CHAPTER IX

Artificial Tendencies and Grammatical Peculiarities

Artificiality:— "Bhāravi, in many ways, is the beginner of mannerism in Sanskrit poets." — This remark of Prof. A. B. Keith is true to some extent. We come across mannerism in a few matters, but he is not always the beginner. The state craft and political precepts dealt with in his poem show that Bhāravi utilises the medium of Kāvya to preach the ideals of the science of politics. The ideal administration of Suyodhana as reported by the spy and arguments and counter-arguments in favour of war and truce are in one way the informations derived from a particular science but in other way it is an artistic exercise on the favourite subject of the then elites of India and thus he has infused new blood into the pedantic and stereotyped body of Kāvya.

It is true that Bhāravi's style is ornate. Artistic development which is seen in Kalidāsa becomes complete in him. In the fifteenth canto of his poem we see a tendency of verbal jugglery which has been followed with greater zeal in later Kāvya. A little of this kind is in the R. or in Śāvaghoṣa and Kalidāsa. Bhāravi might have been inspired by

2. Ibid Canto II.
by the riddle (kūta) stanzas of the Mbh. and also by the
Raghu, of Kalidasā to some extent. Nineth canto of the
Raghu exhibits fourteen types of metres, figures of speech
like 'Yamaka' and 'śleṣa'. Eighteenth canto of the same
abounds in alliteration, 'śleṣa' and 'Yamaka', also the
fourth act of the Vikramorvasiya abounds in such matter.
So in such sphere at least, Bhāravi may not be called
the beginner. But he brought the use of things to such a
state that the later rhetoricians included the use of such
characteristics in the canons of the definition of epics.
Bhāravi seems to be conscious of its hindrances to the
aesthetic appreciation of the poem, because he has confined,
in one canto only, the exhibition of such power of compo-
sition and he has, also, used the short and easy metre
'Anuṣṭup' to minimise difficulties in their understanding.

Asvaghoṣa who preceded the poet for a few centuries
composed his poem 'Saundarāṇanda' with a mission to preach
Buddhism. Bhāravi is rather pragmatic in his selection of
state-craft, a secular subject for his mission. In this
sphere also Bhāravi may not be called the beginner of
mannerism. But there is little doubt that his success
inspired Bhatti to teach grammar through the medium
of a Kāvyā.

3. Kāvyālaṃkāra, Chap V of Rudraṭa
and
Kāvyānuśasana of Hemacandra.
Grammatical peculiarities:—Bharavi has no purposeful application of Pāṇini's rules of rare type. As he was a learned poet, proficient in grammar, some peculiarities and niceties of grammar have crept into the body of his poem. As regards his grammatical peculiarities the following points are to be noted. 'Liṭ' is the tense of his narrative. He has applied it five hundred fifty one times in all whereas 'Laṭ' with 'sma' and 'Māṣma' for eighteen times and 'kta' as a finite verb for forty-eight times. He has generally followed Pāṇini in respect of the use of 'Laṇ' and 'Luṇ'. 'Laṇ' has been used to denote remote past experienced by the speaker. It occurs only ten times and once with 'Māṣma'. 'Luṇ' is more frequent occurring thirty times, of which twenty two times with 'Māṇ or 'Māṣma' and eight times independently. 'Luṭ' has been used seven times and 'Lṛṇ' only once.

Significant use of the root 'Tan':—He has made a significant use of some roots in various senses. For example root 'Tan' has been used twenty eight times of which eight times in 'Laṭ', seven times in 'Liṭ' and thrice as 'Kṛṣanta'.
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'Kr̥ṣita' in 'Satr'. Twelve times it has been used with 'vi' as prefix in the sense of spreading, once in the sense of producing, six times with 'a' as prefix in the sense of pervading, once in the sense of covering and once in the sense of bestowing, single with 'pra' as prefix in the sense of increasing, eight times without any prefix in the sense of extending, once in the sense of producing.

Denominatives are used for twentyone times of which five are formed with 'cvi' one with 'Tiras', ten with 'nic' and five with 'kyah'.

Peculiar compounds and indeclinables: - Adverbial use of 'Sahuvr̥thi' compound like 'Niruddhayaspodaya-saṁnakathan' is peculiar to him. The expounding of the compound word 'Locanādharā kṛtaḥrta-rāgā' where it is to be made 'Locanāyō' kṛta-rāgā, adharād hrtā-rāgā ca', is note-worthy. Here 'Kṛta' has connection with Locana, and 'Hṛta' with Adhāra. Peculiar 'na'-compound with 'na' remaining in-tact comes a few times e.g. 'na nirvṛtam', 'na samhataḥ', 'na bhinnayṛtta-yāh' and 'Na pārayan'. 'Anujānumādhyaṃ'.
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is a peculiar 'Avyayābhāva' compound in the sense of locative. Double negatives making an affirmative have been used twice times. Double 'kvaś' indicating a great difference comes twice. 'nu' expressing dubity and making mostly the figure of speech of 'Sandhāha' appears eight times. 'Prāmaṇa' is once used in singular. The word 'Nicāyitum' in the sense of seeing is peculiar. Mallinātha had to find out authority in support of this meaning. The word 'Apuniya' is used in the sense of saying. 'Sāmikaśayitum' in the sense of stating is queer. 'Disān' used in the sense of saying back. 'Apavāda' in the sense of 'by orders' and 'Apavarga' in the sense of 'end' are peculiar to Bāravi and can hardly

---
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hardly be found elsewhere.

**Some round-about expressions:** Some round-about expressions are found in his work though they go against his usual economy of word. For example, we may cite 'प्राणायाम हरेक्षणानं' for snakes, 'अवाजापात रकोऽि' for नेगलेक्स, 'जगतिरुहणि' for trees, 'कुसुमसंबा विद्विषा' for शिवा, 'हरितुराङ्गा मयुधंमि' for thunderbolt, 'प्लवागाधिपे लक्ष्मणि' for जुना. Most striking of them seems to be the phrase 'फुमसनः पदार्म मध्यममुत्तमस्या' for the sky.

**Formation of the words:** His formation of words with the artifices of grammar are charming. For example the following may be noted: 'अति शालि' for disciple changing the root 'श' by 'स', 'संकार', an adjective formed from 'सुकारा' a boar.
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'Indrasūnavim' an adjective form 'Indrasūna', the son of Indra, 'Suga' in place of 'sugama', 'Haimana' in place of 'Haimantika' an adjective from the season 'Hemanta', and 'Ahimatejasam' for the sun.

Unāniniyam use of some words:— A critic who seems to be a pedantic scholar in grammar in the school of Pāṇini has remarked that there are one hundred ungrammatical words in Māgha's poem but there are three hundreds' such in Bhāravi. What can be said in defence is that such phrases and expressions have found room in the works of other famous poets in Sanskrit. Poets of vision cannot remain fettered by the rules of grammar. It is the duty of the grammarians to find out sanction of grammar for such usages. So-called 'Apsabdas' of Bhāravi as well as of other poets can be justified by looking into the elasticity of Pāṇini's 'sūtras'. Most of them have been defended by Mallinātha in his commentary on the poem. A few of them more are discussed below.
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41. "Apsabdas'tam Māgha Bhāravai tu satatrasam".
(1) "Prajāsu vṛttim yaṇayuntaka vṛditum"). Here 'ātmānepada' in 'ayūkta', which is barred by the vārtika "svarādyantopa- arṣṭaṇām vaktavaman", is justified by the rule *Kartrabhīprāye kriyāphale*

(2) Nathāse kimī prātiṣṭhā bhūbhṛtām. The root 'Nath' is 'ātmānepada' in benediction by the rule 'Āśiśi nāthāh'. Here in the sense of praying it is justified by 'ātmānepada' which sanctions optional 'ātmānepada'. Or, the reading may be changed to nāhase. Then it is all right.

(3) "Vīgāṇaya navaṃi pauruṣaṃ. Vijita krodharayā jīgīsavah" - Here root 'ni' should have been used in 'ātmānepada' by the rule 'Kartrasthe caśāire karmani', because the object 'pauruṣa' resides in the agent. Mallinātha defends it by referring to the object 'ātmānepada' which is not 'Kartrastha'. Rakṣītā brings in this rule 'vi' by 'anuvṛtti' from the previous rule 'veḥ savākarmānāḥ'. Hence 'navaṃi' is in parasmāpada.
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(4) "Bhavantyaneke jaladhivrivormayah"- Here plural number in 'snake', which should have been singular by 'Nah-samāsa' and 'jūapaka rule - "Anekamanya padartha", is justified by plurality attributed to the sense.

(5) 'Na ca na svikrtanartha gauravam'- Here 'Saṣṭhī-samāsa', which is prohibited with a word denoting 'guna' by the rule 'Pārmatguna suhitārtha sada vyaya-tavya-samānādhi karamāna', is justified by Nīkṣita by admitting inconstancy to this prohibition referring to a 'jūapaka sūtra- 'Tadasisyam samhā pramanatvāt'.

(6) 'Sa vernī-litā viditah śmāyaśayah'- Here 'kta' in 'viditah' cannot come in active voice because it is ordained in that voice after intransitive verb by the rule 'Gatyarthākarmaśa'...etc. In order to justify this use it has been said that root 'vid' is to be treated as intransitive, because it has no desire for an object here (avivaksatā) or, with 'kta' in 'Bhāvācayā', it means 'Vedānām'. Then it takes 'ac' in 'astyarthe', or 'Viditāḥ' is equal to 'Viditavṛttāntah'. Attributes of the objects are to be ascribed to the person who is the agent.

(7) 'Rājita nu vividhāstṛuruśālāh'. Here 'Turuśālāh'
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'Tara'allah' which should have been used in singular number according to the rule - 'jātirāprānīnam' is justified by the vārtika 'Sākapārthivādīnām siddhaye uttarapada-lopasyopasam khyānam'. Then the expounding is to be made:—
'Taru-pradhanah sālāh'.

(3) Devasural-ramāntamanvunidhir māmanthē. Here 'Devasurala' should have been used in singular number in 'sāmāhāra dvandva' by the rule 'yesām ca virodhaḥ sāsvatika'. But it is justified by saying that the contention of the gods and the āsuras is not constant but it occurs periodically. Besides their united efforts to churn the ocean is here referred to.

In this way all other so-called 'apāsabdās' can be justified. But in (9) 'Ajaṅghe viśemaviocanasya vaktah' 'Ajaṅghe' seems to be undefensible. 'Śno yamahenah'
'svāṅga karmakāneeti vaktayam'- by this śvāṅga' takes 'ātmameśa' when it is intransitive or when it takes an object of the agent's own limb (svāṅga-karmaka). So it should have been 'Ajaṅghēna'. Grammarians try to defend it
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it in the following way:–

(a) Here the word 'Vakṣaṣā' is to be taken understood and the syntax is to be formed visama vilocanasya vakṣaṣā vekaśa(svam) ājaghne'

(b) 'Visama vilocanasya'– Here the sixth case-ending indicates nearness. Gandivi struck his own bosom near visamavilocana.

(c) It is to be arranged thus:–

Visamavilocanasya vakṣa etya ājaghne'. Then it is intransitive and takes 'ātmanepada'. In the next stanza it has been said that smarāri put up with this act of immodesty like a father of his only child. So ājaghne' cannot be defended as 'svaṅgakarmaka'. The third explanation may be admitted if we take 'pratimukham' as an 'āvyayābhāva' in the sense of seventh case-ending. Then 'etya' can be connected with Vakṣah. Having there no object left for the verb ājaghne' it is to be treated as intransitive and the use of it in ātmanepada can be fully justified. Intransitive ājaghne can indicate its object vakṣah understood from the context. The prose of the stanza is to be constructed thus:–

unmajjan makarṇa paṅgāyāh iva vāmanadyāḥ pratimukham visamavilocanasya kanakasilaniḥbham vakṣah etya gāndivī bhūjābhīyam ājaghne. (XVII/63).