

## On the Construction Type *naṭasya śṛṇoti*<sup>1</sup>

George Cardona

जार्ज कार्डोना महाभागः “उपाध्यायात् अधीते” “नटस्य शृणोति” इति  
व्यवहारद्वयस्य व्याकरणशास्त्रसम्पत्या रीत्या व्यवस्थाकरणे प्रवृत्तः,

1. Abbreviations: A: Aṣṭādhyāyī; AV: Śaunaka recension of the Atharvaveda, (Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute edition with padapāṭha and commentary attributed to Sāyaṇa, 1961); AVS: Sāyaṇa's commentary on the Atharvaveda; Bh.: Mahābhāṣya (vol., page, line of Kielhorn's edition, revised by K. V. Abhyankar); DhPr.: Maitreyarakṣita's Dhātupradīpa (gaṇa and dhātu in Shrish Chandra Chakravarti's edition, reedited by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka, Sonipat, 1986); Kāś.: Kāśikāvṛtti (Osmania edition); KṣT: Kṣīrasvāmin's Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī (gaṇa and dhātu in Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka's edition); MDhvṛ.: Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti (gaṇa and dhātu in Dwarikadas Shastri's edition); N: Jinendrabuddhi's Kāśikāvivaraṇapañjikā alias Nyāsa (sūtra, vol., page of Dwarika Das and Kalika Prasad Shukla's edition); PM: Haradatta's Padamañjarī (sūtra, vol., page of Dwarika Das and Kalika Prasad Shukla's edition); PK: Rāmacandra's Prakriyākaumudī (sūtra, vol., page in K. P. Trivedi's edition); Pr.: Kaiyatā's Pradīpa (vol., page of the Rohtak edition); RVS: Sāyaṇa's commentary on the Ṛgveda; SK: Bhaṭṭoḍī's Siddhāntakaumudī (sūtra, vol., page of Giridhar Sharma and Parameshvar Anand Sharma's edition, 1975); SKŚ.: the Laghuśabdenduśekhara on the Siddhāntakaumudī (vol., page of the text with six commentaries, edited by Guruprasad Shastri); SKŚC: Vaidyanātha's Cidasthimālā on the Laghuśabdenduśekhara (vol., page in Guruprasad Shastri's edition); SKŚCK: Bhairavamīśra's Candrakalā on the Laghuśabdenduśekhara (vol., page of the Kashi Sanskrit Series edition, reprinted 1987); SKT: Jñānendrasarasvatī's Tattvabodhinī on the Siddhāntakaumudī (edition noted for SK); TĀ: Taittirīyāraṇyaka (Ānandāśrama edition/Mysore edition); TĀBh.: Bhaṭṭabhāskara's commentary on the Taittirīyāraṇyaka; TĀS: Sāyaṇa's commentary on the Taittirīyāraṇyaka; TS: Taittirīyasamīhitā (Vaidika Samśodhana Maṇḍala edition with Bhaṭṭabhāskara's and Sāyaṇa's commentaries); TSBh.: Bhaṭṭabhāskara's commentary on the Taittirīyasamīhitā; TSS: Sāyaṇa's commentary on the Taittirīyasamīhitā; Ud.: Nāgeśa's Uddyota (vol., page of Rohtak edition); Uṇ.: Uṇādisūtra (Aufrecht's edition); VS: Vājasaneyisamīhitā (edition with Uvaṭa's and Mahīdhara's commentaries, reprinted, Motilal BanarsiDass, 1971); VSM: Mahīdhara's commentary on the Vājasaneyisamīhitā; VSU: Uvaṭa's commentary on the Vājasaneyisamīhitā. For bibliographic details on works of grammar, see Pāṇini, A Survey of Research.

तत्सम्बद्धान् उपनिशद्व्यवहारान् तत्तत्सूत्रसञ्चारक्रमप्रदर्शनपूर्वकं व्याख्याय  
 केषां शृणोति सुगीव इति वाल्मीकेर्वचनमुद्दत्य अधिपूर्वकधातूनां  
 स्मरणार्थकानां स्थले कर्मकारकस्य प्रसङ्गं व्याख्याय व्यचिद्वैदिकप्रयोगेषु  
 अधिपूर्वकाणां श्रवणादीनां ज्ञानार्थकानाऽच्य धातूनां प्रयोगे षष्ठीप्रयोगस्य  
 निर्वाहार्थं भाष्यकर्तृभिः आश्रितानुपायान् प्रतिपाद्य निगमयति यत् ‘इक्’  
 धातोः “स्मरणे” इत्यर्थव्युत्पादनं वार्तिककारस्य कात्यायनस्य काले  
 नासीदित्यतः पाणिनेरपि अनभिमतं भवितुमर्हतीति, ततश्च  
 पदान्तराध्याहाराद्युपायाश्रयणं विनैव षष्ठीप्रयोगः सुवच इति।

1. Pāṇini's sūtra A 1.4.29: ākhyātopayoge (*apādānam* 24, *kārake* 23) assigns the class name *apādāna* to someone who relates or conveys something (*ākhyātā*) and in doing so plays a role as a direct participant (*kāraka*) in the accomplishment of a particular action, referred to by *upayoge*. After a brief discussion that need not be considered here, Patañjali considers that *upayoga* (loc. sg. *upayoge*) refers to an action which involves certain restrictions (*niyamapūrvakah* ‘preceded by restrictions’). By the example he uses to illustrate this, Patañjali also shows that what is involved is the traditional acquisition of knowledge by students from teachers.<sup>2</sup> Thus, by A 1.4.29, a teacher who, with respect to the act of acquiring traditional knowledge, plays the role of one who imparts this knowledge is called *apādāna*.<sup>3</sup> This accounts for usages such as

(1) *upādhyāyād adhīte* ‘(A student) is studying with a teacher.’

The teacher is an *apādāna*, so that the nominal *upādhyāya* which refers to him is followed by an ending of the fifth triplet

2. Bh. I.329.10-11: *athavopayogaḥ ko bhavitum arhati | yo niyamapūrvakah | tad yathā upayuktā māṇavakā ity ucyante ya ete niyamapūrvakam adhītavanto bhavanti* ‘Alternatively, what should be an *upayoga*? (An action) that is preceded by restrictions. For example, *upayuktāḥ* is said of young men who have acquired learning while observing restrictions.’ The traditional restrictions are a student’s sleeping on the ground, begging, and others.
3. Cf., for example, Kāś. 1.4.29: *ākhyātā pratipādayitā | upayogo niyamapūrvakam vidyāgraḥanam | upayoge sādhye ya ākhyātā tat kārakam apādānasañjñām bhavati*.

(*pañcamī*):<sup>4</sup> *upādhyāya-as* (*Nasi*) → ... *upādhyāyāt*.

**2.** Patañjali begins his discussion of A 1.4.29 by questioning the purpose behind saying *upayoge* in the sūtra and he notes that the formulation is meant to preclude the assignment of the class name *apādāna* to an actor or a story teller. The rule thereby does not allow for

- (2) *naṭāc chṛṇoti*
- (3) *granthikāc chṛṇoti*

instead of

- (4) *naṭasya śṛṇoti* ‘... listens to/hears the actor’
- (5) *granthikasya śṛṇoti* ‘... listens to/hears the story teller.’<sup>5</sup>

If a member of an audience listens to and hears the actor singing a gāthā but this is not given the status of traditional acquisition of knowledge, then (4) is in order. Similarly, if someone listens to and hears a story being told from a book by a story teller and this is not given such status, then (5) is appropriate. (2)-(3) would be appropriate if one granted to the actor and storyteller a respected status comparable to that of a teacher.<sup>6</sup>

**3.** A central topic of Kātyāyana’s and Patañjali’s discussion of A 1.4.29 is whether someone who relates something (*ākhyātā*) under circumstances such that traditional restrictions that apply to students are inapplicable (*anupayoge*) is or is not a kāraka.<sup>7</sup> Kaiyatā merely observes that both of these alternatives are possible, but Nāgeśa brings out how they are possible, taking (4) as an example. It is not possible that a verse sung by an actor

4. A 2.3.28: *apādāne pañcamī*.
5. Bh. I.329.6: *upayoga iti kimartham | naṭasya śṛṇoti granthikasya śṛṇoti*.
6. Nāgeśa makes this point: *yadā tu naṭādibhyo’pi tathādhyayanam taddā naṭāc chṛṇotīti bhavaty eveti bodhyam* (Ud. II.396) Jayanta Bhaṭṭa plays on the contrast between the use of *naṭāt* and *naṭasya* in his Āgamadāmbara (ed. V. Raghavan and A. Thakur, Darbhanga, 1964, p. 14).
7. Bh. I.329.12: *kim punar ākhyātānupayoge kārakam āhosvid akārakam*.

should be heard without the actor; since he produces the singing, he is qualified by the property of being a kāraka, one that brings about an action. On the other hand, one can consider that he is not immediately what brings about hearing. Instead, he may be viewed in a manner comparable to the way one conceives of a potmaker's father: a potmaker is the immediate cause of a pot's production and his father is indirectly the cause of this by virtue of producing the potmaker. Similarly, an actor's role with respect to an audience's hearing what he sings is an indirect one: he does not directly bring about the act of hearing; this role is played by a listener. He does, nevertheless indirectly contribute to this act by producing his song.<sup>8</sup>

**4.** Kātyāyana devotes two vārtikas to the issue, and the following argument takes place.

**4.1.** If the relater is a kāraka, since such a participant is not specifically given any other kāraka class name (*akathitam*), by A 1.4.51: *akathitam ca* (*karma* 49), it will receive the class name *karman*.<sup>9</sup> Consequently, A 2.3.2: *karmani dvitīyā* would apply to introduce a second-triplet ending signifying a karman, so that one would allow only

(6) *naṭam śṛṇoti*

and not (4).

**4.2.** On the other hand, if the actor in question is not a kāraka, stating *upayoge* in A 1.4.29 serves no purpose.<sup>10</sup> It is now not necessary to include the term in the sūtra in order to disallow usages such as (2) instead of (4). If the actor spoken of in (4) is not a direct participant (*kāraka*) in bringing about the act of

8. Pr. II. 397: *kim punar iti : ubhayathā sambhavād doṣadarśanāc ca praśnah.* Ud. II.397: *ubhayathethi : naṭam vinā gītaśravaṇādyayogāt tasya tajjanakatayā kārakatvam kulālapitṛvad anyathāsiddhatvasambhāvanayā cākarakatvam iti bhāvah.*
9. 1.4.29 vt. 1: *ākhyātānupayoge kārakam iti ced akathitatvāt karmasañjñā-prasaṅgah.* Bh. I.329.14-15: *ākhyātānupayoge kārakam iti ced akathitatvāt karmasañjñā prāpnoti.*
10. 1.4.29 vt. 2: *akārakam iti ced upayogavacanānarthakyam.* Bh. I.329.17: *yady akārakam upayogavacanam anarthakam.*

hearing, whatever relation he is involved in falls under the remainder (*sēṣa*) with respect to action-kāraka relations, so that the sixth-triplet ending is accounted for by A 2.3.50: *śaṣṭhī sēṣe*.

**4.3.** The above is all that Kātyāyana has to say on the question. Patañjali, on the other hand, continues the argumentation, first reverting to the position that the person who relates something, such as the actor spoken of in (4), is a kāraka. Now, however, he argues that the consequence brought up earlier does not obtain. Patañjali invokes an enumeration that is given in a śloka cited under A 1.4.51,<sup>11</sup> which specifies particular kārakas that are considered not assigned another class name by sūtras under the heading of A 1.4.23: *kārake*, so that they are given the name *karman* by this rule, as follows: (a) with respect to the actions denoted by *duḥ* ‘milk’, *yāc* ‘ask’, *rudh* ‘enclose, hem in’, *pracch* ‘ask’, *bhiks* ‘beg’, *ci* ‘pick, pluck’, the kāraka which is the cause or source of what results from the action; e.g., *pauravam gāṁ yācate* ‘... asks a Paurava for a cow’, *māṇavakarṇ panthānāṁ prcchati* ‘... asks the boy the way’, *pauravam gāṁ bhikṣate* ‘... begs a Paurava for a cow’: the cow and the path for which one asks are the immediate objects;<sup>12</sup> (b) the participant that is associated with a kāraka relative to the acts signified by *brū* ‘say’, *sās* ‘instruct’; e.g., *putram brūte dharmam* ‘... tells his son his duty’: the immediate object of saying is a duty, with which a son is associated. Since it is assumed that Pāṇini intended this set of kārakas to be referred to by *akathita* in A 1.4.51,<sup>13</sup> the actor of (4), though he is considered a direct participant in the accomplishment of the act of hearing, is thereby not assigned to the *karman* class by this sūtra.

11. *duhiyācirudhipracchibhikṣiciñām upayoganimittam apūrvavidhau | bruviśāsigunena ca yat sacate tad akīrtitam ācaritam kavinā ||* (Bh. I.334.1-2).
12. I have given the three examples which Patañjali admits concern kārakas that truly are not eligible for being assigned kāraka class names by other sūtras. Additional details are not important for the present discussion.
13. *tad akathitam kavinā* is interpreted to mean ‘that is said to be akathita by the author of the sūtra’; e.g., Kāś. 1.4.51: *tad akīrtitam ācaritam kavinā tad akathitam uktam sūtrakāreṇa*.

5. Whether the claim that Pāṇini meant to limit the entities designated by *akathita* to those noted is ultimately acceptable or not is not crucial to my discussion. What is important is the view that the actor and story teller of (4) and (5) are indeed kārakas relative to the act of hearing denoted by *śru* of *śṛṇoti*. For, even if Pāṇini did indeed intend to refer to a set of kārakas relative to a specific group of actions as enumerated above, the fact remains that the kārakas spoken of in (4) and (5) are not covered by sūtras in the section headed by A 1.4.23.<sup>14</sup> Under the assumption that the actor and story teller in question are kārakas, then, how is one to account for the syntax of such sentences, wherein genitive forms are construed with *śru*? This brings up an additional point to be taken into account.

### 5.1. Consider now

- (7) *naṭasya gāthāṁ śṛṇoti* ‘... is listening to the verse (sung by) the actor’
- (8) *granthikasya kathāṁ śṛṇoti* ‘... is listening to the story (told by) the story teller’
- (9) *keśāṁ śṛṇoti sugrīvah* ‘To which does Sugrīva listen?’<sup>15</sup>
- (10) *keśāṁ vacah/vacanāṁ śṛṇoti sugrīvah* ‘To whose word does Sugrīva listen?’<sup>16</sup>

- 14. Pr. 1.4.23 (II.376): *ṣaḍvidhasyaiva cesyate | tadvyatiriktam ca kārakam asti yathā naṭasya śṛṇotī ...* This is said in the context of Patañjali’s initial discussion on A 1.4.23 and the claim that this is a saṃjñāsūtra whereby the name *kāraka* is given to entities specified in subsequent rules. This name should apply only to the six kārakas covered by these rules, but, notes Kaiyatā, there are kārakas additional to these, such as the actor of (4).
- 15. *ke pūrvam abhinivartante mahotsāhāḥ samantataḥ | keśāṁ śṛṇoti sugrīvah ke vā yūthapayūthapāḥ* ‘Which (monkeys) go first into battle always full of energy? To which does Sugrīva listen? Which are the troop leaders’ troop leaders?’ (Rāmāyaṇa critical edition 6.17.7cd-8ab, vulgate with the Tilaka of Rāma and the Bhūṣaṇa of Govindarāja 6.26.9).
- 16. According to the Gujarati Printing Press edition (reprinted 1991, Delhi: Parimal Publications), both the Bhūṣaṇa and the Tilaka say

Under the most straightforward syntactic analysis of (10), the referents of *keśām* are linked with *vacah* ‘saying, statement’. In addition, if the derivate *vacas* is considered underived (*avyutpanna*) in the Pāṇinian system, although it could be considered to contain a suffix *asUN* included in the *unādi* set,<sup>17</sup> the ending of *keśām* (← *kim-ām*) is accounted for by A 2.3.50 (§ 4.2): an ending of the sixth triplet follows a nominal if a remainder (*śeṣe*) is involved, that is, if the nominal in question designates something that is not a direct participant in the accomplishment of an action. On the other hand, if *vacas* is treated as a derivate with a *kṛt* suffix, the end of *keśām* is accounted for by A. 2.3.65: *kartṛkarmāṇoh kṛti* (*saṣṭhi* 50): it is introduced to signify agents relative to the act signified by *vac*, since the nominal base *kim* is here used with a derivate that ends in a *kṛt* suffix. In both cases, however, only *vacah* (← *vacas-am*) here signifies a kāraka directly related to the act of hearing: a statement. The actor is directly linked to the statement, not to hearing. This applies also if *vacanam* is used instead of *vacah* (see note 16), since *vac-ana-* in this term contains the *kṛt* suffix *LyuT*.<sup>18</sup>

**5.2.** There are noteworthy textual variations in the Kāśikā and the Siddhāntakaumudī with respect to (4) (§2) and (7), and these are linked to possible different syntactic analyses.

**5.2.1.** According to Haradatta, the Kāśikā’s comments on A 1.4.29 ends with: *upayoga iti kim | naṭasya śṛṇoti* ‘Why (does Pāṇini say) *upayoge*? (In order to preclude classifying as apādana the

that *vacanam* is to be supplied for *keśām śṛṇoti*, and according to the Lakṣmī Venkaṭeśvara Press edition (Bombay, saṃvat 1992) also Rāma supplies *vacanam*. In the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press edition (reprinted 1983, Varanasi: Indological Book House), however, the Tilaka gives *vacah* as the supplement.

17. *sarvadhātubhyo’sun* (Un. 4.188). As is well known, Pāṇinīyas entertain two views concerning *unādi* suffixes: that derivates with these are considered derived (*vyutpanna*) items and that they are single underived items; I cannot enter into a discussion of this issue here.

18. A 3.3.113: *kṛtyalyuto bahulam*.

actor spoken of in) *naṭasya śṛṇoti*.' This accords with what is said in the Mahābhāṣya (see p. 69 note 2). However, Haradatta goes on to remark that there is also a reading with (7) instead of (4) and (8) instead of (5).<sup>19</sup> Moreover, the earlier commentator Jinendrabuddhi knew the Kāśikā text with (7).<sup>20</sup>

This brings up the issue of which reading should be accepted as original in the text of the Kāśikāvṛtti. Given that *naṭasya śṛṇoti* is the example cited in the Mahābhāṣya and that the Kāśikā regularly cites examples as given therein, one could decide in favor of this reading. On the other hand, the Nyāsa antedates the Padamañjarī by about three centuries, so that on the basis of this chronology one could favor the reading *naṭasya gāthāṁ śṛṇoti*. Based on the evidence of these two works, a reasonable hypothesis would be that the original text of the Kāśikā had (4), and that the text was modified to (7) early enough for Jinendrabuddhi to know this version, but that the original persisted in manuscripts up to the time of Haradatta. Editors of the Kāśikā have varied in their selection. Thus, the Kashi Sanskrit Series edition has *naṭasya śṛṇoti*,<sup>21</sup> as does the Osmania University edition,<sup>22</sup> which refers (I.81 n. 4) both to the Nyāsa and to two manuscripts for the variant reading with *gāthāṁ*. In Vijayapāla's edition of the Kāśikā, this reading has been adopted on the basis of the Nyāsa.<sup>23</sup>

Haradatta and Jinendrabuddhi also differ concerning the syntax of the example under consideration. The latter unambiguously states that the ending of *naṭasya* in (7) is a

- 19. PM I. 543: *kvacit tu naṭasya gāthāṁ śṛṇoti granthikasya kathāṁ śṛṇotīti pāthah.*
- 20. N 1.4.29 (I.543): *naṭasya gāthāṁ śṛṇotīti sambandhalakṣaṇā ṣaṣṭhī.*
- 21. This is the reading in the edition of 1952 by Śobhitamiśra and it has been retained in subsequent editions.
- 22. Edited by Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D. G. Upadhye, Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University, 1969, reprinted 2008.
- 23. Śrīvāmanajayādityaviracitā Pāṇiniyāṣṭādhyāyīsūtravṛttih Kāśikā, Bahālgarh, 1997, p. 73 n. 1: '*gāthāṁ*' iti *yathānyāsam*.

sixth-triplet ending whose occurrence is determined by a relation (*sambandhalakṣaṇā ṣaṣṭhi*).<sup>24</sup> That is, this ending occurs here according to A 2.3.50 and signifies a relation not involving a kāraka. Haradatta, on the other hand, explicitly rejects the position that the actor spoken of in (7) merely qualifies the verse signified by *gāthām*, noting that this would have the undesired consequence that the actor would not be a kāraka. Instead, he interprets (7) as denoting an act of listening that is brought about by a listener and also has an actor as a cause. (7) is said to mean: ‘... brings about the hearing of a verse which (hearing) has an actor as its cause’; a similar interpretation is given for (8).<sup>25</sup>

**5.2.2.** A comparable issue arises concerning (7) and (4) with regard to the Siddhāntakaumudī. Under SK 592 (= A 1.4.29) ākhyātopayoge, published editions of this text give (7) as an example showing why the sūtra has to include *upayoge*.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, the Tattvabodhinī knew this as the example. For, Jñānendrasarasvatī refers to the example with the pratīka *naṭasya* and goes on to say the sentence signifies hearing that has a sung verse as its immediate object and is linked to an actor.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, the Laghuśabdenduśekhara indicates that Nāgeśa knew (4) as an example serving the purpose noted. He comments that the example conveys hearing which is brought about by an actor, so that this person is a kāraka.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, his student Vaidyanātha says this indicates *gāthām* was not part

24. See p. 74 note 2.

25. PM 1.4.29 (I.543): *kvacit tu naṭasya gāthām śṛṇoti granthikasya kathām śṛṇotīti pāṭhah | tatrāpi naṭādinimittam gāthādeḥ śravaṇam karotīty arthah | na tu gāthādivišeṣaṇam naṭādih akārakatvaprasaṅgāt.*

26. SK 592 (I.662): *upayoge kim | naṭasya gāthām śṛṇoti.* Thus also the Nirṇaya-Sāgara Press eighth edition (Bombay, 1913), p. 57; the Kashi Sanskrit Series edition (4th ed., 1958), vol. 1, p. 448; Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Press (saṁvat 1982, p. 187, 1983 ed., p. 185).

27. SKT 592 (I.662): *naṭasyeti : gāthākarmakām naṭasambandhi śravaṇam ity arthah.*

28. SKŚ II.736: *naṭasyeti : naṭajanyam śravaṇam iti bodhāt kārakatvam.*

of the example in the Siddhāntakaumudī,<sup>29</sup> that is, it shows that the text known to Nāgeśa had (4) instead of (7). Commenting on the same passage, Bhairavamiśra not only says the reading with *gāthām* is improper but also gives a reason for the absence of this term: if a genitive form — here *naṭasya* — is used together with a nominal whose meaning is appropriate for being linked with the meaning of the genitive in question, then it is considered related with that alone, so that one could not now justify the actor of (7) being a kāraka.<sup>30</sup> That is, in (7), *naṭasya* is appropriately linked with *gāthām*, which signifies the object of hearing, and the sixth-triplet ending of the form is accounted for by A 2.3.50, the actor not being a kāraka with respect to hearing.

5.3. Since the Rāmāyaṇa text has (9) *keśāṁ śṝnoti sugrīvah* and commentators consider that *vacah* or *vacanam* is to be supplied, so that one understands (10) *keśāṁ vacah/vacanam śṝnoti sugrīvah* (see § 5.1 with p. 73 note 1), it is reasonable to posit a comparable situation for the readings (4) *naṭasya śṝnoti* and (7) *naṭasya gāthāṁ śṝnoti*. (4) is then to be considered the original reading, supported by its use in the Mahābhāṣya. In (4) there is no question of the actor not being a direct participant in the act of listening, and he is not the agent of the act: this is an unspecified person, designated by the verb ending *tiP*. Of course, someone listening to a person who is reciting or singing necessarily implies something recited or sung. In view of this expectation (*ākāṅksā*), then, a sentence like (4) implies one like (7), so that one is justified in considering that a term such as *gāthām*, referring to the immediate object (*karman*) of listening should be understood. Once *gāthām* is overtly supplied, however, as Bhairava points out (see note 2 below), this is syntactically to be connected with *naṭasya* and the actor now is no longer spoken of as a direct participant in the act of listening.

6. That Patañjali cites (4) in his discussion of A 1.4.29 is also of

29. Cidasthimālā II.736: *bodhād iti : etena mūle gāthām ity asyāpāṭhah sūcītah.*
30. SKŚCK I.691: *naṭajanyam iti | kvacit tu gāthām iti pāṭhah sa cāyuktaḥ | ṣaṣṭhyantārthasya svānvayayogyanāmasamabhivyāhāre tatraivānvayasya klptatayā kārakatvānupapādanāt.*

interest historically. For in early Sanskrit, as reflected in Vedic usage, verbs of cognition like *vid*, *adhi i*, and *śru* could be construed not only with accusative forms but also with genitives, referring to persons or things known, learned, or heard. Let us now consider Vedic examples, and let me begin with *śru*.<sup>31</sup>

### 1. Constructions with *śru*

This verb can be construed with an accusative referring to an object heard, as in (6), be it a person or an utterance. For example:

(11) 1.104.9d: *pitevā nah śṛṇuhi hūyamānah* '(Indra,) listen to us as would a father, when you are called': *nah śṛṇuhi* 'listen to us'

(12) 1.89.8ab: *bhṛdrañ karṇebhiḥ śṛṇuyāma devā bhṛdram pāsyemākṣabhir yajatrāḥ* 'We would hear with our ears what is auspicious, o gods, see with our eyes what is auspicious, you worthy of worship': *bhṛdram ... śṛṇuyāma* 'we would hear what is auspicious.'

The object which one hears or harkens to can also be referred to by a genitive, as in (4)-(5) and (9). For example:

(13) 1.37.13: *yad dhā yānti marutāḥ sām hā bruvāte'dhvānn ā | śṛṇotī kaścid èṣām* 'When the Maruts go and make themselves heard on their path, any one hears them': *śṛṇotī èṣām* 'hears them'

(14) 4.22.10a: *asmākām it su śṛṇuhi tvam īndra* 'Indra, listen well

31. Unless otherwise shown, citations are from the R̄gveda. Accentuation marks in transliterations reflect the original: *udātta* unmarked, *anudātta* marked with an underline, *svarita* marked with a superscript grave accent. The constructions with genitives are well known and have been described briefly, with some examples, in standard works; see, for example, B. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax (Halle an der Saale, 1888, reprinted 1968: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft) 158-59 (§ 109), A. Macdonell, A Vedic Grammar for Students (Oxford Univ. Press, 1916, reprinted 1958) 319 (§ 202c), L. Renou, Grammaire de la langue védique (Paris: IAC, 1952) 351 (§ 411). Comparable usage is found also in Iranian (see, e.g., H. Reichelt, Awestisches Elementarbuch (Heidelberg: Winter, 1909) 252 (§ 488) and elsewhere in Indo-European languages, but the comparative evidence is not of import to the present discussion.

to us alone': *asmākam ... śṛṇuhi* 'listen to us'

Further, the construction type seen in (8) and (10) also occurs in Vedic; for example:

(15) 7.29.3d: *adhā ma indra śṛṇavō havemā* 'Then, Indra, you should harken to these my calls': *me ... śṛṇavo havā* 'you should hear my calls'

(16) 8.61.1ab: *ubhayāṁ śṛṇavāc ca nā indrō ... vacāḥ* 'Indra shall hear ... our twofold speech':<sup>32</sup> *Śṛṇavat ... naḥ ... vacāḥ* 'will hear our speech.'

**6.2.** Other verbs of cognition occur in such constructions. Let us consider *vid*, *adhi gam*, *adhi gā* and *adhi i*.

#### 6.2.1. *vid*

(17) 3.39.1d: *indra yat te jāyāte viddhi tasyā* 'Indra, take note of that (praise)<sup>33</sup> which is produced for you': *viddhi tasya* 'take note of it'

(18) TS 1.3.6.1: ... *adhi tvā sthāsyati tasyā vittāt* '... (The yūpa) will rest on you (the chip of wood); take note of it': *tasya vittāt* 'take note of it'<sup>34</sup>

(19) 1.4.3ab: *athā tē antāmānāv vīdyāmā sumatīnām* 'We would know your most intimate beneficences': *te ... vīdyāma sumatīnām*

32. Sāyaṇa understands *ubhayam* 'both' of *ubhayam ... vacāḥ* as referring to two kinds of ritual utterance: chanted (*stotrātmakam*) and recited (*śastrātmakam*).

33. Sāyaṇa supplies *stotram*, in agreement with *yat*, as the complement to *jāyate*: RVS 3.39.1: *he indra te tvadarthaṁ yat stotram mattaḥ jāyate tat viddhi jānihi*.

34. Comparable mantras occur in a different order elsewhere, e.g., VS 6.2: *etasyā vittād adhi tvā sthāsyati*. Uvaṭa and Mahīdhara understand *etasya* to refer to the yūpa's act of resting on the wood chip in the hole: VSU 6.2: *sa tvām he yūpaśakala etasya vittāt | veda jñāne | etasya karmaṇo viddhi vidiṭārthaḥ bhava | katamāṁ tat karma cet adhi tvā sthāsyati*, VSM 6.2: *sa tvām etasya karmaṇo vittāt | karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī | etat karma viddhi jānihi | kiṁ tat karma | yad yūpah tvām adhi sthāsyati tvadupary avasthānam kariṣyati tat tvayā boddhavyam ity arthaḥ*. See § 7.1.

'we would know your ... beneficences.'

#### 6.2.2. *adhi gam, adhi gā*

(20) 9.72.9d: *adhī stotrasyā pavamāna no gahi* '(Soma) pavamāna, take note of our hymn of praise'

(21) 5.55.9c: *adhī stotrasyā sakhyaśyā gātana* '(Maruts,) take note of the hymns of praise, the friendship.'<sup>35</sup>

#### 6.2.3. *adhi i*

The base *i* with the preverb *adhi* is used in the sense of remembering and construed with a genitive, as in

(22a) AV 7.62.3: *yeṣām adhy eti pravasāṇ yeṣū saumanāṣo bāhuḥ | gr̥hān upā hvayāmahe te nò jānāntv āyataḥ* 'We call on those homes which one recalls while on a voyage, in which there is much happiness. May they know us as we come (back)': *yeṣām adhy eti* 'which one remembers'

(22b) VS 3.42: *yeṣām adhy eti pravasāṇ yeṣū saumanāṣo bāhuḥ | gr̥hān upā hvayāmahe te nò jānāntu jānataḥ //* '... May they know us as we know (them).'

As can be seen, (22b) differs from (22a) only in the final pāda. Commenting on (22b), Uvaṭa and Mahīdhara note that *adhy eti* contains a verb form of the base *iK*, listed in the commonly known Pāṇinīya-dhātupāṭha with the gloss *smarane* 'in the meaning "remember"' and the Atharvaveda commentary does this also.<sup>36</sup> In addition, Mahīdhara and Sāyaṇa cite the Pāṇinian

35. In 8.44.22c (*agnē sakhyaśyā bodhi nah*) Agni is asked to be aware (*bodhi* 'be awake, be aware, take note') of the friendship (*sakhyaśyā*) of the participants in a ritual. Sāyaṇa comments that *sakhya* refers to acts of friendship, praise and so on, and glosses *bodhi* with *budhyasva* (RVS 8.44.22: *nah asmākāṁ sakhyasya sakhyāṁ sakhibharma stutyādikāṁ bodhi budhyasva*).
36. VSU 3.42: *yeṣām gr̥hāṇāṁ adhy eti | ik smarane ity etasyaitad rūpaṁ na tv iñ adhyayane ity etasya | yeṣām gr̥hāṇāṁ smarati pravasan gr̥hapatih.* VSM 3.42: *pravasan deśāntaram gacchan yajamāno yeṣām adhy eti | ik smarane | yān gr̥hān smarati.* AVS 7.62.3: ... *yeṣām yān gr̥hān adhyeti smarati | ik smarane.* The entries *iñ adhyayane* (*adhīte* etc.), *ik smarane* (*adhy eti* etc.) appear in KṣT 2.39-40, DhPr. 2.37-38, MDhVṛ. 2.49-50.

sūtra which accounts for the genitive *yeṣām* in this passage: A 2.3.52: *adhīgartha-dayeṣāṁ karmaṇi* (śeṣe 50).<sup>37</sup>

According to the interpretation generally accepted by Pāṇinīyas, *adhīgartha* in this sūtra refers specifically to verbs with the meaning ‘remember’.<sup>38</sup> This accords with the gloss accompanying *iK* in the Pāṇinīyadhātupāṭha as traditionally handed down by commentators such as Kṣīrasvāmin (see p. 79 note 2). However, as is also well known, the glosses which accompany verbal bases in this text were not part of the earliest text as known to Kātyāyana. Moreover, the parallel of *adhi i*, *adhi gam*, and *adhi gā*, all with verbs that, by themselves mean ‘go’,<sup>39</sup> invites the conclusion that in the usage exemplified by early texts *adhi i* also could be used in a cognitive sense other than remember. Thus, in

(23) 10.100.4ab: *indrō q̄sme sūmanā astu viśvahā rājā somāḥ suvitasyādhy ētu naḥ* ‘May Indra be well disposed towards us always, may king Soma pay attention to our well being’

*suvitasya* is construed with *adhy etu*, and in

(24) 7.1.24ab: *māho nō agne suvitasya v̄idvān rayim suribhyā ā vāhā bṛhantām* ‘Agni, take note of our great well being, bring large wealth to the sacrificers’<sup>40</sup>

37. VSM 3.42: *adhīgarthadayeṣāṁ karmaṇi iti ṣaṣṭhī*, Sāyaṇa: *adhīgarthadayeṣāṁ karmaṇi iti yeṣām ity atra ṣaṣṭhī*.

38. For example, Kāś. 2.3.52: *adhīgarthāḥ smaranārthāḥ*, PK 2.3.52 (I.442): *adhīgarthāḥ smṛtyarthāḥ*.

39. Although *gam* used alone can also mean ‘understand’, as, for example, in the phrase *katham anucyamānam gaṁsyate* ‘How will (this) be understood without being stated?’ (e.g., Bh. 1.1.3 [I.44.2-3]).

40. Sāyaṇa paraphrases *vidvān* with *jānan* ‘knowing’ and understands — as elsewhere — *suvita* to mean a sacrificial act that is well carried out: RVS 7.1.24 *suvitasya kalyāṇasya karmaṇāḥ vidvān | asmadīyāṁ kalyāṇāṁ karma jānārṇity arthaḥ*. He also understands *sūribhyāḥ* to refer to those who praise Agni, namely the sacrificers: *tvaṁ sūribhyāḥ stotrbhyo ‘smabhyāṁ bṛhantam mahāntam rayim dhanam ā vaha*.

the same genitive is construed with *vidvān* ‘knowing’.

7. Once the dhātupāṭha entry *ik smarane* (see p. 79 note 2) was established, so that *adhīgartha* in A 2.3.52 (§ 6.2.3) was understood to refer to verbs meaning ‘remember’ (see p. 80 note 2), two major consequences ensue. First, Vedic commentators such as Sāyaṇa, Uvata, Mahīdhara and Bhaṭṭabhbhāskara would not invoke this sūtra to account for the use of genitives in passages such as those considered above (§§ 6.1 - 6.2.2), except for (22a)-(22b). In addition, while A 2.3.52 as traditionally under-stood accounts for the use of a genitive in an example such as (22a)-(22b), this rule cannot account for genitives construed with *adhi i* in (23). Let us consider now how commentators interpret some of the passages considered above.

7.1. In some instances, a genitive referring to an immediate object (*karman*) is replaced by an accusative form in a paraphrase. This accords with the regular syntax accounted for by A 2.3.2: *karmaṇi dvitiyā*: an ending of the second triplet follows a nominal if a karman is to be singified. For example, commenting on (17) 3.39.1d: *indra yat te jāyate viddhi tasyā* (§ 6.2.1), Sāyaṇa paraphrases *viddhi tasya* with *tat ... jānihi*; *yat stotram mattaḥ jāyate tat viddhi jānihi*.<sup>41</sup> Similarly, *etasya* of the passage *etasyā vittād adhī tvā sthāsyati*, a variant of (18) (see § 6.2.1), is interpreted to mean the same as *etat karma jānihi* (see p. 78 note 3). This assumes that the genitive signifies a kāraka classed as karman — as Mahīdhara says explicitly — which is regularly denoted by an accusative form. However, no Pāṇinian sūtra is cited to account for the use of a genitive instead of an accusative.

7.2. At other times, it is assumed that a genitive refers to something not directly related to an action, so that it is accounted for by A 2.3.50 (§ 4.2). In some cases, an accusative construed with the genitive is supplied in a paraphrase of type (7) *natasya gāthāṁ śṛṇoti* (§ 5.1). For example: (13) 1.37.13: *yad dhā yānti mārutāḥ sam hā bruvāte’dhvānn ā | śṛṇotī kaścid eṣām* (§

41. See p. 78 note 2. Similarly, in his commentary on 5.60.6cd (... *asyāgnē vittād dhaviṣo yad yajāma* ‘Agni, be aware of the oblation we offer you in worship’), he paraphrases *asya vittād dhaviṣah* with *etad dhaviḥ ... viddhi*: *he agne tvam asya haviṣah etad dhaviḥ vittāt viddhi*.

6.2): ṚVS: *eṣāṁ marutāṁ sambandhināṁ śabdaṁ kaścit yaḥ ko’pi śṛṇoti.*<sup>42</sup>

A variation of this procedure is illustrated by examples such as ṚVS 4.22.10: *he indra tvam asmākam it asmadīyāḥ eva stutīḥ suśṭhu śṛṇuhi*, paraphrasing (14): *asmākam it su śṛṇuhi tvam īndra* (§ 6.1). Not only is the accusative *stutīḥ* supplied but *asmākam* is also replaced by the adjectival *asmadīyāḥ*.

7.3. In still other instances, commentators' paraphrases involve a syntax different from that of the original; the genitive in question is considered to occur in place of a dative.

Consider first Sāyaṇa's commentary on

(25) 9.72.9d: *adhi stotrasyā pavamāna no gahi* ‘O pavamāna (Soma,) lend an ear to our praise,’

Which he paraphrases as follows:

(26) ṚVS 9.72.9: *he pavamāna nah asmākam svabhūtasya stotrasya śravaṇāya adhi gahi ā gaccha* ‘... come to hear our praise.’

Sāyaṇa here considers that *stotrasya* is a Vedic substitute for *stotrāya*<sup>43</sup> in a construction of the type

(27) *edhebhyo vrajati* ‘... is going for firewood’

equivalent to

(28) *edhān āhartum vrajati* ‘... is going to fetch firewood.’

If *ā hr̥* is used with the cooccurring verb *vraj* and signifies an action for the purpose of which the act denoted by the latter is

42. Similarly, 7.28.1cd: *viśvē cjd dhi tvā vihavānta martā asmākam ic chṛṇuhi ...* ‘All men call to you separately; listen to us alone ...’: ṚVS: *viśve sarve martāḥ manusyāḥ cit hi yady api vihavanta prthag havante tathāpi asmākam it asmākam eva havām śṛṇuhi śṛṇu.*

43. The usage is accounted for by A 2.3.62: *caturthyarthe bahulam chandasī (śaṣṭhī 50)*, which Sāyaṇa quotes (*caturthyarthe bahulam chandasī iti śaṣṭhī*); this sūtra provides that in Vedic usage an ending of the sixth triplet occurs variously in a meaning where an ending of the fourth triplet otherwise is used.

performed, the base *hṛ* takes the suffix *tumUN*,<sup>44</sup> as in *āhartum* of (28). If, however, the verb signifying the act for which going is intended is not used, then a fourth-triplet ending follows a nominal that refers to the immediate object of this action,<sup>45</sup> as in *edhebhyah* of (27). According to Śāyaṇa, *stotrasya* of (25) is a Vedic equivalent of *stotrāya* in a sentence

(29) *adhi ... stotrāya no gahi*

which has the same meaning as (26). In (26), *śravaṇāya* is used instead of *śrotum*,<sup>46</sup> just as

(30) *edhānām āharanāya vrajati*,

which conveys what (27) and (28) signify, has *āharanāya* in construction with the genitive *edhānām*.

Commenting on (18) TS 1.3.6.1: ... *adhī tvā sthāsyatī tasyā vittāt* (§ 6.2.1), Bhaṭṭabhāskara adopts an interpretation that also involves a sixth-triplet ending as a substitute for an ending of the fourth triplet. He considers *tasya* here a genitive accounted for by A 2.3.62 (p. 82 note 2), so that *tasya vittāt* is equivalent to

(31) *tasmai vittāt*.

In addition, Bhaṭṭabhāskara considers that *tasmai* here has a fourth-triplet ending introduced to signify a sampradāna, the yūpa being assigned to this kāraka category.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, the yūpa is categorized as a sampradāna by virtue of being that

- 44. A 3.3.10: *tumun̄vulau kriyāyāṁ kriyārthāyām*. The rules provide also for the agentive suffix *NvuL*, which need not be considered here.
- 45. A 2.3.14: *kriyārthopapadasya ca karmaṇī sthānīnah* (caturthī 13).
- 46. A 3.3.11: *bhāvavacanāś ca* provides for the use of suffixes signifying an abstract action under the conditions stated in A 3.3.10 (note 1 above), and by A 2.3.15: *tumarthāc ca bhāvavacanāt*, an ending of the fourth triplet occurs after a derivate with such a suffix under the condition stated in A 2.3.14.
- 47. A 2.3.13: *caturthī sampradāne*, 1.4.32: *karmaṇā yam abhipraiti sa sampradānam*.

which an agent intends as a goal through his action.<sup>48</sup> Accordingly, (31) here is of the type

(32) *patye śete* (Bh. I.330.19) ‘... lies down for her husband.’

Thus, *tasya vittāt* in (18) is interpreted to mean ‘Be cognizant for it’ and to convey that the wood chip on which the *yūpa* will rest is asked to acknowledge that the *yūpa* represents its greatness.<sup>49</sup>

In this context it is appropriate, I think, to bring in a couple of passages from the *Taittirīyāraṇyaka*:

(33) TĀ 10.1.5/6.1.5:

- (a) *puruṣasya vidma sahasrākṣasyā mahādevasyā dhīmahi | tan nò rudraḥ pra cōdayāt ||*
- (b) *tat puruṣāya vīdmahē mahādevāyā dhīmahi | tan nò rudraḥ pra cōdayāt ||*

Commenting on (33a), Sāyaṇa supplies *svarūpam* ‘proper form’ to be construed with *puruṣasya* and *mahādevasya* in constructions of type (7) (§ 5.1), interprets *vidma* to mean either ‘we are aware of’ (*jānīmahe*) or ‘we would gain’ (*labhemahi*), and understands *dhīmahi* to mean ‘we would meditate on’ (*dhyāyema*).<sup>50</sup> Bhaṭṭabhāskara interprets *vidma* and *dhīmahi* in

48. Bhaṭṭabhāskara refers to Patañjali’s statement (Bh 1.4.32 [I.330.18]: *kriyāgrahaṇam api kartavyam*) that A 1.4.32 should state *kriyayā yam abhiprāti* ‘which ... intends through his action’) in addition to *karmaṇā yam abhiprāti* (‘which ... intends through a karman’): TSBh. 1.3.6.1 (I.421.20-21): *kriyāgrahaṇam kartavyam iti sampradānatvāc caturthyarthe bahulam chandasīti caturthyarthe ṣaṣṭhī*. The Mahābhāṣya goes on to argue that *karman-* of *karmaṇā* in the sūtra as formulated includes reference not only to a karman but also to an action; this need not be discussed here.
49. TSBh. 1.3.6.1 (I.421.19-20): *tasya vittāt tad vijānīhi tam te mahimānam avagantum arhasīti*. Sāyaṇa (TSS I.421.25-26) simply paraphrases *tasya vittāt* of this passage with *tam yūpam anujānīhi* ‘Allow the *yūpa*’: *tasya vittāt tam yūpam anujānīhi*.
50. *tasya puruṣasya svarūpam vidma jānīmahi labhemahi vā | tadarthanam tasya virāḍrūpasya mahādevasya svarūpam dhīmahi dhyāyema* (TĀS 10.1.5).

the same way, but specifies for the second interpretation of *vidma* that the base is *vid* of the sixth *gaṇa* (*vindati* 'finds'), with deletion of the *vikarana Śa*.<sup>51</sup> He differs from *Sāyaṇa*, however, in that he considers all the genitives *puruṣasya*, *sahasrākṣasya*, and *mahādevasya* all used in the sense that calls for a dative. The reason for this is that, in his opinion, although *Puruṣa* and *Mahādeva* are immediate objects (*karman*) of the acts in question, they are treated as being *sampradāna*.<sup>52</sup> Conversely, in his commentary on (33b), *Sāyaṇa* considers not only that *tat* stands for *tam* but also that the datives *puruṣāya* and *mahādevāya* are equivalent to accusatives, referring to *Mahādeva* in the form of *Puruṣa*.<sup>53</sup> *Bhaṭṭabhāskara* here adopts the same interpretation. For he merely says that this passage is self explanatory,<sup>54</sup> which is best understood to mean that here, as in the previous passage, he interprets the datives as designating karmans treated as *sampradāna*.

**8.** In sum, commentators on Vedic passages that have genitive forms construed with finite forms of verbs of preception and awareness, like *śru* and *vid*, as well as *i* and *gam*, *gā* used with the preverb *adhi*, find it difficult to account for such a construction. In general, they either simply assume that a genitive form is used instead of an accusative, but without invoking a Pāṇinian rule to account for this, or they supply an accusative to be linked with the genitive in a construction of type (7) (§ 5.1). Where, however, the verb in question means 'remember', as in (22a,b) (§ 6.2.3), they do link this with a genitive, accounting for the syntax by A 2.3.52.

The basis for this exception is that the sūtra in question states *adhi�artha* and the *dhātupāṭha* known to the commentators

51. *puruṣam viśvasya pūrayitāram viśvātītam dhyānādyaviṣayam vastu vidma jānīma labhemahi vā | vindater vikarāṇavyatyaye śaluk* (TĀBh. 6.1.5).
52. *karmaṇas sampradānatvāt sarvā caturthyarthe ṣaṣṭhī* (TĀBh. 6.1.5).
53. *tam āgamaprasiddham puruṣākāram mahādevam jānīmo dhyāyāma ca* (TĀS 10.1.5).
54. *tatpuruṣāyetyādayaḥ pañca gāyatrīyaḥ | tatra prathamā gatā* (TĀBh. 6.1.5).

concerned had an entry *ik smarane*. Since, however, glosses such as *smarane* did not constitute part of the earliest dhātupāṭha as transmitted to Kātyāyana, it is reasonable to consider that the verb catalog compiled by Pāṇini also lacked these. Accordingly, *adhīgartha* of A 2.3.52 does not have to be constrained by such a gloss in the dhātupāṭha. It means merely ‘having the meaning of *adhi iK*’. And, if *i* used with the preverb *adhi* meant not only ‘remember’ but also ‘be aware of, take note of’, as did *gam* and *gā* used with the same preverb as well as *vid* (see §§ 6.2.1-6.2.3), the same Pāṇinian rule accounts for the use of these verbs with genitives. Further, if by *adhīgartha* Pāṇini intended to refer also to other verbs related to cognitive acts, the sūtra would serve to account not only for the use of genitives with *smṛ* ‘remember’ but also *śru* ‘hear, listen’, as in (4) *naṭasya śṛṇoti*.

I suggest that this is indeed an appropriate interpretation of A 2.3.52.<sup>55</sup>

55. I am grateful to David Buchta for carefully reading a draft of this paper.