

Andrey Klebanov
andra.kleb@gmail.com
(Independent researcher)

When Poetic Usage Becomes Normative On the Interpretation of *A* 1.3.37¹

ABSTRACT: This article examines the interpretation of *A* 1.3.37 in light of an apparent irregularity in the *Kirātārjunīya*, a major epic poem in Sanskrit. It traces how commentators sought to reconcile the grammatical rule with the poetic usage, often by restricting the scope of the sūtra rather than treating the verse as anomalous. The case study illustrates how the interaction between grammatical description and literary practice shaped the interpretative history of a Pāṇinian rule.

KEYWORDS: *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, *Kirātārjunīya*, *Ātmanepadaprakaraṇa*, agentive ātmanepada, *A* 1.3.37

¹ I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their careful reading of the article and for several helpful suggestions and corrections.

1. Introduction

This article examines the reception of a relatively minor grammatical sūtra of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in light of an apparent irregularity in Bhāravi's court epic, the *Kirātārjunīya*. A construction in the poem, which appears to conflict with the grammatical rule, prompted sustained attempts at reconciliation over several centuries. Rather than dismissing the poetic usage as anomalous,² commentators sought to accommodate it within the grammatical framework, either by refining the scope of the rule or by reconsidering the syntactic analysis of the verse.

The present study is concerned primarily with a particular case of interaction between *kāvya* and *vyākaraṇa* within the commentarial tradition. It therefore does not attempt either to evaluate the individual interpretative proposals discussed below or to determine the original intention behind the formulation of the sūtra itself. Nor does it undertake a comprehensive investigation of the underlying linguistic usage that might clarify the historical background of the rule or possibly even point to textual corruption. These broader questions deserve a separate treatment and will, I hope, be addressed elsewhere.

Despite these limitations, the case offers a focused perspective on the diachronic development of the Pāṇinian tradition. It illustrates how even a relatively circumscribed provision could generate a layered interpretative history when confronted with literary usage, and how poetic practice functioned as authoritative data capable of shaping subsequent grammatical reflection.

² A well-known example of such treatment is the form *triyambaka-* in *Kumāra-sambhava* 3.44, used in place of the expected *tryambaka-*. Unlike the case discussed in the present article, however, this usage is generally acknowledged in the commentarial tradition to fall outside the standard grammatical provisions of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and is treated as an exceptional poetic usage.

2. A 1.3.37 and an apparent irregularity in KiĀ 2.35

The sūtra under consideration is located in the subsection of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A) commonly labelled the *Ātmanepadaprakaraṇa* (ĀtmaPra), “section [dealing with the affixes termed] ātmanepada” (A 1.3.12–77).³ It is introduced by A 1.3.12 *anudāttaṇita ātmanepadam*, from which the string *ātmanepadam* is carried forward through the subsequent rules up to and including A 1.3.77. For the most part, this section consists of restrictive (*niyama*) rules that confine the choice between parasmaipada and ātmanepada affixes—introduced as replacements of L-affixes (cf. A 3.4.78, A 3.2.124, etc.)—to those termed ātmanepada.

For a brief introduction to A’s treatment of agentive (*kartari*) ātmanepada and parasmaipada, it will suffice to look briefly at two core sūtras of the ĀtmaPra together with the first sūtra of the immediately following *Parasmaipadaprakaraṇa*:

A 1.3.12 *anudāttaṇita ātmanepadam*

A 1.3.72 *svaritaṇitaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*

A 1.3.78 *śeṣāt kartari parasmaipadam*

A 1.3.12 states that verbal roots marked in the *Dhātupāṭha* with an *anudātta* vowel or consonant *Ñ* take only ātmanepada affixes, independently of any semantic specifications. A 1.3.72 concerns roots marked with a *svarita* vowel or with *Ñ̃* and provides ātmanepada affixes when an agent is to be signified (string *kartari* supplied from A 1.3.14) and when the result of the action is intended for that agent. A 1.3.78—the first sūtra following the ĀtmaPra—covers all remaining cases not specifically addressed in A 1.3.12–77 and stipulates that only parasmaipada affixes are selected as replacements of L-affixes when an agent is to be signified.

³ The label *ātmanepadaprakaraṇa*, familiar from editions of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Mahābhāṣya* (M) published since the late nineteenth century, is already attested in the M (see, for example, M to A 1.3.60.1 in Kielhorn 1880: 285).

Taken together, these three sūtras form the basis for the familiar tripartite classification of verbal roots into *ātmanepadin* (exclusively ātmanepada affixes; cf. A 1.3.12), *ubhayapadin* (both types of agentive affixes; cf. A 1.3.72), and *parasmaipadin* (exclusively agentive parasmaipada; cf. A 1.3.78).

The bulk of the ĀtmaPra addresses the *ubhayapadin* and *parasmaipadin* roots and describes conditions—semantic factors, presence of particular indeclinables, or both—under which ātmanepada affixes are selected. To give but one example, A 1.3.20 *āño do 'nāsyaviharaṇe* states that only ātmanepada affixes are used to express an agent after the root *ḌUdāñ* when it is preceded by the preverb *āñ* and is not used in the sense of ‘opening the mouth’ (*an-āsyaviharaṇe*). Since *ḌUdāñ* is marked with *ñ*, agentive ātmanepada affixes are already licensed under A 1.3.72 when the result of the action is intended for the agent. The present rule, then, further restricts the distribution by enforcing ātmanepada even in cases where the semantic conditions of A 1.3.72 are not fulfilled.⁴

The sūtra under consideration is:

A 1.3.37 *kartṛsthe cāśarīre karmaṇi*

“Ātmanepada affixes (*ātmanepadam*, < A 1.3.12) occur also (*ca*), when an agent is to be signified (*kartari*, < A 1.3.14), after verbal base *ñnī* (*niyaḥ*, < A 1.3.36) when the grammatical object is located in the agent (*kartṛsthe karmaṇi*) and is not the [agent’s] body (*aśarīre*).”

There is no M on this sūtra. The *Kāśīkā* (K) explains that the agent (*kartṛ*) referred to in the compound *kartṛsthe*, “located in the agent,” is identical with the main agent of the action, *i.e.*, the one expressed by the L-affixes (substituted by ātmanepada). It also comments on the word *aśarīre*, explaining that the term *śarīra*, “body of a living being,”

⁴ Cf. K ad loc.: *akartrabhiprāyārtho 'yam ārambhaḥ*.

covers here not only the body as a whole but also any of its parts.⁵ Thus K's examples of the sūtra application are:

[1] *krodhaṃ vinayate*, "Removes one's anger."

[2] *manyuṃ vinayate*, "Removes one's rage."

K's counterexamples illustrate the reasons for each of the conditions to be mentioned in the sūtra (in the following I reproduce only a selection):⁶

[3] *devadatto yajñadattasya krodhaṃ vinayati*, "Devadatta removes Yajñadatta's anger."

[4] *gaḍuṃ vinayati*, "Removes one's neck-swelling."

[5] *buddhyā vinayati*, "Removes with intellect."

In [3], the object — Yajñadatta's anger — is not located in the agent of action; in [4], neck-swelling forms a part of the agent's body; and in [5], no grammatical object is expressed. Hence, A 1.3.37 does not apply in any of the above cases. Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa* (KNyā), an 8th-century commentary on the K,⁷ notes further that the results of the actions illustrated in [1], [2] and [4] — disappearance of anger (*krodhāpagama*), etc. — are naturally intended for the agent and that, since the verbal root *ñiñ* is marked with *ñ*, ātmanepada affixes are available by 1.3.72. He concludes that this sūtra restricts agentive ātmanepada affixes to cases where the grammatical object does not form a part of agent's body. Accordingly, there is no ātmanepada in [4].⁸

⁵ K ad loc.: *nayateḥ kartā devadattādir lakāravācyah. kartṛsthe karmaṇy aśarīre sati nayater ātmanepadaṃ bhavati. śarīraṃ prāṇikāyah, tadekadeśo 'pi śarīraṃ.*

⁶ K ad loc.: *kartṛsthe iti kim? devadatto yajñadattasya krodhaṃ vinayati. aśarīre iti kim? gaḍuṃ vinayati. ghātāṃ vinayati. karmaṇi iti kim? buddhyā vinayati. prajñayā vinayati.*

⁷ Unless otherwise stated, the dating of grammatical texts follows the excellent overview provided in D'Avella 2018:28ff.

⁸ KNyā ad loc. (Misra 1985: 1.441): *atra ca krodhādyapagamaḥ kriyāphalaṃ kartrabhiprāya eveti "svaritañītaḥ kartrabhiprāye" (1.3.72) ity anenaiva*

In the absence of other early grammatical texts belonging to the Pāṇinian tradition, we may briefly consider two early non-Pāṇinian descriptions of the same linguistic phenomenon found in Devanandin's *Jainendravṛtyākaraṇa* (J) and Candragomin's *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇa* (C), composed around the middle and the end of the 5th century, respectively.

C 1.4.83 (Liebich 1918:87): *karṭṛsthāmūrtāpyāt*

“Affixes *tañ* and *āna* (*tañānāḥ*, < C 1.4.46)⁹ occur after the verbal root $\sqrt{nī}$ (*niyaḥ*, < C 1.4.82), whose object (*āpya*) is located in the agent (*karṭṛstha*-) and is non-material (*amūrta*).”

The text of Dharmadāsa's *Vṛtti* (CVṛ) explains the grammatical construction of the sūtra but is otherwise virtually identical with the K and provides the same set of examples and counterexamples.¹⁰

J 1.2.32 (Tripathi and Chaturvedi 1956:28): *karṭṛsthe karmaṇy amūrtau*

“Affixes termed *da* (*daḥ*, < J 1.2.6)¹¹ occur after verbal root *nī* (*niyaḥ*, < J 1.2.31), when its object is located in the agent and is non-material.”

Abhayanandin's ca. 7th-century *Mahāvṛtti* (JMVṛ) provides a few additional examples that parallel [1] and [2] and also contains a note on the restrictive force of this rule similar to that later found in the KNY

siddhe niyamārtham etad vacanam veditavyam—karṭṛsthe karmaṇy aśarīre eva, nānyatreṭi.

⁹ Note that while A 1.4.100 *tañānāv ātmanepadam* separately defines the term *ātmanepada*, which covers the nine verbal endings abbreviated as *tañ* (cf. A 3.4.78 ~ C 1.4.1) as well as the suffixes *ŚānaC* and *KānaC*, C avoids this intermediate step.

¹⁰ CVṛ ad loc.: *karṭṛstham amūrtaṁ akāṭhinaṁ vyāpyaṁ yasya tasmān nayates tañānā bhavanti. krodhaṁ vinayate. manyuṁ vinayate. karṭṛstha iti kim? deva-datto yajñadattasya manyuṁ vinayati. amūrta iti kim? gaṇḍuṁ vinayati. āpyād iti kim? buddhyā vinayati.*

¹¹ The term *da* is an equivalent to Pāṇinian *ātmanepada*. Cf. J 1.2.151.

and discussed above.¹² To complete the list of non-Pāṇinian systems from the 1st millennium, we may briefly refer to Śākaṭāyana's 9th-century composition (Ś):

Ś 1.4.15 (Tripathi 1971:100): *karṭṛsthe 'tanāv āpye*

Śākaṭāyana's own *Amoghavṛtti* largely repeats the JMVṛ, slightly rephrasing Abhayanandin's remark on the larger context of the sūtra within the Ś's section equivalent of Pāṇini's *ĀtmaPra*.¹³

A fitting example of this linguistic usage is found in a verse of Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* (KiĀ), a poem composed prior to the K (since KiĀ 3.14 is quoted in the K on A 1.3.23) but likely after the composition of the J and C:

KiĀ 2.41: *śrutam apy adhigamya ye ripūn vinayante na śarīrajanmanah / janayanty acirāya sampadām ayaśas te khalu cāpalāśrayam //*

"Those who, though having studied the sciences, fail to remove the enemies born in their own body soon indeed give rise to infamy, the ground of the instability of royal fortune."¹⁴

¹² JMVṛ ad loc.: *nayateḥ kartā lakāravācyah. rūpādyātmikā mūrṭiḥ. Karṭṛsthe karmaṇi mūrṭivarjite sati nayater do bhavati. krodham vinayate. harṣam vinayate. śramaṇi vinayate, śamayatīty arthaḥ. atra karṭṛsthatvāt karmaṇaḥ karṭṛpyaphalatā karmatā. tena karṭṛpye kriyāphale siddhe 'pi de niyamārtham etat. karṭṛstha iti kim? Devadatto Jinadattasya krodham vinayate. karmaṇi kim? buddhya vinayati. amūrṭāv iti kim? gaḍḍam vinayati.*

¹³ *Amoghavṛtti* ad loc.: *krodham vinayata ityādaḥ krodhāpagamādeḥ kriyāphalasya karṭṛsamavāyitvāt siddhas taṇ, tatredaṇ niyamārtham.*

¹⁴ I translate the compound *cāpalāśraya-* as a tatpuruṣa, predicative to *ayaśas*, and—admittedly slightly awkwardly—understand it as a *sāpekṣasamāsa*, construing the genitive *sampadām* with *cāpala-*. Cf. Cappeller 1912:13: "[...] ziehen sich bald die mit der Flatterhaftigkeit des Glücks verbundene Schmach zu." It is, however, also possible—following Roodbergen 1984:130—to understand *cāpalāśraya-* as a bahuvrīhi and to construe *sampadām* (gen., pl.) with *ayaśas*: "[...] soon give royal fortune a bad name based on fickleness." Peterson 2016:33 appears to construe the compound in the same way: "[...] soon taint royal fortune with the stigma of infidelity."

Here, the situation described in the first hemistich aligns perfectly with the grammatical conditions described in A 1.3.37 and its counterparts: the construction is based on the verbal root *ṇīṇ*; its grammatical object—the six internal enemies—is clearly located in the agent of the action and does not refer to any part of the agent’s body. There is therefore good reason to assume that Bhāravi was aware of the linguistic peculiarity described in the A. Notwithstanding this, in KiĀ 2.35—only a few stanzas earlier—we encounter a construction that appears to run counter to the same rule:

KiĀ 2.35: *śivam aupayikaṃ garīyasīm phalanīṣpattim adūṣitāyatim / vigaṇayya nayanti pauruṣaṃ vihitakrodhajayā¹⁵ jigīṣavaḥ //*

“Those intent on victory, who have won victory over their anger, having calculated that the attainment of their goal will be great and yield unimpaired future prosperity, direct their manly prowess toward favorable means.”

The main clause—*jigīṣavaḥ pauruṣaṃ aupayikaṃ nayanti*¹⁶—aligns with the conditions described in A 1.3.37: the action is expressed by the root *ṇīṇ*, while the principal grammatical object¹⁷—*pauruṣa*, “manly prowess”—though located in the agent, does not form a part of the agent’s material body. One would therefore expect Bhāravi to use an ātmanepada affix (e.g., *nayante*, which would, of course, be unmetrical in the current position). As I will show below, the grammatical

¹⁵ The reading *vihitakrodhajayā* is supported by the majority of commentaries on the KiĀ (Prakāśavarṣa, Pītāmbara, Devarāja, Ṭaṇa, Jonarāja Lokānanda), whereas only three other commentators—Mallinātha, Vidyāmādhava and Dharmavijaya—read here *vijitakrodharayā*.

¹⁶ For the sake of completeness, it should be noted that the syntactic construction of the verse, with its two ditransitive verbal roots and multiple accusatives, may invite discussion. To the best of my knowledge, however, all commentaries on the KiĀ adopt this syntactic analysis as their primary interpretation and mention other possible combinations only as alternatives.

¹⁷ On Sanskrit ditransitive construction and the distinction between principal (*pradhāna*, i.e., *īpsitātama*) and secondary (*apradhāna*, i.e., *akathita*) objects, see Deshpande 1991.

justification of this construction gave rise to several novel interpretations of A 1.3.37.

3. Interpreting the irregularity: The reception of A 1.3.37 in light of KiĀ 2.35

The construction in KiĀ 2.35 prompted several attempts at grammatical justification. The following discussion examines how technical commentators on A 1.3.37 reconciled Bhāravi's usage with the rule. In many cases, reconciliation is achieved by further restricting the scope of A 1.3.37 rather than reinterpreting Bhāravi.

The earliest deliberation on this verse in grammatical terms appears in the *Laghuṭīkā* (KiĀLaṭī), a commentary on the KiĀ attributed to Prakāśavarṣa. As discussed in Klebanov 2021, Prakāśavarṣa—author of the KiĀLaṭī and of a versified *Gaṇapāṭha*, the *Gaṇapāṭhavivṛti*—hailed from Kashmir and was likely a teacher of Vallabhadeva, which places him around the late 9th century. The transmission of his commentary is, however, intricate: nine manuscripts of the text show an unusual degree of variation. For the present chapter, only six manuscripts are available, and the version of the KiĀLaṭī quoted below is attested only in two of them: JO and PA₁.¹⁸ Both belong to what Klebanov 2021:33 terms the JAGADDATTA-group that likely reflects an early layer of the text. The passage is, however, missing from the manuscript JAI,¹⁹ which also belongs to this group, rendering the evidence of JO and PA₁ less conclusive. The historical value of the quotation must therefore be assessed cautiously: while it may date to the late 9th century, its precise chronology cannot be established with certainty.

¹⁸ JO = Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur, Acc. Nr. 29969; PA₁ = Hemachandra Jain Gyan Mandir, Patan, Acc. Nr. 10693. See Klebanov 2021 for further details.

¹⁹ JAI = Jain Bhandara, Jaisalmere, Acc. Nr. 2774. *ibid.*

KiĀLaṬī to KiĀ 2.35 (Jo 13v8 and PA₁ 22r11): “*kartṛsthe cāsarīre kar-maṇi*” *ity ātmanepadam sopasargād ity āhuḥ*—“*vinayante na śarīra-janmanaḥ*” *iti, tathā ca “krodhaṃ vinayate, manyuṃ²⁰ vinayate” ity udāharaṇadvayam²¹ //*

“They state that the ātmanepada affixes [provided in] A 1.3.37 are assigned [to root *ṇīṅ*] when preceded by a preverb, [as illustrated in Bhāravi’s own verse, KiĀ 2.41]: ‘fail to remove [the enemies] born in their own body.’ and likewise in two examples [provided in the K]: ‘Removes one’s anger,’ ‘Removes one’s rage.’”

In this way, the author of the quoted passage effectively proposes to restrict the scope of A 1.3.37 to constructions in which, in addition to the explicitly stated conditions, *ṇīṅ* is preceded by an *upasarga*. This proposal is justified by Bhāravi’s own usage in KiĀ 2.41 (discussed above) and by the stock grammatical examples [1] and [2], cited in the K—a usual source for grammatical quotations in the KiĀLaṬī—and likewise attested in early non-Pāṇinian grammatical texts, all of which, as shown above, display no explicit awareness of such an additional restriction.

A somewhat similar, though technically more sophisticated, interpretation of A 1.3.37—seeking to justify further constraints on the sūtra’s application from within A itself—appears in three key 12th-century works of what Wielńska-Soltwedel 2006 calls the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini’s grammar: Maitreyarakṣita’s *Tantrapradīpa* (TaPra), Puruṣottamadeva’s *Bhāṣāvṛtti* (BhāVr), and Śaraṇadeva’s *Durghaṭavṛtti* (DurVr), listed here in chronological order. It is worth noting that a version of the KiĀLaṬī similar to that transmitted in the JAGADDATTA-group of MSS circulated in Bengal around the 12th century²² and may, hypothetically, have informed the technical

²⁰ *manyuṃ*] conj., *manyur* Jo PA1.

²¹ *ity udāharaṇadvayam*] conj., *ity āha raṇadvayam* Jo PA1.

²² See Klebanov (2021: 40), who observes that a relatively long quote attributed to a *bhāravīyavyākhyā*, “a commentary on Bhāravi’s work,” in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on A 5.4.135 coincides with the version of the KiĀLaṬī preserved in the MSS of the JAGADDATTA-group on KiĀ 8.21.

interpretations found in these grammatical works. Even apart from questions of direct influence, the Bengali grammarians display sustained engagement with *kāvya* literature, and it is therefore unsurprising that they took note of Bhāravi's grammatically contentious usage. In what follows, I will first quote and translate the relevant passages from these three texts and then offer a discussion.

TaPra on A 1.3.37 (Kanjilal and Kanjilal 2007: 58f.): *etac cātmanepadam “veḥ śabdakarmanāḥ” iti ver iti anuvṛtter apanayanavacanād eveti lakṣyate / tathā ca bhāraveḥ prayogo “nayanti pauraṣam” iti, vi-pūrve ca tasyaivātmanepadam “vinayante na śārīrajanmanāḥ” iti / evaṃ ca “apanaya mānini mānaṃ,” “buddhiṃ vṛddhiṃ²³ nayati” ityādaḥ na bhavaty ātmanepadam //*

“And this ātmanepada affixation, since the string *veḥ* carries over from A 1.3.34 (*veḥ śabdakarmanāḥ*), is understood by extension to apply only [after the root *ñīñ*] denoting removal. And likewise, there is Bhāravi's usage ‘*nayanti pauraṣam*’ (KiĀ 2.35), while in ‘*vinayante na śārīrajanmanāḥ*’ (KiĀ 2.41), by the same author, when [the root *ñīñ*] is preceded by *vi-*, the ātmanepada is used. And in the same way, ātmanepada does not occur in expressions like ‘Remove your pride, proud lady!’ and ‘Leads the intellect to growth.’”

BhāVṛ on A 1.3.37 (Wielńska-Soltwedel 2006:1.86): *maṇḍūkaplutyā ver iti eva / “krodhaṃ samunnayati” “apanaya mānini mānaṃ”//*

“[The string *veḥ* is continued] by a frog's leap [and the ātmanepada affixes] apply only [after *ñīñ*] preceded by *vi-*. [When this condition is not fulfilled, we obtain usages such as] ‘Elevates one's wrath,’ ‘Remove your pride, proud lady!’”

DurVṛ on A 1.3.37 (Miśra 1985: 30): *kathaṃ “vigaṇayya nayanti pauraṣaṃ vijitakrodharayā jigīṣavaḥ” iti bhāraviḥ / “veḥ” ity anuvartate / tena na taṇ iti rakṣitaḥ / evaṃ ca “apanaya mānini mānaṃ”//*

²³ *buddhiṃ vṛddhiṃ*] conj., *buddhir vṛddhir* Kanjilal and Kanjilal 2007.

“How [are we to justify that] Bhāravi [does not use the ātmanepada] in KiĀ 2.35? The string *veḥ* continues, hence there are no *tañ* affixes—so [Maitreya]rakṣita. And in the same way [we explain the parasmaipada in] ‘Remove your pride, proud lady!’”

All three texts advance the same formal argument: the string *veḥ* is carried forward from a prior sūtra, A 1.3.34 *veḥ śabdakarmanah*, which provides agentive ātmanepada affixes after the root *krñ* (*krñah*, < A 1.3.32), when preceded by the preverb *vi-* and when its object is a word signifying sound. This results in a further restriction of A 1.3.37: in addition to the established conditions, the root *ñiñ* must be preceded by the preverb *vi-*. The irregularity lies in the fact that the *anuvṛtti* of *veḥ* skips an intervening sūtra: while both strings *krñah* (< A 1.3.32) and *veḥ* carry over into A 1.3.35, both cease in A 1.3.36. Maitreyarakṣita does not thematize this, but the BhāVṛ justifies the interpretation by invoking the so-called *maṇḍūkapluti*, “a frog’s leap,” also known as *maṇḍūkagati*, “a frog’s movement,” a device already discussed in the M and frequently attested in both the K and the BhāVṛ.²⁴

At this point, a further subtle difference in presentation may be observed. While Maitreyarakṣita explicitly links his additional restriction to Bhāravi’s usage in the KiĀ, Puruṣottamadeva formulates the same qualification without reference to its literary point of departure, presenting it instead as an adjustment derived from the internal logic of the sūtra and illustrating it with generalized examples.

Maitreyarakṣita adds yet another interpretative layer, according to which the specific combination of *vi-* + *ñiñ* suggests that the sūtra applies only where removal is denoted. Yet, given one of his counter-examples—*apanaya mānini mānam*, where *ñiñ* denotes removal but

²⁴ Note that in the M, both terms are used as bahuvrīhi compounds qualifying *adhikāra* and thus need to be interpreted as “those whose leap is like that of a frog.” For a brief explanation of the device and the difference between a bahuvrīhi and a tatpuruṣa interpretation, see, for example, Joshi and Roodbergen 2000: 57 and Roodbergen 2008: 330. Though the history of this device warrants deeper study, we will not delve into it here.

apa- is used instead of *vi-* and *parasmaipada* occurs—we may infer that, on his interpretation, the formal continuity of *vi-* takes precedence over the semantic nuance.

By contrast, Haradatta Mishra, a grammarian from Tamil Nadu whose work appears independent of the Bengali tradition and who perhaps flourished in the 13th century,²⁵ presents a view that explicitly foregrounds the semantic restriction as the principal means of resolving the same tension between grammatical description and linguistic usage. Since his work shows no direct dependence on Maitreyarakṣita, this suggests that the notion of a further restriction of the meaning of *ñīñ* circulated in pan-Indian grammatical circles of the time.

Padamañjarī on K on A 1.3.37 (Miśra 1985:441): *atha katham “vigaṇayya nayanti pauraṣam vijitakrodharayā jigīṣavaḥ” iti? kecid āhuḥ—apagame vartamānād idam ātmanepadavidhānam bhavati, atra tu karotyarthē prāptyarthē vā vartate, anekārthatvād dhātūnām iti //*

²⁵ Haradatta’s dating remains uncertain. Cardona 1976:281 argued for placing Haradatta as early as the 9th century on the basis of a view attributed to him in the vulgate of Dharmakīrti’s *Rūpāvatāra*. By contrast, Pathak 1931, followed recently by D’Avella 2026, argues for a considerably later date, placing Haradatta around the 12th or 13th century. D’Avella observes that quotations from Haradatta’s works in both *dharmasāstra* and *vyākaraṇa* literature begin to appear only in late-13th- and 14th-century sources, while earlier authors otherwise rich in citations—notably Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa and Śaraṇadeva’s *Durghaṭavṛtti* (1173/74 CE)—do not mention him. On this basis, D’Avella suggests that the attribution to Haradatta found in the vulgate of the *Rūpāvatāra* may represent a secondary addition, whether introduced during the manuscript transmission of the text or at the editorial stage itself, the reliability of the vulgate having already been questioned by Belvalkar 1938. Additional complications arise from the surviving excerpts of Maitreyarakṣita’s *Tantrapradīpa* edited by Kanjilal and Kanjilal 2007. As far as I can see, several opinions there attributed to a certain *ṭīkākāra* closely resemble passages found in Haradatta’s *Padamañjarī*, while other views attributed to the same authority differ markedly from Haradatta’s positions. It is therefore conceivable that both Haradatta and Maitreyarakṣita drew on an earlier authority, and that the attribution to Haradatta in the *Rūpāvatāra* arose secondarily during textual transmission. Further research, especially a systematic evaluation of the *Tantrapradīpa* material, will be necessary before the question can be settled with greater confidence.

“Now, how [are we to justify the use of the *parasmaipada*] in KiĀ 2.35? Some [scholars] explain as follows: this provision of *ātmanepada* affixes applies only after [the root *ṇīṅ*] used in the sense of departure (*apagama*). In this verse, however, it is used in the sense of the verbal root *√kr*, “to do,” or in the sense of obtainment, since verbal roots have multiple meanings.”

It is noteworthy that Haradatta, while clearly aware of the problematic passage in Bhāravi’s work and acknowledging the need to account for it within grammatical theory, advances the additional semantic restriction of the *sūtra* only under the attribution to “some [scholars],” thereby perhaps signaling that he does not fully endorse it. It is clear, moreover, that Haradatta was not aware of usages such as “*apanaya mānini mānam*,” which would contradict his reasoning.

A further shift in the status assigned to this argument becomes visible in the commentarial tradition on Rāmacandra’s 14th-century *Prakriyākaumudī*. The interpretation cautiously attributed by Haradatta to “some [scholars]” is here integrated into the ordinary exposition of the *sūtra*. While Rāmacandra’s own *vṛtti* remains faithful to the K and does not introduce further restrictions,²⁶ his later commentators incorporate the semantic qualification into their principal explanation. Thus Viṭṭhala, in his 15th-century *Prasāda* (Trivedi 1931:411), succinctly notes *apagame vartamānād iti ca jñeyam*, “and one should know that this *sūtra* applies [to *ṇīṅ*] in the sense of departure,” whereas Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa’s late 16th-century *Prakāśa* not only restates Haradatta’s reasoning but substantially reproduces his formulation, with only slight rearrangement and changes in wording.²⁷ What had earlier been framed

²⁶ *Prakriyākaumudī* on A 1.3.37: *ṇīṅaḥ kartṛsthe ’mūrte karmaṇi kārake pūrvavat. krodhaṃ vinayate. kartṛsthe kim? guroḥ krodhaṃ vinayati. amūrte kim? gaḍaṃ vinayati*. Note Rāmacandra’s paraphrase of *āsarīre* as *amūrte*, thereby aligning his formulation with non-Pāṇinian reformulations of the *sūtra*.

²⁷ *Prakāśa* on PraKau on A 1.3.37 (Miśra 2000:3.390f.): *etac cāpanayane vartamānād evātmanepadaṃ vidhīyate, nārthāntare. teneha na—“vigaṇayya nayanti pauraṣaṃ vijitakrodharayā jigīṣavaḥ” iti. iha hi karotyartho prāptyarthe vā vartate ’nekārthatvād dhātūnām*.

as a reported opinion thus reappears as part of the standard interpretative framework, reflecting the gradual stabilization of this semantic restriction within the later grammatical tradition.

The same interpretation finds its way back into the commentarial tradition on the KiĀ itself, notably in Devarāja's early modern South Indian (likely Keralan) *Sukhabodhinī* (KiĀSuBo).²⁸ Commenting on KiĀ 2.35, Devarāja invokes A 1.3.37 and explains its inapplicability in familiar terms, following this with a series of additional considerations:

KiĀSuBo on KiĀ 2.35 (Chatterji 1934:65): *pauruṣaṃ nayantīty atra "kartṛsthe cāśarīre karmaṇi" ity ātmanepadena bhāvyam / ucyate—apagamārthān*²⁹ *nayates tenātmanepadavidhānam / iha tu tasya prāpaṇam arthaḥ/ kecid arthasiddhiṃ vigaṇayya sāmādyupāyam eva nayanti*³⁰ *pauruṣaṃ parākramam iti vadanti / anye pauruṣaṃ svasāmārthyaṃ paryālocyocitam sāmādyupāyaṃ phalaṇiṣaptiṃ prāpayantīty āhuḥ /* "[Objection:] In the clause '*pauruṣaṃ nayanti*', on account of A 1.3.37, there should be ātmanepada affixation. We reply: this sūtra provides ātmanepada affixes after *√nī* in the meaning of departure. In this verse, however, the root denotes bringing.

Others say [that the verse should be construed differently]: having calculated the accomplishment of their goals, they direct conciliation and other means towards manly prowess, that is, enterprise. Yet others explain the verse as follows: having considered the manly prowess, that is, their own capability, they direct conciliation and other means towards the attainment of their goal."

The general hermeneutic strategy—two examples of which Devarāja attributes to unnamed scholars—consists not in modifying the grammatical rule but in adjusting the syntactic interpretation of the verse—that is, in assigning a different syntactic function to

²⁸ For the dates and provenance of Devarāja and other commentators on the KiĀ, I rely on the information provided in Klebanov 2021.

²⁹ *apagamārthān*] conj., *avahamārthān* Chatterji 1934.

³⁰ *nayanti*] conj., *yanti na* Chatterji 1934.

the accusative forms—so that the conditions for the application of A 1.3.37 no longer obtain. In this way, both alternative interpretations invoked by Devarāja make *aupayika*, “means,” which do not reside in the agent, the principal grammatical object of $\sqrt{ni}$.

Such alternative construals are by no means unique to Devarāja. A number of commentators on the KiĀ—including Vidyāmādhava (14th c., Kerala), Jonarāja (15th c., Kashmir), Pītāmbara (early 16th c., Bengal), and Lokānanda (post-Mallinātha), to name but a few—while agreeing on what may be regarded as the principal construal of the verse, also record a range of syntactic alternatives. It is noteworthy that many of these commentators do not refer to the grammatical problem at all, even though, as shown above, it had been discussed in grammatical literature since at least the 12th century.

A notable exception is the *Ghaṇṭāpatha* (KiĀGhaPa), a commentary by the influential Mallinātha (14th c., modern-day Telangana), who offers a distinct grammatical interpretation of the passage.

KiĀGhaPa on KiĀ 2.35 (Durgaprasad et al. 1917:29): *nayatiḥ prāpaṇārthe dvikarmakaḥ / atra pauruṣasya kartṛsthakarmatve 'py upāyasyātathātvāt "krodhaṃ vinayate" ityādivat "kartṛsthe cāśarīre karmaṇi" ity ātmanepadaṃ na bhavati //*

“The root $\sqrt{ni}$ in the meaning of bringing takes two objects. In this verse, although ‘manly prowess’ is a grammatical object located in the agent, since ‘the means’ lacks this qualification (*i.e.*, it is not located in the agent), the ātmanepada affixes—such as in the expression ‘removes one’s anger’—provided by A 1.3.37 do not occur.”

In brief, we may observe that Mallinātha advances a distinctly novel approach to the problem at hand. Rather than reinterpreting either the sūtra or the verse of the KiĀ, he argues that the formal conditions for the application of A 1.3.37—namely, that the object be located in the agent, etc.—are not fulfilled in this case. Instead of focusing solely on the principal object of the verb *nayati*, namely, *pauruṣa*, “manly prowess,” he maintains that both objects—*pauruṣa* and *aupayika*, “the means”—must be taken into account, the latter of

which does not satisfy the conditions of the sūtra. Remarkably, apart from Lokānanda—who quotes Mallinātha anonymously—this interpretation does not appear to have been adopted in either grammatical or poetic commentarial traditions.

Finally, several centuries later, the problem is taken up once more in the *Siddhāntakaumudī* (SiKau) by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita (17th c.), whose discussion of the passage represents the last substantial contribution to the tradition on this issue.

SiKau 2710 = A 1.3.37 (Sastrigal 1911:409): *krodhaṃ vinayate, apagamayati / tatphalasya cittaprasādasya kartṛgatvāt “svaritañītaḥ” ity eva siddhe niyamārtham idam / [...] kathaṃ tarhi “vigaṇayya nayanti pauṣaṃ” iti / kartṛgāmītvāvivakṣāyāṃ bhaviṣyati/*

“Removes, that is, causes to depart, one’s anger. Since the result of this action—namely, the clarity of one’s mind—goes to the agent, the ātmanepada affixation is already provided by 1.3.72, and, this being the case, the purpose of the current sūtra is to impose a restriction. [...] How then [are we to explain the use of parasmaipada] in KiĀ 2.35? [Parasmaipada affixes] will obtain when the speaker does not intend to express that the [result of the action] is directed at the agent.”

We may observe that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, though clearly aware of the centuries-long attempts by grammarians to align the interpretation of the present sūtra with Bhāravi’s usage, does not engage in further speculative interpretation. Rather anticlimactically, he reduces the interpretation of the sūtra to its bare essentials, as presented in the early texts of both the Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian grammatical traditions. Reiterating the function of the sūtra within the ĀtmaPra—namely, to restrict the application of the ātmanepada provided by 1.3.72 to cases where the object of *ṇīṅ* is located in the agent and is not the agent’s body—he states that the very application of 1.3.72 depends on the speaker’s intention to present the action as one whose result is directed toward the agent. In the present case, given Bhāravi’s avoidance of the ātmanepada, we may infer that he did not intend to express this semantic aspect, which forms the basis for the application

of A 1.3.72 and, by extension, A 1.3.37. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita thus, albeit in an anticlimactic manner, offers perhaps the most economical resolution of the problem inherited from the tradition, without recourse to additional semantic refinements or to irregular continuations of strings from earlier sūtras. *vivakṣā*—a device difficult to supersede—provides the final explanatory key.

4. Conclusion

This article has examined the reception of A 1.3.37 *kartṛsthe cāśarīre karmaṇi* in light of the apparent irregularity in KiĀ 2.35. After outlining the function of the sūtra within the ĀtmaPra of the A and its early interpretation in both Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian grammatical traditions, the discussion traced the various attempts to reconcile Bhāravi's parasmaipada usage with the rule. These range from formal restrictions based on extended *anuvṛtti* (notably in the Bengali grammatical tradition), through semantic qualifications limiting the sūtra to cases of "removal" or "departure," to syntactic reinterpretations of the verse in poetic commentaries. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's appeal to *vivakṣā* relocates the issue to the level of speaker intention and thereby removes the need for additional formal or semantic adjustments.

Taken together, these interpretations show two complementary exegetical strategies. Technical grammarians tended to refine the interpretation of A 1.3.37 by narrowing its scope through additional formal or semantic conditions. Several commentators on the poem, by contrast, adjusted the syntactic construal of the verse so that the rule would not apply. A comparison of these approaches—restriction of the grammatical provision versus reinterpretation of the literary passage—clarifies how the tension between grammatical description and poetic usage was addressed in different textual contexts.

The material also illustrates the diachronic development of the Pāṇinian tradition. A sūtra concerned with a relatively circumscribed construction generated a layered interpretative history extending across several centuries. While its core syntactic formulation remained

stable, its scope was repeatedly reconsidered in light of engagement with *kāvya*. In the present case, the trajectory of interpretation appears to have been prompted less by internal structural pressure than by the need to account for a particular poetic usage.

At the same time, the episode sheds light on the status of certain poetic works within the Sanskrit intellectual sphere. Bhāravi's usage was not treated as erroneous but as a datum requiring grammatical explanation. In this respect, the poem functioned as authoritative usage, capable of prompting renewed scrutiny of the rule itself. Rather than subordinating poetry to grammar, the tradition allowed literary practice to inform grammatical reflection, illustrating the sustained interaction between the two domains.

References

- JMVṛ – *Mahāvṛtti* = *Jainendravyākaraṇamahāvṛtti*
 Jo – Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur, Acc. Nr. 29969
 K – *Kāśikāvṛtti*
 KiĀ – *Kirātārjunīya*
 KiĀGhaPa – *Ghaṇṭāpatha*
 KiĀLaTī – *Laghuṭīkā*
 KiĀSuBo – *Sukhabodhinī*
 KNyā – *Nyāsa* = *Kā ikāvivaraṇapañcikā*
 M – *Mahābhāṣya*
 PA₁ = Hemachandra Jain Gyan Mandir, Patan, Acc. Nr. 10693
 PraKau – *Prakriyākaumudī*
 Ś – *ākāṭāyanavyākaraṇa* = *abdānu āsana*
 SiKau – *Siddhāntakaumudī*
 TaPra – *Tantrapradīp*

D'Avella, V. B. 2018. *Creating the Perfect Language: Sanskrit Grammarians, Poetry, and the Exegetical Tradition*. Dissertation. Chicago: The University of Chicago. <https://doi.org/10.6082/M12R3PVN>.

- . 2026. Haradatta Miśra's Introduction to Sanskrit Grammar. In: H. David et al. (eds). *Vidvanmānasaprasādinī. Essays in Honor of S.L.P. Anjaneya Sarma*. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, École française d'Extrême-Orient: 113–168.
- Belvalkar, Sh. K. (ed.). 1938. *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collections of Manuscripts Deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Vol. II. Grammar. Part I (Vedic & Pāṇinīya)*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Cappeller, C. 1912. *Bharavi's Poem Kiratarjuniya, or Arjuna's Combat with Kirata. Translated from the Original Sanskrit into German and Explained*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University.
- Cardona, G. 1976. *Pāṇini. A Survey of Research*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chatterji, K. Ch. 1934. Kirātārjunīya, Canto I and II with the Commentaries of Devarājayaḥvan and Vidyāmādhava. In: *The Calcutta Oriental Journal* 1(8): 1–39.
- Deshpande, M. M. 1991. Ditransitive Passive in Pāṇini. In: *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 34(1): 19–35.
- Durgāprasād, Paṇḍit et al., (eds). 1917. *Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi: Text with Commentary (Ghaṇṭāpatha) of Mallinātha and Various Readings*. Bombay: Tukārām Jāvaji.
- Joshi, S. D., J. A. F. Roodbergen. 2000. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini. with Translation and Explanatory Notes. Volume VIII (2.4.1–2.4.85)*. Pune: Adarsha Sanskrit Shodha Samstha.
- Kanjilal, D. K., K. Kanjilal (eds). 2007. *Tantrapradīpa of Maitreya Rakṣita. A Treatise on Kaśikā (!) and Nyāsa*. Kolkata: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.
- Kielhorn, F. (ed.). 1880. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. Vol. I*. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot.
- Klebanov, A. 2021. In Search of the Earliest Commentary on Mahākāvya: The Laghuṭīkā of Prakāśavarṣa. In: *Journal of Indian Indological Studies* 32 & 33 (2020–2021): 21–59.
- Liebich, B. (ed.). 1918. *Candra-Vṛtti. Der Original-Kommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Miśra, M. (ed.). 2000. *Prakriyākaumudī by Śrīrāmacandrācārya [Part Three]. With the Commentary Prakāśa by Śrīkriṣṇa*. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University.

- Miśra, Ś. (ed.). 1985. *The Durghaṭavṛtti by Śaraṇadeva, Revised by Śrī Sarvarakṣita. With the Vivṛti and Appendices*. Varanasi: Ratna Publications.
- Pathak, K. B. 1931. Jinendrabuddhi, Kaiyaṭa and Haradatta. In: *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 12(3): 246–251. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41694028>.
- Peterson, I. V. 2016. *Bharavi. Arjuna and the Hunter*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Roodbergen, J. A. F. 1984. *Mallinātha's Ghaṇṭapatha on Kirātārjunīya I–VI. Part One: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- . 2008. *Dictionary of Pāṇinian Grammatical Terminology*. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Sastrigal, S. Ch. (ed.). 1911. *Siddhānta Kaumudī of Sri Bhattoji Deekshita. With the Commentary Śrī Bālaṃanoramā of Sri Vasudeva Deekshita. Uṭtarārdham*. Teppakulam: Sastrigal, S. Chandrasekhara.
- Tripathi, Sh. (ed.). 1971. *Śākaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇam of Ācārya Śākaṭāyana. With the Svopajña Commentary, Amoghavṛtti*. Varanasi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Publication.
- Tripathi, Sh. N., M. Chaturvedi (eds). 1956. *Jainendra Vyākaraṇam By Pujyapāda Devanandi With Jainendra Mahāvṛtti of Shri Abhaynandi*. Varanasi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Kāshī.
- Trivedi, K. P. (ed.). 1931. *The Prakriyakaumudī of Rāmachandra (in Two Part). Part II. With the Commentary Prasāda of Viṭṭhala and with a Critical Notice of Manuscripts and an Exhaustive and Critical Introduction*. Bombay–Poona: B.I. Press–Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Wielnińska-Soltwedel, M. 2006. *The Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapajjikā of Viśvarūpa, the First Adhyāya and a Detailed Examination*. Dissertation. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg.