Four

*Kāraka*s in *Cāndra* Grammar: An Interpretation from the Pāli Buddhist *Śāstra*s[1]

Alastair Gornall

In all traditional Sanskrit grammars the goal of the treatment of cases is to relate semantics and morphology, ultimately enabling nominal inflection. However, the way in which this is done varies greatly. The nature of the treatment of case relations in the *Cāndra* grammatical tradition and its connection with the closely-related Pāṇinian grammatical tradition has received a fair amount of critical attention, though, due to the lack of editions of commentaries on the *Cāndra-vṛtti,* the inner-workings and mechanisms of the grammatical system have often remained obscure and subject to debate.[2]

---

[2]   Cf. JOSHI and ROODBERGEN (1975: xvi-xix), DESHPANDE (1979), VERHAGEN (1992, 2001: 292).

In this article I explore an interpretation of the *Cāndra* treatment of cases in a highly sophisticated, yet almost completely neglected, system of Pāli grammar, the *Moggallāna* system. This grammatical literature is of particular relevance since it is largely based on the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa* (CV), its *vṛtti* (CVV) and commentaries. Consisting of the *Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa* (Mogg), *Moggallāna-vutti* (Mogg-v) and the *Moggallāna-pañcikā* (Mogg-p), this system was composed in Laṅkā by Moggallāna Mahāthera in the aftermath of the *saṅgha* reforms of Parākramabāhu I in 1165. Moggallāna's pupil, Saṅgharakkhita, later composed a sub-commentary (*ṭīkā*) on the *Moggallāna-pañcikā* (Mogg-p-ṭ) as well as a handbook on case relations, the *Sambandhacintā* (Sambandh).

While this grammatical literature is written in Pāli, it represents the most comprehensive analysis available of a grammatical system that operates on *Cāndra* principles. In this regard, the *Moggallāna* grammatical tradition provides a unique opportunity to understand how 12th century Laṅkan grammarians understood the *Cāndra* tradition's treatment of cases.

1. *MOGGALLĀNA* AND *CĀNDRA*

Moggallāna's treatment of cases is largely based on a CV design and to various degrees a use of the *Cāndra* tradition permeates the *Moggallāna* system. For instance, even with only a superficial analysis of the grammars' *sūtra*s, R. Otto Franke found that 121 *sūtra*s out of Moggallāna's 813 are translated from the CV.[3] In addition, Franke demonstrated that many more *sūtra*s are fashioned from only part of a *Cāndra sūtra* or by amalgamating parts of a variety of *sūtra*s. For instance, Mogg.2.9 *dhyādīhi yuttā* = C.2.1.50 *dhigantarāntareṇayuktāt*.[4] Franke's research has also shown that Moggallāna has a tendency to follow the *sūtra* order of the CV and that he occasionally adopts sections of the CV wholesale into the Mogg. He presented a general concordance of these corresponding sections,[5] which I have adapted below with section headings and revised *sūtra* numbering:

---

[3]   FRANKE 1902-3: 87.
[4]   FRANKE 1902-3: 87.
[5]   FRANKE 1902-3: 88.

Mogg.1.13-25 = C.1.1.6-16 (meta-rules [*paribhāṣā*]); Mogg.2.2-42 = C.2.1.43-96 (treatment of cases); Mogg.2.120-121 and 123-124 = C.2.1.38-39 and 41-42 (the elision of case endings after indeclinables and within compounds); Mogg.2.237-246 = C.6.3.15-26 (specifications for enclitic pronouns); Mogg.3.1-20 = C.2.2.1-49 (defining compounds and their functions); Mogg.3.74-85 = C.5.2.91-106 (substitutions for particles [*na*, *saha* etc.] in compounds); Mogg.4.96-113 = C.4.3.8-16; (some secondary adverbial suffixes, e.g. *-to*, *-ttha/ -tra* and *-dā* etc.); Mogg.5.1-13 = C.1.1.17-39 (suffixes for verbal derivatives [*khādi*]); Mogg.5.55-60 = C.1.2.66-77 (defining *-tavantu, -tāvī* and *-ta* in the sense of agent [*kattu*], object [*kamma*] or state [*bhāva*]).

The work of Franke, then, suggests a large dependence on the CV and, while this reliance is far from uniform, the sections that most clearly exhibit a *Cāndra* design are highly significant. For instance, the Mogg follows the CV in its treatment of case endings, compounds, verbal derivatives and, to some extent, in its treatment of verbal voices, all of which are important engines of grammatical theory. In addition, the Mogg adopts meta-rules (*paribhāṣā*) directly from the CV and therefore operates on *Cāndra* principles.

However, Moggallāna's use of the CV in the treatment of case endings appears more nuanced and complex when analysed through the Mogg-v and Mogg-p. From the concordance given below, it is apparent that Moggallāna does not accept all of the *Cāndra sūtra*s in his treatment of case endings and that many of the *sūtra*s he does not include in the *sūtra-pāṭha* he treats critically in the Mogg-v and Mogg-p:

A Concordance of the sūtras of the Mogg and CV Treatment of Case Endings[6]

Mogg	CV	Mogg	CV
2.1	1.4.148, 2.1.1	2.25	2.1.72
2.2	2.1.43	2.26	2.1.73
2.2 (v)	2.1.49	2.27	2.1.79
2.2 (v)	2.1.50	2.27 (v)	2.1.97
2.3	2.1.51	2.27 (v)	2.1.98
2.4	2.1.44	2.27 (p)	2.1.74
2.5	2.1.45	2.27 (p)	2.1.75
2.5 (v)	2.1.46	2.27 (p)	2.1.76
2.6	2.1.47	2.27 (p)	2.1.77
2.7 i	2.1.48	2.27 (p)	2.1.78
2.8 ii	2.1.49	2.27 (p)	2.1.80
2.9	2.1.50	2.28	2.1.81
2.9 (v)	2.1.52	2.28 (v)	2.1.87
2.10	2.1.54	2.29	2.1.82
2.11	2.1.55	2.30	2.1.83
2.12	2.1.56	2.31	2.1.84
2.13	2.1.57	2.32	2.1.85
2.14	2.1.58	2.33	2.1.86
2.15	2.1.59	2.34	2.1.88
2.16	2.1.60	2.35	2.1.89
2.17	2.1.61	2.36	2.1.90
2.18	2.1.62, 2.1.63	2.37	2.1.91
2.19	2.1.65	2.38	2.1.92
2.20	2.1.66	2.39	2.1.93
2.21	2.1.68	2.40	2.1.94
2.22	2.1.69	2.41	2.1.95
2.23	2.1.70	2.42	2.1.96
2.24	2.1.71		

It seems likely then that the *Moggallāna* system's reliance on the CV is wider and more pervasive than Franke's analysis of the *sūtra*s would suggest. However, R. Otto Franke did also predict a correlation between the Mogg-v and CVV. Using fragments of the CVV obtained by Bruno Liebich, Franke began to prove such a correlation between a few *sūtra*s of the grammars. For instance:

---

[6]   (v) = Mogg-v, (p) = Mogg-p.

M.'s Comm [Mogg-v]. zu II, 122 (*ekatthatāyaṃ*): *ekatthībhāve sabbāsaṃ vibhattīnaṃ lopo hoti bahulaṃ: puttīyati, rājapuriso, Vāsiṭṭho*.

C.'s Comm [CVV]. zu II, 1, 39 (*aikārthye*): *ekārthībhāve supo lug bhavati: putrīyati, rājapuruṣaḥ, Aupagavaḥ*.[7]

As a result of his initial discoveries regarding the intimate relationship between the *Moggallāna* and *Cāndra* traditions, Franke recognised the important contribution the *Moggallāna* tradition could make in understanding the *Cāndra* tradition:

Diese Existenz eines Comm. von Moggallāna zu seiner Grammatik ist ein weiterer Grund, dessentwegen die Sanskritphilologie der Pāli-Philologie zu Dank sich verpflichtet fühlen dürfte…[8]

From my own analysis of the treatment of case endings, I can conclude that all *sūtra*s but two (Mogg.2.3 and Mogg.2.40) use the CVV as a framework.[9] Three *sūtra*s, Mogg.2.11, Mogg.2.16 and Mogg.2.21, could even be classed as translations as they exhibit almost no variation from the CVV at all:

Mogg.2.11 *patiparīhi bhāge ca*[10]	C.2.1.55 *pratiparibhyāṃ bhāge ca*[12]
patiparīhi yuttamhā lakkhaṇādisu bhāge c' atthe dutiyā hoti; rukkhaṃ pati vijjotate vijju, sādhu devadatto mātaraṃ pati, rukkhaṃ rukkhaṃ pati tiṭṭhati, yad ettha maṃ pati siyā, rukkhaṃ pari vijjotate vijju, sādhu devadatto mātaraṃ pari, rukkhaṃ	*pratiparibhyāṃ yuktāl lakṣaṇādiṣu bhāge cārthe dvitīyā syāt. vṛkṣaṃ prati vidyotate. vṛkṣaṃ vṛkṣaṃ prati tiṣṭhati. sādhur devadatto mātaraṃ prati. yad atra māṃ prati syāt. vṛkṣaṃ pari vidyotate. vṛkṣaṃ vṛkṣaṃ pari tiṣṭhati. sādhur deva-*

---

7 FRANKE 1902-3: 95. The square brackets are my own addition.
8 FRANKE 1902-3: 94.
    'The existence of Moggallāna's commentary to his own grammar is another reason for which Sanskrit philology might feel indebted to Pāli philology.'
9 GORNALL 2012: 68-136.
10 '[The second pair of suffixes occurs after a nominal stem co-occurring] with [the particles] *pati* and *pari* when they are used to indicate [a characteristic (*lakkhaṇa*), change of state (*itthaṃbhūta*), distributive function (*vicchā*)], and a division (*bhāga*).'

rukkhaṃ pari tiṭṭhati, yad ettha maṃ
pari siyā.[11]

datto mātaraṃ pari. yad atra māṃ
pari syāt.[13]

      Mogg.2.16 *sattamy ādhikye*[14]   C.2.1.60 *saptamy ādhikye*[16]

ādhikyatthe upena yuttamhā sattamī
hoti; upa khāriyaṃ doṇo.[15]

ādhikye 'rthe upena yuktāt saptamī
bhavati. upa khāryāṃ droṇaḥ.[17]

      Mogg.2.21 *hetumhi*[18]   C.2.1.68 *hetau*[20]

takkiriyāyogge tatiyā siyā; annena
vasati, vijjāya yaso.[19]

tatkriyāyogye tṛtīyā syāt; annena
vasati. vidyayā yaśaḥ.[21]

It is possible to conclude therefore that whenever Moggallāna has used *sūtra*s from the CV he also used the CVV as a basis for his Mogg-v. Whether this reliance extends to the Mogg-p is difficult to determine since commentaries to the CVV remain unedited and are often incomplete.

Despite the lack of available Sanskrit commentaries, the internal evidence from the Mogg-p suggests that Moggallāna's appropriation of *Cāndra* literature was mediated by his teacher Sāriputta, who wrote the *Cāndrālaṃkāra* (CA), a commentary on the *Cāndra-pañcikā* (CP) of Ratnamati, itself a commentary on the CVV. Sanskrit manuscripts of the CP

---

[11]   Mogg-v 1931: 48.

[12]   '[The second sUP triplet occurs after a nominal stem co-occurring] with [the particles] *prati* and *pari* when they are used to indicate [a characteristic (*lakṣaṇa*), distributive function (*vīpsā*), change of state (*itthaṃbhūta*)], and divison (*bhāga*).'

[13]   CVV 1953: 173.

[14]   'The seventh [pair of suffixes occurs after a nominal stem co-occurring with the particle *upa*] when it is used in the sense of *ādhikya* "more".'

[15]   Mogg-v 1931: 50.

[16]   'The seventh [sUP triplet] occurs [after a nominal stem co-occurring with the particle *upa*] when it is used in the sense of *ādhikya* "more".'

[17]   CVV 1953: 174.

[18]   '[The third pair of suffixes occurs after a nominal stem] in the sense of a cause (*hetu*).'

[19]   Mogg-v 1931: 53.

[20]   '[The third sUP triplet occurs after a nominal stem] in the sense of a cause (*hetu*).'

[21]   CVV 1953: 175.

are extant,[22] though an edition of the work has yet to be published.[23] A facsimile edition of parts of the CA has been recently published by Dragomir Dimitrov,[24] though it does not include the CV section on the treatment of case endings.

That Moggallāna utilised a commentarial lineage on the CV, which included Ratnamati's CP and Sāriputta's CA, is explicitly confirmed by a 15th century monk, Śrī Rāhula, who states in his *Padasādhana-ṭīkā* (Pds-ṭ), a commentary on a *Moggallāna* handbook, that Moggallāna had learned and memorised, among many other grammatical texts, 'the grammar and critical commentary composed by the Teacher Candragomin, [and] its *vṛtti*, commentary and sub-commentary composed by Jaḍḍugomi (?),[25] Ratnamati and Sāriputta the Grand Master (*mahāsāmi*)…'.[26]

Moggallāna and his pupils appear to have seen both Sāriputta and Ratnamati as authorities and sometimes refer to them in points of grammatical dispute. The reverence paid to Sāriputta as commentator on the *Cāndrapañcikā* ('*ratnamatipañcikālaṅkārakāra*' [lit. the author of the ornament of Ratnamati's extensive commentary]) is clear from the Mogg-p-ṭ (Mogg.2.6) where Saṅgharakkhita states that Moggallāna 'illuminates the basics points already taught by the teacher (Sāriputta).'[27]

---

22 Cf. SĀṄKṚTYĀYANA 1937: 43 nr. 295, OBERLIES 1989: 27-28.

23 I am aware that Dragomir Dimitrov plans to publish a monograph on Ratnamati. This work will be useful for understanding the adoption of the *Cāndra* tradition by the Laṅkan *saṅgha*.

24 DIMITROV 2010.

25 Most Tibetan and North Indian source material states that the author of the *Cāndra-vṛtti* is Dharmadāsa. Therefore, the identification of the *vṛttikāra* with one 'Jaḍḍugomi' is particularly significant here. In addition, the description of the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa* as a 'critical commentary' (*paccakkhānabhassa*, S, *pratyākhyāna-bhāṣya*) is also interesting. It perhaps refers to the fact that the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa* is largely a reformulation of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* based on the recommendations of Kātyāyana's *vārttika*s.

26 Pds-ṭ 1908:6, 8-10: *ācariyacandagomiviracite saddalakkhaṇe paccakkhānabhasse ca jaḍḍugomiratanamatisāriputtamahāsāmīppabhutīhi viracitesu vuttipañcikā-pañcikālaṅkāresu ca…*

27 Mogg-p-ṭ Bᵉ 85: *duhādīnaṃ ty evam ādo amhākam paramagurunā ratanamati-pañcikālaṅkārādikārena nānākārasāratthavedavinditu mahāpaññāpāṭavānaṃ pañña-vantānaṃ sāminā mahāsāminā sambuddha-sāsanaratanavaropakārakena* "*idam ettha vicāraṇīyaṃ*"*ty abhidhāya nānāmatantaram ākaḍḍhiya bahuṃ sampaveditam atthi,*

In addition, Moggallāna and his commentators also saw Ratnamati as a grammatical authority. For instance, Moggallāna justifies his rejection of a particular grammatical issue in Mogg.2.28 *pañcamy avadhismā*[28] by stating in the Mogg-p that 'it has been rejected by Ratnamati etc. (*ratanamatippabhuti*) [and, therefore,] we are not pressed for a refutation [of our own].'[29] The use of the term '*ratanamatippabhuti*' (lit. beginning with Ratnamati) is also important here since Moggallāna is not just appealing to Ratnamati but to a lineage beginning with him. In this regard, Ratnamati's commentary can perhaps be seen as the stimulus of *Cāndra* grammatical production within the reformed *saṅgha* in 12th century Laṅkā. Therefore, it is possible that like the Mogg and Mogg-v, the Mogg-p is also based on *Cāndra* grammatical literature and therefore preserves clues concerning the ways the *Cāndra* tradition interpreted the CV. In this regard, I illustrate below the way in which the treatment of cases is interpreted in the *Moggallāna* tradition as a possible means of obtaining an insight into the *Cāndra* treatment of cases. However, before turning to the *Moggallāna* tradition it is perhaps beneficial to first compare the treatment of cases in the Pāṇinian and *Cāndra* traditions.

---

mayam pan' ettha ācariyenādhippetamattam evālamba-attham pakāsayissāma. (With respect [to the statement] '*for the* [*verbal bases*] *'duh' etc.*', saying that 'this here should be considered' [and] drawing out various alternative views, much has been taught by our teacher's teacher/supreme teacher, author of the *Ratnamati-pañcikālaṅkāra* etc., the master among the learned—who are skilled, have great wisdom and realise excellent knowledge of various types—the great master, the most eminent assistant, like a jewel, to the teaching of the Perfectly Enlightened One. Again here we will explain a supporting meaning that has simply been taught by the teacher.)

[28] 'The fifth [pair of suffixes occurs after a nominal stem] that is a limiting point (*avadhi*).'

[29] Mogg-p 1931: 68, 17-19: *ratanamatippabhutīhi yeva paṭikkhittā na amhehi paṭikkhepāya payatitabbaṃ.*

2. *KĀRAKA*S IN THE PĀṆINIAN TRADITION

In the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A), *kāraka*s are abstract syntactico-semantic categories that mediate between the semantics and morphology of a case suffix.[30] This separation of semantics and morphology by means of *kāraka*s allows for variation in the phonological representation of underlying semantic structures in Sanskrit nominal inflection. For instance, as I illustrate below, it accounts for such sentences as '*grāmam adhiśete*' (he lies/sleeps in the village), where the second case suffix -*am* of '*grāmam*' is assigned as a *karman* (grammatical object) in the sense of a locative. The key idea in the A's treatment of cases is that there is no one-to-one correspondence between three modules, i.e. between semantics and *kāraka*s, *kāraka*s and morphological cases (*vibhakti*s) and, ultimately, semantics and morphological cases.[31] I have adapted Joshi and Roodbergen's representation of this principle as follows:

(*a*) one and the same semantic characterisation may be linked to different *kāraka*-names,
(*b*) one and the same *kāraka*-name may be linked to different semantic characterisations,
(*c*) one and the same *vibhakti* may be linked with different *kāraka*-names,
(*d*) one and the same *kāraka*-name may be linked with different *vibhakti*s.[32]

As part of the derivational process, then, *kāraka*s are linked with various semantic characterisations (A.1.4.24-55). There are six different *kāraka*s: *apadāna* 'stable point when there is moving away', *sampradāna* 'recipient; indirect goal', *karaṇa* 'instrument', *adhikaraṇa* 'locus', *karman* 'object; goal' and *kartṛ* 'agent'.[33] As mentioned, these *kāraka* labels may be assigned to more than one semantic characterisation and, likewise, a semantic characterisation may be assigned more than one *kāraka*. For instance, the

---

[30]   For further reading on the topic of *kāraka*s, cf. CARDONA (1967, 1970, 1971 and 1974), DESHPANDE (1979, 1980 and 1991), JOSHI and ROODBERGEN (1975), KIPARSKY (1982) and MATILAL (1991).

[31]   It is important to bear in mind that these three modules are etic, rather than emic, descriptions of the architecture of the A. They are not labelled as such in the A itself.

[32]   JOSHI and ROODBERGEN 1975: xvi.

[33]   KAHRS 1998: 51.

principal definition of *karman* (grammatical object) is A.1.4.49 *kartur īpsitatamaṃ karma* '[The technical term] *karman* denotes what the agent (*kartur*) most desires to reach (*īpsitatamam*) through his action'.[34] This rule is used to derive forms such as *kaṭam* (mat) in the sentence *kaṭaṃ karoti* (he makes a mat), where the second case suffix −*am* is assigned to the *kāraka* category *karman* in the sense of object, i.e. 'what the agent most desires to reach'.

However, the *kāraka* category *karman* can also be assigned other semantic characterisations, such as locus (*ādhāra*) by means of *adhiśīṅsthāsāṃ karma* A.1.4.46 (*ādhāraḥ* # 45, *kārake* # 23) '[The technical term] *karman* denotes [the locus or substratum] in relation to the verbal stems *śīṄ-*, "lie down, sleep", *sthā-*, "stay, stand", and *ās-*, "sit", all co-occurring with the preverb *adhi*'.[35] This rule is used to derive forms such as *grāmam* (village) in the example '*grāmam adhiśete*' (he lies/sleeps in the village), where the second case suffix -*am* is assigned to the *kāraka* category *karman* in the sense of locus (*ādhāra*). The semantic characte-risation locus (*ādhāra*), though, primarily defines the *kāraka* category *adhikaraṇa*, by means of A.1.4.45 *ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam* '[The technical term] *adhikaraṇa* denotes the locus or substratum (*ādhāraḥ*)'.[36] This rule is used to derive forms such as *kaṭe* (mat) in the example '*kaṭa āste*'[37] (he sits on the mat), where the seventh case suffix -*Ṅi* is assigned to the *kāraka* category *adhikaraṇa* in the sense of locus. Therefore, while *kāraka* categories, such as *karman*, have a variety of semantic characterisations, their semantic characterisations may also be assigned a variety of *kāraka* categories.

After a *kāraka* category has been assigned a semantic characterisation in the derivational process, any of six morphological case categories (2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th cases) are then assigned to a *kāraka* (A.2.3.1-73). Again, a single *kāraka* may be assigned to a variety of cases and a single case may be assigned to a variety of *kāraka*s. For instance, the second (*dvitīyā*) case is assigned to the *kāraka* category *karman* by A.2.3.2

---

[34] KATRE 1987: 88. For more detail, see VERGIANI, forthcoming.
[35] KATRE 1987: 88.
[36] KATRE 1987: 87.
[37] '*kaṭe āste*' before *sandhi* (A.6.178, A.8.3.19).

karmaṇi dvitīyā 'The second sUP triplet (*dvitīyā*) is introduced [when not specified otherwise] to denote the object (*karman*)'.[38] However, the third (*tṛtīyā*) case, as well as the second, is also assigned to the category *karman* under certain circumstances by A.2.3.3 *tṛtīyā ca hoś chandasi* 'In the domain of Chandas (*chandasi*) the third sUP triplet, as well as the second, is introduced to denote the *karman* of the verbal stem *hu-* "sacrifice"'.[39] For example, in the sentence '*payo / payasā juhoti*' (he offers milk), the word '*payas*' (milk) denotes the grammatical object and can either be in the second or third case. The third case, though, is primarily assigned to the *kāraka* categories *kartṛ* (agent) and *karaṇa* (instrument) by A.2.3.18 *kartṛkaraṇayos tṛtīyā* 'The third sUP triplet (*tṛtīyā*) [is introduced after a nominal stem] to denote the agent (*kartṛ*) and instrument (*karaṇa*)'.

Once a *kāraka* category has been assigned a semantic characterisation, and a morphological case has been assigned to that *kāraka* category, it is then possible for phonological representations of the morphological case categories to be assigned. For instance, '*am*', '*au*' and '*as*', representing singular, dual and plural, respectively, are the basic suffixes of the second case. Taking the derivational process of '*grāmam*' (village) as an example, the interrelation of the different derivational modules described above can be represented in the Pāṇinian system as follows:

1. Semantic characterisation: *ādhāra* 'locus'
↓[*adhiśīṅsthāsāṃ karma* A.1.4.46 (*ādhāraḥ* # 45, *kārake* # 23)]
2. Abstract syntactico-semantic structure (*kāraka*): *karman*
↓[*karmaṇi dvitīyā* A.2.3.2]
3. Morphological structure (*vibhakti*): *dvitīyā*
↓ [*sV-au-Jas--am-auṬ-CHas--Ṭā-bhyām-bhis--Ṅe-bhyām-bhyas--Ṅasi-bhyām-bhyas-- Ṅas-os-ām--Ṅy-os-suP* A.4.1.2]
4. Phonological representation: *am*[40]

---

38   KATRE 1987: 138.
39   KATRE 1987: 138.
40   The headings of this four-fold framework are adapted from CARDONA 1974, KIPARSKY and STAAL 1969: 84, KAHRS 1998: 52, and HOUBEN 1999. My discussion of the A is indebted to the summaries in KAHRS 1998, and VERGIANI, forthcoming.

Through this flexible mechanism, the variation in the phonological representation of underlying semantic structures in Sanskrit nominal inflection is accounted for.

3. *KĀRAKA*S IN THE *CĀNDRA* TRADITION

In contrast to the A, the CV does not have a formal semantic module that defines the *kāraka* categories to which morphological structures are assigned. It treats the *kāraka* categories as semantically meaningful technical terms and relates morphological cases directly to them. In this way, it appears to lose the *kāraka* module as a mediator between semantics and morphology. In this regard, Joshi and Roodbergen state:

> Candragomin…links syntactic meanings, and, in some instances, non-linguistic features directly with case endings. Thus he can do without a *kāraka*-section proper, and confines himself to a *vibhakti* section…Moreover, since Candragomin leaves the syntactic meanings undefined, and relates the use of case-endings to *vivakṣā*: 'the wish of the speaker' (to present items in language as he likes)', it relieves him of problems, such as rule-ordering, conflict procedure, and adjustments due to the definitions. [41]

Joshi and Roodbergen's initial statement that the CV links semantics directly to case endings has become almost universally accepted. For instance, more recently Madhav Deshpande has reiterated this view and has stated that 'Candragomin dispenses with this intervening layer and links semantics directly with morphology'.[42] While Deshpande agrees with Joshi and Roodbergen in this regard, he has also illustrated that the treatment of case-endings in the CV is not as loosely regulated as Joshi and Roodbergen describe. He has shown that the CV is sensitive to rule-ordering and conflict procedure, and that the notion of '*vivakṣā*' is not meant to replace automatic operations.[43] In support of Deshpande, I illustrate below that Moggallāna shows that *vivakṣā* in the *Moggallāna* tradition—and therefore

---

[41]   JOSHI and ROODBERGEN 1975: xvi-xvii.
[42]   DESHPANDE 1992: 49.
[43]   DESHPANDE 1979.

by analogy also in the *Cāndra* tradition—is not a freelance principle that allows one 'to present items in language as he likes'.[44]

Since the CV lacks distinct semantic and *kāraka* modules, it appears to adopt *kāraka* categories that are designed to encapsulate many of the senses outlined in the semantic module of the Pāṇinian system. They are six-fold: *kriyāpya* 'object' (lit. reachable by an action),[45] *karaṇa* 'instrument', *sampradāna* 'recipient', *avadhi* 'limiting-point', *ādhāra* 'locus' and *kartṛ* 'agent'. Pieter Verhagen argues that, although these technical terms are designed to be semantically self-evident, it does not mean that the CV combines the semantic module and *kāraka* categories into a single module. He argues that one should implicitly distinguish between the semantic module and *kāraka* categories, despite the fact the semantic module is not explicitly defined. In this respect, Verhagen states:

> As the *kāraka* terms themselves are more obvious reflections of the semantic aspect of the categories, *Cāndra* grammar gives the impression of combining the semantic and *kāraka* level in one. I think that this is not the case; if we compare the formation processes (*prakriyā*) according to Pāṇini and *Cāndra* we find that the *kāraka*s assume the exact same intermediate position allowing for bilateral mapping in (and from) both the semantic and morphological levels.[46]

Verhagen concludes that 'the *kāraka*s occupy the same position in *Cāndra* grammar as in Pāṇini's original *kāraka* system.'[47] There is some evidence in the CVV that would support such a view. For instance, the CVV does acknowledge some degree of variation between semantic representation and *kāraka* categories. For instance, the CVV on C.2.1.43

---

[44] It should be noted that JOSHI and ROODBERGEN (1975) and DESHPANDE (1979) viewed the CV and the *Cāndra-vṛtti* (CVV) as the product of the same author and, therefore, their observations on the CV often amount to readings of the CV in light of the CVV. However, it is now accepted that the CV and CVV were written by different authors, Candragomin and Dharmadāsa, respectively. For an overview of this debate, cf. VERGIANI 2009. Therefore, I use the expression '*Cāndra* tradition' instead of CV to indicate that, like Moggallāna, I am interpreting the CV through the lens of Dharmadāsa's CVV.

[45] In the CVV the term '*āpya*' (reachable) is glossed with '*vyāpya*' (pervaded).

[46] VERHAGEN 2001: 292.

[47] VERHAGEN 2001: 292-293.

kriyāpye dvitīyā (The second case is introduced to denote that which is reachable by an action) defines '*āpya*' (reachable) in the sense of '*īpsitaṃ*' (desired), '*anīpsitaṃ*' (undesired) and '*īpsitaṃ nāpy anīpsitaṃ*' (neither desired nor undesired)[48] in an analogous way to A.1.4.49-51.[49] The CV too also acknowledges variation between *kāraka* categories and morphological cases. For instance, by C.2.1.87 *stokālpakṛcchrakatipayād asattvārthāt karaṇe*, the fifth case, as well as the third, is assigned in the sense of instrument (*karaṇa*) after the nominal stems *stoka* 'a little', *alpa* 'a little', *kṛcchra* 'difficult', and *katipaya* 'a few', when these do not denote a substance (*asattvārtha*). While it is difficult to come to definitive conclusions about the relationship between semantic representations and *kāraka* categories in the *Cāndra* system, I show below that the closely-related *Moggallāna* grammatical tradition viewed the *Cāndra* treatment of cases in a similar way to Verhagen.

In any case, throughout its treatment of case-endings, the *Cāndra* tradition clearly shows that it does not *formally* account for separate semantic and *kāraka* modules as in the A. By way of illustration, I return to the example '*grāmam adhiśete*' (he lies/sleeps in the village). In the CVV on C.2.1.49, the second case *-am* of '*grāmaṃ*' is accounted for by the maxim '*vivakṣāto hi kārakāṇi bhavanti*' (for *kāraka*s are [used] according to the desire to express [them]). Through this statement, the CVV intimates that since there is a desire to express the grammatical object, i.e. that which is reachable by an action (*kriyāpya*), the second case is suffixed. Whether or not the grammatical object is employed in the sense of locus (*ādhāra*) as in the A is not stated. In this instance, then, the CVV does not define *kriyāpya* in terms of locus (*ādhāra*) and is certainly unable to do so in the same way the A is able to define '*karman*', *via* A.1.4.46 *adhiśīṅsthāsāṃ karma*. Joshi and Roodbergen interpret the lack of a formal re-cognition of an underlying

---

48   CVV 1953: 168, 21*ff.*

49   For instance, the three main definitions of *karman* are: A.1.4.49 *kartur īpsitatamaṃ karma* '*karman* denotes the item that the agent most desires to reach (through his action)'; A.1.4.50 *tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam* 'also (*karman* denotes) that which is not desired to be reached (directly) (through an action)'; A.1.4.51 *akathitaṃ ca* 'also (*karman* denotes) that which has not been mentioned (when it becomes instrumental in bringing about an action).'

semantic module, separate from a *kāraka* module, as meaning that the sense of grammatical object in effect replaces the sense of locus:

> In this connection it is interesting to see how Candragomin accounts for usages like *grāmam adhiśete*: 'he sleeps in the village'…He accounts for them by appealing to the dictum *vivakṣāto hi kārakāṇi bhavanti*: 'as we know, *kāraka*s are (used) according to the wish of the speaker'. Whenever a speaker wants to express the idea of *vyāpya*, i.e. *āpya*: 'to be reached (directly)' instead of *ādhāra*: 'location'…he is free to do so.[50]

For Joshi and Roodbergen then a comparison between the A and CV could perhaps be represented as follows:

Pāṇinian	*Cāndra*
1. Semantic representation: *ādhāra* 'locus'	1. Semantico-syntactic representation: *kriyāpya*
↓[*adhiśīṁsthāsāṃ karma* A.1.4.46 (*ādhāraḥ* # 45, *kārake* # 23)]	↓ [*kriyāpye dvitīyā* C.2.1.43]
2. Abstract syntactico-semantic structure: *karman*	2. Morphosyntactic structure: *dvitīyā*
↓[*karmaṇi dvitīyā* A.2.3.2]	↓ [*am-auṬ-CHas* C.2.1.1]
3. Morphological structure: *dvitīyā*	3. Phonological representation: *am*
↓ [*am-auṬ-CHas* A.4.1.2]	
4. Phonological representation: *am*	

At face value it would seem that Joshi and Roodbergen were right in their observation that by conflating the semantic module and semantico-syntactic (*kāraka*) module the CV had greatly limited the scope of variation in the phonological representation of underlying semantic structures.[51] However, as mentioned above, I will show that the *Moggallāna* system provides a different interpretation of the *Cāndra* treatment of cases.

---

50   JOSHI and ROODBERGEN 1975: xviii.
51   For a further account of this reduction in variation, cf. JOSHI and ROODBERGEN (1975: xvi-xix).

5. *KĀRAKA*S IN THE *MOGGALLĀNA* TRADITION

The Mogg's treatment of *kāraka*s is essentially the same as the CV. However, Moggallāna changes the name of the *kāraka* category '*kriyāpya*' in the CV to '*kamma*' (object, S. *karman*). His *kāraka* categories are likewise six-fold: *kamma* 'object', *karaṇa* 'instrument', *sampadāna* 'recipient', *avadhi* 'limiting-point', *ādhāra* 'locus'' and *kattu* 'agent.'

The mechanism through which these categories relate to morphological structures is essentially identical to the CV. The Mogg accounts for the same level of semantic variation in its *kāraka* categories as the CV. However, it tolerates less variation between morphological cases and *kāraka* categories. For instance, the prescription of the fifth case in the sense of *karaṇa* (instrument) by C.2.1.87 *stokālpakṛcchrakatipayād asattvārthāt karaṇe* is rejected by Moggallāna and is dealt with under Mogg.2.28 *pañcamy avadhismā*.[52] However, Moggallāna does not posit a one-to-one correspondence between *kāraka* categories and morphological cases and still accounts for variation between them. For instance, by Mogg.2.18 *kattukaraṇesu tatiyā* (the third case occurs in the sense of agent and instrument), the third case can still express the sense of both '*kattu*' (agent, S. *kartṛ*) and '*karaṇa*' (instrument).

Just as in the CV, the lack of recourse to a formal semantic module as found in the A is often explained through the principle of '*vivakṣā*' (the desire to speak).[53] To highlight the different approach of the *Moggallāna* system to the A, it is useful to explore Moggallāna's treatment of the example '*grāmam adhiśete*' (he lies/sleeps in the village), represented in the Mogg-v by the canonical quotation '*paṭhavim adhisessati*' (he will lie on the ground). This quotation is taken from verse 41 in the *Dhammapada*:

---

[52] 'The fifth [pair of suffixes occurs after a nominal stem] that is a limiting point (*avadhi*).'

[53] Alongside the discussion of *vivakṣā* in *Cāndra* grammar in JOSHI and ROODBERGEN (1975: xvi-xix) and DESHPANDE (1979), there is also a notable contribution by RADICCHI (2002). For more general studies on the concept of *vivakṣā* in grammar, cf. van NOOTEN (1983), RADICCHI (1994), and SCHARF (1995, 2002).

aciraṃ vat' ayaṃ kāyo pathavim adhisessati,
chuddho apetaviññāṇo niratthaṃ va kaliṅgaraṃ.[54]

Too soon this body will lie on the ground, bloated and devoid of consciousness like a useless log.

I quote the relevant passage of the Mogg-v below alongside the CVV to show that '*paṭhavim adhisessati*' is a direct substitute for '*grāmam adhiśete*' as found in the CVV:

CVV 2.1.49: **grāmam adhiśeta** *iti vyāpya-vivakṣaiva. evaṃ* **grāmam adhitiṣṭhati,** **vṛkṣam adhyāste**, *dharmam abhiniviśate, trirātram upavasati, grāmam anuvasati, parvatam adhivasati āvasatham āvasatīti.*[55]

[For the example], '*grāmam adhiśete*' (he lies/sleeps in the village), there is only the desire to speak of that which is pervaded [by an action] (i.e. the grammatical object). Likewise, [there is only the desire to speak of the grammatical object for the examples] '*grāmam adhitiṣṭhati*' (he stays at the village), '*vṛkṣam adhyāste*' (he sits at the tree), '*dharmam abhiniviśate*' (he enters into the *dharma*), '*trirātram upavasati*' (he dwells for three nights), '*grāmam anuvasati*' (he settles at the village), and '*parvatam adhivasati*' (he lives on a mountain), '*āvasatham āvasati*' (he dwells at the lodging).

Mogg-v 2.2: **paṭhavim adhisessati, gāmam adhitiṭṭhati, rukkham ajjhāsate** *ti adhisīṭhāsānaṃ payoge 'dhikaraṇe kammavacanicchā vatticchāto hi kārakāni honti.*[56]

[For the examples], '*paṭhavim adhisessati*' (he will lie on the ground), '*gāmam adhitiṭṭhati*' (he stays at the village) and '*rukkham ajjhāsate*' (he sits down at the foot of a tree), when there is the use of the roots '*sī*', '*ṭhā*' and '*ās*' [preceded by the pre-verb] '*adhi*', there is the desire to speak of the grammatical object in the sense of locus (*adhikaraṇa*), for *kāraka*s [are used] when there is the desire to express [them].

When these two discussions are compared, it is clear that Moggallāna has used the canonical quotation '*paṭhavim adhisessati*' as a substitute for '*grāmam adhiśete*'. Moggallāna's discussion is especially significant since he

---

54   Dhp 1855: 8, 7-8.
55   CVV 1953: 170, 21-23.
56   Mogg-v 1931: 38, 3.

reveals that he interprets the prescription of the second case here along
Pāṇinian lines. For instance, while the CVV states that the second case is
appointed in sentences such as '*grāmam adhiśete*' only when one wishes to
speak of a grammatical object, Moggallāna makes it explicit that the
grammatical object is used in the sense of locus (*adhikaraṇa*), i.e. he
mentions a semantic module. His discussion directly refers to A.1.4.46
adhiśīṅsthāsāṃ karma and his recognition of semantic variation underlying
the linguistic choice of *kāraka* categories can be seen as a more Pāṇinian
interpretation of the mechanisms involved in the *Cāndra* treatment of cases.

That Moggallāna is providing a Pāṇinian-style interpretation of the
CVV is made clear in the commentaries on this passage. For instance, the
Mogg-p states:

> *adhipubbasīṭhāsānam ādhāre dutiyābhimatā paresaṃ, sāpīha kammavacanicchāy'*
> *eva siddhā ti dassetuṃ vuttaṃ paṭhavim icc ādi.*[57]

Others (the Pāṇinīyas) approve the second case in the sense of locus (*ādhāra*) for
the roots '*sī*', '*ṭhā*' and '*ās*' preceded by [the pre-verb] '*adhi*'. Here too (i.e. in this
grammar), it (the second case) is appointed only when there is the desire to speak
of the grammatical object. To show that it is said '*paṭhaviṃ*' etc.

In the Mogg-p-ṭ, Moggallāna's pupil, Saṅgharakkhita, makes a further
explicit comparison between the *Moggallāna* system and the Pāṇinian
grammatical system:

> *atha adhisīṭṭhāsānaṃ kammaṃ ty ādinā* (A.1.4.46) *tena tena kammasaññaṃ*
> *vidhāya paṭhaviṃ adhisessatī ti ādo (tattha) tattha kamme dutiyā ti* (A.2.3.2) *dutiyā*
> *vidhīyate tehi tehi satthakārehi. sabbatth'ev'ettha lokassa kamma-vacanicchā ti*
> *kamen'etaṃ 'ññasaññāpubbakaṃ kammam upadassento āha adhi-pubba icc ādi.*[58]

Now, the grammarians, having appointed the technical term '*karman*' by a (rule)
such as A.1.4.46 *adhiśīṅsthāsāṃ karma*, appoint the second case in [examples]
such as '*paṭhaviṃ adhisessatī*' according to A.2.3.2 *karmaṇi dvitīyā*. In each
instance (*sabbattha*) here, showing that this grammatical object (*kamma*), which
was previously a technical term of others, (is used) since the people (*loka*) desire

---

[57]   Mogg-p 1931: 40, 24*ff.*
[58]   Mogg-p-ṭ Bᵉ 80.

to speak of the grammatical object, it is said "preceded by [the pre-verb] '*adhī*'" etc.

Here, Saṅgharakkhita explains that Moggallāna is contrasting the formal appointment of *kamma* in the sense of locus (*ādhāra*) in the A with the informal appointment through *vivakṣā* in the Mogg. In his Sambandh, Saṅgharakkhita makes it explicit that, even though the grammatical object is governed by *vivakṣā*, it still refers to the same semantic range as in the A. In doing so he quotes the additional examples from the CVV 2.1.49 given above:

> *paṭhaviṃ adhisessati, gāmam adhitiṭṭhati, rukkham ajjhāvasate, dhammam abhinivisate, rattim upavasati, gāmam anuvasati, pabbatam adhivasati, gharam āvasati, nadiṃ pibati, gāmaṃ carati ty ādīsv ādhāre kammavacanicchāyaṃ kamme yeva dutiyā.*[59]

> The second case occurs only in the sense of grammatical object (*kamma*) when there is a desire to speak of the grammatical object in the sense of locus (*ādhāra*), such as in (the examples) '*paṭhaviṃ adhisessatī*' (he will lie on the ground), '*gāmam adhitiṭṭhatī*' (he stays at the village) and '*rukkham ajjhāsate*' (he sits down at the foot of a tree), '*dhammam abhinivisate*' (he enters into the *dhamma*), '*rattim upavasatī*' (he dwells for a night), '*gāmam anuvasatī*' (he settles at the village), and '*pabbatam adhivasatī*' (he lives on a mountain), '*gharam āvasatī*' (he dwells at the house), '*nadiṃ pibatī*' (he drinks in [from] the river), and *gāmaṃ carati* (he wanders in the village).

From the discussions above, it is clear that the *Moggallāna* tradition is aware of the intricacies of the Pāṇinian treatment of cases. In addition, the tradition acknowledges that the relationship between the formal semantic and *kāraka* modules of the A has been replaced by the intentions of a linguistic community. Importantly, however, Moggallāna shows that these linguistic judgements imply the same semantic range as that which is pre-scribed in the A. In this regard, the degree of semantic variation underlying *kāraka* categories would appear to be unchanged from the A, although Moggallāna, following the *Cāndra* tradition, rejects the formalism of the A.

---

[59]   Sambandh 1891: 44, 4-7.

It is therefore possible to compare Moggallāna's treatment of cases with the
A's as follows:

Pāṇinian	*Moggallāna*
1. Semantic representation: *ādhāra* 'locus'	1. Semantic representation: *ādhāra* 'locus'
↓[*adhiśīṁsthāsāṃ karma* A.1.4.46 (*ādhāraḥ* # 45, *kārake* # 23)]	↓ [*vivakṣā*: the desire to speak]
2. Abstract syntactico-semantic structure: *karman*	2. Abstract syntactico-semantic structure: *kamma*
↓[*karmaṇi dvitīyā* A.2.3.2]	↓ [*kamme dutiyā* Mogg.2.2]
3. Morphological structure: *dvitīyā*	3. Morphosyntactic structure: *dutiyā*
↓ [*am-auṬ-CHas* A.4.1.2]	↓ [*aṃ-yo* Mogg.2.1]
4. Phonological representation: *am*	4. Phonological representation: *aṃ*

The *Moggallāna* tradition, then, appeals to *vivakṣā* as a link between the
semantic and *kāraka* modules, rather than formalising the two modules in
his grammar. However, importantly, according to the *Moggallāna* gram-
matical tradition, the semantic and *kāraka* modules are not conflated. The
kāraka module holds the same intermediary position as in the A and, while
the semantic module is subject to *vivakṣā* rather than being formalised in
the grammar, the senses conveyed by the *kāraka* categories also appear to
be identical to the A. However, as shown above, in contrast to Joshi and
Roodbergen's interpretation of '*vivakṣā*' in the CVV as meaning 'the wish
of the speaker (to present items in language as he likes)'[60], Moggallāna
provides a different, perhaps more orthodox, understanding of the term. His
arguments accord with Madhav Deshpande's views that *vivakṣā* in the CV
'is not meant to replace the automatic operations of Pāṇini's grammar, but
to indicate the source of input for voluntary operations.'[61]

The way Moggallāna interprets *vivakṣā* in his grammatical system is
most clearly articulated in Mogg-v.2.28, where he rejects the Pāṇinian
*sūtra*s A.2.3.34 *dūrāntikārthaiḥ ṣaṣṭhy anyatarasyām*,[62] A.2.3.35

60 JOSHI and ROODBERGEN 1975: xvi.
61 DESHPANDE 1979: 143.
62 KATRE 1987: 146. '(Optionally), the sixth sUP triplet [as well as the fifth] are
     introduced after (nominal stems) co-occurring with synonyms of *dūra*- "distant, far",

dūrāntikārthebhyo dvitīyā ca[63] and the relevant portion of A.2.3.36[64] *saptamī adhikaraṇe*.[65] Moggallāna states that the cases governed by A.2.3.34-36 can be assigned instead in the sense of their own specific domain (*savisaya*, S. *svaviṣaya*), i.e. according to their own governing rules. With respect to this rejection, the Mogg-p states: 'Here, the linguistic community's desire to speak (*lokiyā…vacanicchā*) is the restriction. Therefore, one should not consider the possibility of the over-application [of a rule].'[66] Moggallāna, then, anticipates that some may interpret *vivakṣā* as a freelance principle that would allow 'the over-application [of a rule]', meaning that the application of a case-ending would be subject to the whim of the speaker. In this regard, he makes it explicit that '*vivakṣā*' in the Mogg-v is not a *speaker's* desire but the desire of a linguistic community, i.e. a common linguistic convention. On this point, Saṅgharakkhita states the following in the Mogg-p-ṭ:

---

and *antika-* "proximate, near".'

    In his translation KATRE does not translate '*anyatarasyām*' (optionally) and therefore I have amended it accordingly.

[63] KATRE 1987: 146. 'The second sUP triplet (*dvitīyā*) and [the fifth as well as the third] are introduced (after nominal stems) synonymous with *dūra-* "distant" and *antika-* "proximate" [when they do not imply a substance].'

[64] KATRE 1987: 146. 'The seventh sUP triplet (*saptamī*) is introduced (after a nominal stem) to denote the *adhikaraṇa kāraka* and [also after synonyms of *dūra-* and *antika-*].'

[65] Mogg-v 1931: 67, 4-7: *dūrantikatthayoge pi savisaye va pañcamīchaṭṭhiyo siyuṃ: dūraṃ gāmasmā, antikaṃ gāmasmā, dūraṃ gāmassa, antikaṃ gāmassā ti. dūrantikatthehi tu sabbā 'va savisaye siyuṃ bādhakābhāvā: dūro gāmo, antiko gāmo tv evam ādi.* (Also in connection with [words] meaning 'far' (*dūra*) and 'near' (*antika*), the fifth and sixth cases should occur in the sense of their own domain (i.e. in the sense of limit (*avadhi*) and relation (*sambandha*)). For example: 'far from the village (*gāmasmā*)', 'near to the village (*gāmasmā*)', 'far from the village' (*gāmassa*), 'near to the village' (*gāmassa*). However, all [cases] should occur after [words] meaning 'far' and 'near' in the sense of their own domain, since there is no problem [in doing so]. For example: 'the far village', 'the near village' etc.)

[66] Mogg-p 1931: 68, 15-16: *lokiyā c'ettha vacanicchā nibandhanan ti nātippasaṅgam maññate.*

evaṃ carahi taṃtaṃkārakavacanicchāyam aññā pi vibhattiyo kasmā na ppayujjeyyun ti āha "lokiyā cetthā"ti ādi, ettha vibhattīnaṃ niyame lokiyā eva vacanicchā nibandhanaṃ kāraṇan ti attho.[67]

Since, in this case, [it is asked] 'why could not other cases also be used when there is the desire to speak of this or that *kāraka*?', [the statement] beginning '*lokiyā c'etthā*' is said. The sense is that, here, when there is a restriction of cases, only the linguistic community's desire to speak is a restrictive cause.

The Mogg-p-ṭ makes it explicit here that there is a restriction in variation due to the common linguistic convention and not due to an individual speaker's desire. This is, in fact, also the dominant interpretation of *vivakṣā* in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*[68] and Patañjali defines the term under A.5.1.16[69] *tad asya tad asmin syād iti*.

vivakṣā ca dvayī. asty eva prāyoktrī vivakṣāsti laukikī. prayoktrī vivakṣā. prayoktā hi mṛdvyā snigdhayā ślakṣṇayā jihvayā mṛdūn snigdhāñ śabdān prayuṅkte. laukikī vivakṣā yatra prāyasya saṃpratyayaḥ. prāya iti loko vyapadiśyate.[70]

The desire to speak is twofold, that pertaining to the user (*prayoktrī*) [of language] [and] that pertaining to the linguistic community (*laukikī*). The desire to speak pertaining to the user is when an individual utters soft, slippery words with a soft, slippery and smooth tongue. A linguistic community's desire to speak refers to the understanding of the majority. The linguistic community (*loka*) is what is meant by the term 'majority'.

Like Patañjali, Moggallāna understands that *vivakṣā* is not a freelance principle but a restriction based on the linguistic usage of a community. Therefore, Moggallāna does not replace the automatic operations of the A's *kāraka* section with voluntary ones, but replaces them with the restrictions imposed by common convention. This reliance on the intentions of a linguistic community fundamentally questions the A's formalistic approach.

---

[67]   Mogg-p-ṭ Bᵉ 108.
[68]   SCHARF 1995: 72.
[69]   KATRE 1987: 518. 'The *taddhita* affixes listed prior to below occur after a nominal stem ending in the first sUP triplet to denote "may possibly be (*syāt*)", "of it (*asya*)", or "in it (*asmin*)".'
[70]   MBh II 2.342.26-343.3.

How far Moggallāna's almost Pāṇinian interpretations of the CVV reflect actual discussions in commentaries on the CV is unclear. However, until the commentaries on the *Cāndra* tradition are edited, Moggallāna's grammatical insights may provide the first clues on the deeper workings of the *Cāndra* tradition's treatment of cases.

6. CONCLUSION

This article has compared the general principles underlying the treatment of case-endings in the Pāṇinian, *Cāndra*, and *Moggallāna* systems, to highlight the sophisticated and nuanced discussions of linguistic issues in the Pāli grammatical tradition. In doing so, I have shown that a group of 12th century Laṅkan grammarians, who certainly modelled their grammar exceptionally closely on the *Cāndra* tradition and its commentaries, have interpreted the treatment of cases in their own system in ways that are often quite different from the usual understanding of how *Cāndra* grammar operates.

In contrast to the almost unanimous opinion of scholars who have worked on the *Cāndra* treatment of cases, the *Moggallāna* grammatical tradition appears to support Verhagen's view that 'we find that the *kāraka*s assume the exact same intermediate position allowing for bilateral mapping in (and from) both the semantic and morphological levels.'[71] In addition, the *Moggallāna* grammarians support Deshpande's criticisms of Joshi and Roodbergen's argument that '*vivakṣā*' is 'the wish of the speaker (to present items as he likes)'. Such interventions by Pāli gram-marians in pan-South Asian debates only reinforce the importance of Pāli *śāstra* as source for understanding South Asian intellectual history.

---

[71] VERHAGEN 2001: 292.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

A (*Aṣṭādhyāyī*): KATRE, Sumitra M., trans. *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini in Roman Transliteration*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987.

CV (*Cāndravyākaraṇa*): CHATTERJI, Kshitish Chandra, ed. *Cāndravyākaraṇa of Candragomin Part 1 (Chapters 1-3)*. Pune: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1953.

CVV (*Cāndra-vṛtti*): CHATTERJI, Kshitish Chandra, ed. *Cāndravyākaraṇa of Candragomin Part 1 (Chapters 1-3)*. Pune: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1953.

Dhp (*Dhammapada*): FAUSBÖLL, V., ed. and trans. *Dhammapadam*. Copenhagen, 1855.

Mbh II (*Mahābhāṣya*): KIELHORN, F., ed. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Adhyāyas III, IV and V*. Third edition revised and furnished with additional readings, references and select critical notes by MM. K. V. ABHYANKAR. Volume II. Pune: Bhandarkar Institute Press, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1965.

Mogg (*Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa*): Śrī DHARMĀNANDA, ed. *Moggallāna pañcikā suttavuttisametā: anurādhapure thūpārāmamahāvihāramajjhāvutthena mahāsaddikena Sirimatā Moggallānamahāsāminā viracitā*. Colombo: P.A. Peries Appuhamy Wirahena, Saccasamuccaya Press, 1931.

Mogg-v (*Moggallāna-vutti*): Śrī DHARMĀNANDA, ed. *Moggallāna pañcikā suttavuttisametā: anurādhapure thūpārāmamahāvihāramajjhāvutthena mahāsaddikena Sirimatā Moggallānamahāsāminā viracitā*. Colombo: P.A. Peries Appuhamy Wirahena, Saccasamuccaya Press, 1931.

Mogg-p (*Moggallāna-pañcikā*): Śrī DHARMĀNANDA, ed. *Moggallāna pañcikā suttavuttisametā: anurādhapure thūpārāmamahāvihāramajjhāvutthena mahāsaddikena Sirimatā Moggallānamahāsāminā viracitā*. Colombo: P.A. Peries Appuhamy Wirahena, Saccasamuccaya Press, 1931.

Mogg-p-ṭ Bᵉ (*Moggallāna-pañcikā-ṭīkā*): *CSCD Tipiṭaka (Roman), s.v.* "Moggallānapañcikāṭīkā".

Pds-ṭ (*Padasādhana-ṭīkā*): Sri DHIRANANDA and VACISSARA, ed. *Buddhippasadani: A commentary on Padasadhana, Grammar of the Pali language by Sangharaja Sri*

Rahula, Principal of the College Sri Sanghabodhi Srivijayabahu Parivena, Totagamuwa. Colombo: A.D.A. Wijeyasinha Arachchl, Kalutara, Vidyasagara Printing Works, 1908.

Sambandh (*Sambandhacintā*): SĀRĀNANDA, ed. *The Sambandha-cintā by Venerable Sthavira Sri Sangha Rakshita, translated by Gotama Mahasami*. Colombo: K.D. Simon Appuhāmi, Lakrivikiraṇa Press, 1891/2434.

II. SECONARY SOURCES

CARDONA, George. "Pāṇini's Syntactic Categories". In *Journal of Oriental Institute*, Baroda, vol. XVI, 1967: 201-215.

———. "Some Principles of Pāṇini's Grammar". In *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 1, 1970: 40-74.

———. "Cause and Causal Agent: The Pāṇinian View". In *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, Vol.21, 1971: 20-40.

———. "Pāṇini's Kārakas: Agency, Animation and Identity". In *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 2, 1974: 231-306.

DEOKAR, Mahesh A. "The treatment of compounds in the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* vis-à-vis *Cāndravyākaraṇ*' in *Ocean of Buddhist Wisdom*, Vol.4, edited by Satyaprakāśa Śarmā. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation, 2009.

DESHPANDE, Madhav M. "Candragomin's Syntactic Rules, Some Misconceptions". *Indian Linguistics*, Vol. 40, 1979: 133-145.

———. *Evolution of Syntactic Theory in Indian Grammar: Syntax of the Sanskrit Infinitive –tumUN*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, Inc, 1980.

———. *The Meaning of Nouns: Semantic Theory in Classical and Medieval India*, Nāmārtha-nirṇaya *of Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1992.

DIMITROV, Dragomir. *The Bhaikṣukī Manuscript of the Candrālaṃkāra: Study, Script Tables, and Facsimile Edition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Harvard Oriental Series, 2010.

FRANKE, R.O. "Moggallāna's Saddalakkhaṇa und das Cāndravyākaraṇa." In *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1902-3: 70-95.

GORNALL, Alastair. *Buddhism and Grammar: The Scholarly Cultivation of Pāli in Medieval Laṅkā*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2012.

JOSHI, S.D. and J.A.F ROODBERGEN, eds. and trans. *Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya Kārakāhnika (P.1.4.23-1.4.55)*. Poona: University of Poona, 1975.

KAHRS, Eivind. *Indian Semantic Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

KATRE, Sumitra M., trans. *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini in Roman Transliteration*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987.

KIPARSKY, Paul and J.F. STAAL. "Syntactic and Semantic Relations in Pāṇini". In *Foundations of Language,* 5, 1969: 83-117.

KIPARSKY, Paul. *Some Theoretical Problems in Pāṇini's Grammar*. Post Graduate and Research Department Series, No.16. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1982.

MATILAL, Bimal Krishna. "Bhāvananda on 'What is Kāraka?'". In *Pāṇinian Studies: Professor S.D. Joshi Felicitation Volume*. Edited by Madhav M. Deshpande and Saroja Bhate. University of Michigan: Centre for South and Southeast Asian Studies, 1991: 263-283.

van NOOTEN, Barend. "*Vivakṣā*-, or intention to speak, as a linguistic principle". In *PCASS E 9, Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, edited by S.D Joshi and S.D. Laddu. Pune, 1983: 43-52.

OBERLIES, Thomas. "Studie zum Cāndravyākaraṇa. Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV.4.52-148 und V.2". Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien herausgegeben von Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an der Universität Hamburg. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1989.

RADICCHI, Anna. "*Vivakṣā* in the *Vākyapadīya*". In *Bhartṛhari, Philosopher and Grammarian: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Bhartṛhari*, edited by Saroja Bhate and Johannes Bronkhorst. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994: 221-234.

———. "Two Buddhist Grammarians: Candragomin and Jayaditya." In *Indian Linguistic Studies: Festschrift in Honour of George Cardona*, edited by M. Deshpande and P.E. Hook. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002: 165-181.

SĀṄKṚTYĀYANA, Rahul. "Sanskrit Palm-leaf Manuscripts in Tibet". JBORS XXIII, 1937: 1-57.

SCHARF, Peter M. "Early Indian Grammarians on a Speaker's Intention". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 115, No. 1, Jan. - Mar., 1995: 66-76.

SCHARF, Peter M. "Pāṇini, *vivakṣā* and *kāraka* rule-ordering". In *Indian Linguistic Studies: Festschrift in Honour of George Cardona*, edited by M. Deshpande and P.E. Hook. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002: 121-149.

VERGIANI, Vincenzo. "A Quotation from the *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* of Bhartṛhari in the *Pratyāhāra* Section of the *Kāśikāvṛtti*". In *Studies in the Kāśikāvṛtti. The Section on Pratyāhāras: Critical Edition, Translation and Other Contributions*, edited by Pascale Haag and Vincenzo Vergiani. Società Editrice Fiorentina: Firenze, 2009.

———."The adoption of Bhartṛhari's classification of the grammatical object in Cēṉāvaraiyar's commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*". In *Bilingualism and cross-cultural fertilisation: Sanskrit and Tamil in medieval India*, edited by Whitney Cox and Vincenzo Vergiani. Pondicherry: Publications de l'Institut Français de Pondichéry, Forthcoming-a (expected date of publication: January 2013).

VERHAGEN, P. "A Ninth Century Tibetan Summary of the Indo-Tibetan Model of Case Semantics". In *Tibetan studies. Proceedings of the 5th seminar of the International Association for Tibetan studies, Narita 1989*. Edited by Shōren Ihara, Yūshō Miyasaka, Shigeaki Watanabe, and Shōkei Matsumoto. Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji, 1992: 833–844.

———. *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Volume 2: Assimilation into Indigenous Scholarship*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001.