

PĀNINI AND KĀTYĀYANA ON SECOND CASE-ENDING:
AN APPROACH TO THE KĀRAKA-THEORY

Kārakas are nothing but the relation of words in a sentence. These relations of words are analysed in the form of parts of speech. But apart from these parts of speech, noun has some characteristic features. A noun is generally characterised by number, gender, cases, and case-terminations. Cases are normally regarded as eight in number including of course, genitive and vocative, though these two are not regarded by Indian grammarians as *kāraka*. In western grammars nominative is the real case and other than nominative all are oblique cases, and in oblique cases all other cases, except the nominative are included, and therefore both genitive and vocative are cases according to western grammarians. The Indian grammarians do not consider genitive and vocative as cases because there is no direct connection of verb with these two cases. That is why, the word *sambandha* is used in case of sixth case-ending. However, in the Indian and western grammar case-endings are generally used to denote cases in the wider sense of the term. Thus following the western and Indian tradition as well as the latest principles of linguistics, we consider nominative, accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, genitive and locative as cases and to these vocative could be added to maintain the parity of the eight case-endings in linguistics.

It is generally believed that each case-ending has a distinctive meaning which is not expressed by other case-endings. The case-

endings are normally added to indicate the meaning of a sentence and to establish the relationship of one word with the other. The case-endings are added in order to denote (1) case-relations (*kāraka*), (2) special meaning as indicated by some cases where some words are used to find out that meaning, and (3) some case-endings are added by the use of some words like *vinā*, *antarā* etc. On the whole, the relationship of noun in a sentence as expressed by case-endings can be discussed probably under these heads.

It is a fact worth-noting that in ancient times the grammarians who discuss the relationship of words in a sentence are Pāṇini and his followers. Incidentally it may be mentioned that the earliest Greek grammarian Dionysius Thrax (2nd Cen. B.C.) and Roman grammarian Marcus Terentius Varro (born in 116 B.C.) did not discuss the problem on the case-relations of words as it was done by Pāṇini. So we are grateful to Pāṇini for giving us a detailed description of cases (*kāraḥ*). In fact, these discussions of *kāraka* by Pāṇini are still the basis of analysing *kāraḥ* in a grammar book. His theory of *kāraka* can not only be applicable to Sanskrit and Indian languages, but also to other European languages as well particularly belonging to the Indo-European group. But a closer analysis of the Sanskrit language beginning from the Vedic down to the classical period, say, Kālidāsa and others, will show that some of the usages of *kāraḥ* are not always in accordance with the *sūtras* of Pāṇini. It is true that Pāṇini has vast literature in front of him, before he has formulated his *sūtras* and his experience must be based on literature prevalent at his time, but there is no denying the fact that some of his *sūtras* may reflect only the dialects of Sanskrit or the type of spoken Sanskrit with which Pāṇini was familiar, and that is why, some of his prescriptions of Sanskrit language cannot prove otherwise. This fact was realised by Kātyāyana who was in the Deccan nearly 200 years after Pāṇini. A gap in time and place might have actuated Kātyāyana to add some of the *sūtras* to the rules of Pāṇini and these are considered as appendix to Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. It is after 150 years of Kātyāyana, Patañjali came, and the land in which he flourished was somewhere in midland. Even Patañjali has noticed by way of explaining the *sūtras* of Pāṇini and Kātyāyana that some of the *sūtras* of Pāṇini are not relevant as far as the then Sanskrit language is concerned. Therefore Patañjali has

not explained all the *sūtras* of Pāṇini and also Kātyāyana as he considers them redundant from the point of view of the then Sanskrit language. This idea of Patañjali indicated that the difference in time and place between Pāṇini-Kātyāyana and Patañjali has changed the language and therefore its usages are not covered by the *sūtras* of Pāṇini. From this we can deduce that the Sanskrit language was never static, but dynamic and this dynamic character of a language indicates that the language was in a spoken form and therefore usages are bound to differ from time and from place to place.

Besides these above points, there are some other factors also to explain the relationship of words in a sentence. It is often seen that what appears to be very clear to Pāṇini was not so at a later time when we analyse the language in a deeper sense. The *sūtras* like “*upānvadhyañvasaḥ*” (1.4.48), “*adhīgarthadayeśāṃ karmaṇī*” (2.3.52) etc. bear the testimony to this fact when they are analysed from the linguistic point of view based on the *sūtras* of Pāṇini.

Lastly, there are some usages which are found to be used when some particular words are in any case-relationship in a sentence. These are *vinā*, *prthak*, *nānā* etc.

Viewed under these inductions I will analyse some of the usages of *karmakāraka*, second case-ending in particular and try to show how these apparent irregularities can be solved on the basis of the *sūtras* of Pāṇini and Kātyāyana. I have taken examples from literatures beginning from the Epic down to the classical times and have given emphasis on the usage rather than on the precept. I have only considered the views of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, because they are the earliest and subsequent Sanskrit grammarians are based on them. Even though, when necessary, I have given the views of other grammarians, provided, they differ from the views as expressed by Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali.

The usages of the second case-ending are regulated by the *sūtras* of Pāṇini and Kātyāyana. Linguistically when analysed the second case-ending has generally four broad meanings – *karma* (desired object), *anīpsita* (not desired), *antarā* (illative) and *vahiryoga* (allative).

Karmakāraka which is the accusative case, is also called the direct object. Accusative case is that, where the wish or action comes to an end. Thus, the main aim of the second case-ending is the termi-

nation of an action, and as all verbs are incapable of this termination they do not take this case-ending too: *anīpsita* also takes the second case-ending because, the verb of this object being different, a sense of termination is expressed in case of that verb, e.g. “*grāmaṃ gacchan tṛṇaṃ sprśati*”. In this case, however, one verb does not take two objects but rather, two different verbs take two different objects.

This terminative is again divided into illative and allative which reveal different meanings. An action having an inward direction is illative and the one having an outward direction is allative or lative.

These linguistic or grammatical ideas have been reflected in the *sūtras* of Pāṇini. In a sense all the usages of accusative are covered by Pāṇini, even though Kātyāyana has added some more *vārttikas* to Pāṇini's *sūtras* on some types of usages which are not perhaps covered by Pāṇini. Herein lies the problem, whether the *vārttikas* of Kātyāyana are formulated on the basis of the usages current at the time of Kātyāyana, or at the time of Pāṇini those usages of Kātyāyana were not prevalent in his locality. How are the *vārttikas* of Kātyāyana to be treated? Should they be considered as additions to the *sūtras* of Pāṇini or should they be treated as necessary, either because of the omission of Pāṇini, or as a development of the language at the time of Kātyāyana? The additions of the *vārttikas* of Kātyāyana to Pāṇini's has posed some problems which are more linguistic than grammatical. These problems are stated below.

I. Regarding *karma* or accusative Pāṇini has three *sūtras* – “*kar-turīpsitatamaṃ karma*” (1.4.49), “*tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam*” (1.4.50), “*akathitañca*” (1.4.51). It may be stated that all that he prescribes regarding *karmakāraka* deals with the transitive verbs. There are some usages which take accusative even with the intransitive verbs, – which according to Kātyāyana cannot be supported by Pāṇini's rules. So in order to support those usages Kātyāyana has made a *vārttika*. Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita has placed it under “*akathitañca*”

Pāṇini: “*akathitañca*” (1.4.51)

Kātyāyana: 1. “*akarmakadhātubhiryoge deśaḥ kālo gantavyo 'dhvā ca karmasamjñaka iti vācyam*”.

II. Regarding the position of a primitive subject in the causative form, Pāṇini has stated that generally the primitive subjects become instrumental in the causative form by the prescription “*karṭṛka-*

raṇayostrīyā” In this case he has mentioned some verbs which can only take accusative instead of instrumental. But even in spite of that there are many usages which do not go on a par with this rule; when accusative is expected we see instrumental and when instrumental expected, accusative is used. This fact gives rise to some problems – which are recorded by Kātyāyana in the form of *vārttikas*.

III. Pāṇini: “*gatibuddhipratyavasānārthaśabdakarmā-karmakāṇāmaṇikartā sa nau*” (1.4.52)

- Kātyāyana: i) “*nīvahyorna*”
 ii) “*niyantrkarṭṛkasya vaheraniṣedhaḥ*”
 iii) “*ādikhādyorna*”
 iv) “*bhakṣerahiṃsārthasya na*”
 v) “*jalpatiprabhṛtīnāmupasamkhyānam*”
 vi) “*dr̥śeśca*”
 vii) “*śabdāyaterna*”.

So also –

Pāṇini: “*hr̥kroranyatarasyām*” (1.4.53)

Kātyāyana: “*abhivādidr̥śorātmanepade veti vācyam*”.

IV. Pāṇini has suggested that *upa-* √*vas* governs accusative as he says “*upānvadhyañvasaḥ*”. But *upa-* √*vas* in sense of fasting does not take accusative and this fact is noted by Kātyāyana by a *vārttika*.

In many cases accusative is used with some particular words, such as, *antarā*, *pr̥thak*, *vinā*, etc. which are mentioned by Pāṇini, but there are cases where accusative is used with *ubhayataḥ*, *sarvataḥ*, *nikaṣā*, *hā* etc. which are not mentioned by Pāṇini. In order to support these usages Kātyāyana has formulated two *vārttikas*.

Pāṇini: “*upānvadhyañvasaḥ*” (1.4.48)

- Kātyāyana: i) “*abhuktyarthasya na*”
 ii) “*ubhasarvatasoḥ kāryā dhiguparyādiṣu triṣu dvitīyāṃreditānteṣu tato 'nyatrāpi dr̥śyate*”
 iii) “*abhitaḥ-paritaḥ-samayā-nikaṣā-hā-pratiyogepi*”

Let us discuss the problems below:

The first *vārttika* is cited with reference to Pāṇini’s “*akathitañca*” (1.4.52). The *sūtra* implies that when a word used along with an object is not intended by any *kāraka* like *apādāna*, *sampradāna* etc. is to be defined as *karmakāraka*. The word *tathāyuktam* from the previous *sūtra* “*tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam*” (1.4.51) is continued here.

What verbs are to be considered as having such types of secondary object along with the original are enlisted by Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita in a *kārikā* –.

“*duhyācpadandrudhipracchicibrūśāsusujimathmuṣām*
karmayuksyādakathitaṃ tathā syānnīhrkṛṣvahām”

The examples given by him are as follows:

“*gām dogdhi payah*” – he milks the cow, “*balim yacate vasudhām*” – he begs the earth of Bali, “*avinītaṃ vinayaṃ yācate*” – he supplicates for tolerance from the intolerant, “*taṇḍulān odanaṃ pacati*” – he cooks the raw-rice into boiled rice, “*gargān śataṃ daṇḍayati*” – he fines the Gargas a hundred pieces money, “*vrajama-varuṇaddhi gām*” – he shuts up the cow-pen, “*māṇavakaṃ panthānaṃ pṛcchati*” – he asks the boy (which is) the road, “*vṛkṣamavacino-ti phalāni*” – he gathers fruits from the tree, “*māṇavakaṃ dharmāṃ brūte śāsti vā*” – he expounds *dharmā* to the boy or teaches him *dharmā*, “*śataṃ jayati devadattam*” he wins hundred from Devadatta, “*sudhām Kṣīranidhim mathnāti*” – he churns out ambrosia from the ocean of milk, “*devadattaṃ śataṃ muṣṇāti*” – he steals a hundred from Devadatta.

“*grāmamajām nayati-harati-karṣati vahati vā*” – he leads the goat to the village.

In the above examples *gām*, *balim* etc. are not coming under any one of the special relations of ablation etc. If any *vivakṣā* of other *kārikas* is indicated the sentences would have been “*gordogdhi payah*”, “*baleryacate vasudhām*”, “*vraje avaruṇaddhi gām*” etc.

When they are not intended by these *kārikas*, they should be defined as *karma*. In this *sūtras* Pāṇini has designated the spheres where a word may be defined as *karma*.

Whatever Pāṇini has uttered about accusative, centres round the transitive verbs obviously. But the point hinted at by Kātyāyana is that as literature displays, intransitive verbs also sometimes govern accusative. We, however, get no such references from Pāṇini on this matter. But there are found many usages of accusative with intransitive verbs which go beyond the prescription of Pāṇini. In order to support those usages Kātyāyana has prescribed *akarmaka* etc.

The *vārttikas* simply means the intransitive verbs govern the accusative case of place, time, condition and length of road to be gone

over. That is, in relation to the intransitive verbs, the nominatives indicating time, place, verbal noun and measurement of path become accusative cases, such as – “*Kurūn svapiti*” – He sleeps in the land of the Kurus; “*māsam āste*” – He stays for a month; “*godoham āste*” – He is engaged in milking cow; “*krośam āste*” – He goes over one *krośa*.

In these examples *kuru*, *māsa* etc. are employed with accusative in relation to the intransitive verbs *svapiti*, *āste* etc. That is, *kuru*, *māsa* should be actually *adhikaraṇa*, but they become *karma* with the intransitive verbs. It is normally said “*yeśāṃ deśakālādibhinnaṃ karma na sambhavati tetrākarmakāḥ*” (Bhaṭṭoji). These intransitive verbs cannot have an object excepting *deśa*, *kāla*, *bhāva* etc.

Patañjali states in his *Mahābhāṣya* under Pāṇini’s “*akathitañca*” that by intransitive verbs we understand “*kālabhāvādhvagantavyāḥ karmasamjñā hyakarmakāñām*” and illustrates “*māsamāste, māsaṃ svapiti, godoham āste, godoham svapiti, krośamāste, krośam svapiti, kurūn svapiti, pāñcālān svapiti*”. Some examples are cited from literature where the illustrations of these rules are found, indicating the use of accusative in the sense of space and time (both in the transitive and intransitive verbs) – “*babhūva hi samā bhūmiḥ samantāt pañcayojanam*” – for the soil became flat over an extent of five *yojanas* in every direction (*Rāmāyaṇa*, 2.91.29), “*nigṛhya taṃ ... cakarṣa ha tasmād-deśāddhanūṃśyaṣṭau*” (*Mahābhārata*, 1.153.40) – he seized him and dragged him along over a space of eight bow-lengths, “*etāvanti dināni tvadīyamāsīt*” (*Pañcarātra*, 165) – for so many days it was yours, “*bhadrakāḥ pratīkṣyatāṃ kañcitkālam*” (*Daśakumāracarita*, 96) – gentle sirs, please wait a moment.

In fact, Pāṇini has not classified the verbs in transitive or intransitive. For *karma*, the general rule prescribed by him is “*kartturīpsitamaṃ karma*” (1.4.49). The instances of this type quoted above, perhaps would be supported by this rule. The implication is – the thing, the agent desires earnestly should be accusative, whether the verbs are transitive or intransitive it does not matter. So “*sa grāmaṃ gacchati*” – the root $\sqrt{\text{gam}}$ though generally intransitive (as in English) *grāma* is employed with accusative, as *grāma* is intended by the agent. We may think that “*kartturīpsitamaṃ karma*” can be used to support this usage. This explanation is given in the commentary of Bālaṃanoramā

under “*kurūn svapiti*” thus «*tathā hi “kurūn svapiti” ityādaḥ svāpādikriyayā kurvādīn vyāpnotītyarthāḥ, dhātūnāmanekārthatayā kadācit teṣāṃ svāpādikaraṇakavyāpane ’pi vṛttech, tataśca “kartturīpsitātamam” ityeva siddham*».

It is further clarified in the commentary:

– «*gantavyatvaviśeṣaṇādadhvanyāste ityatra na bhavāti, anatyantasamyogārthamidaṃ vārttikam, atyantasamyoge tu kālādhvanoratyantasamyoge ityeva siddhamiti prācīnānusārī panthāḥ, vastutastu “akarmakadhātubhīryoga” – ityādi-vacanam bhāṣye na dṛśyate. kiṃtu akarmakadhātūnāṃ katham dvikarmakatvamityāśāṅkāyāṃ kālābhāvādhvagantavyāḥ karmasamjñā hyakarmanām.*»

In later period to make the grammar easily accessible and the rules easily applicable verbs are divided into transitive and intransitive, on the idea that some verbs are incapable of having an object other than place, time etc. In considering what rules may be taken as concerning the intransitive verbs we may say that Pāṇini has laid down a scope for the intransitive verbs to become transitive in his *sūtras* – “*adhiśīṣṭhāsām karma*” (1.4.46) “*abhiniviśāśca*” (1.4.47) & “*upānvadhyānvasaḥ*” (1.4.48) which sanction the accusativeness of the locative of the verbs, though the sense of *karmapravacanīya* remains suppressed in them. Such as – “*adhiśete adhiṣṭhāti adhyāste vā vaikunṭham hariḥ*”, “*abhiniviśate sanmārgam, grāmam upavasati*” etc. Another *sūtra* prescribed by him is “*kālādhvanoratyantasamyoge*” (2.3.5) which denotes – after a word denoting time or length, the affix of the second case is employed, when denoting full duration, such as – “*māsamāste*” (he stays for a month). Here the root *√as* though intransitive bears an object in sense of duration. According to Pāṇini all verbs may have an object by this rule, but the condition is “*atyantasamyoga*” or complete relating of time or space with its action, attribute or substance; otherwise locative is available. It is notable that as far as usages are concerned it is seen that intransitive verbs generally have *ādhāra* in *deśa*, *kāla*, *bhāva* etc. These locatives become accusative when the sense of continuity is indicated. Kātyāyana’s “*akarmaka ...*” says that the intransitive verbs may have a *karma* only in time, place etc. which can also be expressed by Pāṇini’s “*kālādhvanoratyantasamyoge*”. So far usages are concerned it seems that mostly the verb is intransitive.

Patañjali while discussing Pāṇini's "*kālādhvano ...*" (2.3.5) has raised the problem which says what verbs could be treated as governing the accusative in *kāla*, *adhva*, *deśa*, etc. It is stated – "*atyanta-saṃyoge kālādhvanau karmavadbhavatīti vaktavyam*". The term *karmavat* generally indicates that the verb does not have a *karma*, that is *akarmaka* or intransitive. "*akarmakāṇāmityucyate na ca kecikālabhāvādhvabhirakarmakāḥ*". We may assume that according to Patañjali words denoting place, time etc. become *karma* in relation to the intransitive verbs only, when duration or *vyāpti* is implied. So the rule "*kālādhvano ...*" is applicable to the intransitive verbs mainly. The examples cited by Bhaṭṭoji regarding "*akarmaka ...*" and "*kālādhva ...*" are almost the same. Under "*akarmaka ...*" he illustrates "*kurūn svapiti, māsamāste, godohāmāste, krośamāste*". Under "*kālādhvano ...*" "*māsaṃ kalyāṇī (bhavati), māsaṃ adhīte, māsaṃ guḍadhānāḥ (santi), krośaṃ kuṭilā nadī (vartate), krośaṃ giriḥ (tiṣṭhati)*".

We find that most of the instances stated under Pāṇini's "*kālādhvano ...*" are *akarmaka*. Though Pāṇini has cited a provision that sense of duration must be present, it seems that in later periods that sense became less important, and the ideas of the two rules had been mingled.

Some later grammarians also have taken the two rules together.

In the commentary of *Kalāpavyākaraṇa* it is said "*kālādhvabhā-vadeśānāmantarbhūtakriyāntaraiḥ sarvairakarmakairyogekarmatvamupajāyate*" – that the words denoting time, way, place etc. are employed with second case-affix in relation to an intransitive verb – as the *vārttika* of Kātyāyana implies. The speciality as laid down in the *śloka* as quoted by the commentator is "*antarbhūtakriyāntaraiḥ*" – that is, in connection with some elided verbs denoting *vyāpti*. In other words these accusatives are used in the sense of *vyāpti*. It should be mentioned that *vyāptikriyā* is intended in the case of *kāla*, *adhva*, *kriyā* and *deśa* – "*kālāderanyatra dhātorvyāptivivakṣā nābhidhīyate*". So the verbs attain an object when they are transitive or the accusativeness is admitted in *vyāptivivakṣā* of the words like time, place etc. with the intransitive verbs. Perhaps, Kātantra has combined Pāṇini's "*kālādhva ...*" and Kātyāyana's "*akarmaka ...*" and has taken Kātyāyana's view under the condition of Pāṇini.

Some have accepted only Kātyāyana's statement.

Śākaṭāyana says “*kālādhvabhāvadeśaṃ vā karma cākarmaṇām*” (1.3.124) and follows Kātyāyana’s view that words denoting time, path, place etc. are employed with accusative when the verbs are intransitive. Such as - “*māsamāste*”, “*krośaṃ svapiti*”, “*godohamāste*”, “*grāmaṃ vasati*”.

Kramadīśvara states “*akarmakadhātuprayoge kriyāntarāntarbhāve deśabhāvābhyāñca*” (70) and illustrates “*māsamāste māsamāsyate devadattena*”, “*divasaṃ svapiti*” etc. He mentions “*kriyāntarāntarbhāve*”, that is, intransitive verbs may govern accusative when *vyāpti* or duration is implied.

The example “*kurūn svapiti*” that is cited by Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita under the *vārttika* “*akarmakadhātubhi ...*” is mentioned by Rāmatarakavāgīśa under Vopadeva’s “*deśādhvakālābhāvaṃ vādhaiḥ*” (283) meaning, intransitive verbs govern accusative in the words denoting time, place etc.

From the above discussions it is clear that Kātyāyana’s opinion is accepted by almost all. It is true that the *vārttika* of Kātyāyana and Pāṇini’s “*kālādhvano ...*” are similar to some extent, as place, time etc. are designated by both. In the former the verb should be intransitive, in the later also intransitive verbs may be inserted. But the condition in “*kālādhvano ...*” makes the two rules not at all synonymous. In this connection we may mention the remark found in the *Tattvabodhinī* while explaining *māsaṃ kalyāṇī* under Pāṇini’s “*kālādhvano ...*”. We assume that this rule may have a possibility to be confused with “*akarmaka ...*”. It is said – “*akarmakadhātubhīryoga eva deśakālādīnāṃ karmasaṃjñādhānānneha karmaṇi dvitīyā iti dvitīyā prāpnotīti bhāvaḥ*”. Again if Pāṇini’s “*karturīpsitatama ...*” would be sufficient to cover these usages, the difficulty may arise in denoting an *adhikaraṇa*. It is normally said “*vivakṣāvaśāt kārakāṇi bhavanti*” or place, time etc. may be a *karma* in *karmavivakṣā*, but that may not be a distinct judgement. It is admissible that in considering the intransitive verbs as a separate class we would have failed to support their governing accusative as in some cases found, because we have got no such indication from Pāṇini. Though some intransitive verbs may be inserted in Pāṇini’s “*kālādhvano ...*” but the provision may not be present always or in spite of the sense of *vyāpti* verbs may not be intransitive. The point is that excepting the verbs *upa-* √*vas*, or

adhi- √*śī* etc., or excepting the sense of continuity there are found many intransitive verbs which may govern accusative in place, time etc. Besides Kātyāyana's rule they cannot be supported grammatically. So Kātyāyana's statement is very important from that point of view. Later grammarians also have strengthened his statement.