.Kielhorn, rev.by K.V.Abhyankar, 3 Vols. Poona: BORI, 1962, 1965, 1972. [Text is referred by volume, page, and line]

(b) — with the *Pradīpa* of Kaiyata and *Uddyota* of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa. Ed. by Guru Prasad Shastri (rev.by Bal Shastri) 6 vols. (7 parts), (Vol.1 has two parts. The first part contains Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Śabdakaustubha* but only *navāhnikas*). Varanasi: Vani Vilas Prakashan, 1987. (Rep. of Shri Rajasthan Sanskrit College Granthamala 30, 1938?).

(c) — with *Pradīpa* and *Uddyota*. Eds. by Bhārgavaśāstrī Bhikāji Joshi et al. 6 Vols. Vrajajīvan Prācyabhāratī Granthamālā No. 23, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 1988. (Rep. NSP. edition); Volume 2 is edited by M.M.Pandit Shivadatta Sharma [Text referred by volume and page].

MDhV: *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti* of Mādhava or Sāyaṇa.

Eds. by Pt.Ananta Sastri Rhadake and Pt. Sadasiva Sarma Sastri, Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 103, Varanasi, 1934.

MS: Manuscript of *ŚK* preserved in Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. No. 655 of 1891-95, folios 48, lines 11, letters 42, Devānāgarī, Saṃvat 1847.

Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi.

see *KV*(b) [Text referred by volume and page].

P: Pāṇini's *sūtra*.

hetor grahaṇam. tadyo vyāpārah preṣanādhyeṣaṇatatsamarthācaraṇalakṣaṇo hetumān iha grhyate.

- PM: Padamañjarī* of Haradatta Miśra.
 (a) see *KV(b)* [Text referred by volume and page].
 (b) Eds. by P. Sri Ramacandruru and V. Sundara Sarma. 2 Vols. Sanskrit Academy Series No. 26, Hyderabad, 1981.
- ŚK: Śabdakaustubha* of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.
 (a) Ed. by Gopāla Shastri Nene. 3 Vols. Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series No. 2. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Office, rep. 1991.
 (b) see *MBh(b)*.
- SK: Siddhāntakaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.
 with *Bālaṃanoramā* and *Tattvabodhinī*.
 Eds. by Giridhara Śarmā Caturveda and Parameśvarānanda Śarmā Bhāskara, 4 Vols. Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1958-1961 [Text referred by volume and page].
- VBh: Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa* of Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa.
 Ed. by Pt. Manudeva Bhaṭṭācārya. Harijivandas Pracyavidya Granthamala No. 2, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan, 1985.
- VBhS: Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇsāra* of Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa.
 with *Darpaṇa* commentary by Śrī Harivallabha.
 Ed. by Chandrika Prasad Dwivedi. Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala No. 42, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan, 1989.
- VMM: Vaiyākaraṇamattonmajjana* of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.
 see *VBhS* and *VBh*.
- VP: Vākyapadīya* of Bhaṭṭarṭhari.
 (a) Ed. by Wilhelm Rau. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes Bd. 42.4. Wiesbaden, 1977.
 (b) Eds. by K.V. Abhyankar and V.P. Limaye. University of Poona Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. 2, Poona: University of Poona, 1965.
 (c) — *Kāṇḍa* III. part i, with *Prakīrṇaka-Prakāśa* of Helārāja. Ed. by K.A. Subrahmanya Iyer. Deccan College Monograph Series No. 21, Poona: Deccan College, 1963.
- VSLM: Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntalaghumañjūsā* of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa.
 Eds. by Pt. Madhava Shastri Bhandari, Pt. Narahari Shastri Pendey, et al. 2 Vols. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series No. 44, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Office, 2nd ed., 1989.
- VSM: Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntamañjūsā* of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa.
 Ed. by Kapila Deva Shastri. Kurukshetra: Vishal Publication, 1985.
- (A-2) Sanskrit Source [Other System].
- ŚV: Śloka-vārttika* of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa.
 with Nyāyaratnakāra of Pārthasārthi Miśra.
 Ed. by Svāmī Dvārikādāsa Śāstrī. Ratnabharati Series No. 3, Varanasi: Ratna Publications, 1978.
- (B) Secondary Sources.
- Bhate, Saroja
 1982 "A Note on *Karmakartari*," in *CASS Studies* 6, Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit Class E No. 8, University of Poona, pp. 173-6.
- Deshpande, Madhav M.
 1985 *Ellipsis and Syntactic Overlapping: Current issues in Pāṇinian Syntactic Theory*. Post-graduate Research Department Series No. 24, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Filliozat, Pierre
 1983 "The Pāṇinian Conception of *Karmakartṛ*," in *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Eds. by S.D. Joshi and S.D. Laddu, Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit Class E No. 9, University of Poona, pp. 11-16.
- Iwasaki, Yoshiyuki
 1993 "Pāṇini Bunpougaku ni okeru <Tai> Kijyutsu no Ichi Kousatsu — Jidou Saiki Youhou (*karmakartari*) ni tsuite," in *Indotetsugaku Bukkyougaku* ("Remarks on the Voice Description in the Pāṇinian School — Concerning the Intransitive-reflexive (*karmakartari*)," in *Hokkaido Journal of Indological and Buddhist Studies*) No. 8, pp. 40-62 [In Japanese].
- Joshi, S.D.
 1984 "The Reflexive Constructions in Pāṇini," in *CASS Studies* 6, Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit Class E No. 8, University of Poona. pp. 199-214.

- Joshi, S.D. and J.A.F.Roodbergen
 1975 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Kāraṇāhnikā* (P.1.4.23-55), Publication of the Centre of the Advanced Studies in Sanskrit Class C No. 10, Poona: University of Poona.
 1990 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Sthānivadbhāvāhnikā* Part I (P.1.1.56-1.1.57), Poona Research Unit Publications No. 11, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
 1994 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, with Translation and Explanatory Note, Vol. III (1.3.1-1.3.93), Pune: Sahitya Academy.
 1995 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, with Translation and Explanatory Note, Vol. IV (1.4.1-1.4.110), Pune: Sahitya Academy.
- Katre, Sumitra M.
 1987 *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul
 1982 *Some Theoretical Problems in Pāṇini's Grammar*, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kiparsky, Paul and J.F.Staal
 1969 "Syntactic and Semantic Relations in Pāṇini," in *Foundations of Language*, Vol. 5, pp. 83-117.
- Kudo, Noriyuki
 1994 "Why *jñāyate svayam eva ghaṭaḥ is not Accepted? — Karmakartari Construction Discussed by Navyavaiyākaraṇas," in *Vācaspatyam: Felicitation Volume of Pt. Vaman Shastri Bhagavat*, Eds. by Madhav M. Deshpande and Saroja Bhate. Poona: Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, pp. 17-33.
 1996 "A Study on Sanskrit Syntax (1): Śabdakaustubha on P.1.4.23," in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṁbhāṣā*, Vol. 17, pp. 27-64.
 1997(a) "A Study on Sanskrit Syntax (2): Śadakaustubha on P.1.4.24 [Apādāna (1)]," in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṁbhāṣā*, vol. 18, pp. 143-181.
 1997(b) "Shin-ronrigakuha no Koui-syutaisei (kartṛtva) Teigi — Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgiśa Kāraṇakakra Dai-ni-syou," in *Bukkyō Daigaku Bukkyōgakkai*, Vol. 5, pp. 29-74 ("Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgiśa on Kartṛtva: Annotated Japanese Translation of the Kāraṇakakra §2," in *The Bulletin of the Association of Buddhist Studies*, Bukkyō University, Vol. V, pp. 29-74) [In Japanese].
 1998 "A Study on Sanskrit Syntax (3): Śabdakaustubha on P.1.4.25-31 [Apādāna (2)]," in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṁbhāṣā*, Vol. 19, pp. 83-123.
 1999 "A Study on Sanskrit Syntax (4): Śabdakaustubha on P.1.4.45-48 [Adhikaraṇa]," in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṁbhāṣā*, Vol. 20, pp. 63-87.
- Ogawa, Hideyo
 1990 *Koui to Gengo — Sansukuritto Imiron Kenkyū: Dousi Gokon no Imi*, as Special Issue of *Hiroshima Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyō*, 49.3 (Action and Language — A Study of Sanskrit Semantics: the Meanings of Verbal Roots) [In Japanese].
- Sharma, Rama Nath
 1987 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, Vol. I. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.
 1990 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, Vol. II. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.
 1995 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, Vol. III. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Lecturer

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology

Soka University

Hachioji, Japan