

Mahesh A. Deokar

The *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*: An Important Tool for the Study of the *Moggallānavuttivivaraṇapañcikā*

A Case Study Based on a Cambridge Fragment of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* with Special Reference to CV 2.2.1 and MV 3.1

Abstract: The 12th-century Pali grammar by the Sinhalese elder Moggallāna called *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* and its auto-commentary *Vutti* are heavily indebted to the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and its *Vṛtti*. Similarly the *Moggallānapañcikā* written by the same author is closely linked to the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* composed by the Sinhalese monk-scholar Ratnamati in the 10th century. In order to demonstrate the close relationship between the two Pañjikās, and to highlight the importance of studying them side by side, a sample text of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* on CV 2.2.1 from the Cambridge Add.1657.1 and the *Moggallānapañcikā* 3.1 are presented in this article with an English translation. The subsequent discussion exemplifies how the study of these two texts together is not only useful, but also mandatory for ensuring any further progress in their textual study. It underlines the importance of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* in understanding the text of the *Moggallānapañcikā* and Moggallāna's grammatical ideology in the broader context of the changing trends in the Pali grammatical literature of Sri Lanka. It also suggests the utility of such a study for the understanding of the methodology adopted by Moggallāna to translate scholastic Sanskrit into Pali.

Candragomin's *Śabdalakṣaṇa* (5th century CE),¹ popularly known as the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, is an attempt to revise Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Soon this new grammar became popular and evolved into a full-fledged grammatical school independent of the Pāṇinian system. The major known commentarial works of the Cāndra tradition are:

I am thankful to Prof. Em. George Cardona and Dr habil. Dragomir Dimitrov for going through the draft of this paper and making valuable suggestions.

1 For the date of Candragomin, see Oberlies 1989, 11–14; 1996, 269–275.

1. Dharmadāsa's *Cāndravṛtti* (c. 6th century CE)² on the *Cāndrasūtras*
2. Three *Pañjikās* on the *Cāndravṛtti*:
 - a. Ratnamati's (c. 900–980 CE) *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇapañjikā* (c. 920s–930s)³
 - b. Pūrṇacandra's *Śabdakṣaṇavivaraṇapañjikā* (sometime between the 6th and the beginning of the 12th century CE)⁴
 - c. Sumati's *Sumatipañjikā* (second half of the 10th century CE)⁵
3. Three commentaries on the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇapañjikā*:
 - a. Sāriputta's *Candrālamkāra* (first quarter of the 12th century CE)⁶
 - b. Ānandadatta's *Ratnamatipaddhati* (middle of the 12th century CE)⁷
 - c. Ratnadatta's *Nibandha* (after the 10th century CE)⁸

2 Cf. Oberlies 1989 and 1996. For an overview of the controversy regarding the authorship and date of the *Cāndrasūtra* and the *Cāndravṛtti*, see Vergiani 2009.

3 For a detailed discussion on the date of this erudite Sri Lankan monk-scholar and his *Pañjikā*, see Dimitrov 2016, esp. 599 ff.

4 Being a commentary on the *Cāndravṛtti*, the lower limit of the *Śabdakṣaṇavivaraṇapañjikā* is 6th century CE. Since Pūrṇacandra as well as his *Śabdakṣaṇavivaraṇapañjikā* and the *Dhātupārāyaṇa* are mentioned in Subhūticandra's (c. 1060–1140 CE) *Kavikāmadhenu* commentary (c. 1110–1130 CE) on the *Amarakośa* and in Ānandadatta's *Ratnamatipaddhati* (cf. below), the upper limit of Pūrṇacandra can be safely assumed to be the end of the eleventh century or the beginning of the twelfth century (Deokar Lata 2014, 58ff, Dimitrov 2016, 664). After comparing a number of passages from the *Śabdakṣaṇavivaraṇapañjikā* of Pūrṇacandra with the parallel passages in Ratnamati's *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇapañjikā*, Dimitrov (2016, 687) expresses doubt regarding the exact chronology of the two works. He says: 'Neither the passage quoted above [see *ibid.*, p. 684] nor any other passage from the *Śabdakṣaṇavivaraṇapañjikā* consulted by us so far permits us to determine confidently whether Pūrṇacandra's work has been influenced by Ratna or whether it was written before him.' According to Dimitrov (2016, 688) '[t]he question of Pūrṇacandra's date, therefore, needs to be investigated further, and more evidence is required.'

5 Dimitrov 2016, 690: '... this commentary was composed by a scholar from the Kathmandu Valley less than a century, perhaps just a few decades, after Ratna had written his *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇapañjikā*.'

6 A detailed discussion on the date of this learned Sinhalese monk can be found in Dimitrov 2010, 46; 2016, 601, n. 8.

7 For a detailed discussion of Ānandadatta's date, cf. Dimitrov 2016, 626, 676, and 687.

8 In the absence of a manuscript of the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇapañjikā* on the portion for which the text of the *Nibandha* is available, Dimitrov compared the available portion of the latter with the corresponding portion in Ānandadatta's *Paddhati*. After comparing the two texts, Dimitrov (2016, 696) remarks that '[i]t is safe to reach this conclusion after observing that, for example, in the commentary on Cān. 1.4.34 and 1.4.39 both Ānandadatta's *Ratnamatipaddhati* and the work contained in the Cambridge fragment share the same *pratīkās* (!) which prove that both authors have been commenting upon the same text, namely, the *Cāndravṛtyākaraṇapañjikā*.' Regarding

The textual and inscriptional evidence indicates that the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* was well-received and was also quite influential in the Buddhist academia in Sri Lanka, Tibet, and Myanmar. In Sri Lanka, Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* gave an impetus to the creation of new scientific treatises based on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*. Besides the composition of *Candrālamkāra* by Śāriputta mentioned above, it inspired a simplified pedagogical handbook of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* called *Bālāvabodhana* written by Mahākassapa (12th century CE).⁹ Another Sinhalese monk Buddhanaḅga, about whom very little is known, wrote a commentary called the *Linārthadīpa* or *Pātrikaraṇaṭikā* some time between the middle of the tenth and the middle of the fifteenth century.¹⁰ It is a Sanskrit commentary on another abridged version of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* namely the *Pātrikaraṇa* written apparently by a Mahāyāna Buddhist of Indian origin named Guṇākara.¹¹ This Sri Lankan scholarly lineage of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* prepared a solid foundation for the advent of a new school of Pali grammar based on the Cāndra system.

Moggallāna, who flourished during the reign of King Parakkamabāhu I (r. 1153–1186 CE) in the second half of the twelfth century, was a junior contemporary of Śāriputta. He composed all by himself three major works on the Pali grammar, namely, the grammatical aphorisms (*suttas*) known as *Saddalakkhaṇa* or *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, their gloss named *Vutti*, and the commentary called *Vuttivivaraṇapañcikā*. This threefold composition replicates the Cāndra grammatical lineage consisting of the *Cāndrasūtras*, their *Vṛtti*, and the *Pañjikā*.

As early as 1890, H. Devamitta brought out the first edition of the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* along with its commentary, the *vutti*, printed in Sinhalese script. In this publication, the editor pointed out the relation between the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, on the one hand, and the Pāṇinian, the Cāndra, and the Kātantra

the date of the *Nibandha*, Dimitrov (2016, 695) says: 'Ratna's date supplies, therefore, the *terminus post quem* for Ratnadatta who cannot have composed his *Nibandha* any earlier than the middle of the tenth century and may have been a close contemporary of Ānandadatta. The question of Ānandadatta's and Ratnadatta's relative chronology, however, still remains unanswered.'

9 Cf. Gornall 2013, 46, Dimitrov 2016, 565.

10 Based on the information provided by Pannasara (1958, 86–97), Dimitrov (2016, 566) states: '... it is possible to establish that Buddhanaḅga has quoted anonymously the seventh stanza from the introductory part of the *Śabdārthacintā*.' This implies that Buddhanaḅga certainly flourished later than Ratnamati. Following Bechert (1987, 11) and Wijesekera (1954–55, 96), Gornall (2013, 190–191) mentions: 'It is uncertain whether this work was also produced during the reforms though it must have been before 1458 since Sri Rāhula quotes it in his *Moggallāna-Pañcikā-Pradīpaya* (Mogg-pd). Wijesekera, though, has tentatively linked this Buddhanaḅga with Śāriputta's disciple of the same name, who authored the *Vinayatthamañjūsā* (Kkh-ṭ), a commentary on the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* (Kkh).' For Śrī Rāhula's quote, see also Dimitrov 2016, 565, n. 1.

11 Cf. Pannasara 1958, 88–90, and Dimitrov 2016, 565.

grammars, on the other. Soon after this publication, in 1902, R. Otto Franke published an excellent monograph on the history of Pali grammar and lexicography entitled *Geschichte und Kritik der einheimischen Pāli-Grammatik und Lexicographie*. In the subsequent years, he wrote two important articles concerning Moggallāna's grammar. In the first of the two articles, Franke, for the first time, discussed in detail the relationship between the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* and the Cāndra grammar. He prepared an elaborate concordance of parallel rules from the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* and the *Cāndravvyākaraṇa* and also pointed out a partial correspondence between the *Moggallānavutti* and the *Cāndravṛtti* (Franke 1903, 71–95). In spite of this early breakthrough in the comparative study of these two grammatical systems, no further advances were made for more than a century.

In 2008, in a book entitled *Technical Terms and Technique of the Pali and the Sanskrit Grammars*, I presented my observations on Moggallāna's indebtedness to the *Cāndravvyākaraṇa* in terms of technical terminology, and the technique of writing a grammar. In the following year, I published a brief comparative survey of the *samāsa* sections of these two grammars in an article *The Treatment of Compounds in the Moggallānavyākaraṇa vis-à-vis Cāndravvyākaraṇa*.

Alastair Gornall, in his doctoral dissertation *Buddhism and Grammar: The Scholarly Cultivation of Pāli in Medieval Laṅkā*, presented a dialogical analysis of the Pali grammatical literature of the twelfth century Laṅkā. In this connection, he undertook a serious comparative study of the treatment of cases in the *Cāndravṛtti* and the three above-mentioned works of Moggallāna. By focusing on the immediate texts and personalities that inspired Moggallāna, Gornall claimed that Ratnamati's commentarial lineage influenced the creation of the new Moggallāna school of Pali grammar, and that 'Moggallāna's use of the Cāndra was facilitated by Ratnamati's *Cāndra-Pañjikā* and its commentary the *Candrālaṃkāra* of Sāriputta' (Gornall 2013, 136). He also speculated about the possible correlation between the *Moggallānapañcikā* and the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā* on the basis of a quotation from Śrī Rāhula's *Buddhippasādiniṭṭikā*¹² on the *Padasādhana* of Piyadassī and from some other references to Ratnamati and his work found in the *Moggallānapañcikā* and its commentaries *Moggallānapañcikāṭṭikā* by Saṅgharakkhita and *Moggallānapañcikāpradīpaya* by Śrī Rāhula. Gornall could not, however, fully determine the exact scope of this correlation due to the unedited and incomplete nature of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā* (Gornall 2013, 89).

In November 2012, during my short visit to Germany, I had a chance to meet Dr Dragomir Dimitrov of the University of Marburg. He was then busy working on

¹² *Padasādhanaṭṭikā* 6, 13–14 quoted and translated in Gornall 2013, 53.

his habilitation thesis entitled *The Legacy of The Jewel Mind* focused on the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese works written by Ratnamati. By that time, he had already noticed the close affinity between Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* and the *Moggallānapañcikā*. Due to our common interest, we decided to read together selected portions of these texts. In the spring of 2013 and 2014, we further studied the two texts along with the relevant portions from Pūrṇacandra's *Śabdalaṅkāṣṇavivaraṇapañjikā* and Ānandadatta's *Paddhati*.

Our study of this important material confirmed Dimitrov's following conclusions:

1. Just as the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* and its *Vutti* are heavily indebted to the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and its *Vṛtti*, similarly the *Moggallānapañcikā* is closely linked with the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*.
2. Pūrṇacandra's *Śabdalaṅkāṣṇavivaraṇapañjikā* is an independent commentary on the *Cāndravṛtti*.
3. Ānandadatta's *Ratnamatipaddhati* is a direct commentary on Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*.

In his *Legacy of the Jewel Mind* Dimitrov has discussed at some length the influence of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* on the *Moggallānapañcikā*. He (2016, 606ff) has presented three passages from the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, namely, CV 2.1.85, 2.1.87, and 2.2.23, along with their parallels from the *Moggallānapañcikā*, namely, MV 2.32, 2.28, and 3.10 and demonstrated (2016, 22) that 'on many occasions the Pali commentary contains nothing less than a very precise translation of carefully selected passages from Ratna's seminal work.'

In the following pages, I propose to cite a sample text of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* on CV 2.2.1 from Add.1657.1.¹³ The text that I am going to present is based on the excerpt provided for the first time by Dimitrov in his book, which also includes an edition of the corresponding part of Ānandadatta's *Ratnamatipaddhati* on this section (2016, 650–658). I will then supply the corresponding portion from the *Moggallānapañcikā* 3.1 in order to demonstrate the close relationship between both texts. This will substantiate Dimitrov's claim that

¹³ <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01657-00001>. As summarized by Dimitrov 2016, 675, this fragmentary manuscript of fifty-five folios preserves Ratnamati's commentary on *Cāndravyākaraṇa* 2.2.1–18, 2.2.19–23, 36–46, 48–81, and 83–87 covering the *samāsa* section. The last one or two folios of this manuscript are missing, which initially made its identification difficult. When Bruno Liebich (1862–1939) examined the said manuscript, he thought that it also contains a part of Ānandadatta's *Paddhati*, like the other three manuscripts of the said text. Dimitrov (2016, 645 ff.) has provided evidence for the correct identification of the Cambridge fragment. By juxtaposing the text of *Cāndravyākaraṇa* 2.2.1 of this manuscript and Ānandadatta's *Paddhati*, he has shown that this is a text of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*.

the two works can be mutually helpful in the process of editing them. It will clearly underline the important role of the *Cāndravṛttikā* in understanding the text of the *Moggallānapañcikā* and Moggallāna's grammatical ideology in the broader context of the changing trends in the Pali grammatical literature. Apart from this, the comparison of the two passages will demonstrate Moggallāna's methodology of adopting and adapting materials from the Cāndra tradition.

Cāndrasūtra:

sup supaikāṛtham (2.2.1)

[A word ending in] a siglum *sup* together with [another word ending in] siglum *sup* forms a single integrated meaning.

Cāndravṛtti:

subantaṃ subantena sahaikāṛthaṃ bhavati etad adhikṛtaṃ veditavyam. sa ca pṛthagarthānām ekārthibhāvaḥ samāsa ity ucyate.

'A word ending in the siglum *sup* together with another word ending in the siglum *sup* forms a single integrated meaning.' This should be understood as a heading phrase (*adhikāra*). Furthermore, this formation of a single integrated meaning out of words having separate meanings is called 'a compound'.

Cāndravṛtyākaraṇapañjikā:

sub iti prathamaikavacanam ārabhya saptamibahuvacanapakāreṇa pratyāhāragrahaṇam. vidhigrahaṇanyāyena tadantagrahaṇam ity āha: **subantaṃ** ityādi.

Sup is accepted as a siglum starting from the nominative singular suffix [su] and ending with the letter *p* of the locative plural suffix [sup]. As per the maxim concerning the understanding of a grammatical injunction, *sup* is accepted as the word ending in it. Therefore, [the *Vṛttikāra*] says *subantaṃ* ('a word ending in the siglum *sup*'), and so on.

sāmānyoktāv api yasya yena saṃbandhas tena saha tad ekārthaṃ bhavati saṃbandhād vijñāyate. tadyathā: mātari vartitavyaṃ pitari śuśrūṣitavyam iti. na cocyate svasyaṃ svaminn iti. atha ca yā yasya mātā yaś ca yasya piteti saṃbandhāt pratīyate. tadvad ihāpi. tenāniṣṭaṃ na kiṃ cid ihāpadyate. ata eva vyapekṣāsāmarthyaparigrahāya samarthavacanāṃ nāśritam. ekārthibhāvas tv ekārthavacanenaiva saṃgrhītaḥ. tenātra vṛttāv ekārthibhāva eva, na vākye vyapekṣābhēdādīlakṣaṇe.

Even though it is a general statement [describing the compound of two unspecified *subantas*], due to a relation, it is understood that a *subanta* forms a single integrated meaning [only] with that *subanta* which is related to it. For instance, [it is said,] 'One should attend

to the mother' (*mātari vartitavyam*), 'One should obey the father' (*pitari śusrūṣitavyam*). However, it is not said 'to one's own mother' and 'one's own father'. Rather, due to the relation, it is understood that [the respective act is related with] the one who is one's mother and the one who is one's father. It is the same here too. Hence, nothing undesirable is likely to happen here [in the context of the present aphorism]. Therefore, [the Sūtrakāra] has not resorted to the word *samartha* [in the aphorism] so as to imply the semantic connection in the sense of mutual expectancy [between words]. The formation of a single integrated meaning is rather implied by the word *ekārtham* itself. Therefore, here in a compounded word-formation, only the formation of a single integrated meaning is present, but not so in an un-compounded expression, which is characterized by mutual expectancy [between word-meanings] as well as by differentiation [of word-meanings], etc.

tathā hi rājñah puruṣa iti rājā svāmyantarād bhedakah, puruṣaḥ svāntarād iti bhedaḥ. saṃsargo 'trārthagṛhitaḥ. na hi vyāvṛttasya saṃbandhyantareṇāsaṃbaddhasya svāder avasthānam asti. yadā rājā mamāyam ity apekṣate, puruṣo 'ham asyeti ca tadā saṃsargaḥ. vyāvṛttir arthagṛhita. na hy avyāvartamānayoḥ saṃbandhyantarebhyaḥ saṃsarga upapadyate. yadā tūbhayam api prādhānyenocyate tadobhayabhedasaṃsargo vākārthaḥ.

Thus, as for the expression *rājñah puruṣaḥ*, the king differentiates [himself] from other owners [of the servant], and so does the servant [who differentiates himself] from other owned things [of the king]. This is the differentiation. Here the association [between the two word-meanings] is discerned by reasoning. Because, an owned thing, etc., cannot be so distinguished, if it is unrelated to another related [word-meaning]. When the king expects 'he is my [servant]', and when the servant expects 'I am his [servant]', then there is an association. The distinction [of both the word-meanings from other similar word-meanings] is discerned by reasoning, because the association [between these word-meanings] cannot take place unless both are being distinguished from other related [word-meanings]. Furthermore, when both [the differentiation and the association] are expressed primarily, then both, the differentiation as well as the association [among the word-meanings] is the meaning of an un-compounded expression.

ekārthibhāvasya samāsvyapadeśa iṣyate cārthasamāsa ityādau [cf. Cān. 4.1.149: cārthasamāsamanojñādibhyaḥ] vyavahārārthaḥ. sa katham ity āśaṅkyāha: sa cetyādi. anvākhyānāya rājapurūṣāda buddhyā pravibhajya yāni padāni pṛthagarthāni prakalpitāni rājan as puruṣa su ityādīni teṣaṃ pṛthagarthānām bhinnārthānām ekārthibhāvāḥ sādharmaṇarthatā viśeṣaṇasya svārthaparitayāgena viśeṣye vṛttau saṃpadyate. tataś caikārthibhavanam samasanam iti kṛtvānugatārthatayā samāsa ity ucyate.

[The Vṛttikāra] wishes to designate the formation of the single integrated meaning as *samāsa* with the purpose of using [the said designation] in the expressions *cārthasamāsa* ('a compound having the copulative sense'), etc. [Anticipating the objection], 'How is it [justified]?', [the Vṛttikāra] says, *sa ca* ('Furthermore, that'), and so on. For the sake of explanation of the words *rājapurūṣa* ('a royal servant'), etc., the words *rājan as puruṣa su*, etc. are mentally analyzed and considered to possess a separate meaning; the formation of a single integrated meaning, [that is to say] the compositeness of meaning, out of those words having separate meanings [that is to say] isolated meanings is accomplished, when a qualifier, by abandoning its own meaning abides in the sense of a qualificant noun. Thus, since the

formation of a single integrated meaning is [equal to] compounding, it is called ‘a compound’ (*samāsa*) because of the similarity of meaning.

nanu ca jahatsvārthāyāṃ vṛttau śrīyamāṇāyāṃ rājapuruṣam ānāyety ukte puruṣamātra-syānayanam prāpnoti, na jātu cid rājavīśiṣṭasya? naitad asti. jahad api rājaśabdaḥ svārtham nātyantāya hāsyati. tadyathā: takṣā rājakarmaṇi pravartamānaḥ svaṃ takṣakarma rājakarmavirodhī jahāti, nāvīruddham hasitakaṇḍūyitādi. tathā rājaśabdo 'pi viśeṣyārthavṛttivirodhinam artham hāsyati, na tu viśeṣanam. athavānvayad rājavīśiṣṭasya grahaṇam. tadyathā: campakapuṭo mallikāpuṭa iti niṣkrāntāsv api sumanaḥsu vyapadeṣo 'nvayād bhavati. tathehāpi. tena rājavīśiṣṭasyānayanam, na puruṣamātrasya.

[The opponent argues:] If one resorts to the type of formation where [a qualifier] loses its own meaning, then, when one asks ‘Bring a royal servant!’, it may result in the bringing merely of a servant, but certainly not of the servant qualified by [the adjective] royal. [The proponent responds:] It is not the case. Even while abandoning its own meaning, the word *rājan* will not abandon it in the absolute sense. For instance, a carpenter, while performing a royal duty, abandons his own duty of a carpenter, which is in conflict with the royal duty; but not [the acts of] laughing, scratching etc., which are not in conflict [with the royal duty]. Similarly, the word *rājan* will also abandon that meaning which is in conflict with the meaning of a qualificant noun (*viśeṣya*), but not the qualifying meaning. Or alternatively, due to [their former] association, the comprehension [of the meaning ‘servant’] qualified by [the adjective] ‘royal’ is possible. For instance, the designations, namely, ‘a wrapper of *campaka* flowers’ (*campakapuṭa*), ‘a wrapper of *mallikā* flowers’ (*mallikāpuṭa*) are used on account of their [former] association, even when the flowers are no longer there. The same is also valid here. Hence, only that servant who is qualified by [the adjective] ‘royal’ is brought, and not someone who is merely a servant.

Moggallānasutta:

syādi syādinekattham (3.1)

Moggallānavutti:

syādyantaṃ syādyantena sahekattham hotiti idam adhikataṃ vedītabbaṃ; so ca bhinnat-thānam ekatthībhāvo samāso ti vuccate.

Moggallānavuttivivaraṇapañcikā:

si ādi yassa so syādi – si yo aṃ yo nā hi sa naṃ smā hi sa naṃ smiṃ su ti idaṃ vidhig-gahaṇāyena tadantaggahaṇam icc āha: syādyantam iccādi.

sāmaññena vutte pi yassa yena saṃbandho tena saha tad ekattham bhavati ti saṃbandhato viññāyati. taṃ yathā: mātari vattitabbaṃ pitari sussusitabban ti. na coccate sakāya sake ti. atha ca yā yassa mātā yo yassa pitā ti saṃbandhato patiyate. tathehā pi. tenāniṭṭham kiñci piha na hoti. ato yeva vyapekkhāsāmatthiyapariggahāya samatthavacanaṃ na kataṃ. ekatthībhāvo pana ekatthavacanen’ eva saṃgahito. ten’ etha vuttiyam ekatthībhāvo. vākye vyapekkhā bhedādīlakhanā.

*tathāhi rañño puriso ti rājā sāmyantarato bhedako, puriso sāntarato ti bhedo. saṃsaggo ettha atthagahīto*¹⁴. *na tu vyāvuttassa saṃbandhyantareṇāsambaddhassa sādino avatthānam atthi. yadā rājā mamāyan ti apekkhate, puriso ahaṃ asseti tadā saṃsaggo. vyāvutti atthagahītā*¹⁵. *na hi avyāvuttānaṃ saṃbandhyantarehi saṃsaggo uppajjate. yadā tūbhayam api padhānatāya vuccate tadobhayaṃ bhedasasaggo vākyattho.*

ekatthibhāvassa samāsavyapadeso abhimato catthasamāse ti ādo [cf. MV 2.143] *vyavahārattho. so kathaṃ icc āsaṅkiy' āha so ca iccādi. anvākhyānāya rājapurisādo buddhiyā pavibhajja yāni padāni puthagatthāni pakappitāni rāja sa purisa si iccādiṇi tesam puthagatthānaṃ bhinnatthānam ekatthibhāvo sādharmaṇatthatā visesanassa sakatthapariccāgena visesse vuttiyam saṃpajjate. tato c' ekatthibhavanaṃ samasanaṃ iti katvā anugatthatāya samāso ti vuccate.*

*nanu ca jahamānasakatthāyaṃ vuttiyam upādiyamānāyaṃ rājapurisam ānaye ti vutte purisamattassānyanaṃ pappoti, na kadāci rājavisitthassa. nedaṃ atthi. jahanto api rājasaddo sakattham nāccantāya jahāti. taṃ yathā: tḥapati rājakamme pavattamāno sakaṃ tacchakammaṃ rājakammaviruddhaṃ (jahāti, nāvīruddhaṃ) hasitakaṇḍuyatādiṃ. tathā rājasaddo pi viessatthavuttiviruddham attham jahāti, na pana visesanaṃ. athavā 'nvayato rājavisitthassa gahaṇaṃ. taṃ yathā: campakapuṭo mallikāpuṭo ti niṭṭhitesu pi kusumesu vyapadeso anvayato bhavati. tathehā pi. tena rājavisitthass' ānyanaṃ, na purisamattassa.*¹⁶

The main topics discussed in these passages are as follows:

1. An explanation of the words *subanta* or *syādyanta*.
2. Proving the futility of the Pāṇinian metarule *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ* (A. 2.2.1).
3. Three views about the meaning of an uncompounded expression (*vākyārtha*).
4. Justification for accepting the technical term *samāsa* used in the Pāṇinian school.
5. The problem in accepting the type of compounded word-formation where the qualifier loses its own meaning (*jahatsvārthā vṛtti*) and the solutions thereby.

When we compare the above two passages, it becomes evident that the Pali text is a literal translation of the Sanskrit original as in some of the other cases demonstrated by Dimitrov (2016, 606 ff.). In view of such a close affinity, the comparison of these texts proves helpful with regard to the textual study of the *Cāndravākaraṇapañjikā* and the *Moggallānapañcikā* alike. As far as the progress of the textual study of both these texts is concerned, we are not in a very happy position.

14 °gahīto em.] °gahito Printed text

15 °gahītā em.] °gahitā Printed text

16 Dharmānanda 1931, 138–139. Here the orthography of the text has been standardized, and the *pratikas* and the quotations are marked distinctly for the sake of convenience.

As Dimitrov reports, the available manuscripts material of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā* suffers from its fragmentary nature and partly poor quality.¹⁷ Moreover, although the text of Ānandadatta's *Ratnamatipaddhati* is helpful in some cases, it cannot be used for editing the entire text of the *Pañjikā*, since the former is a commentary only on some selected rules of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇa*. Thus, it is a challenging task to edit the text of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā*.

In the case of the *Moggallānapañcikā*, the situation is equally gloomy. Although we have a printed text of this work in Sinhalese and Burmese scripts published in 1931 and 1954 respectively, these are not critical editions. As Ven. Dharmānanda (1931: Preface ii), the editor of the Sinhalese publication, informs us, the text presented by him is based on a single manuscript preserved in the library of the Asgiri Vihāra. There is no information available on the date and the condition of this manuscript. The Burmese edition of the *Pañcikā* seems to be based on the Sinhalese edition with a few corrections made by its editor Bhadanta Aggadharmābhivamsa Thera. Obviously, these printed texts should be used with great caution, since they are not entirely reliable.

On the background of these inconveniences, it will be worthwhile studying the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā* and the *Moggallānapañcikā* in close juxtaposition in order to achieve further progress in the textual study of these two texts. Dimitrov (2016, 622) has already pointed out that '[b]ecause [...] Moggallāna's partial rendering of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā* is so close and reliable, the Pali *Pañcikā* may be regarded as an additional incomplete textual witness of Ratna's work.'

There is one instance in our present passage that can illustrate how the text of the *Moggallānapañcikā* can indeed help us to verify reliably the reading of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā*. In the above-mentioned passage of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā* the manuscript reads: *rājan as puruṣaḥ su*. In this case, the *visarga* in the word *puruṣaḥ* is unwarranted. Ānandadatta in his *Ratnamatipaddhati* has preserved the correct reading:

tad ekārthaṃ vidhīyamānam ekārthibhāvayogyānām rājan as puruṣa su ityādīnām samāsāyopakalpitānām eva vidhīyata iti tadarthākṣepo labdha iti. (Dimitrov 2016, 656).

Here, the parallel Pali text reads *rāja sa purisa si*, which further confirms the absence of the *visarga* after the word *puruṣa*. In the light of these witnesses, the Sanskrit text should be emended to *rājan as puruṣa su* despite the evidence of the

¹⁷ For an overview of the fragmentary manuscripts of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā* identified until now, see Dimitrov 2016, 623ff.

manuscript. Although in this particular case it is possible to emend the text on the basis of our general knowledge of Sanskrit grammar and grammatical conventions, it suffices to prove the utility of the *Moggallānapañcikā* as one of the witnesses to verify readings of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*.

Apart from this, there is another instance where the text of the *Moggallānapañcikā* helps us to verify the reading of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* against the *Ratnamatipaddhati*. While commenting on the word *subantaṃ* in the *Cāndravṛtti*, Ratnamati says: *vidhigrahaṇanyāyena tadantagrahaṇam*. However, Ānandadatta seems to have had a different reading before him, for he begins his comment on this portion of the *Pañjikā* with the following words:

*paravidhinyāyēti. parādhikāravihitasya vidher nyāyaḥ. kevalasyāsaṃbhavāt pratyaya-grahaṇe yasmād asau vihitas tadādes tadantasya grahaṇam iti yas tena tadantagrahaṇam.*¹⁸

‘As per the maxim concerning a grammatical injunction under [the head-word] *para*’ means a maxim concerning a grammatical injunction prescribed in the section headed by the word *paraḥ* (‘follows’, i.e. ‘a suffix’). Since it (i.e. a suffix) does not occur alone, *sup* is accepted as the word ending in it; as per this maxim, namely, whenever there is a mention of a suffix [in a grammatical injunction,] it is accepted as a word beginning with that to which the suffix is prescribed and ending with that [very suffix].

Moggallāna, on the other hand, in his *Pañcikā*, confirms the reading of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* by using the same words in Pali: *vidhiggahaṇañāyena tadantaggahaṇam*. Here it is interesting to note that Saṅgharakkhita in his *Ṭīkā* reproduces the reading of the *Pañcikā*, but explains the said *nyāya* exactly as Ānandadatta does in his *Paddhati*. He says:

vidhiggahaṇañāyēnā ti paccayaggahaṇe yasmā so vihito tadādino tadantassa ca gahaṇanti nāyena.

‘As per the maxim concerning the understanding of a grammatical injunction’ means, according to the maxim, namely, whenever there is a mention of a suffix [in a grammatical injunction], it is accepted as a word beginning with that to which the suffix is prescribed and ending with that [very suffix].

This implies that the text of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, which was available to Moggallāna, must have been the same as the one preserved in the Cambridge manuscript. The probable source of Saṅgharakkhita’s comment is, however, unclear for the want of sufficient evidence. It is quite possible that Sāriputta’s *Can-drālamkāra* was Saṅgharakkhita’s direct source of this *Paribhāṣā*. However, this

¹⁸ Dimitrov (2016, 653, n. 130) has attested this *Paribhāṣā* in Puruṣottamadeva’s *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*.

cannot be proved with certainty, since the corresponding part of the *Cāndrālaṃkāra* is not available.

During our joint reading of these two texts, Dimitrov and I strongly felt that just as the *Moggallānapañjikā* can be used to verify readings of the *Cāndravāyākaraṇapañjikā*, the latter text too will be helpful when re-editing the text of the *Moggallānapañjikā* by rectifying the possible corruptions in the text. These corruptions are either of the nature of obvious printing mistakes, or that of faulty readings. In order to give some illustrations let us turn once again to the passage discussed above.

There are two instances of minor corruptions in the corresponding passage of the *Moggallānapañjikā*. In the first instance, the printed Pali text reads *atthagahito* and *atthagahitā*. It is quite obvious that here *ī* is required instead of *i*, and the long vowel has indeed been retained at another place, namely, *saṃgahito*. The parallel Sanskrit text has the correct reading in both places. At another instance, the Pali text has the reading *kaṇḍūyata*. In the corresponding passages of the *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya* and the *Cāndravāyākaraṇapañjikā*, we find the correct form *kaṇḍūyita*. Although once again these are simple cases of correcting the typographical errors, they are sufficient to prove our point.

Besides these two cases of minor corruptions, there is one instance in which the printed text of the *Moggallānapañjikā* indicates a different reading than that of the *Cāndravāyākaraṇapañjikā*. The Sanskrit text reads as follows: *na hi vyāvṛtasya saṃbandhyantareṇāsaṃbaddhasya svāder avasthānam asti*. The corresponding Pali text, on the other hand, says: *na tu vyāvuttassa saṃbandhyantareṇāsaṃbandhassa sādino avatthānam atthi*. The use of the particle *tu* in the Pali portion, which might be a result of misreading, does not make much sense. The *Moggallānapañjikāṭīkā* is of no help in this regard, since Saṅgharakkhita has not commented on this particular sentence. Based on the parallel Sanskrit passage, however, it is possible to emend the Pali text as: *na hi vyāvuttassa saṃbandhyantareṇāsaṃbaddhassa sādino avatthānam atthi*. It is noteworthy that a couple of sentences later we have a similar statement in Pali where the correct reading *na hi* can be found: *na hi avyāvuttānaṃ saṃbandhyantarehi saṃsaggo uppajjate*.

Let us now turn to another interesting and complex textual problem. While explaining the difference between the compounded and un-compounded expressions, the text of the *Cāndravāyākaraṇapañjikā* reads *tenātra vṛttāv ekārthibhāva eva, na vākye vyapekṣābhedaḍilakṣaṇe*. Here the corresponding Pali text differs considerably, for it reads: *tenettha vuttiyaṃ ekatthibhāvo. vākye vyapekkhā bhedaḍilakkhaṇā* ‘Therefore, here, the formation of a single integrated meaning is present in a compounded word-formation. [However,] in an un-compounded

expression, there is mutual expectancy [among word-meanings], which is characterised by a differentiation [of word-meanings], etc.’

Here Ānandadatta’s gloss confirms the reading of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*. He says:

evakāro bhinnakramaḥ. vṛttāv ity asmād anantaraṃ draṣṭavyam. tenāyam artho vṛttāv eva vṛttyartham upakalpitavākya evaikārthibhāvo nānyatra vākya iti. vyapekṣābhedādīlākṣaṇa iti. vyapekṣā parasparaśaṃbandhalakṣaṇaḥ samsargaḥ. bhedo ’nyato vyāvṛtīḥ. ādiśabdāt tad ubhayam padāntarasāṃbandhādīś ca. sa eva lakṣaṇaṃ svabhāvo ’syeti vīgrahaḥ. (Dimitrov 2016, 656)

The word *eva* is misplaced and should be read after the word *vṛttau*. Thus, the meaning is as follows: The formation of a single integrated meaning is present only in a compounded word-formation, that is to say, only in a sentence imagined with respect to a compounded word-formation, [but] not elsewhere in an uncompounded expression. The analysis of the compound *vyapekṣābhedādīlākṣaṇe* is as follows: The mutual expectancy [among word-meanings] means an association [between word-meanings], which is characterised by a mutual relationship. Differentiation means distinguishing from others. The word ‘etc.’ implies these two together [namely, the association and differentiation] as well as the relation with another word, and so on. This is the characteristic, that is to say, the nature of that [uncompounded expression].

On the other hand, Saṅgharakkhita in his *Moggallānapañcikāṭīkā* confirms the reading of the *Moggallānapañcikā*. He says:

evakāro na vākyae tathā ti dīpeti,¹⁹ vākyae kathaṃ ti āha – vākyae ti ādi. vākyae ti vīggahavākyae. ... kāyaṃ byapekkhā ti āha – bhedādīlakkhaṇā ti. ādisaddena saṃsaggabhedasamsaggānaṃ ca gahaṇaṃ. (Moggallānapañcikāṭīkā²⁰ on Moggallānavyākaraṇa 3.1)

The word *eva* indicates that it is not so in an uncompounded expression. [Anticipating the question] ‘How is it with respect to an uncompounded expression?’, [Moggallāna] says: ‘In an uncompounded expression (*vākyae*)’, and so on. ‘In an uncompounded expression’ means in a sentence presenting an analysis of a compound. ... [Anticipating the question] ‘What does this mutual expectancy mean?’, [Moggallāna] says ‘It is characterized by differentiation etc.’ By the word ‘etc.’ association as well as both the differentiation and association together are understood.

¹⁹ It is noteworthy that the word *eva*, which is necessary in this context, is missing from the printed text of the *Moggallānapañcikā*. Based on the reading of the *Ṭīkā*, the text of the *Pañcikā* should be emended as: *tenettha vuttīyaṃ ekatthibhāvo va*.

²⁰ In the online version of the Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana edition, the text is wrongly titled as *Moggallānapañcikā*.

Thus, the above-mentioned testimonia leave no doubt with respect to the readings of both the *Pañjikās*. However, this leads us to the next question, namely, what might have caused the difference between the two texts at this point. Did Moggallāna have a different reading of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* before him or did he modify the text for some reason? Or is the text of the *Moggallānapañcikā* as we have it today somehow corrupt?

As shown above, the difference between the two readings under consideration is observed in the latter half of the sentence. In the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, the said portion begins with negation, namely, *na vākye*. It is followed by the expression *vyapekṣābhedādilaṣaṇe* ('characterized by the mutual expectancy [among word-meanings] as well as differentiation [of word-meanings] etc. '), which Ānandadatta explains as a *bahuvrīhi* compound qualifying *vākye*. In the *Moggallānapañcikā* the negation before *vākye* is missing, and the portion beginning with *vākye* forms an independent sentence describing the nature of an uncompounded expression. Although *na* is missing in the *Moggallānapañcikā*, according to Saṅgharakkhita, *na vākye* is rather implied by the particle *eva* used earlier in the sentence. He further explains *vyapekkhā* and *bhedādilakkhaṇā* as two separate words, where the latter is explained as a *bahuvrīhi* compound qualifying the former. It is very likely that due to the missing *na* in the manuscript of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* used by Moggallāna, he was forced to separate *vyapekkhā* from the rest of the compound and also to convert the locative *bhedādilaṣaṇe* in Sanskrit into a nominative *bhedādilakkhaṇā* in Pali. With respect to this adaptation, one may further ask whether these changes are sensible, and whether Moggallāna's modified text is in agreement with the understanding of this issue in the overall tradition of Sanskrit grammar.

In this regard it is worthwhile to examine other similar passages in the Sanskrit grammatical works. A careful survey of the commentarial literature of the Pāṇinian and the Kātantra systems reveals that Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa* on the *Kāśikāvṛtti* and the *Durgaṭikā* on the *Durgavṛtti* on the *Kātantravyākaraṇa* have a close affinity with our present passage of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*. Before turning to the parallel passages in the *Nyāsa* and the *Durgaṭikā*, let us first examine the text of the *Mahābhāṣya*, which is the primary source of this entire discussion. In the *Mahābhāṣya*, the concerned discussion begins with the definition of *sāmarthya* in the sense of *ekārthībhāva* proposed by Kātyāyana in his *Vārttika*. Here, the text reads as follows:

prthagarthānām ekārthībhāvaḥ samarthavacanam | *prthagarthānām ekārthībhāvaḥ samartham ity ucyate* | *kva punaḥ prthagarthāni kva ekārthāni* | *vākye prthagarthāni* | *rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ iti* | *samāse punar ekārthāni rājapuruṣa iti* | (Joshi 1968, 9, nos 42–44)

Samartha is said to be the formation of a single integrated meaning out of [words having] separate meanings [of their own]. [When] we say *samartha* [it means] formation of a single integrated meaning out of [words having] separate meanings [of their own]. But where [do words] have separate meanings [of their own], [and] where [do they] have a single integrated meaning? In an uncompounded expression [words] have separate meanings [of their own], like in *rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ* ('king's servant'). But in a compound, [words] have a single integrated meaning, like in *rājapurusaḥ* ('royal servant').²¹

This explanation of *sāmarthya* has been accepted by later grammarians of the Paṇinian, the Kātantra, and the Cāndra schools alike.²² Further, in the *Mahābhāṣya*, Patañjali defines *vṛtti* as *parārthābhīdhānaṃ vṛttiḥ*.²³ This definition presupposes the view that the compounded word-formation is derived from its components (*kāryaśabdikapakṣa*).²⁴ He then brings up a discussion on the probable difficulties in accepting either the *jahatsvārthā* or the *ajahatsvārthā* types of *vṛtti*, and possible solutions thereby. He first talks about problems posed by the *jahatsvārthāvṛtti*, and then provides three different solutions to them. The discussion of the first two solutions goes as follows:

yadi jahatsvārthā vṛttiḥ rājapurusaṃ ānāyety ukte puruṣamātrasyānāyanaṃ prāpnoti | aupagavam ānāyety ukte apatyamātrasyeti | ... evaṃ hi dṛśyate loke puruṣo 'yaṃ parakarmaṇi pravartamānaḥ svakarma jahāti | tadyathā | takṣā rājakarmaṇi pravartamānaḥ svaṃ takṣakarma jahāti | evaṃ yuktam tad yad rājā puruṣārthe vartamānaḥ svaṃ arthaṃ jahyāt | upaguṣ cāpatyārthe vartamānaḥ svaṃ arthaṃ jahyāt | nanu cuktam – rājapurusaṃ ānāyety ukte puruṣamātrasyānāyanaṃ prāpnoti | aupagavam ānāyety ukte apatyamātrasyeti | naiṣa doṣaḥ | jahad api asaṃ svārthaṃ nātyantāya jahāti |

21 All the translations of the quoted passages of the *Mahābhāṣya* are based on Joshi (1968) and are modified by me for the sake of consistency with the translation of parallel passages from other grammatical works quoted in this paper. — Based on Joshi 1968, 50–52.

22 Cf. the *Nyāsa* on the *Kāśikā* on A. II.1.1: *ekārthībhāvaś ca pṛthagavasthitānāṃ bhinnārthānāṃ padānāṃ samāse sādharāṇārthatā nāma avasthāviśeṣaḥ |*, and the *Durgatikā* on the *Durgavṛtti* on Kt 2.5.1: *pṛthagarthānāṃ ekārthībhāvaḥ samāso bhavati |*

23 Kaiyaṭa in his *Bhāṣyapradīpa* (p. 328) explains it in the following terms: *parasya śabdasya yo 'rthas tasyābhīdhānaṃ śabdāntareṇa yatra sāvṛttir ity arthaḥ | yathā rājapurusa ity atra rājaśabdena vākyāvasthāyām anuktaḥ puruṣārtho 'bhīdhīyate |* 'Where the meaning of one word (viz. the main member of the compound) is conveyed by another word (viz. the subordinate member), that is compounded word-formation, such is the meaning of the passage. Just as in the word *rājapurusaḥ* ("royal servant") the word *rāja*-conveys the meaning of (the word) *puruṣa*, which is not (so) expressed in the stage of the uncompounded expression.' (Joshi 1968, 75)

24 Cf. Kaiyaṭa's *Bhāṣyapradīpa* (p. 328): *kāryaśabdikā vākyād eva vikalpena vṛttim niṣpādyāṃ manyamānāḥ kiṃ vṛtter lakṣaṇam kurvantīti praśnaḥ ||* 'How do those grammarians, who hold the view that words are to be produced, (i.e. words are not eternal), and who consider the *vṛtti* as something created out of an uncompounded expression, define *vṛtti*? This is the question.' (Joshi 1968, 74)

yah parārthavirodhī svārthas taṃ jahāti | tadyathā | takṣā rājakarmaṇi pravartamānaḥ svam takṣakarma jahāti na tu hikkitahasitakaṇḍūyitādi | na ca ayam arthaḥ parārthavirodhi-viśeṣaṇaṃ nāma | tasmāt tan na hāsyati | athavā anwayād viśeṣaṇaṃ bhavati | tadyathā ... | yathā tarhi mallikāpuṭaś campakapuṭaś ceti | niṣkīrṇāsv api sumanaḥsu anwayād viśeṣaṇaṃ bhavati | ayam mallikāpuṭaḥ, ayam campakapuṭaḥ iti (Joshi 1968, 13–14, nos 75, 78, 80–81, 83)

If [we take the view of] *jahatsvārthā vṛttih*, [then,] when we say *rājapurūṣam ānaya* ('bring the royal servant'), [the result is that] any man might be brought [and,] when we say *aupagavam ānaya* ('bring the offspring of Upagu'), [the result is that] any offspring might be brought. ... For thus we observe in daily life: the man when he takes on a job [assigned to him] by somebody else, abandons his own work. Take an example: a carpenter, when he takes on a job [assigned to him] by a king, abandons his own carpenter's job. In the same way, it is proper that [the word] *rājan* ('king'), when it is used in the sense of *puruṣa* ('servant'), should abandon its own meaning. And [the proper name] *Upagu*, when used in the sense of 'offspring', should abandon its own meaning [too].

But still, was it not pointed out that, when we say *rājapurūṣam ānaya* ('bring the royal servant'), [the result is that] any man might be brought? And when we say *aupagavam ānaya* ('bring the offspring of Upagu') [the result is that] any offspring [might be brought]? No difficulty here. Although this [i.e. the subordinate member] gives up its own meaning, it does not do so entirely. That meaning of its own, which is incompatible with the meaning of the other [word, i.e. the main member] is abandoned. Take an example: a carpenter, when taking on a job [assigned to him] by a king, abandons his own carpenter's job, but he does not stop hiccupping, laughing, and scratching. And this [subordinate] meaning, which, in fact, acts as a qualifier, is not incompatible with the meaning of the other [i.e. main word]. Therefore, it will not abandon that [i.e. its own meaning]. Or rather, it [i.e. *rāja-* in *rājapurūṣa*] will act as a differentiating [word], because of [its] connection [with the following member *puruṣa*]. Take an example ... Then take this example: jasmine- [or] *campaka-* flower wrapped up in leaves. Even when the flowers are scattered from [the wrappers], [still] they act as differentiating, because of their [former] connection [with jasmine- or *campaka-* scent]: 'this is the jasmine- wrapper', 'that is the *campaka-* wrapper'. (Based on Joshi 1968, 74–80)

It can be observed that just as the above-mentioned definition, these solutions have also been accepted by Patañjali's successors in the Kātantra and the Cāndra grammatical schools. While providing the third alternative solution to the problem caused by the acceptance of the *jahatsvārthā vṛtti*, Patañjali says:

athavā samarthādhikāro 'yaṃ vṛttau kriyate | sāmartyaṃ nāma bhedaḥ saṃsargo vā | apara āna – bhedaṃsaṃsargau vā sāmartyam iti | kaḥ punar bhedaḥ saṃsargo vā ? iha rājña ity ukte sarvaṃ svaṃ prasaktam, puruṣa ity ukte sarvaḥ svāmī prasaktaḥ | ihedāniṃ rāja- puruṣam ānayet²⁵ ukte rājā puruṣaṃ nivartayati anyebhyaḥ svāmibhyaḥ, puruṣo 'pi rājānam

25 *rājapurūṣa ity ukte* Kielhorn

anyebhyaḥ svebhyaḥ | evam etasminn ubhayato vyavacchinne yadi svārthaṃ jahāti²⁶ kāmaṃ jahātu, na jātu cid puruṣamātrasyānayanam bhaviṣyati | (Joshi 1968, 14–15, no. 84)

Or rather, this *adhikāra*-rule: *samartha* etc. is framed with regard to compounded word-formation. Semantic connection means [either] differentiation or association. Some other [grammarian] says: semantic connection means both differentiation and association. But what [do you mean by] differentiation or association? When we say *rājñāḥ* ('king's') any [word denoting a] thing owned has a chance to be supplied here [in connection with the word *rājñāḥ*]. When we say *puruṣaḥ* ('servant'), any [word denoting] owner has a chance to be supplied [in connection with the word *puruṣaḥ*]. When we say now: *rājavuruṣam ānaya* ('Bring the royal servant') then, [the word] *rājan* keeps the servant away from other owners [and the word] *puruṣaḥ* on its part, keeps the king away from other things owned. When delimitation is made in this way on both sides, if that [word *rājan*] gives up its own meaning, let it do so. In no case whatsoever will just any servant [without relation to a king] be brought. (Based on Joshi 1968, 80)

It is noteworthy that here Patañjali talks of *sāmarthya* in the context of compound-formation (*vṛtti*). According to him, when *sāmarthya* in the sense of differentiation (*bheda*) and association (*saṃsarga*) is there between the constituents of a compound, then it does not really matter whether such well-defined constituents abandon their meanings or not. Further in the text, Patañjali explains *sāmarthya* in the sense of mutual expectancy among word-meanings (*vyapekṣā*), as follows:

parasparavyapekṣām sāmarthyam eke | parasparavyapekṣām sāmarthyam eke icchanti | kā punaḥ śabdāyor vyapekṣā ? na brūmaḥ śabdāyor iti | kiṃ tarhi | arthayoḥ | iha rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ ity ukte rājā puruṣam apekṣate mamāyam iti puruṣo 'pi rājñam apekṣate aham asyeti | (Joshi 1968, 16, no. 98)

Some [say that] semantic connection [is] mutual expectancy. Some prefer [to take that] semantic connection as mutual expectancy. But what [do you mean by] expectancy between two words? We do not say: 'between two words'. What then? Between two meanings. When we say *rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ* ('king's servant'), [the meaning] *rājan* ('king') expects [the meaning] *puruṣa* ('servant'), saying: 'he (i.e. servant) is mine (i.e. king's)'. [The meaning] *puruṣa* also expects [the meaning] *rājan*, saying: 'I (i.e. servant) am his (i.e. king's)'. (Based on Joshi 1968, 87).

One can easily notice that the material from these last two passages of the *Mahābhāṣya* forms the basis of Ratnamati's discussion of the three-fold *vākyārtha*. In order to understand the transmission of these ideas, and their adaptation in the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, let us now turn to the parallel portions found in

²⁶ *jahāti* Kielhorn | *jahātu* Joshi, which does not make a good sense.

the *Nyāsa*. The *Nyāsa* brings up the said discussion, while explaining the two alternative definitions of *sāmarthya* given in the *Kāśīkāvṛtti*, which reads as follows:

samarthaḥ śaktaḥ. vīgrahavākyārthābhīdhāne yaḥ śaktaḥ sa samartho vedītavyaḥ. athavā samarthapadāśrayatvāt samarthaḥ. samarthānām padānām saṃbaddhārthānām saṃsṛṣṭārthānām vidhīr vedītavyaḥ.

Samartha means able. That which is able to denote the meaning of the hypothetical word-structure at the base of the compounded expression should be known as *samartha*. Alternatively, [a grammatical operation concerning *padas* is called] *samartha*, since [that grammatical operation] depends on the *padas*, which are syntactically connected. [*Samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ*] should be understood to be a grammatical operation involving those *padas*, which are syntactically connected, that is to say, which have related or composite meaning.

Thus, out of the two definitions of the word *samartha*, the first is based on the primary (*mukhya*) or the conventional (*rūḍha*) meaning of the word *samartha*, whereas the second relies on its figurative (*upacarita*) or etymological (*yaugika*) meaning. In the context of the first definition, the *Nyāsa* understands the *vīgrahavākya* as an uncompounded word-structure underlying a compounded word-formation (*vṛttyarthaṃ yad vākyam upādīyate ...*). It further elaborates the three-fold meaning of the *vīgrahavākya* as follows:

sa punar arthaḥ saṃsargaḥ bhedaś ca bhedaṣaṃsargau vā. tatra svaviśeṣasya svāmīviśeṣeṇa svāmīviśeṣasya ca svaviśeṣeṇa yaḥ saṃbandhaḥ sa saṃsarga ākhyāyate. svāntarasya svāmīyantarebhyaḥ svāmīyantarasya svāntarebhyaḥ vyāvṛtīḥ bheda ākhyāyate. tatra saṃsargavādinō mate saṃsarga eva śabdārthaḥ. vyāvṛtīḥ tu arthasaṃgrhītā. na hi avyāvarttyamānayoḥ svasvāmīnoḥ saṃbandhyantarebhyaḥ saṃsarga upapadyate. Bheda-vādinā tu vyāvṛtīr eva padārthaḥ, saṃsargo 'rthasaṃgrhītā, na hi vyāvarttyamānasya saṃbandhyantareṇāsaṃbaddhasya svāmīyāder avasthānam asti. ubhayavādinā tu ubhaya eva śabdārthaḥ. (Vol. II, p. 5)

Further, that meaning [of an uncompounded expression] is association, differentiation or both association and differentiation. Among these, whatever relation is there between a particular servant and a particular master, or between a particular master and a particular servant, that is called an association. The distinction of other servants from other masters, and of other masters from other servants is called differentiation. Here, in the opinion of the proponents of association, association alone is denoted by the word, whereas the distinction [of both a king and a servant from other similar objects] is discerned by reasoning. Because the association [between these objects] cannot take place unless both the owned and the owner are being distinguished from other related objects. On the other hand, for the proponents of differentiation, distinction alone is the meaning of the word, [whereas,] the association [between the two] is discerned by reasoning. Because the words master etc. cannot be so distinguished, if they are unrelated to other related words. For the proponents of both [association and differentiation,] both are denoted by the word.

It may be noted that in the *Nyāsa*, views regarding the *vākyārtha* are discussed in the context of *vigrahavākya*, and are presented in the order: *saṃsarga*, *bheda*, and both. However, it is not the same order that we find in the *Mahābhāṣya* or in the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*. Moreover, the *Nyāsa* passage also differs from the latter in the structure of its presentation of the three views. Jinendrabuddhi further elaborates upon the second definition of *samartha* given in the *Kāśikā* in the following words:

samarthānām ity anena vākye vyapekṣālakṣaṇaṃ sāmartyam āha. tathā hi rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ ity atra vākye rājā puruṣam apekṣate mamāyam iti puruṣo 'pi rājānam apekṣate aham asyeti. saṃsṛṣṭārthānām ity anena samāse padānām ekārthībhāvalakṣaṇaṃ sāmartyam darśayati. (Vol. II, p. 6–7)

By the expression ‘of the syntactically connected [words]’, [the *Vṛttikāra*] denotes the syntactic connection characterised by mutual expectancy among the word-meanings in an un-compounded expression. For instance, when we say *rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ* (‘king’s servant’), [the meaning] *rājan* (‘king’) expects [the meaning] *puruṣa* (‘servant’), saying: ‘he (i.e. servant) is mine (i.e. of the king)’. [The meaning] *puruṣa* also expects [the meaning] *rājan*, saying: ‘I (i.e. servant) am his (i.e. of the king)’. By the expression ‘of the [words] having a composite meaning’, [the *Vṛttikāra*] points out the syntactic connection characterised by the formation of the single integrated meaning of the constituent words in a compound.

Thus, according to the *Nyāsa*, the two secondary meanings of the word *samartha*, namely, *saṃbaddhārtha* and *saṃsṛṣṭārtha* signify mutual relation among word-meanings (*vyapekṣā*) and formation of the single integrated meaning (*ekārthībhāva*) respectively. Out of these two, the former is available in an un-compounded expression, whereas the latter is present in a compound. It is sufficiently clear that the above discussion has a direct impact on our concerned passage in the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*. As shown by Dimitrov (2016: 650–659), Jinendrabuddhi’s *Nyāsa* is the immediate reference point of the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition for Ratnamati. The latter heavily draws upon the *Nyāsa*, and at times even criticizes it. The *Nyāsa* has also been used by Ānandadatta and Saṅgharakkhita in their commentaries.

If we turn to the two sentences before our problematic line in the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, we can clearly see that this portion is Ratnamati’s refutation of the Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ*, and the position of the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa* thereupon. According to Ratnamati, in the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* the word *samartha* is not required to govern the compound-formation, since the expected relation (*saṃbandha*) between the constituent members of a compound can take care of *sāmartya* in the sense of *vyapekṣā*, and the word *ekārtham* (‘single integrated meaning’) in the *Cāndrasūtra* can very well denote the

ekārthībhāvasāmarthya. In the following sentence, Ratnamati concludes this argument by saying that *ekārthībhāva* is there only in *vṛtti*, whereas *vyapekṣā* as well as *bheda* etc. are available in a *vākya*.

Ānandadatta treats this concluding remark of Ratnamati to be a refutation of the first definition of *sāmarthya* mentioned in the *Kāśikā*.²⁷ According to him, by this statement Ratnamati distinguishes *vṛtti* from *vākya*, and since both are distinct entities, the view that a *vākya* turns in to a *samāsa* is rejected.²⁸ Here, Ānandadatta interprets the word *vṛtti* as an imaginary linguistic structure presupposed for the formation of a compound, which is equivalent to *vigrahavākya*.²⁹ He further differentiates this imaginary linguistic structure, which he refers to as a *samāsavākya* (= *vṛttivākya*) from a conventional sentence (*vyavahāravākya*),³⁰ and rejects the view of the *Kāśikā* that a compound has a capacity to denote the meaning of an uncompounded expression. Ānandadatta's interpretation of the word *vṛtti* is unique, and does not agree with its explanation found in the works of Patañjali, Kaiyaṭa, etc. (ref. above). It may be noted that Saṅgharakkhita in his *ṭīkā* attributes the meaning *vigrahavākya* to the word *vākya* instead of *vutti* in a manner similar to that of the *Nyāsa*.

Immediately after the concerned sentence, Ratnamati proceeds to discuss the three views about the meaning of an uncompounded expression (*vākyaṛtha*) in the following order: *bheda*, *saṃsarga*, and both *bheda* and *saṃsarga* together. As indicated above, this particular sequence is certainly contrary to the one proposed by Ānandadatta in his explanation of the compound *vyapekṣābhedaḍilakṣaṇe*. According to his explanation, the word *vyapekṣā* in the compound signifies *saṃsarga* ('association'), with which the list of the three views begins. Thus, according to Ānandadatta in the sequence of these views, *saṃsarga* precedes

²⁷ *vigrahavākyaṛthābhīdhānaśaktīlakṣaṇasya ṛtīyasya sāmarthyasya kā vārtety āha: tena ityādi*. (Dimitrov 2016, 656) 'As for the question "what about the third meaning of the word *sāmarthya*, which is defined as an ability to denote the meaning of the hypothetical word-structure at the base of the compounded expression?" [Ratnamati] says: 'tena ("therefore"), and so on.'

²⁸ *anena vākyaṃ eva samāsībhavatīti pakṣaṃ nirasyati, anayor atyantabhedāt* | (Dimitrov 2016, 656) 'By this [statement,] [Ratnamati] rejects the view that the uncompounded expression itself turns into a compound, because there is an absolute difference between the two.'

²⁹ *yaṃ tūpakalpitam vṛtīyāi vṛttivākyaṃ tad iṣyate | viśeṣagrahahetuvāt vīgraho 'pi nirucyate* || (*Ratnamatīpaddhati* as quoted in Dimitrov 2016, 653) 'Moreover, a linguistic structure underlying a compounded word formation (*vṛttivākya*) is accepted to be that which is imagined for the sake of forming a compounded expression. The same is also explained (etymologically) as *vīgraha* on account of being a cause of special knowledge.'

³⁰ ... *anyad dhi samāsavākyaṃ anyac ca vyavahāravākyaṃ* | (Dimitrov 2016, 654) 'Because a linguistic structure underlying a compound (*samāsavākya*) is different from a conventional sentence (*vyavahāravākya*).'

bheda and both *bheda* and *saṃsarga* together. This is the same sequence, which we find in Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*. Here, Ānandadatta's interpretation of the compound *vyapekṣābhedaḍilakṣaṇe* in general and that of the word *vyapekṣā* in particular seems to have been misled by this very sequence found in the *Nyāsa*. Moggallāna's text, on the other hand, is consistent with the order of the three views as found in Ratnamati's *Pañjikā* and Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*.

It is interesting to note that in the *Durgaṭikā*, the views on *vākyārtha* occur exactly in the same order as that of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* in almost identical words. The text of the *Durgaṭikā* reads:

idam api prakriyājālaṃ. 'rājñah puruṣaḥ' iti vākye rājā svāmyantarād vyavacchidyate puruṣaś ca svāntarād iti bhedaḥ. saṃsargo vātrārthagṛhītaḥ³¹. na hi vyāvṛttasya saṃbandhyantareṇāsambaddhasya svāmyāder avasthānam iti. yadā rājā mamāyam ityapekṣate, puruṣo 'py aham asyeti, tadā saṃsargaḥ vyāvṛttir arthagṛhītā.³²na hi avyāvṛttya-mānayoḥ saṃbandhyantarebhyaḥ saṃsarga iti. yadā tūbhayam api prādhānyenocyate, tadobhayaḥbhedasaṃsargo vākyārtha iti | idaṃ darśanam āśrityāha - abhidhānāt kvacid vikalpa ityādi. (Durgaṭikā on Kt II.5.1, Dwivedi II.2, p. 257)

In the *Durgaṭikā*, one finds a discussion only of the first two solutions to the problems arising from accepting the *jahatsvārthā vṛtti* on the lines of the *Mahābhāṣya*. Thereafter, it deals with the problem of the *ajahatsvārthā vṛtti*, and then proceeds with the above-cited explanation of the three positions on the meaning of an un-compounded expression (*vākya*). However, it is not clear as to why here this position is singled out from the other two positions regarding the *jahatsvārthā vṛtti*. It is interesting that the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* also singles out the explanation about the three views on *vākyārtha* from the rest of the discussion about the *jahatsvārthā vṛtti*, and uses it to describe the nature of *vākya*. Although we do not know much about the exact chronology of the *Durgaṭikā* and the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, their relationship is beyond doubt.

Scholars like Haldar, Keith, and Dwivedi believed that the *Durgaṭikā* was also written by the same Durgasiṃha who composed the *Vṛtti* on the *Kātantrasūtras*. However, Yudhiṣṭhir Mīmāṃsak in his *Saṃskṛt vyākaraṇaśāstra kā itihās* argued against these scholars. In the *ṭikā* on the opening verse of the *Durgavṛtti*, the Ṭikākāra refers to the *Vṛttikāra* as *bhagavān*.³³ On this basis, Mīmāṃsak estab-

31 *vātrārthagṛhītaḥ* em.] *vātrānugṛhītaḥ* Dwivedi II.2, p. 257

32 *saṃsargaḥ, vyāvṛttir arthagṛhītā* em.] *saṃsargavyāvṛttir anugṛhītā* Dwivedi II.2, p. 257

33 *tatra śāstraprastāvād vācanika eva namaskāro nyāyā iti bhagavān vṛttikāraḥ ślokaṃ ekam kṛtavān - 'devadevam' ityādi* | (Kt. vol. 1, p. 1)

lished that the author of the *Durgavṛtti* and that of the *Durgaṭikā* are different persons. Based on a reference to Śrutapāla, a commentator of the *Dhātupāṭha* composed by Devanandin and a citation from the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* found in the *Durgaṭikā*, Mīmāṃsak proposed the 9th century CE as a probable date of its author (1994: I.653–654). D. G. Koparkar (1952: Intro. p. ix) in the introduction to Durgasiṃha's *Liṅgānuśāsana* also considered the author of the *Durgavṛtti* and that of the *Ṭikā* as two different persons and assigned to the latter a date between 700 and 950 CE. He fixed this lower limit for the *Ṭikā* on the basis of Ugrabhūti's (about 1000 CE.) *Śiṣyahitānyāsa*, which is a commentary on the *Durgaṭikā*. According to Koparkar, Alberūni in 1030 CE. knew Ugrabhūti's commentary by the name *Śiṣyahitāvṛtti*.

Besides the passage cited above, there are other parallel passages, which not only speak in favour of the relationship between the *Durgaṭikā* and the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇapañjikā*, but also suggest the posteriority of the former to the latter. I shall now cite two parallel passages from the *Durgaṭikā* in support of this assumption. The first such passage occurs, when, while explaining the aphorism *nāmnām samāso yuktārthaḥ* (Kt 2.5.1), the ṭikākāra interprets the word *yuktārtha* as signifying the *vyapekṣā* type of syntactic relation. According to him, in this sense, the word *yuktārtha* is redundant, since the said meaning can be indicated well enough by the expected relation between the constituent members of a compound. The *Durgaṭikā* reads:

athavā nāmnām samāsaḥ saṃkṣepo bhavati | yuktārtha iha saṃbandhārtho viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvalakṣaṇa ucyate | yukto 'rtho yeṣāṃ padānām tāni yuktārthāni | yuktārthāśrayatvād yuktārthaḥ samāsa ucyate | tadā tu yuktārthagrahaṇam sukhārtham eva |

yasmāt sāmānyoktāv api yasya yena saṃbandhas tasya tena saha samāso bhavatīty arthād evāvāsīyate | yathā mātari pravartitavyam, pītari śuśrūṣitavyam | na cocyate svasyām svasminn iti | yasya yā mātā yasya yaḥ pītetī gamyate | tathehāpīti | (Durgaṭikā on Kt 2.5.1, Dwivedi II.2, p. 255)

As mentioned above, the first two solutions to the problem arising from the acceptance of the *jahatsvārthā vṛtti* are discussed in the *Durgaṭikā* on the line of the *Mahābhāṣya*. However, the affinity of this portion with the one in the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇapañjikā* is indeed worth noting. The text of the *Durgaṭikā* reads:

parārthābhīdhānam vṛttir iti | parasyānātmīyasyārthasya yad upasarjanapadenābhīdhānam sā vṛttir ity arthaḥ | tatra parārthābhīdhāne kalpanāmātrakṛtānām upasarjanapadānām svārthatyāgena jahatsvārthavṛttir bhavati prakriyāvāde | yathā takṣā rājākarmaṇi pravartamānaḥ svaṃ takṣakarma rājākarmavirodhi jahāti na tu viśeṣaṇam | athavā anvayād rājavīśiṣṭasya grahaṇam | yathā campakapuṭo mallikāpuṭa iti niṣṭhyūteṣv api

*nistr̥ṭṣeṣv api*³⁴ *puṣpeṣv anvyād viśeṣaṇaṃ bhavatīti* | *tena rājavīśiṣṭasyānayaṇaṃ na tu puruṣamātrasya* | (*Durḡaṭikā* on Kt 2.5.1, Dwivedi II.2, p. 256)

Thus, the three passages in the two texts cited above exhibit striking similarities. In Ratnamati's *Pañjikā*, these portions occur as parts of systematically formulated arguments and hence appear to be organic elements of the text. However, the passages in the *Durḡaṭikā* seem to be sporadic, and often give an impression of being borrowed from some other sources, and somehow put together to suit the context. For instance, in the *Durḡaṭikā* the three views about *vākyārtha* are presented without their proper context. Ratnamati uses the argument '*sāmānyoktāv api*, and so on' to justify the lack of use of the word *samartha* to signify *vyapekṣā* in the *Cāndrasūtra*. However, in the *Durḡaṭikā* it is put forth simply to indicate futility of the word *yuktārtha* in an alternative explanation of the *Kātantrasūtra*. Furthermore, just as Patañjali, Ratnamati first presents the difficulty in accepting the *jahatsvārthā vṛtti*, and then offers its solution. But, in the *Durḡaṭikā*, these solutions are provided without mentioning the problem. Moreover, in this commentary, one can witness a conscious attempt to alter the original text, either by abridging it or by replacing its vocabulary with different words. For example, in the third passage cited above, the sentence from the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, namely, *tad yathā: takṣā rājakarmaṇi pravartamānaḥ svaṃ takṣakarma rājakarmavirodhi jahāti, nāviruddhaṃ hasitakaṇḍūyitādi* is abridged as *yathā takṣā rājakarmaṇi pravartamānaḥ svaṃ takṣakarma rājakarmavirodhi jahāti na tu viśeṣaṇam*. Similarly, words from the *Pañjikā*, namely, *bhedakaḥ* and *sumanaḥsu* are replaced with *vyavacchidyate* and *puṣpeṣu*. Finally, the phrase *iti darśanam āśrityāha*, which occurs at the end of the afore-mentioned first passage of the *Durḡaṭikā*, is a clear testimony to the fact that here the Ṭikākāra is quoting an opinion of some former authority. Although, the first known occurrence of the three views regarding *vākyārtha* can be traced back to the *Mahābhāṣya* and then its more systematic formulation in the *Nyāsa*, the exact wording of their presentation matches with Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*. On the basis of this evidence it is justified to believe that the author of the *Durḡaṭikā* has borrowed these passages from the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* with some deliberate modifications, unless the manuscript of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* available to the Ṭikākāra read slightly differently from the Cambridge manuscript. There is also a possibility that some corruptions have occurred later in the transmission of the *Durḡaṭikā* resulting in minor deviations. Since Ratnamati flourished in the 10th

34 The use of these two synonymic expressions is puzzling. The editor does not make it clear whether one of them is a variant.

century CE (cf. Dimitrov 2016, 745), it would be safe to place the anonymous author of the *Durgaṭikā* in the eleventh century or later.

I shall conclude the present discussion by pointing out that in the problematic sentence under discussion, Moggallāna in all probability had a faulty reading of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, which he wisely emended to suit the context in the light of the entire tradition of the Sanskrit grammar. Although both Ānandadatta and Saṅgharakkhita do not agree with each other in their own explanations, there is no doubt that Moggallāna has maintained the spirit of Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* in his own work. Thus, the above discussion makes it clear that the parallel study of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* and the *Moggallānapañcikā* is not only useful, but is rather mandatory for ensuring more reliable results.

Besides its importance for text-critical purposes, a comparative study of such passages is also interesting from the point of view of the transmission and reception of ideas. Śrī Rāhula in his *Buddhippasādinī* mentions a number of grammatical works that Moggallāna either studied or memorized. These works include, apart from the Pali grammatical treatises in the Kaccāyana tradition, the texts belonging to the Pāṇinian, the Cāndra, and the Kātantra schools along with the grammars of Āpiśali and Śākaṭāyana.³⁵ How far Moggallāna used these grammatical works as his source material and how he adopted, modified or rejected the grammatical ideologies from these texts could be known only through a serious comparative study of Moggallāna's grammar and these works. For instance, the passages under consideration reveal that Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* was the exact source of Moggallāna's discussion, and that he has adopted the Cāndra ideology without alteration. Furthermore, Moggallāna's adherence to the Cāndra tradition can, in turn, be looked upon as one of the many instances of his rupture from the Kaccāyana school. This ideological shift in Moggallāna's grammar can be explained as follows:

Pāṇini's metarule (*paribhāṣā*) *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ* (A. 2.1.1) states that a grammatical operation concerning a *pada* takes effect only when there is a semantic and syntactic coherence and compatibility in the meaning (*samarthaḥ*).³⁶ It regulates grammatical operations such as compounding, formations of secondary derivatives etc. Patañjali has discussed this *paribhāṣā* in detail in the *Samarthāhnikā* section of his *Mahābhāṣya*. According to him, *sāmarthya*, that is to say, semantic and syntactic coherence or compatibility of meaning is a precondition

35 *Padasādhanatīkā* 1908, 6, 13–14 as quoted in Gornall 2013, 53, n. 109.

36 This is my own modified translation of the rule based on Katre 1987.

for compounding. Patañjali emphasizes the inevitable role of this *paribhāṣā* in regulating the compound formation.

As shown above, the Cāndra grammatical school argues that if the rule defining the compound formation is modified as *sup supaikārtham*, one can do away with this *paribhāṣā*, since the word *ekārtham* captures the sense of the word *sāmarthya* in an appropriate manner. The said idea, which is implicit in the *Cāndrasūtra* and in the *Vṛtti* thereupon, is made explicit in the *Cāndravāyākaraṇapañjikā* and the *Ratnamatipaddhati*. The Cāndra grammarians hold that since the compounded and un-compounded expressions are principally two distinct entities, the view that the un-compounded expression is transferred into a compound is untenable.³⁷ According to this school, only *sāmarthya* in the sense of the formation of a single integrated meaning (*ekārthibhāva*) is relevant to compounding, but not the one in the sense of mutual expectancy among word-meanings (*vyapekṣā*), and since *sāmarthya* in the sense of the formation of a single integrated meaning is already denoted by the word *ekārtham*, the meta-rule *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ* is not necessary to regulate the compound-formation.

In this particular case, Moggallāna incorporates the entire discussion available in the Cāndra tradition in his *Sutta*, *Vutti*, and *Pañcikā*. Although he has not contributed anything new to the ideological standpoint of the Cāndra school, his non-acceptance of the position of the *Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa* and, through it, of the *Kātantra* certainly marks an ideological shift in the context of the Pali grammatical tradition. The position of the Kaccāyana and the Kātantra schools can be elucidated as follows: as is well-known, Kaccāyana's *Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa*, which is modeled after the Sanskrit grammar *Kātantra*, is the earliest available text on Pali grammar composed in the 6th or the 7th century. The *Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa* and the *Vutti* explain the compound formation on the same lines as that of the *Kātantra* and the *Durgavṛtti*. Kaccāyana defines a compound as:

nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho. (318)

³⁷ Cf. the following verses quoted in the *Ratnamatipaddhati*: *padāntareṇa sambandho vyavadhānaṃ viparyayaḥ | samkhyā vyaktiś cayogaś ca vākye syān naiva vṛttiṣu || ata evānayoḥ bhedāt saṃsargādyaṛthabhedataḥ | vākyam eva samāsīsyād ity ayuktam pracakṣate ||* (Dimitrov 2016, 653) 'Relation with another word [outside the compound], intervention [of another word], change in the sequence [of words], [comprehension of specific] number, clear manifestation [of meaning], and the use of the particle ca are possible in an un-compounded expression, but never in those that are compounded. Therefore, since there is a difference between the two on the basis of a difference in the meanings such as association etc., [the view that] an un-compounded expression turns into a compound is declared to be unreasonable.'

A conjoined meaning of nouns is called a compound (*samāsa*).

The *Vutti* explains it in the following words:

tesaṃ nāmānaṃ payujjamānapadatthānaṃ yo yuttattho so samāsasañño hoti.

A conjoined meaning of those nouns, that is to say, the word meanings that are being used, is called a compound (*samāsa*).

Cf. *Kātantra* (2.5.1): *nāmnāṃ samāso yuktārthaḥ*.

Durgasiṃha, in his *Vṛtti*, explains the said aphorism as follows:

vastuvācīni nāmāni, militaṃ yuktam ucyate. nāmnāṃ yuktārthaḥ samāsasaṃjñō bhavati.

Nouns are the words that denote a thing. The word ‘conjoined’ (*yukta*) means ‘combined’. The conjoined meaning of nouns [denoting things] is designated as ‘compound’.

The *Kātantra* school favours the *nityapakṣa*, that is to say, the position that words are eternal and not created (*kārya*) by a speaker.³⁸ According to this position, a compound is an ever-existing indivisible word and not something that is created by combining constituent words. In other words, a compound word like *rāja-puruṣaḥ* and its parallel uncompounded expression, namely, *rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ* are two independent entities. According to the Pāṇinian position expressed in the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, the compound primarily appears to be *kārya*, that is to say, it is formed by putting together the constituent words.

It is Bhartṛhari, who in his *Vākyapadīya*, explicitly advances the *nityapakṣa* in the context of compound. He says:

*abudhān praty upāyās ca vicitrāḥ pratipattaye |
śabdāntaratvād atyantabhedo vākyasamāsayoḥ || (3.14.50)*

Many methods are adopted in order to make the ignorant understand. Being different sets of words, the sentence and the compound are quite different from each other. (Iyer 1969, 148)

*upāyamātraṃ nānātvaṃ samūhas tv eka eva saḥ |vikalpābhyuccayābhyāṃ vā bhedasamśar-
gakaḥ || (3.14.97)*

The splitting-up is only a means, the compound is one whole. Difference and connection can be understood either as alternatives or together. (Iyer 1969, 170)

³⁸ Cf. Trilocanadāsa’s *Kātantravṛttipañjikā* and Suṣeṇaśarman’s *Kalāpacandra* on *Kātantra* 2.5.1.

*vṛttiṃ vartayatām evam abudhapratipattaye |
bhinnāḥ sambodhanopāyāḥ puruṣeṣv anavasthitāḥ ||* (3.14.98)

Those who explain complex formations in order to instruct the ignorant adopt different and variable methods of explanations. (Iyer 1969, 171)

This position of Bhartṛhari has been accepted by both the Kātantra as well as the Cāndra schools. The above-mentioned verses from the *Vākyapadīya* are quoted in the *Durḡaṭikā* on *Kātantra* 2.5.1 in support of the *nityapakṣa* (Dwivedi II.2, p. 255). Thus, as per the primary position of the *Kātantra* school, the rule *nāmnām samāso yuktārthaḥ* is a *saṃjñā-sūtra*, which simply describes the nature of a compound word and does not teach its formation.³⁹ Hence, the school does not require the meta-rule *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ* like the Pāṇinians. However, according to the *Durgavṛtti*, as an alternative explanation, it is possible to say that the term *samāsa* in the said *sūtra* implies its formation even in this grammar. While commenting on it, the *Durḡaṭikā* maintains that this alternative favours the view that an uncompounded expression turns into a compound.

Moggallāna distances himself from both the ideological positions, namely, that of the Pāṇinians and of the Kātantra school by incorporating the ideas from the Cāndra system, particularly from Ratnamati's *Cāndravāyākaraṇapañjikā*. By taking such a stand, he suggests his departure from the Kaccāyana school, and his adherence to a new grammatical ideology.

Apart from this, the value of a comparison of the *Moggallānavāyākaraṇa* with the Cāndra grammatical works could even be judged from its utility in understanding the methodology adopted by Moggallāna for translating the scholastic Sanskrit parlance into Pali. As shown by Gornall (2013, 90), such adaptations of the Sanskrit material could give us much deeper insights into the processes of familiarization with a foreign literature by restructuring its strangeness in order to establish a dialogue between the two different traditions. I will now analyse the above two passages in order to highlight the peculiarities of Moggallāna's Pali rendering of the Sanskrit text.

The passage from the *Moggallānapañcikā* quoted above is, to use Dimitrov's words (2016, 622), 'nothing less than a very precise translation' of the *Cāndravāyākaraṇapañjikā* with some modifications wherever necessary. The first major modification is seen in the non-use of abbreviated terms (*pratyāhāras*). Like Pāṇini, Candragomin makes use of *pratyāhāras* in his grammar. In this particular instance, there is the *pratyāhāra sup*, which denotes all the nominal case endings. Unlike Candragomin, Moggallāna avoids the use of *pratyāhāras*. In this

³⁹ Cf. the *Durḡaṭikā* on *Kātantra* 2.5.1.

case, he follows his predecessor Kaccāyana and uses the term *syādi* to represent all the nominal endings. Thus, Ratnamati's comment on the *Cāndravṛtti* begins with the explanation of the *pratyāhāra sup*, whereas Moggallāna starts his *Pañcikā* with the elaboration of the word *syādi*:

si ādi yassa so syādi – si yo aṃ yo nā hi sa naṃ smā hi sa naṃ smiṃ su ti idaṃ vidhigahaṇāñāyena tadantaggahaṇam icc āha: syādyantam iccādi.

Syādi means the set of nominal case endings, which begins with *si*, that is to say, *si, yo, aṃ, yo, nā, hi, sa, naṃ, smā, hi, sa, naṃ, smiṃ, and su.*

The second type of modification can be observed in Moggallāna's Pali rendering of Sanskrit vocabulary. He occasionally replaces unfamiliar Sanskrit expressions by relatively better known Pali words, for example, *nāśritam* is replaced by *na kataṃ*, *śrīyamāñyāṃ* is replaced by *upādiyamānāyaṃ*, *iṣyate* by *abhimata-*, and *sumana* by *kusuma*.

Similarly, when the compounded Sanskrit form could not be rendered conveniently in Pali, Moggallāna prefers to use an uncompounded expression, for example, the compound *sāmānyoktau* is rendered into Pali as *sāmaññena vutte*. Barring these few cases, Moggallāna generally sticks to the hardcore technical terminology of the Sanskrit grammar and uses mere Pali versions of the same, for example, *ekārthībhāva* is rendered as *ekatthībhāva*, *vyapekṣā* as *vyapekkhā*, and *samsarga* as *samsagga*. At places, Moggallāna's Pali rendering, although close to the Sanskrit, hints at a different underlying form. For example, *upapadyate* (*upa + pad*) is rendered as *uppajjate* (*u = ut + pad*), which, in spite of being a synonym, differs in its derivation.

Sometimes Moggallāna is not consistent in his Pali rendering of the Sanskrit. Three instances may be cited in this connection:

- 1) The word *prthagartha* occurs once in the *Cāndravṛtti* and twice in the corresponding passage of the *Pañjikā*. Moggallāna in his *Vutti* renders it as *bhinnattha*. However, in the *Pañcikā*, the word *prthagartha* has been translated as *putthagattha*. Out of the two occurrences of *putthagattha*, on the second occasion it is paraphrased as *bhinnattha* on the line of the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*. It is puzzling, since Moggallāna has in fact used the word *bhinnattha* in the *Vutti*, which he is expected to paraphrase in the *Pañcikā*. It seems that Moggallāna's use of *bhinnattha* in the *Vutti* instead of *putthagattha* is inspired by a similar usage found in Buddhapiya's *Rūpasiddhi*:

etena saṅgatathena yuttatthavacanena bhinnatthānaṃ ekatthabhāvo samāsa-lakkhaṇan ti vuttaṃ hoti. (Rūpasiddhi as quoted by Tiwari and Sharma 1989, 150)

This expression *yuttattha*- ('conjoined meaning') in the sense of coherent meaning implies that a formation of a single integrated meaning out of the [words having] separate meanings [of their own] is the characteristic of a compound.

This refers back to the *Vārttika* quoted in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* mentioned above:

prthagarthānām ekārthibhāvaḥ samarthavacanam |

However, the more direct source of Buddhapiya's explanation seems to be either our current passage of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā* or its parallel found in the *Durgaṭikā*:

prthagarthānām ekārthibhāvaḥ samāso bhavati pūrvottarapadayor arthasya saṃsṛṣṭarūpasya pratīteḥ |

The compound is a formation of a single integrated meaning out of the [words having] separate meanings [of their own], since one observes [from it] a united form of meaning out of [the two, namely,] initial and final words.

- 2) Similarly, there is no consistency in the usage of the verbal form *hoti*. Although in the *Vutti*, we find the use of *hoti* as a usual parallel form for Sanskrit *bhavati* used in the *Cāndravṛtti*, in the *Pañcikā* Moggallāna uses *bhavati* in the expression *sāmaññena vutte pi ... tena saha tad ekatthaṃ bhavatīti ...* exactly in the same manner as that of the *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā*.
- 3) The third inconsistency is found in Moggallāna's Pali rendering of the Sanskrit word *takṣan* in the sentence *takṣā rājakarmaṇi...* Here it is rendered in Pali as *ṭhapati*, which Saṅgharakkhita glosses as *vaḍḍhakī* 'a carpenter'. Surprisingly, later in the same sentence, Moggallāna retains the word *taccha-* in *tacchakammaṃ*, which, otherwise, could have been easily translated into Pali as *ṭhapatikammaṃ*.

Another peculiarity of Moggallāna's translation is his free use of Sanskritisms, that is to say, forms that are akin to Sanskrit. Examples of such Sanskritisms in our passage are *vyavahārattho* and *anvākyānāya*. A comparison of the current passages from the *Moggallānavutti* and the *Pañcikā* shows that the tendency to use Sanskritisms is greater in the latter than in the former. Moreover, given the

fact that both works are composed by the same author, one does not find deliberate efforts to standardise the Pali vocabulary for rendering the Sanskrit equivalents. One more instance of Moggallāna's use of peculiar Pali expressions is the rendering of *niṣkrāntāsv api sumanaḥsu* by *niṭṭhitesu pi kusumesu*. Here, it is clear that *niṭṭhita* is in no way parallel to *niṣkrānta*. Furthermore, Moggallāna has rendered *sumana* into equally less familiar *kusuma* instead of the more known *puppha*. It is interesting to know that the parallel expression in the *Mahābhāṣya* reads *niṣkīrṇāsv api sumanaḥsu*, whereas in the *Durgaṭikā* it reads *niṣṭhyūteṣv api nistṛteṣv api puṣpeṣu*. It is difficult to point out with any certainty the exact motivation behind Moggallāna's peculiar Pali rendering of the concerned Sanskrit phrase. These observations are mere glimpses into Moggallāna's project of introducing scholarly material available in Sanskrit to his Sinhalese audience in Pali. A further comparison between Moggallāna's grammatical works and the treatises in the Cāndra grammatical tradition can provide us substantial data to understand more precisely Moggallāna's methodology of translating Sanskrit material into Pali.

The above discussion illustrates in unambiguous terms the role of the *Cāndravākyakaraṇapañjikā* as an important tool to study the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*. I fully agree with Dimitrov's suggestion (2016, 622) that 'due to its specific dependency, Moggallāna's work should be studied along with Ratna's original which will certainly prove helpful, not least when preparing a new critical edition of the Pali text.' Apart from facilitating critical editions of both the texts, a comparative study of these works can prove important from the point of knowing the exact relation of Moggallāna's grammar to the Cāndra tradition in terms of transmission of grammatical ideas and methodology. Moreover, such a study can provide valuable information on the technique used by Pali scholars to translate and adapt śāstric literature in Sanskrit, and can thereby improve our understanding of larger issues concerning the new era of the Pali literature based on the Sanskritic models.

References

Primary sources

- Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini in Roman Transliteration*. By Sumitra M. Katre. University of Texas Press, Austin, 1987.
- Bharṭṛharis Vākyapadiya*. von Wilhelm Rau. Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden. 1977.
- Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa. Die Grammatik des Candragomin. Sūtra, Uṇādi, Dhātupāṭha*. Herausgegeben von Bruno Liebich. Leipzig 1902. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. XI. Band, No. 4.)
- Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Tipiṭaka 4.0 [digital edition]. See www.tipitaka.org/cst4.
- Liṅgānuśāsana of Durgasimha*, Edited by D. G. Koparkar. Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute, Poona, 1952.
- Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti*. Edited by Ole Holten Pind. The Pali Text Society, Bristol 2013.
- Kaccāyana Vyākaraṇa*. Critically Edited, Translated and Annotated with Notes & Indices by Lakshmi Narayana Tiwari and Birbal Sharma. Tara Book Agency. Varanasi. 1959.
- The Kasika Vivarana Panjika (The Nyāsa). A Commentary on Vamana-Jayaditya's Kasika by Jinendra Buddha*. Edited with Introduction and Occasional Notes by Srish Chandra Chakravarti. Rajshahi 1913-25.
- Kātantravyākaraṇa of Ācārya Śarvavarmā, [Part-Two] [Volume-2] with four Commentaries 'Vṛtti' and 'Ṭīkā' By Śrī Durga Singh, 'Kātantravṛttipañjikā' by Śrī Trilocanadāsa, 'Kalāpacandra' by Kavirāja Suṣeṇaśarmā. Edited by Jānakīprasāda Dwivedī. Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi 1999.
- Moggallāna Pañcikā with Sutta Vutti by the Venerable Moggallāna Mahā Sāmi*. Revised and edited by Sri Dharmānanda Nāyaka Sthavira. Wirahena 1931.
- Moggallān pañcikā aphvaṇ Sāratthavilāsini maññ so Moggallān pañcikā ṭīkā* kui Abhayārāma charā tō Arhañ Aggadhammābhivaṃsa mahāther mrat cī rañ saññ. Pāḷi charā Charā Taṇ, Charā Pu, Kui Kyō Nñvaṇ tuḷ krīḥ krap prañ chañ saññ. Rankun 1955.
- Moggallānavyākaraṇaṃ vuttisametam ācariyena mahāveyyākaraṇena Moggallānattherena racitaṃ*. H. Devamitta. Lañkābhinava Vissuta Printing Press, Colombo 1890/2434.
- The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Volume I. Government Central Book Depot. Bombay 1892. (Second edition revised).

Secondary sources

- Deokar, Lata Mahesh (2014), *Subhūticandra's Kavikāmadhenu on Amarakośa 1.1.1-1.4.8*: Together with Si tu Paṇ chen's Tibetan Translation, Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Deokar, Mahesh A (2008), *Technical Terms and Techniques of the Pali and Sanskrit Grammars*, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, Varanasi.
- Deokar, Mahesh A (2009), 'The Treatment of Compounds in the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa vis-à-vis Cāndravākaraṇa*', in Satyaprakāśa Śarmā(ed.), *Ocean of Buddhist Wisdom*, Vol. 4, Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation.

- Dimitrov, Dragomir (2016), *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind*. On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati. A Philological Chronicle (*Phullalocanavaṃsa*). Napoli (Università degli studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", Dipartimento Asia Africa e Mediterraneo, Series Minor, LXXXII).
- Franke, R. Otto (1903), 'Moggallāna's Saddalakkhaṇa und das Cāndra-vyākaraṇa', in *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1902–1903. London, 70–95.
- Gornall, Alastair (2013), *Buddhism and Grammar: The Scholarly Cultivation of Pāli in Medieval Laṅkā*, An unpublished Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the University of Cambridge.
- Iyer, K. A. Subramania (1969), *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari*. Chapter III, part 2. English Translation with Exegetical Notes. Poona: Deccan College.
- Joshi, S[hivaram] D[attatray] (1968), *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Samarthāhnikā (P. 2.1.1)*. with Translation and Explanatory Notes. Poona: University of Poona. (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 3).
- Oberlies, Thomas (1989), *Studie zum Cāndravākaraṇa. Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV.4.52-148 und V.2*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Oberlies, Thomas (1996), 'Das zeitliche und ideengeschichtliche Verhältnis der Cāndra-Vṛtti zu anderen V(ai)yākaraṇas (Studien zum Cāndravākaraṇa III)', in *Festschrift Paul Thieme, Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, 20, 265–317.
- Pannasara, Dehigaspē (1958), Sanskrit Literature Extant Among the Sinhalese and the Influence of Sanskrit on Sinhalese (Ph.D. thesis). Colombo.
- Vergiani, Vincenzo (2009), 'A Quotation from the Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartṛhari in the Pratyāhāra Section of the Kāśīkāvṛtti', in Pascale Haag and Vincenzo Vergiani (eds), *Studies in the Kāśīkāvṛtti. The Section on Pratyāhāras: Critical Edition, Translation and Other Contributions*, Firenze: Società Editrice Fiorentina.