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Introductory Remark

In this part of the ŠK, only two rules are dealt with: P.1.4.54 and 55. In the definition of “kārtr: 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: kim yasya svam 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 kartṛ would be applied only to tantuvāya (a weaver). Rejecting this pūrva-pakṣa, Patañjali states the intended meaning in this rule, namely “ayaṃ tantraśabdo ‘sty eva viśeṇa vartate. ... asti prādhānye vartate. tadyathā. svatantra ‘sau brāhmaṇa ity ucyate svapradhāna iti ganyate: Sometimes this word tantra stands for viśeṇa (extension, canopy).1 ... But it is sometimes used in the sense of prādhānyā (being prominent). For example, svatantra ‘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 kartṛ over other members of kāraka — apādāna, adhikaraṇa, sampradāna, karana, and karmā —, Patañjali, after replying to the Vārttika XV: na vā svatantra-

1 Kaiyta explains this word as “vitanyate: it is expanded” [Pradīpa on do., II, 277r] and Nāgeśa further says “sa ca sanniveśasvāśiṣṭas tantusamīhah: it means an assemblage of threads regularly weaved” [Uddyota, II, 278i].
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paratantrayoh paryāyena vacanam vacanāśrayā ca samjñā (It [= the difficulty given in the \textit{Vt} XIV, namely that \textit{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 \textit{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] (\textit{evaṁ tarhi pradhānena samavāye sthāli paratantrā vyavāye svatantrā} [\textit{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 \textit{kartr}, to be accurate, that to be expressed as agent takes highest priority over others, is asserted.

Bharṭṛhari further summarizes the notion of \textit{svātantrya} [\textit{VP} III.7.101-102]:

\begin{quote}
prāg anyataḥ śaktilabhāṁ nyagbhāvāpādanāṁ api ||
tadadhinapravṛttitvāt pravṛttānāṁ nivartanāt ||
adṛṣṭatvāt pratinidheḥ pravivekē 'pi darśanāt ||
ārād apy upakāритvāt svātantryaṁ kartur iṣyate ||
\end{quote}

From above verses, we can extract following reasons why \textit{kartr} is regarded as independent comparing to other \textit{kārakas}:

1) bringing to bear its capacity preceding to other \textit{kārakas} (prāg anyataḥ śaktilabhāṁ);
2) having a control of [other \textit{kārakas}] (nyagbhāvāpādanāt);
3) [others] depend on it for their performances (tadadhina-pravṛttitvāt);
4) having [others] stop performing (pravṛttānāṁ nivartanāt);
5) no alternative for it (adṛṣṭatvāt pratinidheḥ);
6) 1982 appearing without others (pravivekē 'pi darśanāt);
1983 being helpful even from far place [= indirectly] (ārād apy upakāритvāt).

\footnote{Keeping this verses of the \textit{VP} in his mind, Kaiyṭa comments on the \textit{MBh}'s passage (\textit{kim punah pradhānām. kartā. katham punar jhāyate kartā pradhānām iti. yat sarveṣu sādhanēsu sāmnāhīśu kartā pravartaye iti bhavaḥ} [MBh ad P.1.4.23, I.326, 9-10]): kartā pravartayet. tadadhinapravṛttityavartitvāt karanādaṁnāṁ tasya ca prāg anyataḥ śaktilabhāṁ pratinidhyadarśanāt karanādaṁbhāve 'py "āśe" "śe" iti yādau kevalasya kartur darśanāt kartprahitiṁ karanādaṁnāṁ adarśanāt prādhānyaṁ kartur ity arthaḥ [\textit{Pradipā 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 "\textit{ārād āpy upakārītvād iti. yady āpy asau taṭasthaḥ phalasiddhāv upakarotī} (even though this indifferent person becomes helpful in producing result, [he is regarded as agent])" \cite{PM on P.1.4.54, I, 524}.

Traditionally in the grammar, the agent is classified into three types, namely \textit{suddhakartr}, \textit{prayojakakartr}, and \textit{karmakartr}. Here is a passage from the \textit{Vaiyākaranabhūṣaṇasāra} of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa [p. 243]:

\begin{quote}
ayaḥ ca trividhāḥ — ēśuddhāḥ, prayojako hetuḥ, karmmakarttā ca. "mayā hariḥ seyyate" "kāryate hariṇā" "gamayati krṣṇaṁ gokulam." madabhinnāśrayako harikarmakasevanānukūlo vyā-pāraḥ. haryabhinnāśrayaka utpādanānukūlo vyāpāraḥ. gokula-karmakagamanānukulākrṣṇāśrayakatādṛśavyāpārānukūlo vyā-pāraḥ iti śābdabodhaḥ.
\end{quote}

Tr.: There are three types of \textit{kartṛ}, namely, a direct agent (\textit{suddha-kartr}), an instigator (\textit{prayojaka}), i.e., a causal (\textit{hetu}) [agent], and a reflexive agent (\textit{karmakartr}). Examples for each types are "\textit{mayā hariḥ seyyate}: Hari is worshipped by me" "\textit{kāryate hariṇā}: X is led to make by Hari," "\textit{gamayati krṣṇaṁ gokulam}: Y lets Krṣṇa go to Gokula." Verbal cognitions of each sentences are as follows: \cite{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 Krṣṇa as its substratum and being conducive to the act of going wherein Gokula is its goal.

The notion of \textit{kartṛ} is denoted by several grammatical elements. P.2.3.18 prescribes that what is designated as \textit{kartṛ} or \textit{karaṇa} takes the third case ending (\textit{kartaṁ karanaṁ trītiyaḥ}) and by this rule the agent "I" in the first example takes the Instrumental case. In the second case, its underlying sentence is "\textit{hariḥ kārayati}" which is a causative construction and then passivization is applied to it. The \textit{prayojya-kartṛ}, X, is denoted by the verbal ending -\textit{te} which denotes the object of the
instigation, so that Hari, *prayojaka-kartr*,\(^4\) takes the Instrumental case which denotes the agent. The third one is a case of the causative: Kṛṣṇa is a *prayojya-kartr* and Y is *prayojaka-kartr*. In its underlying sentence, “*kṛṣṇo gaccatī 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: *gatibuddhipratyavasānārthaśabdam-karmākarmakānāṁ aNikartā sa Nau*, it takes the second case by P.2.3.2: *karmanī dvitiyā*. This case, although Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa picks up as the example of *karmakartr*, shows the example of *karma-kartr* in the sense that original agent in non-causative is termed *karman* in the causative. However, in the technical use, *karmakartr* means the agent which is turned from original *karman* and oft-used example is “*odanah pacyate svayam eva,*” which is called “reflexive construction.”

Among these types of *kartr*, 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 ŠK that in conceptualizing the *kartrta*, not only Patañjali but Bhartrhari stand on the point of view that how the agent functions in relation to the other *kārakas*, in other words, they focus on the relativity of *kārakas* although they admit the predominancy of agent over other *kārakas*. However, Bhā(toji), having their arguments as fundamental premise, introduces another scheme to define the *kartrta*: the definition intrinsically correlating with the meaning of verbal root.

---

\(^4\) The *prayojaka-kartr* is classified into two: *mukhya* (principal) and *itara* (other than principal). The Nyāsa says [on KV on P.1.4.55, 1.585]: *prayojakatvam dvividham — mukhyam, itarac ca. devadattah kaṭam kārayati atra devadattasya mukhyam. bhikṣā vāsayaity atra bhikṣānīm vāsahetuvāt prayojakatvam upacaritam, na mukhyam. na hi bhikṣā yāyaṁ vasathety evam prayuṣyate. iha ca kārakādhikāre tamaBgraṅhaṇena jhāpitam etat. tena yasyäpi prayojakatvam upacaritam, na mukhyam, tasyāpi hetuśaṃjñāḥ bhavaty eva.* The example for the first type is “*devadattah 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.
32. **svatantraḥ kartā** [P.1.4.54: SK. 559].

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

Text: *kriyāyām svātāntreyena vivakṣito 'ṛthāḥ kartā syāt. dhātu-pātavā vyāpārāsrayatvām svātāntreyam.*

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

Notes: The designation *kartr* is defined as "svatantra" in the sense of "what is predominant/principle" (*pradhiinabhuta*). 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 kartr (*'svatantraḥ' iti pradhānabhūta ucyate. agunabhūto yah kriyāsiddhau svātāntreyena vivakṣyate tat kārākam kartṛsāṁjñam bhavati*) [I, 583-4]. 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 kartr; 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 (sthiilī) 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.: aṣṭy ayaṃ svatāntraśabdo bahuvrihiḥ. svam tāntrome yasya sa svatantraḥ. asti ca samāsapratisārapako rūdhīśabdoḥ, pradhānārdhavṛttīḥ, yathā — svatantro 'yam iha devadatta iti, pradhānabhūta iti, ganyate. tatra yadi pūrvo grhyate tadā tuntvāyasyaiya syāt; vistṛtā hi tantavas tāntre, tāc ca tantu-vayasyaiś ca. devadattāḥ pacattyāduṇa na syāt. itarasya tu grahaṇe sarvatra bhavati. tasmād vyāptar nāyāt sa eva grhyata iti maṭvāḥ — *svatāntre iti pradhānabhūta iti.* yady evam apradhānam apeksya pradhānam ucyati iti yatrādhiķaranādiny apradhānāṁ kārakāṁ santi, devadattāḥ kāṣṭharih agrniṇānaṁ sthāyām pacattyāduṇa tatraiva syāt. yatra tu teṣām avivakṣyā — āste devadattāḥ, śete devadatta ityāduṇa, tatra na syād iti yo desāyat tam praty āha — agunabhūta (584) iti. evam manya-te — pradhānēṇa-āgūnabhāva upalakṣyate. gunabhāvo yatra nāsti sa kārtṛte. kārakāntārā vivakṣyāyām api agunabhāvo 'stv eveti sarvatra bhavati. nanu ca sāmagnadyadhīḥ hi kriyāsiddhiḥ, ekasyāpy abhāvo na sidhyati, tat kasyaśc chandaḥ ucyeta. yād api kriyāsiddhau sarvaśeṣām vyāpārāḥ, tathāpi svātāntreyena yasya vivakṣyate sa eva svatantra ity ucyate, nānya iti. devadattāḥ pacātitya atra devadattāḥ kartṛsāṁjñakatvāt kartṛpratrayenocaye laukāreṇa.
in the sense that others are under the supervision of it. This understanding is clearly presented in the above-quoted verses of Bhartrhari.

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 *kartr* exercises control over other *kārakas*, 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 *kāaraka*-category have certain relationship to the action, as is prescribed in P.1.4.23: *kārake*. Whatever related to the action, more precisely, to the accomplishment of the action is *kāraka* and particularly called *apādāna, kartr*, 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 *kārtrtvā* by introducing new scheme which is based on the semantic investigation into the meaning of verbal root, namely *dhātupāttavyāpārāśrayatvā*.

Although action itself denoted by the verbal root is realized as a complex of subsidiary activities and, as for the relation of *kāraka* to the action, Bhartrhari also states that particular *kāraka* is determined on the basis of to which action, i.e., main or subordinate action, it is tied (VP III.7.20-21: *guṇakriyānāṁ kartāraḥ kartrā nyakṛta-sāktyaḥ | nyakṛtyāṁ api sampūrṇāṁ svair vyāpāraṁ samanvītāḥ || karaṇatvādibhir jñātāḥ kriyābhedānupātibhīḥ | svātantryam uttarāṇ labdhvā pradhāne yānti kārtṛtvām ||), it is Bhaṭṭoji who clearly distincts two aspects of the meaning of one verbal root and claims that specification of each *kāraka*, in this case *kartr* or *karman*, is determined by the relation of a participant to the aspects. Navyavaivāyākaraṇas — Bhaṭṭoji Diksita, Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa and Nāgėśa Bhaṭṭa (it is probably enough to mention only three famous grammarians) — hold the same opinion that *kartr* is a substratum of *vyāpāra* and *karman* is that of *phala*. However, since Bhaṭṭoji and Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa are generally known as the “prthaksaktivādin: one who has an opinion

---

6 VP III.8.4: *gunabhūtair avayavaivāṁ samūhaḥ kramajyānāṁ | buddhyā prakalpitābhedaḥ kriyēti vyapādiśyate ||
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 tiṃṇh śmṛtāḥ | phale pradhānāṃ vyāpāras tiṃṇarthaḥ 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]: “tāṇḍulaṃ pacati caitraḥ” ity atra “ekatāṇḍulāśrayikā yā viklittiḥ, tadāmukulaika- caitrābhinnāśrayikā vartamāṇā bhāvanā,” “tāṇḍulaḥ pacyate caitreṇa” ity atra ca “ekacaitrāśrayikā ekatāṇḍulābhinnāśrayikā yā viklittiḥ, tad anukūlā sāmpratiki bhāvanā” iti bodhaḥ.

On the other hand, Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭa is known as “viśiṣṭaaktivādin: 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 vyāpāravacchinne phale ca dhātunāṃ saktiḥ. kartrkarmārthakatattat- pratyayasanabhivyāhāraś 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 kartr. See his Laghusabdendusekhara on P.1.4.54 [I, 657-8]: kārakādhikārāt kriyājanane svatantra ity arthāḥ, tad āha — kriyāyām iti. svātantryaḥ ca kartṛpratyayasanabhivyāhāre pradhānī- bhūtadhatvarthaśrayatvam (Since this rule is under the heading of kāraka, [kartr] is [the one] which is independent when an action is taken place. Thus said by [Bhaṭṭojoj] 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]: kārakādhikārāt “kriyāyām svatantraḥ kartrṣamjñakah” iti tasayārthaḥ. svātantryaḥ ca vyāpāravacchedakasambandhena taddhatvarthanishṭhaviṣeyata- nirūpita-prakārātāsrayatve sati tannirūpitaviṣeyatārūpamukhyaviṣeyatāvaddhatvarthāśrayatvam. “taddhatvarthanisṭha” ity atra dhatvarthaḥ ca tātparyagrāhakānāpekṣadhūtasakya eva grāhyah.
32.1 Authority quoted {139, 12-13}
Text: āha ca — “dhiitunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛtesyate” 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 (dhiitunoktakriye).

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

ŠK on P.1.3.1 [II, 51, 25-28]: yadi tu — “dhiitunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛtesyate” iti Bhartṛharipratipāditarītyā prādhānyena dhiitupātāvāyāparatvarūpaṃ kartṛtvāṃ tavāpi sammataṃ, kas tarhidānīṃ 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 Bhartṛhari and you too admit this, then how is the meaning of the verb?;

VBhs on the VMM k.24 [244]: kartṛtīyāyā āsrayo ’rthah. tathāhi “svatantraḥ kartā” [P.1.4.54]. svātantraṇaḥ ca dhiitvarthavāyāśrayatvam. “dhiitunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛtesyate” iti Vākyapadiya. ata eva yadā yadiyo vyāpāro dhiitunā’bhidhiyate tadā sa karteti, sthāli pacati, agnih pacati, edhāṃsi pacanti, taṇḍulaḥ pacyate svayam evetyādi saṅgacchate.
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 Vākyapadiya, namely “dhiitunoktakriye nityaṃ kārake kartṛtesyate.” 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, “sthāli pacati,” “agnih pacati,” “edhāṃsi pacanti,” and “taṇḍulaḥ pacyate svayam eva,” etc.;

8 The VBhs also quotes this half verse and, furthermore, two verses (VP III.7.103-104) [pp. 106-107]. Cf. Bālamonaramā on ŠK No. 559 [I, 633]: uktam ca Harinā — “dhiitunoktakriye...
This half verse is the part of śloka found in the Ślokavārttika of Kumārila, vākyādhikaraṇa [MS 1.1.24], śloka 71cd. The context wherein this half verse is stated is how other kārakas can be regarded as kartr in relation to the meaning of verbal root.

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 "vikledyanti: 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 \(\sqrt{pac}\) <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,

---

9 We cannot find this half verse in the VLM but in the Kalā commentary of Bālam Bhaṭṭa on VLM reads [p. 1249]: \(\text{ata eva } - \text{dhaṭunoktakriye nityam kārake kartṛteṣyate} \) iti Harih.

\( \sqrt{pac-} \) denotes the action of Devadatta [in "devadattah 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 kartr is principle in the action denoted by the verbal root <71cd>. All \([\bar{kar}akas]\) are related to the action (bhāvanā) and there is no other definition of kartr <72ab>. Hence, we have usages such as “kāśṭhāni pacanti,” etc. according to speaker’s intention <72cd>. Such usage would be impossible unless we accept above definition of kartr <73ab>.

32.2.1 Reflexive Construction {139, 14-16}


Translation: This [definition of kartr] 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 \( \sqrt{pac-} \), 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, vyaśāra and phala] separately and that it has significative capacity wherein one is limited by the other.

Notes: Now, Bhaṭṭo ji gets to the point whether above-mentioned definition of kartr goes for the reflexive constructions (karmacartari).\(^{12}\) 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 kartrtvam svātantryasya vivakṣitavāt). 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 kāśṭhair devadatta 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]; Bate [1982]; Filliozat [1983]; Deshpande [1985]; Iwasaki [1993]; Kudo [1994], [1996, 45-46], [1997(b), 48-54].
rule is *kártr* so that the introduced personal ending, although it is Atmanepada ending, expresses the agent (*odanah 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 *kártr* in the reflexive. According to the definition given by Bhaṭṭoji, *kártr* is the substratum of *vyāpāra* and *karman* is the substratum of *phāla*. 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 *kártr* 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 Kaiyāṭa 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]):

```
svātantryañ ca pradhānadhatvarthāśrayatvam. tac ca karma-
vyāpāramātrasya dhātvarthatve sambahavitīty 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 Pradiṣṭa on *MBh* ad P.3.1.87 [III, 119r]: *svātantryasyeti*. “pacyate odanah svayam eva’ti vikliśtimātravāci paciḥ, tatra caudanasya kārttvam eva (in case of “pacyata odanah 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., 1201]: evaṃ ca saukaryātisāyavivakṣayā vidyamānopi kartṛvyāpāro na vivaksyate, kim tu anekārthatvād dhātunāṃ kamaniṣṭhāvyāpāramārāparatā. tadā karmanāḥ kartṛte “karmanāḥ tulyakriya” ity atrāvasthāntariyakarmanāḥ tulyakriyatvam ity evārtho vivaksyata 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 kartṛ, 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 prthaksaktivādin 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”tyādau. atra hy ekodanaḥ-bhinnāśrayakah pākānukūlo vyāpāra iti bodhaḥ) and “vyāpāra” in this case is “contact with fire” (agnisamyoga).14

In the view of viṣiṣṭaśakti, 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 prthaksaktivāda and the viṣiṣṭaśaktivāda, see the following extracted passages respectively:

“tanḍulaṃ pacati caitraḥ” ity atra “ekatanḍulāśrayikā yā viklittiḥ, tad anukūlaikacaitrabhinnāśrayikā vartamānā bhāvanā,” “tanḍulaḥ pacyate caitrena” ity atra ca “ekacaitrāśrayikā ekatanḍulābhinnāśrayikā yā viklittiḥ, tad anukūlā sām-pratikā bhāvanā” iti bodhaḥ [VBh on VMM k.2, p. 19].

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

---

14 See Darpaṇa on do.: saukaryātisāyadyotanārthā ca tadāvaksā tanḍulādīgatāgni-samyogādirīpavāparyasayaḥ phalajanakataya dhātvarthatvavivaksāyām ity arthah. vastutas tu phalasyāpi janakavyāpārgatapaurvāparvānāpānaḥ vyāpāratvena bhānād iti pūrvam utkutvāt tanḍulagataphalasyāvaḥ vyāpāratvena vivakṣāyām ity arthah.
resides in rice-grain [expressed] in singular number, whose substratum is identical with Caitra [expressed] in singular number, belonging to the present time. In “tāṇḍulaḥ 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 “grāmam gacchati caitraḥ” ityatraikatvāvacchinna-caitrābhinnakartṛko vartamānakāliko grāmābhinnakarmanīṣṭho yas saṁyogaḥ tad anukūlo vyāpāraḥ. “grāmā gamyate maitreṇa” tyatra tu maitrakartṛkavartamānakālikavyāpārajanyo grāmābhinnakarmanīṣṭhaḥ saṁyoga iti ca bodhaḥ [PLM, p. 140].

Tr.: In “grāmam 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: nivṛttapreṣāṇaḥ karma svakriyāvayave sthitam iti pakṣe tu pradhānabhūtadāhāvartha evahe kriyā, dhātuvaṁ*1 tu bhūta-pūrvabhāvanārthatvāt.

*1. MS110Ob5: dhātuḥūti°

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 (sthānivaḍaśeśo ‘naLvidhau) [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 (sthānīn) except the case of the rule concerning to the sounds. Since sthānīn 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, Bhaṭṭoṭji refers to one of two opinions concerning to the derivational stages of the reflexive causative construction, namely *nivṛttapreśaṇapakṣa*, which is manifested by Bhārtrhāri [*VP* III.7.56]. 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 (*Ner aṈau yat karma Nau 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 deriving the reflexive causative sentence in order to clarify the difference of two opinions, namely “*nivṛttapreśaṇapakṣa*” and “*adhyāropitapreśaṇapakṣa*.”

A. *Nivṛttapreśaṇapakṣa*.


The *nivṛttapreśaṇapakṣa*, although Kātyāyana and Patañjali sow the seeds of discussion, 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] (*nivṛttapreśaṇam karma svakriyāvayave sḥitam*).

---

16 This verse is quoted by Bhāṭṭoṭji 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.3.187 [II, 393, 1-13]: *yaGātmanepadaCiṅ-CiṅNvadbhāvāḥ prayojanam.* “ḥiṣyate kāṣṭhaṁ svayam eva.” “abhedī kāṣṭhaṁ svayam eva.” “kāṣṭyate kāṭha svayam eva.” ātmanepadosya tṛṇy api imāny udāharaṇāni. *yaKCiṅ-CiṅNvadbhāvāṁ tu kramaṇeti vivekāḥ.*

*nivṛttapreśaṇam karma svakriyāvayave sḥitam* ।

*nivarttamāne karmacīve karteṣe ‘vatisthate’ [VP III.7.56]*

asyāṁ cāvasthāyām akarmakatvā karttari bhave ca laṅkāraḥ. tatra yad vā kartari tadā śuddhe karttariva rūpeṣu prāptesu pūrvavasthāyāṁ bhīdeḥ karmābhūte kāṣṭhe yādṛśī kriyā dvidhā-bhavanarāpāī, karoteh karmanī ca kete utpattirāpāī, tāyā tulyakrīyo ‘yam bhidikṛṇoh karttā lakārvācyayaḥ cety atidesād yaGaḍacauṣṭayapravṛtīḥ. yathā “nivṛttapreśaṇasyākarmakatvam, yathā ca kriyāyāḥ kvacit karmasthatvam, kutracin na, tathā “Ner aṈau” [P.1.3.67] iti śutre vyupādātīm.

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 *MBa* ad P.1.3.67 [I, 290-292] wherein Patañjali uses the example “ārohayanti hastināṁ hastipakāḥ” (p. 290, 3).
nivartamāne karmatve sve kārtṛṭve 'vatiśṭhate ||.19 Bhartrhari gives five stages of derivational process in forming the reflexive causative sentence.20 These are sketched in the VP III.7.59-60:

nyagbhāvanam nyagbhāvanam ruhau śuddhe prātiyate ||
nyagbhāvanam nyagbhāvanam Nyante 'pi prātipadyate ||
avasthām pañcamīṃ āha Nyante tam karmakartāri ||
nīryttrapreṣaṇād dhātoḥ prākyṛte 'rthe NiJ ucyate ||

Tr.: In the meaning of bare verbal root ruh-, what is understood is “nyagbhāvāna: to cause to bent down” and “nyagbhāvana: to bent down.” [Both meanings] nyagbhāvana and nyagbhāvana are realized in case of the causative. It is on the fifth stage [of the derivational process] when it [Vruh-] 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 “ārohanti hastinaḥ hastipakāḥ: elephant-drivers mount the elephant.” We cannot know how Bhartrhari had made derivational sentences but with the help of the commentary of Helārāja the sentences supposed by Bhartrhari are as follows21 (Mg. meaning):

---

19 See the Prakīrtakaparakāśa of Helārāja on VP III.7.56 [273]: dhāvartvāṃśukūlyena ceṣṭanāṃ kartuḥ preṣaṇāṃ svavyāpārah kārakāntaraviniyogalakṣaṇam. tadanabhīdhiyāmāne kartari pacaye odanaḥ svayaṃ evetādāva nivartate. kartrāśrayasya vyāpāsya kartari prayatvānabhīdhiyāmāne dhātunābhidhiyāmaṇātvaḥ. pratīyāmaṇātvaṃ tu tasya dvayarthaḥ pacit iti bhāvyavirudhādh asangaṃtā iti akhyātām. “tāni dhāvarttāni” [VP III.7.57a] iti ca vakyayāmāṇatvād visāyaśvēdhānaḥ dhāvartvāḥ kārtvyāpāśraya granthakṛtāḥ bhīptetā. tasmā nivṛtte svasaṁ kriyāvave pradānākriyāpēkṣāyā guṇabhūte svavyāpāre karmā sthitām, kartṛṭyā bhūtaśūnyatvātāṃ tv asya karmayupadesah. yady api ca kārtvyāpāre vivākṣe svakriyāyaṃ evaṃvasthānam taddvāreṇa pradānākriyāvīravatānāt, kāraṃ karmeti sāmśānaḥ-dhikarāyaṃ ca, tathāpi sāmśānaḥ atra prādhāniyāvasthānam boddhavyam. ati eva kārtvyāpāpēkṣāya karmatvasya nivṛttyāvāmye sarvataḥ bhavati svakriyāvīṣye kartrītye 'vatiśṭhate iti kārtvyāpāpēkṣāya pīrvaṃ karmā bhūtāva sakuirātkiṣaṣayapratis-pādaṇaparatiṣyāṃ taddvākṣāyaṃ kartā sampadāya iti bhavati karmakartaḥ. ayaṃ bhāvah. na kevalāṃ kārtvyāpāśrayāvīvaśāṃśāmaḥ karmakartrī, api tv svavyāpār svātāntravyāvākṣāyaṃ api satyām. tatas cāpiroṣṭāni yaGaṅgīni karmakāryāni “karmavat karmānā tulyakriyāḥ” [P.3.1.87] iti sāstrēna prāpyante. tad uktam Vārttikākṛtā “karmakartā kārtṛṭvam svātāntrasyāya vivākṣātāvā” [Vṭ 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 nīryttrapreṣaṇapakṣa in contrast with the adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa referred as “aparaḥ prakāraḥ” [ibid., 466]. See also the Pradīpa and Uddyoṭa 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 hastinām hastipakāh <simple, non-Caus., non-reflexive>
Mg. (nyagbhāvayanti: to cause elephant to bent down)
a-2) āruhaye hastī svayam eva <reflexive>
Mg. (nyagbhavati: to bent down)
a-3) ārohayanti hastinām hastipakāh <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.

On the other hand, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita construes four stages, using not only above example but also his own example, “paśyanti bhavaṁ bhaktāḥ: the devotees see Bhava,” in his ŠK on P.1.3.67 [II, 81, 17-82, 10]:
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tatah punar Nyarthisya saukaryadyotonarthan avivakṣāyāṁ “darśayate bhavah” viṣayibhavatity arthāḥ. tad iha paśyati-
darśayatvōḥ saṃānārthatayā kartṛsthabhāvavatvāc ca karma-
vadbhāvavirahe prakṛtasūrenātmanepadam. iha hi NiCpaprākti-
ṛūttena drśinā ya evārtho dvitiyakakṣāyāṁ upāttaḥ sa evam
caturthāyaṁ iti sāmānakriyavatvam asti aṇau yat karma
prathamakakṣāyāṁ tad eva kartṛ.
evaṁ “ārohayate hasti” ity apy udāharanāṁ. “ārohani
tastinaṇm hastipakāḥ.” nyagbhāvayantīry arthāḥ. “ārohati hasti”
nyagbhavat[i]ty arthāḥ. tato nivṛtta(82)ṣaṅān NiCi “āroha-
yantī” ārohantīty arthāḥ. tataḥ punar Nyarthatyāgo “āroha-
yate” nyagbhavatīty arthāḥ. ihāpi prāgyat prathamātyitor
dvitiyacaturthyoś cārthasāmyāc caturthī kakṣā udāharanaṁ. so
(’)yaṁ nivṛttrapreṣaṇapakṣāḥ. āha ca
nyagbhāvam viṁyagbhavam ruhau śuddhe pratiyate ||
nyagbhāvam nyagbhavam Nyante ’pi pratipadyate ||
avasthīḥ paṃcamīm āha Ńyantatakarmakartari ||
nivṛttrapreṣanād dhātoḥ prākṛte ’rthe Niṣ ucyaṁ || iti. [VP
III.7.59-60]
iha viśiśṭavācakayōḥ śruddhaNyantayor vācyōv aṁsau
vācakabhedāṇa dvedhā gaṇayitvā pūrvokapratthamatṛitiyakakṣā-
yāṁ avasthācauṣṭaṇāyaḥ caturthakakṣāyāṁ tu paṃcami avastheti
ślokārtho bhīpṛetaḥ.
Tr.: In this case, “kartṛ” 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 bhavam bhaktāḥ” means that
[the devotees] make [Bhava] be an object through the optical
sense (cāksuṣajñānena viṣayikurvanti). However, when in terms
of the intention to express an extreme facility [of the object] the
instigation of the agent is removed, “paśyati bhavah” is made in
the sense that [Bhava] becomes the optical object [by himself]
(viṣayibhavati). As for this [formation], it is said by Bharṭṛhari.
<translation omitted, see above>
Then, the causal affix NiC which express the meaning “to cause
one who is seeing to do” (paśyantarman prerayanti) is introduced to
“paśyati” and the sentence “darśayanti bhavam bhaktāḥ” is
derived in the sense that [the devotees] see [Bhava] (paśyanti).
Again as for this, [Bharṭṛhari] said. <translation omitted, see
above>
Then, in case that there is no intention to express the function of
the causative conjugation, the sentence “darśayate bhavah” is
made in the sense that [Bhava] becomes the optical object [by
himself] (viṣayibhavati). In above process, since the verbal forms
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*paśyati* and *darśayati* denote same meaning and \( \sqrt{dṛś} \) itself is *kārtṛsthabhāvaka* 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 \( \sqrt{dṛś} \), 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 hastinaṁ hastipakāh" 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 [hastinaṁ hastipakāṁ]" 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 Bhartrhari.

b-1) ārohanti hastinaṁ 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 hastinaṁ 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 Bhāṭṭoji himself.

c-1) paśyanti bhavamī bhaktāḥ <simple, non-Caus., non-reflexive>

   Mg. (*paśyanti*: to see Bhava)

c-2) paśyati bhavāḥ <non-Caus., with reflexive nuance>

   Mg. (*viśayībhavati*: to become an object by oneself)
Comparing to the process of Bhatṛhari, 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 ṭdrś- is kartrsthabhāvaka-root so that it cannot form the karmakartari construction.23

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

From 1) to 2). ṭdrś- denotes “cāksusajñāna-anukūla-vyāpāra” and the verbal form paśyati is paraphrased as “cāksusajñānena viśayikurvanti (or cāksusajñānaviśayāṇa kurvanti).” 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 NiC is introduced by P.1.3.67 and the verbal form is “darśayanti” [3.pl.] but in this case the affix NiC 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]: kartrsthabhāvakānām kartrsthakriyānām vā kartā karmavan mā bhūd iti.

24 Bālamane margam on SK. 2738 [III, 574-5]: yadā cāksusajñānaviśayatvāpatter eva drśer artho vivakṣitaḥ, na tu tadanukālavyāpārah kṛṇḍhātugamyah presaṇāṁśaiḥ. tādā “paśyati bhava” ity asya cāksusajñānaviśayāḥ sampadyate ity arthaḥ. saukaryātisāyatavivakṣāḥ anukūla- vyāpārahśasya avivakṣā bodhyā. tathā ca cāksusajñānaviśayatvāpā(575)ter eva dṛṣṭarthatvāt tadāśrayasya bhavasya kartrtvam eva, tad āha viśayo bhavatity artha iti. lakṣanaāy cāksusajñānaviśayāyo bhavatity artha ity arthaḥ.

25 Ibid. [III, 575]: tata iti kṛṇḍhātugamyam presaṇāṁśām vihāya cāksusajñānaviśayatvāpattivyātter drśer hetumāṇu NiJ ity arthaḥ. darśayanti bhavam bhaktā iti. cāksusajñānaviśayatvam
From 3) to 4). Bhava is the karman in c-1) and treated as prayojyakartr 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 hasti” 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 kartr such as c-4).

B. Adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa.
B-1. Bhartrhari.

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

\[\text{keśāmci} \text{devadattāder vyāpāro yaḥ sakarmake} \]
\[\text{sa vinā devadattādeh kaṭādisu vivakṣyate} \]
\[\text{nivṛttapreṣaṇaṁ karma svasya kartūḥ prayojakam} \]
\[\text{preṣaṇaṁtarasambandhe Nyante lenābhidihiyate} \]

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 Ni/C in the relation of another instigation.

Seemingly, the example that Bhartrhari supposed is “devadattaḥ kaṭaṁ 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 Prakṛṣṇakaprakāśa of Helārāja,26 “kārayati kaṭaḥ devadattena.”

\[\text{apādayanittī NiJantasya phalito 'rthaḥ, tad āha paśvantī artha itī. cākṣuṣajñānavisayaṁ kurvanīty arthaḥ.} \]

26 Two sentences are found in the Prakṛṣṇakaprakāśa 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 kaṭaṁ karoti; (2) yajñadattaḥ kaṭaṁ kārayati devadattena; (3) kaṭaḥ kaṭaṁ kārayati devadattena; (4) kaṭa ātmānaṁ kārayati devadattena; (5) kaṭa ātmānaṁ kārayati: (6) kārayate kaṭaḥ svayam eva.
B-2. Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita.

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

yadva — “paśyanti bhavaṁ bhaktāḥ.” “ārohanti hastinam hastipakāḥ” iti prāgyat eva prathamakāksa. tataḥ saukaryadyotanārthaṁ karmanā eva preṣaṇam adhyāropya NiC kriyate. “darśayati bhavaḥ” “ārohaya Hasti” iti paśyata ārohataḥ ca prerayatīty arthaḥ. tato NiCprakṛtibhyām NiJbhyaṁ copātayor dvayor api preṣaṇayor yugapat tyāge “darśayate” “ārohaya” ity udāharanam. viṣayibhavati nyagbhavatitī ca pūrvavad evārthāḥ. so 'yam adhyāropitapreṣaṇapakṣa(m). iḥādyāropita-preṣaṇapakṣe “darśayati bhavaḥ” “ārohaya Hasti” ity dvitiyakāksāyāṁ atityāptīṁ vārayītum samānākritvaparam atityāṁ vākyam. tena preṣaṇādhikyaṁ nātiyāptīṁ. nivṛttapreṣaṇapakṣe “darśayanti bhavam” “ārohaya Hastinam” ity evamṛūpaṁ tritiyakāksāyāṁ atityāptīṁ vārayītum “aNau yat karma sa cya Nau karte” ty evamṛūpaṁ tritiyaṁ vākyam. iha tu aNau karmanor bhavahastinōh karmatvam eva, na tu kārtṛte nātiyāptīṁ.

Tr.: Or rather, [some grammarians have different view]. To start from the two examples “paśyanti bhavaḥ bhaktāḥ” and “ārohanti hastinam 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 “ārohaya 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 [bhavah]” and “ārohayate [hasti].” Their meanings are respectively “[Bhava] becomes the optical object [by himself]” and “[elephant] bends 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., “aNau yā kriya Nau cet”] is stated. By this reason, since the

27 See also SK No. 2738 [III, 577-578]: yadvā paśyantīārohanītī prathamakāksa prāgyat. tataḥ karmanā eva hetutvārhow NiC. “darśayati bhavaḥ.” “ārohaya Hasti.” paśyata ārohataḥ ca prerayatīty arthaḥ. tato NiJbhyaṁ tatrpraktibhyāṁ ca upātayor dvayor api (578) preṣaṇayos tyāge “darśayate” “ārohaya” ity udāharanam arthaḥ prāgyat. asmin pakṣe dvitiyakāksāyāṁ na tāṁ samānākritvābhāvāṁ NiJarthasyādhyākṣāyāṁ.

28 Traditionally, P.1.3.67 is divided into three portions: (1) Nek; (2) aNau yat karma Nau cet; (3) sa kartā. See MBh ad P.1.3.67 [I, 291, 5-7]; evam vakṣyāmi. Ner ātmanepadāṁ bhavati, tato ‘Nau yat karma Nau cet. aNyante yat karma Nau cya 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 nivṛttapreṇaṇapakṣa, the third portion of the rule [“aNau yat karma sa cēn Nau kartā”] is prescribed [so that the Āmaneṇapada 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 karta so that the over-application is avoided.

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

d-1) árohanti hastināṃ hastipakāḥ <simple, non-Caus., non-reflexive>
   Mg. (nyagbhāvayanti: to cause elephant to bent down)
d-2) árohayati hastī [hastipakān] <causative, original-object-based>
   Mg. (ārohataḥ prerayati: to cause those who are mounting to do so)
d-3) árohaye [hastī] <reflexive-causative>
   Mg. (nyagbhavati: to bent down)

e-1) pasyanti bhavāṃ bhaktāḥ <simple, non-Caus., non-reflexive>
   Mg. (pasyanti: to see Bhava)
e-2) darśayati bhavāḥ [bhaktān] <causative, original-object-based>
   Mg. (paśyataḥ prerayati: to cause those who are seeing to do so)
e-3) darśayate bhavāḥ <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. Bhaṭṭojī follows this division but substitutes the word kriyā for the word karman: Nyāṇōdā āmanepadāṃ svād anādhyāne. aNau yat karma Nau cet iti dvitiyāṃ vākyam. karmeṇa kriyā NiCprakṛtyupātā yā saiva cēn Nyāṇōnucayāti arthaḥ. sa karteti tritiyāṃ vākyam (SK on P.1.3.26, I, 81, 4-6). This substitution is based on the MBh ad P.1.3.14 (karti karmanayatihāre) [I, 277, 22]: kriyāṃ hi lōke karmatv upaśaranti kā kriyāṃ karisyasti. kim karma karisyasti. 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]: Nau cēd 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 Bhave and involved in the meaning of √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 √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 kārtr 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 ŠK. See PM on KV on P.3.1.87 [III, 470]:

tatra yadā karmanah sakaryātiśayapratipādanāya kārtyväpāro na vivakṣyate, tadā nivṛttapreśaṇaṁ karma svakriyāvayavasthitam nirvartamāne karmatve sve kārtvē 'vātiśhate. dhātur api tadväyāpāramātre vartate (Tr.: Here, when the activity of the agent is not intended to express in order to convey an
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 kārakāṇāṃ kriyānvayaniyamo ‘pi dvedā vyākhyaṭāḥ.
“devadattah pacati,” “sthāli pacati.” anyalakhyasya śabdā-
rthatvād āśrayo lakārārthāḥ. “devadattena pacyate.”*1 deva-
dattarūpo ya āśrayas tad viśiṣṭo viklittyanukūlayāpāra ity
arthah. vaiśiṣṭyaṃ cādheyatārūpaṃ sāmsargamaryādayā
bhāsate.

*1. MS omits this example.

Translation: Therefore, it is explained in twofold ways that kārakas
are related to the action. E.x., “devadattah pacati: Devadatta is
cooking” and “sthāli 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,] l-
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 (sāmsargamaryādā) [which is not
expressed in the sentence].

Notes: This passage treats with the intention of speaker. In the
definition of kartṛtvā, Bhāṭṭoji, 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 kartṛ 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: nispatṭimātre kartṛtvam sarvatratvaśīti kārake l vyāpārabhedāpeksaśāyām
karanatvādiśambhavāh l l 20-21: gunakriyānaṃ kartāraḥ kartṛa nyakṛtasaktayah l nyaktayām api
sampūrṇaśvair vyāpāraś samanvitaś karantvādibhir jñātāḥ kriyābhedaśāpāebhiḥ l
svātantrayam uttamām labhdhā pradhāne yānti kartṛām l l 103: sarvair abhyuditaiḥ śabdaiḥ niyamo
na tu vastāni l kartṛdharmaśāvikāṣṭāṃ śabdāti kartā pratiyāte l

33. Cf. Bālamanoram on SK 559 [I, 633]: nanu sthāli pacatītyādau katham sthāyādīnāṃ
kartṛtvam, svātantryābhāvād ity ata āha — vivakṣito ’ṛtha iti; Tatvabodhini [ibid.]: sthāyādīnāṃ
kārakas can be regarded as kartr and how the sentences whose agent is originally karman, karaṇa, or adhikaraṇa 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 Bāṭṭa school, is mentioned in the ŚK elsewhere: for example, on P.3.1.67 (sārvadhiṭṭuke yaK) [II, 384]: pradhānabhūtadhīṭvarthāśrayaḥ kartā, phalāśrayaḥ ca karma. phalavyāpārayoṣ ca dhūtunaivopāttavāt. āśrayamātraṃ lakārārthaḥ, ananyalabhyaśayaiva śabdārthavāt.

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

33. tatpravojakā hetuṣ ca [P.1.4.55: SK. 2575]
33.0 On the meaning of rule [139, 22-23]
Text: tasya kartuḥ pravojakā hetusamjñāḥ syāc, cāt kartṛsambjñāḥ.

Sanjñāsambāvesārthaḥ cakāraḥ.
Translation: The term hetu is introduced to ‘pravojaka: instigator’ of that agent. Since the word ca is included [in this rule], it [= pravojaka] is also [called] kartr. 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 anantarāḥ kartā parāmrṣyate. tasya pravojakāḥ = tatpravojakāḥ. nipātanāt samāsāḥ. svatantrasya apravojako yo ‘ṛthaḥ tatpravojakāṃ hetusamjñām bhavati, cakārāt kartṛsambjñāṃ ca. samjñāsambāvesārthaḥ cakāraḥ. As is stated in this KV, the compound tat-pravojaka is analyzed as a genitive-tatpurusa compound: tasya pravojakāḥ. 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 case2.2.8 is not2.2.10 compounded with a pada ending in the affixes trC or aka2.2.15] which denotes agent [to form tapuruṣa2.1.22]. Then, the KV regards this form as nipātana (ad hoc, already derived form).35

vastuṛataḥ svātantrayābhāve ‘pi sthālī pacati kāṣṭhāni paccantīyādiprayogyo ‘pi sādhur eveti dhvanayati — vivākṣita ‘ṛtha iti.
34 This explanation is based on that of the KV: karttari ca yaU tr-jakau tāhhyām saha saṣṭhi na samasyaTE. sāmarthyād akasya viśeṣanārthaṃ kartṛgraṇaṇam, itaratra vyāhikkārābhāvāt. 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 saṣṭhisamāsapratisēdhenātra bhavitavyam ity āha — nipātanāt sumāsa iti; PM on do.: tasya pravojakaḥ tapravojakaḥ iti. nanu “ṛṭalakābhhyām 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 samāveṣa (co-application) of two designations: one is hetu and the other is kartr prescribed in the previous rule. By introducing another samijñā in this rule, tatprayojaka become called hetu and kartr as well. This treatment of the particle ca is, by designating X as hetu and kartr, to afford facilities for introducing suffix 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-kartr because he is independent in his instigation; Y is prayojya but he is kartr 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]:

Praśe 'svatantraprayojakatvād dhetusamijñāprasiddhiḥ || Vt I || praśe 'svatantraprayojakatvād dhetusamijñāyā aprasiddhiḥ. svatantraprayojako hetusamijño bhavatiy ucyate na cāsa vatantram prayojayati. svatantratvāt siddham. siddham etat. katham. svatantratvāt. svatantram asau prayojayati.
Svatantratvād siddham iti cet svatantraparatantratvam viprati-siddham || Vt II || yadi svatantro na prayojyo 'tha prayojyo na svatantraḥ prayojyaḥ svatantraś ceti vipratisiddham.
Uktam vā || Vt III || kim uktam. ekam tāvad uktam “na vā svātantrẏād itarathā hy akurvaty api kārayati syād” [Vt II on P.1.4.54] iti. aparam

pratishedhāt katham atra samāśa iti āha — nipātanāt samāśa iti. atra vicāryam asti samāśasprakaranā eva vicārayisyāmāḥ.

36 See the followings: Nyāsa on KV on P.1.4.55 [I, 586]: samijñāsamāveṣārthatā ca kārya iti. asati tasmin ekasamijñādhikārād eva kartpasamijñā na syāt. atah samijñāsamāveṣārthatā ca kāryaḥ kriyate. hetusā vidyātā samijñādvayasya prayojanam darśayati. prayojakavyastē hi “hetumati ca” iti NJ vidhiyate. tasya hetuvaṃ prayojakasya hetuve saty upapadyate. hetuvāt prayojaka NiCo nimittām bhavati. kartpratvyayena ca lakārenābhidhānaṃ kartpasamijñāyāṃ satyāṃ bhavatītī kartṛtvāt kartpratvyayena lakārenocayata iti;

Tattvabodhini on SK. 2575 = P.1.4.55 [III, 425]: ca kārya ekasamijñādhikārabādhanārthas tād āha hetusamijñāś ceti. hetusamijñāḥ prayojanam “bhīsmyor hetubhaye” [P.1.3.68] “bhīyo hetubhaye suK” [P.7.4.40] iyādau prayojakasya hetutvena vyavahārāḥ. kartpasamijñāyās tu “lāh karmanī ca bhūve ca —” [P.3.4.69] iti sūtrena prayojake vācye lakārādayah.
uktam “na vā sāmānyakṛtatvād dhetu hy aviśiṣṭam svatantraprayojakatvād aprayojaṇaka iti cēn muktasaṁśayena 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) “tātprayojaṇakaḥ” and P.1.4.55(b) “hetuṣ 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 kartrtvāt kartari lakāraḥ. 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 kartr 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 kartr, 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

\[
\begin{align*}
kr + NiC & \quad \text{P.3.1.26 [hetu = Hari, hetumat = tadvyāpāra]} \\
kr + i + lAT & \quad \text{P.3.2.123 [present tense selected]} \\
kr + i + tiP & \quad \text{P.3.4.77, 78 [l- > tiP-replacement]} \\
kr + i + ŠaP + ti & \quad \text{P.3.1.68 [kartari]} \\
kār-i-a-ti & \quad \text{P.7.2.115, 1.1.51 [r > ār]} \\
kār-e-a-ti & \quad \text{P.7.3.84 [i > e]} \\
kār-ay-a-ti & \quad \text{P.6.1.78 [e > ay]} \\
\end{align*}
\]


Tattvabodhini on do.: svanīṣṭhādharatīrṇāpitādhīyatāsambandhena hetur yatrāsti sa hetumān vyāpāraḥ, tasmin vācye NiJ ity āhuḥ. pravojakavyāpāra 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* 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]: *preśīte ca kilāyāṃ kriyām cākriyām ca drśtvādhyava-syati kurvan svatantro 'kruvan neti. yadi ca preśito 'sau na karoti svatantro '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]:

\[katham idam vijñāyate. hetumaty abhidheye NiC bhavatīti. āhosvid dhetumati yo dhātur vartata iti.\]

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

*hetuḥ svatantrasya (kartuḥ) prayojakah, tadiyo vyāpārah preṣanādilakṣaṇo hetumān, tasmin abhidheye dhātort 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 kartṛsamjñāyāṃ hetumaty upasamkhyānam asvatantratvāt; VΠI [ibid., 339, 1]: *na vā svatantarṇyād itarathā hy akurvaty api kārayatīti svār; Vt III [ibid., 5]: *nākurvatīt cet svatantrāh.*

40 The *Nyāsa* comments [ibid.]: *tadiya iti. tattvabandhi kriyāṁako vyāpāraḥ. See also the Pradīpa on *MBh* ad P.3.1.26 [III, 57r]: *hetumati ca. kṛtrimasya pāribhāṣikasya prayojakasyeḥa*
In order to illustrate this interpretation, the KV gives examples: *kurvāṇaṁ prayūṅkte, kārayati. hārayati* [on P.1.4.55, I, 586]. In this way, the word *hetumati* 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 ĀŚK follows established interpretation of the rule.

End of the āhnika.

Text: *iti Śabdakaustubhe prathamasya adhyāyasya caturthe pāde tṛtiyam āhnikam.*

*(to be continued)*
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