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SUMMARY

A FIREFLY IN THE BAMBOO REED

The Suttaniddesa of Saddhammajotipāla
and the Grammatical Foundations of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma

My doctoral thesis assesses the role of Pāli grammatical studies in the consolidation of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma (Myanmar). Since the establishment of Theravāda Buddhism in the 11th century A.D., Pāli Grammar and philology were by far the most cultivated fields of study in Burma. Western scholarship has been aware of this phenomenon, but the vast corpus of grammatical treatises in Pāli remains poorly studied. Due to a lack of understanding and direct reading of the sources, scholars have considered Pāli grammar a merely instrumental discipline in which monks were trained before pursuing the higher studies of the Buddhist doctrine. In my dissertation I dispute this view. In the first part I examine unexplored primary sources and I show that grammatical studies were part and parcel of the Buddhist education. What we call Pāli grammar is nothing but the philological discipline that equips a Buddhist scholar for the correct understanding of the doctrine. This is so because the doctrine consists of a set of canonical texts in Pāli that need to be interpreted correctly, for they are considered to be “word of the Buddha” (buddhavacanaṃ).

After a general introduction discussing the role of Pāli grammar in medieval Burma, I focus on a text called the Suttaniddesa (“Explanation of the sutta [of Kaccāyana]”). This text was written by the renowned scholar monk and reformer Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla in the 15th century. Saddhammajotipāla was a member of the oldest, and therefore most prestigious, Theravāda lineage of Burma. His Suttaniddesa remains as one of the finest examples of the blend of grammatical scholastics and Buddhism, a blend that characterises medieval Burmese Buddhism.
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My main aim in studying a Pāli vyākaraṇa text from Myanmar was to highlight the philological nature of Theravāda Buddhism. This is the only great living tradition of Buddhism in which the teachings of the Buddha are recited and studied in an original Indian language, Pāli, which is not the vernacular language of the devotees in Theravāda countries such as Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Thailand, etc. It is believed that the canonical Pāli literature, the Tipiṭaka, represents “the words of the Buddha” (buddhavacanaṃ). The Tipiṭaka is therefore considered a guide in the path to nibbāna. The Theravādin does not naively believe that everything written in the Pāli language was actually spoken by the Teacher. Rather, he believes that everything written in the Pāli language is in accordance with the teachings of the Buddha. The fact that the language of the scriptures is originally from north India makes it easier for the devotees to believe that the suttas are an authentic record of the Buddha’s words.

Theravādins call the language of the suttas māgadhī “the language of the Magadha”, the language of the country where the Buddha lived. This language is considered the mūlabhāsā “root language” of humankind. It is believed that māgadhī is the sabhāvaniruttī “spontaneous way of expression” of human beings. Whereas other Buddhist traditions have preserved the teachings of the Buddha in their respective national languages (for instance, Tibetan, Chinese, Japanese), the Theravādins have preserved what they believe to be the original words spoken by the master. This conservatism in the language is in the nature of Theravāda Buddhism and what distinguishes this tradition from the other great living traditions. In fact, the label “theravāda” (“the doctrine of the elders”) itself refers to the Pāli textual tradition, which was initially oral. The importance of the texts is present almost in every milestone of the history of Theravāda, because the texts are the embodiment of the
Dhamma. This is in accordance with the instructions that the Buddha left in his last days:

Suppose a monk were to say: “Friends, I heard and received this from the Lord’s own lips: this is the Dhamma, this is the discipline, this is the Master’s teaching,” then, monks, you should neither approve nor disapprove his words. Then, without approving or disapproving, his words and expressions should be carefully noted and compared with the Suttas and reviewed in the light of the discipline. If they, on such comparison and review, are found not to conform to the Suttas or the discipline, the conclusion must be: “Assuredly this is not the word of the Buddha, it has been wrongly understood by this monk,” and the matter is to be rejected. But where on such comparison and review they are found to conform to the Suttas or the discipline, the conclusion must be: “Assuredly this is the word of the Buddha, it has been rightly understood by this monk.”

This passage goes on with the other three mahāpaṭdesas “great authorities”. Independently of the possibility of being an interpolation, it presupposes a set of texts, oral or written, that can be consulted as the real teaching once the master has passed away. It is not a surprise, then, that the foundation of the Buddhist school called Theravāda is conventionally considered the moment when the texts had to be written down, around the 1st century B.C. in Laṅkā. A second moment of importance was the writing of the commentaries termed atṭhakathā (“explanation of the meaning [of the Pāli texts]”) by Buddhaghosa, Dhammapāla, and others in the 5th and 6th centuries A.D. A third moment is the beginning of the second millennium of the Christian Era, especially the 12th century, when important monastic reforms define the canon of the text that we have today. The first centuries of the second millennium witness the birth of the vernacular languages in many parts of South and Southeast Asia. But in Theravāda countries Pāli texts remained untranslated. Instead of devoting efforts to the translation of the words of the Buddha, as was the case, for instance, in Tibet or China, and instead of promoting vernacular grammars that would raise the local

---

language to the level of the classical Sanskrit or Pāli, scholar monks devoted their efforts to
the study of the philological sciences (saddasattha). Pāli grammatical treatises were not
meant to teach the Pāli language to beginners. They were rather meant to teach how to
interpret the Pāli scriptures. Was not this simply following the Buddha’s principle, namely
that the truth was found in the right interpretation of the Suttas? Indeed, this is what we
understand when we examine the religious or philosophical aspects of the so-called Pāli
“grammars”. In the gloss to the introductory sutta of the Kaccāyana grammar, the
commentator Saṅghanandin affirms that “the study of grammar is of great assistance in the
[understanding of the] the suttantas.” In the closing section of the Saddanīti, a Burmese Pāli
grammar of the 12th or 13th century, a similar relationship between the study of the canon
and the study of grammar is established by recalling an old tradition, according to which,
when the Buddhist religion is in danger of decline, the first thing to protect are the texts, the
theory (pariyatti), not the practice (paṭipatti). Because if the theory is preserved, the practice
can be revived at any moment. But if the theory disappears, the practice is doomed. We can
thus observe how grammar became a fundamental tool in the preservation of Theravāda
pariyatti. Aggavamsa concludes his encyclopedic grammar with the statement: “the study of
the texts is the root of the (Buddha’s) teaching.”

In order to avoid a misrepresentation of the Pāli grammatical texts, they need to be
approached from this point of view. A purely linguistic approach does not reveal their
essence, and gives a distorted image. For it is true that Pāli grammarians many times
overlooked linguistic phenomena that are important to the linguist or to the philologist, but,
as I will try to show in this dissertation, Pāli grammarians did not play the role of linguists
but rather they played the role of exegetes. This was so for the simple reason that, as I said
before, they were not concerned with language or words in general, but with the unfailing
words of the Buddha. In this context, when a Pāli grammarian breaks the most sacred rules
of grammar in order to understand a Pāli word, he is actually abiding with the most sacred

---

2 Sadd 927.9: pariyatti yeva hi sāsanassa mūlaṃ.
belief of his religion. Many Theravādins will be ready to accept that Pāli grammarians are perhaps not the most brilliant luminaries in the \textit{vyākaraṇa} tradition. But they are probably among the most brilliant luminaries in the constellation of Buddhist exegetes of all ages. For their struggle consisted in analysing the words of the Buddha, which are the very substance of the Dhamma. In the present dissertation I will show the religious nature of the philological sciences in the Pāli language, a nature that has traditionally been neglected in favour of a more utilitarian assessment of these texts. In the same way that Alastair Gornall recently explored the grammatical literature of Laṅkā and situated this branch of Buddhist education in its cultural context, I will do the same with the grammatical texts written in Myanmar. With the exception of Gornall, scholarship on Pāli \textit{vyākaraṇa} has traditionally overlooked the cultural context in which grammatical and philological works were composed. I do not mean to say that looking at the context is essential in order to understand these texts. Indeed, the work of Senart, Franke, Smith, Kahrs, Pind, Deokar, and others, proves that profound scholarship on Pāli grammar can be done focusing on the internal development of the discipline. But I claim there are some aspects of the grammatical texts that can better be explained if we look at the cultural context in which they were written. It is also interesting to raise the question whether Pāli grammarians were purely linguists or they wrote grammar as part of a general program which included the traditional branches of Buddhist learning: Sutta, Vinaya, Abhidhamma. I have chosen the \textit{Suttaniddesa} of Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla as my main focus because this work was for some time believed to be a grammatical masterpiece written by the greatest Buddhist reformer of Burma, the legendary Chapaṭa Thera (12\textsuperscript{th} century A.D.). During my research I have discovered that this assumption was false, because the author of the \textit{Suttaniddesa} was not the 12\textsuperscript{th} century reformer. It seems, however, that the real author, known as Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla, was in some way or the other related to the legend of the founder of the Sinhalese lineage of Burma.
In the first chapter I will explore the role of Pāli grammatical studies in Pagan Burma. In doing so I will offer the bigger picture in which we can situate the *Suttaniddesa*, which will be the topic of the second chapter. I will try to explore all the issues that make the *Suttaniddesa* a piece both of *vyākaraṇa* and of Buddhist philosophy. The third and last chapter is an established edition and translation with copious notes of the *Samāsakappa* of the *Suttaniddesa*, that is to say, the commentary of Saddhammajotipāla on the chapter on compounds in Kaccāyana. I have chosen this chapter because of its intrinsic philosophical nature. Words mean realities. Compounds are made of two or more words. Even so, in a compound, the words that are its members lose their meaning and become part of a single integrated meaning. Indeed a compound (*samāsa*) is characterised by “having a single integrated meaning” (*ekatthībhāva*), or, in other words, having a single referent. I thought this would pose several problems to a Buddhist thinker and certainly the *Samāsakappa* of the *Suttaniddesa* is a very interesting piece of Pāli scholastic literature. In the three chapters of this dissertation I have examined and translated Pāli scholastic texts that have never been studied before in the West. It was therefore not always possible to understand the texts fully and satisfactorily. I nevertheless believe that the effort has been worthwhile, and I hope this dissertation will broaden the perspective from which we study medieval Buddhism in general, and Burmese Buddhism in particular.

3 For the concept of *ekatthībhāva* in Sanskrit and Pāli grammar, see Deokar, 2008: 287f.
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THE MIRROR OF THE TIPIṬAKA

THE ROLE OF PĀLI GRAMMAR IN PAGAN BURMA
1. INTRODUCTION

Grammar is a species of Philosophy

S. K. Belvalkar

When Theravāda Buddhism was established in Pagan around the 12th century A.D., Pāli grammar soon became a favourite field of study among Burmese monastics. A vast majority of the Pāli works composed in medieval Burma are texts of grammar (vyākaraṇa), semantic analysis (niruttī), lexicography (abhidhāna), and similar types of philological sciences. This phenomenon has puzzled modern scholars, for, in principle, there is nothing particularly Buddhist in the discipline of grammar. Indeed, it is a secular discipline that had to be processed before it could serve the purposes of the religion. The process of desecularisation of grammar in Theravāda Buddhism begins with the grammar of Kaccāyana (ca. 7th century A.D.). Scholar monastics of the Kaccāyana School such as Buddhappiya and Vimalabuddhi, with their exegetical contribution in the Rūpasiddhi and the Mukhamattadīpanī respectively, refined the grammatical theology of the Theravāda. This was the basis of the Kaccāyana School that flourished in Pagan Burma. Even today Burmese monastic education is inconceivable without the study of Pāli grammar. This is so because the protection of the religion goes hand in hand with the protection of Pāli grammar and literary scholarship. Grammar is as much a part of the syllabus today as is Vinaya (“monastic discipline”) and Abhidhamma. In 2012 a junior monk informed me that the government of Myanmar made it compulsory for every preacher-monk in the country to hold, at the very least, a

1 Belvalkar, 1915: 2.
2 This estimation derives from the list of Pāli works referred to in Bode’s Pali Literature of Burma. I am well aware of the many problems in using this book as a source, but as far as my knowledge goes, if we look at the literary records of that period and the following Ava period, grammar and Pāli philology were the most cultivated genres of Burmese Buddhism.
3 Pind, 2012: 73.
Dhammacariya degree (equivalent to a B.A. in Buddhism). In this way the proliferation of monks who, in the words of my informant, “preach their own ideas,” would be stopped. This shows that the knowledge of Pāli is indispensable in order to acquire religious authority, and it is conventionally assumed in Burma that the knowledge of Pāli implies the knowledge of Pāli grammar. To judge from the literary records, this assumption goes back, at least, to the days of the Pagan dynasty (1044–1287 A.D.). The common opinion maintains that Pāli Grammar was given a special status in Pagan because it was a foreign language that had to be learnt before the study of the doctrine could be pursued. This hypothesis, with variations, has remained unchallenged up to today. I will begin this chapter by examining this argument in greater detail. My claim, however, is that the traditional explanation of the role of Pāli grammar in Burma does not correspond to the actual testimony of the Pāli grammatical texts. I will show that the study of what we call Pāli grammar demands a considerable command of Pāli; at any rate, this type of grammar is not meant to teach Pāli as a foreign language. For how could one learn Pāli using a grammar that is written in Pāli? It would be as trying as to learn Chinese with a grammar written in Chinese.

The reason why we do not clearly comprehend the role of Pāli grammar in old Burma is because the concept vyākaraṇa has been used in a loose sense. In order to properly understand the concept of vyākaraṇa in Burma, it is necessary to trace the history of this concept back to its Sanskrit roots. In other words, we must go back to the first Sanskrit grammar: Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī. I will therefore recover the notion of vyākaraṇa from the context of the Vedic auxiliary disciplines (vedāṅgas) and I will propose a new approach to the concept of “grammar” as vyākaraṇa or niruttī in the Pāli tradition. I will support my case by translating and commenting upon several passages from two paradigmatic Pāli grammatical texts written in Burma during the Pagan dynasty: the Saddatthabhedacintā and the Kārikā. These examples will provide enough evidence to illustrate the nature and the purpose of grammar in Pagan (and in Burma for that matter). If we want to understand the nature of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma we need to explain why it was initially based on philological
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sciences. In other words: why was a monk supposed to be proficient in Pāli vyākaraṇa as if it were any other branch of the Buddhist doctrine. A learned Buddhist should know the Yamaka and the Paṭṭhāna, but also the monumental grammatical treatise called the Mukhamattadīpani or Nyāsa.¹ The thesis I defend in this chapter is that Pāli grammar in Burmese Buddhism played the role both of grammar and philosophy (or, at least, a species of hermeneutics). It was not an ancillary science, but the spearhead of a new Buddhist movement that was based on textual authority.²

In his grammatical commentary called the Suttaniddesa,³ a commentary based on the Nyāsa, Saddhammajotipāla compares the language of the Tipitaka with a face that is reflected in a mirror that is the grammar.⁴ The sāsana (i.e. the buddhasāsana) is reflected in the anusāsana (i.e. saddānusāsana). In other words, Pāli grammar is merely an abstract, paradigmatic, representation of the words of the Buddha. As we will see, the Pāli grammarians of the Kaccāyana School believed that particular utterances are impermanent (anicca) phenomena, but the word of the Tipitaka is permanent (nicca). It is from this presupposition that we need to understand Chapaṭa’s simile, a simile that encapsulates the philosophical and theological framework of the so-called “indigenous” Pāli grammar. The work of the Pāli grammarians was a process of adaptation. Indeed, this adaptation went both ways: vyākaraṇa had to undergo a conversion to Buddhism, but Buddhism had to become flexible enough to incorporate some of the philosophical presuppositions that are embedded in grammatical thought.

¹ Charney, 2006: 42: “Among these proper monks was Shin Nyana of Taung-dwin-gyi, who was selected by King Naung-daw-gyi for his wisdom. As Nyanabhivamsa relates, this monk could demonstrate his authoritative textualism not only through his authorship of expositions on the Nyasa, the Yamaka, and the Patthana, but especially through the display to the court of his ability to recite nine or ten chapters of scripture a day.”
² In this chapter I focus on the grammatical texts themselves. For the study of grammar as a fundamental aspect of the transmission of canonical literature, see von Hinüber, 1983.
³ See Chapter 2.
⁴ Kacc-nidd 30,12–13.
2. PĀLI GRAMMAR IN BURMA: DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS

The grammatical portion of Buddhistic literature is vast; so much so that more than a thousand aṅgās are taken up in elucidation of the original texts. In fact, the higher branches of the study of Pāli Grammar gradually merge into the subtle questions of the sublime Ethico-psychological philosophy of Buddhism.¹

Tha Do Oung

2.1. An overwhelming corpus of texts

According to the available catalogues of Pāli literature, over eighty percent of Burmese Pāli scholars between the 11th and the 15th centuries A.D. composed grammatical treatises of some sort: short versified grammars, commentaries on the Kaccāyana Pāli grammar, commentaries on lexicons such as the Abhidhānappadīpakā, works on prosody (metrics), encyclopaedias of grammar and philology such as the Saddanīti, commentaries on older grammars, and so forth.² The production of Pāli vyākaraṇa in Burma began when Theravāda Buddhism was established in Pagan, around the 11th or 12th century A.D.³ According to the chronicles,⁴ the crucial moment in the formation of Burmese Buddhist culture was the conquest of the southern provinces of Rāmañña, the Mon kingdom. The conquest was carried out by the king of Pagan, Anoratha (or Aniruddha), around 1056–57 A.D. At that time different kingdoms existed in western Southeast Asia. The kingdom of Pagan corresponded to present day Upper Burma, and the Mon kingdom of Rāmañña corresponded to present day Lower Burma (which still includes a Mon state).

¹ Oung, 1902: Preface.
² That is, at least, if we follow the narrative of such works as the Sāsanavaṃsa and its Burmese model, the Sāsanālarikā; and Burmese catalogues of books such as the Piṭ-sm.
³ Handlin, 2012: 165.
⁴ See, for instance, KI.
Pāli grammar as a scholastic field evolved simultaneously with the Theravāda religion in Pagan. Instead of writing apologetic works on Buddhist topics, or poems praising the Dhamma, Burmese Theravādins preferred to write on Pāli grammar. Scholars have tried to account for this phenomenon, which seems to be very much related to the distinctive attachment to textual authority in Theravāda Buddhism vis a vis the relative permissivity or openness of other traditions of Buddhism.

As I have said earlier, the dominant opinion maintains that Pāli grammar was fervently studied within the literati elite of Pagan because Pāli was a foreign language. According to this view, the Burmese monks and intellectuals had to struggle with this strange language before they could master the actual Buddhist teachings. Bode was the first Western scholar to articulate this view. As early as 1908, Bode published a seminal paper on the topic: “Early Pāli Grammarians from Burma” (JPTS, 1908). In that paper, Bode follows the Sāsanavamsa in her interpretation of the extraordinary development of Pāli scholarship in Pagan:

The causes of this speedy maturity are easy to trace. Rāmañña was conquered. Relics, books, and teachers had been forcibly carried to Burma. Instead of suffering by transplantation, the religion of the Buddha seems to have flourished more vigorously in its new centre.¹

One year later, Bode’s book The Pāli Literature of Burma (PLB) was published, and since then it became the standard manual on the subject. In PLB Bode elaborates her own hypothesis on the role of Pāli grammatical literature in Pagan:

In India, where certain of the Upaniṣads belonged to a yet earlier phase of thought than the doctrines of Gotama, men’s minds were prepared for Buddhist conceptions. A philosophical language was already formed in which the teacher or the disputant could lead his hearers step by step in an idiom they knew to conclusions not unfamiliar to their minds. But in Burma the

¹ Bode, 1908: 86–87.
grammars of the Buddhist texts first had to be studied, and when the great legend of the Founder was learned and the code of the Order had grown familiar, there was still a new world to conquer, a new science to master.\footnote{1}{PLB, xiii.}

According to this passage, the science of grammar was, in Pagan, a discipline that preceded the proper doctrinal training. Grammar represented a preliminary stage that would prepare a monk for proper Buddhist intellectual training (pariyattī). Bode's statement is based on a conception of grammar in the European sense. Bode, for instance, describes the Saddanīti as “aphorisms on Pāli grammar,”\footnote{2}{Bode, 1908: 88.} a definition that can hardly apply to a third of that work—a work that is everything but aphoristic. It is tempting for the modern scholar to think of the 11th-century Burmese monk as struggling with a foreign language such as Pāli. The fact is, however, that Buddhist texts in Sanskrit and Pāli were known in Burma from much earlier times. The first records go back to the 4th century A.D.\footnote{3}{Aung-Thwin, 2012: 71.} Sanskrit Buddhism in its Mahāyāna, Tantra, Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin\footnote{4}{I use this distinction for the sake of convenience, but in fact the history of Burmese Buddhism is one more proof that there is no clear-cut boundary between the Mahāyāna and the Hinayāna.} forms was present in Burma before the 11th century. Therefore, the philosophical language of Buddhism was everything but new to the intellectual elites of the country. If we add the fact that Pāli grammars are written in a scholastic style that itself requires a higher knowledge of the Pāli language and its technical terminology, Bode’s hypothesis is difficult to accept wholesale. The hypothesis, however, has been generally accepted. Mahesh Deokar’s interpretation of the purpose of Pāli grammar is similar inasmuch as he understand this discipline as a means to learn the Pāli language, not
as a Buddhist sub-discipline. Tilman Frasch, a historian who specialises in the Pagan period, follows Bode’s argument in his assessment of the grammatical culture of Pagan:

It is surely not by chance that a major part of the extant Pāli literature of Pagan deals with Grammar. Pāli was, for the monks and scholars of Pagan, a foreign language, whose structure and rules had to be made transparent first. That is why commentaries were usually composed in the form of nissaya, in which short Pāli portions were interspersed with Burmese translations. Compared to Old Burmese, Pāli was without doubt a culture language (Hochsprache) and exerted a correspondingly strong influence on it. This is evident not only in a great number of loanwords, but also in the auxiliary translations. Words like attaññ-may (“Impermanence,” Pāli anicca) are indeed pure Burmese, but they cannot conceal their Pāli origin. As an instance of successful effort we can see the auxiliary translation si-cap-mrañ-nhamṁ-so (“all knowing and everywhere seeing”) for Pāli sabbaññuta (Omniscience). The adjustment to Pāli goes so far, that sometimes the privative a- is used instead of the usual Burmese negation ma. It is against this backdrop that we can understand why scholars and monks of Pagan busied themselves almost exclusively with grammar.¹

¹ Deokar, 2008: 341: “[T]he emergence of an indigenous Pali grammar was probably prompted by a need to prepare a textbook for the monastic community to teach the broad features of Pali in the simplest possible way. Śarvavarman’s Kātantra was the best model of such type of grammar before the compilers of Kacc. (…) Thus, the nature of the Pali grammars is more like a guiding manual.” In the same page the author distinguishes this approach from the approach of Pāṇini’s Aṣṭ: “the form of the Aṣṭ is not that of a students’ textbook on the Sanskrit grammar.”

This interpretation is partially correct. It is true that Burmese monks wrote *nissayas* on Pāli grammars, but as far as my knowledge goes, these *nissayas* are later than the Pāli grammatical texts. We actually have no record of grammatical *nissayas* from the Pagan period. A fundamental grammatical text as the *Nyāsa-nissaya*, for instance, dates from the 18th century and it basically consists of the Burmese translation of passages from two older Pāli commentaries on the *Nyāsa*, namely the *Porāṇaṭīkā* (or *Thanbyin-ṭīkā*) written in Pagan around the 12th century, and the *Niruttisāranañjūsā* written in Toungoo in the 17th century.

In relying on Bode and others, Frasch overlooks the actual nature of Pāli grammars. The main reason for that is the ambiguity in the label “grammar” for *vyākaraṇa* and *nirutti*. For it is one thing to speak of *the* grammar of Pāli (that is to say the way Pāli language works), and another thing to speak of a “grammar” of Pāli (that is to say a *vyākaraṇa* or *nirutti* treatise written in Pāli). In other words, one aspect is the influence of Pāli language on Burmese language, and another aspect is the influence of Pāli grammatical thought on Burmese literary culture. As I will show later on in this chapter, the concept of “grammar” that Frasch and Bode are using is misleading. It does not represent the nature of the works we are talking about.

### 2.2. Grammar as recovery

A different assessment of Pāli grammatical scholarship in Burma is given by Helmer Smith, the editor of the *Saddanīti*. In this case, the argument is surely based on first hand knowledge of the texts. In the *Avant-propos* to his edition of the *Saddanīti*, Smith speculates on the role of Pāli grammar in the medieval Theravāda world:

> [...] la fin du 12ème siècle et le début du 13ème comme un temps fertile en ṭīkākāras et en grammairiens, dont les doctrines auraient influé sur les générations successives de copistes et de correcteurs qui nous ont transmis la littérature du Theravāda.¹

¹ Smith, 1928: v.
Smith is plainly saying that Pāli grammarians exerted a determinant influence in the way Pāli literature was transmitted. What we should understand from this statement is that Pāli grammars from that period helped retain the original forms of the Pāli language and avoid an inexorable process of sanskritisation. Later on Smith makes an even stronger claim that has become a commonplace in secondary literature on the Pāli grammarians:

C’est donc dans la conviction que notre Pāli est une fonction de celui du 12me siècle – et que la connaissance de la philologie birmane et singhalaise de ladite époque est indispensable à qui voudra *remonter*, à travers la recension Buddhaghosa-Dhammapāla, à un Pāli d’intérêt *linguistique*, que j’ai entrepris l’étude de la norme Pālie enseignée par Aggavaṃsa dans les trois volumes qui forment la Saddanīti.²

Smith was aware that Pāli grammarians were anything but Pāli teachers for ignorant monks. Smith postulates, therefore, that Pāli grammarians were not language teachers, but language makers. Scholiasts and grammarians strengthened the linguistic paradigm of the canonical literature versus the more refined or sanscritised Pāli of Buddhaghosa and the *aṭṭhakathā* masters of Laṅkā. Grammar was the act of establishing a “guide” (*nīti*) and a “rule” (*naya*), a normalisation of the “ecclesiastical” language, so that it could withstand the push of Sanskrit culture through grammar and maintain the original flavour of the Buddha’s own words. This is certainly the same Sisyphean task that Sanskrit grammarians had undertaken since the times of Pāṇini (ca. 500 B.C.).

Everything points, therefore, to an earnest spirit of preservation of the canon and commentaries on the part of the so-called 12th-century philologists. The role of Pāli grammar

---

1 The emphasis is mine. Norman, 1983: 165: “It is not overstating the case to say that a knowledge of the Burmese and Sinhalese philology of the period is essential if we wish to go past the recensions of Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla and *return to a Pāli of real linguistic interest*. It seems very likely that the manuscripts consulted by European editors go back to originals which have been revised in the spirit of Aggavaṃsa and his contemporaries.” The emphasis is mine.

2 Smith, 1928: vi.
was not normalising the language, but rather protecting it by describing and analysing it. Important questions arise at this point: why was it so important to describe and analyse the language of the Tipiṭaka in order to preserve the Tipiṭaka? Would it not be enough to keep copying the Tipiṭaka? Is the study of the Tipiṭaka a grammatical activity in itself?

2.3. A Marxist approach

Steven Collins has suggested a different interpretation of Pāli scholarship in pre-modern Laṅkā and continental Southeast Asia, especially at the beginning of the second millennium. His explanation, I think, applies to Burma as well:

[R]oyal elites seem to have chosen, at specific moments in history, what Andrew Huxley (1990) called “the Pāli Cultural Package.” This included Theravāda Buddhism, written law, and monastic institutions and lineages. (...) [L]anguage provided an “aesthetic of power” (Pollock, 1996) which functioned as an ideology by imposing a single medium of expression – and by excluding others – rather than by giving voice to a single belief system.

In most parts of what Pollock has called the “Sanskrit cosmopolis,” the aesthetic of power is carried by kāvya (“poetry”), especially in laudatory hymns (praśasti) to the kings. The case is different in Burma. Collins has rightly pointed out that Burmese scholars resisted kāvya and were very much attracted to what Collins defines as “ancillary sciences.” Collins seems to

1 See Huxley, 1990: 42: “The conversion to Theravāda Buddhism between the eleventh and the fifteenth centuries entailed the adoption of the Pāli Cultural Package, in which I include a script, language, literature, and the Sāṅgha, as an organized institution.”
3 It is important to note that, even though Pāli kabba never flourished in Burma, treatises on prosody and poetics were abundant. It is also noteworthy that vernacular Burmese poetics is based on the rules of Sanskrit and Pāli treatises.
4 Collins, 2003: 651: “There are Pāli inscriptions on mainland Southeast Asia dated to the first millennium, in what are now Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos. Some have been dated as early as the fourth century, and some indicate acquaintance with sophisticated Higher Teachings texts and commentaries. Our picture is still very sketchy, but it seems that the provenance of much if not all Pāli at this time and place was south India rather than Sri Lanka. Pāli texts were certainly part of what Skilling calls the ‘Theravādin renaissance’ in this part of the world, which began with Pagan in Burma in the eleventh century and
accept that Pāli scholarship was part of the political agenda working for the ideological integration in Pagan (that is to say, the ideological integration of different kingdoms of the empire). As is well known, a Buddhist emperor justifies his overlordship by supporting the religion and thus proving himself to be a bodhisatta, the future Buddha Metteyya. According to this logic, sponsoring Pāli grammars and such texts implied sponsoring Theravāda Buddhism. The success of this discipline, then, must be explained by the fact that the Pāli language represented a value that was much cherished by the kings. Pāli was a language of prestige; it was the very substance of the buddhasāsana. Sponsoring the Pāli language was tantamount to sponsoring Buddhism in the eyes of the society.

In his argument, Collins does not take into account what the Pāli grammarians actually state, perhaps because their view could be rightly dismissed as “emic.” Collins, instead, explains why the study of Pāli grammar was materially possible, and the role it played in politics, but not the role it played in Buddhism itself. If grammar was chosen by kings as a symbol, we may ask: What did grammar offer that kāvya could not? Why sponsor grammar and not, for instance, astrology? We cannot possibly understand why Pāli grammars were useful and used if we do not examine the very substance of such texts. In his pioneering study “Exploring the Saddanīti,” Eivind Kahrs raises a crucial question that no one has addressed so far:

What kind of grammar is the Saddanīti? Is it a good grammar? This immediately triggers the question: What is a good grammar anyway?

continued in subsequent centuries in all areas of mainland Southeast Asia (with the exception of Vietnam). Royal sponsorship of monastic lineages deriving from the Mahāvihāra in Sri Lanka and of Pāli texts, however, seems not to have resulted in any significant production of Pāli kāvya in these areas of Southeast Asia. Literature’s ancillary sciences – notably grammar and prosody – were certainly known, but little Pāli literature seems to have been written in these areas and none has survived.” My emphasis.

When confronted with the bulky stock of grammatical and philological literature produced in the Burmese kingdoms of Pagan and Ava between the 11th and the 15th centuries, I think we should first ask ourselves the same question: What kind of grammars are they? Are they simply manuals for learning Pāli, as the ones we use, like Warder’s *Introduction to Pāli*? Are they reference grammars like Geiger’s *Pāli Grammar*? What are they meant for? What are their actual contents? And finally, what do Pāli grammarians have to say about this matter? In order to answer these questions in a satisfactory manner, we need first to go back a few millennia, to the times when Sanskrit grammatical thought crystallised in north India. We cannot understand the nature of Pāli grammar without looking at the Sanskrit tradition, for Pāli grammar is an offshoot of Sanskrit grammar.
3. THE CONCEPT OF VYĀKARAṆA: FROM KASHMIR TO PAGAN

The Pāli grammar that I will study in this dissertation is known as the Kaccāyana (Kacc). It was probably composed between the 6th to 8th centuries A.D. It is, still today, the staple Pāli grammar for Burmese Theravādins. Although it is the oldest Pāli grammar extant, Kacc belongs to an even older tradition, on which it confidently relies. This is stated in a *sutta* ("grammatical rule") at the very beginning of Kacc: *parasamaññā payoge* “when applicable, use the concepts of others.” The commentary *Kaccāyanavutti* (Kacc-v) clarifies: “others,” here, does not mean other Pāli grammars but the “Sanskrit books” (*sakkataganthesu*). The ninth aphorism of Kacc is a *paribhāsā* (“metarule”) that does not explicitly refer to any particular system of grammar. Scholars, however, trace the genealogy of Kacc back to two models: Pāñini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (ca. 500 B.C.) and Śarvavarman’s *Kātantra* (2nd century A.D.). According to Pind, 215 rules in Kacc are “reproduced in a more or less edited form” from Kātantra, and 300 rules “including the overlap with Kātantra [...] appear to be edited versions of Pāñini *sūtras.*” This adds up to almost half of Kacc. The other half is assumed to be original work by the author or authors of the *Kaccāyana* grammar. In its “original” portion, Kacc is designed to describe the peculiarities of the canonical discourses of the Buddha (*suttantesu,* Kacc-v ad Kacc 1). But for the rest, Kacc follows Sanskrit models: it benefits from their terminology and methodology, developed through centuries of scholarship and lively debate.

---

1 Kacc 9.
2 Kacc-v ad Kacc 9.
3 Pind, 2012: 79.
4 Note how the *vuttikāra*, in using the word *suttanta* instead of *sutta*, avoids the ambiguity *sutta* “Buddha’s discourse” and *sutta* “grammatical rule.”
The Sanskrit grammar known as Aṣṭādhyāyī (hereafter Aṣṭ), “The Eight Chapters,” is the oldest extant grammatical treatise in South Asia. It was composed around 500 B.C. by Pāṇini, a Brahmin from Śalātura in Kaśmira (today’s Pakistan).¹ The Aṣṭ has exerted a strong influence on the rest of the South Asian grammatical systems, and the Pāli grammatical tradition is no exception. Katre, in the introduction to his English translation of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, says that the Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa is “fully influenced”² by Pāṇini’s Aṣṭ. This seems to be an exaggeration, although, as I will show, there are good reasons to consider Pāṇini as one of the legitimate forefathers of Pāli grammar.

The Aṣṭ consists of nearly 4000 sūtras. A sūtra is an extremely compressed line of verbal information designed for memorization. The nature of a sūtra-grammar can be described as algebraic. Its main characteristic is the refinement of the metalanguage.

The material covered by the Aṣṭ includes the Vedic usages (chandas, vaidika), but it is mainly concerned with spoken language (bhāṣā, laukika). Even though the object of study may be secular to an extent, vyākaraṇa as a discipline is considered part of the Vedic tradition, even by grammarians. Indeed, vyākaraṇa is one of the six vedāṅgas “limbs of the Veda.” The main purposes of vyākaraṇa, according to the commentator Patañjali, are related to assisting in Vedic learning (I will come back to this point later). The other five vedāṅgas are:

- śikṣā “teaching [on pronunciation]” “phonetics”
- nirukta “semantic analysis”
- jyotiṣa “astronomy” “astrology”
- chandas “metrics” “prosody”
- kalpa “ritual”³

---

¹ Cardona, 1988: 1. The date of Pāṇini is disputed. Other scholars, such as Yudhistira Mīmamsaka, push it back to the 7th century.
³ The oldest attestation of the list is probably in Muṇḍakopaniṣad, see Ciotti, 2012: 18.
The *sūtra* style is not exclusive to *vyākaraṇa*. Other branches of Indian thought such as Mīmāṃsā, Nyāya, and Yoga, for example, resort to the *sūtra* style. The concept of *sūtra*, “thread,” involves a metaphor that applies to the entire system, as Scharfe points out:

The name for this style is taken from the image of weaving where a thread is stretched out lengthwise as a warp to be brossed by the woof. The warp may be one continuing thread or it may be cut on both sides of the frame: this explains the use of *sūtra* for both the whole work and its sentences. The *sūtra* is thus a stripped *textus*. This explanation is supported by the parallel case of *tantra* “thread, text” with its counterpart *āvāpa* “insertion.”

Moreover, *vyākaraṇa* is not the only *vedāṅga* that deals with language, for *śīkṣā* and *nirukta* also do. What is, then, the hallmark of *vyākaraṇa* among other linguistic disciplines? The Sanskrit grammarian Kātyāyana, in his *vārttika* 14, gives the standard definition of what we conventionally call “grammar:” *lakṣyalakṣaṇe vyākaraṇaṃ* “grammar is the sum of ‘characterized’ [words] and ‘characterizing’ [rules].” That is to say, *vyākaraṇa* is a set of rules that allow us to analyse (that is to say dissolve) words. This is what the etymology of the name seems to indicate: *vi + ā + √kṛ* “to separate the whole into its parts,” “to analyse.” The word *vyākaraṇa* is considered *karaṇasādhana* “instrument of action,” and the standard Sanskrit definition would be *vyākrīyate anena iti vyākaraṇam* “*vyākaraṇa* is that by which the analysis of words is made.” As Scharfe points out:

Grammar distinguishes roots, suffixes, and prefixes, and assigns each of the latter to a meaning or function. The interest is centred on forming correct words and sentences from these basic elements so that the intended meaning is expressed.

---

1 Scharfe, 1977: 87 and n.
In other words, *vyākaraṇa* teaches the formation of correct words (*śabda*).\(^1\) In Pāli grammatical literature “word formation” receives the technical name *rūpasiddhi* (“achievement of the [final word] form”).\(^2\)

The Vedic sub-discipline of *śikṣā*, on the other hand, focuses on the articulation or pronunciation of *varṇas* “speech-sounds.”\(^3\)

The oldest Vedic grammatical treatises receive the title of *Prātiśākhya* (Pr), literally “appendix to a branch (or school) [of Vedic ritual].” Every branch of Vedic learning has its own treatise on recitation. The main purpose of the Pr treatises is, as Whitney has put it:

> [T]o establish the relations between the combined (*sandhi*) and disjoined (*pada*) forms.\(^4\)

The *pada* forms, it is understood, are the forms recorded in Vedic literature. The later manuals on phonetics are simply called *śikṣā*.\(^5\)

With regard to *nirukta*, the standard, and the only treatise available to us, is the *Nirukta* of Yāska (perhaps ca. 4th century B.C.\(^6\)). As a linguistic discipline, *nirukta* focuses on semantic analysis, that is to say, how words mean what they mean. Yāska qualifies *nirukta* as *vyākaraṇasya kārtsnyam* “the completion of *vyākaraṇa*” or “a supplement to *vyākaraṇa*.”\(^7\) The method of *nirukta* normally consists of tracing obscure words back to a verb or an activity expressed by a verb. That is why the word *nirukta* has been also translated as “etymology.” This translation might be slightly misleading, as the main aim of *nirukta* is establishing the

---

1 Cardona, 1997: 543.
2 The formula *iti rūpasiddhi veditabbā* is used throughout the *Mukhamattadīpanī* when illustrating strings of connected rules in the process of word formation. I am tempted to believe that the title *Rūpasiddhi* for Buddhappiya’s Pāli grammar is based on that formula and the re-arrangement of Kaccāyana’s sutta in *Rūpasiddhi* is probably based on the strings of suttas proposed in the commentary *Mukhamattadīpanī*.
3 I follow Ciotti, 2012 in this translation of *varṇa*.
4 Whitney, 1862: 339.
5 For *śikṣā* literature, see Ciotti, 2012. See also Allen, 1953 and Scharfe, 1977.
semantic content of a word, not its linguistic history. In Pāli grammatical texts this “method” (naya) of word analysis is known as nirutti.

Śikṣā, nirukta and vyākaraṇa overlap in certain aspects, but they are considered three different domains. We need to keep this in mind when studying how Pāli grammar evolved from Sanskrit models. Indeed, what we call Pāli grammar is not only influenced by vyākaraṇa, but also by śikṣā and nirukta. For instance, the phonemic table we find in Kacc 7: vaggā pañcapañcaso mantā (“the groups are [the akkharas] in fives, ending with ma”) is already found, with slight differences, in the so-called pañca pañca vargāḥ “five groups of five” of the Rgvedaprātiśākhya (Ṛg-Pr). This table of vargas is already taken for granted in Pāṇini’s A.

According to Scharfe, the nirukta vedāṅga never prospered beyond Yāska’s work, although there are two well known commentaries on the text: Durga’s and Skanda-Maheśvara’s commentaries. According to Scharfe, again, nirukta never crossed the boundaries of Vedic education, but the fact is that methods of nirvacana were used, for example, in Śaiva Kashmir, where devotees employ nirvacana techniques in the analysis of names. We should also mention here the influence of nirukta in the grand scholastic literature on kāvya and other genres.

Pāli grammarians should also be considered heirs of the nirvacana tradition, for they frequently style themselves as neruttikas. This is so because grammar, in the Pāli linguistic domain, emerged together with the exegetical disciplines of the aṭṭhakathā (“commentaries”). The oldest instance of nirukta analysis in Pāli is found in the para-canonical work Niddesa, a commentary on some sections of the Suttanipāta. The aṭṭhakathā (lit. “explanation of the meaning”) essentially operates as nirvacanaśāstra “the science of semantic analysis,” rather than vyākaraṇa “word formation,” even though the aṭṭhakathā

1 Kahrs, 2005: 37: “The term nirvacana itself has been aptly defined by Vijayapāla, the editor of the Niruktaṣlokaśārvīrtti, who states: nirvacanaṃ nāma śabdasya yathārtham vyatpatiḥ, ‘nirvacana means the derivation of a word according to its meaning’.”
2 Ṛg-Pr, I, 2.8.
Aleix Ruiz-Falqués

frequently resorts to *vyākaraṇa*. It is noteworthy that the words *neruttika* “semantic analyst” and *akkharaṅcintaka* “phonetician” or “grammarians” are synonymous in Pāli. Both, together with the word *veyyākaraṇa*, can be conventionally translated as “grammarians.” But this blend is not exclusive to the Pāli grammatical tradition. The conflation of *vyākaraṇa*, *ṣikṣa* and *nirukta* was already achieved by Pāṇini’s commentators in India.

The text of the Aṣṭ has not survived independently of its written commentaries. Our oldest version of Aṣṭ seems to be the one embedded in Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* “Great Commentary” (ca. 150 B.C. henceforth Mbh). But Patañjali does not comment on absolutely every *sūtra*. Intensive Pāṇinian scholarship and criticism was certainly current before the time of Patañjali, but we know this only because Patañjali discusses some of these criticisms, and sometimes even grants them some validity, although he finally dismisses them with the formula *sidhyaty evam apāṇinīyaṃ tu bhavati* “it works this way, but then it becomes un-Pāṇinian [i.e. it is unacceptable].” Patañjali presupposes the inviolability of Pāṇini’s system, and tries to give a rational explanation for every problem derived from ambiguity. A similar role was fulfilled by Vimalabuddhi (10th century A.D.), the earliest extant commentator on Kacc and Kacc-v. The Pāli tradition followed Sanskrit models not only in terms of terminology and method, but also in the systematisation of authority. For there were other important commentaries on Kacc and Kacc-v, but the reason why they did not survive is probably the authority of Vimalabuddhi’s Mmd.

The most important grammarian between Pāṇini and Patañjali is Kātyāyana (somewhere between Pāṇini and Patañjali, therefore ca. 250 B.C.). He was from a southern region, and that is why he was aware of different usages of Sanskrit and adds some

---

1 An instance of Buddhaghosa operating simultaneously on the levels of *vyākaraṇa* and *nirukta* has been critically analysed by Pind (1990: 187–191). But as Pind has explained, Buddhaghosa’s grammatical discussions are extremely rare.


3 Scharfe, 1977: 150.

4 Scharfe, 1977: 159.

5 Pind, 2012: 118.
extra “rules” or notes called *vārttikas*. It is thanks to Patañjali that Kātyāyana’s *vārttikas* on *A* have been preserved. Patañjali, as Scharfe points out, “included them in his ‘great work in colloquial language’ (*mahābhāṣya*) and discussed their pros and cons.” The word *bhāṣya* normally means “commentary” and *Mahābhāṣya* “the great commentary.” According to Scharfe, this Kātyāyana is most probably the author of the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* (henceforth *VāPr*) otherwise known as the *White Yajurveda Prātiśākhya* or *Kātyāyanaprātiśākhya*.

This point is relevant for the study of Kacc. For Kacc seems to have been conceived originally as a *sandhikappa* “chapter on phonetics.” I think we should not overlook the fact that the name Kātyāyana, in Pāli “Kaccāyana,” is reminiscent of one of the earliest and most authoritative treatises on *sandhi* and phonetics. It would have been easy for the Buddhists to believe that the famous grammarian was Mahā Kaccāyana, the disciple of the Buddha.

According to Scharfe, Kātyāyana’s style betrays the style of the Pr, which is different in method from the Pāṇinian style. In terminological terms, the *prātiśākhya* style is characterised by the use of meaningful (*anvartha*) labels, rather than convention (*rūḍhī*). The “meaningful” style is figurative, similar to using icons on the computer desktop, whereas the “conventional” style is abstract, like using the concise but highly versatile language of computer programming. In the case of grammatical texts, the Pr use the term *svara*, which means “vowel,” in order to say “vowel,” whereas Pāṇini uses the *anubandha* “ac” in order to say “vowel;” the Pr uses the term *sparśāghoṣa*, which means “soft (*sparśa*) aspirate (*ghoṣa*),” to refer to soft aspirate consonants, whereas Pāṇini uses the *anubandha* “khay,” the term *śvastanī*, literally meaning “referring to tomorrow (*śvas*),” indicates, quite logically, a verbal suffix to express the future, but the Pāṇinian method prefers the shortcut “luṭ” to express the

---

3 Kacc Introductory stanzas, ka, *pāda d: vakkhāmi sutthahitam ettha susandhikappam* “Here [in this treatise] (ettha) I will expose (vakkhāmi) the good (su-) chapter on sandhi (*sandhikappam*) arranged in sūtra style (*suttahitam*).”
4 Scharfe, 1977: 140.
same suffix. The first style saves mental strain, the second saves memory and increases accuracy. The Kacc School, on the main, follows the “meaningful” method.

Furthermore, Kātyāyana, the vārttikakāra, occasionally uses the term vikāra (“modification”) instead of the Pāṇinian term ādeśa; he also uses the accusative case instead of the genitive case to denote such a replacement. And, as Scharfe points out,

Kātyāyana’s obligation to Prātiśākhya techniques goes still deeper and touches on the basic difference between grammar and Prātiśākhya. Grammar strives for scientific generalization, for the essence of things; the Prātiśākhyas look for practical rules to aid the priestly practitioner, with every detail spelled out.¹

It is because Kātyāyana partakes of both Pāṇinian and Prātiśākhyan metalanguage that Scharfe describes it as having a “dual approach.” The dual approach of Kātyāyana is found, again, in Kacc. For instance, the mixed usage, in Kacc, of the synonyms vikāra and ādesa; or the alternate use of meaningful terms for the kārakas, but conventional terms such as ga for the vocative; jha for i/ī masc. and neut. endings; la for u/ū masc. and neut. endings; pa for -i/-ī/-u/-ū feminine endings, and so forth.

It has been suggested that Kātyāyana was a critic of Pāṇini, but that later on Patañjali, in discussing Kātyāyana’s vārttikas, restored the authority of Pāṇini. This view does not seem to be tenable, as Kātyāyana himself uses a reverential formula to refer to Pāṇini at the end of each vārttika: bhagavataḥ pāṇineḥ siddham “[This formulation] of the venerable Pāṇini is correct.”² Thus, we need to think of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali as a triad of grammarians forming one single system. This triad has been called the trimuni-vyākaraṇa or munitraya, where Patañjali is conferred the highest degree of authority.³ This conception of the trimuni is found in relatively late grammatical texts. The grammarian

---

¹ Scharfe, 1977: 141.
² Scharfe, 1977: 141.
Kaiyata (11th century A.D.) in his commentary upon A 1.1.29, states that among Panini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, "the later author overrules the earlier one in case of conflict of opinion." A similar triadic system developed in other schools of grammar in South Asia, including the Kacc School. As I have said above, the Kacc system was formed by Kaccāyana’s *sutta* “set of rules,” the *vutti* “commentary” ascribed to Saṅghanandin and the *nyāsa* “detailed commentary” of Vimalabuddhi. The development of Pāli grammar in these three stages constitutes what Pind has called the formative period of Pāli grammar.¹ For this reason I conventionally call the triad Kaccāyana-Saṅghanandin-Vimalabuddhi the Pāli *timuni*. Here also, the later author should overrule the earlier if we really want to make Kacc work as a descriptive device. This principle of authority has been repeatedly overlooked, or simply ignored, by many scholars of Kacc.²

Apart from borrowing rules and borrowing the dialectic model of the *trimuni-vyākaraṇa*, there are also other aspects in which the Pāṇinian School has influenced Pāli grammarians. As is well known, the labours of Patañjali were not purely grammatical. He also established the foundations for a philosophy of grammar and a philosophy of language.³ And it is not by chance that one of the greatest philosophers of language in India, Bhartṛhari (5th century A.D.), was a Patañjali scholar.

Linguistic disputations along the lines of Patañjali and Bhartṛhari are also found among Pāli grammarians of Laṅkā and Pagan. It is probably not a mere coincidence that one of the earliest known works on the Pāli philosophy of language, the *Mañjusā* (ca. 9th century A.D., now lost), was written by a certain Patañjali.⁴

---

¹ Pind, 2012: 61: “[T]he period that stretches from the time of composition of Buddhaghosa’s Aṭṭhakathās through the complicated history of Kacc and Kacc-v to the completion of Vajirabuddhi’s *Mukhamattadīpanī*, presumably in the tenth century A.D.” Vajirabuddhi is an alternative name for Vimalabuddhi.

² Some important works that are critical with the Kaccāyana system but completely overlook the commentary of Vimalabuddhi: D’Alwis, 1863; Kuhn, 1869 and 1870; Senart, 1871; Grünwedel, 1883; Vidyabhusana, 1901; Franke, 1902.


⁴ Pind, 2012: 110–111. What we know from the *Mañjusā* is thanks to Vimalabuddhi, who quotes this work in the *kāraka* section of Mmd.
To sum up, we can distinguish four types of influence from the Pāṇini system to the Kacc system: (1) an explicit borrowing of rules, as in the *kāraka* section, where Kacc reuses Pāṇini’s materials wholesale; (2) the method by which the grammatical tradition operates: the meta-syntactical device of the *anuvṛtti* (“recurrence”), optionality, hermeneutic devices such as the *maṇḍūkapluti* “frog’s leap” and certain implied *paribhāṣā* (“metarules”) belong to this second type of influence, which is not manifest in the *sūtra* text of Pāṇini or Kacc, but in the commentarial literature; (3) the model of the *trimuni-vyākaraṇa*; (4) the philosophical approach to language found in Mbh and picked up by Vimalabuddhi in his *Mukhamattadīpanī*. 
4. The Kātantra Grammar and its Influence on Kaccāyana

The identity of the plans of the Kātantra and Kaccāyana needs no illustration

Burnell

From the early stages of Pāli studies in Europe, scholars have recognised the influence of Kātantra (Kāt) in Kacc, or at least their striking similarity. Indeed Kāt enjoys privileged recognition among Pāli grammarians, for it is frequently quoted, alongside Pāli authorities, in Pāli grammars such as Kacc-nidd. There is thus an awareness that Kāt is somehow part of the Kacc tradition. The presence of Kāt manuscripts in old Burma and also in modern Burmese monastic libraries seems to corroborate this fact.

The first level of influence of Kāt on Kacc is the borrowing of sūtras. Out of the approximately 675 rules of Kacc, 215 are supposed to be adaptations or edited versions of Kāt. The second level of influence is the arrangement of the topics. Kacc reproduces the general structure of Kāt in four sections: Sandhi,Nama, Ākhyāta, Kṛt. The influence is visible even in sub-sections. A third level of influence is the technical terminology, which is also very similar and follows the anvartha principle and keeps rūḷhī to a minimum.

Kāt is a grammar that was presumably meant to supersede Pāṇini’s Aṣṭ. The major departures or innovations of Kāt (and by extension Kacc) with respect to the Pāṇini system are, as Saini has pointed out, the adoption of “an independent and new method in respect of topic-wise rearrangement of the sūtras, non-use of the Pratyāhāra-sūtras and total omission

---

1 Burnell, 1875: 11.
2 See chapter I.
3 PLB, 101f. I have personally consulted and photographed a Kalāpa manuscript in Sanskrit, written in Burmese characters, stored in the Thar Lay Monastery near Inle, Burma.
4 Pind, 2012: 79.
of the rules dealing with the Vedic Sanskrit and the accents.”¹ In this respect, Scharfe remarks that Kāṭ, although it goes back to Pāṇini in terms of terminology, uses much less metalinguistic determinatives, and contractions are absent:

[The Kāṭantra] lacks the generative tendency of Pāṇini’s rules and appears more like a contrastive tabulation.²

This feature brings Kāṭ and Kacc closer to the Prātiśākhyaas than to Pāṇini. The Kāṭantraṭīkā of Durgasimha (6th–8th centuries A.D.) defines the title kātantra as “concise grammar, where kā is a substitute of the affix ku in the sense of conciseness (iṣadarthe), and tantra means sūtra.”³ Instead of the nearly 4000 sūtras of Aṣṭ, Kāṭ has 855 sūtras, and around 1400 sūtras if we include the kṛt section, a section allegedly composed by a certain Kātyāyana.⁴ It has been repeatedly suggested, indeed, that Kāṭ is meant to be an essential grammar, easy to learn by all sorts of people.⁵ The target audience of Kāṭ was described by Śaśideva with a touch of humour:

The Kalāpaka, [a word] having many meanings, is meant to instruct quickly those who are:

Vedic scholars, dumb people who are engaged in other śāstras, kings, physicians, lazy people,

---

¹ Saini, 1987: v.
³ Kāṭ-ṭ 2.4-5: saṃkṣiptaṃ vyākaraṇaṃ kātantram. iṣadarthe kuśabdasya kādeśa ucyate. tantryante vyutpadyante ‘nena śabdā iti tantraṃ sūtram.
⁴ Belvalkar, 1915: 87.
⁵ Belvalkar, 1915: 81; Saini, 1999: 19; Pollock, 2006: 62: “What makes this grammar remarkable is that it is clearly a work of popularization in both its mode of presentation and its substance. It almost totally eliminates the complex metalinguistic terminology of its Paninian model (which it clearly sought to displace, and successfully displaced for many reading communities for centuries) and excludes all rules pertaining to the Vedic register of the language—a striking modification in a knowledge form that for a millennium had regarded itself as a limb of the Veda, and, as Patañjali showed, was above all intended to ensure the preservation of the Veda.” The legend of Kāṭantra in the Kathāsaritsāgara (I, 7, 12-13) suggests that this grammar was destined to supersede Pāṇini, but it failed.
merchants, those who are involved in the production of corn, etc. and are set on worldly matters.¹

Saini claims that Kāt is “the oldest among the post-Pāṇinian systems of grammar”² (note the implication of “post-” instead of “non-”³). Saini argues that Kātantra was the first challenge to the grammatical authority of Pāṇini (that is of the Pāṇinian system), and therefore all non-Pāṇinian systems are, to a certain extent, indebted to the Kātantra. This includes, again, the Kacc system.

The authorship of Kāt is ascribed to a certain Śarvavarman (known as Saptavarman in the Tibetan tradition⁴). There is much confusion regarding the origins of his grammar. According to the legendary account of Somadeva’s Kathāsaritsāgara (12th century A.D.),⁵ Śarvavarman was a Brahmin in the court of a certain Sātavāhana king (around the 2nd century A.D.). According to Durgasiṃha, the vṛttikāra, a certain Kātyāyana (or Vararuci, or Śākaṭāyana) is the author of the kṛdanta section of Kāt.⁶ The kṛdanta section is probably a later addition, for it has not been found in the 4th-century A.D. fragments of Kātantra in Eastern Turkestan (see below).⁷

---

¹ My translation. These verses are from the Vyākhyānaprakriyā, quoted from a Ms. in Belvalkar, 1915: 82; quoted in full by Dwivedi 1997 Bhūmikā, 5:

chāndasah svadpamatayah śāstrāntararatāḥ ca ye
iśvarā vyādhiratās tathā lasyayutās ca ye
vānasasyādisaṁsaṅkṣaktā lokayātrādiṣu sthitāḥ
tēśāṁ kṣipram prabodhārtham anekārtham kalāpakam.


³ Belvalkar (1915: 57) on the contrary, uses the term “non-Pāṇinian.”

⁴ Burnell, 1875: 6.

⁵ The legend is found in Somadeva’s Kathāsaritsāgara I, 7,1-13 and Kṣemendra’s Brhatkathāmañjarī, Kathāpīṭha, 3, 48 (ed. Pāṇḍuraṅga, Śivadatta and Kāśinātha, Bombay, 1901).


As for the date, Saini postulates the 2nd century B.C.¹ Other scholars, such as Belvaklar or Haraprasād Śāstrī, propose 100 A.D.² Pollock is of the same opinion and places Śarvavarman at the Sātavāhana court, ca. 2nd century A.D.³ On the other hand, Lüders, followed by Oberlies, dates Kaumāralāta’s grammar (see below) to the end of the 3rd century A.D. (Macdonell postulates the same date for Kātantra⁴) and Kātantra to the 4th.⁵ Except for Saini, scholars seem to agree on dating Kāt during the period of the Kuṣāṇa and Sātavāhana empires. What is not clear is which grammar was first: the Buddhist Kātantra of the Kuṣāṇa kingdom, or the brahmanical Kātantra of the Sātavāhana kingdom.

The history of the Kātantra School is also problematic. The oldest extant commentary on Kāt is Durgasiṃha’s Kātantra-vṛtti (Kāt-v), composed around the 6th–8th centuries A.D. (600–680 A.D. for both works, according to Dwivedi⁶). The religious affiliation of Durgasiṃha is still disputed. According to Belvalkar, he was a śaiva, and he is not the same as the author of the Kātantra-ṭīkā (Kāt-ṭ) also called Durgasiṃha,⁷ who was (according to Belvalkar) a bauddha “Buddhist.” Belvalkar gives no date for the ṭīkākāra but suggests that he is pre-11th century A.D.⁸ Conversely, Scharfe and Deokar maintain that Durgasiṃha the vṛttikāra was a Buddhist and that he was also the author of the ṭīkā.⁹ Deokar informs us, however, that Koparkar considers the author of the ṭīkā a different Durgasiṃha, who lived ca. 700–950 A.D.¹⁰ Be that as it may, the text of Kāt-v implies that a previous vṛtti, allegedly composed

---

1 Saini, 1987: v.
2 Saini, 1987: x. “Dr. S.K. Belvalkar and Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstrī are of the opinion that Sātavāhana ruled about 100 A.D. Pandit Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmānsaka holds the opinion that Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya referred to the Kālāpas, and therefore the Kātantravyākaraṇa must have been written before the composition of the Mahābhāṣya.”
4 Saini, 1999: 19.
6 Dwivedi, 1997: 8–9.
8 Belvalkar, 1915: 88.
9 Deokar, 2012: 151–152.
10 Deokar, 2012: 152; Saini, 1987: 152:

\textit{vykṣādivadāmī rudhā kṛtīnā na kṛtāḥ kṛtaḥ}
by Śarvavarman himself, was the base of the extant vṛtti, for this commentary states: kātantrasya pravakṣyāmi vyākhyānaṃ śārvavarmikam “I will explain the commentary made by Śarvavarman.”

According to Lüders, a different commentarial tradition is attested in two Eastern Turkestan manuscripts of Kāt: one from Šorcuq, edited by Stieg (SBAW, 1908) and one fragment from Qyzil, not edited. Lüders maintains they are the same work. Its authorship is not known with certainty, but it could be the original commentary by Śarvavarman. The manuscript of this work (ca. 4th century A.D.) is older than the manuscripts of Durgasiṃha’s vṛtti (ca. 6th century A.D.). The introduction of a Dhātupāṭha (modelled on Candragomin) and an Unādipāṭha in the Kāt school was created by Durgasiṃha the vṛttikāra. The Liṅgānuśāsana was composed by Durgasiṃha the tīkākāra.

There is scholarly consensus that the Kātantra has always been a popular grammar among Buddhists. It has enjoyed recognition not only in Central Asia, but also in Bengal, Kashmir, South India, Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia. A grammar similar to Kāt is also known under the title Kaumāravyākaraṇa. It was allegedly written by a certain Kumāralāta. Lüders says that Kumāralāta, Mātṛceta and Aśvaghoṣa formed the triumvirate of Buddhist literature in Sanskrit during the first centuries A.D. in the Kuṣāṇa Empire. Kumāralāta must have been a fine prose and verse writer in the style of ākhyāna (“story-telling”) and he allegedly composed the first Sanskrit grammar for Buddhists. Fragments of this grammar dating from ca. 325 A.D. have been found in Eastern Turkestan and were edited by Lüders in

---

1 Scharfe, 1977: 163; Kāt-v, introductory stanzas; Kāt-ṭ 2,9–13. I understand śārvavarmika as “made by Śarvavarman” but this secondary derivative could have many other meanings, among them, “to [the grammar] of Śarvavarman”.
2 Lüders, 1930: 21f.
3 Deokar, 2012: 152.
5 Lüders, 1930: 53; Lüders (1926) has also edited fragments of Kumāralāta’s Kalpaṇāmaṇḍitikā.
6 Lüders, 1930: passim; Scharfe, 1977: 162.
1930. The terminology of the *Kaumāravyākaraṇa* betrays familiarity with written texts, not just an oral tradition, and is adjusted to Buddhist scriptures instead of Vedic texts. That is, at least, what the recurrent usage of the locative ārṣe ("in the language of the ṛṣi [= the Buddha"] suggests. But we have to keep in mind that this is only a conjecture by Lüders.1 Nonetheless it seems clear that Kaumāralāta quotes Buddhist canonical passages from a Sanskrit recension. For instance, in fragment 6R32 we find the line “….rmavinaye a[p] (rama)tto vihāryati,” which corresponds to *Udānavarga* IV 38: *yo hy asmin dharmavinaye tv apramatte bhaviṣyati,*3 and to *Gāndhārī Dhammapada* and Pāli canonical texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Dh. 125 (Brough)</th>
<th>Pāli (DN ii. 121; SN i. 157; Thg 257)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>yo imasma dhama-viṇa’i</em></td>
<td><em>yo imasmiṁ dhammavinaye</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apramatu vihasiḍi</td>
<td>appamatto vihessati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praha’i jatisatsara</td>
<td>pahāya jātisaṃsāruṇaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dukhusada kaviṣadi.</td>
<td>dukhassantaṃ karissati.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Kaumāralāta* manual was apparently used in Buddhist monasteries of Central Asia as a specific grammar for Buddhist texts. As Lüders has convincingly argued, the recensions of *Kaumāra* and Kāt are too similar to be unrelated, but they are too different to be considered the same work.4 As a consequence of this, it is generally assumed that one precedes the other, but there is disagreement regarding which one is the original model. Scharfe and Pind, following Lüders, believe that Kāt is a “recast of Kaumāralāta.”5 This would imply that the first challenge to Pāṇinian grammar came from a Buddhist milieu. Pollock, on the contrary,

---
1 Scharfe, 1977: 162; Lüders, 1930: 51: “Diese Regeln über das Arṣa und die im Kommentar dazu angeführten Beispiele sind für die Beurteilung des Textes des Sanskritkanons nicht ohne Wert.”
2 Lüders, 1930: 29.
4 Lüders, 1930: 53.
5 Pind, 2012: 79.
thinks that the differences between Kaumāra and Kāt are due to Buddhist additions. Indeed, the Kaumāra contains examples found in Kāt or Kāt-v, but there is no trace of Kaumāra examples in the Kāt text. Be that as it may, we have some evidence that the Kacc grammar is closer to the Buddhist Turkestan Kātantra recension than to the Indian brahmanical Kātantra.

It is believed that Kāt influenced later grammars, not only the Kacc in Pāli, but also Hemacandra’s chapter on Prakrit grammar, or the Sanskrit Sārasvata grammar, and probably the Tamil Tolkappiyam as well. Burnell suggests even Tibetan grammars were composed under the influence of Kāt. Indeed the influence of Kāt is widespread in South, Central and Southeast Asia.

Before Saini’s scholarship on the so-called “Post-Pāṇinian systems,” Burnell claimed, already in 1875, that Pāṇini, in applying algebraic conciseness to the ultimate consequences, was the actual revolutionary. According to Burnell, the Pāṇinian system was an innovation with respect to an older tradition, which he calls the “Aindra system” because it was allegedly revealed by the god Indra. Burnell states that the Aindra School is referred to by Pāṇini under the name prāñcaḥ, which is commonly translated as “the Eastern grammarians,” but Burnell prefers to understand it as meaning “the former grammarians,” a translation that is quite difficult to accept. Furthermore, according to Burnell, non-brahmanical movements such as Buddhism or Jainism, and even the kaumudi grammarians of

1 Pollock, 2006: 170; “But it is precisely the Kātantra’s core project of desacralization that makes parts of Kumāralāta’s text appear to be the additions of a borrower—such as the sections on ārṣa, or ‘seer’s’ usage, where the seer is the Buddha and the texts in which the usages in question occur are Buddhist Sanskrit canonical works.”
2 Lüders, 1930: 17.
4 Burnell, 1875: 13; “It is sufficient to point out here that for the old simple terms, we find in Pāṇini an elaborate classification of nouns and verbs to suit the grammatical forms and irregularities; the analysis is no longer philosophical, but according to the forms.”
5 Even Patañjali’s account in the Paspaśāhnika (51f.) points to a primordial role of Indra in the knowledge of grammar as a science that can know all correct words without listing them all.
6 Burnell, 1875: 19.
Sanskrit later on, adopted the straightforward methods of the “Aindras.” If that is true, we should not necessarily understand that Kacc derives from Kāt, but that both derive from the same pool of grammatical knowledge. According to Burnell, the Aindra School contains works such as the Vedic Prātiśākhyas, Yāska’s Nirukta, the Tamil Tolkappiyam, the Sanskrit Kātantra, the Pāli Kaccāyana and Vopadeva’s Mugdhabodha. In their approach to language, these texts show a remarkable number of similarities that cannot be passed over unnoticed. Their ur-version, Burnell speculates, is the legendary first grammar composed by Indra:

In the old times, Speech (vāc) spoke undivided. The gods asked Indra: ‘Divide (vyākuru) speech for us!’ He replied, ‘Let me choose a boon! Let it be taken for my sake and for that of Vāyu together.’ This is why the aindravāyava is taken together. Then Indra, having descended in the middle [of speech], divided it. This is why this speech is spoken divided (vyākṛta). *(Taittirīyasamhitā 6.4.7.3)*

What Burnell supposes is what ancient Indians probably supposed. It is to be suspected, however, that the reality was much more complex. The scope of this question is far larger than the subject of this chapter. Suffice it to say that Kāt is the earliest version of a grammar modelled, in terms of structure and terminology, exactly like Kacc, and that this model was not exclusive to these two grammatical systems.

---

1 Translation by Ciotti (2012: 18).
2 Cardona 1976: 150: “One need not posit a single treatise by the god Indra: one need posit no more than a pre-Pāṇinian methodology.”
5. The Kaccāyana System

Kacc is not the only extant Pāli grammar, but it is, without doubt, the oldest one among the surviving Pāli grammars. There are three different corpora of grammatical suttas in Pāli: Kacc, Moggallāna (Mogg) and Saddanīti (Sadd). Some scholars suggest, with good reason, that Sadd should be included in the Kacc system.\(^1\) Franke considered it a separate system, probably because the suttas do not match exactly with the Kacc.

In Burma, the Kacc tradition is the oldest and the newest at the same time, for very few monks and scholars study Mogg and Sadd in Burmese monasteries today, whereas Kacc is known as the “Great Grammar” (saddā-kyī:) and it is still commented upon and translated. To judge from the number of grammatical texts that belong to the Kacc tradition, this has been the state of affairs in Burma since the Pagan period.

The basic text of the Kacc system is the Kaccāyanasutta, composed around the 6th–8th centuries A.D. Its earliest commentary is the Kaccāyanavutti (Kacc-v), ascribed to a certain Saṅghanandin, composed after Kacc, but before the 10th century A.D. We do not know the exact place of composition of these two works.\(^2\)

The Moggallāna system is based on Moggallāna’s Pāli grammar Mūgadhasadda-lakkhaṇa and the vutti (Mogg-v) and pañcikā (Mogg-p) by the same author. These works were written in 12th-century Laṅkā by a Mahāthera called Moggallāna, a disciple of Sāriputta, the renowned ṭīkā author. Mogg was written in the context of a major monastic reform that gave birth to what we know as Theravāda Buddhism of the Mahāvihāra lineage.\(^3\)

---

1 For further references to Kaccāyana literature and Pāli grammarians, see D’Alwis, 1863, Franke, 1902. Pind, 2012. For Sadd as a system dependent on Kacc, see Kahrs, 1992: 7: “[T]here can be no doubt that Aggavaṃsa was strongly indebted to Kaccāyana in as much as he included all of the Kaccāyana rules and most of the vutti in the Suttamālā.” For similarities and differences between Kacc and Sadd, see Tin Lwin, 1991, passim.


3 For more nuanced and up to date discussions of the label theravāda in different historical contexts, see Skilling et al., 2013.
The Mogg grammar was conceived as a critique of Kacc, for Kacc was seen as “confused” or “disordered” (ākula). The Sanskrit model for Mogg is not Kāt, but Pāṇini and especially the Cāndravyākaraṇa of Candragomin, a 5th-century scholar from Nālandā. As sources for Mogg we should also include the commentaries upon the Cāndravyākaraṇa.

The Sadd system consists simply of the grammar called the Saddanīti, “Guide to words” or “Rational explanation of words.” To the best of my knowledge, no Pāli commentaries on this work exist aside from Paññasāmi’sṭīkā written in the late 19th century. This ṭīkā follows the style of the Nyāsa and the Suttaniddesa of Saddhammajotipāla. It has never been published.

Sadd is a work of encyclopaedic breadth, aiming at an exhaustive description of the Pāli language. It is not purely grammatical, but also philological and hermeneutic. Sadd was allegedly composed by Aggavaṃsa of Pagan (Burma) probably in the 12th–13th centuries A.D. The Pāṇinian system seems to be an important influence on Aggavaṃsa, although his main intention was not to produce a perfect grammar, but to produce a grammar that would be adjusted to the Pāli language as recorded in the Tipiṭaka.

Other systems of Pāli grammar existed apart from Kacc, Mogg and Sadd. Although they are not extant, we know about them because they are frequently quoted in the surviving grammatical treatises (See Chapter 2).

The core of the Kacc system of grammar is conventionally divided into four layers of text: 1) Kacc, which is a set of 674 rules; 2) Kacc-v, a concise commentary ascribed to

---

2 For the influence of the Cāndravyākaraṇa on Mogg see Gornall, 2012 and Gornall, 2014.
3 Ruiz-Falqués, 2014b. Paññasāmi’sṭīkā has not been edited or published. Pind does not mention it in any of his works, nor do Kahrs, 1992 and Deokar, 2008. A Burmese nissaya was composed by U Budh in the 18th century, and Helmer Smith used this nissaya in his edition of Sadd.
4 Aggavaṃsa’s date is not known with exactness, but probably around the 12th or 13th centuries. See Tin Lwin, 1991: 124.
5 Kahrs, 1992: 2.
6 The most detailed examination of lost Pāli grammars is found in Pind, 2012. I will explore this subject in the next chapter.
7 The number of suttas may slightly vary from edition to edition.
Saṅghanandin, ca. 8th century A.D.; 3); the payoga (“example”) section, allegedly composed by a certain Brahmadatta; 4) Mukhamattadīpanī or Nyāsa (Mmd), an extensive commentary written by Vimalabuddhi (or Vajirabuddhi), allegedly in Sri Lanka, around the 10th century A.D.

Kacc has been repeatedly commented upon, and also reworked, either in abbreviated versions (e.g. Dhammakitti’s Bālāvatāra was written in the 14th century A.D.) or in versions with the rules arranged in a different order (e.g. Buddhappiya’s Rūpasiddhi was written in the 12th century A.D.). The Rūpasiddhi (Rūp) is a rearrangement in which the rules are given according to the order necessary for the derivation of certain types of words. Buddhappiya replaced Kacc-v with his own vutti, which is the original text of Rūp. A ṭīkā on Rūp (Rūp-ṭ) is ascribed to Buddhappiya himself. The Bālāvatāra (Bāl) as the title indicates (“Introduction for beginners”), is conceived as a Kacc primer. Thus, not only the order of Kacc’s rules is slightly rearranged, but many rules are simply omitted. The popularity of Bāl is still noticeable among South and Southeast Asian Theravādins, especially among novice monks. It was also the first Pāli grammar to be translated into a European language.¹

Commentaries on Kaccāyana in Burma are abundant. The oldest one extant is the Mukhamattadīpanīporūṇatiṭkā (Mmd-pṭ), also known as Thanbyin ṭīkā (ca. 12th century A.D., Burma). This text was allegedly composed by a nobleman of Pagan. The legend says that he had to ordain as a monk and perform this intellectual exploit before has was given a princess as a wife.² Whether that legend is true or not, we cannot tell, but the clear and bold style of Mmd-pṭ makes it evident that the author was well acquainted with vākaraṇa and the scholastic style, for this commentary clearly explains when the pūrwapakṣa is objecting and when the siddhāntin is replying, something that is not always evident when we read Mmd. Mmd-pṭ is the main, or the official, Kacc commentary of the Pagan period. The other Kacc commentaries, it seems to me, are all representatives of different political moments in the

¹ Benjamin Clough’s Pāli Grammar (Colombo, 1824), which is, as the author acknowledges, “chiefly a translation of a celebrated work called Bālāvatāra” (Clough, 1824: iv).
² PLB 21.
history of Burma, each one representing one capital city. The next important commentary, chronologically, is the *Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa* (Kacc-nidd) by Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla (15th century A.D.). Though composed in Pagan, this is the main grammatical commentary of the Ava period. Another well-known commentary on Kacc is Mahāvijitāviś’s *Kaccāyanavanāṇanā* (Kacc-vaṇṇ) composed in the 16th century A.D. in Panyā, Burma. This one, again, is an extensive and erudite commentary that incorporates and supersedes the previous literature on the topic. Kacc-vaṇṇ is the representative Kacc commentary of the Panyā period. Next comes Dhāṭanāga’s *Niruttisāramāṇijusā*, written in the 17th century A.D. in Toungoo, capital of Burma during the so-called Toungoo period. This commentary is meant to be a ṭīkā not directly on Kacc, but on Mmd.

There is another commentary on Kacc that still enjoys popularity in Burma, the so-called *Galoun Pyan* “The flight of the Phoenix” (date unknown). Even though this is a Pāli commentary, its style follows the method of Burmese nissayas. It is a rather tedious work that cannot be compared in depth and insight with the previously mentioned commentaries.

In my assessment of the Pāli grammatical commentaries of Burma I will not include the Burmese nissayas, even though, as Smith has proved, they are extremely useful in textual criticism. Their inclusion would be beyond the scope of this study.

Furthermore, there are a number of so-called “minor” grammatical texts, mostly written in Burma. It is not evident that all of them are based on Kacc, but some of them are, for instance: Dhammasenāpati’s *Kārikā* (11th century A.D.), Mahāyasa’s *Kaccāyanabheda* (unknown date, Burma) and Yasa’s *Kaccāyanasāra* (unknown date, Burma). The number of minor grammars has been canonised as fifteen since the 1956 Burmese edition—an edition virtually contemporaneous with the Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti edition. But the number of extant minor Pāli grammars is far greater. Due to their conciseness, these minor texts have been commented upon several times. We preserve ṭīkās “commentaries” of nearly all of them, and

---

1 Smith, 1928: vii.
3 Piṭ-s 78f.
sometimes two or three śīkās on the same work. As is the case with minor Abhidhamma manuals, the minor grammatical works usually focus on one particular topic, for instance, sandhi (e.g. Akkharasamūha), or case syntax (e.g. Vibhattyattha), or lexicography (e.g. Ekakkharakosa), or else they focus on a particular approach, for instance the Kaccāyanabheda is a summary of Kaccāyana, but the Mukhamattasāra is a summary of Kaccāyana through the interpretation of the Mukhamattadīpanī; and the Saddatthabhedacintā is a minor grammatical text that is probably based not on Kaccāyana exclusively but on Ratnaśrījñāna’s Śabdārthacintā. As I will show below, it is in the commentaries (śīkās) upon these minor works that we find interesting information and references to grammatical systems and grammatical ideas of the time. Thus, although these works seem to treat the same topics, they actually focus on particular aspects of the grammar.

A complete assessment of the Kacc tradition presents several problems because, as Pind has pointed out, “most of the literature is no longer extant and has to be studied on the basis of a few fragments quoted in Pāli grammars written at a later date.” A good example is the Atthabyākhyāna (Atth), which had to be an important work, known and frequently quoted by Pāli grammarians of Pagan. It seems to have the same authority as Sadd, Rūp or Mogg. It is always quoted as a commentary in prose. My guess, after examining the many quotations of Atth in Kacc-nidd (see Chapter 2), is that it was a recast of Kacc suttas, with an original commentary, much in the style of Rūp. This grammar was already known in 13th-century Burma, for there is a library inscription that bears its name.

Indeed, given the fact that many Pāli books have been lost, inscriptions become an important source for the study of Pāli literature. Sometimes they are the only evidence we have of the existence of certain Pāli texts in Pagan. Around 500 lythic inscriptions from 12th–13th centuries have been edited, and there are many more that are still to be “excavated or read or published.” Since these inscriptions generally record donations, they

---

1 Pind, 2012: 100.
2 Lammerts, 2010: 117.
often contain inventories of book collections given to a particular monastery. We need to keep in mind, as Lammerts warns us, that they simply represent the “literary values held by the donor and the immediate monastic recipients of the donation.” We cannot draw general conclusions about Pagan Buddhism (which was an amalgam of different traditions and lineages) only from the evidence of some Buddhist texts that are found in a particular monastery. We can however prove that certain texts were known in certain monasteries.

According to Lammerts, the 1227 A.D. inscription “that records the donation of Buddhist texts to a monastery constructed by Lord Siṅghavīr Sujjabuil is by far the most detailed” testimony of the Pagan period. This inscription, as the well-known, but latter (Ava period) 1442 A.D. list, contains a significant number of grammatical works that I reproduce as edited by Lammerts (2010: 118–119), including the lacunae:

\[
\begin{align*}
  kaccay & [kaccāyana pāṭha?] \\
  ni/ay & [nyāsa] \\
  ṭikā mahāther{a} & \\
  ṭikā saṃbyaũ & \\
  cuḷasandhi & \\
  [manuscript containing:] & \{sandhi\v isodhanā \\
  & \{ku ṭikā mahānamakkār \ [mahānamakkāra ṭika]
\end{align*}
\]

The inscription goes on with a second donation of \textit{piṭakas} (“books”) by the son of Siṅghavīr Sujjabuil. The second list contains the following grammatical works:

\[
\begin{align*}
  kāccāy mahāniritu & [kaccāyana mahāniruttā] \\
  ṭikā mahāther & \\
  ṭikā mahāsampeñ &
\end{align*}
\]

1 Lammerts, 2010: 117.
2 Handlin, 2012: 171f.
3 Lammerts, 2010: 117.
From the study of grammatical texts such as Kacc-nidd, some of Lammerts’ conjectures can be improved. The byākhyan mahānirut, for instance, is most probably the frequently quoted Atthabyākhyāna. And the “ṭīkā byākhyā(...)” is probably the ṭīkā on the Atthabyākhyāna, also quoted in Chapaṭa’s Kacc-nidd.

The fact that Kaccāyana and the Atthabyākhyāna are called Mahānirutti is noteworthy. It seems that the title Mahānirutti is a generic that applies to full grammatical sutta texts, not to abridgements. This could indicate that, perhaps, Kaccāyana and Mahānirutti are the same work, or Atthabyākhyāna and Mahānirutti are the same work.1 Lammerts also raises some important points on the terminology of the inscription:

Here piṭaka does not refer exclusively to those texts understood as belonging to modern editions or understandings of the tipiṭaka (the “Pāli canon”), but encompasses a range of commentarial, “paracanonical,” and grammatical treatises.2

---

1 Tradition ascribes a certain work called the Mahānirutti to Kaccāyana, cf. Pind 2012: 71, based on Ap-a 491,17–21 (ad Ap 531): therọ ... puna satthu santikam eva āgato attano pabhapatthanāvasena Kaccāyanappakaraṇam Mahāniruttippakaraṇam Nettipakaraṇam ti pakaraṇattayaṃ saṅghamajjhe byākāsi “The Thera, again, going into the very presence of the Master, on account of his previous aspirations, explained in the midst of the Saṅgha the triple treatise, namely the Kaccāyana treatise, the Mahānirutti treatise and the Netti treatise” (my translation).

And subsequently he adds:

Another interesting feature of the 1227 book list epigraph is the prevalence of named Pāli chronicle and grammatical texts. From the first list we notice that of the named and presumably single-treatise texts 7 are vaṃsas (some, such as the Thūpavamsa, Bodhivaṃsa, and Mahāvaṃsa are connected with the Sinhalese Mahāvihāra lineage), 5 are grammatical texts, 2 are somewhat uncertain, and 1 is a panegyric verse text (the Mahānamakkāra). In the incomplete second list all of the named and presumably single-treatise texts are grammatical works except for the Mahānamakkāra and the somewhat uncertain ṭīkā mahāther{a} although the placement of the last text, both in this inscription and in the later 1442 Tak nvay Monastery epigraph, might indicate that it is a grammatical text as well.¹

Quotations of the Mahāthera-ṭīkā in Kacc-nidd confirm Lammerts’ guess that this is a grammatical treatise (see Chapter 2). This is a good example of how a grammatical text of the 15th century, preserved in manuscripts of the 19th century, can help us in the correct understanding of 13th-century inscriptions.

Some other titles mentioned in the list are known by name, but the works have never been found. The Sandhivisodhana and its ṭīkā are also lost. The Cūlasandhi is lost, and also the Mañjūsā-ṭīkā. The Nirutti could be the Niruttipiṭaka quoted by Sadd (for instance Sadd 310, 8–10).

According to Pind, Mmd quotes two grammars that are responsible for 33 interpolated suttas in Kacc: the Sudattakisivaniruttī and the Mahāniruttī, both lost.² What Pind does not state is that these two grammars are mentioned but once in the entire Mmd (a volume of five hundred pages in the Burmese edition).³ According to the Mmd-pṭ interpretation, these are grammars belonging to other nikāyas (nikāyantaravāsīṇāṃ byākaraṇavīsesanāni⁴).

¹ Lammerts, 2010: 121.
³ Mmd 231, 1–2.
⁴ Pind, 2012: 100, n.171.
A work called the Cūlaniruttī and ascribed to Yamakathera is quoted in Sadd and Padasādhana-ṭīkā.\(^1\) It is allegedly lost. The Cūlaniruttī we find today in manuscripts is a new version composed in Burma. The Mañjūsā or Mañjūsā-ṭīkā is the commentary on the Niruttī (or Cūlaniruttī) and is, according to Pind, “one of the most influential post-Kaccāyana Pāli grammars.”\(^2\) It is also lost. But the fact that such a great portion of the Kacc literature has vanished is probably not the result of misfortune or carelessness only. Indeed, all the Pāli grammatical texts forcefully treat the same content. When the decision to copy these texts had to be taken, scholar monks probably opted for those texts that were more authoritative, for instance, Kacc with Mmd, or those texts that offered something more than grammar, for instance, short grammatical-philosophical works that focused on one aspect or topic. On the other hand, some grammarians like Saddhammajotipāla incorporated relevant points of independent grammars into the Kaccāyana line of commentaries, and with that works such as the Atthabyākhyāna became perhaps redundant after the 15th century (a relatively late date for the grammatical tradition, but a relatively early date for the manuscript tradition).

It is also generally the case that a monk will select a single grammatical system and master it. If there is time, a monk will also study the minor grammatical treatises. In one of my visits to Burma I had a conversation about Pāli grammars with a senior monk, a lecturer of Pāli vyākaraṇa in the Theravāda University of Yangon. When I showed him the edition of the 15 minor grammatical works, he remarked, with admiration, that these texts contained the ultimate meaning. What the scholar monk intended to say, I think, is that minor grammatical works are philosophical treatises of some sort. That is probably the reason why they survived side by side with basic grammars. It is important to keep all these aspects of the Pāli grammatical tradition in mind, for they can help us in understanding why the study of grammar was so important in Pagan. In the following sections I will examine some of these minor grammars. These texts have never been studied, let alone translated, in the West, and

---

\(^1\) Pind, 2012: 107.  
without the study of the actual texts it is quite impossible to clarify what they were meant for. After summarising the long journey of *vyākaraṇa* from Kashmir to Pagan, I will now focus on the texts written by Burmese monastics.
6. Saddhammasiri of Pagan and His Philosophy of Language

6.1. The Saddatthabhedacintā

One of the core texts of grammatical philosophy in Burma is a minor grammar called the Saddatthabhedacintā (SBC).¹ This treatise consists of nearly 400 stanzas (silokas). It was composed by Saddhammasiri of Pagan around the 13th century A.D. According to Dimitrov, the author was inspired by a Sanskrit work (now lost) on the philosophy of language called the Šabdārthacintā and written by the Sinhalese scholar named Ratnaśrījñāna.²

Aside from Dimitrov’s (unpublished) study on the Šabdārthacintā, there is no significant bibliography on SBC in any European language, and what we find in Burmese and Sinhalese bibliography relies on late and untrustworthy chronicle material.³ The only description I have been able to find is in Bode’s PLB. Bode, in her chapter on “The Rise of Pāli Scholarship in Upper Burma,” mentions Saddhammasiri and his work in the following passage:

Names of grammarians follow close on one another at this period [i.e. Pagan dynasty]. Schisms had indeed arisen, but the time had not yet come for works of polemik, and the good monks of Pagan were busy enriching the new store of learning in the country. In the work of Saddhammasiri, the author of the grammatical treatise Saddatthabhedacintā, we catch a glimpse of a culture that recalls Aggavaṃsa. Saddhammasiri’s grammar is based partly on Kaccāyana’s Pāli aphorisms and partly on Sanskrit authorities. The Sāsanavanśa tells us that

---

¹ PLB 20; Piṭ-s 395.
² Dimitrov, 2015: 594f.
³ For instance, in the Pugan-sāsanā-vañ of U Kelāsa, we read that Saddhammasiri was “the Third Chapaṭa.” This statement is not backed with any evidence. U Kelāsa does not refer to any source. See Kelāsa, 2005: 111.
Saddhammasiri also translated the *Brihaja (?)* into the Burmese language. He was probably among the first to use Burmese as a literary instrument.¹

This passage seems to imply that there is nothing particularly original about SBC. The relationship with Kaccāyana and Aggavaṃsa can be said of practically any Pāli grammatical text. In reading Saddhammasiri’s work, however, it becomes evident that it combines traditional Pāli grammar with notions of a philosophy of language and communication. By philosophy of language here we have to understand both Abhidhamma philosophy and the śabdaśāstra tradition of Patañjali, Bhartṛhari and other Indian philosophers, including Buddhists such as Dignāga and Dharmakīrti. By “grammar” we have to understand, mainly, the *suttas* of Kaccāyana and its commentaries. Philosophical ideas about language and communication are already found in Kacc commentaries such as Mmd, but not in the *suttas* proper.

With regard to Saddhammasiri’s originality, it is difficult to single out a completely original thought exposed by this author. It seems that SBC is a summary of the grammatical philosophy of its time. Being in verse form, it was probably meant to be committed to memory, as is customary in Burma. But one is not supposed to immediately understand the verses of Saddhammasiri, which are, as Eric Braun would put it, “concise to the point of being cryptic.”²

Two Pāli commentaries on SBC written in Pagan have been transmitted together with the “root” text.³ These commentaries are Abhayathera’s *porūṇāṭīkā*, known as the *Sāratthasaṅgahaṭīkā*,⁴ and the anonymous *navaṭīkā* or *Dīpanī*.⁵ According to the colophon,

---

¹ PLB 20.
² Braun, 2014: 49.
³ A third, modern ṭīkā called the *Saddatthabhedacintā Mahā Ṭīkā* was written by Talaing Koun Sayadaw, published in Yangon, 1937.
⁴ Piṭ-s 396.
⁵ Piṭ-s 397.
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the Dipani was composed in the 14th century in the Shwe Gu Kyi monastery of Pagan. Abhayathera’s commentary seems to be older and, according to a certain tradition, it was composed in the same monastery. It is not unlikely that Saddhammasiri himself was somehow related to the Shwe Gu Kyi monastery, but we lack epigraphical evidence for this.

Since the two commentaries are the key to understanding the verses of SBC, and they do not interpret the text exactly in the same way, I will refer to both of them alternately when unpacking the meaning of SBC verses. In the following section I will try to highlight some passages in SBC where grammar and philosophy are inseparably connected. With that I would like to shed some more light on the characteristics of what we call, perhaps too simplistically, “Pāli grammar.” I will concentrate on the first chapter of SBC, called the saddabhedacintā “enquiry on the different types of sound.” It will be immediately conspicuous that what we have traditionally called “grammars” are text of a more speculative nature.

6.2. The origins of sound (SBC 2)

At the very beginning of SBC, Saddhammasiri engages in a brief analysis of sound (sadda) origination. He distinguishes between two main types of sound, and he summarises two different theories on how thought becomes expressible through meaningful sound. In reading the following passage it is convenient to keep in mind that the word sadda literally means “sound” (or even “noise”), and only by extension does it mean “speech-sound,” “word.” Therefore I will always translate sadda as “sound,” and not as “word.” The Pāli equivalent of “word” is normally pada. Unlike pada, which is a linguistic category, sadda is in Theravāda

1 SBC-nt 247.22-25: suvaṇṇamayakūṭādīhi virocamānaguhāhi samannāgatattā rhvegū ti pākaṭanāmadheyye mahāvihāre vasatā mahātherena katāyaṃ saddatthabhedacintatthadīpanī catuvīsādhisattasatasakkarāje kattikamāsassa kāḷapakkhuuposathe gurudine niṭṭhaṃ pattā “this Elucidation of the Meaning of the Saddatthabhедacintā was completed on Thursday (gurudine) of the dark fortnight uposatha of the month of Kattika, year 724 Sakkarāj, by the Mahāthera dwelling in the great monastery well known as the ‘Shwe Gu’ (Golden Cave) on account of its being endowed with beautiful caves with temples with the roof and other parts made of gold.”

2 Piṭ-s 78, § 392. The colophon of Sambandhacintā-poriṇaṭīkā does not mention the authorship, but I understand this is the commentary ascribed to Abhaya Thera in Piṭ-s. The colophon of the Sambandhacintā-navaṭīkā mentions a Thera called Adiccavaṃsa as the author.
Buddhism an ontological category: it is the object of the sense faculty of hearing. The Abhidhamma philosophy tells us how *sadda* ("sound") is a material phenomenon (*rūpadhamma*) that arises under specific conditions. Sound, we all know, is not necessarily meaningful. Only when it is accompanied by consciousness (*viññāṇa*) can it become "sound-communication" (*saddaviññatti*), that is to say "verbal communication."

Let us now examine the actual text of Saddhammasiri:

\[\text{saddo hi dubbidho cittajo kārādotujodare} \]
\[\text{saddādy atthopakārattā cittajo v’ idha gayhate || 2 ||} \]

Sound is indeed twofold: mind-originated, as [the speech-sounds] beginning with a, [and] temperature-originated, as the sound that arises in the stomach and so on. Here [namely in the *Saddatthabhедacinta*] only mind-originated [sound] is dealt with, because of its instrumentality in conveying meaning.

The distinction between two main types of sound is found already in Mmd-ﾟ (51, 27f.). Abhaya, the author of the *porāṇatīkā* on SBC, will quote the original passage of Mmd-ﾟ in his commentary on SBC 3. The present stanza simply opens the question. As the title of the treatise indicates, *sadda* is one of the main topics of the treatise. A definition of *sadda*, therefore, becomes necessary. This is how Abhaya Thera illuminates the distinction between bare sound and sound originated in the mind:

Here, with the word "and so on" (*ādi*), the author includes the sound of the wind, a conch, or a drum. Here [in this treatise], only the [mind-originated sound] is included because the mind-originated [sound] is instrumental in conveying the meaning of words such as "man," etc., and because the temperature-originated [sound] by implication of that [mind-originated sound] (*tabbasena*) [itself] is not instrumental (*anupakārattā*) [in conveying meaning].

---

1 SBC-ﾟ 5,5–8: \*idhādisaddena vātasaṅkhabherisaddaṃ saṅgaṇhāti. purisādyatthassa kathane upakārattā cittajassa. tabbasena cânupakārattā atujassa so vidha gayhate. \*
What the commentator means is that *utujasadda* ("sound originated in temperature") is only included in this treatise as long as it produces meaningful sound, that is to say, as long as it helps *cittajasadda* to originate. Indeed, even if *sadda* is produced in the mind, it requires *utujasadda* in order to be articulated as physical sound.

### 6.3. How sound becomes meaningful (SBC 3—4)

The next stanza explains, in a rather technical manner (ultimately based on canonical Abhidhamma literature), how the sound that is originated from the mind becomes meaningful:

\[
\text{so ca kaṇṭhādiṭhāne bhibyattito tattha cittaja-}
\text{pathavīsaddaviññattī ti paṭhanti keci} \]

And because this [namely the mind-originated sound] is made manifest in places of articulation such as the throat, it is considered to have originated due to the striking together there of the earth originated from the mind and the earth [originated from *kamma*] due to the [former’s] capacity of communication.

This verse requires the help of the following commentary of Abhaya Thera in order to be interpreted:

Now, in order to teach the cause of the production (*uppatti*) of mind-originated [sound] from the point of view of the ultimate reality (*paramatthato*), he says “And because this...”, etc. The meaning is: and because this, namely the sound originated from the mind, is manifested — i.e. made distinct — in the places of articulation such as the throat, it is considered to have originated due to the striking (there in the places of articulation such as the throat) of the earth

---

1 Karunadasa, 2010: 187f.
2 SBC-pṭ 5,27: *pathavīsaddaviññattī ti paṭhanti keci*.
element originated from the mind against the kind produced by \textit{kamma}, i.e. the earth element originated from [past] \textit{kamma}, due to the [former’s] capacity of communication.\footnote{SBC-pt 5,9-13: \textit{idāni paramatthato cittajuppattikāraṇaṃ dassetum āha so c’ icc ādi. so cittajasaddo ca kyāṭhādīmihī ṭhāne abhibyttīto abhipākaṭattā tattha kyāṭhādīṭhāne cittajapathavidhātussa sattībhūlaviṇṇattīto kammaśambhūtena kammajapathavidhātunā saha ghaṭṭanato jāto ti mato ty attho.}

This passage, if I have understood it correctly, implies some basic notions of the Abhidhamma ontology. Although the technical vocabulary of Pāli grammar is mainly borrowed from Sanskrit sources, we can observe how in this case the Abhidhamma theory of materiality penetrates the secular (or interreligious) field of grammar. Abhidhamma penetrates grammar precisely in what is fundamental to it: phonetics, the theory of articulate sound. This is not a minor point, for the nature of \textit{sadda} (Skt. \textit{śabda}) is one of the most disputed topics in the history of Indian philosophy. Indeed, every school of thought in India and its cultural domain has taken a strong stance regarding sound, because that implied taking a strong stance regarding language and textual (oral or written) authority. The first reason of dispute, I think, is due to the ambivalence of the word \textit{sadda}, which, as I said before, means both “sound” and “word.” The phenomenon of human speech is a mystery that most cultures need to solve in order to situate human beings in their cosmology, and Theravāda Buddhism is no exception. On the other hand, the substance of the Tipiṭaka consists of speech, that is why it is called the \textit{buddhavacanaṃ} “the speech of the Buddha.” If we are going to study speech, we need to know, first of all, what is it made of. What is the relationship between speech, sound, and meaning? How do we understand the meaning of sounds? And what is sound, anyway? Following these questions, the philosophy of language merges with the philosophy of materiality. The so-called Pāli grammars have to deal also with this fundamental philosophical problem. The following passage is taken from the grammatical
commentary called the *Sampyañ-ṭīkā* (= Mmd-pṭ). Abhaya Thera quotes it (*ad sensum*¹) in his commentary on SBC 3:

This has been stated [in the *Nyāsa-ṭīkā*]: “For one who has the intention of saying something, a thought (*cittam*) arises, and this thought produces a sound which is adequate to the meaning that is to be expressed. When it [*vīz.* that thought] arises, at the very moment of its arising, it produces, in some place such as the throat, etc., the eight material elements (*rūpāni*), namely earth, water, fire, wind, colour, smell, taste, and nutriment. At that very moment, also (*ca*), the *kamma* accumulated from the past grasps the occasion, and together with the life faculty, causes the same eight material elements to arise. At this point, the earth element originated from the mind strikes [or combines with] the earth element originated from *kamma*. In this way, sound arises in the throat, etc., due to the striking against [or combining with] each other of the two earth elements that depend on two different clusters [of material elements].”²

The presuppositions to understand this passage is the following: materiality can be originated only from four sources: *citta* (“mind”), *kamma*, *utu* (“temperature”) and *āhāra* (“food”). These are not actual places but basic conditions that can be phenomenically distinguished. Now, among the different types of materiality that can be produced, eight are called *avīnībhogarūpaṃ* “inseparable materiality;” for they arise whenever any type of materiality is

---

¹ The formula *ti vuttaṃ* does not necessarily express a literal quotation. Petra Kieffer-Pülz has rightly pointed out to me that the meaning of *ti vuttaṃ* in Pāli scholastic literature is frequently the similar as *ti attho*, that is to say an explanation of the content of some authoritative text. Gornall and myself, however, have not found in Pāli grammars any instance of *ti vuttaṃ* as introducing an explanation in the author's own words, rather *ti vuttaṃ* may introduce either a literal quotation or at the most a paraphrase.

² SBC-pṭ 6,1–8: *idaṃ vuttaṃ hoti*: *idaṃ vakkhāmī ti cintentassa vacanīyatthānurūpasaddassa samuṭṭhāpakam cittam uppajjati. tam uppajjamānam evutanoppādakkhaṇe pathabāpotejo-vāyovānaṇṇagandhorasoojā ty aṭṭharūpāni kaṇṭhādīsu aññatarasmiṃ ṭhāne samuṭṭhāpeti. tatreva ātane laddhokāsaṃ purimāniṭṭhāṇam kammaṃ ca jīvitindriyarūpānaṃ saha tānevaṭṭharūpāni nibbatteti. atra cittaṭjapathavīdhatū kammajapathavīdhatūnaṃ ghaṭṭety evam dīsu kalāpesu samabhīnvīṭṭhānaṃ dvinnam pathavidhātānaṃ aṇīnānaṃ ghaṭṭanena kaṇṭhādīsu so saddo jāyatī. This a gloss on Mmd 10,29–11,3; the commentary begins in Mmd-pṭ 52,27f.: *duvidho hi saddo cittaṭjotuvavasena. tatra saṅkhapavāvādibhūrasaddo utajo. akārādivaṇṇabyatirekakayultasavāṇṇatiṭṭhisaddo cittaṭjo. tesu cittaṭjusaddasupattiya hetuvātāmālasamuṭṭhā- pakacittam puggalābhīṭṭhānavasena dassento anuvilakkayato anuvicārayato ty aha. This passage is an almost literal quotation of Mmd-pṭ 53,8–15.
produced. The cluster of inseparable material elements is formed by the four great elements (earth, water, fire, wind), in addition to vaṇṇa (“colour”), gandha (“smell”), raso (“taste”) and ojā (“nutriment”). Even though they are different elements, they arise together and they are never found independently of one another. These are the eight material elements mentioned in the quoted passage. The idea of the commentary is that, when one has a thought in the form of an intention to verbalise something, two basic material conditions, namely citta and kamma, are given: citta is the intention to speak itself, and kamma has to be understood as past actions that have consequences in the present, determining the shape of our body, etc. Each of these basic conditions produces, immediately, a cluster of eight inseparable materialities. But among these eight, the earth element is prominently effective in creating sound, for the earth element represents solidity, hardness, and sound is always produced as the result of two hard objects striking against each other (for instance, the stick against the drum). The Vibhāvinī-ṭīkā on the Abhidhammatthañgaṇa, the classic Abhidhamma text in Burma, explains it in this way:

> Verbal communication is a particular alteration that becomes the condition for the mind-originated earth element, which causes changes in the voice, to strike against the grasped materialities in the place where speech-sounds are originated.¹

The process is practically the same in the case of bodily communication (kāyaviññāṇatti). Contrary to what we would expect, however, the dominant element in bodily communication is the wind element (vāyu), for the wind element manifests itself as distension and movement. Conversely, the dominant element in verbal communication is the earth element (pathavī), an

---

¹ Wijeratne and Gethin, 2007: 226. I have edited the translation in order to be consistent with the terminology that I am using throughout the chapter: “mind-originated earth element” instead of “consciousness-produced earth-element”; “speech-sounds are originated” instead of “syllables are produced.” The overall interpretation of the passage remains the same. Cf. Vibhāviṇī-ṭīkā 201,13-15: vacibhedakaracittasamutthānapathavīdhatuyā akkharuppatti-ṭṭhānagataupādinnarūpehi saha ghaṭṭhānapataggāya-bhūto eko vikāro vacīvīṇāṇatti.
element characterised by solidity and hardness, for sound is produced out of the collision of two solids.

So far, the explanation refers to the ideas of materiality in Abhidhamma. Abhaya’s commentary goes on to explain the timing of sound production according to the theory of the *vīthi* “[consciousness] process” and the *javanas* (“impulsions” or “active stages [in consciousness process]”):

Now, the striking [of mind-originated earth element against kamma-originated earth element] arises only seven times, beginning from the first impulsion, etc., within a single consciousness process. Therefore, even the speech-sounds produced by it are to be considered [as arising] in all seven [impulsions]. Others, however, say that the first six impulsions, due to lack of momentum, do not produce any speech-sound from the striking, but the striking produced by the seventh impulsion, due to having [enough] momentum, produces a clear and distinct speech-sound. As it has been stated that a mother is a condition for the son born due to *kamma*, [and that] with the support of that [kamma] the mother produces a son, likewise it has been stated that the striking of the earth elements too is a condition for the speech-sound originated in mind, [and that] with the support of that [mind] the striking produces the speech-sound. “But indeed all seven consciousness impulsions produce seven speech-sounds at the moment of the striking.” Others, however, say that the consciousness [impulsions] that are gathered in one single impulsion [i.e., the seventh] produce one single speech-sound.

---

1 Presumably a quotation *ad sensum* from the authoritative *Vibhāvinī-ṭīkā*. The orthodox opinion holds that in the case of bodily communication, only the last *javana* produces communication, but not in the case of verbal communication. *Vibhāvinī-ṭīkā* 201.20-22: *ghaṭṭhanena hi saddhiṃ yeva saddo uppajjati, ghaṭṭanañ ca pathamajavanādosu pi labbhathe va*. Wijeratne and Gethin (2007: 226) translate “for sound arises simply with the striking together, and striking together is also obtained with the first and subsequent impulsions.”

2 SBC-pṭ 6,8-17: *saṃghaṭṭanañ ceekavitthiyaṃ pathamajavanādīhi sattakkhattum evuppajjati ti taṃ nibbatta-kkharūpi satte vā ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. apare ca chahi javanehi nibbattitaghaṭṭanam dubbahāvato nākkharaṃ nibbatteti. laddhāsevanena sattamajavanena nibbattitaghaṭṭanam eva balabhāvato ekaṃ pariṣṭattakkharṇaṃ nibbatteti ti vadanti. yathā mātā kammanibbattassa dārakassa nissayo hoti. tadupādāya mātā dārakaṃ nibbatteti ti vuttaṃ. tathā bhūsamghaṭṭanam pi cittejakkharūnaṃ nissayo hoti. tadupādāya saṃghaṭṭanam akkharṇaṃ nibbatteti ti vuttaṃ. cittāny eva tu sattajavanāni bhūtaghaṭṭanavatthiyaṃ sattakkharṇaṃ nibbattenti ti. apare te ekavavārapariṣṭappannāni cittāny ekakkharṇaṃ nibbattenti ti vadanti.*
According to Abhidhamma philosophy, a material dhamma\(^1\) (a material phenomenon), lasts, at most, seventeen thought-moments.\(^2\) In regular circumstances, the first five thought-moments consist of adverting and identifying the object (in our case, a speech-sound). Once the object is determined, it is held (or propelled) in consciousness during seven thought-moments. These seven moments of propulsion are called “impulsions” (javanas). If the object is “very great” (atimahantam), that is to say perfectly clear, after the seven moments of impulsion there are normally two more thought-moments of “registration” (tadārammaṇa). According to the passage I have quoted, the actual origination of sound takes place during the seven javanas. Now the controversy is whether sound occurs in each one of them, or only at the end of them when there is enough momentum. The orthodox opinion seems to be the one of the Vibhāvinī-ṭīkā: every javaṇa produces one speech-sound.

When commenting upon SBC 3, the Dīpanī, is, as usual, more succinct in saying basically the same thing as the Porāṇatīkā. But this time the Dīpanī explicitly brings up the concept of viññātī “communication”, which is not found in Abhaya’s commentary on SBC 3. A classic definition of “verbal communication” is “that which communicates intention through speech, reckoned as sounds associated with consciousness, and is itself understood because of that speech.”\(^3\) As I have said before, communication can be made bodily

---

1 The meaning of dhamma is so complex that it is sometimes better to leave it untranslated. See Wijeratne and Gethin, 2007: xix: “The word dhamma is perhaps the most basic technical term of the Abhidhamma. While it has been variously rendered as ‘state,’ ‘phenomenon,’ ‘principle,’ etc., none of these conveys its precise Abhidhamma meaning (which I take as ‘an instance of one of the fundamental physical or mental events that interact to produce the world as we experience it’), and I have preferred to leave it untranslated and preserve the resonances with dhamma in the sense of the truth realized by the Buddha and conveyed in his teachings. To adapt a well known saying of the Nikāyas: he who sees dhammas sees Dhamma, he who sees Dhamma sees dhammas. The reader who is interested in the specifically Theravādin understanding of the notion of dhamma is referred to Professor Y. Karunadasa’s The Dhamma Theory: Philosophical Cornerstone of the Abhidhamma (The Wheel Publication 412/413, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1996).”

2 Abhid-s IV, 9; Vibh-a 28.

3 Wijeratne and Gethin’s translation (2007: 225); Vibhāvinī-ṭīkā 200,4-6: saviññāṇapasaddasaṅkhātavācāya adhippāyaṃ viññāpeti sayañ ca tāya viññāyatī ti vaci-viññātī.
(kāyaviññatti) or verbally (vacīviññatti).\(^4\) This is how the concept of viññatti appears in the Dipanī on SBC 3:

Now, because the sound originated from the mind is manifested — i.e. is made distinct—, in places of articulation such as the throat, etc. — it is thought — i.e. it is stated by the teachers —, that this sound originated from the mind is produced there — i.e. in places of articulation such as the throat, etc.—, due to the striking of the earth element, [a striking] which is caused by verbal communication.\(^1\)

According to this passage, the material element of verbal communication (vācīviññatti) is defined as that phenomenon which triggers the striking of the earth element of both clusters (cittaja and kammaja). That is why it is sometimes called sattī (Skt. śaktī) a “capacity” or “potencial.”

To sum up, verbal communication is a material phenomenon of mental origin.\(^2\) It does not directly cause the speech-sound, but it causes the striking of the earth element generated by the mind against the earth element generated by kamma. When we say “the earth element generated by the mind” we should not understand this element as occupying a particular position in the body. Rather, we should conceive it as becoming manifest in any part of the body, insofar as this part of the body falls in the domain of consciousness (the stomach, the throat, the tongue, etc., are all included in this domain). With regard to the material phenomenon of speech-sound, there are different places in the body that are activated due to

---

\(^4\) Abhidh-s VI, 13.

\(^1\) SBC-nṭ 140,13–16. Here is the full commentary on SBC 3: SBC-nṭ 140,7–16: cittajasaddassa kaṇṭhādīṭṭhāne abhibyattito pākaṭabhāvato so ca cittajasaddo vacīviññattikāraṇā bhūsaṅghaṭṭnanato tattha kaṇṭhādīṭṭhāne jāto ti mato kathito acarīyehi ti. ayaṃ pana padasambandho — tassa cittajasaddassa ṭhānavasena bhedaṃ dassetuṃ so ca-pa-mato ti āha. cittajapathaviyā sattisamathabhāvocittajapathavisattī. sā eva viññatticitta-japathavisattivīññatti. vacīviññatti ti vutto hoti. bhūnaṃkammajapathavicittajapathavidhātānaṃ saṃghaṭṭanāṃ bhūsaṅghaṭṭanāṃ. cittajapathavisattivīññattikāraṇā bhūsaṅghaṭṭanāṃ cittajapathavisattivīññattibhūsaṃghaṭṭanāṃ. tato jāto cittajapathavisattivīññattibhūsaṃghaṭṭanajajo saddo.

\(^2\) Mind (citta) is one of the four possible bases for material phenomena, the other three being kamma, utu (“temperature”) and āhāra (“nutriment”). See Abhidh-s VI.
the process of verbal communication. The variety of such places demonstrates the theory that
the mind-originated earth element has no fixed position.

6.4. Jinendrabuddhi’s theory of sound production

The previous explanation of speech-sound origination is the orthodox opinion of Burmese
Theravādins, but not the only one they considered acceptable. Saddhammasiri offers a second
explanation of speech-sound production. This time, as the commentator Abhaya points out
later, the source is Sanskrit grammar, in particular the grammar of a certain Jinindabuddhi.
This is probably Jinendrabuddhi, the 8th–9th-century1 author of the Nyāsa, a detailed
commentary on the Kāśikāvṛtti. Jinendrabuddhi was probably a Buddhist.2 He is the
proponent of the following theory:

nābhitoccāraṇussāhabhūtapāṇo paropari
saṃghatṭanorakaṇṭhādi sirajo ty apare vidū || 4 ||

Other specialists [consider that] the air (pāṇo) that comes into existence due to the effort of
making an utterance comes from the navel, goes upward, and it is originated in the head after
striking the chest, the throat, and other places of articulation.

What is interesting in this theory, I think, is that it basically says the same as the previous
verse, but does so without Abhidhamma terminology. What some call “effort of utterance”
(uccāraṇussāha) would be probably called vacīviññatti in Abhidhamma. The actual parts of
the body (chest, throat, head...) correspond to the Abhidhamma “earth element” (produced
by kamma). The difference between the previous explanation and this one is the role of “air”
(pāṇa). As Abhaya says, “air means here the element of wind” (pāṇo ti cettha vāyodhātu

---

2 SBC-pṭ 6,24–25: apare ti jinindabuddhyādikā (“[Here] ‘others’ means Jinendrabuddhi, etc.”).
Indeed, according to the Abhidhamma, this wind is the result of an increase of the temperature in the stomach. It becomes a supporting factor in the act of speech, but it does not play a central role. In the present stanza, however, the air plays a central role. Air itself becomes sound when colliding against certain parts of the body. This explanation does not require metaphysical conjectures on how thought is materialised in meaningful hot air.

According to the Dīpanī, the main point of this stanza is to show that every speech-sound, whatever its final place of articulation, is ultimately born in the “navel,” that is to say the stomach. In other words, even when we call the speech-sound t a “dental,” or the speech-sound k a “velar,” insofar as they are sounds made of air, they can be ultimately reduced to hot air arising from the stomach:

The velar (kaṇṭhajo) [speech-sound] is not only produced in the throat, [but] also in the stomach, in the chest, and in the head. The palatal (tālujo) [speech-sound] is not only produced in the palate, [but] also in the stomach, in the chest, in the throat, and in the head. Similarly it is said also regarding the retroflex, the dental, and the labial speech-sounds.2

The complexity of this topic could lead us astray. So far Saddhammasiri’s theory of sound production has been sketched in some detail. In the following section I will move on to the concept of logical inference (anumāna) embedded in grammar.

6.5. Sentence as inference (SBC 14—15)

The following passage comes after a sequence of stanzas that define speech-sound as “incomplete word, being the ultimate reality” a definition of word as being “complete” in meaning, but ultimately made of speech-sounds, and a definition of sentence as being an “aggregate of words” (padasamudāya).3 A sentence, says Saddhammasiri, can have five parts,
which are the five parts of the logical inference according to the ancient Nyāya School. Stanza 15 offers the stock example of the inference of fire through the perception of smoke:

\[ \text{paṭiññā upamā hetu udāharaṇa nigama-vasenāvayavā paīcavidhā vákye yathārahaṃ.} \quad || \ 14 \ || \]

The parts in a sentence are fivefold, on account of their being, accordingly: proposition, comparison, cause, example [and] conclusion.

\[ \text{yathā mahānase evam aggi dahanadhāmato} \]
\[ \text{manyate kattha dhamminosiddhito}^1 \text{calamatthake} \quad || \ 15 \ || \]

As in the kitchen, similarly, fire is inferred because of the smoke resulting from the burning. Where? At the top of the mountain. [Why?] Because of not finding \((\text{asiddhito})\) what bears the sign \((\text{dhammino})\) [in other places].

The first verse is a mixture of grammar and logic. The parts of the inference in Nyāya philosophy are defined canonically in the \textit{Nyāyasūtra} of Akṣapada Gautama (ca. 2nd century A.D.).\(^2\) The technical terms are all the same as the ones we find in SBC, except for \textit{upamā}, which is a peculiar Pāli rendering of the Sanskrit term \textit{upanayana}.

The example in SBC 15 tries to prove what follows: if one sees smoke at the top of a far away mountain, one infers that there must be fire on the mountain. We might have never seen that mountain before, but we have seen smoke and fire before, and every time that we

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{aniṭṭhite pade vaṇṇo paramattho saniṭṭhitām} \quad \textit{padaṃ paññattisaddo ti saddo bhavati dubbidho.}
    \end{itemize}

SBC 13:
\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{aniṭṭhite pade vaṇṇo vākkharaṃ niṭṭhite padam vākyam tassamudāyo tamanāṇnoññāpekkhālakkaṇṇaṃ.}
\end{itemize}

1 SBC-pṭ 12.18-19: \textit{asiddhito ti byatirekahetunidassanāṃ, SBC-nṭ 143.15-16: dhammino siddhito ti dhammino asiddhito ti chedo.}

have seen smoke, there was fire, as in the kitchen. Conversely, we have never seen smoke without fire (that is what “because of not finding what bears the mark” means). The conclusion follows that there must be fire in the mountain, even though we do not perceive it directly. This is what Abhaya’s ṭīkā elaborates with greater philosophical sharpness:

And in this respect:

(1) When something that can be a proposition is there, as “there is fire in the kitchen,” then the [main] proposition is made [as follows]: “Fire is inferred [in the mountain] due to the smoke resulting from the burning of a mountain fire.”

(2) When the object of comparison is there, for instance the fire in the mountain, the kitchen becomes the comparison.

That whose existence is evident cannot be made an object of the comparison. Therefore the word “Where?” has been stated.¹

The following passage explains how the comparison (upamā) operates in the process of logical inference:

Furthermore, the comparison is applied on what is compared, because, on account of its function, it is only secondary (apadhānā). Because [the compared] needs to be compared via the comparison, [it] is the principal matter. The word “fire,” which functions in this principal matter, is to be related also to the non-principal matter, namely the kitchen [i.e. the fire in the kitchen]. [That is so] because of the exclusion that consists of not finding, by means of an instance (ādhārena), that which bears the mark [i.e. fire] (dhammino) and which is compared (upamita), accompanied with a mark (dhamma) of comparison (upamā) which is similar (sadisabhūta) [to it].²


² SBC-pṭ 12,22-26: upamā ca upamitam ārocetvā pavattattā apadhānā va. upamitupamāya upametabbattā padhānāṃ. tasmiṃ padhāne pavatto aggisaddo apadhāne mahānase pi sambandhitabbo. sadisabhūtupamādhammasahitopamitadharmānī ādhārena asijjhato ti nivārapattā.
According to the second half of the argument, the positive example that always follows logically and therefore is called *anvaya* “consequent” must necessarily imply its logical “inversion” or “exclusion,” called *byatireka*. In our example, the reasoning by exclusion is made by proving that the absence of smoke will always imply an absence of fire (dust and other phenomena similar to smoke do not count). Abhaya illustrates the different ways in which a mark (*dhamma*) can be a “cause of implied knowledge” (*ñāpaka*) by exclusion:

(3) “Because of not finding” is formulated as a cause by exclusion. Because, when there is no heat, [it means that] the result [of fire] is not there, [but] when the result is there [the cause] is given. Now, with regard to this topic [i.e. regarding *hetu* “cause”]: the seed is the cause of generating (*janakahetu*) because it generates the trunk of the tree; the noble way is the cause for the attainment (*sampāpakahetu*) [of *nibbāna*] because it makes good people attain *nibbāna*; smoke is the cause of the implied knowledge (*ñāpakahetu*) [of fire] because it makes implicit the knowledge of fire to those who see smoke. Therefore (*tī*), among these three stated [types of cause (*hetu*), we are concerned with] the cause of implied knowledge (*ñāpakahetu*). And this cause of implied knowledge, in turn, is threefold: by its own nature (*sabhāva*), by exclusion (*byatireka*), by causation (*kāriya*).\(^1\)

Furthermore the various *ñāpakas* are applied to our example:

Therein a cause of implied knowledge (*ñāpako*) of the existence of fire in the kitchen [can be exemplified in the following ways]: the cause of implied knowledge by its own nature (*sabhāvanāpaka*) is fire as heat, due to the understanding (*avabodhakattā*) that there is hot fire because of the heat; the cause of implied knowledge by exclusion (*byatirekañāpaka*) is the absence of heat, due to the understanding that there is no fire because its heat is not there. The

---

\(^1\) SBC-pṭ 12.26—13.1: *(ga) asiddhīto ti byatirekahetu. anuṇhattā asatī ti phale sati kato. idha tu bijaṃ rukkhabhandhassa janakattā janakahetu. ariyamaggo sujane nibbānāṃ pāpetabbattā sampāpakahetu. dhūma dhūmanāṃ passante jana aggīṃ avabodhāpetabbattā ñāpakahetu ti vuttavā tiṣu majhe ñāpakahetu. so ca sabhāvabyatirekañāpakañāpakavassā tividho.*
example [in the stanza under consideration] has to be considered as follows: Because of seeing
that the existence of smoke is due to fire, the cause of implied knowledge of this (*taṃñāpako*)
[namely of fire, is] smoke, its product, [and that is] the cause of implied knowledge by causation
(*kāriyañāpaka*) [for smoke is always caused by fire].

The Dipani, on the other hand, illustrates the case in similar terms, but more graphically:

When touching a cooking place with the hand in order to know whether there is fire or not, one
knows that there is fire by the heat. This heat is a cause of implied knowledge by its own nature
[as the nature of fire is heat]. When touching [a cooking place with the hand], one knows that
there is no fire by the coldness. This [coldness] is a cause of implied knowledge by exclusion.
Smoke is a cause of implied knowledge by causation, because smoke is caused, and it is
necessarily caused, by fire, and because smoke is the product of fire.

The insistence in the difference between heat and smoke as *ñāpakas* is quite remarkable. To
the best of my knowledge, the example of heat as a proof for the existence of fire is never
found in Nyāya literature. I suspect that some Abhidhamma presuppositions may have forced
our grammarian to adopt heat as a *ñāpaka*. For it is definitely true, in Abhidhamma, that
there can be no heat without the fire element. This seems to be an original contribution of
the Pāli grammarians to the Buddhist theory of inference.

The fourth member of the inference, according to Saddhammasiri, is the *udaharaṇa* or
“instance.” In this case, the instance is given as the actual place where the *sūdhya* (“what is
to be demonstrated”) is found. Abhaya comments:

---

1 SBC-pṭ 14,1-5: *tattha mahānase pavattaggino ñāpako. vippaggi uṣhhattā aththi ty avabodhakattā vippaggino (uṣham aggino) sabbāvañāpakahetū. anuṇhattā tassa natthi ty avabodhakattā taṃ (anuṇhaṃ) byatirekañāpakahetū. aggito pavāddhūmassa diṭṭhattā taṃñāpako phaladhūmo kāriyañāpakahetū ty udāharaṇaṃ veditabbaṃ.*

2 SBC-nṭ 143,22-26: *aggi atthi natthi ti nātuṃ uddhanatṭhāne hatthena parāmasante yena uṣhena aggi atthi ti jānāti. taṃ uṣham sabbāvañāpakahetū. parāmasante yena sitena aggi natthi ti jānāti. taṃ byatirekañāpakahetū. dhūmassa aggīnā kāriyattā kattabbattā aggīsā phalattā ca dhūmo kāriyañāpakahetū.*
(4) When that which is to be exemplified is there as “where?”, the example is [also] there as “at the top of the mountain.”

What that means is namely that the word “where?” in SBC 15 is a rhetorical question that implies the answer “at the top of the mountain,” and this represents the udarahaṇa of the inference.

The fifth member of the inference, nigama, somehow redundant, is the repetition of the proposition. Nevertheless it is formally stated as a conclusion, as the QED in European Logic.

Abhaya finally accounts for the use of the five members of the inference. He points out the obvious fact that they are not obligatory in every sentence. Some sentences contain only a proposition, some are simply examples:

(5) When that which needs to be concluded, namely “as fire in the kitchen,” is there, the conclusion is made as “thus, similarly.” How, for instance? A sutta such as sarā sare lopaṇ (“a vowel is elided before a vowel”) is a proposition. yass indriyāni etc., are the examples. [Sentences such as] “the man walks the path” are single propositions. “The rest is [to be understood] according to the [same] method,” thus, in this way (imina), he shows the result (phalaṇ) accordingly (yathārahaṇa).

The Dīpanī summarises the entire discussion in a rather oblique manner:

Thus, “fire is known” is the proposition (paṭiññā), because it is the principal statement; “at the top of the mountain” is the instance (udarahaṇa), because fire, which is the object of the comparison, is indicated; as fire is inferred in the kitchen due to the smoke produced by the

---

1 SBC-pṭ 13,8–9: (gha) kattha ti udarahaṇiye sati acalamatthake ty udarahaṇaṃ.
2 SBC-pṭ 13,9–15: (ṅa) yathā mahānase aggi ti niggamaniye sati evam lathā ti niggamanāṃ kataṃ, kathaṃ — sarā sare lopaṇ ti ādisuttaṃ paṭiññā. yassindriyāny ādikam udarahaṇaṃ, pariso maggam gacchati ti ādikā ekā paṭiññā. sesam vuttanayaṃ eva. iti imina yathārahaṇaṇ phalaṇ dasseti.
burning [of fire]; [If one asks] “Where is the fire?” [The answer is:] “At the top of the mountain”. In this sentence, however, there are [only] four members, because of the lesser importance of [the fifth member, namely] the conclusion (nigama) [which is generally introduced by the expression] “thus.”

This will surely strike some readers as the most convoluted interpretation of the Nyāya theory of inference, but we have already seen how Pāli grammarians resort to philosophical concepts from the Indian tradition and apply them not to the study of phenomena in general, but to the study of religious and grammatical texts. I will subsequently explore some other philosophical debates of the same type.

6.6. Non-eternity of sound (SBC 20–25)

The first chapter of SBC ends with a discussion on the nature of sound. It brings up the question whether sound is never produced and therefore eternal (nicco), or produced, like a pot, and therefore “non-eternal” or “impermanent” (anicco). This is a classical topic in the Indian philosophical debate. Someone familiar with the basic tenets of Buddhist philosophy will take it for granted that Saddhammasiri will support the last view, namely that sound, as all other phenomena of the universe, is impermanent, like a pot. Surprisingly, however, it is difficult to ascertain whether Saddhammasiri himself supports a straightforward non-eternalism or not. What is clear is that the commentator Abhaya argues for a more nuanced perspective. He accepts that sadda can also be considered eternal, if by sadda we understand the sadda of the Tipiṭaka, which is the Dhamma. As I will show, the Pāli grammarian is faced with a tricky dilemma. Let us follow the argument in the original texts:

---

1 SBC-nṭ 143,26—144,1: evaṃ aggi manyate ti paṭiññā. padhānavacanattā. acalamatthake ti udāharnanam. upameyya aggissa nidassanattā. yathā mahānose aggi dahanadhūmato manyate. kattha aggi ti. acalamatthake ti vākye pana cattāro avayavā. evan ti niggamanassa hīnattā.
Even though there is permanence on account of the mere correctness [of the speech-sound] regarding the meaning, it \[viz. sound\] is made \[i.e. a product\], in the same way that elephants and other figures are made \[i.e. drawn\] with colours, impermanently, but are similar to something that is permanent.

The thesis of this verse contradicts a theoretical pillar of Buddhism, the impermanence of all phenomena (except \textit{nibbāna}). The idea of this stanza is that the correspondence of word and meaning is necessarily permanent, otherwise communication would be impossible. This is, I think, a synthesised rendering of Kātyāyana’s \textit{vārttika} 3: \textit{siddhe śabdārthasambandhe} “[grammar can be taught] when it is assumed that the relationship between a word and [its] meaning has already been established [on account of the usage of the people],” including the Mbh commentary upon it.\textsuperscript{1} When language is used according to this permanent relationship of speech-sound and meaning, we call it correct language. What is impermanent, says Saddhammasiri, are the particular instances of meaningful sounds. That is why sound can be considered permanent and impermanent at the same time. The commentator Abhaya explains the essence of SBC 20 as follows:

Therein, even when there is permanence of the sounds, regarding the meaning, i.e. in the meaning that has to be known, just by being adequate, the \textit{sutta}, etc., \[i.e. the grammatical treatise\] is made. Like what? Like elephants and other things are drawn with colour, i.e. by the painter; similarly the triad of the \textit{sutta}, \textit{vutti}, and examples of Kaccāyana are made as [something] impermanent, [but] similar to the word\textsuperscript{2} (\textit{sadda}) of the Tipiṭaka, which is permanent, [thus] it is to be construed. For, in the same way that a painter, after seeing the natural form of the elephant and other beings, paints reproductions of the elephants and other

\textsuperscript{1} Translation by Joshi & Roodbergen, 1986: 90.

\textsuperscript{2} Where I translate \textit{sadda} as “word” in this passage one may as well read “speech-sound”.

\textit{atthe sādhuttamattenā niccatte pi kariyate}

\textit{niccena sadisāniccaṃ raṅgahatthādayo yathā} || 20 ||
beings; similarly, Kaccāyana, after seeing the natural [i.e. original] Tipiṭaka in the form of words (sadda), writes, in a book, the words, i.e. the sutta and the rest [of the grammar], which takes the form of a reproduction. This is how this matter should be considered.\(^1\)

I am not sure whether Abhaya is right in his analysis, because the verses do not seem to refer to the grammar of Kaccāyana at all, but to linguistic usage in general. I think what SBC 20 means is simply that what is permanent is the relationship between word and meaning (following Kātyāyana’s vārttika 3). On the other hand, what is impermanent are the particular utterances. Abhaya understands it quite differently: according to him, what is eternal is the word of the Tipiṭaka, and what is perishable is the word used in the grammar of Kaccāyana. I think Abhaya does not understand that not all the stanzas in SBC need to defend the tenets of Buddhism. They may well express the tenet of a rival school, doxographically, in such a way that it can be subsequently refuted. Indeed, the belief in the permanence of speech-sound is ridiculed with two amusing examples in the next stanza:

\[
guḷaṃ va gilite nigghitaṃ siddhedam uccate
\]

\[
mārū va marūvimbandhā siddhedaṃ siddham uccate \| 21 \|
\]

It is said that it [viz. the permanence of speech-sound] is proved, as a rice-ball that was concealed [in the navel and is shown] after one has eaten [another ball of rice]. It is called proved [although] it is as if proving the existence of the Wind god from a statue.

This verse plays with two similes that explain why sound is wrongly called eternal, when in reality it is not. The word siddha is used here with all its polysemic power, meaning

---

\(^1\) SBC-pṭ 15,7–14: tattha saddānaṃ niccatte satī pi atthe nāttabbatthe sādhabhāvamattena suttādikaṃ karīyate. yathā kiṃ. raṅgena cittikārena likhitā hatthyādayo yathā niccena piṭakattayasaddena sadisaṃ aniccaṃ kaccāyanakaṃ suttavuttiudharanattayam karīyate ti vojaṃ. pakatīhatthyādinaṃ hi rūpaṃ disvā cittikāro vikati hatthyādayo likhati yathā. pakatīpiṭakattayam saddarūpaṃ kaccāyano vikatirūpabhūtāṃ suttādikaṃ saddaṃ likhati potthake ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.
“proved,” “established,” “permanent,” and it is therefore equivalent to nicca.\(^1\) It is quite plausible that the insistence on “siddha” aims at ridiculing the vārttika of Kātyāyana, accepted as a fundamental principle by all pāṇinīyas.

The interpretation of the Porāṇatikā and the Dīpanī differs. In the Porāṇatikā Abhaya maintains that the simile expresses the relationship between the permanent sound, which is the word of the Tipiṭaka and the atṭhakathā, and the impermanent sound, which is the reproduction that we find in grammars such as the Kaccāyana. He concludes:

> And, in this regard, it is said: “The permanent sound (niccasaddo) is similar to the swallowed rice-ball. The impermanent [sound], however, is [similar to] the concealed [rice-ball].”\(^2\)

I think this interpretation is missing the point, for both examples intend to show that permanence is a mirage.

The interpretation of the Dīpanī offers a much more sensible explanation. According to the Dīpanī, the first simile has to be understood as follows: a magician eats a ball of rice, but he has another ball of rice hidden in his navel. When he shows the hidden ball he pretends it is the same ball of rice he has just eaten. People then believe (of course, foolishly) that the ball of rice is the same, that is to say, the permanence of the rice-ball has been “proved” (siddham). The fact is, however, that those are two different balls of rice and people have been cheated. The point of the simile is to explain why permanence can be wrongly inferred from similarity. For instance, since the word “pot” seems to be the same every time it is uttered (otherwise we would not recognise it), one may (wrongly) assume that it is the same word, manifesting itself at two different moments. According to a Buddhist grammarian, however, only common people (loka) would entertain such an idea.

The second simile (pādas c and d) is also elliptic if one does not look up the commentaries. In this case both commentaries agree. The idea is that marū is the Wind god

---

\(^1\) SBC-ṇṭ 145,23: siddhasaddo niccatthā.

Marut, and the *paṭibimba* ("reflection") is a statue or reproduction of the god. I assume the Wind god has been intentionally chosen in order to enhance the contrast between a constantly changing and moving reality (wind) and the staticity of a sculpture representing the same god. In the Pāli grammatical literature, this simile, as well as the previous one, are found for the first time in Vimalabuddhi’s Mmd. The author of *Dīpanī* quotes the original passage from Mmd, which corresponds, interestingly, to Mmd ad Kacc 317, a rule on the formation of compounds (see Chapter 3). I quote the entire passage from Mmd, including the example of the rice-ball eaters:

In the same way that some people put flowers and other honourings at the statue of a god and other places, and they will say (*vattāro bhavanti*) “I have honoured the gods,” for this is how they understand it; [and in the same way that] one who plays with rice balls, swallowing a ball and hiding another ball, again says “Look, ladies and gentlemen! I have swallowed the rice ball, but I will make it appear again from my navel” and as he says so, he makes as if he would take out the hidden rice ball, and shows it, and the people believe (*aveti*) it [saying]: “Sir, that’s amazing: you just swallowed the rice ball but then you have shown it after taking it from the navel!”; similarly, some sentence formed with separate words, which is the replica of a word, having been arranged, in that elision of the ending that we may call the “navel” they call it a “compound sentence.” And with that they understand their meaning. And, again, in a separated sentence which is its replica, after eliding the case endings, they call this type of compound “with elided endings.” And the people believe that this compound word is with elided endings.¹

¹ Mmd 269,21—270,1: *yathā devādippaṭibimbe pupphādisakkāraṃ katvā vattāro bhavanti devā me sakkatā ti. bhavati ca tena tesāṃ buddhi. gulakilaṃ kilanto ekāṃ guḷaṃ gilatvā ekañ ca niggūhitvā puna passantu bhonto gilitaṃ me guḷaṃ nābhito niharitvā dassemī ti vattvā nābhito taṃ niharitaṃ viya katvā niggūhitam eva dasseti. avetī ca taṃ loko acchariyaṃ bho gilitaṃ guḷaṃ nāma nābhito niharitvā dasseti ti. evam sadappatirūpakaṃ kiñci vigghahāvākyam vikappetvā vibhattiloṣe nibhisankhate tasmiṃ samāsavākyam abhisankhan tan ti vadanti. bhavati ca tena tesam atthappaṭipatti, vigghahāvāye ca tapatiṣṭṭake vibhattiloṣe katvā puna luttavihāttikam idan taṃ samāsapadoṣe dassenti. avetī ca taṃ loko luttavihāttikam eteṃ samāsapadoṣe ti.*
The point of this argument is that, in fact, we cannot say that a compound is the result of the sentence being deprived of case endings, or the sentence the result of a broken compound where words have been given case endings. In the context of Buddhist philosophy, we can only accept that they are equivalent: two ways of expressing the same thing. To make it simpler, however, we may conventionally pretend that a compound is “like” a sentence where case endings have been elided. This is the trick that grammar does with words. Vimalabuddhi settles the dispute with one of his categorical statements, a statement that the Dipani, I suspect, has intentionally left out:

This is only conventional talk, proved by convention. And when the meaning is established by the people, only the people are the means of knowledge. For it has been said: “speech is a conventional truth, resulting from social agreement.” But in the ultimate sense, one does not become a cow killer only by simply destroying the picture of a cow.¹

The concluding statement gives us the key to the example of the Wind god statue: one does not address the Wind god by simply addressing an image of the god. I detect here some intrusion of artistic iconoclasm into the field of language, as if we should not confuse words with the things they represent. This variant of iconoclasm, perhaps a reminiscence of the very ancient “an-iconic phase” of Buddhism, is remarkable indeed, and more so when it finds an advocate in Vimalabuddhi, one of the greatest Pāli grammarians.

Now to summarise the meaning of SBC 21: we can call speech-sound or word (sadda) “permanent” only conventionally, and that is due to two different causes: out of similarity of one sound with another (as in the example of the rice-ball), or through conventional representation, as in the case of someone praying to a god through its statue. As we will subsequently see, both conventions are ultimately false—at least according to Buddhism:

¹ Mmd 270,1–5: sammuti kathā hesā lokasaṅketasiddhi. lokappasiddhe catthe loko va pamaṇaṃ. vuttañ hi saṅketavacanaṃ saccaṃ. lokasammutikāraṇaṃ ti. na hi paramatthato gopatiyūpakaṃ hantvā goghātako hoti ti.
anicco khaṇiko saddo ghaṭādi viya kāriyo

icc eke satthakārā te ye niccāniccavādino || 22 ||

Sound is impermanent and momentary; it is a product, like a pot. In this way (iti), among those who are masters of this discipline (sattha), some defend the permanence and some defend the impermanence.

If we follow Abhaya’s explanation, the theory of permanence is described in SBC 20, whereas SBC 21 and 22 (pādas a and b) correspond to the theory of impermanence, presumably closer to Buddhism:

For (hi) among them (tesu), the latter defend the theory of momentariness (khaṇikavādī); the former defend the theory of continuity (santativādī), [this] has to be understood.¹

The Dīpanī elaborates on the philosophical concept of sound and specifies that it is impermanent because (according to the Theravāda view), a sound is a mental phenomenon that lasts for the duration of a thought-moment:

Sound is impermanent due to the continuous movement of one thought after the other, and [sound] is yoked to one single thought moment. Furthermore, it is something produced, like a pot and other things which are produced.²

The niccavādins develop their grammatical science from the axiom that meaning is only conveyed through the use of correct words, for correct words are invariably connected to their meanings. This definition seems to refer both to the tradition of Patañjali in the Paspaśā and

¹ SBC-pṭ 16,7-8: tesu hi pacchimavādino khaṇikavādānām, purimavādino santativādānānām ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.
² SBC-nṭ 146,12-14: saddo cittasahabbhūcittānuparivattattā anicco ekacittakkhaṇapayutto ca ghaṭādi viya kāriyo ca.
to the Kātantra grammarians, whose texts, we know, became authoritative among Burmese grammarians under the label “kalāpa.”¹ The next three stanzas go on with the same debate, comparing the two points of view:

\[
\textit{niccatte piṃsalādīnaṃ} \textit{saññā rūḷhī va manyate} \\
\textit{aniccavādīnaṃ vāde anvatthāpi patiyate} \| 23 \|
\]

According to the school of eternalists such as Piṃsala (?) and the like, a name (\textit{saññā}) is only understood as a convention (\textit{rūḷhī}). According to the theory of the non-eternalists, [however³, a name] is also (\textit{pī}) understood according to the meaning (\textit{anvatthā}) [that is to say, according to its etymology].

Abhaya considers that Saddhammasiri is positing the \textit{codanā} “objection” in this stanza. “Piṃsala” seems to be a proper name of one of the defenders of eternalism, for Abhaya glosses: \textit{tattha piṃsalādīnaṃ niccavādīnaṃ vāde}.⁴ And the Dīpanī: \textit{satthakāresu tesu piṃsalādīnaṃ niccavādīcāriyānaṃ vāde}.⁵ The main point of the verse is to distinguish between two schools of grammarians, eternalists and non-eternalists. There is however an ambiguity in the word \textit{saññā}, which means “name” or “designation,” but in grammar it means a “technical name.” If we read \textit{saññā} as simply “name,” the eternalists believe that names are related to their meaning by convention. Non-eternalists believe in the etymology of names (for instance, a “woodpecker” receives a name that is descriptive of the referent, it is not an arbitrary convention). On the other hand, if we understand \textit{saññā} as “technical name” in grammar, eternalists believe that \textit{saññās} based on convention (\textit{rūḷhī}), for instance, as we

---

¹ See, for instance, Mmd-pṭ 11,4: \textit{kattā nāma sakalalkalāpabyākaraṇānucaritabuddhi vimalabuddhitthero} “the author is, namely, Vimalabuddhi Thera, whose intellect follows the whole Kalāpa (= Kātantra) system of grammar.” The Mmd-pṭ was probably written in 12th-century Pagan.

² So reads Bhadanta Vāsettha’s edition. The 1964 ed. reads \textit{pi salādīnaṃ}, which does not match with the commentary.

³ I follow Abhaya’s gloss: \textit{aniccavādīnaṃ vāde tu}.

⁴ SBC-pṭ 16,12-13.

⁵ SBC-nṭ 146,16-17.
have seen, Pāṇini uses the convention \textit{ac} in order to say “all vowels.” The non-eternalists, however, believe that \textit{saññās} should be meaningful (\textit{anvattha}) designations. For instance, \textit{svara} “vowel” actually means “vowel.” Exceptionally, non-eternalists can also resort to conventions, as Abhaya reminds us:

\begin{quote}
[The stanza] is to be construed [as follows]: with the word “also,” even [technical] names (\textit{saññā}) such as \textit{ga}, \textit{gha}, \textit{jha}, \textit{la} and \textit{pa} are understood.\textsuperscript{1}
\end{quote}

He is clearly describing the practice of the Kaccāyana School.

If we follow the interpretation of the \textit{Dīpanī}, the stanza intends to say that eternalists are forced to accept that even compound words mean what they mean eternally (note that this question arises from the grammatical discussion on compound semantics). Non-eternalists, conversely, accept that the meaning of a compound ultimately derives from the meaning of its parts. That does not mean that non-eternalists cannot use conventional \textit{saññā} technical terms. In fact, what they accept is that every meaning is conventional in the sense that it is not invariably related to the word.\textsuperscript{2}

\textit{nicco nikkāraṇonicco kāraṇānugatorito}

\begin{flushright}
nāyaṇa kaṇṭhādivuttittā nicco vuṇḍhe tu vuttito || 24 ||
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{1} SBC-pṭ 16,15–16: \textit{pisaddena gaghajhalapaiccādirulhisaññāpi patiyyate ti yojjaŋ}.

\textsuperscript{2} SBC-nṭ 146,21–26: \textit{idam vuttaṃ hoti — samasanaṃ samāso ti samāsasaññā ekasmiṃ yeva pade na kattabbā. chinnahathādisaddo tu chinnahathādinā yeva ekapadattena paraṃparā paveṇi āgato. tasmi tatha samāsasaññā ruḷhi yeva niccavādinā vāde. aniccavādinā vāde pana niggahavākyanā katvā vibhātiloṣapā katvā samāsassa katattā anvatthasaññā. gasaṅgādayo pana vādadvaye pi ruḷhi ye vā ti “This is what is said: Composition, compound, that is what is meant by a ‘compound name’, does not apply to each word [of the compound] only, but in words such as \textit{chinnahatthā} ‘cut-off-hand’ [i.e. ‘a person whose hand has been cut off’] the tradition, the lineage, has transmitted it as a single word. Therefore in this case the name of the compound is only conventional according to the doctrine of the eternalists. According to the doctrine of the non-eternalists, however, since the compound is made after analysing the sentence [into separate words] and deleting the case endings, the name follows the meaning [of the members of the compound]. In both views, however, [technical] names such as \textit{ga}, etc. are merely conventional.” The word \textit{saññā} (Skt. \textit{samjñā}) “name” “designation” or even “definition” depending on the context. I have tried to be consistent with the Pāli text using the translation “name.” The syntax of \textit{paraṃparā paveṇi āgato} is problematic. I have translated it as a compound: \textit{paraṃparāpaveṇiāgato}.}
What is permanent is said [to exist] without a cause, [whereas] what is impermanent is said [to be] the consequence of a cause. This one [viz. the impermanent], on account of being uttered in [places of articulation such as] the throat, etc., cannot be called permanent; however, on account of being spoken by more and more (vuḍḍhe) [people], and on account of its being uttered by [an established] convention, it cannot be called impermanent either. Therefore, now, the scientific treatise is composed in order to provide a convention.

If we follow the commentaries, the view of these two stanzas represents a third possibility: the position of those who accept both the permanence and impermanence of speech-sounds, that is to say, the position of the grammarians. Grammarians argue that, from the point of view of particular utterances, speech-sound cannot be called permanent: sound, indeed, is a product, and products cannot be eternal. Moreover, we know that something permanent is that whose nature cannot be destroyed (yassa vatthussa taṁsabhāvo na nivassate so vatthu nicco¹). This definition applies to phenomena such as nibbāna, but not to sound. However, the stanzas argue that calling sound impermanent would also be inaccurate, for there is some sort of permanence in spech-sounds or words. This permanence is given by tradition. The word vuḍḍhe is used, according to Abhaya, in the sense of growth in the frequency of usage: vuḍḍhe tu paramparā vuḍḍhatare jane ... “however, in the growth, i.e. in the increasingly bigger number of people in the tradition ...”² This explanation implies an interesting cultural assumption, namely that a language is transmitted by oral tradition, as if it were an openended epic poem that every speaker learns by heart and hands it down, in fragments (words) to the next generation. It is not true, then, that speech-sound is eternal, but it is also wrong to believe that it has no permanence whatsoever. According to Abhaya, the previous

¹ SBC-pṭ 16,30—17,1.
² SBC-pṭ 17,5.
two views (eternalism and non-eternalism) are the views of other satthas. The view of SBC 24-25 is the view of the Kātantra School.¹ The Dīpanī, on the other hand, maintains that this is the view of yet another group of unidentified teachers.²

To sum up, in the short doxography about the eternality or non-eternality (permanence or impermanence) of speech-sounds, Saddhammasiri adopts a compromise between Buddhist tenets such as the impermanence of all phenomena (which would correspond to paramatthasacca “ultimate truth”) and the conventional truth (sammutsisacca) of language as a social institution, an idea that is already found in the Tipiṭaka and that does not contradict the spirit of Indian grammatical philosophy. What is interesting, in my opinion, is that a Buddhist philosopher such as Saddhammasiri is forced to occupy the field of conventional truth when discussing grammar, and yet he is unable to overcome the conflict between worldly truth and the principles of the Abhidhamma. With this it becomes clear that the study of grammar posed a major philosophical challenge to Buddhist authors. They met this challenge with a scholastic discourse that had to be, necessarily and to their dismay, original.

¹ SCB-pṭ 17,7-8: aññasatthe hi purimavādavagāṃ vadanti. kalāpaganhe tu pačchimavādaman vadanti.
² SBC-nṭ 147,3: iti vacanaṃ aññehi ácariyehi vaccante.
7. THE Kārikā ON THE ROLE OF PĀLI byākaraṇa

7.1. Dhammasenāpati of Pagan and the Kārikā

We will now move to the period when King Kyanzittha ruled in Pagan (1084–1113 A.D.). According to historians, Kyanzittha was one of the most prosperous, or at least, better known monarchs of the Pagan dynasty, and the one who most probably established Theravāda Buddhism as a state religion in Pagan.1 Legend has it that Kyanzittha built the Nanda (or Ānanda) temple of Pagan. This construction remains, still today, one of the major cultural and touristic attractions in Burma, and is considered a World Heritage Site by UNESCO. The architecture of this temple, it is said, was inspired by a vision of the Nandamūla cave of the Himālaya, a vision “granted to the king by eight saints of that region, who journeyed through the air daily to receive Kyansittha’s hospitality.”2 Even though this tale is the product of fantasy, it probably contains a grain of truth, for the Nanda monastery seems to be intimately related to north Indian culture.3 It was in this monastery that a scholar called Dhammasenāpati composed the Kārikā (Kār), a work that Bode defines as a “modest little metrical treatise”4 on grammar. Apart from this brief description, nothing else about Kār has been written in English. Dhammasenāpati also wrote a commentary upon his own verses, the Kārikā-ṭīkā (Kār-ṭ). We do not know whether this author was a monastic or a layman. The Gandhavaṃsa calls Dhammasenāpati an ācariya, from what we understand that he was a monk.5 But in Forchhammer’s List, he is considered a nobleman of Pagan.6 Bode concludes:

---

2 PLB 15.
4 PLB 16.
5 Gv 63, 73.
6 PLB 16 n.1.
It is likely that he was known as a man of rank and importance before he entered the Order, and perhaps he threw himself into serious studies while still a layman. We shall find such cases later.\(^1\)

Indeed, a similar narrative is transmitted about the author of Mmd-pt, a certain saṃ-pyañ “higher officer” of the royal court. Apart from Kār and Kār-t, Dhammasenāpati allegedly composed two other works: the Etimāsamidīpanī and the Manohāra, both written at the request of a certain Āṇagambhīra of Pagan.\(^2\) To the best of my knowledge, these two works have never been published or studied.

There is little about the life of Dhammasenāpati that we can learn from his works, but we can indeed surmise that he was an influential figure in the intellectual milieu of Pagan. The colophon of Kārikā reads:

> This treatise was composed by Dhammasenāpati Thera, who was of steadfast mind and who rejoiced in the teachings of the Conqueror; he lived in the Nanda monastery, the residence of Mahā Theras, in the excellent city of Arimaddanapura (Pagan) in the country called Tambadīpa.\(^3\)

Interestingly, these two verses are not commented upon in the ūṭīkā. Perhaps they are a later addition. But I think it is more plausible that the ūṭīkā and verses were composed simultaneously, in such a way that the verses were the colophon of the two works combined.

\(^1\) PLB 16.
\(^2\) Āṇagambhīra is perhaps the author of the Tathāgatuppatti. Cf. PLB 16.
\(^3\) Kārikā 567–568:

\[
\begin{align*}
tambadīpavhaye raṭṭherimaddanapure vare
mahātherānām āvāse nandānāmavihārake
vasatā thirucittena jīnasāsananandinā
dhammasenāpatināmatherena racitā ayaṃ.
\end{align*}
\]
The ṭīkā, on the other hand, has been printed with the following colophon, most probably a later addition, of which I will give a provisional translation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iminā lekhapūñena mitīgyajinasantike} \\
\text{chihikkhupātiśambhadāhi saddhiṃ labheyya taṃ.} \\
\text{piṭakattayam catubbedam jīvāgge mama tiṭṭhatu} \\
\text{diṭṭhaṃ sutān ca nissasam sabbaṃ sippaṃ samijjhatu.} \\
\text{anena hatthakammena saṃsaratante bhavabhave} \\
\text{panditechvā saṃvāso na bālente samāgamo.} \\
\text{panditechvā saṃvāsohaṃ satthuvādaṃ vinicchayaṃ} \\
\text{yāva jīvaṃ saritvāna jinapatham gacchām abāñ.} \\
\text{ciraṃ tiṭṭhatu saddhammo sampuṇṇasamasanakkappā} \\
\text{yaṃ yaṃ pāthanti taṃ sabbaṃ labhatu pāṇino sadā.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

With the merit [accumulated] by this writing [of the ms.] may I attain that, namely to be among those who are granted full ordination directly from the Maitreya Jina. May the Tipiṭaka and the Four Vedas remain at the tip of my tongue, and may all that has been seen and heard quickly give its fruits. By this work of my hand, in the cycle of existences until the end of saṃsāra, may I live together with wise people, being spared of the foolish ones. Living with the wise, memorising the unequivocal doctrine of the teacher as long as I live, I will follow the way of the Jina. May the true Dhamma live long, may beings in the plenitude of their virtuous intention always understand what they read.

From the insistence on “handwork” and “writing” this may simply be the colophon added by the scribe. But it is nevertheless interesting to note the expression “may the Tipiṭaka and the Four Vedas remain at the tip of my tongue” (piṭakattayam catubbedam jīvāgge mama tiṭṭhatu), which means “may I know the Tipiṭaka and the Four Vedas by heart” and indicates some close relationship with Sanskrit culture and Brahmanism.

---

1 Kār-ṭ 441,12-21.
In the history of Pāli literature, Dhammasenāpati stands as one of the earliest Burmese authors. Kār has a place in the modern canon of the 15 minor grammars, and it is still studied in higher monastic examinations. In this section I will analyse the chapter which deals with the purposes of grammar. The question “Why was Pāli grammar so important in ancient Burma?” will be tackled from a purely *emic* perspective. I will show how its central ideas can only be properly understood against the classical brahmanical backdrop. In this particular case, we need to go back to the earliest monument of grammatical philosophy in South Asia: Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya*.

### 7.2. Why study *vyākaraṇa*?

The section of Kār 19–41 bears the title *saddānusāsanappayojanavinicchayo* “Determining the purposes of the study of grammar.” The specific five purposes of grammar will be explained in stanzas 28–41. Before that, Dhammasenāpati discusses the importance of knowing the aim of any study. The issue at stake, here, is simple. Any treatise of *sattha* (S. *śāstra*) must begin with the clear statement of four things: what is it (*abhidhāna*), what is the object of the treatise (*abhidheyya*), what is the purpose of studying this object (*payojana*), and what is the relationship between the object of study and the purpose of studying it (*sambandha*). This is a convention that Dhammasenāpati respects. I will subsequently translate and analyse the stanzas introducing this issue. In doing so I would like to highlight the view of a Pāli grammarian on the question that I have formulated at the beginning of this chapter: “Why is grammar important for a Buddhist monk?” Let us try to answer this question by examining a chapter of Kār:
kākadantaparikkhā va na cettha nippayojanaṃ

dasatāḷimavākyaṃ va na cetthanabhidheyyakaṃ || 19 ||

Here [in the Kaccāyanabyākaraṇa], it is not that there is no purpose, as in the investigation of whether crows have teeth or not; and it is not that there is nothing meaningful, as in the sentence dasa tāḷima.

According to Kār-t, this verse tells us two things: grammar has a payojana “purpose” and also an abhidheyya “object of study.” The first counter example shows an activity without purpose, namely the study of whether crows have teeth or not. The second is a counter example of something that lacks reality, something that does not exist and therefore cannot be studied even if it can be named. I must acknowledge, however, that the line in the verse is extremely concise and particularly difficult to interpret. The commentary glosses: dasatāḷimavākyaṃ vā ti dasa janā tāḷimā bijapūrā ti vacanāṃ viya which I would tentatively translate: “as the sentence dasatāḷima means 'ten persons, pomegranates [are] full of seeds’.”

This example is taken from Patañjali (Mbh 1.38.5).

It is important to keep in mind that when Kār says “here” (tattha or idha), it means in the grammatical treatise of Kaccāyana, not in the Kār itself. We know that from the commentary.

1 I will not translate the entire ṭīkā, but I will give the Pāli text in a footnote after every stanza. Kār-t 338,17–27: idaṇi saddānusāsanaṃ dassetum āha — kākadantaparikkhā ti. kākā sadantā kiṃ udāhu adantā ti puṭṭho keci sadantā adīṭṭhā ti vadanti. keci mukhatvadamattā adantā ve ti vadanti. iti kākānaṃ saddanta adantabhipāpāparikkhāvīcāraṇānippayojanā īva. na cettha nippayojanān ti ettha saddānusāsanasaṅkhāte kaccāyanabyākaraṇe piṭakattayānukālanipphādanahitaatthappakāsa udāharana-sādhakalakkhaṇaṃ nippayojanāṃ nipphalanaṃ na. cakāro upanyāsattho. upanyāso nāma vākyārambhō. dasatāḷimavākyaṃ vā ti dasa janā tāḷimā bijapūrā ti vacanāṃ viya. cakāro samuccayattho. etthā ti saddānusāsane. anabhidheyyakaṃ nisambandhami aṇṇamaṇṇasambandha ekattapatijāyātaka padasamudāyāpavāvākyātā.
Furthermore, in this treatise there is no instruction on something that is impossible to achieve, as the instruction regarding the crown jewel of Takkha, [a jewel] that destroys aging, [sickness and death].

The commentary confirms that Takkhaka is the king of the snakes (nāgas): takkhako ti takkhakanāmako nāgarājā. The meaning of the stanza is that the subject matter of grammar is clear, visible and attainable to anyone, unlike the crown jewel of the king of the snakes, a jewel that gives eternal youth and immortality, but, hidden in the underworld, it is impossible to obtain. The implication is perhaps that the grammar of Kaccāyana can potentially lead to the same result, the “deathless” (that is, nibbāna) through the right understanding of the Tipiṭaka, unlike fake promises such as the prophecy about the jewel of the Snake King.

Poetic similes regarding the nature of grammatical teaching continue in the following stanzas. The author seems to be criticizing other methods of instruction, seemingly immoral and unsystematic:

---

1 Kār-ṭ, 338.28–339.6: jarassa haro takkhakacūlāmaṇyopadesanaṃ yathā ti ettha jarassā ti jarārogassa. haro ti vināsako ti attho. takkhako ti takkhakanāmako nāgarājā. cūḷāmaṇī ti tassa cūḷāyaṃ maṇi. upadesanaṃ yathā ti ayan tu jarūrogo takkhakanāmanāgarājassas cūḷāyaṃ jarakaramaṇinā ti laddhetu pasamissati ti upadesanaṃ yathā. asakkānuṭṭhānaupadeso ti ettha antu upṭhātuṃ asamatho upadeso. apisaddo samuccayatto. ettha nā ti etasmiṃ kaccāyanaabyākaraṇe natthi.
Here there is no blameworthy instruction as “marry your own mother.” Here the method is quick, and here there is no lack of method.

In the five sections, flaws have been avoided by the author of the book [i.e. the Kārikā]. A good scientific treatise (susatthaṃ) is without flaws, it has a relationship, and a purpose.

The relationship belongs both to the science and to its purpose. It is part of them, therefore they are not stated separately from the purpose.

---

1 Kār-ṭ 339,7-13: mātuvivāhupadeso yathā ti bho tava mātuyā taṃ vivāhaye ti yathā mātuyā vivāhassa upadeso asammatto viya. nettha asammatto ti ettha kacciyavanabārana viññūhi asammatto upadeso na. lahapāyantarane ti yaththa pariggahena attho sijjhati, gahiyo pi ca haniyo upāyo evaṃ lahuka-upāyananatthaṃ attha atthi. na cettha anupāyanaṃ upameyyassa anipphannahetabhūtataatthaghaṇaṃ attho natthi.


Only when the purpose has been stated, the relationship is [also] established. In the same way, when the relationship is established, the purpose too is established.

For no one can undertake the study of any science, or any action, as long as its purpose has not been stated.

The syntax in the stanzas tends to be loose, but the meaning seems to be quite clear. The author is very insistent that he is going to tell us the purpose of the study of grammar, for no one undertakes any action without a purpose. Only when the fruits of the action are known does a person undertake this action. The following stanzas insist, yet again, on the same idea:

The student begins to study once the purpose and the relationship are known.

When the purpose and the relationship of the \textit{satthā} are not known, the \textit{satthā} is not grasped.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Kār-ṭ 339,29: \textit{tato parām silokam ekaṃ uttānattham eva}.
\item Kār-ṭ 339,30—340,4: sakalakammassa phale vijjamāne yeva taṃ kenaci gayhate ti dassetum āha — sabbasseva ty ādi. \textit{sabbasse} ti sakalassā satthassa \textit{kammassa vā yāva} yattakaṃ \textit{payojanaṃ vuttaṃ}. kenaci pi puggalena na sūrtena lāva tattakaṃ kālaṃ taṃ satthaṃ vā kammaṃ vā gayhate sikkhate ti attho.
\item Kār-ṭ 339,30: sakalakammassa phale vijjamāne yeva taṃ kenaci gayhate.
\item Kār-ṭ 340,5–9: \textit{svatā} puggalo \textit{nātatthaṃ nātasambandham} sotā sotum pavattati. \textit{aviśnātatthaṃ nātasambandham} satthaṃ nābhīyupagamyate || 26 ||
\end{enumerate}
Therefore, at the beginning of a sattha, the relationship, alongside the purpose, is stated. When the sattha is stated with a relationship and a purpose, then he may recite it.

7.3. The fivefold use of Pāli byākaraṇa

The following section examines the five purposes of grammar proper. As I will show, the model is the Paspaśāhnika (Pasp) chapter of Patañjali’s MBh. Dhammasenāpati, however, made convenient adjustments in order to transform a Vedic auxiliary discipline into a Buddhist discipline.

If one would ask: “What is the purpose of the instruction on speech-sounds?”, [The answer would be] “The purpose is protection, proper attention, tradition, brevity of method, and removal of doubt.”
These five purposes of grammar are taken directly from Pasp in its commentary upon Kātyāyana’s Vārttika 2: rakṣohāgamalaghvasaṃdehāḥ prayojanaṃ. Let us now examine them one by one.

**RAKKHĀ — PROTECTION**

tattha rakkho ti atthassa nupāyaparihārakā
suttantarakkhanattham hi sikkhitabbaṃ sudhimatā || 29 ||

Here, “protection” means guarding from wrong methods. For the wise should study byākaraṇa in order to protect the Suttantas.

The commentary specifies that the study of grammar is meant for the protection of the entire Tipiṭaka, not only the Suttantas. The commentary also points out that it is the Kaccāyanabyākaraṇa, and not grammar in general, that we are talking about.

Now if we look at the source of Kār 29, we can observe how in Patañjali’s Pasp, “protection” is obviously a concept that refers to Vedic literature:

One should study vyākaraṇa in order to protect the Vedas. For one who knows about elision (lopa), augments (āgama) and sound-modification (substitution, varṇavikāra) will be able to preserve the Vedas correctly.

1 I follow Joshi & Roodbergen, 1986: v.
2 anupāyahārikā in the commentary. The meaning remains the same. See the following note.
The Kārikā follows the same reasoning in the following verse, which takes up Patañjali’s idea, namely that knowing lopa (“elision”), āgama (“augment”) and vikāra (“change” “[speech-sound] modification”) are the tools for the protection of the sacred texts:

\[
evaṃ sa te ti ādimhi lopo sakāraādinam
\]
\[
yathayidam ti ādimhi yakārādinam āgamo || 30 ||
\]

[For instance:] in the case of \textit{evaṃ sa te}, there is elision (lopo) of the syllable \textit{sa}, etc. In the case of \textit{yathayidam}, there is augment (āgamo) of the syllable \textit{ya}, etc.

The construction of this verse is very concise. If we read the commentary, we see how it makes a direct reference to the Kaccāyana grammar. The meaning of the first line is that \textit{evaṃ sa te} is the result of sandhi after \textit{evaṃ assa te}, following Kacc 41 byañjano ca visaṇño go. The first example is \textit{evaṃ sa te āsavā} [M I 9, 28].\textsuperscript{2} Kacc 40 paro vā saro tells us that, after niggahīta (= \textit{ŋ}), a vowel is optionally elided. By Kacc 41, if the vowel is elided and the next consonant forms a cluster (sañño go) with the previous niggahīta, this cluster is to be dissolved (visaṇño go).

The second line of the stanza is easier to explain: \textit{yathā idam} takes an augment -y-, a glide that can be justified by Kacc 35 yavamadanatarālā cāgamā, which allows for the intervocalic insertion of \textit{y, v, m, d, n, t, r, l} and even other consonants. For, according to Kacc-v, followed by Kār-ṭ, the word \textit{ca} in Kacc 35 stands for many other types of āgama.

This seems to me a far-fetched interpretation that has nothing to do with the original purpose of the word \textit{ca} in the rule.\textsuperscript{3} But what is important here is to note that Kār-ṭ follows

\begin{itemize}
  \item [3] Kacc-v 11,9f. Kacc-v understands the word \textit{ca} in the sutta as \textit{vā}. The \textit{vuttī} subsequently elaborates on the
\end{itemize}
not only Kacc, but also Kacc-v, and calls “kaccāyanabyākaraṇa,” that is to say, the *suttas* along with the *vutti*.

The next stanza exemplifies what is “protection” with regard to “modification”:

\[
\text{ārisyaṃ ajjavan ty ādi vikārakaraṇam pi ca}
\]

\[
icc ādi suttaganthassa ārakkhā ti pakāsitā || 31 ||^1
\]

The protection of the sutta book is shown also in examples of mutation (*vikāraṇa*) such as *ārisyaṃ*, *ajjavan*, etc.

The examples of this stanza are two words in which we can see the effect of *vikāraṇa* (or *vikāra*) “mutation.” The long \( \text{ā} \) of *ārisyaṃ* (Skt. *ārṣeya*, “the state of being a seer”) is originally short, and the short \( \text{a} \) of *ajjavan* (Skt. *ārjava*, “straightness”) is originally long (shortened by the law of morae).

**UHANA — ADAPTATION**

The word *uhana* (or *ūhana*) stands for the Sanskrit *ūha*, “adaptation [of a mantra to suit a particular context].” Due to the complexity of the syntax of the stanzas 32–34, I will not translate them literally, but I will paraphrase them following the commentary, assuming that, as tradition maintains, the verses and the commentary were written by the same author:

---

1  Kār-ṭ 341,7–13: *ārisyaṃ ajjavan ty ādi vikārakaraṇam pi ca ti ārisyaṃ ajjavan ty ādi payoge ivanetaṇaṇānaṃ akārakaraṇaṃ. akārikārakārānaṃ āśūdīghakaraṇaṃ. ākārikārakārānaṃ aiurassakaraṇaṃ ca saṅgyhate. icc ādī ti evam ādi vikārādikaraṇam ti attho. pakāsitā ti vinā saddasatthena lopavikārādikaraṇaṃ suttaganthassa ārakkhā ti dipitā.*
A mantra that one has to recite due, for instance, to previous bodily misconduct, may be taught in the masculine gender, but when it is a woman, one needs to adapt it to the feminine gender. Similarly, in the case of a verb, one needs to adapt it to the [proper] number, whether it is singular or plural. Thus, the study of grammar brings about the adaptation of the suttaṁ.

If I follow this explanation correctly, the specific meaning of uhana refers to the correct adaptation of mantras. Now, these mantras, according to the commentary, are kāyaduccāritādinā, which I understand in an expiatory sense, “due, for instance, to previous bodily misconduct.” That is to say, when a monk has committed a fault, he will recite a mantra. However, if it is a nun who has committed the fault, the mantra needs to be recited in the feminine, otherwise it will not take effect. Otherwise, we could simply understand, in a more general sense, that Pāli mantras used to expiate infringements must be uttered with care in relation to the gender, the number, etc. of the words spoken. But that is not how I understand the commentary: “when it is a woman, i.e. in the occasion when a woman has committed bodily misconduct or any other offence” (yadā itthī siyā ti yasmiṃ kāle kāyaduccaritādinā paṭipannā itthī bhaveyya).

---

1 Kār-t 341,14–24: mantāṃ pulliṅganiddīṭṭhan ti gato ti ādi pulliṅge niddīṭṭhamantaṃ paramatthabhūtaṃ buddhavacanam. yadā itthī siyā ti yasmiṃ kāle kāyaduccaritādinā paṭipannā itthī bhaveyya. tadā na gato. itthiliṅgena whate ti itthiliṅgasaddena vitakkyate. mante niddīṭṭham ekattan ti ekavacanane niddīṭṭhanām. sampādehi ti ādīna ti sāmaññabhūtakiriyāpade payujjamānavisesapadatthassa ekattā ekavacanante niddīṭṭhānaṃ sampādehi ti ādīnaṃ kiriyāpadānaṃ. sampādehā ti ādīnā ti sāmaññabhūtakiriyāpade payujjamānavisesapadatthassa bahatte sati bhaveyya niddīṭṭhānasampādehā ti ādīnā whate ti vuttaṃ hoti. suttantassa piṭakattagassa pulliṅgādiekavacanabahvacanādi uhanañ ca saddānusāsanena sūdhanaṃ nipphādānaṃ.
What the *Kārikā* says here can only be fully understood as the Buddhist replica of the Sanskrit tradition. In the Sanskrit tradition, *ūha* is the proper attention to the correct pronunciation of Vedic mantras. The following is the definition given by Patañjali:

Certainly, the [suitable] adaptation [of a mantra according to the requirements of a particular ritual is] also [a use of grammar]. The mantras are not recited in the Veda in all genders and all case endings. And they have to be suitably adapted of necessity by the person in charge of the sacrifice. A non-grammariam cannot suitably adapt them. Therefore grammar must be studied.¹

It is clear that Dhammasenāpati has adapted Patañjali’s theory to Buddhism. It is also clear that *uhana* is a purpose connected with mantra recitation. The person in charge of the sacrifice is replaced, in Buddhism, by the person who sacrifices his or her own self, that is the monk or nun, or lay follower of the Buddha. This reminds us of the interesting introduction to the *Suttaniddesa*, where Chapaṭa also argues that the goal of phonetics is the correct adaptation of the meditation mantras.²

Dhammasenāpati goes on to explain the purposes of *uhana* in greater detail:

\[
\text{naccagītassa ādīnaṃ naccagīte ti ādinā}
\]

\[
\text{sattamyaṇantādi uhanam uhanan ti pakāsitaṃ || 35 ||}
\]

*Uhana* is illustrated (*pakāsitam*) as the [adequate] consideration on the seventh case, etc., by understanding, for instance, “in dance and singing” instead of “of dance and singing.”

The key to this stanza is a reference to an example taken from the *Apadāna* (VIII, 10, 62):

1 Pasp 18: *ūhaḥ khalvapi. na sarvābhivāhaktibhirvede mantrā nigadiṭṭāḥ. te cāvaśyaṃ yajñāgatena yathāyathāṃ vipariṇamayitvāḥ. tān nāvaiyākaraṇaḥ śaknoti yathāyathāṃ vipariṇamayitum. tasmād adhyāyaṃ vyākaraṇam.*

2 See Pind, 1996; I will study this particular case in Chapter 2.

3 Kār-ṭ 341,25-28: *naccagītassā ti ādīnaṃ chaṭṭhyāntavasena niddhitānaṃ padānaṃ kusala ti saddantavasanaṃti naccagīte ti sattamyaṇatena uhanam vitakkanām. uhanan ti pakāsitaṃ ti uhanam iti uhanānāma iti pakāsitaṃ.*
Thousands of millions of apsaras, experts in dance and singing [lit. of dance and signing], and also in music (vādite pi), will surround [you] and walk [you] around by the right hand side ...

This text exemplifies Kār 35. The first thing to be noted about this passage is that it is a canonical text without āṭṭhakathā or ṭīkā commentary upon it. Dhammasena-pati therefore warns us that we need to learn grammar in order to be sufficiently equipped to understand such passages by ourselves. The commentary reads:

“Uhana” [means] considering (vitakkanaṃ) words expressed in the sixth case ending, such as naccāgitassa, in the seventh case ending, [i.e. as] “naccāgite,” because of the rule that relates the meaning “being able” (chekā ti) to a word separated from it [i.e. naccāgitassa], namely kusalā. Uhana is illustrated, i.e. uhana, the term uhana, is illustrated.¹

I could translate this passage but very literally, as the meaning is quite elusive. The point seems to be that a grammarian knows, without the help of the commentary, that naccagītassa in the verse should be understood as naccagīte, in the locative, as vādite, for they are complements of the adjective kusalā. This is clearly a new modality of uhana that has nothing to do with the Sanskrit model of Patañjali. In this case, the adaptation of the word is made in the commentary. It has nothing to do with adapting a mantra for recitation. The main text remains as it is, but the exegete knows that in order to analyse it properly, one needs to modify the case endings.

¹ See n. 1.
Tradition (āgama) is the uninterrupted instruction from one [teacher] to the other. The Dhamma of the Conqueror without desire, this is the Conqueror’s Teaching (sāsanaṃ) of nine limbs.

This stanza is the best example, in my opinion, of the mechanisms of cultural translation that operate in Kār. The verse states an obvious fact, namely that tradition is the uninterrupted transmission of the teachings that are, of course, the Dhamma of the Conqueror (jina), i.e. the Buddha, in its “nine limbs” (an early, pre-Tipiṭaka division of the Buddhist literature). Now the interpretation of this verse changes dramatically if we compare it to what Patañjali states in MBh with regard to āgama:

Certainly, [complying with] a Vedic injunction also [is a use of grammar]. [For instance,] brāhmaṇena niṣkāraṇo dharmaḥ ṣaḍaṅgo vedo ‘dhyeyo jñeyah “a brahmin should [learn to] recite [and] should understand the Veda with its six ancillaries as his duty without motive [of gain].” And among the six ancillaries, grammar is the most important one. An effort made regarding what is most important becomes fruitful.

1 Kār-ṭ 341.29—342.4: **paramparānavacchinnaupadeso va āgamo** ti paresaṃ ācariyānaṃ santatiyā paveniya avacchinno upadeso va āgaminissati ito ti atthasambandhena āgamo nāmā ti uccate. ettha upadeso nāma pekkhāpanaṃ purimapurimehi pacchimānaṃ saddassanāṃ. **ikkāmajinadhammo** ti nikkāmassa kilesakāmarahitassa jinassa vijitakilesassa buddhassa pariyattidhammo. so vedo navāṅgajinasāsanan ti uccati.


3 Joshi — Roodbergen’s translation. Pasp 19: *āgama khalv api brāhmaṇena niśkāraṇo dharmaḥ ņaḍaṅgo vedo’dhyeyo jñeyah iti. pradhānaṃ ca saṅsuvaṅgeseva vyākaraṇam, pradhāne ca kṛto yatnaḥ phalavān bhavati.*
Dhammasenaññathī has completely reworked Patañjali’s words. In Patañjali’s text niṣkaraṇo refers to the “disinterested” pupil, but Kār has taken the same word in order to describe the Buddha (the teacher is disinterested, not the pupil). Similarly the six vedāṅgas, which are only satellite texts, have been transformed into the canon: the nine aṅgas of the Pāli literature.

Noteworthy, as well, is the vocabulary used in Kār-ṭ: āgama is a santati “continuity,” and a paveṇi “lineage”: paresaṃ ācariyānaṃ santatiyā paveṇiyā avachinno upadeso va āgamissati “the instruction itself, not cut off from the lineage, i.e. the continuation of other teachers, will become the tradition.” The ṭīkā makes an even stronger claim when it says that the Dhamma of the jīna, called the pariyattidhamma, is a vedo “Veda” with nine aṅgas (instead of six).

\[
\text{tadāgamajānanatthanā sikkhitabbaṃ hitesinā} \\
\text{veyyākaraṇanāmetāṃ niruttisaddalakkhaṇanāṃ} \quad || \quad 37 \quad ||^1
\]

The one who aspires to welfare, in order to understand that tradition, should study this nirutti, the rules on speech-sounds, known as veyyākaraṇa.

---

^1 Kār-ṭ 342,5-11: \text{tadāgamajānanatthanā ti tassa sammāsambuddhato paṭṭhāya yāvajjatanā anavacchinnopadesassu navanāgamajānaśanabhūtassa aṅgamassā jānanatthanāṃ. hitesinā ti dīṭṭhadhammikasamparāyikācattathaparāthasānkāhātahitagavesinā kulaputtena. veyyākaraṇanāmetāṃ niruttisaddalakkhaṇanāṃ ti māgadhikabhāsābhāvato aviparītaniruttisaddānaṃ sudhakalakkhaṇasahiṣitaṃ ētāṃ kaccāyanaveyyākaraṇaṃ sikkhitabbaṃ ti vuttāḥ hota.}
asaddikam anajjhānaṃ milakkhavacanaṃ yadi
anuvaditavākyattā bhikkhunā nopagamyate || 38 ||

A monk who does not know the correct words, who uses barbaric and unintelligible speech, who keeps using this language — this monk will not learn.

My translation is based, again, on the commentary. The commentary specifies that anajjhānaṃ means “unintelligible” on account of being wrong speech deviating from correct usage. “Barbaric” (milakkha) means other than the māgadhikā language, that is to say any expression not suitable to “the words of the Buddha’s glorious lotus mouth.” “He will not learn” means that even though he may be devoted to the sāsana, he will not “attain,” i.e. he will not be trained (na sikkhate). In other words, without grammar, the training is useless. This stanza is a recast of an idea formulated by Patañjali in the section on extra purposes of grammar (see below).³

---

1 Kār-ṭ reads anugahitavākyattā.
2 Kār-ṭ 342,12–18: asaddikan ti apasaddena niyuttaṃ susaddarahitan ti attho. anajjhānan ti susaddarahita-apasaddattā anajjhayaṃ acintaniyam. milakkhavacanaṃ ti sassirikamukhapodumavivarato niggatabuddha vacanānamukulapaccantade savacanaṃ. māgadhikāya bhūsāya bahi bhūtan ti attho. yadi ti saṁsayatthe nipāto. ce ti attho. anugahitavākyattā ti punappunaṃ gahitabhāvena pavattavākyattā. bhikkhunā nopagamyate ti sūsane yuttapayuttena bhikkhunā nopagamyate na sikkhate.
3 Pasp 4f.
LAHŪPĀYO — BREVITY OF METHOD

Therefore the [correct] words need to be learnt, and for knowing them there is no quicker method than the nirutti. [Therefore] one should study the rules on words (saddalakkhaṇaṃ).

Paraphrasing the commentary once more, the meaning of this stanza is the following:

Because a monk who uses wrong words never becomes properly trained, a monk should learn the correct words, for they comply with the nature of the Māgadhī language (i.e. Pāli), and if one wishes to learn the correct words, there is no quicker method than nirutti.

The topic of this stanza is already found in the Mbh and taken up and elaborated by later grammarians. The Kār version is a metrical rendering of Patañjali’s words, and therefore it is hard to believe that Dhammasenāpati was unfamiliar with the following passage from the Mbh:

And grammar is also to be studied for the sake of simplicity. [An authoritative text says] brahmaṇena avaśyaṃ śabdā jñeyaḥ “a brahmin must necessarily understand the [correct] words.” And without [the help of] grammar words cannot be understood by any easy means.

One simply needs to replace brahmaṇena with bhikkunā. The idea of lahupaya (“quick method”) is a reference to a well-known discussion in the Mbh where it is explained that the

1 Kār-ṭ 342.19–23: ato ti yasmaś milakkhavanam apasadattā bhikkunā na sikkhate. tasmā saddāpi nātabbā ti ete milakkhavanabhāvato apasadā ēte na sabhāvanīruttiḥ bhūtamāgadhikabhāvato yatī hi sotabbāpanetabbāvibhāgam katvā saddā nātabbā. nāne ti tesaṃ saddānaṃ jānane. natthī ti niruttisatthato anīno lahu upāya na yajjati.

2 Pasp 20: laghvarthaṃ cādyeyaṃ vyākaraṇam. brahmaṇena avaśyaṃ śabdā jñeyaḥ iti. na cāntareṇa vyākaraṇam laghunopāyaṃ śabdāḥ sakyā jñātam.
The Mirror of the Tipiṭaka

number of wrong words is infinite, and therefore it is quicker to learn the limited number of correct words.

ASAṂDEHO — REMOVAL OF DOUBT

daṇḍinam āhareyyā ti sandeho jāyate tadā
daṇḍīnaṃ dhanam āhara iti vutte na saṃsayo || 40 ||

When doubt arises, as in an example such as daṇḍinam āhareyya, if one states it [in a different way, namely] daṇḍīnaṃ dhanam āhara, the doubt is removed.

If we follow the commentary, the problem in the word daṇḍīnaṃ is the ambiguity of the case ending after the suffix ī in daṇḍi (“policeman”). This type of suffix follows the declension of the so-called jha endings (i/i non-feminine endings). After the jha stem daṇḍi, the suffix aṃ of the acc. sing., by Kacc 84 agho rassam ekavacaṇayosu api ca, prescribes the shortening of the thematic vowel: daṇḍī -n- aṃ > daṇḍi -n- aṃ. The suffix naṃ of the gen./dat. pl., by Kacc 89 suṇaṃhisu ca, allows for a long ī before the plural suffixes su, naṃ and hi: daṇḍīnaṃ. One may be confused, however, and think that the particle ca in the sutta suṇaṃhisu ca [Kacc 89] is retrieving the long ī prescribed in previous suttas, in which case even acc. sing. could be optionally derived as daṇḍīnaṃ. This is not the case. A grammarian will gloss the sentence daṇḍīnaṃ āhareyya as follows: daṇḍīnaṃ dhanam āhara “bring the

---

1 Kār-tt 342.24-29: sandeho jāyate tadā ti daṇḍīnaṃ āhareyyā ti vutte sandeho jāyate. tasmā katarassato jhato aṇṇvacanassa namaḍesakaraṇena. suṇaṃhisu ce ti ettha sutte caggahaṇanivattana-sunanavibhāt innovittārūpena missakattā. na saṃsayo ti daṇḍīnaṃ dhanam āhara ti vutte saṃsayo sandeho naththi. kasmā. sambandhivisesanaddassanato.

2 According to Kacc 368 daṇḍādito ikā ī “the suffixes īka and ī after words [of the group] beginning with daṇḍa [express the one who possesses it].” E.g. daṇḍa means “stick,” daṇḍi means “the one who possesses a stick” that is to say a policeman.

3 Kacc 58.

4 This interpretation goes against Kacc-v ad Kacc 89: caggahaṇanamavadhāranaṭṭhattaṃ “the mention of ca is for the purpose of restriction (avadhāraṇa).” That is to say ca marks an exception (apavāda) to the shortening of the thematic vowel.
money of [or to] the policemen.” How is the ambiguity removed? Adding an accusative that immediately turns the previous daṇḍīnāṃ into a gen. pl., because the verb āharati cannot have double accusative. The commentary explains it in a rather convolute manner: “because of the relationship between that which is related [i.e. the money] and the specific reality to which this is related [i.e. the policemen].” That is to say, the grammarian makes clear that in the action of bringing, expressed by the verb, there is something given (dhanāṃ) and this is given to someone (daṇḍīnāṃ).

In theory, however, only knowing that daṇḍīnāṃ with long ī can only be gen. dat. pl. would be enough. Moreover the grammar of Kaccāyana fails to explain where the -n- in acc. sing. daṇḍinaṃ comes from. But I think this is precisely the point of the controversy: in cases where the stem can be, for instance, daṇḍi- or daṇḍin-, the anāṃ vibhatti after the stem daṇḍin- can be confused with the namāṃ vibhatti after the stem daṇḍi-. A grammarian will now that, in the second case, the ī will be lengthened: daṇḍīnāṃ.

7.4. The fire of understanding

Once the five purposes of grammar have been stated, the Kārikā closes the section by reminding us that knowledge without understanding is barren:

\[\text{yam adhītam aviññātadupadeso na vijjate} \]
\[\text{anaggimhi va sukkhindho na taṃ jalati katthaci || 41 ||} \]

That which is learnt by a person who has not understood the instruction cannot blaze, as dry wood cannot blaze anywhere without fire.

---

1 Kār-ṭ 342,30—343,6: te evaṃ sandehe sati ācariyapadesena gaggante ti dassetukāmāha — yam adhītan ti ādi \(\text{yam adhītam-la-vijjate ti yam aviññātapatthaṃ adhītam sikkhtāṃ} \) te pubbācariyapadesena vijjate dissati. pubbācariyapadesena padantarena vijjati ti attho. kim iva. \(\text{na aggimhī} \) ti sukkhe upānīte bāhira-aggimhī asati sukkhindho ti sukkhaṃ kaṭṭhādi-indhanāṃ jalati iva. \(\text{na taṃ jalati katthaci ti} \) tathēva taṃ ānadhītam aviññātam katthaci ōhane atthaṃ na jalati na pakāsayati.
The syntax of this verse is extremely elliptical. In fact, the reading of the Burmese edition is difficult to accept. As I will subsequently show, the Sanskrit model of this verse will give us the clue for how to emend the Burmese edition. The ṭīkā seems to read: *yaṃ adhītaṃ aviññātaṃ upadesena vijjate*, for it says:

That which (*yaṃ*) has been studied (*adhītaṃ*), i.e. learned (*sikkhitam*) without previously understanding it (*aviññātapubbaṃ*), is found (*vijjate*), i.e. it is seen (*dissati*) by you (*te*) through the teaching of previous teachers (*pubbācariyupadesena*). That is to say (*ti attho*), it is learned by means of another word (*padantarena*), namely the teaching of previous teachers (*pubbācariyupadesena*).

The rest of the commentary is a simile that presents no further problems, especially because the image is very familiar. One could perhaps wonder why does Dhammasenāpati use a simile so charged with brahmanical ideology? Indhana is the dry wood or fuel that the young brahmin disciple (the *brahmacārin*) offers to the master as a tuition fee. This tradition is the background that gives poetical force to this verse: if one approaches a brahmin teacher in order to learn the Veda, but he does not understand what he learns, his knowledge will become useless, as the dry wood he brought to the master will be useless if there is no fire. Understanding is compared to fire, with all the very ancient reminiscences that fire awakens in Vedic culture (the first word of the Ṛgveda is *agnim* “fire”). As I have said, this stanza is literally borrowed from one of the examples that Patañjali quotes in his section on further uses of the study of grammar (Pasp 22). In this section Patañjali explains that one also studies grammar in order not to speak barbarisms, in order to understand what is learnt, in order that correct words will lead one to heaven, in order not to be addressed like women, in order that one becomes *ārtvijīna* (an ambiguous word, according to Kaiyaṭa, a person on behalf of whom a rite is performed or one who causes others to sacrifice), in order to become like a mighty god, in order to become a lord of men, in order that Speech will reveal itself

1 Joshi — Roodbergen, 1986: 51.
like a woman who strips naked in front of a desired husband, in order that speech becomes auspicious, in order to avoid expiation, in order to give proper names to one’s own progeny, in order that we may become “truth-deities.” These are all purposes that suit a brahmin, but not a Buddhist monk. That is why Dhammasenāpati has only preserved the following one:

\[
yad \text{adhītam aviṁñātam nigadenaiva śabdyate}
\]
\[
anagnāv iva śuṣkaidho na taj jvalati karhicit.
\]

What has been recited [but] not understood [and] is merely mechanically uttered, that never blazes forth, like dry fuel on a non-fire.\(^1\)

This stanza is found in the Mbh, but it is actually a quotation from the Nirukta (I, 18\(^2\)). We suppose that, as with the rest of the section, Dhammasenāpati has taken it from the MBh.

With the Sanskrit model in mind, we can go back to the Pāli text and compare: \textit{aviṁñātad} has to be restored, as the \textit{ṭīkā} suggests, to \textit{aviṁñātam}. A copyist might have thought that the \textit{m} was a glide, and he replaced it with another glide, \textit{d}, as is frequently the case. The Sanskrit \textit{nigadena} (“with mechanical recitation”) has been replaced with \textit{upadesena} (if we follow the \textit{ṭīkā}, not the \textit{mūla}, which is wrong). \textit{Upadesa} literally means “by instruction.” The verb \textit{śabdyate} (“is uttered”) is changed to \textit{vijjate} (“is found” or simply “is”; or perhaps from √\textit{vid} “is known” “is learnt”). The emended text would read:

\[
yam adhītam aviṁñātam upadesena vijjate ...
\]

What is memorised by [mere] instruction, but not understood ...

---

1 Translation by Joshi — Roodbergen, 1986: 42.
2 Nirukta reads grhītam for \textit{adhītam}. 
This version makes more sense than the text we find in the Burmese edition. The exegesis of Kār-ṭ, however, is very far from the explanation of Patañjali. According to Patañjali, if one learns a Vedic mantra without understanding it, its recitation will not produce any effect. The Pāli commentary has readjusted the parameters. When glossing *upadesena* ("by instruction") Dhammasenāpati tries to give a new meaning to the stanza:

\[ \text{pubbācariyupadesena padantarena ti attho} \]

["by instruction"], that is to say by another word, namely the instruction of ancient masters.

I think this is how we need to understand *padantarena* (Skt. *padāntareṇa*). The point is that if one learns through "instruction," that is to say through "the word of someone else," without understanding it, the effort in the discipline is in vain. This is again a reminder that, as Aggavaṃsa declares at the end of the *Saddanīti, pariyatti* (the study of the texts) is the authentic root of the *sāsana*. Grammar is the means to correctly understand the texts. This is the understanding that buttresses the effectiveness of the practice. With the assistance of grammar the texts can be learned in such a way that the practice (*paṭipatti*) becomes fruitful, and insight (*paṭivedha*) into the highest truth becomes finally possible.

8. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the beginning of this chapter I have revised the current views on the role of Pāli grammar in Pagan Burma. Whereas all scholars agree that Pāli grammatical literature is extraordinarily vast in Burma, their explanation of this phenomenon differs. But in all cases scholars have tended to elaborate their theories without taking into account the actual texts. A reading of the primary sources has revealed that the connections between Pāli grammar in Burma and the Indian tradition go beyond the technicalities of grammar. The connection has to do with
deeper cultural influences. Indeed, Pāli grammar is considered a discipline that is closely related to the study of the religious texts. As I have shown with the examples from the Saddatthabhedacintā and the Kārikā, the role of Pāli grammar in Burma was not simply to facilitate linguistic comprehension, but to provide an instrument of doctrinal exegesis. This instrument was highly needed, because Theravāda Buddhism is a Buddhist tradition that bestows a transcendental importance to the texts: they are considered the verbal embodiment of the Dhamma. This belief is vividly illustrated in the late Burmese chronicles when they narrate the establishment of Theravāda Buddhism in Pagan as a struggle for textual authenticity.

In examining some grammatical portions I have also shed light on their immense richness in terms of linguistic and philosophical debate. Such discoveries can be made by studying the ocean of so-called ancillary texts written in medieval Burma. Reading them as what they really are: Buddhist literature. If we can read Dignāga’s theory of apoha ("exclusion") as Buddhist philosophy, I do not see why we cannot do the same with Pāli grammars. The fact that they are difficult and highly technical does not make them less Buddhist. If we overlook the grammatical mass of literature in Burma, we run the risk of overlooking the essence of Burmese Theravāda.

The aim of this chapter was to open the perspective from which we approach Pāli grammatical texts from Burma. I am well aware that there is still much research to be done, and the study of particular texts will surely bring interesting results. That is why in the following two chapters I will focus on one of these grammatical texts, the Suttaniddesa, ascribed to the 15th century Buddhist reformer Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla.
II

A Firefly In The Bamboo Reed

Exploring the *Suttaniddesa* of Chapāṭa Sāddhammajotipāla
1. THE AUTHOR

1.1. Two Chapaṭas

The Pāli grammatical work called the *Suttaniddesa* is one of the most renowned commentaries on the Pāli grammar of *Kaccāyana*. The *Suttaniddesa* is ascribed to a Burmese monk from Pagan called Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla. We do not know much about this personage, and the few things we know come from sources that are not completely trustworthy. Nevertheless I will try to sketch the figure of this author with the scanty materials we have at our disposal.

For a long time, Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla was believed to be the same person as the legendary twelfth-century reformer Chapaṭa (or Chapada) Thera of Pagan. Paññasāmi’s *Sāsanavaṃsa* (1861) and Bode’s *Pāli Literature of Burma* (1909, based on the *Sāsanavaṃsa*) bear the main responsibility for this confusion. Two articles, one by Buddhadatta Mahāthera (1957) and another by Godakumbura (1969) pointed out the mistake. Since then, there is a general scholarly consensus that they are two different personages who lived in different periods. The first Chapaṭa Thera (sometimes called Chapada Thera) is a legendary figure, the founder of the Mahāvihāra lineage of Burma, situated in the 12th century, and the second Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla is the name of the author of the 15th century who has left important Pāli texts that we can still read. These two personages, and all the other Burmese scholar monks who are named “Chapaṭa,” are probably members of what Blackburn has termed a “textual community” (in this case, the orthodox texts of the Mahāvihāra monastery of Laṅkā).

---

1 These two articles did not always receive the attention of scholars and a number of important publications after 1969 are still based on Bode’s PLB, for instance: PLC; DPPP; Pind, 1996; Deokar, 2008; Norman, 1983; but they are already incorporated in works such as von Hinüber, 1996, and Nyanatusita’s Table (see Bibliography). For a criticism of the *Sāsanavaṃsa* as a historical source see Lieberman, 1976.

that share the same orientation “by and toward shared texts,” even though “their interpretations of these texts are not homogeneous.”

1.2. The Saddhammajotipāla of the verse colophon

There are aspects of Saddhammajotipāla’s life that we can learn directly from the colophons of his books. Colophones have to be read with all the necessary caution, as there is no way of knowing if they were written by the author, or even if they were written during his lifetime. In the verse colophon of the *Suttaniddesa* it is said that he composed this work in 1447 A.D., after having gone to Laṅkā:

One thousand years, plus ten times ninety-nine years, after the extinction of the Buddha (= 1990 BE), he who went from this city of Arimaddana (= Pagan) to the excellent Tambapaṇṇi (= Lankādīpa) ruled by King Siri Parakkamabāhu; the one who, on account of the stain on the Teaching, caused it to be purified through very knowledgeable monks who are experts in the Vinaya and set up a flawless *simā* (“monastic boundary”) according to the Vinaya [rules] in the excellent city called Jayavaḍḍhana, and taught Vinaya and Abhidhamma to the community of monks — he, whose heart was purified by wisdom and who was compassionate towards the people, austere, and praised for his qualities of morality and energy, rich in faith — he who sympathised with persons of pure intellect, who was able to see through the Three Piṭakas in all its parts — he, Chapaṭa, a learned and beloved king of monks, composed in abridgement this explanation of the beneficial *sutta* of Kaccāyana, for the benefit of the Teaching of the muni (Buddha). By all the merits greatly obtained in composing the *Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa*, wishing to benefit the good Dhamma, may all beings prosper in happiness, and may the kings, following the Dhamma, protect the continuity of the Teaching.

---

1 Blackburn, 2001: 12.
2 The same colophon is repeated, with the appropriate changes, at the end of the *Suttaniddesa*, the *Saṅkhepavāṇanā* and *Sīmālaṅkāra-ṭīkā*.
3 I translate the Pāli text of the Sinhalese edition, Kacc-nidd 279,5-24:
   
   *puṇṇe dase nawanavatigaye ca vasse*
   *vasse sahassagaṇane jīnavibhūṭayāṃ,*
   *iddhārimaddanapūrṇa varatambapaṇṇaṁ*
In this colophon Saddhammajotipāla is known only as Chappaṭa. He allegedly visited Laṅkā during the reign of Parakkamabāhu VI of Koṭṭe (r. 1412–1467). Koṭṭe is known also in its Pāli name Jayavaḍḍhanapura “the city of victorious prosperity.” If the colophon is correct, Saddhammajotipāla took part in the consecration of monastic boundaries (sīmā) in Jayavaḍḍhanapura. He allegedly perform these ceremonies in Laṅkā under the auspices of a king who had become a munificent patron of the Mahāvihāra Saṅgha, funding monasteries, having monastic boundaries made for proper ordination, and building monastic colleges. Parakkamabāhu VI allotted lands to the scribes who were daily engaged in the work of copying the Tipiṭaka, the aṭṭhakathās, and the ōṭīkās.1 According to Frasch, it seems that it was this king, with his military and cultural successes, who inspired the Sinhalese revival model in Lower Burma, Chieng Mai, and mainland Southeast Asia in general, the KI and the Thai chronicle Saddhammasaṅgaha being examples of this influence.2 Frasch has framed this renaissance in a Buddhist crisis of millenialism, for 1456 was believed to be the 2000th anniversary of the Buddha’s parinibbāna, and therefore the beginning of the disappearance of the sāsana. Copying the Tipiṭaka and writing new commentaries, consecrating monastic lands and funding monasteries, would have all been measures to counterbalance the natural

---

1 PLC 247f.
decay of the religion.\textsuperscript{1} The work of Saddhammajotipāla may therefore be understood as his own contribution to the preservation of the \textit{sāsana} in that millenialist context.

The main proponent of Parakkamabāhu’s reform was the erudite monk Śrī Rāhula, a chaplain who was himself a polyglot grammarian of remarkable acumen. In his \textit{Moggallānapañcikāpradīpaya} (in Sinhalese and Pāli), Śrī Rāhula quotes, among other grammatical works, the \textit{Suttaniddesa}.\textsuperscript{2} This provides us with a reliable \textit{terminus ante quem} for Saddhammajotipāla.

### 1.3. The Chapada Pagoda Inscription

The verse colophon I have quoted above states that Saddhammajotipāla wrote the \textit{Suttaniddesa} in 1990 B.E., that is to say around 1447 A.D. Now, this date is very close to the date of the foundation, or repair, of a certain Chapaṭa (or Chapada) Pagoda in Pagan. The only scholar who has drawn attention to this pagoda in connection with the name Chapaṭa is Frasch.\textsuperscript{3} The monument is clearly of the Sinhalese style and, because of its name, some scholars thought that it had been built in the 12th or 13th century. With that they assume that it was the pagoda associated to the first Chapaṭa Mahāthera, founder of the Mahāvihāra

\begin{itemize}
\item[2] PLC 252.
\end{itemize}
The foundational stone inscription of the Chapada Pagoda is not preserved in its original form, but in 18th century copies commissioned by king Bodōpayā. The authenticity of these copies is highly suspect. The different stone copies of this inscription present evident damage and misspellings, for which reason the reading becomes, in some places, unintelligible. But to the best of my knowledge this seems to be the only inscription of Pagan clearly mentioning a respectable Buddhist master called Chapaṭa (the name Saddhammajotipāla is missing) who attracted the attention of the Ava monarchy. I will simply summarise the content of the official printed edition.\footnote{For instance, Godakumbura, 1969: 5; Luce, 1969: 280: “Sapada pagoda S. of Nyanung-u, built in Cañsū II’s reign, when Singhalese influence became strong at Pagān.” King Cañsū II is Narapatisitthu, r. 1173–1210. This is the king whose preceptor was, according to the chronicles, Uttarājīva, the teacher of the legendary Chapaṭa Mahāthera. Another example is found in Strachan, 1996: 94: “If the Araññavasi represented a degenerate aspect to the Buddhism of the period, then increased contact with Ceylon maintained a purifying current in the religious life of Late Pagan. The mission of the monk Sapada (= Chapada) to Ceylon, as described in the chronicles, for reordination so as to strengthen the lineage connections between Burma and the heartland of Pali Buddhism was commemorated with the construction of the Sapada stupa, so named after him, which manifests this strong Ceylonese connection, with a Ceylonese type of finial and harmikā, a feature that was to be repeated on numerous stupas built from this time onwards across the plain.” Both Luce and Strachan’s assumption is based on chronicles, not on the inscription of the pagoda. Strachan’s view of the Araññavasins as “degenerate,” is based on a biased interpretation of medieval archaeological records based on very late (19th-century) chronicles (such as the Sāsanavaṃsa).}

According to the Chapada Pagoda Inscription, in the year Sakkarāj 803 (1441 A.D.) the queen of Kūkhan (= Pakhan Kyi, a town near Pagan), mother of the great king Sihapate, was keen on performing acts of “merit” (kusala). At that time, a certain venerable personage called “Chapaṭa” had already gone to Laṅkā three times. The inscription seems to state that “a crocodile received him, and riding on the back of the crocodile” he returned to Pagan with some marvelous relics from the island. When the queen of Kūkhan learnt about his arrival and discovered that he had brought some relics, she invited the monk to the court. Chapaṭa
offered the relics to the queen: “the image of the *ratanaceti*, the seed of the Bodhi tree, and the bodily relic.” In the year Sakkarāj 804, on Thursday, 4th day of the Waxing Moon of the month of Nayon, the queen enshrined the body relic in a place called Yang Pyu La, “in a suitable land [for monastic purposes],” east of the Shwezigon Pagoda (this reference to the location is important). According to the inscription, a village headman was requested to indicate the monastic boundaries of the land of the Chapaṭa Pagoda, and the ceremonial water was poured. The land and its produce was dedicated to the Saṅgha.\(^1\) The king Narapate (that is to say, Narapati the Great of Ava, r. 1443–1469\(^2\)) assisted her in the plastering of the pagoda and in the funding of a monastery near the monument.

So far the inscription. The presence of King Narapati indicates that the royal family of Ava was visiting Pagan on that occasion, and the royal family itself offered the monastic land to Chapaṭa. This is not a simple coincidence, for 804 Sakkarāj is the year of Narapati’s coronation. The king was touring the kingdom, performing auspicious acts of merit.\(^3\)

Now in Sīlavaṃsa’s royal chronicle *Yazawinkyaw* (the oldest extant Burmese chronicle, written in the 15th century) there is a reference to a monastery sponsored by the queen of Kūkhan and Narapati. If my reading is correct, what Sīlavaṃsa states is that among the acts of merit of King Narapati the Great of Ava we have “a great monastery in a village to the east of the Shwezigon [Pagoda]” and also a *ceti* (pagoda).\(^4\)

---

1 Another copy of the inscription dating from the time of King Bodōpayā bears the signs of being a repair inscription, with the re-enactment of the royal patronage. The content of this inscription is practically the same as the previous one, but with the addition of the King Bodōpayā’s statement that he re-enacts the monastic status of the land, which probably includes being exempt from taxes and so on.
3 *Yazawinkyaw* 146f.
4 *Yazawinkyaw* 148.
1.4. The prose colophon

We find further references to the residence of Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla in the *nigamana* ("prose colophon") of some of his works. I offer here my translation of the *nigamana* as recorded in the *Suttaniddesa*:

This [work] with the name *Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa* was composed by the very learned and famous Thera called Chapaṭa, known also under the name Saddhammajotipāla, [a name] taken from master Tipiṭakadharas endowed with very pure intellect, energy, morality, and behaviour. He, Chapaṭa, endowed with a quick wit, expert in excellent and versatile method, having incalculable pāramis, memoriser of the Piṭaka by his natural wisdom and power, from a village in the land of the city of Arimaddana (Pagan); [it is he] who completed the study of the texts (pariyatti) for the students living in Laṅkādīpa [that is, the island of Sri Lanka] and Jambudīpa [that is to say Burma].

There is another version of the *nigamana*, which includes a mention of the monastery of Pagan where Chapaṭa allegedly lived: arimaddana-nagara-gocaru-gāma-pācīnadīśābhāgaṭṭhita-tilokanayana-sabbaññu-dhātuñhīsa-cetiyaṃ “The monastery of the hair relic of the Omniscient One, [called] Tilokanayana (Guiding-Eye of the Three Worlds), which is located in a village to the east of the district of the city of Arimaddana.” This version of the


2 Recorded, for instance, in the E" of Nāmac (Saddhātissa, 1990).

3 This is the full version of the second type of *nigamana* according to Saddhātissa’s edition (JPTS, 1990): paramavicicitta-nayakovida-paññājavana-samannāgatena suvisuddha-buddhi-viriya-silācāra-ruṇasamannāgatena aparimitapāramitāsambhūta-paññānubhāvajanitapiṭakadharena Arimaddana-nagara-gocara-gāma-pacina-disābhāgaṭṭhita-tilokanayana-sabbaññudhātu-unhisacetīyaṃ nissāya vasantena diṭṭhadhammasamapparyākattathānusāsakasatthhuno sāsanahitakāmānaṃ Laṅkādīpa-paradīpavāsināṃ sotujanānaṃ pariyattimā pariyaṃ antena suvisuddha-buddhi-viriya-silācāra-ruṇa-samannāgata-tapiṭakadhara-gahita-Saddhamma-
nigamana, however, omits the phrase *chappaṭo ti vissutena* “the famous [Thera] called Chappaṭa.” The Burmese catalogue *Gandhavaṃsa* “History of Books”\(^1\) also refers to Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla simply as Saddhammajotipāla.\(^2\) The *Sāsanavaṃsa*, moreover, suggests that the name in the colophons is Saddhammajotipāla only.\(^3\) My impression is that the name Chapaṭa may have been added in the *nigamana*, with the date-colophon, at a later stage of the textual transmission.

### 1.5. Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla’s texts as symbols

By the end of the 18th century, Ṛṣabhivaṃsa, the abbot of the Asokārāma of Amarapura and Saṅgharāja (*thathanabaing*) under King Bodōpayā,\(^4\) sent a letter to the Theravāda fraternity of Laṅkā. The letter, known under the title *Sandesakathā* (literally “Letter Tale”),\(^5\) was written in Pāli and was meant to sanction the ties between the Burmese Saṅgha and its recently born scion overseas: the Sinhalese Amarapura Nikāya. If we believe what the text of the *Sandesakathā* says, the letter was accompanied by a gift, namely a set of three Abhidhamma works including a manuscript of the *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā* ascribed to “Thera Chapada.” This was supposed to be a reminder of the old and close relationship between the Sinhalese and Burmese Theravāda traditions.\(^6\) Both the legend and the “facts” associated

---

1. **Von Hinüber, 1996: 4.** Probably 17th to 19th century (see Kumar, 1992: 5–6). There are no significant differences between the Minayeff and Kumar editions of Gv with regard to Saddhammajotipāla.

2. **Gv 64; 74.** The Saddhammapāla mentioned among the masters of Pagan in Gv 67 may well be Saddhammajotipāla, for otherwise he would be unexpectedly missing in the list.

3. **Sās 74.**

4. **See PLB 77–78.** According to Charney (2006: 19) the group of monks lead by Ṛṣabhivaṃsa “had campaigned over the course of the eighteenth century to win court recognition of their monastic practices and succeeded in winning lay and royal support for their conspicuous displays of authoritative textualism regarding Pali and Sanskrit literature.” For the struggle of the Theravāda community against other sects in 19th-century Burma, see Pranke, 2004 and Kirichenko’s *Atula* (see Bibliography).


6. **Minayeff, 1885: 28:** *laṅkādīpe anuruddhattherena kato sodānaṃ pitvaḍdhana nāmācāradīpako nāma niṭṭhito. jambudīpe arimaddanāpure chapadatthereṇa katoṃ saṅkhepavaṇṇananā nāma tiṃaṃ ca anbhākaṃ dhammadānatthāya sihaḷabhikkhusaṃghassa dema.*
with Chapaṭa connect him with Laṅkādīpa. The destiny of Chapaṭa’s literature may also be related to this connection. It seems very likely to me that the preservation and distribution of the works of Saddhammajotipāla was due to the fact that he was already confused with the first Chapaṭa Mahāthera and therefore considered the most important Buddhist reformer of Burma, only equalled by Soṇa and Uttara, Asoka’s envoys to Suvaṇṇabhūmi in ancient times. The preservation of Saddhammajotipāla’s texts is even more remarkable given the little interest, even in Burma, for their actual content.¹ This neglect is due, I think, to the fact that the content was less important than the symbolic power of the author. But before we try to understand the nature of Saddhammajotipāla's grammatical work, it is important to take perspective and consider the place of the Suttaniddesa in the context of other works, related to other disciplines, written by the same author. As Charney has rightly observed:

For the Burmese monk or layman afterwards, the boundaries of knowledge were not socially prescribed, but were limitless. These boundaries expanded as the growth of the Burmese state incorporated ever-broadening fields of knowledge.²

In the following section I will briefly survey the literature that has been transmitted under the name of Saddhammajotipāla. I think it is important to keep in mind that they are all considered branches of the Buddhist education.

1.6. Saddhammajotipāla’s works

Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla’s works bear the mark of some sort of intellectual modesty, for all of them, without exception, are characterised by a systematic concision, to the point of

¹ The Suttaniddesa, the Saṅkhepaevamana and the Nāmacāradīpikā are no longer available in Burmese monastic book stores. Early 20th-century editions are extremely hard to find in libraries.
² Charney, 2006: 12.
being frequently overlooked in the Theravāda tradition, but important from the point of view of the Buddhist textual tradition. Indeed the greatest merit of Saddhammajotipāla is the vast erudition displayed in his commentaries.

In Nandapañña’s *Gandhavaṃsa* (Gv) eight books are ascribed to the master Saddhammajotipāla: (1) the *Mātikaṭṭhadīpanī* (“Illustrating the meaning of the mātikā”) (2) a ṭīkā on the *Simālaṅkāra* (“Treatise on Monastic Boundaries”) (3) the *Gandhasāra* (“Essence of the book/s [of the Tipitaka (?)]”) (4) the *Paṭṭhānagaṇanānaya* (“A method for counting (?) [the dhammas in] the *Paṭṭhāna* [book of the Abhidhamma]”) (5) The *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā* (“Concise commentary [upon Anuruddha’s Compendium of Abhidhamma]”) (6) The *Suttaniddesa* (“An explanation of [Kaccāyana’s] suttas”) (7) the *Vinayasamuṭṭhāna* (“Illustrating the arising [of offences (?)] in the Vinaya”) (8) the *Pāṭimokkhavisodhanī* (“Purification of the Pāṭimokkha [text]”).

1 For instance, in his edition of the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*, Bodhi considers the Vibhāvinī-ṭīkā and Ledi Sayadaw’s *Paramatthadīpani-ṭīkā* the two important reading guides, and the *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā* of Saddhammajotipāla is not taken into account.

2 This is clear, for instance, in Pind’s critical edition of *Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavuttī* (PTS, 2013).

3 Edited by Minayeff, *JPTS* 1886: 56–80. Edited again by Kumar, 1992. There are many such lists of books in Burma and elsewhere and their content usually derives from colophons that we can sometimes consult. In this chapter I am using two lists that are easily accessible, which are Gv and Piṭ-s. I am aware that any local catalogue or inventory of manuscripts could count as one of such lists and further research on this issue will bear interesting fruits.

4 Gv 64: mātikatthadīpanī simālankārasssa ṭīkā vinayasamuṭṭhānādīpanī gandhasāra paṭṭhānagaṇanānaya abhidhammatthasaṃgahasssa saṅkhepavaṇṇanā navatikā kaccāyanasssa suttaniddeso pāṭimokkhavisodh桑 ceti aṭṭha gandhe saddhammajotipālācariyo akāsi. Another list in Gv 74: mātikatthadīpanī abhidhammatthasaṃgahavānṇanā simālankārasssa ṭīkā gandhisāra paṭṭhānagaṇanānayo ca ti ime paśca pakaraṇāni attano mātiyā saddhammajotipālācariyena kata. saṅkhepavaṇṇanā parakkamatthabhānāmena jambudīpissareṇa raṇā āyāciterena saddhammajotipālācariyena kata. kaccāyanasssa suttaniddeso attano sissena dhammacāritththerena āyācitena saddhammajotipālācariyena kata. vinayasamuṭṭhānādīpanī nāma pakaraṇaṃ attano gurunā sanghattherena āyāciterena saddhammajotipālācariyena kata. sattā pakaraṇāni pana tena pakkāmanapare katāni saṅkhepavaṇṇanā yena laṅkadipe kata. For some reason, Nandapañña is inaccurate in this passage and mentions the (6) Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā (= (2) *Abhidhammattha-san-sāgahavanāna*) twice. Instead of this title, we would expect the *Pāṭimokkhavisodhānī* in the list of handbooks. This is a good example of the unreliability of book lists such as Gv. We find another list in Sās 74: arimaddanapagare sīhālaḍīpiṃ gantvā pacāyato chapado nāma saddhammajotipālathero saddanaye chekatāya suttaniddesam akāsi, paramatthadhamme ca chekatāya saṅkhepavaṇṇanāy nāmacarudipakān ca, vinaye chekatāya vinayagilthhadīpanī simālankārān ca akāsi. attano katāni gandhānaṃ nighame saddhammajotipalo ti mūlanāmena vuttam “In Arimaddanapura, having gone to and returned from Sīhāladipa, Saddhammajotipāla, called Chapada, wrote a grammatical work called Suttaniddesa; on the
Paññasāmī seems to mention only those books with the signature “Saddhammajotipāla” in the colophon. We might understand here that the rest of the works listed in Gv were written by a different Chapaṭa, but there is no certainty about that. A brief examination of the available texts can tell us more about the reliability of traditional reports.

1.6.1 Nāmacāradīpaka\(^1\) and Nāmacāradīpaka-ṭīkā

The Nāmacāradīpaka or Nāmacāradīpikā (Nāmac) “Explaining the Action of Mind” according to Saddhātissa (the editor). In want of manuscripts, Saddhātissa used a Burmese printed edition. A new edition, using more mss. and the commentary by the author (see below) remains a desideratum in the field of Abhidhamma studies.

---

1 Edited by Saddhātissa in the JPTS 1990. HPL § 353 translates “(Explaining the) Action of Mind” following Saddhātissa. I see no reason for using brackets. I am well aware that Saddhātissa died before finishing the edition, which was made in collaboration with Ven. Pesala from London. Thanks to Professor Norman and Dr William Pruitt I had access to the correspondence between Professor Norman, Saddhātissa and Pesala regarding Nāmac publication. In a letter dated February 14th 1990, Ven. Pesala informs Professor Norman about the unfortunate and untimely death of Saddhātissa: “I have prepared this new copy listing all the variations. However, I am very sorry to have to inform you that Venerable Dr Saddhātissa will not be able to complete the work which we started. Last Wednesday he went into West Middlesex hospital for a checkup and was admitted for an operation. Unfortunately, he was not strong enough to recover from the operation and died yesterday.” Saddhātissa had, by that time, ordered from Burma a copy of the Visuddhimaggagaṇṭhi, a rare (I would say lost) book ascribed to Saddhammajotipāla. This tells us about Saddhātissa’s intention to exhaust all available materials before he would publish the edition of Nāmac. For references to Nāmac see Nyan section on Abhidhamma manuals, and Nāmac-ṭīkā, 3.8.9.1. According to Professor Norman, the Nāmacāradīpikā is not included in the list given by the Sāsanavaṃsa, and from that he infers that this work was perhaps not authored by Saddhammajotipāla, but only brought to Pagan from Laṅkā. Saddhātissa ratifies the position of Professor Norman in his introduction to the edition of this text. But the fact is that this work is included in the list given by Sās (see note 27). Furthermore, it is the Saṅkhepaṇaṇṇā and not Nāmac that is said to have been composed in Sri Lanka. As I have said before, Paṭṭhānagaṇanānya, listed in Nyan 3.7.19, is probably Nāmac.
The title Nāmac-ṭikā is allegedly Chapaṭa’s own commentary on Nāmac. To the best of my knowledge, this work has not been edited nor was it consulted for the European edition. The title is found in one manuscript that contains the Nāmac text only, and therefore it is possible that Nāmac-ṭ is another title for the same work.

Nāmac is a brief manual of Abhidhamma in 299 verses organised in 7 sections or paricchedas. It is counted as one of the nine “little finger manuals of Abhidhamma” (Abhidhamma-lak-sañi) in Burma. As it happens with such types of versified epithomes, the reading of Nāmac is dry and incomprehensible without a commentary, for it simply consists of lists. Its merit is synthesising the bulky Paṭṭhāna literature in around 300 stanzas. The title Paṭṭhānagaṇanānaya in Gv is surely another title for the Nāmacāradīpaka. That title describes the content of the work in a better way, because it is really about numbers and counting groups of dhammas following the Paṭṭhāna arrangement. Indeed, unlike the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha and other versified treatises, Nāmac follows exclusively the Paṭṭhāna method of classification, as the author states in the introductory stanzas: “I will compose in brief an exposition of the action of mind according to the method in the Paṭṭhāna, therefore pay heed to it, those of you who are of composed mind.”

---

1 Nyan 3.8.9.1 Nāmac-ṭ. In the Piṭ-s 286 it is said that the Nāmacāradīpaka[-aṭṭhakathā] is composed “by Saddhammajotipāla of Pugaṃ,” it is also said (Piṭ-s 319) that Nāmacāradīpaka-ṭikā is by “Rhañ Saddhammajotipāla of Pugaṃ city.” I have not found any manuscript of this work.

2 The other eight “Little finger manuals” are: Amuruddha’s Paramatthavinicchaya, Amuruddha’s Nāmarūparipariccheda, Buddhadatta’s Abhidhammadvatāra, Buddhadatta’s Rūpārūpavibhāga, Dhammapāla’s Saccasaṅkhepa, Mahākassapa’s Mohavicchedani, Khema’s Khemappakarana and Amuruddha’s Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha (commented upon by Saddhammajotipāla, see under Saṅkhepavanavanā).

3 Nāmac 2:

racayissam samāsena nāmacārassa dipakam
paṭṭhānanagāhanam taṁ taṁ suṇātha samāhitā.
1.6.2. Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā

This book is the third known commentary in the line of commentaries upon Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha (Abhidh-s) the most famous among the “little finger manuals of Abhidhamma,” written by Anuruddha in Anuradhapura, Sri Lanka, perhaps as early as in the 5th century A.D.² The oldest known commentary upon Abhidh-s is the so-called Porāṇa-ṭīkā by Kassapa from Dimbulagala³ (the Forest Monastery of Sri Lanka), also attributed to a certain Vimalabuddhi.⁴ The second commentary is known in Burma as “the famous ṭīkā” (ṭīkā kyaw), also mahāṭīkā, namely the Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī (Abhidh-s-mṭ), written around the 12th century by Sumaṅgala Thera of the Mahāvihāra monastery of Anuradhapura in Lanka. A latter commentary on the same work is the monumental Maṇisāramañjūsā by Ariyavamsa of Pagan, who composed this voluminous work in Sagaing around the year 1466.⁵ This sub-commentary has not received much attention from scholars, but its thoroughness and erudition, including frequent grammatical discussions, contrasts with the conciseness of the Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā written some twenty years earlier in the same milieu.

The introductory stanzas of the Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā (Abhidh-s-sv) offer a salutation to the king, who requested personally a commentary on this work. The second stanza is a justification for writing yet another commentary. This sort of prologue states that previous commentaries already examined most of the relevant topics that a commentary on Abhidh-s needs to discuss, but Abhidh-s-sv will cover those questions that have been overlooked by general commentators:

1 Nyan 3.8.1.4. The Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā has been published in a Sinhalese edition under the title Abhidhammatthasaṅgahasāṅkhepavaṇṇanā, edited by Paññānanda Bhikkhu, published in 1899, Jinalankara Press, Colombo. To the best of my knowledge, this is the only existing printed edition of this work. The Myanmar edition has gone out of print many years ago, because I have been unable to find a copy. To the best of my knowledge, the earliest edition is Yangon, 1910. Manuscripts of this work are, however, very abundant, either containing the Pāli text alone, or with the Burmese nissaya. A critical edition of this commentary remains a desideratum.

4 Wijeratne and Gethin, 2007: xiii.
5 Maṇisāramañjūsā II 580,13–14: ayaṃ vaṇṇanā affhavisādhika-affhasatasakkarājamsi “this commentary in the Sakkarāja year of 828.”
After saluting the Lord of the World [i.e. the Buddha], who went to Laṅkā three times and established the teaching (sāsanaṃ), [and saluting] the Dhamma and his [the Buddha’s] excellent congregation, I will compose a commentary concise in words at the request of Mahā Vijayabāhu, who [requested it] crouching [in supplication], he[, Vijayabāhu,] has gone through all the āgama and sattha, he is as bright as the moon in the clear autumn sky, and he wishes for the welfare of the teaching.

Even though there are many commentaries composed by the older masters, they are like the moon, unable to shine inside [hidden places] such as the bamboo reed. Therefore I will compose some commentary which, like a firefly, [is able to shine inside hidden places such as a bamboo reed]. Pay heed to it, good people, for the easy understanding of the teaching.

Saddhātissa is of the opinion that Chapaṭa, with the simile of the moon and the firefly, downplays the importance of his work in comparison with the Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī and earlier Abhidhamma scholastic texts, such as the Abhidhammāvatāra. A similar judgement had already been made by Malalasekera. I think, however, that the words of our author are meant to be a humble defense of his work, for what Chapaṭa intends to say is, precisely, that some other commentaries were “unable” to reach certain hidden spots. As a matter of fact, Chapaṭa’s commentary does not engage with the entire text of Abhidh-s (it skips some

---

1 Abhid-s-sv 1.3-14:

```
tūkkhattuṃ pattalaṅko yo patiṭṭhapesi sāsanaṃ
vanditvā lokanāthaṃ taṃ dhammanī satthohe ca pūjitaṃ
āgatāgamasatthena cando va sarudambare
pākaṭe nīdha ṃiphami mahāvijayabāhunā
ekkutikaṃ nisidhitvā sasanatthaḥkaṇkhinā
yācito ‘haṃ karissāmi saṅkhapadacanānāṃ.
poruṭhe kathāca santī yā penā vaṃpanā
etā velūdīgabbhesu ajotacandarāpamā,
tasā khajjotantupamā karissāṃ kiṃci vaṃpanānāṃ
sādhavo taṃ nisāṃsathā sasanassa subuddhiyā ti.
```

2 Saddhātissa, 1989: xix: “By this pretty and simple simile the author modestly extols the superiority of the Vibhāvinī-ṭīkā and shows the comparative insignificance of his own work, the Saṅkhepa vaṃpanā”; PLC 201.
sections), and it functions more like footnotes to earlier commentaries. The main purpose of these notes is to justify the word order of lists of dhammas, which sometimes follow the canonical Abhidhamma and sometimes follow a different order. Very rarely the author delves into original Abhidhamma discussions. The style of the commentary follows the sixfold method of analysis that is found in Kacc-nidd (see below), and that is why I have chosen the simile of the firefly as the title of this central chapter. I think it depicts very well the scholarly ambitions of Saddhammajotipāla.

1.6.3. Sīmālaṅkāra-ṭīkā

The work is also known as Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgahavanṇanā. To the best of my knowledge, this commentary has never been edited or published. Kieffer-Pülz is currently preparing a critical edition of the Sīmāl-v based on Sinhalese and Burmese manuscripts, to which I had access. This work is a concise gloss, not an extensive discussion, on the Sīmālaṅkāra (saṅgaha), a work on “monastic boundaries” (sīmā) by the Sinhalese scholar Vācissara (12th c.). The Sīmālaṅkāraṭīkā follows the line of the Sinhalese Mahāvihāra ācāriyas against the customs of the coḷīyabhikkhus which we would tentatively identify with Tamil monks. The style is concise and clear, avoiding unnecessary digressions and concentrating on clarifying the elliptical style of Vācissara’s verses. The mention of Pāli texts, from the Tipiṭaka, the aṭṭhakathā, the gaṇṭhipadas, and other works, is abundant. The very concise introductory stanzas do not share the elements common in Kacc-nidd and Abhid-s-sv, but the idea that the author is going to be concise is there again. I offer here the Pāli text and a translation of the incipit:

1 Nyan 1.5.1.1: “Sīmālaṅkāraṭīkā, Sīmālaṅkāravaṇṇanā (B or C, Chappaṭa, 15th c.) (Maybe identical with 1.5.2.1. Sīmālaṅkāravaṇṇanā is given on the title page in the NA though in the text it clearly is called Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgahavanṇanā.). Piṭ-s 302 “Sīmālaṅkāra-ṭīkā by Rhaṅ Saddhammajotipāla Mahā-thera of Pugaṃ city.” I have consulted UPT 509.
Having saluted the sun-conqueror rising in the Yugandhara mountain of wisdom (bodhi), I will comment concisely (samāsena) on the [treatise] known as “The Ornament of the Monastic Boundary.”

The verse colophon is the same as in Suttaniddesa and Saṅkhepavāṇṇanā. In it the author states again that he has written a commentary “in brief” (saṅkhepato).

1.6.4. Vinayasanuttthinadīpanī
This work is not known to survive in any manuscript. It is probably a confusion with the Vinayagūḷhatthadīpanī.

1.6.5. Vinayagūḷhatthadīpanī
I have not found any manuscript of this work. The Piṭ-s (no. 277) ascribes it to Saddhhammadajotipāla. Nyanatusita postulates that this work is the same as Vinayagūḷhatthapakāsanī. Piṭ-s lists the latter as a different work (no. 278) composed by an unknown Thera. I have examined a manuscript of the Vinayagūḷhatthapakāsinī and found no attribution to Saddhhammadajotipāla.

1.6.6. Pātimokkhavisodhana
The Pātimokkhavisodhana or Pātimokkhavisodhanī has not been edited. I have been able to consult the Ms. UPT 509. This treatise, as the introductory stanzas make clear, is a mixture of Pāli indigenous philology and Vinaya scholastics. The author is a certain Ariyālaṅkāra, and in the colophon he says he composed the book in the city of Haṃsāvatī (Bago). Some

---

2 UPT 509, jhô_v 1–2:

namassitvāna jinādiccaṃ bodhiyugandhroditaṃ
vaṇṇayissaṃ samāsena simālaṅkārasaṅkataṃ.

I would like to thank Dr Kieffer-Pülz for clarifying the principles of sīmā literature to me.

2 This is the relevant part of the colophon in terms of author, place and date. I transcribe the text only editing the punctuation, not the letters, from UPT 509 ku-r 9–ku-v 3:
catalogues, however, ascribe this work to Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla.¹ Bode suggests that this work, together with the Simābandhanī-ṭīka, may belong to the 15th c.² The beginning of the Pātimokkhavisodhana explains quite clearly that the aim of the work is to remove confusion about the text of the Pātimokkha. Immediately after that, we find a discussion on the pronunciation and spelling of the word pannarasā (“fifty”). The text goes on giving the correct spelling of other words from the Pātimokkha text. The author seems well versed, or at least interested, in grammar. He supports his arguments with Kaccāyana’s suttas. He also quotes the Saddanīti and Moggallāna as authorities. The display of grammatical erudition is undertaken in the scholastic style of question and answer. The author had at his disposal a great number of versions of the Pātimokkha, including very old and reliable manuscripts of it, for in some passage he dismisses a variant reading with the following statement: suparisuddhe porāṇapotthake idiso pāṭho natthi tasmā neso porāṇa pāṭho “in a very pure ancient book such a reading is not there, therefore this is not an ancient reading.”³ As I have said, the authorship of the Pātimokkhavisodhana has been ascribed to Saddhammajotipāla and, whereas the style could point to this authorship, the manuscript does not confirm this tradition. Perhaps Saddhammajotipāla wrote a similar work and it has been lost.

¹ Nyan 1.3.6.4; Ms. 509? Piṭ-s 277: “Vinayaguḷhattha-dīpanī by Rhaṅ Saddhammajotipāla of Pugaṃ city.”
² PLB 39 n.1.
³ UPT 509 khu r. 10.
2. **The Suttaniddesa**

2.1. Introduction to the *Suttaniddesa*¹

Kacc-nidd, as the title indicates, is a commentary on the Pāli grammar known as *Kaccāyana* (ca. 6th century A.D.²). The word *niddesa* literally means “explanation” or “exegesis.” In this particular work, *niddesa* means a “detailed explanation; specification” (DOP, s.v. *niddesa*³), namely the specification of the syntactic function of the words contained in every sutta. Kacc-nidd obviously discusses other grammatical issues, normally regarding the formulation of a sutta, but what makes this work distinct are the exhaustive *niddesas*. We can understand better what is the meaning of *niddesa* in this context if we follow the author’s own words.

According to Saddhammajotipāla, there are two types of *suttaniddesa*, the explicit (through case ending) and the implicit (when the word appears without a case suffix). This idea is expressed in the commentary on Kacc 347 *ṇāyanaṇāna vacchādito* “the affixes Ṇāyana and Ṇāna after words such as vaccha etc. [are inserted in the sense of descendancy];”

---

¹ Nyan 5.1.2 Piṭ-s 381: “*Suttaniddesa* by Rhaṅ Chapada, also known as Saddhammajotipāla Mahā-thera, who was born in Chapada village, province of Pu-sim city [Mranmā]. After returning from Sri Lanka, he wrote this text while residing at a hermitage in Pugaṃ city.” The nissaya on Kacc-nidd was written by Rhaṅ Ariyālaṅkāra of Amarapūra Ava city (Piṭ-s 403n: “A renowned scholar, also known as Ne-raṅ: Charā-tō or Maniratanā Charā-tō, who resided at Maniratāna monastery (Manoramma in the verses). He was a native of Ne-raṅ: village, Pakhan:-kri district, during the reign of King Tanaṅga-nve (according to Ganthav, King Sa-ne). There was also another Ariyālaṅkāra (Pa-luiṅ: Charā-tō or Dakkhiṇāvan Charā-tō of Cac-kuṅ:). Our author is one of those rare scholars who did not write a draft of his work (Kelāsa 1980: 60).”

² See Pind, 2012: 73. For the Kaccāyana tradition, see Chapter 2.

³ The *Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa* or simply *Suttaniddesa* (Kacc-nidd) has been printed in Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Thailand. The Burmese edition, under the title *Suttaniddesapāṭh*, was published in Yangon, 1912, by the Jabu Meit Swe Press. This edition, in my opinion, is by far the best (for a more detailed discussion on textual criticism, see Chapter 3). The Sinhalese edition, under the title The *Kachchayanasuttaniddesa*, was published in Colombo, 1915, by the Vidyabhusana Press. The text was “revised and edited by The Rev. Mabopitiye Medhankera (sic) Bhikkhu.” In the Pāli introduction of this edition, Medhankara says that the author (Chapaṭa) was the disciple of Uttarājīva, and makes an explicit reference to KI (with a different spelling: *kalyāṇippakaranādisu* “In the *Kalyāṇī* manual, and others”). The Thai edition was published by the Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, without printing the date of publication.
Indeed, even though in this case the sutta could have been formulated as ṇāyanaṇāna vacchādito, it has been formulated in the current manner by the force of the niddesa without vibhatti. For the suttaniddesa is twofold: with vibhatti and without vibhatti. Others, however, state that the form ṇāyanaṇāna is the result of shortening an ending.¹

What Saddhammajotipāla tries to say here, I think, is that the function of some words can be inferred from the case ending, for instance, the locative may express nimittasattamī, the genitive expresses the sthānin, etc. But some words may express a particular function without a case ending. How do we know which function it is without knowing the case ending is something that Saddhammajotipāla does not say, but as we will see later on, the function of an indeclinable word in a sutta may be grasped by the context.

The word nirdeśa in Sanskrit vyākaraṇa usually means a mention or an explicit statement. In some cases (and this is I think the meaning here) it means a feature of a word that expresses or indicates the type of word it is.²

2.2. The oral method of grammatical debate

In the beginning of the commentary, the “sixfold [method of] sutta commentary” is mentioned as one of the topics that need to be looked up in the “Nyāsa.” Saddhammajotipāla subsequently states that he will only follow the “oral” (mukhamatta),³ that is to say the scholastic, method (naya) for what remains (avasiṭṭha).⁴ “What remains” means what has not been discussed in Mmd. Indirectly, this statement tells us something about the title Mukhamattadīpanī, a title whose meaning has been taken for granted by scholars, as no one,

---

¹ Kacc-nidd 172.9-13: ettha hi ṇāyanaṇāna vacchādito ti vattabbe pi avibhattikanidesavasena evaṃ vuttan ti davidho hi suttaniddeso savibhattikaniddeso avibhattikaniddeso cā ti. apare paṇa ākārassa rassattaṃ katvā ṇāyanaṇāna iti vadanti.
² DSG sv nirdeśa “mention, actual statement; the word is often used in the Mahābhāṣya in sentences like sa tathā nirdeśaḥ kartavyaḥ, nirdeśaṃ karute etc. (...) Sometimes the mention or exhibition made by a word shows the particular type of word...”
³ See MW sv mukhamātra “reaching to the mouth.”
⁴ Kacc-nidd 4.32-33: chabbidhā suttavaṇṇanā nāse olokettabbā. avasiṭṭhamukhamattanayam eva karissāmi.
to the best of my knowledge, has attempted to translate it. According to Saddhammajotipāla’s words, the title would mean something as “Illuminating [the sutta of Kaccāyana] according to the oral method.” By oral here we have to understand the dialectic procedure established in the aforementioned sixfold method of commentary:

1. the relation between the words (sambandha)
2. the words (padaṃ)
3. the referents (padattha)
4. the analysis of words (padaviggaha)
5. the objection (codanā)
6. the refutation of the objection (parihāra).¹

The last two are the specific dialectic elements. They are the backbone of the scholastic discussions between the student (sissa), who plays the role of pūrvapakṣa, and the teacher (ācāriya), who plays the role of siddhāntin.

2.3. Quotations and lost sources

As I said earlier, the works of Saddhammajotipāla are characterised by a remarkable display of erudition. This is immediately perceived by the reader in the very many quotations that are used in order to support the arguments of the siddhāntin. The only scholar who has studied the quotations in this commentary is Pind. In his 2012 article, but especially in his critical edition of the Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti (PTS, 2013), Pind makes constant references to lost grammatical works that are mentioned, and quoted, in Kacc-nidd. Pind concludes that any historical approach to the Pāli grammatical literature cannot be complete

¹ Kacc-nidd 3,33–34 (= Mṇḍ 7,26–27):

\[
\text{sambandho ca padañ caeva padattho padaviggaho}
\text{codanā parihāro ca chabbidhā suttavāppanā ti.}
\]
without the study of the Kacc-nidd.1 However, he does not provide all the references to the passages in Kacc-nidd where lost works are quoted. Pind only gives one reference for each work, except in the case of the Atthabyākhyāna, where he says Kacc-nidd “25, 11 and passim.” This could give the impression that the other works are quoted but once, which is not always the case. Pind himself acknowledges the list is not exhaustive due to lack of space in his article.2

Apart from quotations where the source is explicitly acknowledged, we find in Kacc-nidd very many quotations that are not ascribed to any work or author. Some of them I could trace back to, or find a parallel in some grammars that are not mentioned in Pind’s list; some I have not traced, but I suspect they must be Saddhammajotipāla’s own verses summarising a prose section, as is customary in such type of scholastic work.

2.4. Lost grammars

The quotations of non-extant works should allow us have a glimpse into this ocean of lost literature. But we need to be careful here, because when we examine the quotations of works that have been well preserved (Mmd, Rūp, etc.) we discover that Saddhammajotipāla does not always quote them literally, even though he is using the formula ti vuttaṃ (“thus has been stated”). For instance, in the commentary upon Kacc 82, Kacc-nidd quotes the Nyāsappadipaṭīkā (=Mmd-pṭ), a work that we can easily consult in the Burmese edition:

---


nyāsappadipaṭikāyam pana amno ti paṭhamāpayogavasena vuttan. anuvacanassa makārassa ti sambandhavasena vuttan ti vuttaṃ.¹

The printed edition of the same text, however, reads:

tasmā anmmoniggahitan ti kārikāriyānaṃ paṭhamapayogavasena sutte nidditthe pi anuvacanassa makārassa niggahitam hoti ti sampadānapaccattavasena vuttiniddeso pi ādesādesividhānam eva gamagati ti na koci virudo ti vuttaṃ hoti.²

From such instances one could infer that the formula ti vuttaṃ does not necessarily imply a literal quotation. But in some cases (see Chapter 3) the difference between the quoted text and the source, if there is any, may be due to textual divergence, not to the fact that Saddhammajotipāla is paraphrasing it. Therefore the formula ti vuttaṃ does sometimes indicate literal quotations.

2.4.1. **Atthabyākhyāna**

Even when the quotations cannot to be taken literally, it is particularly interesting to examine quotations from lost works in terms of content. For instance, let us see the oft-quoted *Atthabyākhyāna* (Athb), “Explanation of the meaning,” ascribed to a certain Culavajirabuddhi or Culavimalabuddhi of Pagan.³ This grammar was circulating in Pagan as early as the 13th century (see Chapter 2). In Kacc-nidd, quotations of this work begin in the section on Nāma. The interpretation of Athb is usually given as an alternative interpretation, generally in contrast with Rūp, Sadd, Mmd and other authorities. In the following case, for

---

¹ Kacc-nidd 40,22–24.
² Mmd-pṭ 109,11–14.
³ PLB 28.
instance, the *anuvutti* “recurrence”\(^4\) of words from previous suttas is interpreted by Athb differently than in Rūp:

In the *Atthabyākhyāna*, however, it is stated: “And the name *ekavacanādayo* is included here by the mention of *ca*, therefore this is a [technical] name (*saññā*) sutta.”\(^1\) In the *Rūpasiddhi* however it is stated: “With the mention of *ca* also *tave tunā* and other affixes and indeclinables [are included].”\(^2\)

From such passages we assume that Athb was a prose commentary which included the suttas of Kacc, but instead of the Kacc-v, the Athb has its own *vuttī*. The treatment of the suttas is very free, as it happens with Rūp. Athb often joins suttas in order to increase concision. For instance, in the commentary of Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 81 we read:

In the *Atthabyākhyāna*, after making one single sutta out of the present one and the previous one, it is stated: “if [the sutta] is formulated as *goṇa naṃsuhināsu ca*, then heaviness is avoided.”\(^3\)

We do not know whether the Athb joined the suttas or only advised to read them jointly, but in any case the criticism of the Kacc sutta is evident.

Athb was probably similar to Rūp in many respects, also in the fact that Athb quotes versified portions which summarise the content of the prose passages.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Kacc-nidd 25,11-12: *atthabyākhyāne pana ekavacanādayo ca saññā ettha caggahaṇena gahitā, tasmā saññā suttan ti vuttaṃ.

\(^2\) Kacc-nidd 25,16-17: *rūpasiddhiyaṃ pana casaddaggahaṇena tavetunādippaccayantaniipītato pi ti vuttaṃ.

\(^3\) Kacc-nidd 39,28-31: *idaṃ anantaruttena ekayogam katvā, goṇa naṃsuhināsu cā ti vattabbe evaṃ vacanaṃ garubhāvanivattanatthan ti atthabyākhyāne vuttaṃ.

\(^4\) For instance, Kacc-nikk 170,23-24: *atthabyākhyāne pana*
Moreover this work betrays a clear influence of Pāṇini. Consider Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 286:

In the *Atthabyākhyana*, however, it is stated: “the first case ending [applies] only when expressing the nominal base (*pāṭipadikattha*), or gender, or measure, or number, which is called the meaning of the nominal base (*liṅga*).”¹

The authority for this statement is no doubt Pāṇini 2.3.46: *prātipadikārthaliṅgaparimāṇa-vacanamātre prathamā*. In some cases Athb is a lengthy commentary that goes into detail, like the Sadd, as we can conclude from Saddhammajotipala’s words:

Indeed this sutta is explained in many different ways [i.e. in great detail] in the *Atthabyākhyāna* and the *Saddaniti*. Those who wish can take from one or the other.²

One may suspect, after reading such type of references to Athb, that the erudition of Kacc-nidd functioned like a synthesis of the available opinions of his epoch, thus making less necessary the transmission, or at least the study of the entire stock of grammatical texts that were available. The next examples point, I think, in the same direction.

---

¹ Kacc-nidd 125,10–12: *atthabyākhyāne pana liṅgatthasaṅkhāte pāṭipadikatthiliṅgaparimāṇavacanamattte paṭhamā hoti ti vuttaṃ.*

² Kacc-nidd 197,13–15: *idaṃ hi suttaṃ atthabyākhyānasaddanītisu ca bahudhā papañcenti, taṃ kāmakhi tattha tattha gahetabban ti.*
2.4.2. Ṭīkābyākhyāna

The Ṭīkābyākhyāna, which seems to mean a commentary upon the Athb, must have been somehow influential, for in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 440 it is said:

In order to show the result of the mention of [the word] “attha,” [the vutti] said “with the mention of attha” and so on. These words are not found in ancient Kaccāyana books, but have been borrowed from the Ṭīkābyākhyāna.¹

The same work is quoted in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 441 as differing from Mmd in the interpretation of ca in the sutta, that is to say, in the scope of the anuvutti. There is no quotation from Athb or Ṭīkābyākhyāna in the last section of Kacc on kita “primary derivatives.”

2.4.3. Traceable verse quotations

Apart from the works that are quoted giving the name of the source, some quotations correspond to older sources that are not directly mentioned, but simply introduced by formulae: vuttañ ca, honti cettha, tenāha. For instance, in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 52 we read:

\[
\text{vuttañ ca} \\
\text{nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsaṃ taddhitaṃ tathā} \\
\text{kitanāmañ ca nāmaṇīṇū nāmaṃ pañcavidhaṃ vade ti}.²
\]

The verses are practically identical to Kaccāyanabheda 27:

\[
\text{nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsaṃ taddhitaṃ tathā} \\
\text{kitanāman ti viññūhi nāmaṃ pañcavidhaṃ mataṃ.}
\]

¹ Kacc-nidd 222,8–10: evam dassetum atthaggahaṇenā ti ādiṃ āha idam vacanaṃ porāṇakaccāyanapāthe natthi ṭīkābyākhyānavacanaṃ gahetvā ñapitan ti vadanti.
² Kacc-nidd 21,14–15.
Pind does not include these types of references in the list of sources, even though he was probably aware of the fact that some verses are found in minor grammars such as the *Kaccāyanabheda*. It is interesting that one of the most quoted, or paralleled works in Kacc-nidd is the *Jālinī* of Nāgita Thera from Panyā, without ever mentioning the title. I have also found quotations from Saddhammasiri’s *Saddatthabhedacintā*, Dhammasenāpati’s *Kārikā* (which is quoted by name elsewhere\(^1\)), *Kaccāyanasāra*, *Sambhandhacintā*, *Payogasiddhi*, *Vācakopadesa*, and *Saddavutti*.\(^2\)

Sometimes it is not possible to determine whether we are faced with a quotation or a mere parallel, for some ideas clearly belong to a shared stock. For instance, Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 280 quotes this verse from *Saddatthabhedacintā* directly:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kriyānissayabhūtāni kattukammāni tiṭṭhare} \\
yatthokāso ti so yeva paramparapacārato ti.\(^3\)
\end{align*}
\]

But subsequently this other verse is quoted:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kiriyākattukammānaṃ yattha hoti patiṭṭhitā} \\
okāso ti pavutto so catudhā byāpikādito.\(^4\)
\end{align*}
\]

The latter is not found in *Saddatthabhedacintā*, but has a parallel in *Saddasāratthajālinī* 393:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ādhāro kattukammānaṃ kiriya yatthakārake} \\
sa adhāro ti viññeyyo catudhā byāpikādito.
\end{align*}
\]

---

1 Kacc-nidd, 223,7.
2 For minor grammars, see chapter I.
3 *Saddatthabhedacintā* 83; Kacc-nidd 112,16–17.
4 Kacc-nidd 112,23–24.
Quite often a series of *silokas* is quoted in Kacc-nidd and we only find some of the *pādas* in some older source. This means that series of verses in Kacc-nidd may come from different sources. For instance, in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 285:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sambandhi viya sambandho rūpato na kudācanam} \\
\text{daṭṭhum sakko ti viññūhi ūyate anumānato} \\
\text{asambhayā tu sambandhe sambandhasahacāśi} \\
\text{jātisaṅkhyāsamāhārakiriyānam iva sambhavo ti.}
\end{align*}
\]

Only the first *siloka* is from the *Jālinī*. The second one is not found in the *Jālinī*, and I have not been able to trace it.

### 2.4.4. Saṅgha

The *Saṅgha* (“Compendium”), despite its grand title, does not seem to be a very important text. In this case we only have one quotation from the *saṅghahakāras*, in plural, in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 287:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vuttañ ca saṅghahakārehi} \\
\text{liṅgatthe kattukammatthe karāṇe sampadāniye} \\
\text{nissakke sāmibhāmatthe disatthālapane tathā.}
\end{align*}
\]

1 Kacc-nidd 123,9–12.
2 *Saddasāratthajālinī* 234:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sambandhi viya sambandho rūpato na kudācanam} \\
\text{daṭṭhum sakko ti viññūhi manayate sonumānato.}
\end{align*}
\]

3 Kacc-nidd 126,4–6.
The work is quoted as a type of *kāraka* classification, for not all the Pāli grammars agree on which are the *kārakas* and how many.\(^1\) I am not sure if we have to understand the author in the plural (*saṅghakārehi*) literally, as the author is usually referred to in the singular.

2.4.5. *Niruttijotaka*

Another interesting work that Saddhammjotipāla quotes is the *Niruttijotaka*. For instance, in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 352:

\[ niruttijotake pana yena vā tarati-pa-saṁsaṭṭham niyo ti pi vuttaṃ.\(^2\) \]

Leaving aside the textual problem between the B\(^e\) and C\(^e\), Saddhammajotipāla is highlighting the difference between the sutta in Kacc and the sutta in *Niruttijotaka*. They are clearly formulated in a slightly different manner:

**Kacc 352** *yena vā saṁsaṭṭham tarati carati vahati niyo*

**Niruttijotaka** *yena vā tarati [carati vahati] saṁsaṭṭham niyo*

References to the commentary (*vaṇṇanā*) on the *Niruttijotaka* are also found in Kacc-nidd. This means that the *Niruttijotaka* itself is taken as a *suttapāṭha* (“thread of [grammatical] rules”) and its commentary is treated separately:

\[ tenāha niruttijotake taddhitavanṇanāyam pi yena vā tarati-pe-yena vā saṁsaṭṭham sajjitam yojitam vā. tasmā yena ti niddiṭṭhanāvādivatthuto paresu atthesu tarati-pe-saṁsaṭṭhan ti niddiṭṭhesu ti vuttaṃ.\(^3\) \]

---

1 For a full-fledged discussion on *kārakas* “participants in the action” both in Sanskrit and Pāli grammar, see Kahrs, 1992: 10f and Gornall, 2014: *passim*.
From this reference we gather that the *Niruttijotaka* was a sutta very similar to the *Kaccāyana*, and that it had a commentary very similar to the *vuttī* or the *nyāsa*. The *Niruttijotaka* was probably a treatise in the manner of Rūp, Athb, which are recasts of *Kaccāyana*. Thus the interpretation of *Niruttijotaka* can be contraposed with Athb in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 359:

> For this very reason, in the commentary on the *taddhita* section of the *Niruttijotaka*, it is stated: “in the sense of comparison [means] in the sense of similarity.” In the *Atthabyākhyāna*, however, it is stated: “That by which the meaning is compared is called comparison, and the meaning through comparison is the comparison-meaning.”

### 2.4.6. *Bījākhyā*

We find a few quotations of this work which was already known from the famous 1442 inscription of a library donated in Pagan. Bode speculates on the content of the work called the “Bijakhyam, on algebra (?).” From the quotations in Kacc-nidd we know that it is not a mathematical work, but a versified grammatical text, probably along the same lines of *Kaccāyanabheda* and other minor grammars. The title *Bījākhyā*, which literally means “Seed-explanation,” could perhaps be translated into English as “Pāli Grammar in a nutshell.” Saddhammajotipāla only quotes this work in the Taddhita and Kita sections, that is to say in the two sections on derivatives. This could indicate that the work has a specific scope in derivatives and hence the word *bīja-* in the title could have the sense of “primary material” from which the word is derived. In Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 354 it is said:

---


2. PLB 106.
In the Bījakhyā, however, it is stated:

There is no vuddhi (Skt. vyādhi) in suffixes which go together with ṇa [suffix] in words such as [the colour words] “blue,” “yellow,” etc. The word phussa suffers the elision of the speech-sound s. The replacement for siro (“head”) is sirasaṃ.

A similar observation from the same work is found in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 362:

That is why he stated in the Bījakhyā:

With five suttas have been taught the suffixes regarding the bhāvataddhita.

There, with the word tu (“however”) the rest [of the suffixes] are taught by the knower of taddhīta.

In the introduction to the Kitakappa, the work is quoted again in agreement with some stanzas:

That is why he said:

Three [types of] suffixes should be known, namely kitaka, kiccaka as well as the [suffixes] called kitakicca, which are shown in the science of words.

The kitaka should be generally understood as active, the kiccaka as passive and the kitakicca, on the other hand, as both.

This is also stated in the Bījakhyā.

---

1 Because it is derived, allegedly, from śprś “to touch” which becomes śphas (phassatē) in Pāli.
2 Kacc-nidd 175,21–24:

bijakhyāyaṃ pana
na vuddhi nilapitesu paccaye sanakārake
salopo phussasaddassa sirussa sirasaṃ vade ti
vuttaṃ.
3 Kacc-nidd 177,26–28:

tenāha bijakhyāyaṃ:
desitā pañcasuttehi paccayā bhāvataddhite
tattha sesā tasaddena desitā taddhitāṇṇunā ti.
4 Kacc-nidd 245,10–15:

tenāha
In the commentary of Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 627 there is a reference to a work called *Niruttibijākkhyāne*, which is also in verse and I think it is simply the *Bōjakhyā*, even though Pind lists it as a different title:

In the *Niruttibijākkhyāna* however it is said: “These six are called suffixes (*paccayā*): *tabba aṇiya nya rīca rīya kha,*” because it stated:

“There are 13 *kita* suffixes and six *kicca* suffixes
15 *kitakicca* suffixes. 34 Overall.”

Therefore the *kita* suffix should be understood as a *kitakicca* and the *kha* suffix as a *kicca*.¹

2.4.7. *Bhassa*

The title *Bhassa* probably means commentary in the style of a dialogue (Skt. *bhāṣya*). Sometimes it is quoted from its author, the *bhassakāri*. There are indeed many references to this work starting from the Taddhita section. We understand that this is a commentary on the suttas of Kaccāyana independent from the Kacc-v reading, for, as we can see in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 384 *aṭṭhādito ca* “and when preceded by [number] eight [the word *dasa* (‘ten’) is replaced with ‘*rasa*’”:

---

¹ Kacc-nidd 268,25–29:

*tayo paccayā viṇñeyyā kitaṅka kiccaṅka tathā
ikitaṅkakanāṁ ca saddasatthe pakāsitā
kitakā kattariṇeyyā bhāvakammesu kiccaṅka
kitakicca tu sabbattha yebhuyyena pavattare ti.
bījākkhyāne pi vuttaṃ.*

---

niruttibijākkhyāne pana tabba aṇiyāṇya rīca rīya kha īme chappaccayā kicca nāmā ti vatvā
kitapaccayātersa kicca honti cha paccayā
kitakicca paṇṭarasa catutthīṃsa samāsato ti
vuttattā kitappaccayo kitakicca ti ca khappaccayo kicca ti ca veditabba.
In the Bhassaka this sutta is not there, it is included in the previous sutta only.\(^2\)

This does not mean that the author of the Bhassa has joined this sutta with the previous one, but simply that the purport of this sutta is already implied in the previous one, namely Kacc 383 *ekādito dasa ra saikhyāne* “In number, *dasa* becomes *rasa* when preceded by *eka*, etc.” I think the economy of the Bhassa is correct as the interpretation of *ādi* as etc. is what even Kacc-v follows, giving as examples not only *ekarasa* “eleven” but also *bārasa* “twelve,” and we could easily include *aṭṭhārasa* “eighteen.”\(^2\) It is therefore possible that Kacc 384 is an interpolation.

There are more quotations of the Bhassa, for instance Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 417 *āṇattyāśīṭhe nuttakāle pañcamī*:

> In the Bhassakāri and other works, however, also take the technical name *āṇatti* as an artificial technical name.\(^3\)

My translation here is very tentative as I do not understand the meaning of *parikappitaśaṅṇaṃ* in Kacc-nidd very clearly. It could mean something like “a falsely imagined term” or simply an “artificial term.”

Another instance is found in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 441 *dhāturūpe nāmasmā ṇayo ca* “when it has the form of a verb, after the noun the affix *ṇaya* also [expresses the sense of doing]:

> Also the Bhassakāri states: “after the noun there is the suffix *ṇaya* in the sense of doing.”\(^4\)

\(^2\) Kacc-nidd 183,18–19: *bhassake idaṃ suttaṃ natthi pubbasutteneva sabbāṃ sangahitaṃ.*

\(^2\) Kacc-v 136,22.

\(^3\) Kacc-nidd 211,27–28: *bhassakāri-ādisu pana āṇattisaṅṇaṃ parikappitaśaṅṇaṃ ca karonti.*

\(^4\) Kacc-nidd 222,23–24: *bhassakārinā pi nāmasmā ṇayappaccayo hoti karotyatthe ti vuttaṃ.*
In this case the Bhassa supports Kacc-v. In fact the Bhassa seems to be a gloss very similar to the vutti.

We also find verses from the Bhassa, for instance in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 455 attanopadāni bhāve ca kammani “the attanopadāni [affixes are used] in the intransitive and in the passive”¹:

And the Bhassakāri states:

It should be easily understood that “attano” [i.e. attanopada, is used] in the impersonal, the passive and the active. The [verbs which] by virtue of their verbal root [are] transitive, [are used] in the impersonal [when conjugated] in the third person singular.²

In Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 569 pādito ritu after [the verbs of the group] beginning with pā ‘to protect’ the affix ritu³ [applies]” the bhassakāri gives an alternative reading to the sutta:

For in the Bhassakāri the sutta text is also presented as: “pātismā ritu.”⁴

The difference between this reading and pādito ritu is that the latter includes other verbal bases. Another difference of sutta formulation in the Bhassa is mentioned in Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 626 kattari kit “the kit [affixes apply] in the active:”

---

¹ For the concept of bhāva in Sanskrit and Pāli grammars, see Deokar, 2008: 310f.
² Kacc-nidd 227,5–7:
   bhassakārīnā ca vuttaṃ
   attano ti suviññeyyaṃ bhāve kammani kattari
dhātuṇā yā kammakā bhāve pathamekavacanaṃ tathā ti.
³ The ritu affix is equivalent to the Sanskrit -īṛ ending that we find in pīṭa “father.” According to Kacc-v 186,17: puttaṃ pālayati ti pīṭā “he protects the son that is why [he is called] ‘father’ (pīṭā).” The nominative of pitu is pīṭā according to Kacc 199 satthupilādināṃ ā sīmīṃ silopo ca “after the words of the group beginning with satthu, pitu, etc. ā [ending is prescribed] in the nominative singular and the sī affix [of the nominative singular] is elided.”
⁴ Kacc-nidd 257,20–21: bhassakāriyaṃ pi hi pātismā ritu ti suttapāṭho dissati.
In the Bhassakāri manual, however, having established the uṇa affix in the beginning, it begins by saying: “karavāpājimisv adisādhya subhi uṇa.”

The sutta Kacc 626 kattari kit is the first of the uṇādi section of Kacc. The quotation from the Bhassa seems to be a Pāli rendering of Unādisūtra 1.1. kṛpāvājimisvadisādhyaṣūbhya uṇ.

Do we need to understand, therefore, that the work called Bhassa is simply Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya? Although it is a tempting conclusion, we shall consider a very interesting line from the Bhassa is found in the colophon of the last chapter of Kacc-v, namely at the end of the uṇādi section:

In the Bhassakāriya, which puts this chapters in the eighth place, it is also stated: “the eighth section of the grammar of the natural (sabhāva) language, called explanation of the uṇādi, is finished.”

The expression sabhāvaniruttibyākaranē is found in C° and B°. If the original reading was sakāyaniruttī, it would be a reference to the well-known, and controversial, Vinaya passage about the language of the Buddha’s discourses in which the expression sakāyaniruttī “in his own expression” is used. Perhaps sabhāvaniruttī means the same, or it is a corruption of sakāyaniruttī. But I suspect it is rather related to the tradition mentioned for the first time in Buddhaghosa’s Visuddhimagga. According to this tradition, the Māgadhī language, that is to say Pāli, is the “root language” (mūlabhāsā) of all beings, and any child would naturally speak Pāli if not taught any other language. This idea is also found in the Rūpasiddhi.

---

1 Kacc-nidd 267,33–268,2: bhassakāripakarane pana uṇapaccayaṃ ādimhi ṭhapetvā karavāpājimisv adisādhya subhi uṇa icc evam ādim āha.
2 Kacc-nidd 278,14–16: bhassakāriye pi imaṃ kappāṃ atṭhamatthāne ṭhapetvā sabhāvaniruttibyākaranē uṇādiniddeso nāma atṭhamo kaṇḍo parisamatto ti vuttaṃ.
3 Vin. II 139,1f.
4 Cf. Vism 441,34: māgadhikāya sabbasattānaṃ mūlabhāsāyā “[speak] in the Māgadhī language, the root language of all beings.”
5 Cf. Rūp 42,19–20: sā māgadhī mūlabhāsā narā yayādikappitā,
From all these quotations we understand that the Bhassa is a grammar like the Kaccāyanavuttī, that is to say, it contains a particular version of the suttas alongside an original commentary. This grammar, as Kacc, had the vocation of being a general reference grammar for the Pāli language. Although based on Sanskrit sources, it does not seem to be a straightforward adaptation of Patañjali’s Mbh.

2.5. Authority of the Kalāpa (Kātantra)

It is interesting that among the quoted authorities of Saddhammajotipāla we can also count the Kātantra, known also as Kalāpa. It is referred to as an authority for the grammar of the Pāli language. As an instance of this, I will translate a part of the commentary of Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 17 *yam edantassādeso* “ya is the replacement of an ending e.” Note how the commentary is on both Kacc and Kacc-v as if they were the same text:

“– O teacher: why does the master state the word ‘in some places’ (*kvaci*) [in the *vuttī*]?”

“– O pupil, because the expression ‘in some places’ excludes [the application of Kacc 17] in cases such as *tenāgatā* [= *te anāgatā*, instead of *ty anāgatā*], in which a vowel follows, but [the speech-sound] *e* does not become *ya*. That is why the word ‘in some places’ is stated. The word *nettha* has to be analysed as *ne ettha*. Even though there is a phonetic kinship between the two speech-sounds *e*, we rely on the statement of the Kalāpa, namely that these [two speech-sounds] are not the same, [and] because they are not the same, the second *e* is elided by the application of the sutta *vā paro asarūpā* [Kacc 13].”

---

1 Kacc-nidd 11.30–36: *bho ācariya, kvacī ti padaṃ kasmā ācariyena vuttam. bho sissa, tenāgatātyādisa sati pi parsare kvacisaddena nivāritattā ekārassa yakārādeso na hoti ti nāpanattham kvacī ti padaṃ vuttam. nettha ne etthā ti padacchedo, ekāradvayassa sutisamānabhāve pi asamāṇā ti kalāpavacanam nissāya asamānabhāvato vā paro asarūpā ti suttena paralopo hoti.*

brahmāno ca’ssutālāpā sambuddho cāpi bhāsare.
2.6. The Suttaniddesa and the textual transmission of Kaccāyana

Pind was the first to notice that Kacc-nidd is an important source of information about the textual transmission of Kacc and Kacc-v. For instance, in the commentary upon Kacc-v 20, Saddhammajotipāla informs us that in some manuscripts the vutti reads tro tassa instead of tro ttassa. He says that only the second reading (pāṭho) is correct (sundaro).¹ If we follow Kacc-nidd, we conclude that Kacc and Kacc-v, already in the 15th century, were transmitted as one single corpus. In other words, what we call Kaccāyana is actually our version of the suttas together with the vutti.

In the commentary on Kacc 436, Saddhammajotipāla refers to katthaci potthake “in some book” where the sutta ends in the word ca. He concludes that this reading fits well in his own interpretation.² That is to say, he decides which manuscript has a better reading according to his own interpretation of the sutta, and not according to any other formal criterion.

In the commentary on Kacc 440, Saddhammajotipāla removes a reading that has been incorporated in Kacc from the Ṭīkābyākhyāna. I am not sure on what principle Saddhammajotipāla is rejecting the originality of this reading, for maybe it was the Ṭīkābyākhyāna that cited an even older version. In any case, such types of textual criticism have been adopted by Pind in his critical edition of Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti.³

Another interesting case of variant reading, where a sutta is found in a different form in some sources, is Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 562 īsadusuhi kha (C ṭīsadussūhi kha). Here Saddhammajotipāla informs us that there is also a different reading: īsadususaddaparehi (C ṭīssadususaddāparehi). Surprisingly, he does not object to this alternative reading with the formula ti pāṭho na sundaro.

---

¹ Kacc-nidd 12, 29–30.
³ Pind, 2013: 156 n.4.
On one occasion we find a reference to the Sinhalese version, that is in the examples of Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 279:

ārādho me rañño ārādho me rājānaṃ ti ettakā yeva payogā sīhalapotthakādisu dissanti, na ārādho me rājā ārādho maṃ rājā ti payogā.¹

“I pay homage to the king,” “I pay homage to the kings,” such type of examples are found in Sīhala books and others (ādisu), and not the examples ārādho me rājā and ārādho maṃ rājā.

Then Kacc-nidd also gives the following examples: ārādho haṃ rañño pi pāṭho atthi,² and ārādho me rājā ti ādim āha,³ again further on: evam āha ārādho te haṃ tam ahaṃ ārādho ti.⁴ This passage has been controversial in the tradition of Pāli grammar as they seem to derive from Sanskrit usage. In Rūp the examples is worded as follows: ārādho me rañño ārajjhati, rājānaṃ vā aparajjhati,⁵ but in Sadd ārādho haṃ rañño ārādho haṃ rājānaṃ. As Kahrs has pointed out, the reason for this confusion may be that the examples are made up for the sake of the example, and they do not represent a particular canonical usage of Pāli.⁶

2.7. Far fetched interpretations

When Saddhammajotipāla wrote the Kacc-nidd, several grammarians had already tried to improve on the sutta and commentary of Kaccāyana. Our author however stuck to the old sutta with its vutti, most probably because of the authority that was attached to the figure of Mahā Kaccāyana, a direct disciple of the Buddha and, according to some traditions, the author of Kacc. The conservative decision of Saddhammajotipāla entailed that sometimes he

1 Kacc-nidd 166,17-20.
3 Kacc-nidd 107,4-5.
4 Kacc-nidd 107,8.
5 Rūp 102,ṣf.
6 Sadd 696,2-3. For further discussion on this topic see Pind, 2013: 92 n.14; Kahrs 1992: 85-86.
had to solve inconsistencies of Kacc by means of far fetched interpretations, scholastic arguments that would not stand the criticism of other Pāli grammarians. I will offer now some instances in order to illustrate this.

In the sutta Kacc 28 paradvebhāvo thāne allows for the doubling of a consonant after a vowel when suitable (thāne); and subsequently Kacc 29 vagge ghosāghosānāṃ tatiyapaṭhamā specifies that any consonant, voiced or unvoiced, adopts the third and first of the same vagga. We understand that this rule applies only to consonants of the second and fourth position in a particular consonant group, and excludes the fifth position, but the sutta does not specify it. The commentators therefore have to explain why it is so.\(^1\) This is what Saddhammajotipāla tells us:

Even though it has been stated in general that “according to the group, voiced and unvoiced are replaced by the first and third [speech-sound of the group],” it should be understood in this way: “the consonants of the fourth and second positions become double adding their equivalent from the third and first speech-sound of their group [respectively].” And by this [specification (?)] there is no contingency about the fifth position [i.e. the nasal speech-sound of the group], because making a paribhāsā out of the previous sutta which prescribes a general rule for doubling, by the present sutta a specific doubling rule should be applied [that is to say, a specific rule that overwrites the general rule]. Some, however, make a paribhāsā out of the present sutta, and they state that the doubling should be carried out [not by the force this sutta, but] by the previous sutta. This however is prohibited by the statement: “Because this [sutta (?)] does not prescribe what is not already obtained, but only limits what has been obtained by the previous sutta.”\(^2\)

\(^{1}\) Rūp 40,7–10.

\(^{2}\) Kacc-nidd 15,7–15: vagge ghosāghosānāṃ tatiyapaṭhamā ti sāmaññena vutte pi vagge catutthadutiyaṇāṃ tabbagge tatiyapaṭhamā ti viṁṇāyati. tena ca pañcāme tatiyappasaṅgo natthi, pubbasuttaṃ dvebhāvasāmaññena paribhāsaṃ katvā iminā suttena asadisadvebhāvo kātabbo. keci pana iminā suttena paribhāsaṃ katvā pubbasuttaṃ dvebhāvo kātabbo ti vadanti. tam pana “idaṃ hi na sampattaṃ vidadhāti, atha kho pubbasuttaṃ sampannaṃ niyameti” ti vacanena virajjhati. So reads the quoted text in Mmd 43.1. Kacc-nidd C wrongly reads nāsampattaṃ vidadhāti. The Burmese edition of Kacc-nidd (B’ 19,8-9) skips part of the quotation: tam pana idaṃ hi pubbasuttaṃ sampattaṃ niyameti ti vacanena virajjhati.
If I understood him correctly, Saddhammajotipāla thinks that by simply interpreting Kacc 28 as a paribhāsā, as the Mmd does, the problem is solved. But in the formulation of Mogg 35 catutthadutiyesv esaṃ tatiyapaṭhamā, for instance, the sutta does not leave room for ambiguities. This formulation was surely known by Saddhammajotipāla, and yet the Burmese grammarian was reluctant to accept Moggallāna’s improvement and defended the validity of the Kaccāyana system. I think the symbolic power of Kaccānaya should not be underestimated. For according to the tradition, this grammar was inspired by the Buddha and composed by the arahant Mahā Kaccāyana, an arhant who was a direct disciple of the Buddha.\(^1\)

A similar problem is found in the commentary of Kacc-nidd on Kacc 31 vaggantaṃ vā vagge. This rule prescribes the assimilation of final niggahīta (Skt. anusvāra) to the nasal of the same group as the following consonant. This is a well know rule. For instance: dhammañ care sucaritaṃ (“one shall practise the Dhamma correctly”) instead of dhammaṃ care sucaritaṃ. Now, the Kacc-v says that “with the mention of vā [in Kacc 31] the niggahīta is actually replaced by the sound l.”\(^2\) This is a more or less acceptable extension (atidesa) of the rule by the force of the word vā, interpreted in a rather unsystematic manner. The real problem lies in the subsequent example given by the Kacc-v: puggalāṃ. This is the example in Pind’s edition, following, I think, the Sinhalese tradition. The word puggalo is the text received by Kacc-nidd, and pulliṅgaṃ in other textual traditions. From the textual divergence we can already suspect that there is something wrong with this example. It is easy to see that pulliṅgaṃ is the right example of the rule and puggalo is not. But Saddhammajotipāla tries to explain how the word puggalo (or puggalaṃ) can be derived from Kacc 31:

---

1 Modern scholarship however dismisses this tradition as pure legend. See Pind, 2012: 71.
2 Kacc-v 10,5–6: vāggahaṇena niggahītaṃ kho lākāṛadeso hoti.
Aleix Ruiz-Falqués

In the example puggalam, because of the governance of niggahīta, the vibhatti aṃ [acc. sing.] is stated by the force of the implication (upalakkhaṇa). In examples such as puggalo, having established the nominal base pugga, we take the replacement o for the vibhatti si [nom. sing.], and, by the sutta niggahītaī ca [Kacc 37], we apply the augment m. By the word vā in the present sutta the niggahīta is substituted by l and the form puggalo is derived. The same should apply to the other examples.¹

This is a far fetched, if not utterly desperate explanation of how to arrive to the word puggalo. The procedure our commentator has followed is the following:

* pugga - SI > * pugga - o > * puggaṃ - o > puggal - o

This way of using the suttas is simply anarchic and cannot match the grammatical precision of other Buddhists scholars such as Vimalabuddhi or Moggallāna.

2.8. Word enumeration

Another important mechanism in textual transmission is the word enumeration device after every sutta. Even though the mechanism is taken from Mmd, sometimes the Suttaniddesa differs from Mmd and therefore gives a different interpretation of the sutta text. For instance: Kacc 202 satthunāttā ca “After the word satthu ‘teacher’, the affix ā also [before naṃ vibhatti, optionally].” Mmd says this sutta consists of three words, without accurately mentioning them because “the meaning is easy to understand” (attho suviññeyyo va²). But Kacc-nidd says it consists of four words: satthu, naṃ, attaṃ and ca. Furthermore the Suttaniddesa is at pains to prove that naṃ is a “locative of condition” (nimittasattamī) and forces the argument to the following extent: “in the word naṃ there is elision of the locative

¹ Kacc-nidd 16,2-7: puggalan ti ettha hi niggahilādhikarattā amvibhatti upalakkhaṇavasena vuttā. puggalo ty ādisu pugga iti līgāṃ ḫapeṭvā sivecanassa okaradiesaṃ katvā niggahītaī ca ti suttena niggahitagamaṃ katvā īminā vāsaddena niggahitassa lakāre kate puggalo ti rūpasiddhi. evaṃ sesesu pi.

² Mmd 168,5.
case ending” (nan ti ettha sattamilo). This is obviously wrong. The author is simply trying to read the word naṃ (which is the vibhatti for dat. gen. pl.) in the sutta, when the commentaries actually state that the word naṃ is taken by anuvutti from Kacc 201. The way we should analyse the sutta, as Pind has edited, is satthunā (abl. sing. left context) āttaṃ or attaṃ (“the state of being the ā [affix]”) ca “also.” And we do not read naṃ in Kacc 202 itself, but naṃhi (“before naṃ vibhatti”) by anuvutti from Kacc 201.

2.9. Grammar vis-à-vis Buddhist Philosophy

We have seen in the first chapter how Pāli grammarians are also philosophers. Sometimes Saddhammajotipāla delves into topics that are philosophical in nature. The solutions he presents do not necessarily correspond to the Abhidhamma point of view, but they are nonetheless acceptable for a Theravādin. For instance, in the definition of nāma which is a noun or a name, the philosophical distinction between the particular and the universal comes into action. In the commentary on Kacc 52, this double definition of nāma (“name” or “noun”) is given:

It is called name (nāma) because it points towards (namati) objects [directly], or because it causes to convey (nāmeti) its own meaning. For, when someone sees a particular substance associated with a meaning, it is called name because it points to the meaning [i.e. the referent]. And when somebody hears a word that is a name, it is called name because it causes the signification of its own meaning.²

I think this definition of noun may have as one of its sources Bhartṛhari’s commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, where the Sanskrit grammarian states that a word has the power of

---

1 Kacc-nidd 74.9-10.  
2 Kacc-nidd 21.4-6: tattha atthe namati attani catthe nāmeti ti nāmaṃ, yadā hi atthasaṅkhātaṃ dabbaṃ passati tadā atthe namati nāma, yadā nāmasaddaṃ suṇāti tadā attani atthaṃ nāmeṭi nāma.
illuminating itself and also the power of illuminating other substances.\(^3\) If not directly from Sanskrit sources, I think at least the \textit{Rūpasiddhi} may be the direct source of Kacc-nidd:

The designation of a substance is called \textit{nāma} because it points towards the objects or to its own meaning.\(^1\)

**2.9.1. Philosophy embedded in \textit{paribhāsā} suttas**

In the \textit{Suttaniddesa} we find frequent references to \textit{paribhāsā} suttas, that is to say “metarules.”\(^2\) It has to be stated in the first place that there is not a canon of \textit{paribhāsās} in Pāli. Inherited from the Sanskrit tradition, these maxims are immanent in the Pāli grammatical tradition. Some \textit{paribhāsās} encapsulate a way of thinking that implicitly represents the philosophy of the grammarians. For instance, a very oft-repeated \textit{paribhāsā} is \textit{vatticchānupubbikā saddappavatti} “the use of a word depends on the intention of the speaker,”\(^3\) recorded in Pāli for the first time in Mmd (not once, but thirty-two times), where we read \textit{vatticchānupubbikā saddapatipaṭṭi}.\(^4\) This philosophical statement denies the objective value of words and fits in well in the context of Buddhist philosophy. And what is more peculiar, as we will see, is that all these philosophical concepts are applied to the grammatical text only, not to spoken and written language in general.

\(^3\) See MBD 6, 1.4: \textit{dviśaktiḥ śabda ātmaprakāśane ṛthaprakāśane ca samarthaḥ, yathā prudīpoḥ ātmānām prakāśayan nidhyarthān prakāśayati. yas tv ādhyātmikāḥ indriyākhyāḥ prakāśaḥ sa ātmānam aprakāśayan bāhyārthaṃ prakāśayati.}

\(^1\) Rūp 41,3–4: \textit{atthābhikṣukāḥ namanato, attani catthassa nāmanato nāmaṃ dabbābhidhānaṃ.}

\(^2\) Apart from some \textit{paribhāsās}, the \textit{Suttaniddesa} also resorts to well known grammatical techniques as old as the time of Patañjali. The threefold \textit{adhikarasutta}, namely \textit{mandukagatika} “frog’s way,” \textit{sīhagatika} “lion’s way,” \textit{yathānupubbika} “according to sequence.” They are for the first time defined in Pāli in Mmd 62,12–13. The \textit{maṇḍūkagati} is used throughout the work, in the same way as in Mmd. The \textit{sīhagati} is used but twice in Kacc-nidd, the two lion’s gaze suttas being Kacc 52 \textit{jinavacanayuttaṃ hi} and Kacc 463 \textit{dhātuliṅgehi parā paccayā}. In Mmd the \textit{sīhagatika} device is referred to in Kacc 48, Kacc 52 and Kacc 297. There is no \textit{yathānupubbikā adhikara} in Kacc-nidd, but Kacc 52 is recognised alternatively as a \textit{yathānupubbikāparibhāsā} if we follow Rūp 41,22–23. In Mmd also there is no \textit{yathānupubbika} rule.

\(^3\) For instance Kacc-nidd 24,27.

\(^4\) For instance, Mmd 18,6–7.
In Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 319 there is a reference to another \textit{paribhāsā: vuttaṭṭhānam appayogo}. It is called a \textit{sutta},\footnote{Kacc-nidd 145,19.} although it is not a sutta of the Kaccāyana grammar. This \textit{paribhāsā} is frequent also in Mmd.\footnote{For instance, Mmd 22,6-7.} The meaning of \textit{vuttaṭṭha} (Skt. \textit{uktārtha}) is “a word or expression whose sense has been already expressed.” The metarule \textit{uktārthānām aprayogah} is frequently used in the \textit{Mahābhāṣya} and the \textit{vārttikas}, and it is cited in many grammars as a principle against the repetition of words that have already been stated.\footnote{DSG sv \textit{uktārtha}.}

Some of the \textit{paribhāsās} in Kacc-nidd, however, have no precedent in Mmd. For instance:

\begin{quote}
\textit{antaraṅgabāhirāṇgesu antaraṅgo va balavatāro hoti ti vuttatā}  \\
\end{quote}

Because it has been stated: “Among \textit{antaraṅga} and \textit{bahiraṅga} [suttas], \textit{antaraṅga} is stronger.”

The technical term \textit{antaraṅga}, dialectically opposed to \textit{bahiraṅga}, represents generally some \textit{sūtra} that is an “inherent member” in the string of a particular word formation. That usually means that an \textit{antaraṅga sūtra} is one that has already been taken into account at the moment when we are applying a subsequent \textit{sūtra} which comes, as it were, from the outside “of the body (\textit{aṅga})” of the word at that particular stage of word formation. Hence the name \textit{bahiraṅga} (for a detailed discussion of the term see DSG sv \textit{antaraṅga}).

\textbf{2.9.2. Two philosophical approaches to grammar}

Another interesting feature of Kacc-nidd are the two types of philosophical approach to language, namely the \textit{jāti} and the \textit{dabba} approach. Again, this approach is self-referential, for it is applied not to the study of real linguistic usage but to the study of the grammatical text.
itself. These two views replicate the division between ākṛti and dravya that we find in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya. In the case of Kacc-nidd, the categories ākṛti (or jāti) and dravya (P. dabba) are not meant to be used in the understanding of reality in general, but only to understand grammatical phenomena, that is to say the sūtrapāṭha. According to the jāti approach, a word in the singular stands for the universal or class, jāti; the dabba approach conversely maintains that the particular, in the singular, expresses a multiplicity of individual instances, reduced to a singular suffix by the principle of “single remainder” ekasesa (Skt. ekaśeṣa2). Let us examine one of these places where Saddhammajotipāla refers to these two philosophical approaches. In Kacc 61 sāgamo se the augment s is prescribed before the sa case ending (sa is dat./gen. sing.), for instance, if we want to derive purisa in the dat./gen. sing. with the vibhatti -sa, by applying Kacc 61 we obtain purisa-s-sa. Now let us see Saddhammajotipāla’s commentary on the word se in the sutta:

Here also, even if the vibhatti sa implies two case endings, namely the fourth and sixth, according to the opinion of the universalist teachers, the word se in the sutta is a singular. Alternatively, however, according to the opinion of the particularist teachers, sa is a singular by single remainder (ekasesa), but it actually expresses every different sa case (that is to say, sa = dative singular and sa = genitive singular).3

This seems to me a very peculiar use of the jāti/dabba dialectics. Apparently, according to Saddhammajotipāla, one could argue that Kaccāyana, the author of the grammatical treatise, 1

---

1 For a discussion of these terms in Patañjali see Joshi 1968: 29f. This distinction is not from Mmd, because the only moment where the jāti and dabba padatthaka approach is referred to in Mmd is in the commentary on the first sutta of the samāsa section (Mmd 258,4), only to conclude that there is no conflict between the two approaches, something that Saddhammajotipāla also tries to prove in the passage I have quoted. Therefore we must understand that the present philosophical considerations are Saddhammajotipāla’s own contribution.

2 DSG sv ekaśeṣa: “a kind of composite formation in which only one of the two or more words compounded together subsists, the others being elided.” For the concept of ekasesa in the Pāli grammatical tradition, see Deokar, 2008: 306f.

3 Kacc-nidd 28,7-10: etṭhāpi sati pi catutthichatthiḥsakārudyaye jātipadatthakācariyamatena se ti ekavacanam katan, dabbapadatthakācariyamaratūpi vā so ca so ca so ti ekasesanayena ca ekavacanam katan.
sometimes uses the universalistic approach and sometimes the particularistic approach. This
could be understood as an inconsistency. In this regard, Saddhammajotipāla tries to solve the
problem in his commentary upon Kacc 74 when the pūrvapakṣa suggests that the free
alternation between the jāti and the dabba approach involves a contradiction. The siddhantin
replies, categorically, in the negative:

No. Because sometimes the sutta is formulated without dismissing the opinion of the
particularist master. Also, Bhadanta Mahā Kaccāyana Thera, according to the opinion of both
the universalist and the particularist masters, has formulated a sutta sometimes depending on
the universal and sometimes depending on the particular. Therefore the understanding of the
words has to follow the intention of the speaker, that is to say, of the teacher. Enough with the
excursus now.¹

It seems that Saddhammajotipāla is moving in the coordinates of Buddhist pragmatism all
the time: every concept is a convention only to be assessed by its power to explain
phenomena.

These passages show an awareness of the distinction between jāti and dabba. The fact
that they are seen as conflicting philosophical approaches probably indicates that Burmese
Theravādins were familiar with the Indian philosophical debate around the question of
whether words and concepts represent the particular realities known by the sense organs or
whether they represent the concept, the universal, through which sense perception can
become meaningful. As I have said, Saddhammajotipāla and other Pāli grammarians, even
though they are aware of this problem, try to keep a safe distance and argue that both are
valid points of view.

¹ Kacc-nidd 36,15–20: na. kadāci dabbapadatthakācariyassa matiṃ achaḍḍhetvā suttassa katattā ti
bhadantamahākaccāyanattherenāpi dvinnāṃ jātipadatthakadabbapadatthakācariyānaṃ matiyānulomena
kadāci jātyapekkhāya kadāci dabbāpekkhāya suttāṃ katan ti. tasmā ācariyassa vatticchānupubbikā
saddappavattī ti. nālaṃ atippapañcena ti.
2.10. Optionality

Among other techniques of grammatical speculation, we find in Kacc-nidd a very brief discussion on optionality. Indeed, one of the main objections that modern scholars have raised against the Kaccāyana grammar is the lack of a systematic arrangement, especially regarding the loose usage of the particles ca for anuvutti and vā for anuvutti involving optionality. These particles function like a glue that keep the sūtras joined together in a bigger, organic whole. Saddhammajotipāla tries to clarify the exact meaning of navā in his commentary on Kacc 144 tavaṃ mamañ ca navā “Sometimes, [the words] tavaṃ and mamañ [replace the accusative singular case ending].”

Why, now, is the expression navā used in the sutta? It has been used in order to explain that the word navā has the meaning of an option (vibhāsā) in the sense of “sometimes.” Because it is generally stated that the word vā and the word vibhāsā have the same meaning, and the word kvaci and the word navā also have the same meaning.

In his well-known study Pāṇini as a variationist, Paul Kiparsky has defended the idea that there are different degrees of optionality in Pāṇini’s sūtra, but neither Kātyāyana nor

1 Pind 2012: 82–83; Deokar, 2008: 367f. The problem was already observed by Senart, 1871: 94: “Nous avons visiblement affaire à une collection d’observations grammaticales bien plus qu’à une grammaire méthodique, où chaque mot serait pesé et les limites naturelles de chaque règle seraient nettement définies.” Franke (1902: 14) is also very critical with the lack of systematicity in Kacc: “Seine grammatische Auffassung ist im Ganzen durchaus unwissenschaftlich, ja sogar mit dem elementaren Massstabe gemessen verkehrt: auf der einen Seite zu einseitig beschränkt, weil Kacc. die sprachlichen Erscheinungen ganz allein vom Standpunkte des Pāli aus erklärt, die genetische Verbindung mit dem Sanskrit aber ignorirt und so zu absurd ren Angaben gelangt (Beispiele: g in puthag [= Skt. prthak] und in pageva [aus Skt. prāk oder vielleicht praga] soll ein eingeschobener Laut, agama, sein nach I, 5, 1 und 2).” And later on he adds: “[A]uf der anderen Seite zu witherzig, weil er nicht ausschliesslich die Sprachtatsachen des Pāli verzeichnet, sondern daneben auch einfach die Sanskritgrammatik in grossem Stile ausgeschrieben, und zwar nicht nur deren Technik sich angeeignet, sondern auch viele von deren sachlichen Regeln gewaltsam auf das Pāli übertragen hat.” But neither Senart nor Franke consulted Mmd.

2 Kacc-nidd 60,14–17: kasmā puna navāggahanaṃ katan ti. navāsaddo kadāci vibhāsattohi ti ṇāpanatthan katan. vāsaddo ca vibhāsāsaddo ca samānattho, kvacisaddo ca navāsaddo ca samānattho ti hi yebhuyyavasena vuttan ti.

3 See Bibliography: Kiparsky, 1979.
Patañjali were aware of them, and therefore these different degrees have been overlooked for “over two thousand years” in the tradition.¹ This example from the *Suttaniddesa* shows that some Pāli grammarians were aware of two different degrees of optionality, not three. The first one corresponds to Pāṇini’s *vā* and *vibhāsā*, and this is a type of optionality where, among two options, one is preferable. The second type corresponds to Pāṇini’s *anyatarasyām* and, in this case, either option is fine. Interestingly, the Pāli correspondence between *vā* and *vibhāsā* contradicts the Pāṇinian equation *navā = vibhāṣā*. I will return to this question in the final chapter.

¹ Kiparsky, 1979: 1.
2.11. Poetic language

The Suttaniddesa, like Mmd and other Pāli grammatical works, resorts to figurative or poetical language in order to illustrate certain phenomena. This style in Pāli was already there in the Mmd, where the mechanism of akkharas “speech-sounds” becoming a meaningful word is explained with the classical Buddhist simile of the chariot\(^1\) or the simile of the firebrand.\(^2\) The word is always seen as a conventional reality, and sound as the ultimate reality.\(^3\) An original, and amusing, simile in Mmd is the following:

---

1. Mmd 14.23–15.6: atha vai akkharā ti vutto akaarīnaā nāpanattham idāṃ suttaṃ vuttaṃ ti vaddatha. kiṃ tese akkāro yeva akkhare vadati. tathā khakāro tathā rakāro udāhu sabbe vai ti. kinc’ ettha. yadi tavā akkāro va akkhare vadati. niratthakam itaresām vacanāṃ. yadi pana na vakkhati. yathā sakkhankaṭhalā telaṃ pāṭicca aevagge niratthāka va rūṣāṃ katvā piṭitā pi niratthāka va honti. evaṃ aevagge pi vattaṃ asamaththalāya samudīta pi asamatthaṭa va bhavveyyan ti codanā. yathā pana rathacakkanemikubbaradeyo gamanaṃ pāṭicca aevagge kiṃcāpi niratthāka va. tathāpi samudīta sātthakā va sambahavante evoṃ sampadam idāṃ dāṭhhabbhaṃ. ayāhi hi tesāṃ sabbhāvo. samudāye va sātthakata ti pariḥa “But when you say akkhaṃ and according to this rule [Kacc 1] sounds express the meaning: Is it that the sound a means akkhaṃ, and also the letter kh, and also the letter r... or is it all of them together that express the word akkhaṃ? Because if the sound a alone can function as the other sounds [to express the meaning of akkhaṃ], then the utterance of the other sounds is useless. However, if a does not function as the other sounds, letters being just a collection of pieces, would become meaningless (lit. useless), like the parts of a broken pot [are useless] to contain oil. Thus, because the parts are unable to express the meaning, the whole would be also unable to express any meaning. This is how we have to understand (dāṭhhabbhaṃ) that it is produced (sampadaṃ): It is like the components of a chariot: the pole, the wheels, etc. Each one, by itself, cannot move and is not useful [to travel], but if you assemble (samudītaṃ) them, they move and become useful. This is their nature: assembled (samudāye), they become useful.”

2. Mmd 15.6–16: yady evoṃ tumbehi suttaṃ eva na vattabbaṃ. kadāci pi tesāṃ samudāyābhihāvato. tathā hi akkārho sutvā khakārissa savanakāle akāro nassati. khakāraṃ sutvā rakārissa savanakāle khakāro nassati. evaṃ samudāyaṃ apanaladdhi hoti. evaṃ ca sathathavabodho na hoti ti codanā. yathā pana paribbhamanāṃ adittam alaṭṭaṃ passato taṃ cakkhaṃ viya dissati. na ca tāda ekkakhaṇe sabbathopalambhati. evaṃ sante pi taṃ saṭṭhaṃ agataṃ ārammanoṃ katvā pawattu nancaittasatāṇāṃ niruddhesu tehi gahitakaraṃ sabbāṅ sampiṇḍetvā cintayantassa alaṭṭaṃ cakkhaṃ viya dissati. sabbathopalabhāmāṇāṃ viya ca atilahupariavatītyā cittasatāṇānassa “If what you say is true, then the sutta itself cannot work. It is not proved that [sounds] constitute an aggregate. When the letter kh is heard after the letter a, the letter a has already disappeared. Thus it is impossible to understand them as an aggregate (samudāya); and if this is true, we must conclude that there is not expression of any meaning. So far the objection. [We answer:] This is like when someone makes circles with a fire brand. For the one who sees it, it looks like a wheel of fire. And it is not that he grasps the whole object in a single moment. What happens is that, even if he does not grasp the whole sequence in a single moment, he makes an object [of thought] (ārammana) with the apparent staying together. Even if the different ongoing fluxes of mind are constantly disappearing, he collects them, grasping them as a whole, and for the one who has his thought on it (cintayantassa), it looks like a circle of fire. The same happens with the understanding of every meaning with the very swiftly turning (atilahupariavatītyā) flux of mind (cittasatāṇānassa).”

3. The idea is repeated in many places, as an example I quote Saddatthabhedacintā 6:
Here it might be true that letter $a$, the group of $k$, $kh$, $g$, $gh$, and $h$ arise in the same place, that is to say, the throat, but they are heard as different sounds. The same happens when from the womb of a particular woman many children who are different [in colour and other qualities] are born. This is how we have to understand it. One may object: “If, in one single place of articulation, different sounds may arise, why not other different sounds [apart from those you describe]?” This is because a particular place of articulation is not the field for every sound. Similarly, in the womb of a woman many different children can be born, but not other beings such as a nestling, a calf, etc. This is the right way of understanding it.\(^1\)

A favourite example in the *Suttaniddesa* is the simile of the *candakantā* or “moonstone” in contrast with the simile of the shadow of the tree. This contraposition is presented in order to illustrate two different situations. In the first one the cause of the application of a rule should not necessarily be there (that is to say, be explicitly stated in the sutta) in order for its effect to obtain. In the second case, the cause of application or condition should be necessarily present, otherwise the effect does not obtain. For instance, in Kacc 199 *satthupitādīnam ā sismiṃ silopo ca* the sutta prescribes that names of the *satthu* and *pitā* type, by *anuvutti* of Kacc 189 *sy ā ca*, replace the *si* case ending with ā, and *si* is elided.

\(^{1}\) Mnd 11.11-18: *tattha ca avaṇṇakavaggakārā kiñcāpi kaṇṭhe va jāyanti. tathā pi kālasutibhedehi bhinnā ti veditabbā. yathā hi ekissāyeva itthiyā gambhe uppejjamānā dārakā vaṇṇābhedena bhinnā honti. evam imāni pi daṭṭhabbāni. yadi panekasmiṃ thāne visadisakkharā pi jāyanti. aññe pi visadisakkharā tattheva kasmā nuppajjanti ti codanā. tassa sabbesam akhettattā. yathā hi ekissāyeva itthiyā gambhe vaṇṇādivisadisesu dārakesu jāyantesu pi na añño kukkuṭagonapotakādayo uppejjanti. evam sampadam idam daṭṭhabbāni.*
Here, indeed, even in the absence of the condition for application, its effect is not destroyed, as the shedding of droplets from the moonstone, and unlike the shadow of the tree projected on the earth. This is how it should be understood.²

The context for understanding this simile is the following: in the previous sutta, the final -a has been replaced with -u, and now the -u, in nom. sing. is replaced with -ā. The point is that, even when there is no nimitta, that is to say when we are not in the first case ending (sismim), the effect (of the previous rule), i.e. the -u ending, is not lost, “does not perish.” And the metaphor says: it is like the water dripping from the moonstone, and unlike the shadow of the tree on the earth. For, according to the poetical convention, when the moonstone has absorbed the rays of the moon, it keeps dripping shiny droplets even when the moon disappears. Conversely, the tree projects a shadow when the sun (the nimitta) is there, but when the sun is not there, the shadow immediately disappears.²

A cryptic poetical simile is found in the Kacc-nidd commentary on Kacc 273. The opponent, overlooking the fact that vyākaraṇa sūtras function as a bottom to top and top to bottom mechanism where all the rules are interconnected, argues against the circularity involved in the definition of the ablative kāraka, because the apādāna case ending smā has been prescribed in the vibhatti section of the Nāmakappa, even though the technical term apādāna is defined later on in the kāraka section. Therefore the pūrvapakṣa says:

² Kacc-nidd 73,22–24: ettha hi nimittābhāve pi tassa phalaṃ na nassati candakantaselato pavattudakaṃ viya, na mahiruhacchāyā viyā ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

² The simile is explained further in Kacc-nidd 146,28–147,1: kasmā pana idaṃ suttaṃ vuttaṃ, nanu ca asati imasmiṃ sutte mahiruhachāyā viya puna pakatībhāvo āgacchati. yathā hi suriyālokanimitte āgate sati mahiruhachāyā atthi vigate sati chāyā natthi. tathā ādesasaranimitte sati pakati sarulopo hoti, tasmiṃ pabbasuttena vigate puna pakati hoti ti. na hoti. nemittikassa phalassa tathā niyamābhāva yathā hi candakantamaṇḍiyado patīca udakādayo pavattanti tesu vigatesu pi udakādayo tiṭṭhanti. tathā satthādisu pi vibhattinimitte sati ukārassa akāradeso hoti.
As it is not possible to touch beyond the mere fingers, similarly it is not possible for a sutta (yogo) to carry out the prescription of a [technical] name in the sutta (yoge) [where the technical name is being used].\(^1\)

The idea is that a sutta giving a technical name cannot imply that we know this technical name before, but without that, we cannot understand the sutta. Now the refutation:

The refutation:

This sutta has to be understood by the examiner as a lamp which [does all these actions] simultaneously: produces light and destroys darkness, consumes oil and burns the wick.\(^2\)

The objection is based on a simile, and also the refutation. But the simile of the fingers is still elusive to me.

---

1 This is my tentative translation of Kacc-nidd 91,18–21:

\[\text{yathā aṅgulimattānaṁ na sakkā masituṁ paraṁ}
\]

\[\text{evam nāmavidhiṁ kātuṁ yogo yoge na vattati ti.}\]

B\(^{\prime}\) reads yogo yoge na mattānaṁ. The general meaning of the stanza remains the same.

2 Kacc-nidd 91,22–25:

\[\text{ālokaṁ ca nidasseti nāseti timiram pi ca}
\]

\[\text{pariyādiyati telai ca vaṭṭiṁ jhāpeti ekato}
\]

\[\text{padipo va tidam suttaṁ veditabbaṁ vibhāvīnā ti}
\]

\[\text{pariḥāro.}\]
2.12. Non-Buddhist approaches

Sometimes, however, Saddhammajotipāla is forced to use philosophical definitions that involve categories that it is technically impossible for a Buddhist scholar to accept. In the commentary on the same sutta, there is some discussion on philosophical concepts such as šakti of the kārakas, and Saddhammajotipāla explains this “power” as something that is superimposed, with the well known simile of the dyed cloth:

In the same way that a cloth is called white or any other colour after being in contact with the quality white, red, etc.; similarly we should understand a multiplicity of meanings after being in contact with the kāraka power, [meanings such as] agent, object, etc.\(^1\)

This type of argument overlooks the philosophy of Theravādin Abhidhamma, according to which it is improper to make an essentialist difference between guṇa and dabba in the first place, for in Buddhism “the distinction between substance and quality is denied.”\(^2\) But it is also true that operating merely on Buddhist parameters has been a struggle for Buddhist grammarians. They are successful to an extent. But to demand from Pāli grammarians to work without the categories of guṇa and dabba is like asking them to operate without other grammatical categories that entail some sort of essentialism, such as noun or verb. The Buddhist grammarian tends to speculate at the level of sammutisaccan “conventional truth.” But sometimes the reality of the “world” is simply understood as common sense and

---

1 Kacc-nidd 92,10–13:

\(\text{yathā koci paṭo sukkarattādiyavayogato}\
\(\text{sukko paṭo tathā rattapaṭādi samudīrito.}\
\(\text{tatvevaṃ etaṃ daṭṭhabbaṃ yuttaṃ kārakasattinā}\
\(\text{kattukammādibhedena nānathham upapajjate.}\

2 Karunadasa, 2010: 22: “The inter-connection and inter-dependence of these dharmas are not explained on the basis of the dichotomy between substance and quality, what the Pāli Buddhist exegesis calls ‘the distinction between the support and the supported’ (ādhāra-ādheya-bhāva). A given dhamma does not inhere in another as its quality, nor does it serve another as its substance. The so-called substance is only a figment of our imagination. The distinction between substance and quality is denied because such a distinction leaves the door open for the intrusion of the theory of a substantial self (attavāda) with all that it entails.”
therefore it is not in conflict with the ultimate truth. Indeed Vimalabuddhi, perhaps the most authoritative among Pāli grammarians, establishes this principle with the formula “as in the world, similarly in the science of grammar” (yathā loke tathā saddasatthe).1

2.13. Canonical Pāli: Like a face reflected in the mirror

Kacc 63 etimāsam i prescribes that the last vowel of pronouns eta and ima becomes -i instead of -a before the vibhittis -saṃ and -sā (in the singular by anuvutti of Kacc 62 saṃsāsv ekavacanesu ca and the augment -s- from Kacc 61 sāgamo se). That is to say, the locative singular feminine of eta is etissam and the instr. abl. etissā, and not etassam and etassā respectively. Now the question arises:2 why does the sutta say etimāsam and not etimānaṃ? Indeed, objects the pūrvapakṣa, according to the sutta 166 naṁnāṃ sabbanāmikaṃ, when there is a dvanda compound formed by pronouns (sabbanāma), no further (na aññaṃ) operation is allowed, that is to say, we are not allowed to turn the resulting masc. or neut. pronoun samāsa into a feminine. Furthermore, the rule Kacc 168 sabbato naṁ saṃsānaṃ (“after every [pronoun, the suffix] naṁ replaces [the suffixes] saṃ and sā”) precludes the ending etimāsam and prescribes the form etimānaṃ. So far the objection.

The siddhantin replies that this is correct, but that the form etimāsaṃ is used in order to accomplish a different purpose (kiñci payojanantarasambhavato). For if we use the masc. neut. like in the rule dīghaṃ (by anuvutti from Kacc 88 yosu katanikāralopesu dīghaṃ)

---

1 Mmd 14,1-6: yathā loke tathā saddasatthe pi paṭipajjītabbato na evarūpaṃ avagantabbaṃ. loke pi hi rukkhasmiṃ asati na bijena bhavitabbaṃ. bijasmiṃ asati na rukkhenā ti na cintayan ti. paramatthe pi avijjāya asati na khandhena bhavitabbaṃ. khandhasmiṃ asati na avijjāyā ti na cintayan ti. saddasatthe pi saṅkūpamāyesā ti paṭikkhittā ti parihāro “This phenomenon should not be approached as such (evarūpaṃ) (i.e. as a problem), because we follow the principle (paṭipajjītabbato) that in grammar (saddasatthe) things work as in the world (loka). In the world, if there is no tree, there will be no seed, and without seed we cannot think of a tree. Similarly, in the highest level of truth (paramattha), if there is no ignorance (avijjā), the constituents of existence (khandhas) do not arise, and if the constituents of existence do not arise, there is no place for ignorance. In grammar, also, the doubt has to be dispelled through this simile.”

2 I am paraphrasing the discussion beginning in Kacc-nidd 29,15f.
through Kacc 89 sunaṃhisu ca (“and also before the case endings su, nam and hi”) we are only prescribing a rule for masc. and neut. endings, not feminine endings. In order to cancel that rule, the present rule makes a feminine ending to specify that the scope of the sutta is only the feminine (visayabhūtaṃ itthiliṅgam eva nāpetum). Furthermore, this rule overwrites the general rule nāññaṃ sabbanāmikam.

The opinion of the Nyāsappadīpaṭīkā is more or less the same and explains that the word formulated in the feminine is intended to exclude the masc. and neut. It states that the rule Kacc 169 nāññaṃ sabbanāmikam is a “non-permanent prohibition sutta” (nāññaṃ sabbanāmikan ti idam paṭisedhasuttaṃ aniccan). So far the grammatical defence of the usage etimāsaṃ for etimānaṃ. What follows is a more nuanced argument that can be interesting not only for the scholar of grammar, but also for the Theravāda scholar:

An alternative interpretation: the words etā and imā, as recorded in the Tipiṭaka, are only pronouns (ekantasabbanāmikā), [suppose] they are like a face. In the sutta [of Kaccāyana], however, because they have been put in there by the Venerable Mahā Kaccāyana Thera for the sake of establishing their rules (tesaṃ lakkhanaṭṭāya), they are like the reflection in a mirror which is dependent on the face; and the reflection itself (nāma) is included in the category of pure nouns (suddhanāma) [not in the category of pronouns, sabbanāma]. The words etā and imā, however, being brought up for the sake of the example because of their referring to words recorded in the Pāli [texts], they are expressive of the referent. And this rule, namely [Kacc 169] nāññaṃ sabbanāmikam can only limit the dvanda of words that are only pronouns, not the pure nouns that have the nature of being an imitation. Therefore it is stated etimāsaṃ [and not etimānaṃ, because we are not referring to the pronoun, but to the particular instances of the word etā and imā in the canon]. “If that is so” [one may argue] “how can we obtain the suffix -saṃ overruling the rule [Kacc 168] sabbato nam saṃsānaṃ [which prescribes the suffix -nam in all cases]?” [We reply:] Because [etā and imā] are pure nouns[, not pronouns]. The operation
-saṃ is there because it is a pure noun, for it has been clearly stated as an imitation, and because of its similarity with pronouns.\(^1\)

Our grammarian culminates his argument backing it up with the statement: “this is the common interpretation of the old masters” (ayaṃ porañkapācariyānaṃ samānādhīppayo).\(^2\)

Another interpretation postulates that this rule is posited in order to make clear that in fem. sing., after the replacements -saṃ and -sā, the thematic vowel a is always replaced with i (ekavacanādesesu pana saṃsāsu paresu niccaṃ hoti ti ṇāpeti). This interpretation is not ascribed to any grammarian. But Saddhammajotipāla subsequently brings up the interpretation of the Mukhamattasāra, a versified grammatical text based, allegedly, on Vimalabuddhi’s Mmd. The Mukhamattasāra seems to hold the same opinion. I translate the verses:

In the Mukhamattasāra, however, it has been stated:

It does not say etimānaṃ but etimāsaṃ. It has been stated [in this way] in order to illustrate the scope of the replacements saṃ and sā only. For, when the words etā and imā are to be followed by vibhattis sa (dat./gen. sing.) or smiṃ (loc. sing.), they are always replaced with saṃ and sā respectively, and not otherwise.\(^3\)

---

1 Kacc-nidd 30,12–22: atha vā pitaṭkataye āgata etā imāsaddā mukhaṃ viya ekantasabbanāmikā honti. sutte pana tesaṃ lakkhaṇattāya bhadantamahākaccayavattherena ṭhapitattā ādāse mukanimoṭtāṃ viya anukaraṇamā nāma anukaraṇaṃ ca nāma suddhanāme antogadhaṃ. pāliyaṃ āgatasaddapadatthakattā udāharṇavasena ānītā pana etimāsaṃ udhārapadatthaka honti. idāṃ na nāṇīnaṃ sabbanāmikāṃ ti suttam ekantasabbanāmadvande nivāretum samattham, na anukaraṇabhūte suddhanāme. tasmā etimāsaṃ ti vuttaṃ. yady evaṃ kathaṃ sabbato naṃ saṃsānan ti suttena saṃ kāriyaṃ sīga. suddhanāmattā ti. yaṃ pakataṃ tad anukaraṇan ti vuttaṃ ekantasuddhanāmabhāva sabbanāmasadisattā ca saṃkāriyaṃ hoti.

2 Kacc-nidd 31,1.

3 Kacc-nidd 31,10–14:

\[
\begin{align*}
mukhamattasāre pana \\
avate etimānaṃ ti etimāsam udirīṇam \\
saṃsānaṃ visayasseva paridīpetum īritam \\
yadā hi etimāsaddā sasmiṃ yadi sīgaṃ parā \\
tadā tāṣam pi saṃsāṭṭhaṃ hoti niccaṃ na caṇṇathā ti.
\end{align*}
\]
Saddhammajotipāla strongly criticises what he considers a wrong interpretation of the Mmd:

The interpretation of these verses is based on master Vimalabuddhi, but this is not what the master intended to say. From the sutta that states “n can replace t [of pronoun tad], optionally, in all cases” [Kacc 175], because of the governing of the word vā “optionally,” the sutta “After -ā and i, ō, u ending feminines, the vibhattis smiṃ and sa are replaced with saṃ and sā respectively” is not obligatory (niccaṃ na hotī). For it is stated: etāyaṃ, imāsaṃ, etāya, imāsa. Therefore the interpretation that after etā and imā the suffixes saṃ and sā follow compulsory is not good (na sundaro). If one would understand the verses [changing the punctuation] as “it is not obligatory (niccaṃ), but it is otherwise,” even that interpretation is not logical, because there is no word agreement (saddayutti abhāvato). That is why the masters reject this interpretation.¹

This passage gives some food for thought, as the Mukhamattasāra is a respected work in the tradition, ascribed to a monk named Guṇasāgara who, allegedly, was the counselor to the Burmese emperor Kyaswa (13th century). Moreover, Guṇasāgara is considered a Chapaṭa by some scholars, that is to say a member of the same lineage as Saddhammajotipāla.²

---

¹ Kacc-nidd 31.15-22: vimalabuddhiācariyassādhippāyavasena vuttaṃ. nāyam pi ācariyenādhippeto. tassa vā nattāṃ sabbathā ti ito hi adhikāravāsaddena ghapato smiṃsānaṃ saṃsā ti suttaṃ niccaṃ na hoti. vuttaṃ ca etāyaṃ imāsaṃ etāya imāsa ti tasnaṃ etimasadda paraṃ saṃsāttaṃ niccaṃ hoti ti adhippayo na sundaro. yadi niccaṃ na hoti aṭṭāthā pi hotī ti atthaṃ vadeyya evam pi attho na yujjati, saddayutti-abhāvato ti. ācariyaṃ pi hi idam vādaṃ chaddhitapakkhe ṭhapenti ti.

² PLB 25. For information on Mukhamattasāra and excerpts of the text, see Ruiz-Falques 2014b.
2.14. Hellishly Big Numerals

In Kacc-nidd ad Kacc 397 we find a detailed discussion on the formation of numeral words, especially big numbers. These numbers are important because they are commonly used in naming the different types of hell (that is to say after-life punishment). As hells are named according to the time that one has to spend being tortured, the number of years in hell is remarkably high. But these high numbers are not always interpreted in the same way, and we may know that in a particular hell the number of years is one \textit{abbuta}, but how many years are in an \textit{abbuta} is a matter of dispute.\(^1\) The \textsc{Mmd} does not discuss much on this topic and simply refers to the Kacc-\textsc{v}. The \textit{Suttaniddesa} intends to fill the gap and gives a long commentary on the correct interpretation of higher numerals in canonical and post-canonical literature. The conclusion of this commentary is based on Sadd, for Saddhammajotipāla quotes Aggavaṇṣa: \textit{ettha va pālinayo va sārato paccetabbo sabbaññubuddhassa aññātabhāvabhāvato ti vuttaṃ} “In this case only the method of the canon should be considered of value because of the absence of ignorance of the omniscient Buddha.”\(^2\) What is important about this long discussion is that Kacc-nidd takes up Sadd criticism of Kacc and incorporates it into the Kacc tradition. Indeed Sadd criticises the fact that Kacc does not follow canonical usage in the exposition of the numerals: \textit{kamo kaccāyane eso pāḷiyā so virujjhati} “this is the sequence [of numerals] in \textit{Kaccāyana}, but this is contradicted by the canon.”\(^3\) A latter work such as the Kacc-\textsc{vaṇṇ}, for instance, leaves the topic of big numerals practically untouched. Kacc-\textsc{vaṇṇ} does not even point out that the progression by twenties (instead of hundreds) is the canonical one, and ends the summary with a diplomatic \textit{ayaṃ ēmasmiṃ sutte ācariyānaṃ samānādhippāyo} “this is the general interpretation of this sutta according to the masters.”\(^4\) I understand this to mean that the author is not adding

---

\(^1\) Kacc-nidd 192,32f.

\(^2\) Kacc-nidd 192,12-14. B’ 201,19-21: \textit{ettha ca pālinayo va sārato paccetabbo, sabbaññubuddhassa aññāthābhāvābhāvato ti vutta ti}. This is an almost verbatim quotation from Sadd 803,3-4: \textit{ettha pālinayo yeva sārato paccetabbo. sabbaññubuddhassa aññātaduññātadibhāvabhāvato}.

\(^3\) Sadd 802,17.

\(^4\) Kacc-\textsc{vaṇṇ} 270,1-2.
information to what Saddhammajotipāla already stated. The conflict between canonical and non-canonical usage is also found in other Pāli grammars, for instance, as I said, in Sadd, and also in other non-grammatical texts of Saddhammajotipāla, for instance the Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā.¹

2.15. The commentary on the ākhyātakāvya

The ākhyāta section of Kacc-nidd begins with the commentary on some stanzas that are considered an interpolation by Pind.² Pind has not been able to trace the origin of these stanzas composed in the kāvya style, but I think they were taken from the Kārikā (12th century A.D.).³ But whatever the origin, at the time of Saddhammajotipāla, the 15th century A.D., the stanzas had already been incorporated into the text. Saddhammajotīāla quotes the Kārikā several times by name, and if these stanzas were taken from Kārikā, he could have mentioned it. A possibility is that the stanzas were incorporated even before the Kārikā, and the Kārikā took them from the Kaccāyana text. The Kārikā-ṭīkā comments upon the stanzas as if they were an original part of this work, and no reference to the Kacc-v is made.⁴ The question therefore remains open, but, for now, at least, we can say that the earliest testimony of the ākhyātakāvya is the Kārikā, and it is not impossible that this is the original source.

---

¹ See for instance Abhid-sv (7,19f.) for the discussion about the stages of the human embryo according to the canon (pāḷim nissāya) vis-à-vis the position of the author of the Abhidhammaṭīkā (abhidhammaṭīkākāramatena).
² Pind, 2012: 74.
³ Kārikā 541 = Kacc-v 146, n.1:
   ākhyātasāgaramathājjutanitaraṅgaṃ
dhātujjalaṃ vikaraṇagamanakālaminatṃ
   lopānubandhariyam atthavibhāgatīraṃ
dhīrā taranti kavino puthubuddhīnāvā.
2.16. The revealed aphorism

A very old Indian tradition predating Saddharmajotipāla considers that speech-sounds are not the product of grammatical speculation, but something given beforehand by a noumenic entity. When letters are revealed to the muni (“sage”), he is able to unravel a sūtra (“thread”) of aphorisms that constitute the theoretical substance of the discipline called vyākaraṇa. This principle of Grammatical Theology applies to Śarvavarman’s Kātantra, to the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini as well. The pratyāhārasūtras are not ascribed to Pāṇini, but to the god Śiva. That is why they are commonly known as Śivasūtras. Legends of alphabet revelation are common to different grammatical traditions, and Pāli grammar is no exception. It is in Mmd where we find for the first time in Pāli grammatical literature speculation about the authorship of Kacc 1, and a hint to its exceptional, sacred, nature. But the most important passage regarding Kacc 1 is found in Kacc-nidd. In his remarks about the origin of Kacc 1, D’Alwis refers to, and quotes, a passage of the Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa (Kacc-nidd) according to which Kacc 1 attho akkharasaññāto is an utterance of the Buddha, and “it is subsequently put by Kaccāyana at the beginning of his grammar.” Pind has discovered a parallel of this narrative in Vimalakirti’s Saddavimala (12, 1–11), a speculative grammatical text of the Mūlasārvastivāda School, and has given a full translation of it. The

---

1 Saini, 1987: viii: “it is difficult to say that the origin of the Kātantra-vyākaraṇa, as given in the Kathāsārasagara [I, 7,1-13] is correct or not, because most of the post-Pāṇinian systems claim their origin from some god.” For more on grammatical theology and structures of grammatical authority see also Deshpande, 1997 and Deshpande, 1998.

2 Pind (1995: 284) translates: “the meaning [of the Buddha’s words] is conveyed through the letters” and he points out that Kacc-v ad Kacc 1 usage of the concept dunnayatā is related to “describing the confusion caused by incorrect recitation of canonical text.”

3 Pind 2012: 72.

4 Pind 1996: 68.

5 Pind 1996: 68. This is the Pāli text followed given by Pind (1996: 68): attho akkharasaññāto [Kacc 1] tī idaṃ bhagavato mukhapāṭhābhātām prabhāvako, na kaccāyanaṃ vuttavākyo, tathā hi eko buddhapabbajīto bhagavato santike kammāṭhānanāṃ gahetvā anottatatātīr [sic] sālukkhamūle nissinno udayabbayakammāṭhānam karo, so udekkā kan ti kammāṭhānam karo, bhagavā tanvītāthabhāvanā disvā buddhapabbajītām pakkośapetvā attho akkharasaññāto ti vākyam āha, kaccāyanathereṇa pi bhagavato adhippāyam jānīti attho akkharasaññāto ti vākyam pubbe āpaṭetvā idampakaroṣam katan ti. kaccāyanaṃ katasuttan ti pī vadanti “The introductory sentence ‘the meaning is expressed by means of the syllables’ [Kacc 1] is a reading that stems from Bhagavat’s own mouth; it is not a
story, says Pind, occurs in Kacc-nidd “for the first time in Pāli grammatical literature.”¹

Pind’s relative chronology, however, needs revision, as he dated Saddhammajotipāla to the 12th or 13th century when he wrote the article on Saddavimala.² Notwithstanding this problem, I think Pind is right when he links the story of the old recluse who is unable to pronounce a mantra with Kacc-v and Rūp commentaries upon Kacc 1, stressing the importance of phonetics in the recitation of Buddhist texts. Furthermore, Pind opportune

ly reminds us that Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla, the author of Kacc-nidd, was aware of a different interpretation, according to which other scholars considered Kacc 1 as being composed by Mahā Kaccāyana himself. Thus, two different traditions about Kacc 1 were in circulation in the 15th century: the first one maintains that Kacc 1 was uttered by the Buddha, the second one maintains that it was composed by Mahā Kaccāyana, the disciple of the Buddha.

Pind points out that the story found in Kacc-nidd is repeated in Kacc-vaṇṇ. But this is not totally exact. Subhūti already noticed the divergences between the two versions of the story.³ In the version of Kacc-nidd, the protagonist is an old monk, whereas in the Kacc-vaṇṇ, the protagonists are two brahmins, Yama and Uppala. The plot is the same: the two brahmins take the mantra khayavaya (“rise and decay”) as a meditation subject. The first brahmin sees a heron and corrupts the mantra as udakabaka (“water heron”), the second

---

² Pind has corrected the date of Saddhammajotipāla in his second version of the Survey (Pind, 2012), even though traces of the wrong relative chronology are still visible in that publication (Pind, 2012: 120): “Since they antedate Kacc-nidd, they may have been composed in the twelfth century A.D.”
³ Subhutī, Padamālā § 1: “It is difficult to be certain, however, and scholars should continue to ponder it over since there is a slightly different telling of this account in the Kaccāyana-vanpanā and there is also no mention of it in any commentarial teaching.” I would like to thank for this translation Gunasena and Gornall.
brahmin sees a pot and a cloth and changes the mantra to *ghaṭa-paṭa* (“pot and cloth”). Vijitāvī, the author of Kacc-vaṇṇ, finally observes: “Others tell the story that relates to an old recluse sitting at the root of a Sal tree in the banks of the Anotatta lake.” This is a direct reference to Kacc-nidd. It implies that Vijitāvī was aware of two different sources of the story.⁴

Interestingly there is also a reference to the Kacc-nidd story, mixed with the story of Kacc-vaṇṇ, in a little known versified grammar called the *Saddabhedarāsi* “Grammatical Miscellanea.” The author of this compendium of 736 stanzas is unknown, and also the date, but the author defends the opinion that the Buddha pronounced the first sutta and Kaccāyana the rest.³ In any case, at the time of Vimalabuddhi (10th century A.D.) some grammarians already believed that Kacc 1 was a *pubbavākya* “preliminary statement,” not a proper *sutta*:

---

⁴ Kacc-vaṇṇ 7,26f.: *idaṁ suttaṃ kena vuttaṃ. bhagavatā vuttaṃ. kadā vuttanti. samauppannamakāde ve brahmānākhaṇaya-kammatthānaṃ gahetvā gacchantā naddāre khayavayanti kammatthāne kaṣiramāne eko udake maccharaṃ gārhitum carantaṃ bakaṃ disvā udakabako ti virajjhati. eko ghaṭa paṭaṃ disvā ghaṭapaṭoti virajjhati. tado brahmava ohātasam maṇīcīvā attho bhikkhave akkharasauṇiṇāto ti vakyaṃ thapeti. tesaṃ ca kammatthānaṃ titṭhati. tasmā bhagavatā vuttanti vuccti. taṃ niśva mahākaccāyano bhagavantam yācitvā himavantaṃ gantvā manosiṭaṭedakkhina-dissabbhāgaṃ sīsaṃ katvā purathimadisabbhīmukho huvā attho akkharasauṇiṇato tyādi kaṃ kaccāyanappakaranam race, tasmā pubbavākyaṃ vuttaṃ. therena thapitattāparihāsāti pi vuttaṃ. vutta ni saṃ.

*pubbavākyaṃ daṃ suttaṃ vadantācariyā pare*

suttanāmānurūpena parihāsātinomatī ti. anotattāre sālārakkhamāle nissinno ekaṃ vuddhabbjitaṃ sandhāya vuttan ti pi vadanti. ayam imassa atthuppatti.

³ Saddabhedarāsi 17–19:

anotattasamipe ‘ko koronto udakabayaṃ
udake gocaraṃ disvā bakaṃ bhikkhubakaṃ bakaṃ
virodhi kammatthānaṃ pattadvijan ghatena so
udakedhovanaṃ disvā tathā hi udakaṃ ghaṭaṃ.
pakkasete jino bhikkhuṃ attho tyādi idaṃ aha
ādo vuttaṃ thapetvā taṃ kaccāyanena sesakaṃ.
Others say that the first two introductory stanzas were composed by the author of the *vutti*, and that the author of the *suttas* composed the preliminary statement, namely *attho akkharasaññāto*.\(^1\)

Furthermore, the fact that Vimalabuddhi does not begin his full-fledged commentary until the second *sutta*, indicates that he is dubious about the status of the first one.

### 3. CONCLUSION

I have started this chapter by examining the figure of Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla as a 15th-century Buddhist author who was active in the propagation of the *sāsana* both in Laṅkā and the Ava kingdom of Burma. I have explained that his works in Pāli, although preserved in manuscripts, have not enjoyed great recognition and are nowadays quite difficult to access. These works, in my opinion, need to be studied as products of 15th-century Theravāda reformism, perhaps even under the shadow of some Buddhist millenialism, as Saddhammajotipāla lived during the 2000th anniversary of the Buddha’s *parinibbāna*, a moment that was supposed to mark the beginning of the decline. Despite the uncertainty regarding Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla’s biography, it seems clear to me that his works have been preserved due to the fact that he was related to, or confused with, Chapada Mahā Thera, the founder of the Mahāvihāra lineage in Pagan. I consider it very likely that 19th-century monks of the Sudhammā Council are ultimately responsible for the preservations of these texts in the 19th century, and to the campaign of propagation of the Sudhammā Council we owe our reception of Saddhammajotipāla’s texts.

After briefly surveying the literary production of Saddhammajotipāla, I have given an overview of his longest and most challenging work, the *Suttaniddesa*. Though mentioned very often in books on Burmese Theravāda, this work has never been examined in detail before. I

\(^{1}\) Mmd 7,17–19: *vuttiṃ kubbatā vuttādo gāthādvayaṃ vuttaṃ. sutte kubbatā suttassādo pubbavākyamāraddhaṃ attho akkharasaññāto ty apare.*
have tried to disclose what I consider the most salient characteristics of this grammatical work. Saddhammajotipāla was probably not the brightest Pāli grammarian, but he definitely struggled in order to make sense of a philological text that he respected as a very ancient work based on the Buddha’s aphorism “meaning is understood by means of speech-sounds.” It is clear from the very beginning of Kacc-nidd that vyākaraṇa was for Saddhammajotipāla one among the different Buddhist scholarly disciplines of his time. Grammar was part of Buddhist scholastics as was Abhidhamma and Vinaya. The originality of some of Saddhammajotipāla’s arguments and strategies cannot be denied. But Kacc-nidd remains a minor commentary in the Kaccāyana tradition. As the author himself acknowledges, Kacc-nidd works well as an appendix of Mmd. I also think that Saddhammajotipāla’s level of grammatical insight cannot be compared to Vimalabuddhi’s, Aggavamsa’s or Moggallāna’s. Indeed our author composed this commentary more as a tribute to the tradition than because of real need. The same can be said of his Abhidhamma work the Saṅkhapavaṇṇanā. But precisely because the Suttaniddesa is a tribute to the Kaccāyana tradition, and therefore a tribute to textually-oriented Buddhism, this text has become a miniature of the Pāli grammatical constellation. This is the tradition in which Saddhammajotipāla situated himself.

A critical edition of this work remains a desideratum. In the third chapter I will make a contribution in that direction by editing and translating the entire Samāsakappa (“Section on compounds”) of Kacc-nidd.
III

THE SAMĀSAKAPPA OF THE SUTTANIDDESA

CRITICAL EDITION, TRANSLATION AND NOTES
1. Introduction

This is the first attempt at critically editing and translating a complete section of Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla’s Suttaniddesa, the well-known commentary on the Pāli grammar known as Kaccāyana (Kacc) along with its gloss, the Kaccāyanavutti (Kacc-v). Chapaṭa’s commentary obviously includes the suttas (“aphorisms”) of Kacc. Since a critical edition of Kacc and Kacc-v has been recently published by Ole H. Pind (2013), I will not repeat the footnote references that can already be found in that edition. The Kacc-nidd is better understood as an appendix to Kacc; similarly, my edition of Kacc-nidd is also better understood as an appendix to Pind’s Kacc and Kacc-v edition. I will therefore concentrate on discussing and clarifying the meaning of some passages that may present special difficulties to those who are not familiar with the Indian grammatical literature and the Pāli scholastic style. It is only with that purpose in mind that I will refer to other commentaries, trying to keep erudition to the necessary minimum. I will also refer to specific passages in Mukhamattadīpanī, Saddanīti, etc., in their editions when this helps understanding the text of Kacc-nidd, but not every time that there is a parallel.

It is well known that in composing the Suttaniddesa, Chapaṭa followed the main commentaries to Kacc, namely Kacc-v and Mmd. It is for this reason that we often find verbatim quotations of these texts or paraphrases without acknowledgement of the source. I will not indicate these references unless they are of some relevance regarding the meaning of the passage, that is to say when they provide a better context for understanding the passage.

1.1. The style

The style of grammatical commentaries is not different from other scholastic works. It is usually devised as a dialogue between three parties: the pūrvapakṣin “prior party,” the advocatus diaboli who constantly tries to find faults in the doctrine (in this case, the
grammatical aphorisms); the *siddhāntyekadeśin* “the one who only sides with the doctrine,” who duly replies to the *pūrvapakṣin*’s challenges, taking sides with the author of the commented text (in our case, Kaccāyana), and giving “partially correct answers;”¹ and finally the *siddhāntin* “doctor” “holder of the doctrine,” who has the final decision.² Due to the conciseness characteristic of the scholastic style, it is often difficult to determine who is talking in a given passage. Nevertheless, the editor and the translator are supposed to know, or at least guess. In manuscripts or local Burmese, Sinhalese, Thai editions, the “speaking turns” are usually marked by full stop — a double stroke (||) — whereas the simple stop is marked by a single stroke and is a pause in the discourse of one of the speakers. A change of approach, focus, subject of discussion, etc., is marked by formulae such as *atha vā* “alternatively”, “or rather.” In editing the text I have tried to keep the structure of the dialogues as visible as possible. I hope this will help clarify certain passages.

1.2. Editorial criteria

The textual tradition of the Suttaniddesa is fairly consistent and therefore I have tried to keep the apparatus to the minimum. If I have used manuscripts it is simply to verify the readings of the printed editions. Due to the great number of mistakes in the manuscripts I have not recorded all the variant readings. I have only left those that I considered relevant in the sense that they offer a meaningful and plausible variant reading. I say relevant and meaningful because sometimes a variant may be meaningful but implausible. For instance: if a rule deals with the *a* augment called *atta* (Skt. *atva*), the variant reading *attha* is meaningful but not plausible when reference is made to the word appearing in the sutta, especially when the rest of mss. and editions agree. The following are some of the criteria I have adopter throughout the text: I read *kaṭhina* always for *kathina*, *padhāna* for *paṭṭhāna* in some Burmese sources; I keep long vowels long before *ṭi*; *pariṇāma* for *parināma*, and similarly with retroflex option *ṇ/ñ*; endings in *ā* plus following *pi* retain sandhi -āpi, not so

1 Joshi, 1968: ii.
2 For this classification I follow Joshi, 1968: ii. Others only divide between *pūrvapakṣin* and *siddhāntin.*
with long vowel plus ti, because it is quotation and therefore I artificially separate it, as is the usual practice in editions of Pāli texts; in the niddesa section of the commentary, sometimes some sources read, e.g. saññīniddeso, some only saññī, I leave the word -niddeso out except in the beginning and the end of the chapter as is customary; with regard to gahaṇa at the end of a compound, I read always ggahaṇena, e.g. soggahaṇena, except in cases of consonant cluster (saññoga), e.g. kiṃgahaṇena; turiya for tūriya (both are correct); I kept all marks of abbreviation (peyyāla), which are pe, pa and la, as pe; pathamā for pathamā; disantarāla for disantarāla; itaretarayoga for itarītarayoga (consistently in C); ending -ādīsu always with long ī; I also kept the long ī in words such as saññī, kārī, dutīyā, tatīyā, etc.

1.3. Sources of this edition

I have used three printed editions (Sinhalese, Burmese, Thai) and three Burmese mss. In general it is evident that the Burmese edition and mss., together with the Thai edition, form one family, and the Sinhalese stands apart. I have generally followed the Burmese for the simple reason that it makes better sense. Common sense also would suggest that the Burmese family is closer to the original, as this text was written in Burma five centuries ago. Still, I have sometimes maintained the Sinhalese reading when I felt that all Burmese readings were following a misreading. Page numbers of the Sinhalese edition (C) are in brackets. I have used this edition as a reference because of its free availability online.
PRINTED EDITIONS

B = Burmese Printed Edition, Yangon, 1933

MANUSCRIPTS


S = Staatsbibliothek Berlin Hs.or.3180. The title in the margins is “Saddāniddesa.”
2. TEXT AND TRANSLATION

|| namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa ||

[141] evaṃ sattavibhattyantānaṃ² dvinnaṃ nāmapadānaṃ chakkārakā³ diatthabhedamī⁴ dassetvā atha⁵ taṃ vācakabhāvena aññaṃ nāmappakāraṃ dassetuṃ

|| nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho || 318 ||

ity ādi āraddhaṃ.

Honour to him, the Bhagavā, the Arahat, the fully Enlightened One.

Having thus shown the difference of meaning of the six kārakas, etc. belonging to the two [types (singular and plural) of] noun ending in the seven case endings, now, in order to show another type of noun on account of its modality of direct expression (vācakabhāvena), it begins:

318. That which has the combined meaning of nouns [receives the technical name] “compound.”

NOTE: According to the Kaccāyana literature, there are ten “modalities of direct expression of a meaning” (vācakas): the six kārakas, the samāsa, the taddhita, the kita, and the ākhyāta (see below in

---

1 So T, S. Not in printed editions.
2 C sattavibhattyantaṃ.
3 C chakārakā. T chappakārā.
4 C atthappabhedaṃ.
5 T attha.
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the section on bahubbīhi). The word vācaka literally means “expressive,” a word that denotes the meaning, as opposed to words that are rather connotative or suggestive (dyotaka, vyañjaka, sūcaka, bhedaka), see DSG s.v. vācaka.

paṭhamaṃ kare padacchedaṃ samāsādiṃ¹ tato² kare
samāsādo kate pacchā atthaṃ niyātha³ paṅditō⁴ ti
vuttattā nāmānan ti ekaṃ padaṃ. samāso ti ekaṃ padaṃ. yuttattho ti ekaṃ padaṃ. vibhatyantapadavibhāgavasena tipadam idaṃ suttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ⁵.

Because it has been stated:
First, one should make the division of words (padacchedaṃ),
then one should make the original compound and the rest,
once the original compound and the rest are made, then
the learned man should determine its meaning.⁶

“Of nouns” (nāmānaṃ) is one word; “compound” (samāso) is one word; “that which has the combined meaning” (yuttattho) is one word. On account of the division of words according to their case endings, this sutta has to be considered as having three words.

NOTE: In the Pāṇinian system, a pada is any word ending in a nominal or verbal affix (P. 1.4.14 suptīnantam padam). In Kacc literature, however, “pada” means simply a word, or an aggregate of speech sounds. When defining a compound, Vimalabuddhi argues that “in the same way that a word is a collection of many speech sounds, similarly a compound word is a collection of words.”⁷ This shorthand definition gives a reference for the meaning of “pada” in Kaccāyana literature, especially in

---

¹ T samasādi.
² S hito.
³ C niyyātha. D niyyātha.
⁴ B, U paṅditā.
⁵ D om.
⁶ Source not found.
⁷ Mmd 266,23: anekakkharasamūho viya hi padam anekapadasamūho samāsapadan ti.
the context of samāsa. In this stanza, it is not clear what the word samāsādi means. Probably we have to understand this verse as giving instructions for commentarial composition that will follow, which consists of analysis, synthesis, and finally the determination of the particular meaning of a word, a compound, a sentence, etc. That is why I understand niyātha as “should determine” and therefore I adopt the reading paṇḍito in the singular. The word count that we find after every sutta is a device already used in Mmd. Although it may strike us as a “pedantic” overstatement, it is deemed relevant in the correct transmission and understanding of the sutta text. Occasionally, the number of words in a sutta is the object of grammatical controversies (see Chapter 2). The method is followed, among others, by Kacc-nidd, Kacc-vaṇṇ, Niruttisāramavaṇṇusā, Sadd-ṭ.

nāmānan ti sambandhachaṭṭhiniddeso². niddhāraṇachaṭṭhī ti pi vadanti³ samāso ti saññānimiddeso. yuttattho ti saññānimiddeso. saññādhikāraparibhāsāvidhisuttesu saññāsuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

“Of nouns” (nāmānan) expresses (niddeso) a genitive that denotes a relation; some also say it [expresses] a partitive (niddhāraṇa) genitive; “compound” (samāso) expresses a technical name (saññā); “that which has the combined meaning” (yuttattho) expresses that which receives the technical name (saññā). Among the [different types of] sutta, viz. sutta of technical name (saññā), governing sutta (adhiṭṭha), metarule (paribhāsā), and operational sutta (vidhi), this sutta has to be considered a sutta [defining a] technical name.

NOTE: The different types of sutta referred to are the same we already find in the Pāṇinian tradition. A saññā sutta introduces and defines a technical name or technical term; an adhiṭṭha sutta is a heading that governs a number of subsequent suttas; a paribhāsā, commonly translated as “metarule,” is a sutta that “regulates the proper interpretation of a given rule or its application;”⁴ a vidhi is a

---

1 Pind, 2012: 118.
2 D sambandhachaṭṭhikāriniddeso.
3 Kacc-vaṇṇ (219,8-9) add. sahatthatatiyā nidadeso vā. Probably based on Kacc-nidd (see below).
4 Sharma, 1987: 89.
sutta that prescribes a certain operation (replacement, augment, deletion, etc.). There are other types of sutta that are frequently referred to in Kaccāyana literature, for instance paṭisedha “prohibition,” atidesa “extension,” etc., but they seem to be considered functions or modalities of the four main types.

kathāṃ pana ayaṃ saññā ayaṃ saññī ti ñāyatī ti. ācariyaparamparāya samāsapakaraṇan ti vohārassa pakaṭattā viññāyati.

But how does one recognise whether this (ayaṃ) [word, namely samāsa] is the technical name or that which receives the technical name? It is recognised because of the evidence (pakaṭattā) that the tradition of masters calls this chapter “Treatise on compounds” (samāsapakaraṇan tī).

NOTE: This seems to be a rather unusual argument. The title of the chapter as transmitted by the lineage of teachers is Samāsakappa, and this can only indicate that samāsa is the core concept or topic that is going to be studied. In this way we know that samāsa is the saññā (“name”), and through elimination nāmanañ yuttattho has to be the saññī “what is named.” The commentary is trying to prevent the confusion, namely thinking that the saññī is yuttattho and therefore the rule would mean “a combined meaning (yuttattho) is an aggregate (samāso) of nouns (nāmanañ).” As Saddhhammajotipāla suggests, nothing would prevent us from understanding the sutta in this way, and hence the hypothetical question “But how does one recognise ... ?” This discussion is not found in Mmd, but it reminds us of the long and intricate discussion in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya on P. 1.1.1 vṛddhir ādāic, where Patañjali explains how we can ascertain which word is saṃjñā and which one is saṃjñī. A reference to the “masters” (ācāryas) is brought up in what seems to be a justificatory

2 T, S, U, D kathāṃ pana ayaṃ saññī ayaṃ saññī ti ñāyatī tī.
3 S pakaṭattā.
4 C ñāyatī.
vārttika by Kātyāyana: "ācāryācārāt saṃjñāsiddhiḥ "the technical name is established from the usage of the teachers."¹

samāso ti garusañṇākaraṇaṃ² sañṇīsabhāvaparidīpanatthan ti pi vadanti.³

Some also say: the formulation of the heavy technical name, i.e. samāso, [is used] in order to thoroughly illustrate (paridīpanatthan) the nature (sabhāva) of what receives the technical name (sañṇī).

NOTE: This is a quotation from Mmd (253, 26–27). “Heavy” (garu), here, means that Kaccāyana has not used an algebraic convention (rūḷhī), but a “meaningful” (anvattha) one. Although a long or “heavy” word to name a grammatical category may not be suitable for memorisation, it is however advantageous because it expresses unambiguously the nature of this category (see Chapter 1). In P. the technical name samāsa is used but not defined; its meaning is taken for granted in the governing sūtra P. 2.1.3 prāk kaḍārāt samāsaḥ.

payujjamānapadatthānaṃ tesāṃ nāmānaṃ yo yuttattho atthi⁴ so samāsasañño hotī ti attho. ettha tesāṃ ti sutte vuttaṃ parāmasati.⁵

The meaning is: that which has the combined meaning of those nouns whose referents are being employed (payujjamānapadatthānaṃ), that is something to which the technical name “compound” (samāsa) applies. In this regard, the word tesāṃ has to be inferred in the sutta.

¹ The passage is Mbh 37, 21. Patañjali’s conclusion is that saṃjñā and saṃjñī are determined “by the usage of the teachers only” (ācāryācārād eva).
² S garusañṇāṃ karaṇaṃ.
³ Mmd 253, 26–27.
⁴ C om. U attha.
⁵ T parāmassati.
NOTE: This is a slightly edited quotation from the gloss we find in Kacc-v (107, 3-4) and what follows next is an alternative interpretation of the pronoun tesam in Kacc-v. The word padattha means that reality which is expressed by a word, that is to say, the referent.

atha vā. tesan ti aniyaniddesavacanaṃ. tassa sarūpena avuttenāpi atthato siddhena yāni ti iminā bahuvacanena paṭiniddeso kātabbo. tasmā yāni nāmāni upasagganipātapubbako\(^1\) abhayībhāvo [Kacc 321] ti ādi\(^2\) suṭṭhehi samasyante\(^3\) tesam nāmānan ti sambandho kātabbo. atthayogachāṭṭhyāyaṃ.\(^4\)

Alternatively, “of those” is a word (vacanaṃ) that expresses (niddesa) that it is not restricted (aniyata). [The relative pronoun yāni, in the plural, has to be provided as an antecedent (paṭiniddeso) to tesam], because, even though its own form (sarūpena) has not been stated (avuttena), it has been established (siddhena) from the meaning (atthato). Therefore (tasmā) the relationship (sambandho) has to be [the following]: “of those (tesam) nouns, [i.e. those nouns] which (yāni) become compounds (samasyante) through suttas beginning with upasagganipātapubbako abhayībhāvo [Kacc 321].” This [viz. the word tesam] has a sixth case ending that connects the meanings [of yāni and nāmānaṃ].

NOTE: According to this alternative interpretation, the implied word tesam is not a partitive genitive (as in the previous interpretation), but a general anaphoric genitive relating the main clause with a relative clause that needs to be supplied. In the previous interpretation, tesam means tesam nāmānaṃ “of those [words that are] nouns;” in the present interpretation, tesam refers to all the words that can make a compound. This allows for the inclusion of upasagga and nipāta in the category of nāma (see Mmd 253, 1-8). The purpose is to prevent the following objection: “If only

\(^1\) S upasaggapubbako.
\(^2\) C ādi.
\(^3\) C samassante.
\(^4\) C atthayogachāṭṭhyāntoyamaṃ. T atthayogachāṭṭhyāntayaṃ.
The Samāsakappa of the Suttaniddesa

nāma can be used for compounds [Kacc 318], why is there a rule concerning upasagga and nipāta [Kacc 321] in the section of compounds?"

nanu ca¹ atthakkamena² nāmānaṃ yuttatthro samāso ti suttena bhavitabbaṃ. kasmā antarikenāpi³ vuttan ti.⁴

Well, but, is it not true that, following the sequence of the meaning (atthakkamena), the rule should be [formulated as] nāmānaṃ yuttattho samāso [and not as nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho]? Why is it stated [in this way], even with a separation (antarikena) [of namānaṃ from yuttattho]?

NOTE: Here begins a discussion already found, in extenso, in Mmd (252, 14f.). The “sequence of the meaning” means the succession of words that we find in Kacc-v. The main objection is that, if nāmānaṃ goes with yuttattho, they should be contiguous. It is remarkable that the Kaccāyana grammarians are not aware of, or they do not give relevance to, the fact that the equivalent rule in Kātantra (259) nāmnāṃ samāso yuktārthaḥ, is part of a śloka that contains three more sūtras:

[Kāt 259] nāmnāṃ samāso yuktārthaḥ [Kāt 260] tatsthā lopyā vibhaktayah

The samāsa section in Kāt was originally a treatise composed in ślokas. The “sequence of meaning” is not followed due to metrical reasons. But the Kaccāyana scholars found a different way to justify the separation, as we can see in the following discussion.

1 S om.
2 T athakkamena.
3 B, U, D antarikena pi. S andharikena pi.
4 The same objection is raised in Mmd 252,14f.
saccam bhavitabban.\textsuperscript{1} tathapi saddakkamenapi bhavitabban. namaggaha\nassa antarikenapi yuttaggaha\nena\textsuperscript{2} sambandhath\textsuperscript{3} ca ki\nicipayojanasambhavato ca. sam\\textsuperscript{4}sa\textsuperscript{5}saddantarikenapi hi\textsuperscript{6} siras\textsuperscript{7} pasum abhidh\textsuperscript{8}vantam \textsuperscript{9}avahant\textsuperscript{5}i\textsuperscript{5} gha\textsuperscript{t}am addakkhi ti \textsuperscript{4}adisu viya\textsuperscript{5} namaggaha\textsuperscript{6}nassa yuttatthaggaha\textsuperscript{6}nena sambandho bhavati ti.

True, it should be [as you say]. Nevertheless (tathapi), it can also follow the sequence of the words (saddakkamena). Because there is a [semantic] relationship (sambandhatta) between the mention of nam and the mention of yutta, even with a separation (antarikenapi) [in between], and also because this kind of usage is possible. For, even with the word sam\textsuperscript{4}sa as a separation (antarikena), there is [still] a relationship between the mention of nam and the mention of yutta, in the same way as in sentences such as “with the head, the running animal, carrying a pot, she saw” [i.e. “she saw a running animal while carrying a pot on her head”].

NOTE: The mention of nam and yutta are respectively references to the words in the sutta. The meaning of this passage is that what counts is the syntactical and semantic structure and not the sequence of the words. Optionally, one could simply say that there is a certain freedom regarding word order, as the final example, taken from Mmd, demonstrates. Vimalabuddhi explains the example as follows: ayan h’ etha attho siras gha\textsuperscript{t}am \textsuperscript{9}avahant\textsuperscript{5}i pasum abhidh\textsuperscript{5}vantam addakkhi ti “This is the meaning: while carrying a pot on her head, she sees a running animal.”\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{1} Mmd (252,17) replies with a stronger tan na “That is not so.” The argument of Mmd is that the order should be kept as it is because it allows a proper yogaribba\textsuperscript{a} application (see below). Saddhammajotip\textsuperscript{a}la seems to follow the same argument.
\textsuperscript{2} S, U yuttatthaggaha\textsuperscript{6}nena. T yuttatthaggaha\textsuperscript{6}nena.
\textsuperscript{3} S ki\textsuperscript{6}ncipayojanasab\textsuperscript{a}vato. D reads separately ki\textsuperscript{6}nci payojanasambhavato.
\textsuperscript{4} S sam\textsuperscript{4}sa\textsuperscript{5}n. T sam\textsuperscript{4}.
\textsuperscript{5} S ti.
\textsuperscript{6} U, D \textsuperscript{9}avahant\textsuperscript{5}i.
\textsuperscript{7} T om.
\textsuperscript{8} = Mmd 252,21.
vuttañ ca

yena yassa hi sambandho dūraṭṭhaṃ pi ca tassa¹ taṃ,

atthato hy² asamānānaṃ āsannattam akāraṇan ti³

And it has been stated:

“For, the relation between one [word] and the other [exists] even though (api ca) one is far from the other. Because (hi), for those [words] that do not share the same referent, being adjacent is not a cause [for relating them].”

tattha hī ti kāraṇatthe nipāto.⁴ yasmā yena yuttatthādiggahaṇena. yassa nāmādiggahaṇassa atthasambhavena⁵ sambandho bhavati.⁶ tasmā taṃ nāmādiggahaṇaṃ dūre ṭhitam pi tassa yuttatthādiggahaṇassa āyattaṃ⁷. hi⁸ saccaṃ atthato asamānānaṃ āsannattaṃ akāraṇaṃ na ūpakahetū ti attho.

In this regard, the word hi is a particle in the sense of cause. The meaning is: “Because between one [word], i.e. the mention of yuttattha, etc., and the other, i.e. the mention of nāma, etc., there is a relationship (sambandho) on account of the possibility (sambhavena) of their meanings, therefore (tasmā), one [word], i.e. the mention of nāma, etc., even though it is far, [it] reaches (āyattaṃ) the other [word], i.e. the mention of yuttattha, etc. Indeed (hi), i.e. certainly (saccaṃ), for those [words] that do not share the same referent, being adjacent is not a cause, i.e. it is not a cause (hetu) of an indicator (ūpaka).⁹

---

1 S tasmā.
2 U ty.
3 = Mnd 252.23-24, introduced by vuttam pi cetam.
4 = Mnd-pṭ 176,11: ettha hi iti kāraṇatthe nipāto.
5 C atthasambandhena.
6 S bhavatam.
7 C reads āgatattā, which does not make sense syntactically. U āyatthaṃ, cor. āyattaṃ.
8 C ti. S hi.
9 na ūpakahetu is Saddhammajotipāla’s gloss to akāraṇaṃ. According to Kahrs (1998: 216 n.98): “The
They also explain the meaning in this way: “between one” (yena), i.e. between the word nāma or any other; “[and] the other” (yassā), i.e. [and] the word yuttattha, or any other; “one”, i.e. the word yuttattha, or any other; “from the other”, i.e. the word nāma, or any other.

NOTE: “or any other” (-ādinā) is stated in order to clarify that the stanza applies to any two words that are semantically connected but not sequentially uttered.

If one would say nāmaṇaṃ yuttattho samāso following the sequence of meaning, [then] it would not be possible to form [sentences or words] such as acandamullokikāni mukhāni “faces not looking up to the moon,” assaddhabhoji “not eating during the saddhā period,” alavaṇabhoji “not eating salty food,” etc. But being stated in this way, by means of splitting

technical term jñāpaka [P. nāpaka] may best be rendered ‘something which serves to indicate’. Based on supposed implications which result from internal analysis of the rules of grammar, a jñāpaka is a structural argument through which a valid interpretation can be inferred and justified. In other words, when seemingly conflicting features occur in the grammar, one should look for some other feature which indicates the valid interpretation on the basis of consistency and a unified system.” What Saddhammajotipāla intends to say, then, is that being adjacent is not an indicator of semantic relation.

1 U yuttattādino.
2 T mukhā.
4 = Mmd 252,29.
5 B, U eva.
up the sutta \textit{(yogavihāgavasena)} as \textit{nāmānaṃ samāso}, even those \textit{[words]} that do not have a combined meaning \textit{(ayuttatthānī)} would be formed \textit{[as compounds]}.

NOTE: The hermeneutic device known as \textit{yogavihāga} “splitting up \textit{[the sutta]}” consists in dividing the rule into two (or more) independent rules, so that the grammar can explain word-formations that otherwise would remain ungrammatical. By means of \textit{yogavihāga}, we obtain the sutta \textit{nāmānaṃ samāso} “a compound \textit{[is]} of nouns,” which would probably function as a governing rule \textit{(adhiikārasutta)}, and would allow for word-composition where the meaning of the members is not necessarily combined \textit{(ayuttatthānī)}, as is the case in the examples \textit{acandamullokikāni mukhāni}, etc. (originally from Mbh, the example is already found for the first time in Pāli in Mmd 252, 28–29; Mmd has another example which is not found in Sanskrit sources: \textit{apunageyyā gāthā}). Saddhammajotipāla seems to understand that, because of the privative \textit{a-}, these words cannot express “combination” or “union” \textit{(yoga)}, but the opposite \textit{(see Mmd 252, 27–28: ayuttatthānam pi samāsasañño hoti)}. And yet, they are to be treated as compounds. That is possible if we read \textit{nāmānaṃ samāso} as an independent sutta. This explanation, though far fetched, solves a semantic problem, and it is helpful in describing the Pāli usage.\textsuperscript{1} Kātantra commentators do not resort to this argument, probably because in Kāt the equivalence Pāṇini \textit{samartha} = Kāt \textit{yuktārtha} is still operative. The defense of \textit{yogavihāga} in this rule is found already in Mmd 252, 25f.: \textit{atthānukkamānurūpavasena cāvacanaṃ yogavihāgatthām} “And, due to the sequence of the meaning, the aim \textit{(atthām)} of splitting up the sutta is implicit \textit{(avacanaṃ)}.” The concept \textit{avacanaṃ} “implicit” in Vimalabuddhi is probably related to the concept of \textit{nāpakaṃ} “indicator” that we find in Saddhammajotipāla’s gloss to the verses beginning with \textit{yena yassa hi} etc.

\textsuperscript{1} A similar adjustment against the system of the grammarians but following “the view of the Jina” \textit{(jinamate)} is found in Sadd. Aggavaṃsa states that in some cases a passive verb must be construed only with a subject-agent in nominative (and not in instrumental, as we should expect). See Kahrs 1992: 25.
atthesu namanti¹ attani ca atthe nāmenti ti nāmāni.² yadā hi dussadabbādini passitvā dussan ti voharanti tadā atthesu namanti nāma.³ yadā dussan ti savanakāle dussadabbādīni jānanti tadā atthe⁴ nāmenti nāma.

They are called nouns (nāmāni) because they point (namanti) towards [their] meanings, and also because they cause to point (nāmenti) towards their own meaning. For, when they [namely, people] see substances (dabba) such as a garment (dussa), and they conventionally call it a “garment,” then they [i.e. nouns] point towards the meanings only (nāma). When, at the time of hearing the word “garment” they [i.e. people] understand (jānanti) substances such as garment, etc., then they [i.e. nouns] simply (nāma) point towards [their own] meaning.

NOTE: This passage is already found in Kacc-nidd 21, 4–6. In that case, the discussion refers to nouns in general. In the present case, the example given is a compound noun. A noun expresses an object or reality (attha), but it also expresses its own meaning. The word attha means both “meaning” and “object.” In the context of linguistics it may also be translated as “refferent.” The semantic analysis of nāma is based on the root ūnām “to bend” “to turn towards” (cf. DOP sv namati).

1. C, T namanti ca.
2. For an analysis of Kacc-nidd 21, 4–6, see Ruiz-Falques 2014a: 16. See also Sadd 690,22–25:
   namanti yāni atthesu atthe nāmenti cattani
   padesu tesu nāmesu dhīnā nāmentu mānasam.
   mānasam tesu nāmenta nātevā pālinayuttamaṃ
   nāmadhammesu vindeyyaṃ nāmanāmaṃ sunimmalaṃ.

   These are the ending verses of the Nāmakappa. A similar idea is found in Rūp 41,3–4 (introduction to sutta 60 = Kacc 52 jinavacanayuttaṃ hi): atthābhimukhaṃ namanato attani c’ atthassa namanato nāmaṃ dabbabhidhānāṃ. The idea is repeated in Sadd 878,14–15: tatra nāmaṃ ti atthābhimukhaṃ namanati ti nāmaṃ attani ca atthaṃ nāmeti ti nāmaṃ. ghaṭapathādiko yo koci saddo so hi sayanṃ ghaṭapaṭādiatthabhidhānaṃ namati. atthe sati tadabhidhānānassa sambhavato tan taṃ atthaṃ attani nāmeti. asati abhidhāne atṭhāvabodhanass’ eva asambhavato.
3. U om.
4. S atthaṃ.
tesaṃ nāmānaṃ\(^1\) ti\(^2\) iminā

nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsa\(^3\)taddhitaṃ tathā

kitanāmaṃ ti nāmaññū nāmaṃ pañca pi niddise\(^4\) ti

vuttāni\(^5\) pañca nāmāni gahitāni.\(^6\)

With [the expression] *tesaṃ nāmānā*, five types of nouns are included, which are stated [as follows]:

“The expert on nouns distinguishes (*niddise*) five types: noun proper (*nāmanāma*), pronoun (*sabbanāma*), compound (*samāsa*) as well as secondary formation (*taddhitaṃ*), [and] primary formation (*kitanāmaṃ*)”.

NOTE: *nāmaññū* is a singular, and the verb *niddise* is an optative, understood as a general present “one shall indicate,” “one indicates,” “one shall distinguish between,” “one distinguishes.” The alternative reading *pi niddese* does not seem to fit in the syntax, as the nominative *nāmaññū* requires a verb. *C*° *viniddise* is a misreading of a Burmese copy (*vi* and *pi* are very similar in Burmese characters but not so in Sinhalese characters).

---

1 T nāmaṃ.
2 B, S, U, D om.
3 C, T samāsaṃ.

nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsataddhitaṃ tathā

kitanāmaṃ ca nāmaññū nāmaṃ pañca pi niddise ti.

5 S vuttattā tānī.
6 Kacc-nidd 21,13–15: api ca nāmanāmasabbanāmasamāsanāmataddhitānakānāmavasaṃ pañcavidhaṃ hoti. vuttaṃ ca

nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsaṃ taddhitaṃ tathā

kitanāmaṃ ca nāmaññū nāmaṃ pañcavidhaṃ vade ti.
kasmā pana ākhyātapadaṃ na gaṇhāti. nanu anaññātaññassāmitindriyan¹ ti etthāpi ākhyātena samāso dissatī ti.

But why is the verb not included? Is it not true that a compound can also be formed with a verb, as in: “the mental faculty of knowing things one did not remember” (anaññātaññassāmitindriyaṃ)?

NOTE: ākhyātapadaṃ is the category of verb. The compound given as an example is attested in canonical literature.² It is to be understood as the sentence anaññātaññassāmi, literally: “I will know what is not remembered,” plus the particle iti “thus,” and the noun indriyaṃ “faculty” or “faculty of cognition,” in this case “mental faculty.” This compound contains not only a verb, but a full sentence marked with iti as one of its members. To the best of my knowledge, this particular objection is not found in earlier grammars and may be credited to Saddhammajotipāla.

saccaṃ. kiñcāpi ettha ākhyātapadaṃ dissati. tathāpi itisaddena sambandhattā taṃ³ padaṃ nipātapakkhaṃ hutvā samāsapadattaṃ⁴ upagacchatī ti.

It is true. But however much we find a verb (ākhyātapadaṃ) here, nevertheless (tathāpi), because of its relationship (sambandhattā) with the word iti, this word (padaṃ) belongs to the category of a compound after becoming (hutvā) part of a particle (nipātapakkhaṃ).

NOTE: In other words, the iti marker turns the iti clause into a nipaṭa (“indeclinable”). A compound that has as one of its members an iti clause, therefore, should be analysed as a regular avyayibbāvo, according to Kacc 320 upasagganipātapubbako avyayībhāvo (see below).

¹ T aaññataññassāmitindriyan.
² It 53, 3 (It-a) = SN V 204, 19 (Spk).
³ C sambandhathānaṃ.
⁴ C, S samāsapadatthaṃ. U samāsapadattaṃ, cor. samāsapadattaṃ.
samasyante₁ vibhattilopena vā ekattūpagamanena² vā ti samāso. so duvidho saddasamāso atthasamāso ca. duvidho ca³ so luttasamāse⁴ va labbhati. aluttasamāse⁵ pana atthasamāso va labbhati. alutte pi vā ekapadablāvupagamanato ubhayam pi tasmiṃ upalabbhati⁶.⁷

It is called compound (samāsa) because [words] are put together (samasyante) either (vā) through the elision of the case ending (vibhattilopena), or (vā) through becoming one single unit [of meaning]. This [i.e. a compound] is twofold: compound of words and compound of meanings. And this twofold [compound] is found in the elision compound (luttasamāse) only. In the non-elision compound (aluttasamāse), however, only the compound of meanings is found. Alternatively (vā), both [types] are also found even in the non-elision [compound], because they have become one single pada.

NOTE: In Pāṇinian grammar the non-elision compound is called aluksamāsa (P. 6.3.1–6.3.24), and it represents one of the three types of elision. The general term for elision in Pāṇini is lopa, but lu (DSG sv) is also used. The technical term lu (P. 1.1.61–1.1.63) has three types: luk, ślu and lup, which represent elision in different contexts. In Kātantra the threefold elision is reduced to one general type, lup. This terminology is followed by Kacc. The difference between luk and lup is that, in the second case, after the elision of the affix, the base maintains the gender and number, whereas with luk elision (the type used in compounds), with the elision of the case ending (vibhatti) affix, the base of the first member loses its gender and number. The ślu type marks the elision of a specific suffix called śap. In Pāṇinian grammar, lopa means “disappearance of a word or part of a word enjoined in grammar for arriving at the required forms of a word” (DSG sv). lopa is the technical term preferred by Kaccāyana.

1 B, U, D samāsante.
2 C ekapadattupagamanena. S ekattupagamanena.
3 B, U, T om.
4 T luttāluttasamāse.
5 T luttasamāse.
6 B, U, D labbhati.
7 This paragraph, except the first line, is taken from Mmd 253,28–254,1.
Furthermore (ca), the compound of meanings, as the compound of words, causes singleness (ekattakaraṇaṃ) of two meanings. And (ca) how is it possible, then, to find it (taṁ) [i.e. singleness] from something that already has a single meaning (ekatthabhāvo) as in examples such as “great person”?

NOTE: Let us recall that we translate attha as “meaning” but it can also be translated as “referent.” The word mahāpuriso is a kammadhāraya, that is to say, two words that have the same referent. In this case, there is a composition of words, but not composition of referents. The objection raised by the pūrvapakṣa tries to point out that a compound such as mahāpurisa is not creating a unity of reference for two words with different referents.

It is found, because, even if the referent to be expressed is only one, the quality “great” and the class “man,” which are the expressed meanings, make it one.

NOTE: The meaning seems to be that, even though we are referring to one person, there are two referents: a quality and a class, which, combined, describe one single referent. ekato is an adverb that,
together with the root √kara “to do” makes the periphrasis ekato √kara = “transforming [two or more] into one (lit. as one).”

yadi evaṃ samaṇabrāhmaṇādīsu so atthasamāso labhitum na sakkā. ekatthabhāvānūpaganamato ti.

If that is so, [then] a compound of meanings cannot be found in cases such as samaṇabrāhmaṇa, because there is no singleness of referent.

NOTE: That is to say, if singleness of referent is a prerequisite for an atthasamāsa, then dvanda compounds cannot be considered atthasamāsa.

sakkā. ekapadatthabhāvena gahetabbattā ti.

[The compound of meanings] can [be found], because it has to be understood (gahetabbattā) as a single entity (ekapadatthabhāvena).

NOTE: The answer is that they have to be understood “as a single entity” (ekapadatthabhāvena), that is to say: the collective comprising both ascetics and brahmins implied in the compound samaṇabrāhmaṇa. In other words, what mathematicians call a set.
evāṃ duvidho pi samāsavasena1 pākaṭo hoti. vuttañ ca
samāso padasaṃkhepo padappaccayasaṃhitaṁ2
taddhitam nāma kitakaṃ3 dhātuppaccayasaṃhitan4 ti.5

Thus, even if it is twofold, it is commonly known on account of its being a compound. And it has been stated:
“A compound [is] an aggregate (saṃkhepo) of words; a secondary formation is the combination of a pada and an affix (paccaya); a primary formation is the combination of a root (dhātu) and an affix.”

so ca samāso saññāvasena chabbidho. abyayībhāvo kammadhārayo dīgu tappuriso bahubbīhi dvando cā ti. pabhedena pana sattavīsatibheda hoti6. niccāniccavasena vā luttāluttavasena vā duvidho ca hoti.

And this compound is sixfold depending on the type of technical name: avyayībhāva, kammadhāraya, dīgu, tappurisa, bahubbīhi and dvanda. By further division (pabhedena), however, it is of twenty-seven types. And, furthermore, it is twofold on account of being obligatory or alternating; or on account of being with elision or without elision.

1 C, S, T saddasamāsavasena.
2 S padappaccayasaṃhitaṁ.
3 T kitthakaṃ.
4 S, T dhātuppaccayasaṃhitaṁ.
5 See Rūp 178,9-10:
   samāso padasaṅkhepo padappaccayasaṃhitam
taddhitam nāma hot’ evaṃ viññeyyaṃ tesam antaran ti.
6 C sattavīsatibheda honti.
vuttañ ca
cadhā samāsō saṃkhepā vitthārā sattavīsati
niccāniccavasā ceva luttāluttavā dvidhā
tatra dvidhābyāyībhāvo chabbidho kammadhārayo
dīgu dvidhā tappuriso aṭṭhadhā sattadhā bhave
bāhubbīhi dvidhā dvando pabhedā sattavīsati.⁴

And it has been stated:

“Sixfold is the compound in brief (saṃkhepā), but in detail (vitthārā), [it is of] twenty-seven [types]. It is twofold on account of being obligatory or not, or on account of being with or without elision. Therein, abyāyībhāva is twofold, kammadhāraya is sixfold, dīgu is twofold, tappurisā is eightfold, sevenfold is the bāhubbīhi, the dvanda is twofold. By this subdivision, [they are] twenty-seven.”

[143] paṭhamātappurisena vā saddhiṃ aṭṭhavīsatīvidho hotī ti⁶ vadanti.

They also state: “Optionally, with the addition of nominative- tappurisā (paṭhamātappurisena), they are twenty-eight.”

NOTE: Most grammarians do not consider the nominative- tappurisā a tappurisā, for it can be called simply a kammadhāraya. Indeed, it is impossible to distinguish a nominative- tappurisā from a kammadhāraya, for instance niluppalaṃ “blue water-lily.”

---

1 S samāsā.
2 U saṅkhepo.
3 T niccāniccavaso.
4 S, U, D sattavīsati ti.
5 Abhyankar: “invariably effective compound.” Cf. DSG s.v. nityasamāsa.
6 C ti pi. U add. aṭṭhavīsati ti before paṭhama, and then the entire sentence.
tesañ pana sarūpañ tañ tañ ṭhāne yeva vakkhāma.

But we will explain (vakkhāma) their respective (tañ tañ) particular nature (sarūpañ) in the [appropriate] place (ṭhāne) only (yeva).

rūpasiddhiyāṁ pana kammadhārayahubhibhiṁ va1 navadhā gahetvā2 caturaṭṭhadhā3 ti vuttaṁ.

In the Rūpasiddhi, however, it is stated: “thirty-two,” the kammadhāraya and the bahubhiṁ being taken as ninefold.4

niccasamāso5 kumbhakāro6 atrajo kupuriso abhidhammo icc7 ādi ca8, abyayībhāvasamāso că ti9. aniccasamāso ca10 mahāpuriso11 rājapuriso icc ādi.

Obligatory compounds are such [words] as “pot maker” (kumbhakāra), “born from oneself” (atrajo), “bad person” (kupuriso), abhidhamma, etc.; and also [all] the abyayībhāva

---

1 S, U ca.
2 S gahetabbā.
3 caturaṭṭha = four times eight = thirty-two. See Rūp 215,3-5:
duvidho abyayībhāvo navadhā kammadhārayo
digu dudhā tappuriso atṭhadhā navadhā bhave
bahubhiṁ dvidhā dvando samāso caturaṭṭhadhā ti.
4 See Rūp 214,2-6: atha kammadhārayasamāso vuccate. so ca navavidho. visesanapubbapado visesanuttarapado visesanobhayaṇapubbapado upamāṇuttarapado sambhāvanāpubbapado avadhāraṇapubbapado vanipāṭapubbapado kupubbapado pādiṇipubbapado că ti.
5 U niccasamāso ti.
6 T kumbhakāro ca.
7 C icc evaṁ.
8 U om.
9 S, U, T, D om.
10 T, D ti.
11 B, U, D om.
compounds; and alternating compounds are such as “great-man” (*mahāpuriso*), “king’s man” (*rājapuriso*), etc.

luttasamāso ti sabbo vibhättilopasamāso. aluttasamāso ti urasilomo ’cc ādi vibhättialopasamāso ti.

Elision compound (*luttasamāso*) means every (*sabbo*) compound in which the case endings are elided. Non-elision compound means a compound in which the case endings are not elided, for instance *urasiloma* “[having] hair on the chest.”

NOTE: *urasī* is an inflected form, the locative singular of *uras*, meaning “chest”.

*yutto attho yuttattho.*\(^1\) *yutto attho*\(^2\) yassa padaśamudāyassā ti yuttattho.

A meaning [that is] combined [is] a combined meaning. That aggregate (*samudāya*) of words which has a combined meaning is called *yuttattho* “that which has a combined meaning.”\(^3\)

*yuttattho ca yuttattho cā ti\(^4\) yuttattho sarūpekasesavasena. sarūpo ca saddatthatadubhayekadesasarūpavasena catubbidho.

That which has a combined meaning means each and every instance of [an aggregate of words] that has a combined meaning, on account of being the single remainder due to

---

1. S *yutto attho*, corrected to *yuttattho*.
2. S om. *yutto attho*.
3. See Kāt-ṭ ad Kāt 338: *atha vā yuktārtho yasmin samudāye sa yuktārtho nāmnām iti sambandhāḥ; but also Mmd 254,2–3: *yutto attho yuttattho. atha vā yutto attho yassa soyamī yuttattho ti*. In Mmd the possibility of *yuttattho* signifying simply “a combined meaning” is accepted, and therefore the concept of *samāsa* “compound” becomes semantic.
identity. And identity (sarūpo) is fourfold, on account of it being [identity] in: word (sadda), meaning (attha), both of them (tadubbhaya), [or similar] in one place (ekadesa).

NOTE: ekasesa (Skt. ekaśeṣa) is “a kind of composite formation in which only one of the two or more words compounded together subsists, the others being elided” (DSG sv.). In this passage, the author understands that the singular yuttattho is a single remainder that stands for all the cases on the principle of identity.

tattha māso ca māso cā ti māsā ti evam ādi saddasarūpo nāma. vaṅko ca kuṭilo cā ti kuṭilā1 ti ādi atthasarūpo nāma. puriso ca puriso cā ti purisā ti ādi ubhayasarūpo nāma. nāmañ ca rūpañ ca nāmarūpan ti2 ādi ekadesasarūpo3 nāma4.

In this regard, identity in word, as in “bean (māsa) and gold coin (māsa)” = māsā; identity in meaning as in “crooked thing and twisted thing” = “crooked things”; identity in both [word and meaning] as in “person and person” = “persons”; identity in one place as in “name and form” = “name-form” (nāmarūpaṃ).

vuttañ ca
sarūpaṃ catudhā vuttaṃ saddatthobhayāvayavā5
māsā ca kuṭilā6 ceva purisā nāmarūpañ cā ti.
And it has been stated:

Identity is said to be fourfold: [in] word, [in] meaning, [in] both, and [in] part:

“beans/gold coins” (māsā) and “crooked things” (kuṭilā) and “persons” (purisā) and “name-form” (nāmarūpaṃ) [are their respective examples].

idha pana saddasarūpo² va adhippeto ti.

Here [in the example yuttattho], however, only identity in word is intended.

ayam ettha yojanā. yāni pañcappakārāni nāmāni santi, tesaṃ payujjamānapadattāhānam nāmānaṃ yo yuttattho padatthasamudāyo vā atthi,³ so samāsasañño⁴ hotī ti.

This [is] the connection (yojanā) here: among those nouns, which are of five types, and whose meanings are being employed, the technical name “compound” applies to that one which has a combined meaning or (vā) is an aggregate of meanings.

ettha nāmānan ti padattāpekkhāya atthayogasambandhachaṭṭhī. padāpekkhāya⁵ avayavayogasambandhachaṭṭhī.

Here the word nāmānaṃ “of nouns,” with regard to the referent (padattha), is a genitive (chaṭṭhī) of relation that connects the [two or more] meanings [of the words in the

2 D saddarūpo.
4 T samāsasañño. The word sarasā is probably a misreading of sañño in the Burmese script.
compound]; with regard to the word (*pada*), is a genitive of relation that connects the members (*avayava*) [of the compound].

In the *Rūpasiddhi-ṭīkā*, however, the connection (*yojanā*) is made in the following way: “The technical name ‘compound’ applies to that aggregate of words, such as ‘the man of the king’, which consists in the connected meaning of those nouns, namely those nouns that have been previously taught by us, and whose referents are being employed by the Teacher, that is to say whose referents are mutually related in the function of qualifier, [qualified,] etc., for instance: *rañño puriso* ‘the man of the king’.”

---

1 Compare with Rup-ṭ 397,31–35: *payujjamānapadatthānaṃ ti visesanādippakāravasena aṅnamaṅnapayujjamānaṃ sampayujjamānapadatthānaṃ tesaṃ syādīvibhatyantānaṃ rañño puriso ti ādīvākye bhinnatthānaṃ nāmānaṃ yo yuttatthabhūto rañño puriso ti ādiko padasamudāyo so samāso nāmā ti attho.

2 C ācariyā yena.

3 B, U, D *payujjamānaṃ*

4 C *ty*.

5 C *vākye pi*.

6 B om. S has *yo* inserted in pencil.

7 C *yo yuttattho yo yuttatthabhūto*. 
And in the *Mahāthera-ṭīkā*, the connection is made in the following way: “The technical name ‘compound’ applies to the combined meaning of nouns, that is to say, nouns which have been previously taught, whose referents are employed by the Teacher.”

But (*pi*) many teachers make the connection in manifold ways, taking the word *nāmānaṃ* in the sense of a partitive [genitive] (*niddhāraṇatthāṃ*), or as an instrumental with a comitative sense (*sahatthatatīyatthāṃ*), or as denoting a relation (*sambandhatthāṃ*).

NOTE: These are all possible functions of the chaṭṭhī “sixth case ending” (“genitive”). Comitative means “expressing company,” which is one of the two meanings of the third case: instrumental or comitative (of company). The statement of Saddhammajotipāla acknowledges, on the one hand, the different interpretations existing among master grammarians, and he seems to respect all of them as valid interpretations. At this point, the author has commented upon the gloss of Kacc-v. Now begins the commentary on the examples, Kacc-v 107, 5-7.

---

1 T mahātheraṭīkāyaṃ.
2 C bahudhā kārena.
kaṭhinassa dussan ti’ kaṭhinassa ābhatāṃ dussan ti attho. majjhe lopī cāyaṃ2
catuṭṭhītappurisasamāso.

The cloth (dussaṃ) for the kaṭhīna (kaṭhinassa) means the cloth carried (ābhatāṃ) for the
kaṭhīna. This is a dative-tappurisa (catuṭṭhītappurisa) compound with an elision in the
middle.

NOTE: the kaṭhīna is “a framework [covered with a mat] to which the cloth for making robes was
attached while being sewn”; kaṭhinadussa is a “cloth [to be made up] on the kaṭhīna” cf. DOP s.v.
kaṭhīna. Saddhammajotipāla, following Mmd (268, 15f.) understands kaṭhīna- as meaning kaṭhinassa,
and not kaṭhine, and therefore we have to understand the elliptical participle ābhatāṃ “brought”
“carried.”

ñāsādīsu kaṭhinassa dussan ti ādiṇam3 atthesu amādayo4 parapadebhī [Kacc 329]
ti ādina5 padasamasanañ ca tappurisādivisesa6saññañ ca katvā pacchā nāmānañ samāso yuttattho [Kacc 318] timinā sāmaññasamāsasānnañ karonti. samāsasañña
nāma padānañ samasane7 sati labbhatī ti8 tesam adhippāyo.

In the Nyāsa and other works they make [first] the composition of words with regard to the
meanings of kaṭhinassa dussaṃ, etc., according to rules such as [Kacc 329] “[When words
ending in case endings] aṃ, etc. [are combined] with the following words, [the technical name
tappurisa applies],” and [also] the specific definition of the technical name tappurisa, and

---
1 B, U, T kathinadussan ti. S kathinassa dussan ti, cor. kathinadussan ti.
2 C lopīyaṃ.
3 T, D ādi.
4 T amādayo.
5 T ādināma.
6 B, U, D tappurisādivasena. S tappurisādivisesasaññañ ca. T tappurisādivisesasañ ca.
7 T samassane.
8 C om.
afterwards (\textit{pacchā}) they establish the general definition of “compound” according to [Kacc 318] “That which has the combined meaning of nouns [receives the technical name] ‘compound.’” What they intend to mean is that “the definition of the technical name is obtained when the composition of words is already given.”

NOTE: In the analysis of Mmd (268, 15-27), the example \textit{kāṭhinadussaṃ} is interpreted by means of several suttas that do not follow the original sequence of Kacc. What Saddhammājotipāla intends to explain is that Mmd, Mmd-\textit{pṭ}, and other works base the interpretation of Kacc 318 on suttas that are posterior to 318. This should not pose any inconvenience, for everywhere in Mmd the sutta of Kaccāyana is considered a self-referential whole, where the effect of the suttas work both ways: top to bottom and bottom to top, and the order of the suttas does not necessarily imply a correspondence between the order and how the suttas should be applied. The user of the commentary is supposed to know the entire thread of suttas by heart. Thus any rule may be cited and properly located without problem.

\[\text{[144] aṇṇe pana ācariyā sāmaññasaññaṃ}^{1} \text{ katvā pacchā}^{2} \text{ tappurisādivisesasaññaṃ} \text{ karonti. te ācariyā hi sāmaññaśaṣaṅgaṃ sāmaññasañña va paṭhamaṃ vattabbā ti vacanato sāmaññasaññaṃ paṭhamaṃ karonti.}\]

Other masters, however, make the particular definition of \textit{tappurisa}, etc., after making the general definition [of the technical term “compound”]. These teachers, indeed, make the general definition first because of the principle that “among particular and general definitions, the general definition has to come (\textit{vattabbā}) first (\textit{paṭhamaṃ}).”

NOTE: This \textit{paribhāsā} is found in Mmd 7, 22-23. Interestingly, Mmd does not follow it in the present discussion, for the reason that is subsequently explained by Saddhammājotipāla.

\footnotesize{1} C sāmaññasamāsasaññaṃ.
\footnotesize{2} C pacchā \textit{pi}.
kaccāyanasuttakkamaṃ nissāya pana sāmaññasaññā va paṭhamaṃ kātabbā viya dissati.

But (pana) if we rely on the sequence of suttas in Kaccāyana, it seems that the general definition has to be made first.

sabbā saññāvidhiādirūpavicāraṇā ñāse oloketabbā.

A complete examination (vicāraṇā) regarding the nature (rūpa) of definitions (saññā), operational rules (vidhi), etc. has to be looked up in the Nyāsa.

NOTE: The particular analysis of the examples given in Kacc-v has to be studied in Mmd (268, 15f.).

Here begins the commentary on the payoga section of Kacc-v, a section that Pind has completely removed from the Kacc-v text, considering it an interpolation, see Kacc 107 n. 8.

nāmānam iti padaṃ kimatthaṃ kiṃpayojanatthaṃ ācariyena vuttaṃ. devadatto pacatī ty ādīsu udāharaṇesu sati pi tulyādhikaraṇabhāvena yuttatthe, sabbesaṃ nāmānaṃ abhāvā, iminā suttena yuttatthasamāso na hotī ti ŋāpanatthaṃ nāmānam iti padaṃ ācariyena vuttaṃ.

Why, i.e. with what purpose, has the master stated the word “of nouns” (nāmānaṃ) [in the sutta]? The master states “of nouns” in order to explain (ṅāpanatthaṃ) that, in examples such as “Devadatta cooks” (devadatto pacatī), even though there is connected meaning on account of the existence of a common substratum (tulyādhikaraṇabhāvena) [between the

---

1 B, T, D kaccāyanassa. S kaccāraṇassa.
2 T kātabbāṃ.
3 C tulyādhikaraṇe.
4 C yuttattho.
agent and the action], the present sutta does not allow it as a compound with a combined meaning, because they [i.e. the words devadatto and pacati] are not all nouns.

yuttattho ti padaṃ ācariyena kimattham vuttaṃ.\(^1\) bhaṭo rañño putto devadattassā ty ādīsu udāharaṇesu santesu pi nāmesu rañño putto ti padassa asambandhabhāvena\(^2\) yuttatthābhāvā iminā suttena\(^3\) yuttatthasamāso na hotī ti nāpanattham yuttattho ti padaṃ ācariyena vuttaṃ.

Why has the master stated the word “combined meaning” (yuttattho)? The master has stated “combined meaning” in order to explain that, in examples such as “the servant of the king, son of Devadatta,” even though they are [all] nouns, there is no combined meaning due to the unrelatedness of the word “son” with the word “king,” [and] therefore the present sutta [Kacc 318] does not allow it as a compound with a combined meaning.

bho ācariya. samāsa icc anena samāsa iti saññākaraṇena kva katarasmiṃ\(^4\) padese attho payojanaṃ bhavati. kvaci samāsantagatānām akāranto [Kacc 339] ty ādi suttappadesesu samāsa iti vohārapayojanaṃ bhavati.

O teacher: with the word “compound”, i.e. by means of the technical name “compound,” where, i.e. relating to which place [i.e. sutta], is the object (attho), i.e. the purpose (payojanaṃ)? The purpose of the usage of “compound” is found in suttas where it applies (suttappadesesu), such as “sometimes a-ending [is prescribed] for the words at the end of a compound” [Kacc 339], etc.

---

\(^1\) U, T, D read kimattham ācariyena vuttaṃ, following the natural order of the formula in Mmd.
\(^2\) B, D sambandhabhāvena.
\(^3\) B, U, T, D om.
\(^4\) C katarasmiṃ sutte.
kvattho ko attho ti vā padacchedaṃ karonti.

Alternatively some make the word division of kvattho as ko attho “what [is the] object.”

NOTE: This seems actually to be the correct word division, although Saddhammajotipāla prefers the previous one. As I have pointed out in the beginning of this section, Pind considers the payogas of Kacc 318 to be interpolations. But we would perhaps expect an erudite scholar such as Saddhammajotipāla to point out the absence of this section in some manuscripts or some commentaries. What we find is the opposite: he seems to be aware of a tradition of grammarians that do comment upon the payoga section. Therefore I think it should be read in the text of Kacc-v. Furthermore, it has to be pointed out that an indigenous tradition of grammarians consider the payoga section of Kacc a sort of independent commentary composed by a certain Brahmadatta.¹

idāni sabbādhāraṇasaṅñānāntaraṃ sati pi visesasaṅñānaṃ paṭhamaṃ²-vattabbabhāve³ sabbādhāraṇavidhiṃ⁴ dassetuṃ ... 

Now, after the definition which is common to all [compounds,] in order to show an operational sutta [that is also] general to all [compounds, and] even though the particular definitions should come first, ... 

NOTE: The point of this introduction is the following: we expect the beginning of the chapter to give us the necessary definitions: first, general definitions, next, particular definitions, and after that, we expect the grammarian to give us the operational rules. Now, what happens here is different, for the author of Kacc has decided to give another general sutta before going into the particular definitions, even if this general sutta is already an operation, and not a definition.

¹ The locus classicus is Kaccāyanabheda-navaṭīkā 129,15–30.
² B, S, T, D om. 
³ U vattabbaṃ bhāve.
⁴ T sabbādhāraṇavidhi.
it says:

319. And the case endings of them [are] elided.

NOTE: Kāt reads only teṣāṃ vibhaktayāḥ lopyāḥ, which constitutes the second pada of the first śloka of the chapter. The ca in Kacc is either an interpolation or an original feature incorporated by Kacc. The particle ca is interpreted as expressing a “restriction” (avadhāraṇa).

Therein, tesāṃ (“of them”) is one word, vibhattiyo (“the case endings”) is one word, lopā (“elided”) is one word, ca (“and”) is one word. On account of the division of words according to their case endings, this sutta has to be considered as having four words. tesāṃ expresses a genitive of relation, vibhattiyo expresses the object of the operation (kāri), lopā expresses the operation to be done (kāriya), ca expresses a restriction. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta.
The words *yuttatthānaṃ samāsānaṃ*, even though they have been stated in the singular in the previous sutta, they are now retrieved (*anuvattanti*) being changed into the plural, due being related to (*paramāsitattā*) the word *tesaṃ* [in the present sutta, which is stated] in the plural [but refers to the singular *yuttattho* in the previous sutta].

But why, even if in the former sutta it has been stated in the singular, is it now stated in the plural as *tesaṃ* [instead of *tassa*]? It is stated in order to show the six types of nouns. Because here, since he is going to say, [subsequently,] “And the [original] base of the [nominal base] that ends in a vowel” [Kacc 320], the word *vibhattiyo* should include only the replacements which are the case endings.
In the Sanskrit books of the Kalāpa and so on, because of the absence of the sutta regarding the [original] base (pakatisuttassa), doing without the replacement, they simply prescribe the elision of the case endings of the nominal base, and by those two [rules: Kacc 318 and 319], the rest is included (saṅgaṇhāti). Anticipating (manasikatvā) the objection (codanaṃ), [namely:] “Why is it that, even though there is recurrence of [the word] yuttatthasamāsānaṃ, the word tesāṃ is included in the sutta?”, he says “with the mention of the word tesāṃ,” etc.

NOTE: It is difficult to understand why Saddhammajotipāla says that the Kalāpa does not have the rule on pakati. It may be that the Kalāpa text in Burma did not exactly correspond to our Kātantra. The last part of the discussion is a reference to Kacc-v 108, 1-2: tesāṃgahaṇenā samāsataddhitākhyātakappānaṃ paccayapadakkharāgamānañ ca lopā honti “with the mention of tesāṃ, there are also the elisions of affixes, words, speech sounds and augments and compounds, secondary derivatives, verbs, and primary derivatives.” When Saddhammajotipāla says āha, the subject is the vuttikāra. It is noteworthy that Pind reads -kappānaṃ with Kacc-nidd, but Kacc B and Sadd read only samāsataddhitākhyātakitānaṃ.

---

2 D katevā.
3 B, S, U, T, D ubhayasamāse for ubhayehi sesaṃ. I think C is has the correct reading here.
4 T anuvattamāne.
5 C, T gahitan.
In the *Rūpasiddhi* and the *Atthabyākhyāna* they also state exactly (*eva*) this implied meaning.

[145] they also (*pi*) state that, anticipating the objection, namely: “Because in the previous sutta he has said *samāso yuttattho* in the singular, it would work (*vattabbe*) as well (*vā*) saying *tassa* [instead of *tesaṃ*] *vibhattiyo lopā*; why does he say *tesaṃ*, [using the plural]?”, he says the gloss (*vuttī*) “with the mention of *tesaṃ* ...”, etc.

*yady evaṃ,* *bahuvacanesu vo no* [Kacc 151] *ti ādīsu viya bahuvacanaggahaṇenā ti vattabbaṃ na tesaṅgahaṇenā ti ce,* *abhinnapadavasena* evaṃ *vuttaṃ.*

If it is so, we should find the mention of the word *bahuvana* as in examples such as Kacc 151 ‘*vo* and *no* [are replacements] in the plural,’ but not the mention of the word *tesaṃ*. [To this objection we would reply that] it is stated thus [that is, using the word *tesaṃ*] because the word is not split [into the double referent *yuttatthānaṃ samāsanāṇaṃ*]. Their implication is that it is like dragging in the entire book.

---

1 Com.

2 U, T, D *vuttan ti*.

3 T *bhinnapadavasena*.

4 B, U *hatthassākaḍḍhanaṃ.* T *tattassākaḍḍhanaṃ.*
NOTE: I think the main point of the siddhāntin is that prolixity should be avoided, because it would be like dragging everything into every rule, and that is against the economy of words that characterises vyakarana. There is an alternative reading hatthassa “dragging of the hand” which, in my opinion, makes lesser sense.

tattha samāsā ti mahan’ta ca so puriso că ti mahāpuriso iCC ādayo saṃgaṇhāti, taddhitā ti vasiṭṭhasa apaccam vasiṭṭho iCC ādayo saṃgaṇhāti, ākkhyātā ti cicciṭτam1 iva attānam ācaratī ti cicciṭāyiati, saṃgho pabbatam iva attānam ācaratī ti pabbatāyati iCC ādayo saṃgaṇhāti. kitakappānan ti kumbhaṃ karotī ti kumbhakāro, ratham karotī ti2 rathakāro iCC ādayo saṃgaṇhāti.3 atthabyākhyāne pi imān’ eva āharatī4.

Therein, the technical name “compound” includes cases such as “he is a man and he is great: a great man;” taddhita includes cases such as “the son of Vasiṭṭha: Vasiṭṭha;” the verb includes cases such as “he treats himself like a hiss: he hisses,” “the Saṃgha acts as a mountain: it mountains;” the primary derivatives include cases such as “he makes pots: pot maker” [or] “he makes chariots: chariot maker.” Also in the Atthabyākhyāna he [i.e. the author] includes these [cases].

tattha samāse ca soādipadakkharānam5 eva6 lopo. vibhattīnaṃ pana suttena lopo. atthabyākhyāne pana vibhattilopo ti vutto. tenāha kaṭhīnadussan ti evam ādi samāse ti.

---

1 B, S, U cicciṭτam. T cicciṭτam
2 B, U, D om. ratham karotī ti
3 T has the text from kitakappānaṃ up to this point in the right margin of the ms.
4 C saṃgaṇhāti
5 D ādipadakkharānam
6 U, T eva ca
Therein, also (ca), in a compound, the elision is only of the speech sounds [or] words such as so, etc. By the [present] sutta, however, the elision applies to the case endings [as well]. In the Atthabyākhyāna, again, it is stated: “elision of the case endings.” That is why he says: “in a compound such as kaṭhīnadussaṃ,” etc.¹

rūpasiddhibhassādīsu² pana samāsaggahaṇaṃ na gahitan ti.

In the Rūpasiddhi, the Bhassa, and other works, however, the mention of samāsa is not included.

taddhite vibhattipadakkharalopo, ākhyāte sabbalopo, kitake vibhattippaccayalopo labhathi. catūsu hi ṭhānesu tesaṃgahaṇena vā vuttaṭṭhānam³ appayogo ti suttena vā⁴ padakkharānaṃ lopo hoti. vibhattippaccayānaṃ pana tesaṃgahaṇena vā ti adhippāyo.

In taddhita there is elision of the case ending, word, and speech sound; in the verb there is elision of all; in kitaka there is elision of the case ending and the affix. In the four instances [that is, in the four types of words], in any case, there is elision of the speech sounds [and] words, whether it is because of the mention of tesaṃ, or because of the sutta that says “non employment of the already stated meanings.” The implied meaning, however, is that, optionally, by mentioning tesaṃ [in the sutta, the elision affects only] the case suffixes.

NOTE: What Saddhammajotipāla calls a sutta is actually a rule (ñāya), according to the Bālavatāra. This rule is used in Rūp and Bāl in the samāsa chapter. See DSG s.v. aprayoga: “(2) non-employment cf. uktārthānam aprayogaḥ a standard dictum of grammar not allowing superfluous words which is

¹ Kacc-v 107,10.
² B, U, D bhassakariādissu. S bhattachariādissu.
³ U vuttaṭṭhānam.
⁴ B, U, D om. suttena vā.
The Samāsakappa of the Suttaniddesa

given in M.Bh. on P.1.1.44 Vārt. 16 and stated in Cāndra and other grammars as a paribhāṣā.” In the following passage Saddhammajaṭipāla is going to explain that the Nyāsa works only with the paribhāṣā, but his conclusion remains that when an elision is to be made, it can be made on account of this paribhāsa or on account of the mention of tesaṃ in the present rule. This, again, seems to be a genuine contribution of Kacc-nidd.

ñāsādīsu pana vuttaṭṭhānam¹ appayogo ti suttam eva lañcheti.² kaṭhinassa dussan ti ādi samāsavākyesu vā kumbhakāro ti³ ādi kitantasamāsavākyesu vā samāsasānīnā tappurisādi‘visesasañana katā⁵ yeva. suttena vā tesaṃgahaṇena vā yathānurūpam vibhātippaccayapadakkharānaṃ lopo kātabbo.

However, in the Nyāsa and other works, only the sutta “non employment of the already stated meanings” (vuttaṭṭhānam appayogo) is used [in the present discussion on what exactly has to be elided]. In compound expressions such as kaṭhinassa dussan [= kaṭhinadussan], or in kitanta compound expressions such as kumbhakāra, the technical name “compound” is simply made as a definition which qualifies the tappurisa and the other types of words. With the sutta [vuttaṭṭhānam appayogo], or with the mention of tesaṃ, the elision should apply (kātabbo) according to what is suitable, [either] to the speech sounds, or to words, [or] to case suffixes.

apare pana vibhātīdilope kate samāsādisaṃnī katā pi yujjāti ti vadanti.

Others, however, state that it also holds good (yujjāti) if the definition of samāsa and the other types of words is made once the elision of the case ending, etc., has been made.

1 B vuttaṭṭhānam.
3 U, T, D read kumbhāṃ karoti ti.
4 T tappurisā ti.
5 B, S, U, T, D kate.
tam tesam vibhattiya lopæ ce ti iminæ virujjhati.

That is forbidden by the [sutta Kacc 319] “And the case endings of them [are] elided.”

ākhyāte ciciṭam¹ iva attānam ācaraḍ² ti ettha āya nāmato kattupamān̄d ācāre [Kacc 437] ti iminā ciciṭaⁿāmato āyappaccayaṃ katvā idha sutte tesāmgahaṇena anvibhattipadakkharāṇaṃ lopaṃ katvā pakati cassa sarantassā [Kacc 320] ti ettha caggahaṇena ciciṭāya iti⁴ pakatiṃ katvā parakkharāṃ netvā dhātuppaccayehi vibhattiya ti paribhāsaṃ katvā tivibhattiṃ katvā ciciṭāyatī⁵ ti siddhaṃ.

In a verb: in the example “he has the habit of making [a sound] like ciṭ-ciṭ,” here, by the rule “the affix āya is added to the noun showing similarity to the agent,” after the noun ciciṭa, the affix āya is added. In the present sutta, with the mention of tesam, the elision of speech sound [or] word, and the case ending am is made. [Now,] according to the sutta “and the [original] base of the [nominal base] that ends in a vowel” [Kacc 320], here, with the mention of ca, the nominal base ciciṭāya is made. Taking the next speech sound, [and] following the metarule “the affixes [are added] after verbal roots and affixes,” the verbal ending ti is inserted [and] the word ciciṭāyati is formed.

---

¹ B, S, U ciciṭam. T ciciṭam.
² C āvacarati.
³ B, S, U ciciṭa. T ciciṭa.
⁵ B, D ciciṭāyatī. T ciciṭāyati.
In a primary derivative (kitake), the sentence “he makes a pot” is made. Here, with the mention of tesāṃ [in the present sutta], one makes the elision of the nominal ending aṃ [in kumbhaṃ], the affix o [in kar-o-tī], and the verbal ending tī. With the mention of ca in the sutta on the nominal base [that is, in Kacc 320 pakati cassa sarantassa], the nominal base kumbhakāra is made. [Next] one brings in the definition of the verbal root √kara in the sense of “instrument” (karaṇe) with reference to the preceeding word, namely: kumbha “pot,” and one makes the elision of the ending vowel of the verbal root [kara > kar]. The case ending aṃ is added after the word kumbha. And the affix a after the verbal root kara, according [to the sutta] “after any [verbal root the affixes] a, ṛvu, tu, āvī [can be added],” one takes the affix a, and, because of [the present word in formation] is a kita, it is treated as if it were a noun, [therefore] one applies the case endings si, etc., to it. And one makes the definition of
tappurisa compound, etc., in the sense of kumbhaṇḍ karoti “he makes a pot.” By the present sutta the elision of the case endings aṃ and si, etc. is made, and the nominal base kumbhakāra is obtained. Because of its being a samāsa, one treats it as a noun, and applying the case endings to it, the word is formed.

NOTE: Some of the affixes mentioned in Kacc 529 are technical terms: a (e.g. hitakara “one who does well”), ṇvu = aka (e.g. dāyaka “giver”), tu = tā (Skt. tr) (e.g. kattā “doer”), and āvī (e.g. dassāvi “one who sees”), see Senart, 1871: 268.

caggahaṇaṃ pabhaṅkaro amatandado medhaṅkaro ty ādīsu avadhāraṇatthatḥ vuttaṃ¹. avadhāraṇaṃ² hi³ duvidhaṃ sanniṭṭhāpanaṃ⁴ nivattāpanañ cā ti.

The mention of ca is meant to restrict cases such as pabhaṅkaro “day-maker,” amatandado “immortality-giver,” medhaṅkaro “wisdom-maker,” and so forth. Because restriction (avadhāraṇa) is of two kinds: causing limitation and causing exclusion.

vuttañ ca
sanniṭṭhāpanakaraṇaṃ vidhinivattanam⁵ pi ca
duvidhaṃ avadhāraṇaṃ kaccāyanena⁶ pakāsitan ti.

And it has been stated:

Kaccāyana shows two kinds of restriction: a restriction that causes limitation (sanniṭṭhāpana), and also a restriction that causes the exclusion (nivattana) of an operational rule (vidhi).

1 C om.
2 D avadhāraṃ.
3 C hi nāma.
4 B, S, U, D sanniṭṭhāpakam.
5 U vidhinivattanam naṃ. T vidhinivattanaṃ.
6 U, D kaccānena.
idha pana nivattāpanāvadhāraṇam adhīppetam. tattha pabhaṃ karoti ti vākyaṃ ṭhapetvā tesaṃgahaṇena vibhattippaccayalopaṃ kadā pahasaddūpapadassa kara karaṇe tīmassā ti ādi rūpasiddhi niṣe oloketabbā.

Here, however, it has to be understood as restriction causing exclusion. Therein, having created (ṭhapetvā) a sentence such as pabhaṃ karoti, with the mention of the word tesaṃ [in Kacc 319] one makes the elision of the nominal case ending. With the mention of ca in the sutta referring to the nominal base [Kacc 320], the base pabhaṃkara is made. The verbal root ākara in the sense of “instrument” with reference to the preceding word, etc. — the word formation has to be looked up in the Nyāsa.

NOTE: The point of this demonstration via negativa is that, if we follow the same sequence of operations, at some point the aṃ ending of pabhaṃ will be elided and the final word will be *pabhakara. The word ca, according to the commentator, allows for some restrictions, exceptions to the general rule, e.g. pabhaṃkara.

1 C pabhaṃkari.
2 T oloketabbo.
320. And the [original] base of the [nominal base\(^1\)] that ends in a vowel.

catuppadam idam. pakatī ti kāriya, cā ti samuccaya, assā ti sambandhachāṭṭhikārī, sarantassā ti tabbisesana. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. idha caggahaṇena rūpasiddhīte kiṃsamudayō\(^2\) idappaccayatā ty ādīsu byañjanantassa pakatibhāvaṃ samuccinno ti.\(^3\) atthabyākhyāne pana caggahaṇaṃ taddhitādipakatibhāvaṃ sampiṇḍetī ti vuttaṃ. apare pana\(^4\) lopānukaḍḍhanan ti vakanti.

This [sutta consists of] four words. “Base” (pakatī) is the grammatical operation (kāriya), “and” (ca) denotes accumulation, “of the [nominal base]” (assa) is a genitive of relation expressing that which undergoes a grammatical operation (kārī), “that ends in a vowel” (sarantassa) expresses its qualification. Among the types of sutta, this one has to be considered as an operational sutta. Therein, in the opinion of the Rūpasiddhi, with the mention of ca, [there is] exclusion of the base status (pakatibhāvaṃ) of [a word] ending in a consonant, as in examples such as kiṃsamudaya and idappaccayatā. In the Atthabyākhyāna, however, it is stated that the mention of ca combines (sampiṇḍetī) the base status of a taddhita formation and other types of formation. Others, however, say that it [that is to say ca] is a continued reference to the word lopa (“elision”) [in Kacc 319].

---

\(^1\) For the translation assa “of that [nominal base]” I follow the vuttī: assa sarantassa liṅgassa (Kacc-v 108,6).


\(^3\) U, T, D samuccinoti.

\(^4\) S, T pada. C para.
The Samāsakappa of the Suttaniddesa

NOTE: The following is the full passage in Rūp: luttāsu vibhattīsu sarantassa assa yuttatthabhūtassa tividhassa pi liṅgassa pakatibhāvo hoti. casaddena kiṃsamudaya-idappaccayatādisu niggahītantassa pi. nimittābhāve nemittakābhāvassa idha anicchitattā ayam atideso.¹ This is a reference to a paribhāṣā (DSG s.v. nimitta): nimittābhāve naimittikasyāpy abhāvaḥ “When there is absence of the formal cause [for a grammatical operation] (nimitta), there is also absence of that which is brought about by that cause.” But the Pāli version has a different wording, and one wonders whether that is a mistake or a re-interpretation of the metarule. Moreover, we would expect an (i)ti after the paribhāṣā. In any case, what Rūp says is that the ca excludes pakatis like kiṃ or idaṃ, because they end in consonants.

nanu ca idaṃ suttaṃ tesam vibhattiyo lopā cā ti viya pakati ca tesam sarantānan ti vattabbaṃ. kasmā ekavacanantena vuttanta² ti.

But is it not true that this sutta, as the sutta tesam vibhattiyo lopā ca, should be pakati ca tesam sarantānaṃ [and not pakati cassa sarantassa]? Why is it formulated (kataṃ) in the singular?

ekatthībhāvo³ samāsalakkhaṇan ti katvā tathā vuttanm.

It is stated in this way after defining “compound” as [a word] having one single meaning [i.e. a referent].

NOTE: What the commentator implies is that the first sutta of the section with the definition (saṅā = lakkaṇan) of samāsa, is formulated in the singular, and it also implies that, even though the compound is formed with two or more words, their referent is only one, it has a single meaning, and therefore one can refer to it in the singular (ekavacanena).

¹ Rūp 179.16–19.
² C katan.
³ C ekatthabhāvo.
yady evam kasmā lopasuttaṃ ekavacanena na\(^1\) vuttan ti.

If it is so, why then is the sutta on elision [i.e. Kacc 319 \textit{tesaṃ vibhattiyo lopā ca}] not formulated in the singular?

sappayojanattā vuttaṃ hi\(^2\) tattha tesāmgahānenā ti ādi.

It is stated there mentioning \textit{tesaṃ} [and not \textit{tassa}], etc. in order to suit its own purpose.

NOTE: The sutta on elision refers to the words (in the plural) forming the compound, and not to the compound as a single unit. Therefore it uses the plural \textit{tesaṃ} and not the singular \textit{tassa}. This is how I understand Saddhammajotipāla’s comment.

\textit{evam hotu, kasmā vuttiyaṃ pakatirūpāṇi\(^3\)hontī ti bahuvacanantena vuttan ti.}

Let it be so, why [then], in the \textit{vutti}, is it stated, in the plural: “they are (honti) the forms of the nominal base (\textit{pakatirūpāṇi})”?

\textit{pakatibhāvassa samāsato pubbe vākyā\(^4\)padesu ṭhitattā tathā vuttan ti. rūpasiddhiādīsu pana ekavacanantena vuttaṃ.}

It has been stated in this way because it [i.e. the sutta] has been posited (\textit{ṭhitattā}) with reference to the words that are previous to the compound which is a nominal base. But in the \textit{Rūpasiddhi} and other treatises it is formulated with a singular ending (\textit{ekavacanantena}).

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{1}  B, U, D \textit{ekavacanantena}. S, T \textit{ekavacanantena na}.
\textit{2}  T \textit{ti}.
\textit{4}  B, U \textit{vākyāṃ}.
\end{flushleft}
NOTE: The point is that the plural refers to the words that form the compound, not to the compound.

kasmā pana idaṃ suttaṃ vuttaṃ. nanu ca asati imasmiṃ sutte mahīruhachāyā viya puna pakatibhāvo āgacchati. yathā hi suriyā'lokanimitte āgate satī mahī ruhachāyā atthi vigate sati chāyā natthi. tathā ādesasaranimitte sati pakatissaralo po hoti, tasmiṃ pubbasuttena vigate puna pakati hoti ti.

But why is this sutta formulated [at all]? Is it not true, also (ca), that, without this sutta, again, the base state comes as the shadow of a tree [projected] on the earth? Because, as when the light of the sun appears, the earth is shadowed by trees, but when [the light of the sun] disappears, there is no shadow; similarly, when the vowel [which is] the condition for the replacement is there, the elision of the vowel of the base is there, [but] when that [vowel which is the condition] disappears by the force of the previous sutta, the [original] base reappears again [i.e. it does not undergo elision].

NOTE: The point of the pūrvapakṣa is that the sutta is superfluous because if we grant, with Kacc 319, that the vibhattis are elided (Kacc-v 108, 6: luttāsu vibhattisu), then it logically follows that the only thing that remains is the base (pakati).

1 D sūriyā.
2 U, T, D om.
3 B, S, U D add mahīruhanimitte vā sati chāyā atthi, vigate sati chāyā natthi.
4 B, U, D ādesasaranimitte.
5 B, U, D pakatissaralo po.
na hoti. nemittikassa\(^1\) phalassa tathā niyamābhāvā. yathā hi candakantamaṇīdādayo paṭicca udakādayo pavattanti tesu vigatesu pi udakādayo tiṭṭhanti, tathā satthādīsu pi vibhattinimitte [147] sati ukārassa akārādeso hoti. tasmiṃ lope pi ukāra’pakatibhāvo na hoti. nemittikabhūto\(^3\) ākāro va tiṭṭhatī ti. tasmā tādisassa atappasaṅgassa\(^4\) nivattanattham idam suttaṃ vuttan ti.

[No, the original base] is not [necessarily there]. For in this way [that is, without the present sutta] there is absence of a restriction with regard to the effected (nemittikassa) result (phalassa). Because, as water and other elements ooze depending on the presence of the moonstone and other gems, [but] even when they [the moonstone and other gems] disappear, the water and other elements remain [oozing]; similarly, also in examples such as satthu “master”, etc., when there is the condition of a vibhatti, \(a\) replaces \(u\), [and] also when it [that is to say \(u\)] is elided, the base state ending in \(u\) is not there, and only the \(a\) which is the result of a condition remains. Therefore the present sutta is stated in order to prevent such an unwanted consequence with regard to the \(a\).

moggallānakalāpapakaraṇādisu pana mahīruhachāyānayaṃ gahetvā idam suttaṃ na paṭhanti, vibhattivipariṇāmena anuvattanattā\(^5\) luttāsu vibhattīsū\(^6\) ti vuttam.

However, in treatises such as Moggallāna and the Kalāpa, they do not read this sutta resorting (gahetvā) to the rule of the shadow of a tree [projected] on the earth, they [simply] say “when the case endings are elided” due to the recurrence with the change applied to the

---

1 U, T, D nemittakassa.
2 B, S, U, D ukārassa.
3 U, D nemittakabhūto. T nimittakabhūto.
5 U, T, D anuvattattā.
6 Kāt-v ad Kāt 340: svarūntasya liṅgasya yuktārthasya luptāsu vibhaktīsu prakṛtiś ca bhavati.
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case endings prescribed by the previous sūtra in Kātantra 339 tatsthā lopyā vibhaktayah “the case endings that are in such a place are to be elided”.

saratassa pubbe sarantabhāvena ṭhitassā¹ assa samāsabhūtassa liṅgassa pakatirūpānī² sarantāni³ hontī ti attho.

The meaning is: of that, i.e. of that nominal base which is a compound, which ends in a vowel, i.e. which has been established before on account of ending in a vowel, the forms of the original base (pakati), ending in a vowel, take place.

NOTE: The vowel-ending word goes first (pubbe) in the word formation string. This is a gloss on Kacc-v 108, 6.

kasmā⁴ sarantassā ti vuttaṃ. nanu kiṃsamudayo⁵ ti ādīsu byaṅjanantassāpi pakatibhāvo hotī ti.

Why is “of the [word] that ends in a vowel” stated? Is it not true that the base state is there even of words ending in consonants, as for instance in kiṃsamudaya?

NOTE: kiṃ ends in a consonant, but it is the first member of a compound and is considered a base (pakati) ending in a consonant. Therefore bases that end in consonants should be included as well.

Why does the suttakāra say only “of the [word] that ends in a vowel?” This is the objection.

---

1 T ti tassa.
2 C pakātī pakatirūpānī.
3 C, S saravantānī.
4 U, T, D kasmā pana.
5 D samudayo.
saccaṃ. tathāpi sarantassa pakatibhāvena kvacatthassa anicchitattā pakati cassā ti ettakam¹ avatvā sarantassā ti vuttaṃ. byaṅjanantassa pana² pakatibhāvo katthaci hoti, katthaci na hoti. tathā hi kiṃsamudayo ti ādīsu pakatibhāvo hoti. ko nāmāyaṃ³ bhante dhammapariyāyo konāmo te upajjhāyo ti ādīsu na hoti.

True. Nevertheless (tathāpi), because the [word] that ends in a vowel has a base state, [and] because optionality (kvacattha) is not desirable, it is not merely stated “and the base [instead] of it,” [but] it is stated “[the base] that ends in a vowel.” Sometimes, however, a [word] that ends in a consonant has the nature of a base [that is, it constitutes a base], and sometimes it does not. For, in this way, in the expression kiṃsamudayo, it has the nature of a base, but in expressions such as “What is the name (konāmo), venerable Sir, of this discourse on the Dhamma?” “What is the name (konāmo) of your mentor?”, it does not.

NOTE: In the last example reference is made to the base ki (or in the masculine, ka). Our grammarian presupposes that they are the same. In the case of kiṃsamudāyo it ends in a consonant (ṃ), in the case of konāmāyaṃ, it ends in a vowel). The argument does not seem very convincing, unless we take konāma as a compound, which is what Saddhammajotipāla is apparently doing.

¹ U, T ettha kam.
² C om.
³ B, U, D nāma.
tenāha saddanītiyaṃ: kvaci byañjanantassa vibhattilo pakati hoti ti ca. kvaci ti kīṃ. konāmāyaṃ bhante dhammapariyāyo cā ti.³

That is why in the Saddanīti he [namely the author] says: “sometimes the base replaces a word ending in a consonant after the elision of the case ending. And why [do we say] “sometimes”? [See the exception:] “What is the name, venerable Sir, of this discourse on the Dhamma?”

That is why in the Saddanīti he [namely the author] says: “sometimes the base replaces a word ending in a consonant after the elision of the case ending. And why [do we say] “sometimes”? [See the exception:] “What is the name, venerable Sir, of this discourse on the Dhamma?”

idappaccayatā ti etam rūpasiddhiādisu idasaddo niggahitanto ti gahetvā byañjanantassa pakatibhāvena gahitaṃ. saddanītiādisu pana idāsaddo saranto ti gahetvā, sarantassa pakatibhāvena gahitaṃ.⁷ ettha hi idāsaddo niggahitanto vā hotu saranto vā nipāto ti datṭhabbo. na imasaddassādeso. imesaṃ paccayā idappaccayā ti hi aṇṇapadenca viggaho niccasamāsattā ti.

The word idappaccayatā is included in the Rūpasiddhi and other treatises [because] the word ida is taken as ending in ŋ, and its base state ends in a consonant. In the Saddanīti and other treatises, however, the word ida is taken as ending in a vowel, and its base state ends in a vowel. For, in this case, the word ida should either end in niggahīta or be considered an
indelinable (nipāta) ending in a vowel. It is not a replacement of ima. Because (hi), since it is an obligatory compound (niccasamāsattā), the word separation (viggała) [has to be carried out] with another word [namely with ima, not ida]: imesaṃ paccayā = idappaccayā [i.e. not *idesaṃ paccayā = idappaccayā].

NOTE: The reference is to the following passage in Sadd (745, 15–20): 693 vibhattilope sarantassa liṅgassa pakati.
yyāsapadānāṃ vibhattilope kate sarantassa liṅgassa pakatirūpaṃ hoti: cakkhusotam, rājaputto, imesaṃ paccayā idappaccayā icc evam ādi. imasmiṃ thāne pakatirūpaṃ nāma luttasarassa punānayanavasena ca katimādesassa idasaddassa puna attano pakatiyaṃ thitabhāvena ca veditabbaṃ.

“693. When the case ending is elided, the original base replaces the nominal base ending in a vowel. When the case endings of the separate words are elided, what remains is the original nominal base that ends in a vowel, as in cakkhusotam “eye and ear” [not *cakkhuṃsotam], rājaputto “son of the king” [not *rañño putto], imesaṃ paccayā [=] idapaccayā “conditioned by those” [not *imappaccayā], etc. In this case (thāne) [i.e. the word idappaccayā] the form of the original base has simply (nāma) to be understood (veditabbaṃ) both (ca) because of the retrieval (punānaya) of the elided vowel, and (ca) because the word ida, which is a replacement of the word katima, has the condition of staying in its own original base.” Saddhammajotipāla, however, explicitly contradicts the Saddanīti: in the compound idappaccayā, ida is a nipāta, “not a replacement of the word ima” (na imādesassādeso), in spite of what the viggała seems to reveal. The viggała is arrived at with the pronoun ima in want of an alternative.
Thus, having shown the general definitions and operational rules, in order to show the particular definitions, it begins:

321. [A compound] preceded by a preverb or a particle [receives the technical name] \textit{avyayibhava}.

Therein, this sutta consists of two words. “Preceded by a preverb or a particle” (\textit{upasagganipatapubbaka}) expresses that which receives the technical name; \textit{abyayibhava} expresses the technical name. Among the different types of \textit{sutta}, this is a sutta [defining a] technical name.

\textit{upasagganipatapubbako yo yuttattho samaso hoti} so \textit{abyayibhavasaanno hoti}.

That compound of combined meaning which is preceded by a preverb or by a particle receives the technical name \textit{abyayibhava} (“[compound] of indivisible nature”).

\textbf{NOTE:} The \textit{avyayibhava} is usually called “adverbial compound” because it has the nature of an adverb, that is to say an indeclinable word. In this type of compound, as we will subsequently see, the

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] D \textit{idani visesasaanNVidhayo}.
\item[2] T, D \textit{dvipadam}.
\item[3] C om.
\end{itemize}
first term, being an indeclinable, plays the role of the principal word (DSG). Renou translates
avyāyībhāva as “accession à l’état d’invariant.”

idaṃ suttaṃ samāsavidhāyakañ ca saññāvidhāyakañ ca hoti.

This sutta prescribes a compound and prescribes a definition as well.

NOTE: The pūrvapakṣa (?) is trying to point out that the nature of this sutta is double, for it can be
read as a definition of what an avyāyībhāva is, or it can be read as the prescription of how to form a
compound.

yadi samāsavidhāyakaṃ siyā, kasmā upasagganipātā. yadā samasyante tadā so
samāso abyayībhāvasañño hotī ti na vuttan ti.

If it were to prescribe a compound, why [do we need to specify] “preverbs and particles”? It
is not stated that when they [i.e. words] are compounded, the compound receives the name
“indivisible.”

NOTE: The objection has to do with the etymology of the word abyayībhāva “having an indivisible
nature.” How is it possible that a compound is a combination of two or more words and, at the same
time, it is indivisible? In other words, if the members are never found independently, why do we
consider them as multiple? This objection precludes the interpretation of this suttas as an operational
sutta.

1 Renou, 1942: 70.
2 U, D idaṃ hi.
3 C om.
From a general point of view, this is an obligatory compound, because it is obligatory, but if we give more relevance to the words, it is non-obligatory. Similarly in cases such as *majjhesamuddasmiṃ* “in the middle of the ocean” and *tiropbbatam* “beyond the mountain” [if] we give more relevance to the meaning [than to the fact that these are indivisible compounds].

NOTE: The rebuke is very synthetic and elusive. If I understand it properly, the *siddhāntin* argues that the obligatory condition of *avyayībhāva* compounds is a general label, but we can analyse them as non-obligatory compounds if we give more relevance to the members of the compound, either the words or their referents.

That [compounds] which is preceded by a preverb or a particle is [called] “preceded by a preverb or a particle,” that is to say, [a compound] in which the meaning of the preverb or
the particle is predominant. By the same principle it is [considered] an \textit{abyāyībhāva} compound in cases where the meaning of the last word is predominant [if it is a preverb or a particle], as in examples such as “towards the river Nerañjarā” (\textit{nerañjarapati}), “towards the forest” (\textit{vanappati}), [or] in cases where there is predominance of another entity [not stated within the compound], as in the example “[in] the Ummatta [part] of the Gaṅgā river” (\textit{ummattagaṅgaṃ}).

\textit{abrāhmaṇādīsu}¹ yaṁ hi pubbapadatthappadhāno [148] \textit{abyāyībhāvo} ti vuttaṁ, taṁ yebhuyyavasena vuttaṁ.

With regard to examples such as “non-\textit{brāhmaṇa}” (\textit{abrāhmaṇa}), because it is stated that an \textit{avyayībhāva} compound is the one in which the meaning of the first member is predominant, therefore this one is generally stated [as \textit{avyayībhāva}].

\textit{sabbaliṅgavibhattī² vacanesu} na byayanti³ na nassantī ti abyayā. liṅgādīsu sabbe⁴ sadisā ti attho. ke te. upasagganipātā. tesāṁ abyayānam atthaṁ vibhāveti, tehi vā saddhiṁ bhavati tadaṭṭhapādhāṇavasenā ti abyayībhāvo. \textit{abyayatthappadhānattā} nānārūpaṁ na hotī ti attho.

“Indivisible” (\textit{abyayā}) [means that] they are not divided, i.e. they are not lost (\textit{nassantī}) in expressions (\textit{vacanesu}) with regard to every case ending of the nominal base. That is to say, with regard to gender, etc., they all [remain] true to their own forms (\textit{sadisā}). What are these [indivisibles]? The preverbs (\textit{upasagga}) and the particles (\textit{nīpāta}). It is called “indivisible [compound]” (\textit{avyāyībhāvo}) because it explains (\textit{vibhāveti}) the meaning of those that are indivisible; or, alternatively, because it appears (\textit{bhavati}) with them [that is with \textit{upasaggas}]

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] B, S, U, D \textit{na abrāhmaṇo ti ādisu}. T \textit{na brahmaṇo ti ādisu}.
\item[2] U, T, D *\textit{vibhattī}.
\item[3] C, T \textit{abyayan ti}.
\item[4] C \textit{sabbesam}.
\end{itemize}
and nipātas] (tehi saddhiṃ) on account of the predominance of their meaning. That is to say, because of the predominance of the meaning of the indivisible words, [the avyayībhāva compound] does not have different forms (nānārūpaṃ).

NOTE: My interpretation of sadisā as meaning “the form” refers to the form they would have outside the compound. The word vinassati (Skt. vinaśyate) means “to disappear.” What does not disappear is the case ending (vibhatti) of the first members of the compound.

sati pi ekadesena anabyayabhāve tadatthappadhānattā abyayībhāvasamāso nāma.

Even if a part of it is not indivisible, it is called avyayībhāva compound on account of the predominance of its meaning [namely the predominance of the meaning of the indivisible member].

yathā majjhesamuddasmin ti ādi abyayan ti yebhuyyavasena vuttaṃ, na sabbasaṅgāhavasenā¹ ti.

In examples such as “in the middle of the ocean,” it is stated as indivisible in a general way, but not including every single [instance].

so ca samāso duvidho upasaggapubbako ca nipātapubbako cā ti.

Furthermore, this compound is of two types: with a preverb as the first member and with a particle as the first member.

¹ D sabbasaṅgāhavasena.
That is why he says: “in this respect, the avyayībhāva compound is twofold.”

In the Akkharasamūha and other treatises, however, it is stated that it is threefold on account of the predominance of the first member, [the last member, or another one].

In this respect, predominance of the first member, for instance: upanagaran “near the city;” predominance of the last member, for instance: nerañjarappati “towards the Nerañjarā river,” or vanappati “towards the forest;” predominance of another word, for instance:

---

1 This is reference to a verse at the end of the chapter. U, D duvidho avyayībhāvo. T duvidhā abhayībhāvo.
2 C om. T vā ti.
3 B, U nerañjarapati vanapati.
4 U, T ummatthagāṇī.
5 T tuṇhīgaṅgā.
6 T lohitagaṅgā.
7 C pana padese.
8 C ettha pana.
9 T sādhanaṃ.
10 B, S, U, T, D samīpe.
11 C vattanakiriyāṃ. D vattanakiriyāṃ.
12 C vattati.
ummatagāngaṃ “[in] the Ummatta [part] of the Gaṅgā,” tuṇhīgaṅgaṃ “[in] the Quiet [part] of the Gaṅgā,” or lohitagāngaṃ “[in] the Red [part] of the Gaṅgā,” etc. The word ummatagāngaṃ expresses the country where the Gaṅgā river is wild (ummatā). Similarly in the rest of the cases. In the word upanagaram, however, the word upa illustrates an action that happens in the vicinity of, together with [the idea of] instrument (sasādhanaṃ). Therefore (tasmā), a story which occurs in the vicinity of a city is called upanagaram “near the city.”

tathā hi abhidhammaṭīkāyaṃ adhisaddo samāsavisaye adhikāratthaṃ pavattati2 atthañ3 ca gahetvā pavattati4 ti attānaṃ adhi ajjhattā5 ti vuttaṃ.

Because in the same way, in the Abhidhamma-ṭīkā, it is stated: “towards (adhī) oneself (attānaṃ) = inwardly (ajjhattaṃ) because (ti) the word adhi, in the context of a compound (samāsavisaye), functions (pavattati) in the sense of governing (adhikāratthaṃ), and it functions having taken that sense.”

NOTE: The Ṭīkāmātikāpadavaṇṇanā reads: attānaṃ adhi ajjhattā ti adhisaddo samāsavisaye adhikāratthaṃ pavattatījī atthañ ca gahetvā pavattatī ti attānaṃ adhikicca uddissa pavattā ajjhattā.6

---

1 C adhikāratthe. S, D adhikārattaṃ.
2 T pavatta. D pavatti.
3 C adhikatthaṇ.
4 D pavattī.
5 C ajjhattaṃ.
6 This passage from As-mṭ, not available in the PTS series, is found also in Sv-pṭ III 327,8–11.
Indeed, this analysis [i.e. this word division] is [made] with [the assistance of] another referent (padatthena) on account of its being an obligatory compound. This rule has to be considered in the rest of the cases as well.

NOTE: the point here is that when we have to explain the meaning of an avyayībhāva compound by means of a viggaha “[word] analysis,” because the avyayībhāva is by definition an obligatory compound (niccasamāsa), we cannot use the words exactly as they are found in it. Instead, we need to supply synonyms that can be declined. This rule, according to Saddhammajotipāla, applies to all cases of avyayībhāva. He has already made that point earlier.

ettha hi samāse kathaṃ atthisamāso siyā. dvinnam atthānam abhāvā ti.

How is it possible for this very [type of] compound (ettha samāse) to be a compound of meanings (atthisamāso)? Because there is absence of the two referents.

siyā. vākye bhinnatthānaṃ upanagarasaddānam ekathavācakattā ti.

It is possible (siyā). Because the words upa and nāgara, which have different meanings in a sentence (vākye), express one single referent [in the compound upanagaram].

---

1 C aṇṇapadena.
2 C ti.
3 C ettha vācakattā. U ekathavācakatthā.
322. This \textit{avyayībhāva} compound is of the neuter gender.

The \textit{samāsakappa} of the \textit{suttaniddesa}\
\textit{so napuṃsakaliṅgo} || 322 ||

dvipadam idaṃ. so ti kārīniddeso, napuṃsakaliṅgo ti kāriyātidesaniddeso. saññā-pe-vidhisuttaṃ ti daṭṭhabbāṃ.

This sutta [consists] of two words. “This” (so) expresses that which undergoes a grammatical operation; “of the neuter gender” (napuṃsakaliṅgo) expresses an extended application of the grammatical operation. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered as an operational sutta.

so abyayībhāvasanāso napuṃsakaliṅgo va daṭṭhabbo. napuṃsakaliṅge kāriyaṃ va daṭṭhabban ti attho. napuṃsakaliṅgo ti hi kāriyātidesaniddeso. yathā mañcaṭṭhā mañcā ti vuccantī ti.

This \textit{avyayībhāva} compound is to be considered as if being of neuter gender. That is to say, one should consider as if the grammatical operation (kāryaṃ) was in the neuter gender. Because “[the word] ‘of the neuter gender’ [in the sutta]” expresses (niddeso) “an extended application (atideso) of the grammatical operation (kāriya), in the same way as those who are in a cot (mañcaṭṭhā) are called cots (mañcā).”

1 C kāriyaṃ.
2 C napuṃsakaliṅge.
3 B, S, U, D kāriyātideso.
4 T vuccantī.
5 C om. But this is a quotation from Mmd 278,16–17. For the meaning of mañcā I follow Mmd-pṭ 204,23: mañcā ti mañcaṭṭhā janā. The word mañca means “platform” “stage” or “cot” etc.
6 For mañcaṭṭhā and mañcā see note 4.
NOTE: Mmd (278, 16–17) says: \( \text{napuṃsakaliṅgo ti kāriyātideso. yathā maṅcaṭṭhā maṅcā ti vuccanti.} \)

\( \text{tathā napuṃsakaliṅgaṭṭhaṃ kāriyam } \text{napuṃsakaliṅgan ti vuccati. teneva viṅñāyatī. so} \)

\( \text{napuṃsakaliṅgakāriyabhāvo hotī ty attho } \) “the word \( \text{napuṃsakaliṅgo} \) is an extended application of the operation to be carried out. In the same way that those staying on cots are called \( \text{cots}, \) similarly, an operation to be effected in the neuter gender is called of neuter gender (\( \text{napuṃsakaliṅgaṃ} \)). It has to be understood only through this [reasoning]. The meaning is: this [i.e. the \( \text{avyayībhāva} \) compound] has the nature (\( \text{bhāva} \)) of being what has to be effected (\( \text{kāriya} \)) in neuter gender (\( \text{napuṃsakaliṅga} \)).” This digression in Mmd tries to justify that the word \( \text{napuṃsakaliṅgo} \) is the grammatical operation, and not a definition. The concept \( \text{kāryātideśa} \) in Sanskrit grammar means (DSG sv): “looking upon the substitute as the very original for the sake of operations that are caused by the presence of the original; the word is used in contrast with \( \text{rūpātideśa} \) where actually the original is restored in the place of the substitute under certain conditions.” “This type of rule is marked by the use of the suffix \( \text{vatī} \) prescribed in the sense of ‘like there or of that’ by P. 4.1.116. In grammar \( \text{vat} \) means \( \text{vadbhāva} \) ‘treatment like.’ Compare \( \text{sthānivadbhāva} \) ‘treatment [of the substitute] like the original.’ By a rule of extended application properties belonging to one item are extended to another item also.” (Joshi & Roodbergen 1991: 26) Thus the \( \text{avyayībhāva} \) has to be treated, morphologically, as a neuter, although semantically it can also be a masculine or a feminine. This issue will be discussed subsequently by Saddhammajotipāla.

\[ \text{idha ivasaddassa adassanato kathāṃ atidesasuttan ti viṅñāyatī ti.} \]

How is it possible to recognise that this is a sutta of extended application (\( \text{atidesa} \)) if the word “as” (\( \text{iva} \)) is not seen here (\( \text{ettha} \)) [that is, in the sutta]?

\[ \text{saro rasso napuṃsake [Kacc 344] ti vakkhamānattā viṅñāyatī. tenāha vuttiyāṃ:} \]

\( \text{napuṃsakaliṅgo}\)\(^1\) \( \text{vā ti.} \)

---

\(^1\) C \( \text{napuṃsakaliṅge}. \)
It is recognised because of the forthcoming statement, namely “the vowel [is] short in the neuter gender” [Kacc 344]. That is why he says, in the vuttī: “as if (va) [being] of the neuter gender.”

NOTE: The va (= iva = viya) indicates that it is an atidesa sutta (see above). Pind reads napuṃsakaliṅgo va, without the lengthening of the last vowel before the quotative tī, and he justifies this reading with this passage in Kacc-nidd. The word is, indeed, va “as” and not vā “or” (Kacc-v 109, 10).

kasmā soggahaṇaṃ gahitaṃ.¹ nanu anantare² vuttattā abhayībhāvaggaḥaṇaṃ anuvattati ti.

Why is the mention of “this” (so) included? Is it not true that, because [this sutta is] being stated subsequently [i.e. after the definition of abhayībhāva], the mention of the word “abhayaḥ” recurs (anuvattati) [and there is no need to specify subject]?

saccaṃ, tathāpi soggahaṇena abhayībhāvaggaḥaṇaṃ uttaranivattanatthan ti.

True. Nevertheless, with the mention of “this,” the exclusion of a further recurrence of the mention of “abhayaḥ” is intended.

¹ C na gahitaṃ.
² S antare.
In the *Atthabyākhyāna*, however, it is stated: “even though the [expression] is well known (siddhe sati) [that is to say, conventionally accepted], an effort (ārambho) is made to explain it, and the neuter gender for the qualifiers of the action [i.e. adverbs] is explicitly stated (īritaṃ). As in the examples: “he cooks sweetly (muduṃ),” “he cooks dryly (visosanaṃ).”

NOTE: Here the neuters muduṃ and visosanaṃ (or sobhanaṃ if we follow B, U, D readings) qualify the action expressed by the verb to cook. They are not adjectives, they function as adverbs. The meaning of this quotation from *Atthabyākhyāna* is not completely clear to me, but unfortunately we cannot consult this work.

kasmā pana ekattāṇaṁ na karotī ti.

But why is it formulated in the singular (ekattāṇa)?

NOTE: That is, as in the digu case. See Kacc 323 diguss ekattāṇaṁ, where napuṇsakaliṅgaṇaṁ still recurs (Kacc-v 110, 3). We should expect, in Kacc 322, both the prescription of the neuter gender and also of the singular number for avyagībhāva compounds.

---

1 B sāty.
2 C kriyāvisesanāni.
3 C napuṇsakattham.
4 B, U, T, D iti taṃ. S ītitaṃ.
5 C paccati.
6 B, U, D sobhaṇaṃ. T visoṣanaṃ.
7 C paccati.
8 D om.
9 D etattāṇa.
The absence of an *avyayībhāva* compound with a collective (*samāhāra*) meaning.

NOTE: That is to say, because it is taken for granted that a plural *avyayībhāva* cannot exist, as there is no plural number for adverbs.

For, in the sentence “The phenomena (*dhammā*) operate having mind as their governor, [i.e., they operate] *adhicittaṃ*” it has to be considered (*daṭṭhabbaṃ*) that *aṃ* is a replacement of the expression *yo* [i.e. nom. and acc. pl. case endings], according to the sutta “*aṃ* [replaces] the case ending after an *avyayībhāva* compound ending in *a*” [Kacc 343].

NOTE: The implication is that the singular cannot be prescribed as obligatory in *avyayībhāva* compounds in the same way it is prescribed in *digu* compounds. The example of this passage is the word *adhicittaṃ*, which has a plural referent (*dhammā adhicittā*), and is only singular because of the sutta Kacc 343, which prescribes this replacement. But note that it does not prescribe a change in the number: the meaning remains plural. That is why we do not have, and we do not need, a sutta prescribing a singular number for *avyayībhāva* compounds.

---

10 *samāhārabyayībhāvassābhāvā*.

2 The example is from Kacc-v 109.4, with the reading *vattanti* instead of *pavattanti*. Pind refers to M 119.3. This is only a reference for the word *adhicittam*, not for the complete analysis.

3 T *abyayībhāvasuttaṇa*.

4 C *sovacanassa*.

5 S *hoti*. 
kaccāyane pana itthiliṅgappayogo va āhariyati. upanagaran ti ādippayogo pi āharitabbo. tathā-atthassa vācakattā ti.

In Kaccāyana, however, only the exemplification (payogo) in the feminine is brought up (āhariyati). An example such as the word “near the city” (upanagaran) is also (pi) to be brought up (āharitabbo) because of its expressing (vācakattā) such a meaning (tathā-atthassa).

NOTE: The word payoga, lit. “employment,” in the context of Kaccāyana’s grammar, is generally translated as “example.” The payoga is the result of the actual “employment” or “application” (payoga) of an operational sutta (vidhī). In this passage, Saddhammajotipāla highlights the fact that all the examples in Kacc-v on Kacc 322 are feminine words qualified by an avyayībhāva in neuter, e.g. adhikumāri kathā “a story about a girl.” Thus the avyayībhāva functions as an adverb, which can qualify verbs (see the opinion of the Atthabyākhyāna above) or as an adjective, which can qualify nouns, regardless of gender and case ending agreement.

|| digussekattām || 323 ||

323. Of the digu, singleness.

NOTE: Senart (1871: 162) translates: “Le composé digu ne s’emploie qu’au singulier [et au neutre].” I think ekattām is not the same as ekavacanaṃ, although the second is somehow implied in the first. The word ekattām means “unity” “singleness” “singularity.” The idea of this sutta is that a digu expresses a unity or singularity, even though the compound may be preceded by a word meaning “three” as in tilokaṃ “three worlds.” It is certainly impossible to express singularity in a plural, and that is why singular is the default number for ekattām. But Senart follows Pāṇini 2.4.1 dvigur ekavacanaṃ “A dvigu compound is treated as though it signified a single thing” (Katre). According to Katre, then, this is still a semantic remark, and the fact that we use the singular case endings is a

6 T yathā.
The Samāsakappa of the Suttaniddesa

morphological consequence of the rule, not the rule itself. Cardona (§ 324) says: “Accordingly, in A 2.4.1 dvigur ekavacanam Pāṇini provides that a dvigu compound has singular value (ekavacanaṃ). That is, a derivate of the type pañcapuli is treated as denoting a single entity, so that it takes ekavacana endings by A 1.4.22.” Again, Cardona seems to understand this rule as describing a semantic feature of dugu compounds, derived from the equivalence “singularity of meaning (eka[tva]) = singular case endings (ekavacana),” prescribed in A 1.4.22 dviekayor dvivacanaikavacane “Singular and plural for single and double [subjects/objects, respectively]” (my translation). This rule tells us that, when unity is to be expressed, we use the singular case endings. In Kacc 323 the equivalence is, I think, taken for granted, but the word ekattaṃ still refers to the semantic concept of “singleness”, not to the concept of “singular”.

dvipadam idaṃ. digussā ti sambandhachaṭṭhīkārī. ekattan ti kāriya. sañña-pevidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. digussa samāsassā ti1 atthasamāsassa. atthabyākhyāne pana2 digussatthassā3 ti vuttaṃ.

This [sutta] consists of two words. “Of the dugu” (digussa) [is] a genitive of relation [expressing] that which undergoes the grammatical operation; “singleness” (ekattaṃ) [expresses] the grammatical operation. Among the different types of sutta, this has to be considered as an operational sutta. Because [it is] “of the dugu compound,” [we have to understand] of the compound of meanings. In the Atthabyākhyāna, however, it is stated: “of the [compound] that has the meaning of a dugu.”

nanu ca ekatthībhāvo samāsalakkaṇan ti vuttattā vinā pi iminā suttena digusamāse kate ekattaṃ hotī ti.

1 S samāsa. sassā ti. T digusamāsassā ti.
2 B, U, T ca.
3 S dvigussatthassā.
But is it not true that, because the definition of a compound (samāsalakkhaṇaṃ) has been stated as having a single referent (ekatthībhāvo), even without the present sutta there is singleness when a digu compound is formed?

NOTE: The pūrvapakṣa is interpreting the word ekatta “singleness” as being synonymous with ekatthībhāva “having a single referent” or “having a single integrated meaning.” If that is so, then the word ekatta in the sutta is redundant, as ekatta would apply to any type of compound.

na hoti. dvinnaṃ padatthānaṃ ekapadatthabhāvena karaṇassa ekatthībhūtattā. ekatthībhāvo hi dvinnaṃ padatthānaṃ ekapadatthabhāvena karaṇaṃ, na ekavacanena vattabbatthabhāvena karaṇan ti.

[Singleness] is not [there even when there is ekatthībhāva]. Because having a single referent is the cause for the union of two referents [in one word]. Indeed, the fact of having a single referent (ekatthībhāvo) is the cause for the two referents becoming one referent; it is not the cause for using the singular in the meaning that is intended.

NOTE: That is to say, ekatthībhāva has been prescribed, but it does not imply it is singular. With this sutta, we prescribe ekavacana for ekatta. That is why if we translate ekattaṃ in the sutta as “singular” the objection does not make sense, and yet that is what it ultimately means.

nanu2 anekatthābhidhāyino3 saddassa ekatthābhidhāyakaṭṭāṃ4 kattuṃ na sakkā. saddānam atthābhidhānassa sabhāvasiddhattā5 ti.

1 D adds ekapadatthānaṃ.
2 C om. na ekavacanena vattabbatthabhāvena karaṇan ti nanu.
3 U anekatthābhidhāyino.
4 C ekatthābhidhāyakaṭṭāṃ. S, T ekatthābhidhāyitaṃ.
5 C bhāvasiddhattā. S sabhāvasiddhatthā.
But is it not true that, as the declaration of meaning is by nature established in words, it is impossible for a word that denotes many different meanings to cause the denotation of one single meaning?

saccaṃ. tathāpi vacanasamatthatāya atideso viññāyate. tena dvinnam atthānaṃ ekattam iva hoti napuṇḍasakaliṅgaṭṭaṅ ca hotī ti attho. idam pi atidesasuttan ti.

True. Nevertheless, the extended application (atideso) is recognised (viññāyate) because of the [semantic] capacity of speech (vacanasamatthatāya). That is to say, with this [extended application], it is as if there were singleness of the two meanings, and there is the neuter gender as well. This [sutta] is considered an “extended application sutta” as well [as a definition].

NOTE: The discussion on samatthatā, or its Sanskrit equivalent sāmarthya, goes back to Patañjali’s commentary on P. 2.1.1 samarthāḥ padavidhiḥ “An operation on padas (takes effect) only when they are semantically and syntactically connected” (Katre). The following is the definition of sāmarthya given by Patañjali: “Now, apart from the question whether [the word] samartha should be mentioned in P. 2.1.1 [or not], [when] you say samartha, what do you really mean by samartha? [Vārttika 1]
The word samartha [means] single integrated meaning of words which [when uncompounded] have separate meanings [of their own]. [When] we say samartha [it means] single integrated meaning of words which [when uncompounded] have separate meaning [of their own].

But where [do words] have separate meanings [of their own, and] where [do they] have a single meaning? In the uncompounded word-group [words] have separate meanings [of their own], like in rajñaḥ puruṣaḥ: king’s man. But in a compound, [words] have a single meaning, like in rājapuruṣaḥ: ‘king-man’. Why do you say: ‘[words] having separate meanings [of their own]?’ Because when we say:

1 U attānaṃ.
2 S, T ekatthaṃ.
3 S napuṇḍasakaliṅgatthaṅ.
'let the king's man be brought', the king-man is brought. And [when we say]: [let] the king-man [be brought], the same [man is brought]. We do not say at all that a different person is brought.”¹

|| tathā dvande pāṇituriyoyoggasenaṅgakhuddajantuka-vividhaviruddhavisabhāgatthādīmaṇ ca || 324 ||

324. And similarly, in a dvanda compound, [when reference is made] to parts of the body (pāṇi[āṅga]), musical instruments (turiya[-aṅga]), pairs (yogga[-aṅga]), parts of the army (senaṅga), small living beings (khuddajantuka), variety (vividha), opposites (viruddha), extraordinary things (visabhāga), and others.

NOTE: My translation of the sutta is based on the interpretation of Kacc-v (110.9–111.8). This sutta is not based on Kāt, but on a combination of Pāñinian sūtras (P. 2.4.2-8-9).

catuppadam idaṃ. tathā ti upamājotaka². dvande ti ādhārasattamī. pāṇi-pe-dīman ti sambandhachaṭṭhikāri. cā ti samuccaya. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

This sutta consists of four words. “Similarly” (tathā) suggests a comparison; “in a dvanda compound” (dvande) is a locative of support (ādhāra); “parts of the body, ... , etc.” (pāṇi-pe-dīman) is a genitive of relation [expressing] that which undergoes a grammatical operation;

² C upamājotakatthe nipāto.
³ A jotaka (Skt. dyotaka) is an indeclinable that suggests rather than directly indicating. “The nipātas and upasargas are said to be ‘dyotaka’ and not ‘vācaka’ by standard grammarians” (DSG sv. dyotaka).
“and” (*ca*) expresses accumulation [as it triggers the *ekatta* and *napuṃsalakīṅgatta* from the previous sutta] (*samuccaya*). Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta.

yathā² digusamāhārasamāse ekattañ ca napuṃsakaliṅgattañ ca hoti tathā dvande³ samāhārasamāse pi pāṇi-pe-ādinaṃ ekattañ ca hoti napuṃsakaliṅgattañ cā ti. idha casaddo vuttasamuccayattho, na avuttasamuccayattho ādiggahaṇena avasesānaṃ saṅgahaṇato. na kevalaṃ digusamāse yeva ekattañ ca napuṃsakaliṅgattañ ca hoti, atha kho dvandasamāse pī ti adhippāyo.

As in a collective *digu* compound there is singleness and neuter gender; similarly, in a collective *dvanda* compound as well, there is singleness and neuter gender for the meanings “parts of the body,” etc. Here the word “and” (*ca*) expresses accumulation of what has been stated, it does not express coordination with what has not been stated because of the inclusion of the rest of the cases (*avasesānaṃ*) with the mention of “etc.” (*ādi*). The implied meaning is: singleness and neuter gender are found not only in the *digu* compound, but also in the *dvanda* compound.

NOTE: The word *ca* is used sometimes in order to refer back to words used in previous suttas, and sometimes it is used in the sense of “and [others].” In the present sutta, the commentator says that *ca* is used as an *anuvutti*, because the sense of “and others” is in this case expressed by the word *ādi*.

---

2 *T yathā hi.*
3 *C dvanda.*
atha vā avuttasanuccayatto. tena assamahimsan ti adīṃ saṅgaṇhāti. tathā hi atthabyākhyāne pi vuttaṃ. idha cakāro samuccayatto. tena kiṃ sijjhati ti ce. assamahimṣa3 icc evam ādīnaṃ saṅgahaṇatthaṃ. tatra hi pasvatthe4 assamahimṣsassa5 vibhāsāsampatte, ettha6 casaddena niyamekattaṃ hoti napuṃsakaliṅgattaṃ cā ti.

Alternatively, [the word “and”] expresses accumulation of what has not been stated. With that (tena), it includes examples such as “horse-buffalo” (assamahimṣaṃ), etc. For thus has been stated in the Atthabyākhyāna as well: “Here the word ca expresses coordination. If [one asks:] ‘What is accomplished by that?’ [We reply:] It is meant to include instances such as ‘horse-buffalo.’ Because here, even though ‘horse-buffalo’ does optionally obtain (vibhāsāsampatte) within the semantic field of animals (pasvatthe), in this case (ettha), with the word ‘and’ there is restricted singleness and also neuter gender [for the word ‘horse-buffalo’].”

caggahaṇaṃ sanniṭṭhāpanāvadhāraṇan ti pi vadanti.

They also say: “the mention of ‘and’ is a restriction (avadhāraṇa) in the sense of limitation (sanniṭṭhāpana).”
pāṇyaṅgatthe ti pāṇisaṅkhātassā¹ sattassa avayavatthe. turiyaṅgatthe ti² pañcavidhassa turiyassa avayavatthe. evaṃ sesesu pi.

“In the sense of parts of the body,” that is to say in the sense of limbs of a being called “living (pāṇi) [creature].” “In the sense of musical instruments,” that is to say in the sense of components of the fivefold orchestra. Similarly in the rest of the cases as well.

NOTE: The word pāṇi (Skt. prāṇin) literally means “what has breath,” “what is alive,” i.e. a living being. What the commentator wants to say here is that pāṇi actually means the living being, and aṅga is glossed as avayava (“part”). In this case aṅga could also mean “[physical] body,” and that is why, I think, the commentator tries to prevent the ambiguity.

tattha pañcavidhaturiyan ti.

[150] ātataṃ vitatañ ceva³ ātatavitataṃ ghanam
susiram ceti⁴ turiyam pancaṅgikam udīritaṃ.

Herein, with regard to “the fivefold orchestra”:

The orchestra of five [types of] instruments is defined in this way: drum (ātataṃ) and also drum with leather on both sides (vitataṃ), a drum completely covered with leather (ātatavitataṃ), a cymbal (ghanam), and a hollow (susiram).

NOTE: the list of these five instruments is conventional in Pāli literature (for instance, the expression pañcaṅgikena turiyena in Petavatthu 487, meaning “with a full orchestra”), but this particular verse seems the product of Saddhammajotipāla’s ingenuity.

---

¹ T pāṇisaṅkhātassā.
² S, T om.
³ C ceva vitataṃ.
⁴ I follow C ceti (ca iti) because it makes better sense at the end of an enumeration. B, S, U, T, D read ceva, which is probably a contamination from ceva in pāda a.
tattha ātataṃ nāma cammapariyonaddhesu bheriādīsu ākaḍḍhitvā onaddhaṃ ekatalatūriyāṃ. vitataṃ nāma ubhato ākaḍḍhitvā onaddhaṃ ubhayatatūriyāṃ. ātatavitatataṃ nāma ubhato ca majjhato ca sabbato pariyonaddhaṃ tūriyāṃ. ghanāṃ nāma samatāḷādi. susiraṃ nāma vaṃsādī ti.

Herein, ātataṃ means (nāma): among the drums which are covered by leather, that instrument (tūriya) which is tied up (ākaḍḍhitvā) and covered (onaddhaṃ) on one side (ekatala) [only]; vitataṃ means that instrument which is covered and tied up on both sides; ātatavitatataṃ means that instrument which is covered all around, on both sides and in the middle; ghanāṃ means cymbal (sammatāḷa), etc.; “hollow” (susiraṃ) means “flute” (vaṃsa), etc.

|| vibhāsā rukkhatiṇapasudhanadhaṅṅajanapadādīnaṃ ca || 325 ||

325. And optionally [in the case] of trees (rukka), grasses (tiṇa), animals (pasu), wealth (dhana), crops (dhaṅṅa), countries (janapada), etc.

tipadam idaṃ. vibhāsā ti vikappanattha. rukkha-pe-dīnan ti sambandhachatṭṭhikāri. că ti anukaḍḍhana. saṅṅā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. idha vibhāsāsaddo vāsaddena samānattho.

This [sutta consists of] three words. “Optionally” (vibhāsā) [expresses] the sense of alternative (vikappana); “of trees, etc.” (rukka-pe-dīnaṃ) is a genitive of relation [expressing] that which

1 S, T ākaḍḍhitvā.
2 C, T ubhato ca.
3 S om. T sabbā.
4 S, T read ghanāṃ nāma sammatāḷādi after vaṃsādī ti.
5 C, S om.
undergoes a grammatical operation; “and” (ca) [expresses] recurrence (anukaddhana). Among the different types of sutta, this one is to be considered an operational sutta. Here, the word “optionally” (vibhasa) has the same meaning (samanattho) as the word “alternatively” (vasaddena).

vutta\textsuperscript{a} ca

kvaci nav\textsuperscript{a} ca ekat\textsuperscript{h}\textsuperscript{a} yebhuyyenekarupak\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{1}
v\textsuperscript{a} vibh\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{2} samanatth\textsuperscript{a} p\textsuperscript{a}yenobhayarupak\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{3} ti.

And it has been stated:

“[The words] ‘sometimes’ and ‘preferably not,’ having one single meaning (ekat\textsuperscript{h}\textsuperscript{a}) [that is, both having the same meaning], generally (yebhuyyen) [accept] one form (ekarupak\textsuperscript{a}); [the words] ‘or’ (v\textsuperscript{a}) [and] ‘optionally’ (vibh\textsuperscript{a}sa), having a common meaning (samanatth\textsuperscript{a}), generally (p\textsuperscript{a}yen) [accept] both forms (ubhayarupak\textsuperscript{a}).

NOTE: It is interesting that Saddhammajotipala explicitly states the similarity of meaning between vibh\textsuperscript{a}sa (Skt. vibh\textsuperscript{a}sa) and v\textsuperscript{a}. This equation is disputed in Sanskrit grammatical literature after the different interpretations of P\textsuperscript{a}nini 1.1.44 na veti vibh\textsuperscript{a}sa. Kiparsky has interpreted this rule in the sense that vibh\textsuperscript{a}sa does not simply express option, but an option (v\textsuperscript{a}) that is not (na) preferable. Kiparsky has inferred that v\textsuperscript{a} expresses an option that is preferable. According to the same scholar, the formula anyatarasy\textsuperscript{a}m in P\textsuperscript{a}nini expresses a neutral optionality. The situation seems to be quite different in P\textsuperscript{a}li grammar. The technical expression kvaci means literally “in some places” and nav\textsuperscript{a} means literally “or not.” According to this stanza, if, in expressing an alternative, we use kvaci or nav\textsuperscript{a}, that alternative is considered as not preferable. If we, conversely, use v\textsuperscript{a} or vibh\textsuperscript{a}sa, the alternative is free and we can opt for any of the two possible forms as equally valid (see Chapter 2).

\textsuperscript{1} U yebhuyyenekarupak\textsuperscript{a}.
\textsuperscript{2} T v\textsuperscript{a} ti vibh\textsuperscript{a}sa. Remarkable resemblance with P. 1.1.44.
\textsuperscript{3} S, T yebhuyenobhayarupak\textsuperscript{a}.
caggahaṇaṃ napuṃsakaliṅgattekattānukaḍḍhanatthaṃ. samuccayatthan ti pi vadanti. idaṃ hi anantarasutteneva siddhe pi vikappanatthaṃ vuttan ti.

The mention of “and” (ca) is in order to retrieve (anukaḍḍhanatthaṃ) the neuter gender (napuṃsakaliṅgatta) and singleness (ekatta). They also state that it means coordination [with the previous sutta]. Because, even though (pi) it has been established (siddhe) by the previous sutta (anantarasutta) itself (eva), it [i.e. the present sutta] is stated in the sense of optionality.

|| dvipade tulyādhikaraṇe kammadhārayo || 326 ||

326. [When the] two words [of the compound have] the same substratum [the compound is a] kammadhāraya.

tipadam idaṃ. dvipade ti kammattha. tulyādhikaraṇe ti tabbisesana. kammadhārayo ti saññāniddeso. saññā-pe-saññāsuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. idha pana samāso ti saññī anuvattati. apare pana dvipade ti saññī ti pi vadanti. taṃ so samāso kammadhārayasañño hotī ti iminā na sameti. sutte1 dutīyā. vuttiyaṃ pana paṭhamā ti pi vadanti. tam pi na yujjati.

This [sutta] consists of three words. “Two words” (dvipade) [expresses] the object (kammattha); “the same substratum” (tulyādhikaraṇe) [expresses] its qualification; kammadhāraya expresses the technical name. Among the different types of sutta, this one is to be considered a definition of a technical name. Here, again (pana), the word “compound” recurs (anuvattati) as that which receives the technical name (saññī). Others, however, say

1 C, S sutte pana.
that “two words” (dvipade tī) is that which receives the technical name. This (taṃ) does not correspond to “that compound (samāso) receives the technical name kammadhāraya.” They also say that [the word dvipade], in the sutta, is the second case ending (dutiya), but in the vutti it is the first case ending. This does not hold true either.

NOTE: The last discussion is difficult to understand, but if I am not wrong, the meaning is the following: The problem here is to determine what is the technical name (saññā) and what is that which is named (saññī). According to our author, the saññā is kammadhāraya, and the saññī is the compound (samāsa). Now, we are in the chapter on compounds, and therefore, the word compound is understood by anuvutti. Some commentators, however, maintain that what receives the technical name kammadhāraya is the “two words” (dvipade) which are allegedly expressed in the accusative plural in the sutta, but the vutti (Kacc-v 112, 8–9) glosses in the nominative plural (dve padāni ... samassante ...). Saddhammajotipāla criticises this view as illogical. And yet he considers the word dvipade as an “object” of the verb “to combine” (see below). I think this is a wrong decision and dvipade tulyādhikaraṇe is a locative absolute, as Rūp defends in the next line.

rūpasiddhiyam pana bhāvasattamībhāvena vuttam.

In the Rūpasiddhi, however, it is stated: “[the word dvipade is] in the sense of the condition (bhāvena) of the locative absolute (bhāvasattamī).”

NOTE: That is Saddhammajotipāla’s interpretation of Rūp 183, 14–15: tasmiṃ dvipade tulyādhikaraṇe sati so samāso kammadhārayasañño ca hoti “there being in this word two padas which have the same substratum, this compound also receives the technical name kammadhāraya.”

tulyādhikaraṇāni dve padāni yadā yasmiṃ kāle ācariyehi samasyante tadā so samāso kammadhārayasañño hoti ti attho.
That is to say, when, i.e. at the time when, two words having the same substratum are combined (samasyante) by the masters, then that compound receives the technical name kammadhāraya.

idañ ca suttaṃ samāsa\textsuperscript{1} vidhāyakañ ca saññāvidhāyakañ ca hoti. kasmā imasmiṃ samāsappakaraṇe kāriyabhūtaṃ samasanaṃ va\textsuperscript{2} saññī nāma na kārī.

But (ca) this sutta prescribes [at the same time] a [type of] compound and prescribes a technical name as well. Why is it that, in this chapter on compounds, composition (samasanaṃ), which is the operation to be done (kāriyabhūtaṃ), is that which receives a technical name (saññī), [and] not that which undergoes a grammatical operation (kārī)?

NOTE: In other words, if we are in a section dealing with compounds, where the grammatical operation is samasanaṃ “composition,” the specification of the type of composition should be taken as an operation, not as a definition. The contention here is that the present rule has to be understood as an operational rule that tells us how to form a kammadhāraya compound, and not as a definition sutta.

tenāha yadā samasyante tadd\textsuperscript{3} so samāso ti\textsuperscript{4}.

That is why he says: “When they [i.e. words] are combined (samasyante), then that is a compound.”

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] D samasana.
\item[2] C om.
\item[3] C, S om.
\item[4] T hotī ti.
\end{itemize}
NOTE: This reference to Kacc-v is supposedly the answer to the objection expressed in the previous passage. Indeed, Kacc-v makes clear that this sutta is a definition (so samāso kammadhārayasaṅño hoti).  

5 Kacc-v 112.8-9: dve padāni tulyādhikaraṇāni yadā samassante tadā so samāso kammadhārayasaṅño hoti.
4 C om.
5 B, U ye santā ti. D yesaṃ tānī ti.
6 U samānānaṃ.
7 S tulyādhikaraṇā. T tulyadhikaraṇā.
It is called *kammadhāraya* because it is as if it would carry a double (*dvayaṃ*) object (*kammaṃ*). For as it holds [as it were] the object of the mat and other objects in sentences such as “he makes a mat,” and also it holds the purpose (*payojanaṃ*) of the action of sitting, etc., which has to be accomplished (*sādhetabbaṃ*) [as] the action of the instrument (*karaṇakiriyaṃ*) by means of the mat, and so on; because when the object, namely the mat or any other, is there, then the possibility of those two [namely the object and the purpose, is also there]; similarly also this compound holds two noun words showing one single meaning [although they are] different with regard to their cause of application; because, when this composition is there, the possibility of two nouns in one single meaning — namely the qualifier and the one to be qualified — [is there as well].

---

1 B dhārayati. C dārayati.
2 U tathā.
3 D sambhavato.
4 C dvayassa.
so ca samāso chabbidho: visesanapubbapado visesanobhayapado upamānapubbapado\(^1\) upamānuttarapado sambhāvano avadhāroṣo cā ti.

And this compound is sixfold: (1) with a former word being a qualifier, (2) with both words being qualifiers, (3) with the former word being a comparison, (4) with the last word being a comparison, (5) supposition, and (6) restriction.

tattha visesanapubbapado yathā mahāpuriso kupuriso ty ādi. visesanobhayapado yathā niluppalāṁ sītuṇhan ty ādi. upamāpubbapado yathā saṅkhapaṇḍaran ty ādi. upamānuttarapado\(^2\) yathā nayanuppalāṁ narasiho ty ādi. sambhāvano yathā guṇabuddhi ty ādi. avadhāroṣo yathā paññāratanaṁ guṇadhanam ty ādi.

In this regard, (1) with a former word being a qualifier, as in: “great person,” “bad person,” etc.; (2) with both words being qualifiers, as in: “blue water lily,” “cold-hot,” etc.; (3) with the former word being a comparison, as in: “mother-of-pearl pale,” etc.; (4) with the last word being a comparison, as in: “lotus eye,” “lion man,” etc.; (5) supposition, as in: “the virtue of intelligence,” etc.; (6) restriction, as in: “the treasure of wisdom,” “the wealth of virtue,” etc.

---

1 C, T upamāpubbapado.
2 S upamānuttarapubbapado. T upamānuvattanapubbapado.
tenāha
visesanapubbhayo upamāpubbuttare pi ca
sambhāvanovadhāraṇo chabbidho kammadhāryo ti.¹

That is why he says:
The kammadhāraya compound is sixfold: (1) with a former word being a qualifier, (2) with both words being qualifiers, (3) with the former word being a comparison, (4) with the last word being a comparison, (5) supposition, and (6) restriction.

visesanobhayapadaṃ² vajjetvā pañcavidho ti pi vadanti.

They also say that it is fivefold, rejecting the [category] “with both words being qualifiers.”³

nanipātapubbapado kupubbapado⁴ pādipubbapado cā ti imehi tīhi saddhiṃ navavidho ti pi⁵ rūpasiddhiyam vuttaṃ.⁶

In the Rūpasiddhi it is stated that it is ninefold, including these three: having the particle na “no” as a former word, having ku “bad” as a former word, having [preverbs] such as (p)pa, etc., as a former word.

¹ I follow S, D. In pādas a and b, B reads visesanapubbatayo upamāpubbuttaro pi ca. U, T read visesanapubba-bhayo upamāpubbuttaro pi ca. C reads the stanza quite differently:
 visesanapubbpado visesanobhayapado
 upamānapubbpado upamānuttaro pi ca
 sambhāvanovadhāraṇo chabbidho kammadhārayo ti.
 They all express the same meaning.
² T visesanubhayaṃ.
³ This is a reference to Mmd-ṭḍ 174,21f.
⁴ T kunipātapubbapado.
⁵ C om.
⁶ B, S, T, D vutto.
NOTE: This is a reference to Rūp 183, 3–6: so ca navavidho visesanapubbapado visesanuttarapado visesanobhayapado upamānuttarapado sambhāvanāpubbapado avadhāraṇapubbapado nanipātapubbapado kupubbapado pādipubbapado cā ti. The following is the opinion received in the Burmese grammar called the Kaccāyanabheda, an opinion that, as we can see, represents Kaccāyana filtered through Rūp:

visesanapubbaparubhayapadaṃ sambhāvanā
upamāvadhāraṇaṃ ca kunapādipubbāṃ nava || Kacc-bheda 113 ||

mahanto ca so puriso cā ti ettha mahanto ti padaṃ visesanaṃ, puriso ti padaṃ visesitabbaṃ.

In [the sentence] “he is great and he is a person” the word “great” is the qualifier and the word “person” is what is to be qualified.

mahattaguṇasaddappavattinimittako hi mahantasaddo khuddakapurisa-
sādhāraṇattā jātisaddappavattinimittakaṃ purisasaddaṃ1 viseseti. tato khuddakatthato nivattetī ti. tasmāyaṃ samāso visesanapubbapado nāma.

For the word “great” — which has as a cause of its application the quality (guṇa) of greatness (mahatta) — qualifies (viseseti) the word “person,” which, on account of its having a common substratum (sādhāraṇattā) with the inferior (khuddaka) person (purisa) [as well], has the class (jāti) as a cause of its application. Therefore, it [the word mahanta] excludes (nivatteti) the meaning “inferior” [literally: it prevents the class word purisa from meaning “inferior”]. That is why this type of compound is called “preceded by a qualifier.”

---
1 S nimittam kaṃpurisasaddaṃ for -nimittakaṃ purisasaddaṃ.
saddānaṃ visesanavisesitabbbhāvena tadatthānam pi visesanavisesitabbbhāvo veditabbo.

Through the relationship of qualifier and qualified of the words, the relationship of qualifier and qualified of their meanings also has to be understood.

tulyādhikaraṇabhāvappasiddhatthāṃ¹ payutto tasaddo. so yeva mahā.² so yeva puriso. nañño mahā.³ nañño⁴ puriso⁵ ti mahāsaddassa ca purisasaddassa ca ekaṃ atthaṃ dīpeti. casaddadvayaṃ pana⁶ ekasmiṃ atthe pavattāni bhinnappavattinimittāni dve nāmapadāni samuccino ti. esa⁷ nayo cata⁸ saddayogakammadhārayavākyesu sesesu pi⁹ daṭṭhabbo.

The word ta [in the pronoun so ... so] is used (payutto) in order to establish the relation of a common substratum. He (so) only is great, that (so) person only, it is not another that is great, it is not another person; thus it shows the single [shared] referent (atthaṃ) of the word mahā and the word purisa. The two words ca [show that] two noun-words (nāmapadāni) that have different causes of application [that is, referents] apply jointly with regard to one single referent. This rule has to be considered also in the rest of the sentences (vākyesu) of kammadhāraya [compounds] connected by the word “and” (ca) and “that” (ta).

¹ B, U ppasidhattha. S paṇḍidhatthāṃ.
² C om. so yeva mahā.
³ C om. nañño mahā.
⁴ T om.
⁵ C om.
⁶ B, U, D om.
⁷ C, T eseva.
⁸ C ca. D ta.
⁹ B, S, U, T, D om.
ettha hi samāse\(^1\) kathām atthasamāso siyā. ekatthībhāvato\(^2\) ti siyā. vākyesu\(^3\) bhinnappavattinimittatthānap\(^4\) ekasmiṃ dabbe ṭhitabhāvato ti. nīluppalāṃ sītuṇhan ti ettha ca\(^5\) nīlaṃ ca nīlaguṇayuttaṅ ca taṃ uppalaṅ ca uppalajātiyuttaṅ ca ti nīluppalāṃ. sītaṅ ca sītalakkaṅhayuttaṅ ca taṃ uṇhaṅ ca uṇhalakkaṅhaṅaṅ ca ti sītuṇhaṃ. tejodhātu. atha vā. sītaguṇayuttaṅ ca uṇhaguṇayuttaṅ ca ti sītuṇhaṃ. udakaṃ.

With regard to this compound, indeed, how can it be a compound of meanings? It can (siyā) due to the state of having one single meaning. Because in the sentences the referents, though different with regard to their cause of application, abide in one single substance. Thus (ti), in the examples “blue water lily” (nīluppalāṃ) and “cold-hot” (sītuṇhaṃ), that water lily which is blue, i.e. connected with the quality blue, and connected with the class (jāti) water lily, is called “blue water lily;” and the cold which is connected with the characteristic (lakkhaṅa) “cold” and the hot which is connected with the characteristic “hot,” [that is] “cold [and] hot,” i.e. the element of temperature (tejodhātu). Alternatively, what is connected with the quality “cold” and what is connected with the quality “hot,” that is “cold-hot,” i.e. water.

---

1 B, C, T samāso.
2 C ekatthabhāvato.
3 C, T vākye.
4 B, U, D bhinnappavattitthānap.
5 C om.
7 C, T ca taṃ.
Herein, the word “blue” as a cause of application, which has as the cause of its application the word expressing the quality “blue,” qualifies (visesetī) the word “water lily” which has as the cause of its application a class-word on account of being common to the white and the red water lilies; and [the word “blue”] distinguishes (nivatteti) it (taṃ) [i.e. the word “water lily”] from them (tehi) [i.e. from being qualified by the other colours]; furthermore (ca), the word “water lily,” which has that [class] as the cause of its application, qualifies (visesetī) the word “blue” which is the cause of application of that [class (?)] on account of [blue] being common to the blue of the bee, the blue of charcoal, etc., and it [the word water lily] distinguishes (nivatteti) it [the quality blue] from that (tato) [i.e. from the blue that is found in other objects]. That is why this compound is called “that which has both members as qualifiers.” The meaning of the words ca “and” and ta “that” [has to be understood] according to the previously (heṭṭhā) stated rule. Similarly (evaṃ), even in the compound “cold-hot,” [it] has to be understood (veditabbaṃ) after making out (katvā) what is common (sādhāraṇa) to pure cold and pure hot.

NOTE: I am not sure to have correctly understood the words taṃnimittako and taṃnimittamā.

However, we expect them to theoretically refer to the other word of the compound. For the main idea

1 C pātisaddappavattinimittaṃ, U, T, D jātisaddappavattinimittakaṃ.
2 B, S, U, T, D bhamaraṅgārakokilasādhāraṇattā.
3 T taṃnimittakaṃ.
4 C catasadā.
5 S, T sītuṇhasamāso.
of this passage is that a kammadhāraya in which one word is expresses a quality and the other word a substance, involves mutual qualification, and therefore we have to understand that even jāti is somehow vivesana. In this way we avoid assimilating guṇa to vivesana. This is perhaps an acceptable Buddhist way of solving the contingency of the quality/substance relation (see Chapter 2).

saṅkho iva paṇḍaraṃ. nayanam idaṃ uppalaṃ viya. naroyaḥ siho viyā ti. ettha vākyesuubbapade vā uttarapade vā\(^1\) upamāyuttattā ime dve samāsā upamāpubbapadādisamāsā nāma. ivaviyasaddā hi upamānajotakā.

“Pale like mother-of-pearl;” “this eye is like a water lily;” “this man is like a lion.” Here, in these sentences, because of the connection with a comparison in the first member or in the last member, these two [types of] compounds are called compounds with the previous member and the other [i.e. the last] being a comparison. Because the words iva and viya manifest a comparison.

NOTE: For a similar case in Sanskrit grammar, see the rule in Pāṇini (2.1.56) for compounds of the type puruṣavyāghraḥ “tiger like man.”

guṇo  iti  buddhī  ti ettha\(^2\) vākye guṇasambhāvanānidassanatthena\(^3\) itisaddena yuttattā sambhāvanā\(^4\) kammadhārayo nāma.

In the sentence “the virtue that is intelligence,” because of the connection (yuttattā) with the word iti in order to exhibit (nidassana) the supposition (sambhāvanā) of virtue, it is called kammadhāraya of suggestion (sambhāvanā).

---

1 C om. uttarapade vā.
2 C om.
3 B, U, T guṇasambhāvanānidassanatthena.
4 C, T sambhāvanā.
NOTE: Sadd gives the example dhammo ti buddhi dhammabuddhi (Sadd 752, 2-3).

guṇo eva dhanan ti ettha vākye niyamanivattanatthena avadhāraṇabhūtena¹ evasaddena yuttattāyaṃ samāso avadhāraṇakammadhrārayo nāma. ettha hi evakāro puggalassa² dhanatthaṃ aṇñehi³ aguṇehi⁴ suvaṇṇarajatādidhanehi⁵ nivatteti.

In the sentence “the wealth that is virtue itself (eva),” because of the connection with the word eva, which is a limitation (avadhāraṇa) and whose meaning is to exclude through a restriction (niyama), this compound is called a kammadhāraya of limitation (avadhāraṇa). Because here, the form eva excludes the object “wealth” (dhanatthaṃ) of an individual from other things that are not virtue, such as gold, silver, etc.

puggalañ ca saddhādisu⁶ sattasu dhanesu⁷ niyāmeti⁸ accantaṃ yojeti dhanasaddassa aṇñehi suvaṇṇādīhi sādhāraṇaṇaḥ ca anujāṇāti citto dhanudharo⁹ evā ti ettha viya.

And it restricts (niyāmeti), that is it relates (yojeti) completely (accantaṃ), the individual person (puggalaṇ) in the [domain of the] seven wealths that are faith, etc.; and it recognises what is common (sādhāraṇam) between the word “wealth” (dhanasaddassa) and other [types

---

1 S athāguṇabhūtena.
2 S pubbalassa. T pussalassa nimittaṃ.
3 C reads aṇñehi guṇehi asādhāraṇaḥ ca anujāṇāti.
4 S reads guṇehi, pencil correction adds a-.
5 D suvaṇṇarajatādidhanehi.
6 C saṅgādisu.
7 C om.
8 U niyami. T niyamati.
9 B, S, U, T, D dhanudharo.
of wealth] such as gold, etc., as in the example “Citta is only [a person] that increases wealth.”

NOTE: I understand Citta is here the well know treasurer (dhanā-uddhara “increaser of wealth”) and follower of the Buddha. He is mentioned in some canonical texts (see DPPN sv. citta¹). For the “seven wealths” (satta dhanāni), see A IV 4, 28–5, 1: sattimāni, bhikkhave, dhanāni. katamāni satta. saddhādhanāṃ, siladhanāṃ, hiridhanāṃ, ottappadhanāṃ, sutadhanāṃ, cagadhanaṃ, paññādhanāṃ. imāni kхо, bhikkhave, satta dhanāni ti. For saddhādhanā, see also Sadd 752, 8–16.

tividho hi evakāro. ayogavyavacchedo¹ aṇñayogavyavacchedo² accantayogabyavacchendo³ cā ti.

For the word eva is of three types: distinction (vyavaccheda) through non-union (ayoga) [i.e. exclusion]; distinction through union with another (aṇñayoga) [i.e. association]; distinction through complete union (accantayoga) [i.e. identification].

tenāha⁴
citto dhanuddharo⁵ eva pāṭtho⁶ eva dhanudharo⁷ nilaṃ sarojaṃ bhavateva udāharaṇam assidam⁸ ti.

---

1 B aṇñayogavyavacchedo. S ayogābyavacchedo. U, T om.
2 S aṇñayogābyavacchedo. U repeats the word.
3 B, U accantasaṃyogābyavacchendo. S accantasaṃyogā.
4 C vuttañ ca.
5 B, T, D dhanudharo.
7 C, T dhanuddharo.
8 S pāda c reads nilo sarojaṃ bhavito, corrected to bhavite.
9 S idham.
That is why he says:

Citta is only [a person] who increases wealth;
Pāttha only [is] an archer;
the water-lily is indeed (eva) blue;
so is the exemplification of the [threefold eva].

NOTE: See the commentary of Payogasiddhi ad Mogg 67.¹ Payogasiddhi reads pāttho (Skt. Pārtha, that is Arjuna, the hero and great archer of the Mahābhārata). Manuscripts and editions seem to understand that the word dhanuddhara and dhanudhara are the same, but they are simply similar. The first one is dhana-uddhara “increaser of wealth” “treasurer” and the second is to be analysed as dhanu-dhara “bow holder” “archer.” The same threefold division of eva is found in Sanskrit philosophical works, for instance the Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarīprakāśa *I, 7); the examples of the three types are the same except for the first one, which in Sanskrit texts is śaṅkhaḥ pāṇḍura eva “the conch-shell is pale only.”²

tattha citto dhanuddharo³ eva ti ettha visesanato paranipāto evakāro cittassa yo⁴ dhanuddharabhāvo⁵ tassa cittaṁ vinā aṁn̄ehi puggalehi ayogattaṁ⁶ nivatteti. aṁn̄ehi sambandhaṁ anuñjānāti ti attho. cittanāmakaṁ⁷ puggaladabbaṁ ca dhanuddharabhāvavāgne⁸ niyameti.

1 Payogasiddhi ad Mogg 67:
byavacchedaphalaṁ väkyo tato citto dhanuddhara
pāttho dhanuddhara nilappalam atthi ti taṁ yathā.
ettha nipāto ti eva iti nipāto. appayutto pi evasaddo evaṁ yojetabbo. citto dhanuddharo eva ti visesanena yutto ayogavivacchedako. dhanunā yoge patiṭṭhāpanato. pāttho eva dhanuddharo ti visessena yutto aṁn̄aya yogavivacchedako. dhanuddharattassa pāṭhasaṁkhātaajjone eva patiṭṭhāpanato. nilappalam atth’ eva ti kriyāya yutto accantāyogavivacchedako. nilu-ppalassa sabbhāve yeva patiṭṭhāpanato.
3 S, T, D dhanudharo.
4 T yogassa.
5 U, T dhanuddharabhāvo.
6 S ayogatthaṁ.
7 C om.
8 U dhanuddharabhāvavāgne. T dhanudhabhāvavāgne.
In the example “Citta is the only [person] that increases wealth,” the meaning is: the enclitic particle (paranipāto) eva after the qualifier (visesanato) excludes (nivattetī) the non-union between Citta’s state of being an increaser of wealth and other persons that are not Citta; that is, (ti attho) it recognises (anujānāti) the relation with other [people]. And (ca) the designation (nāmakaṃ) “Citta” restricts (niyametī) the particular person (puggaladabbaṃ) with regard to the feature, namely being an increaser of wealth.

NOTE: This discussion seems to be original from Kacc-nidd, even though the stanza is already found in Payogasiddhi. This passage is an example of the first type of eva. The main point is that the particle eva in the example citto dhanuddharo eva distinguishes through exclusion (ayogavyavaccheda), in this case excluding other persons from Citta’s status of being the treasurer.

pāttho¹ eva dhanudharo² ti ettha³ visessato⁴ paranipāto evakāro pāttham⁵ vinā aţiñēhi⁶ saddhiṃ dhanudharabhāvassā⁷ saṃyogattam⁸ nivatteti. taṃ pātthasmin⁹ yeva niyametī ti attho. pāṭhapuggaladabbassa¹⁰ pana aţnagunēhi sādhāraṇaṭṭaṃ¹¹ anujānāti.

In the example “Pāttha only [is] an archer” the meaning is: the enclitic particle eva after the qualified excludes union of the nature of being an archer with other [persons apart from

---

1 S pādho. U, D pāţho. T pādho.
3 B, U om.
4 B, S, U, T, D visesyato.
6 S, U, D aţiñēhi puggalehi.
7 U, T dhanudharabhāvassā.
8 S, T ayogattaṃ.
11 C asādhaṇṇattham.
Pāttha, and it restricts it only to Pāttha. On the other hand it recognises the fact that the individual [called] Pāttha has other qualities.

NOTE: This is an example of *eva* functioning as a distinguisher through association (*aññayogavyavaccheda*), in this case it associates a quality, namely being an archer, with a particular person, Pāttha (Arjuna). What is really implied is that Pāttha is the archer *par excellence*.

\[\text{nīlaṃ sarojaṃ bhavetevā ti ettha kriyā}^1 \text{ paranipāto evakāro sarojassa uppalassa accantaṃ nīlaguṇavirahattaṃ}^2 \text{ nivatteti. sabbakālaṃ sarojadabbe nīluguṇassa [153] atthibhāvaṃ niyametī ti attho. nīluguṇassa pana aññehi bhamarādidabbagehi sādhāraṇattañ ca sarojajātiyā añña'setādiguṇasādhāraṇattañ}^4 \text{ ca anujānātī ti ayam attho saddasatthavidūnaṃ}^5 \text{ matena vutto.}\]

In the the example “the water plant is indeed (*eva*) blue,” the enclitic particle *eva* after the verb excludes (*nivatteti*) completely (*accantaṃ*) the absence of the quality “blue” from the water plant, i.e. the blue water lily (*uppalassa*). That is to say, it restricts the existence of the quality “blue” in the substance “water lily” at all times (*sabbakālaṃ*). It, however, recognises what is common of blue colour with other substances such as a bee, etc., and what is common of the class water plant with other qualities such as “white,” etc. This meaning has been stated according to the opinion of the philosophers of language (*saddasatthavidūnaṃ*).

---

1 B, S, U, T *kiriyā*.

2 C *viragattaṃ*. S, U *virahatthāṃ*.

3 B, U, D *aṁnaṃ*.

4 U *setādiguṇasādhāraṇaṭthañ*. T *setādiguṇadhāraṇattañ*.

5 I follow D. B, C, U *saddatthavidūnaṃ*. S *saddhavidūnaṃ*. T *saddavidūnaṃ*. 
atha vā. dhanuddharo¹ evā ti ettha evakāro cittadabbaṃ aññaguṇehi nivattetvā
dhanuddharabhāvaguṇe² yeva niyamaṃ karoti. dhanuddharabhāvaguṇassa³
aññadabbehi sādhāraṇattam anujānāti.

Alternatively, in the example “the only [person] who increases wealth,” the word eva, after
excluding (nivattetvā) the substance “Citta” from other qualities, makes a restriction only
(yeva) in the quality that being an increaser of wealth as its nature. [And] it recognises what
is common between other substances and only [a person] who has the quality “increasing
wealth” as its nature.

pāttho⁴ evā ti ettha evakāro dhanudharaṇattam guṇaṃ⁵ aññehi dabbhehi⁶
nivattetvā pāthadabbe⁷ yeva niyamaṃ karoti. pāthassa⁸ pana aññaguṇehi
sādhāraṇattam anujānāti.

In the example “Pāttha only,” the word eva, after excluding the quality “being an archer”
from other substances, makes a limitation for it only in the substance Pāttha. It, however,
recognises what is common between [the substance] pāttha and other qualities.

---
¹ B, S, U, T dhanudharo. D om. from dhanudharo ... nivattetvā.
² B, S, U, T dhanudharabhaṅgūṇe.
⁴ S, T pādho. U, D pāṭho.
⁵ B, S, U, T dhanudharaṇattagunam.
⁶ B, S, U, T aññadabbehi.
⁷ S, T pāthadabbe. U, D pāṭhadabbe.
⁸ S, T pāṭhassa. U, D pāṭhassa.
bhavatevā ti ettha evakāro nilagūṇassa bhavanakriyāṃ abhavanakriyato
nivattetvā sarojadabbe yeva¹ niyamaṃ karoti. nilagūṇassa pana
bhamārādi²aṇṇadabbehi sādhāraṇatattāṃ ca sarojajātiyā³ aṇṇaguṇehi
sādhāraṇatattāṃ ca anujānāti ti. ayaṃ⁴ attho ganthakārakānaṃ⁵ matena vutto ti.

In the example “is indeed,” the word eva, after excluding the action of existing of the quality blue from the action of non-existing, makes a limitation for it [i.e. “the existence of the quality blue”] only in the substance “water plant.” It, however, recognises what is common between the quality “blue” and other substances such as the bee, etc., and what is common between the class “water plant” and other qualities. This meaning has been stated according to the opinion of the book writers (ganthakārakānaṃ).

evampakāro cāyaṃ samāsō niccāniccavaṇasāpi duvidho. tattha niccasamāsō yathā
abhidhammo kupuriso ty ādi. aniccasamāsō yathā mahāpuriso ty ādi.

And such a type of (evampakāro) compound is twofold, on account of being obligatory or non-obligatory. In this regard, an obligatory compound [is], for instance: “Abhidhamma” (abhidhamma), “bad person” (kupuriso), etc. A non-obligatory compound [is], for instance: “great person” (mahāpuriso), etc.

---

¹ B, U, D sarojadabbatthe va.
³ S saro va jātiyā.
⁴ B, S, U, T, D ayaṅ ca.
⁵ S, U, T gandhakārakānaṃ.
327. [A kammadhāraya] in which the first member is a number [is called] digu.

dvipadam idā. saṃkhya-pubbo ti saññī. digū ti saññā. saññā-pe-saññāsuttan ti
daṭṭhabbaṃ. saṃkhya-pubbo padhāno yassa soyaṃ saṃkhya-pubbo.

This [sutta consists] of two words. “In which the first member is a number” (saṃkhya-pubbo) is that which receives the technical name; “digu” is the technical name. Among the different types of sutta, this has to be considered a definition sutta. “[That] in which the first member, i.e. the predominant member, is a number is that which has a number as its first word.”

NOTE: padhāno could also be translated as “head” in the sense that it is the most salient feature.

tena vatthuttayaṃ ty ādīṃ saṅgaṇhāti. dve gāvo digu. saṃkhya-pubbvasena ca
tulyādhikaraṇavasena ca digusadisattā ayam pi samāso digu nāma. tehi vā dvīhi
yathāvuttalakkhaṇehi gacchati pavattatī ti digu. saṃkhya-pubbattanapuṇṣake-
kattasaṃkhathehi dvīhi lakkhaṇehi gato avagato ti digū ti pi vadanti. idāṃ
lakkhaṇaṃ asamāhāradīgumhi na labbhati.

With this [definition] examples such as vatthuttayaṃ “three objects” are included. digu means “two cows.” On account of having a number as its head, and on account of having a common substratum, a compound also is called digu because of its being similar to a digu. Or it is called a digu because it goes (gacchati), that is it functions (pavattatī), with those two (dvīhi) aforementioned characteristics [namely a numeral preceding and a common substratum of the members]. They also call it a digu because it is gone to, that is to say, it is understood, by means of the two characteristics, namely having number as its first member and being a
neuter singular. This characteristic does not apply to the non-collective *digu* (*asamāhāradigu*) type.

This *digu* compound is twofold on account of its being collective or non-collective. In this regard, a collective *digu* [is], for instance, “the three worlds comprised together,” that is “comprising the three worlds” (*tilokaṃ*). A non-collective *digu* [is], for instance, “a man of the four quarters” (*puggalo catuddiso*), or “the ten thousand world spheres.” It is also twofold on account of its being single (*ekabhāvi*) or being multiple (*anekabhāvi*).

tenāha
ekabhāvianekattaṃ *digu-r-evaṃ* dvidhā mato
eko samāhāro tattha eko ca asamāharo ti.

That is why he stated:

A *digu* is considered twofold: being single or being multiple.

In this respect (*tattha*), one [type] is collective, and the other [type] is non-collective.

---

1 S *samāhatā*. T *samāhāratā*.
2 C om.
3 B, U, T, D *ekapuggalo*.
4 S, U, D *catuddisā*. T *catudisā*.
5 B, U, D *eva*. 

---
pubbuttarapadatthavasena vā duvidho vatthuttayaṃ ty ādi ca. tilokaṃ ty ādi ca. tenāha
digusamāso viññeyyo dvipadhāno² pakāsito
vatthuttayaṃ pubbapadhāno tilokaṃ uttarapadhāno³ ti.

Or it is considered twofold on account of the predominance of the prior or of the final member of the compound. For instance in “object-triad” (vatthuttayaṃ) [the prior member is predominant], etc., and in “triple world” (tilokaṃ) [the latter member is predominant]. That is why he stated:

“The digu compound should be understood to display two possible predominant [members]: in vatthuttayaṃ the first [member] is predominant, in tilokaṃ the last [member] is predominant.”

NOTE: Mmd-pṭ (174, 18–20), makes a different analysis and considers that digu is only when the first member predominates. When the second member predominates, that is always called a tappurisa: pubbapatthapadhāno digu. sānkhyāparicchinnattā uttarapatthassa. tilokan ti yathā. uttarapatthapadhāno tappuriso.

---

² B, U dvipadhāno. S dippadhāne.
³ B, S, U, T uttarapado. D cuttarapado. The second part of the stanza metrically dubious. I think it should be restored to vatthuttayaṃ pubbapado tilokaṃ uttarapado, the idea of padhānatta being expressed already in pāda b.
Therefore, the technical name “compound” in examples such as *tilokaṃ*, etc., receives the specific technical name *kammadhāraya* when the numeral word expresses what is to be counted, receives the specific technical name *digu* when there is predominance of the numeral, and receives the specific technical name *tappurisa* when there is predominance of the last member.

**NOTE:** *tappurisa* includes *kammadhāraya* and *digu*; it is an umbrella concept (see the following rule). *vatthuttayāṇa* is apparently treated as an exception that is best explained if included in the category *digu*.
328. Both [digu and kammadhāraya receive the technical name] tappurisa.

dvipadam idaṃ. ubhe ti saññī, tappurisā ti saññā. saññā-pe-saññāsuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. idha ubhe ti iminā digusamāsañ ca kammadhārayasamāsañ ca saṅgaṇhāti.1 tassa puriso tappuriso. yathā hi ayaṃ tappirisasaddo uttarapadatthappadhänattā uttarapadatthe yeva vattati, tathā bhūmigato ty ādi samāso pī ti. tasmā tappurisasadisattā bhūmigato ty ādi samāso pi tappuriso nāma.

This [sutta consists] of two words. “Both” (ubhe) [expresses] that which receives the technical name; “tappurisā” [expresses] the technical name. Among the different types of sutta, this one has to be considered a sutta that provides a technical name. Here the word ubhe includes the digu compound and kammadhāraya compound. [The word] tappuriso [is dissolved as] tassa puriso “his man.” For, as this word, tappurisa rests only on the last referent on account of it being predominant, similarly in the compound bhūmigato “gone to ground,” etc. Therefore, because of the similarity with [the word] tappurisa, compounds such as bhūmigato, etc. receive the technical name tappurisa as well.

1 B, S, U, D gaṅhāti.
2 C om. S pi ti.
yakkhasadisattā yakkho ti vohāro viya. ime hi ¹ dve digukammadhārayasamāsā uttarapadatthappadhānabhāvena tappurisekadesasadisattā tappurisā ti vuccanti.
yathā samuddo² hi mayā³ diṭṭho ti ādi. keci pana ime dve samāsā⁴ ubhayatappurisā ti ekanāmaṇ katvā iminā saddhiṃ dutiyātappurisādayo sattā⁵ ti vadanti. tasmā⁶ taṃ⁷ saddanītiādīsu ubhayatappurisasānā nāma nattii ti vatvā paṭikkhipanti⁸.

It is like calling someone a yakkha because of the similarity with a [real] yakkha. For, these two [digu and kammadhāraya], on account of being similar in one place (ekadesa) to the tappurisa[, namely] due to the predominance of their last referent, they are called tappurisa, as in “I have seen the ocean.” Some, however, make one single name, namely “ubhayatappurisa,” for these two compounds; with this they say: “They are seven (satta), starting with accusative tappurisa, etc.” For this reason, then, in the Saddanīti and other grammars they state that there is no such definition as ubhayatappurisa [and] they reject it.

NOTE: The technical term ekadesa “one place” refers to a designation that takes a part for the whole, granted that this whole is homogeneous, as when one says that he has seen the ocean, when, in fact, he has only seen a very small part of it. The term ubhayatappurisa is used in Mmd-pṭ (174, 29f.). Saddhammajotipāla seems to share the opinion of those who reject this interpretation of Mmd-pṭ, because this analysis is not found either in Sadd or in other grammars. Although some consider Sadd later than Mmd-pṭ (Tin Lwin, 1991: 125), this remark of Saddhammajotipāla seems to consider Sadd as an older authority.

¹ C pi.
² B, U, D mahāsamuddo.
³ C yo.
⁴ S, T samāse.
⁵ C kattā.
⁶ S, T om.
⁷ C, U, D tesañ.
⁸ S paṭipakkhipanti.
In cases such as *abrāhmaṇa* “non-brahmin,” the meaning of the word *na* “no” is twofold: denial (*pasajjapaṭisedho*) and committed negation (*pariyudāsapaṭisedho*). In this regard, denial expresses the non-existence of the object, inasmuch as only the last referent is negated. The committed negation applies to, and appears in, an object such as one which is different from [but] similar to the last referent.  

That is why he says:

The non-existence of the object is the characteristic of denial (*pasajjapaṭisedhassa*), and applying to another object is the characteristic of the committed negation (*pariyudāsassa*). 

---

1 D *payirudāsa*.
2 D *payirudāsa*.
3 B, S, D *uttarapadatho*. U *uttarapadatto*.
4 For a clear explanation of the philosophical distinction between these two kinds of negation in the Indian tradition, see Matilal 2005: 128: “Indian grammarians and logicians tried to capture these two aspects of negation by their doctrine of two types of negation, *paryudāsa* (nominally bound negative) and *prasajya-pratiṣedha* (verbally bound negative). In *paryudāsa* type of negation, the ‘commitment’ aspect largely predominates over the ‘denial’ aspect, while in the *pratiṣedha* type of negation, it is the other way around.”
5 S, T *vatthuto aññatra*.
6 B, U, S *pariyudāsa*. T *pariyūdāsa*. D *payirudāsa*. 
In this regard, in examples such as *assaddhabhojī* “one who does not have the habit of eating during the *saddhā* ceremony,” *akatvā* “not doing,” etc., the word “no” has the meaning of negation by denial. In examples such as *abrāhmaṇo* “non brahmin,” etc., the word “no” has the meaning of negation by commitment [to some quality other than being a brahmin, etc.]. And in the original expression (*ādivākye*) “[He is] not a brahmin” (*na brāhmaṇo*), the technical name *samāsa* occurs on account of the words *na* and *brāhmaṇa* expressing one single referent similar to a brahmin [in that both brahmin and non-brahmin are persons], and the technical name *kammadhāraya* occurs on account of having a common substratum; and the technical name *tappurisa* occurs on account of expressing a relationship of what suggests (*jotaka*) and what is to be suggested (*jotitabba*), and on account of expressing a relationship of qualifier and qualified, and because of the predominance of the last member of the compound.

---

1 D payirudāsa.
2 C nasaddabrāhmaṇasaddā taṃ.
3 C jotako hoti tappabhūtattā. B jotakajotitabbabhūtattā.
apañcavassan ti ettha na\textsuperscript{1} pañcavassan\textsuperscript{2} ti väkye samāsasaññā ca. tulyādhikaraṇattā kammadhārayasaññā ca. saṃkhyāpubbattā digusaññā ca. uttarapadatthappadhānattā tappurisasaññā ca hoti. yathā ca\textsuperscript{3} na pañcavassan ti väkye samāsasaññā ca\textsuperscript{4} kammadhārayasaññā ca\textsuperscript{5} tappurisasaññā ca hoti. evaṃ sesasamāsesu pi daṭṭhabbaṃ.

With regard to the example \textit{apañcavassan} “not lasting five years,” in the sentence “[it does] not last five years” the technical name “compound” receives the [specific] technical name \textit{kammadhāraya} because of the common substratum [of the two members]; and receives the [specific] technical name \textit{digu} because of the predominance\textsuperscript{6} of the numeral; and receives the [specific] technical name \textit{tappurisa} because of the predominance of the last referent. And in the same way that in the sentence \textit{na pañcavassan} “[it does] not last five years” the technical name “compound” receives the [specific] technical name \textit{kammadhāraya} and the [specific] technical name \textit{tappurisa}, similarly it has to be considered in the rest of the compounds.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} B, S, T om.
\item \textsuperscript{2} B, S, U, D pañcavassānī.
\item \textsuperscript{3} B, S, U, T, D om. yathā ca.
\item \textsuperscript{4} B, S, U, T, D om.
\item \textsuperscript{5} S, U, T, D om.
\item \textsuperscript{6} I follow the interpretation of \textit{pubbako} as meaning \textit{padhāno} given previously.
\end{itemize}
amādayo parapadehī

329. [When words ending in case endings] aṃ, etc. [are combined] with the following words, [the technical name tappurisa applies].

dvipadam idaṃ. amādayo ti kammatttha, parapadehī ti sahatthatatiyā. saññā-pe-saññāsuttan ti daṭṭhabbāṃ.

This [sutta consists] of two words. “aṃ, etc.” (amādayo) [expresses] the object; “with the following words” (parapadehī) [expresses] a comitative instrumental (sahattha). Among the different types of sutta, this has to be considered a sutta that provides a technical name.

1 = Kacc. B, S, T, D parapadebhī. The meaning remains the same and I will not note the variant in the commentary.
3 S vidhividhāyakañ.
4 C, T kāribhūto.
5 Kacc-v 113,13-14: yadā samāsante tadā so samāso tappurisasañño hoti. ettha hi amādayo ti idaṃ vibhattipadhpānnavasena

6 B, U, T, D om.
vuttaṃ. amādivibhidyantāni pubbapadānī⁵ ty attho daṭṭhabbo. teneva ca² rūpasiddhiyam amādivibhidyantāni yuttatthānī³ padānī⁴ ti vuttaṃ.⁵

Some also state that amādayo is that which receives the technical name. This is not correct, because this sutta prescribes a compound and [at the same time] provides a definition. Therefore that which receives the technical name is only the compound, which is what is to be carried out in the operation, and not amādayo, which is understood as being the object of the operation. That is why he stated: “when ... that compound [receives the technical name tappurisa].”⁶ Those case endings, i.e. aṃ, etc., when they combine with a following word, then this compound receives the technical name tappurisa. For, in this case, “aṃ, etc.” has been stated having the [word] vibhatti as its [external] predominant meaning. What has to be understood here is that the former members of the compounds end in the case endings aṃ, etc. And that is why in the Rūpasiddhi it is stated: “words of connected meaning that end in case endings starting with aṃ, etc.”

NOTE: It has to be understood here that the endings of the first member of the compound correspond to the word when we only have a sentence that will be transformed into a compound by means of the elision of the case endings. For instance: saraṇam gato becomes saranagato, and because the first member ended in aṃ, the resulting compound is called a tappurisa, in this particular case an accusative tappurisa.

---

1 T padāni.
2 S, U, D om.
3 T yuttāni.
4 B, U, D om.
5 Rūp 193.2–4: amādivibhidyantāni yuttatthānī pubbapadānī nāmehi parapadebhi saha vibhāsā samasyante so samāso tappurisasañño hoti.
6 Kacc-v 113.13–14.
with the word *amādayo* it excludes (*nivatteti*) the nominative *tappurisa*, because the nominative *tappurisa* is included in the [preceding] sutta: “Both [digu and kammadhāraya receive the technical name] *tappurisa*” [Kacc 328].

*aḍḍhaṃ* pipphaliyā *aḍḍhapipphali*. *aḍḍhaṃ* kosā takiyā3 *aḍḍhakosā takī* ti ādisu paṭhamapadaṃ uttarapadabhāvena parivattanaṭṭhānesu ca. buddhasaraṇaṃ gato5 ti ādisu iti lopaṭṭhānesu ca paṭhamatappuriso labbhāti ti saddanītiakkharasamūhādīsu vadanti.

The *Saddanīti*, the *Akkharasamūha* and others state: “the nominative *tappurisa* is found in [compounds] where (*ṭhānesu*) the relation of the last word goes back (*parivattana*) to the first word (*paṭhamapadaṃ*), as in: “half a *pipphali* = *aḍḍhapipphali*,” “half a *kosa* with a *takī* = a *takī* of half *kosa*,” etc.; and where (*ṭhānesu*) there is an elision (*lopa*), as in “gone to the Buddha [as] a refuge.”

NOTE: *pipphali* (PED s.v.) is probably black pepper and the passage refers to grains of pepper; a *kosa* may refer to a store house or granary, but it can also be a measure of length (equivalent to 500 bow-lengths); and *takī* may be related to *taka* which is a species of medicinal gum or reisin (cf. DOP s.v.v. *kosa*, *taka*).

1 S, T *aḍhaṃ*.
2 B, D *aḍḍhapippali*. S, U, T *aḍḍhapippali*.
3 B *tatiyā*. U *takiyā*.
4 S *takī*.
5 Sadd 754.22: *saraṇaṅgato*. B, C, U, T *buddhaṃ saraṇaṃ gato* = S, D *buddhaṃ saraṇaṅgato*. The point of the passage is that there should be an elision in the formation of a *paṭhamatappurisa*, and this can only be *buddhasaraṇaṃ*.
tenāha saddanītiyaṃ. saṅkhepato suddhatappuriso kammadhārayatappuriso
digutappuriso\(^1\) ti tayo tappurisā. vitthārato pana paṭhamātappuriso
dutīyātappurisādayo cā ti satta bhavantī ti.\(^2\)

That is why he says in the Saddanīti: “In short (saṅkhepato), there are three [types of] tappurisa: pure tappurisa, kammadhāraya tappurisa and digu tappurisa. In detail, however, they are seven: nominative tappurisa, accusative tappurisa, etc. [with all the seven case endings].

akkharasamūhe pi

paṭhamā dutīyā tatiyā catutthī pañcamī tathā
chaṭṭhī ca sattamī cetī\(^3\) ubhetappuriso\(^4\) mato ti
vuttaṃ.

In the Akkharasamūha, also, it is stated:

The tappurisa, in both [digu and kammadhāraya] is considered [sevenfold, on account of its expressing:] first, second, third, fourth as well as fifth, and sixth and also seventh [case endings].

---

1 C add. ca.
3 C cetī. U co.
4 B, S, U, T ubhayatappuriso.
rūpasiddhiyāṃ pana. āmalakassa aḍḍhaṃ aḍḍhāmalakaṃ. pipphaliyā aḍḍhaṃ aḍḍhapipphaliṭti chaṭṭhītappurisaṭṭhāne āharitvā paṭhamā tappuriso ti vuttaṃ.

In the Rūpasiddhi however, it is stated: “the nominative (paṭhamā) tappurisa is comprised (āharitvā) on the [partitive] genitive (chaṭṭhī) tappurisa, as in ‘a half of āmalaka = half-āmalaka’, ‘a half of pipphalī = half-pipphalī’.”

NOTE: āmalaka is emblic myrobalan, i.e. its seed (CPD s.v.).

vuttaṃ ca tattha. kvaci accantādisu amādivibhatyantaṃ pubbapadaṃ bhavati parapadaṃ bhavati. yathā antaṃ atikkantaṃ accantaṃ, rattiyā aḍḍhaṃ aḍḍharattam ty ādi.

And there [in the Rūpasiddhi] it is also stated: “sometimes, in [words like] accanta, etc., the previous word ending in aṃ, etc., takes the last position. For instance: ‘passing beyond (atikkantaṃ) the end (antaṃ) = complete (accantaṃ),’ ‘half of the night = half-night,’ etc.

NOTE: Rūp 198, 5f. reads: kvaci accantādisu amādivibhatyantaṃ pubbapadaṃ paraṃ sambhavati. yathā antaṃ atikkantaṃ accantaṃ [...] rattiyā aḍḍhaṃ aḍḍharattam.
tappuriso ti¹ tassa puriso ti² tappuriso. tappurisasadisattā ayam pi samāso tappuriso nāma. yakkhasadisapuggale yakkhavohāro viya.³ yathā hi⁴ tappurisasaddo uttarapadatthappadhānattā uttarapadatthe yeva pavattati. tathā ayam pi samāso uttarapadatthe yeva pavattati. pubbapadassa atthaṃ muñcitvā parapadatthe⁵ yeva labbhati ti attho.

\textit{tappuriso} [is dissolved as] \textit{tassa puriso} “his man.” Because of the similarity with [the compound] \textit{tappurisa}, a compound is also called \textit{tappurisa}, in the same way as one is called \textit{yakkha} out of being similar to a [real] \textit{yakkha}. For, as the word \textit{tappurisa} rests only on the last referent on account of its being predominant, similarly this [compound] also rests only on the last member. That is to say, having abandoned the meaning of the first member of the compound, it applies to the meaning of the last member.

so ca tappuriso saṅkhepato duvidho. suddhatappuriso missakatappuriso cā ti. vitthārato pana aṭṭhavidho hoti. dutīyātappurisādayo ca dve kammadhārayadigutappurisā cā ti.

And this [type of compound, namely] \textit{tappurisa}, in short, is twofold: pure \textit{tappurisa} and mixed \textit{tappurisa}. In detail, however, it is eightfold: accusative \textit{tappurisa}, and the other [five case endings], plus the other two, namely \textit{kammadhāraya tappurisa} [otherwise known as nominative \textit{tappurisa}] and \textit{digu tappurisa}.

---

1 C om. \textit{tappuriso ti}.
2 S, U, T om.
3 See Mnd-pt 173:21–23: \textit{tassa puriso ti tappuriso, tappurisasadisattā ayam pi samāso tappuriso ti vuccati, yakkhasadisassa yakkho ti vohāro viya}.
4 S, T hi ayaṃ.
5 B \textit{pubbapadatthe, C parapadattho}. I follow the Mss.
tenāha [156]
duṭiyādisattamantā chadhā1 tappurisā tathā
dve kammadhārayadigu cā2 ty aṭṭha honti tappurisā ti.

That is why he stated:
Beginning with the accusative and ending with the locative tappurisa, in this way tappurisas are sixfold; they are eight if we add digu and kammadhāraya.

NOTE: I could not trace this verse. This stanza seems to express the opinion of Saddhammajotipāla.

imasmīṁ hi samāse kathāṁ atthasamāso siyā. samāsasaddena uttarapadatthasēva gahitattā3 ti siyā. sabbasseva4 pubbapadatthassa5 ajahitattā.6 rājapuriso ti ettha hi rājasaddo rājadabbam7 eva jahitvā8 taṁ9sambandhasakattham gahētvā uttarapadattthē9 pavattatī ti.

In this compound, indeed (hī), how is the compound of meanings possible? It is possible because the word samāsa includes the meaning of the last word only, and it does not entirely reject the meaning of the first referent of the compound. For, in the case of rājapuriso, for instance, the word rāja “king” disregards the substance of the king [and] taking the relationship [inherent in the genitive form rañño] as its own meaning, it applies only to the last referent [of the compound].

1 C cha va. S, T cha ca.
2 C om.
3 C gahitabbā.
4 S sabbase. U sabbassa.
5 C, T add. ca.
6 C ajahitattā.
7 C, S, T rājadabbam.
8 S hitvā.
9 C taṁsambandhasakattham.
10 C add. yeva.
330. When [the words of the compound have] other referents [the compound receives the technical name] bahubbīhi.

dvipadam idaṃ. aññapadatthesu ti ādhārasattamī, nimittasattamī ti pi vadanti. bahubbīhi ti sañña. sañña-pe-saññāsuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

This [sutta consists] of two words. “When [the words of the compound have] other referents” (aññapadatthesu) [expresses] a locative of support (ādhāra); they also state it is a locative that indicates cause of application (nimitta); bahubbīhi [expresses] the technical name. Among the different types of sutta, this has to be considered a sutta [defining] a technical name.

samāsapadato aññesaṃ padānaṃ atthesu nāmāni samāsapadabhūtāni¹ yadā samasyante tadā so samāso bahubbihisañño hoti.

When nouns, i.e. [nouns] that are parts of a compound, are combined with reference to referents of other words, i.e. [words] that are not in the compound, this compound receives the technical name bahubbīhi.

NOTE: This is a gloss of Kacc-v 114, 2-3. For the sake of convenience, I will simply call “external referents” the “other words that are not in the compound.”

¹ C asamāsapadabhūtāni.
bahavo vihaco yassa soyaṃ¹ bahubbīhi. aññapadatthappadhānabhāvena ca² bahubbīhisadisattā ayaṃ pi samāso bahubbīhi ti vuccati.³ yathā hi bahubbīhisaddo aññapadatthappadhānabhāvena⁴ guṇe ṭhito niyutto. evaṃ sakalo cāyaṃ samāso aññapadatthappadhānattā guṇe niyutto ṭhito.

[The word] bahubbīhi [means] that “of which there is much rice.” And any compound that, as [the word] bahubbīhi, has an external referent as predominant, is also called bahubbīhi. For, in the same way that the word bahubbīhi is used as denoting (ṭhito) a quality because of the predominance of an external referent, similarly, every such compound also is used as being a quality because of the predominance of an external referent.

NOTE: Instead of “quality” (guṇa) we would probably use the word “adjective,” but the meaning remains the same — e.g. kaṇhadanto “a black tooth” if it is taken as a kammadhāraya, but if it is taken as a bahubbīhi, it means “[the man] who has a black tooth” or “[the man] who has black teeth.” In the second case, the word kaṇhadanto would express the quality (guṇa) of the substance (dabba) “man” (purisa).

aññapadatthapadhāno ti attho. so ca sāminā saddhiṃ chakkārakānaṃ vācakattā sattavidho hoti. sattavidhayaḥantānaṃ⁵ vā⁶ vācakattā sattavidho.

That is to say, [the bahubbīhi is a compound in which] an external referent is predominant. And this [type of compound] is considered sevenfold because it expresses directly the six

---

1 C so.
2 S, U, T, D om.
3 See Mmd 283,5; Mmd-pt 173,30–174,2.
4 D aññapadatthapadhānabhāve.
5 S sattavidhayaḥantānaṃ.
6 S, U, T, D om.
kārakas along with the genitive (sāminā) [as a seventh]; or it is considered sevenfold because it expresses directly [meanings of items ending with] the seven case endings.

tenāha

paṭhamā dutiyā tatīyā catutthi pañcamī tathā chaṭṭhi ca sattamā ceva bahubbhi sattavidho ti.

That is why he stated:
The bahubbhi is sevenfold: [expressing the] first, second, third, fourth as well as the fifth and sixth, and also the seventh case ending.

akhairasamūhe pana chabbidho va1 bahubbhi ti vuttaṃ. vuttaṃ hi tattha. dvipado. bahuppado.2 saṅkhayobhayapado.3 sahapubbapado.4 byatihāralakkhaṇo. disantarāḷalakkhaṇo ti.

In the Akkharasamūha, however, it is stated: “the bahubbhi is indeed sixfold.” For, there, it is stated: “of two words (dvipado), of many words (bahuppado), with two words being numerals (saṅkhayobhayapado), preceded by saha (sahapubbapado), characterized by reciprocity (byatihāralakkhaṇo), characterized by an intermediate direction (disantarāḷalakkhaṇo).”

tattha dvipado vibhattilopavasena chabbidho. paṭhamāchaṭṭhǐupamāvasena ca6 duvidho.

1 C om.
2 S bahupado ceva. U, D bahupado.
3 C saṅkhyaḥaya. S saṅkhayobhayapado tathā.
4 S, T sahapubbapado ceva.
5 T byatihārassā.
6 B, C om.
In this regard, [the type] of two words is sixfold on account of the elision of the [six] case endings [i.e. accusative to locative]. It is twofold on account of being similar to a nominative or similar to a genitive.

dutīyā tatīyā ceva catutthī pañcamī tathā
chaṭṭhī ca sattamī ceva dvipado hoti chabbidho.

The [bahubbihī] of two words is sixfold [on account of its expressing] the second case, the third, [and] similarly, the fourth and the fifth and the sixth, and also the seventh [case].

paṭhamā upanā ceva chaṭṭhī ca upanā tathā
duvidho dvipado vutto liṅgattayavibhāvito ti.

The [bahubbihī] of two words, appearing in the three genders, is stated as twofold: similar to the first case ending, and similar to the sixth case ending.

yathā dvipado tathā bahupado.

As the [bahubbihī] of two words, similarly the one of many words.

saṁkhyobhayapado yathā dve vā tayo vā vācā dvitivācā tincha vā pañca vā vācā ti chappañcavācā.

The one with two numerals [is] like “of two or three words, i.e. dvitivācā,” “of six or five words, i.e. chappañcavācā.”

---

1 B, S, U, D dvetayovācā. T dvitayo vācā.
2 C, S om.
sahapubbapado yathā. saha mūlena uddhato¹ samūluddhato.² taru.³ sabhikkhusaṃgho [157]. bhagavā.

The [bahubbīḥ] preceded by saha [is] like: “of which the root has been pulled out (samūluddhato)” i.e. a tree; “[accompanied by] the community of monks,” i.e. the Bhagavā.

byatihāralakkhaṇo yathā. musalehi musalehi¹ gahetvā idam yuddham² pavattatī ti musalāmusali. evaṃ daṇḍādaṇḍī.⁶

Marking reciprocity (byatihāra), like “this fight is carried out with clubs (musalehi) against clubs, therefore it is called musalāmusali”. Similarly with “[a fight] stick [against] stick” (daṇḍādaṇḍī).

disantarāḷalakkhaṇo yathā dakkhiṇassā⁷ ca pubbassā⁸ ca disāya⁹ yad antarālaṃ sāyaṃ disā dakkhiṇapubbā.

Marking an intermediate direction, like “that direction which is between the south and the east direction is called ‘southeast’ (dakkhiṇapubbā).”

---

1 C samūladdhato. U samulena uddhato. D saha mūlena uddhato.
2 C samūladdhato. S samuddhato.
3 S dhāru. T tarū.
5 S yuttaṃ.
6 C daṇḍādaṇḍa.
7 U, T dakkhiṇassā.
8 U, T pubbassa.
9 B, S, U, T, D om.
tenāha
dvipado bahuppado ceva saṃkhyobhayapado tathā
sahapubbapado ceva byatihārassa lakkhaṇo
disantarāḷalakkhaṇo vibhāgā chabbidho mato ti.

That is why he stated:

[Bahubbīhi] is considered sixfold after the following division:
of two words and of many words, as well as having two numerals,
and also preceded by saha, marking reciprocity, and marking an intermediate direction.

rūpasiddhisaddanītīsu pana navavidho ti vutto. vuttaṃ hi tattha.¹
dvipado. bhinnādhikaraṇo. tipado. nanipātapubbapado. sahapubbapado.
upamānapubbapado. saṃkhyobhayapado. disantarāḷattho. byatihārassa lakkhaṇo
cā² ti.³

In the Rūpasiddhi and the Saddanīti, however, it is stated as ninefold. For, in them, it is
stated: “of two words; of different substratum; of three words; preceded by the particle na;
preceded by saha; preceded by a comparison; having two numerals; meaning an intermediate
direction; marking reciprocity.”

sarūpaṃ pana heṭṭhā vuttam eva. tattha disantarāḷattho ti⁴ disānaṃ antaro
anudiso⁵ attho yassa samāsassa soyaṃ disantarāḷattho.

¹ D add. dvipado tulyādhikaraṇo.
² B, S, U, T, D read only byatihāralakkhaṇo.
³ Rūp 199,19–22; Sadd 759,29–760,2.
⁴ B, S, U, T, D read only disantarāḷo.
⁵ C anudisā.
Their nature, however, has been previously stated. In this regard, meaning an intermediate direction: a compound the meaning of which is an intermediate point of the compass (anudiso) between [two] directions, this [compound] means an intermediate direction.

byatihāro lakkhaṇaṃ nimittaṃ assā ti byatihāralakkhaṇo. byatihāro ca aññamaññaṃ paccanīkakiriyāya¹ karaṇaṃ.

It is called marking reciprocity that one of which the mark, i.e. the condition, is reciprocity. And reciprocity [is] the cause for a mutually hostile action.

NOTE: In this particular context byatihāra means “exchange [of blows]”, i.e. fight.

sattāhaṃ parinibbutassa assa bhagavato soyaṃ sattāhaparinibbuto. aciraṃ pakkantassa assa purisassa soyaṃ acirapakkanto. aparajjugatāya assā² puṇṇamiyā ti aparajjugatā. māso jātassa assa³ kumārassa soyaṃ māsajāto ti evam ādayo bāhiratthabahubbīhi nāma.

“Of the liberated [for] seven days” (sattāhaparinibbuto) means of that Bhagavā who has been completely extinguished during seven days. “Of the gone not so long ago” (aciraṃ ppakantassa) means of that man who was gone not so long ago. “Of the one coming the next day” (aparajjugatā) means of the day after which the full moon day comes. The boy which is born for a month [that is to say, a month old] is called “month-born” (māsajāto). A compound of this sort is a bahubbīhi with an external referent.

¹ C kriyā.
² B assa.
³ B, U, D om.
ettha hi uttarapadam samāsapadato aūñena padena samānādhikaraṇaṃ bhavati.
aūnnapadattha uttarapadaṃ ākaḍḍhitvā pavattati.2 samānādhikaraṇabhāvena tena saddhiṃ sampajjati3 ti ayam pi4 samāso bāhiratthasamāso ti vuccati.

Because, in this case, there is a common substratum (samānādhikaraṇaṃ) between the last member of the compound and a word other than the compound. It functions (pavattī) by bringing together the last member [of the compound] and an external referent. This compound is also called “compound with an external referent” (bāhiratthasamāso) because it obtains (sampajjati) together with that one (tena) [that is, together with the external referent] by virtue of a common substratum.

atathābhūtā5 sesā abāhiratthā6 nāma bahubbīhi ti7 ayaṃ saddasatthavidūnaṃ8 mati. amhākaṃ matiyā pana aūnassa padassa9 samāsapadena samānādhikaraṇattā aūnatthabahubbīhi10 nāma. saddanītiyaṃ pana bāhiratthabahubbīhi ti vatvā pacchā bāhiratthasamāso pi abāhiratthasamāso11 hotī ti vuttaṃ.

1 B, S, U, D aūnnapadaṇ ca.
4 U, T om.
5 C atthā vā bhūtaṃ. T tathābhūtatā.
6 B, S, U, T, D abāhirattho.
7 B, U, D om.
9 B, S, U, D aūnapadassa.
10 C aūnatthabahubbīhi. B, S, U, T, D antatthabahubbīhi. The Burmese copyist apparently did not understand this word. In Sanskrit grammar anyārthabahuvrīhi means a bahuvrīhi having “another sense which is different from what is expressed; cf. anyārtho bahuvrīhiḥ: Cān. 2.2.46” (DSG sv. anyārtha2). There is a possible influence of Candragomin and other Nālandā erudites (see Cornall, 2012: 68f.).
11 B, S, D om.
Alternatively, the opinion of the experts in semantics (saddasatthavidūnaṃ) is that the rest, the ones that are not like this, are called bahubbīhis without an external referent. In our opinion, however, it is called a bahubbīhi with an internal meaning (antattha) because of the common substratum between the compound and another word. In the Saddanīti, however, after calling it a bahubbīhi with an external referent, [he] later says that even a compound of external referent is a compound without external referent.¹

atha vā sabbo pi bahubbīhisamāso bāhirattho nāma. samāsapadena aaññapadatthassa gahitattā. avasesā pañcasamāsā abāhiratthā nāma. samāsapadatthasseva gahitattā bahi anikkhantattā ca. sattāhaparinibbuto ti ādayo pana bāhiratthā pi abāhiratthā pi samāsā honti. ayaṃ ganthakārakānaṃ mati. imā dve matiyo saddanītiyaṃ² āgatā.

Alternatively, all bahubbīhi compounds are considered of external referent. Because [the bahubbīhi] compound word includes an external referent, the other five types of compound are called “without external referent,” because only the referent of the compound itself is included, and because of not going beyond it. Examples such as sattāhaparinibbuto, etc., however, are compounds with an external referent as well as without an external referent. This is the opinion of the authors of books. These two opinions are recorded (āgatā) in the Saddanīti.

¹ Sadd 765.3-10.
² B saddanītiya.
Thus, the bahubbīhi compound, which is of many kinds, is twofold on account of expressing its quality or not expressing its quality. Because, in this regard, where the referent of the compound which is a qualifier of an external referent conveys (viññāyati) [the external referent] by means of another referent in which the quality, action, or substance are inherent, that one is called “expressing its quality.” For instance: “having morality,” “having wisdom,” “having a son,” “having strength,” “having children and wife he has come,” “he offers a great donation to the saṅgha having the Buddha at its head,” “with children, having cattle, having wealth.” Furthermore (pi), the state of expressing its quality is there only when there is a relation of inherence by virtue of a quality, an action, or a substance, not otherwise.

yattha pana visesanabhūto attho aṅnapadatthena guṇādisamavāyayasena na viññāyati, so atagguṇasaṃviññāṇo nāma. yathā bahudhanam ānaya, pabbatādīni khettāni cassati, amalo lokuttaradhammo ti.
But where the meaning, which is a qualifier, does not distinguish by means of another referent in which the quality, action, or substance are inherent, this \([bahubbīhi]\) is called “not expressing its quality.” For instance: “bring the one of much wealth,” “he ploughs the fields starting with the mountains, etc.” “the supramundane Dhamma without flaw.”

\(\text{ñāse pana payogakriyāhi viññāyatī ti vuttaṃ.}\)

In the \(Nyāsa\), however, it is stated: “it is known by the way usages are done \(\text{(payogakriyāhi)}\).”

NOTE: That is to say, the opinion of the \(Nyāsa\) is a pragmatic one, as we can only know whether a \(bahubbīhi\) is \(tagguṇasaṃviññāṇa\) or \(atagguṇasaṃviññāṇa\) if we know the particular context in which it is used.

\(\text{yattha visesanabhūto attho aṅnapadatthagahaṇena gayhati, so tagguṇasaṃviññāṇo nāma. yathā lambakaṇṇam ānayā ti. yattha pana visesanabhūto attho aṅnapadatthagahaṇena na gayhati so atagguṇasaṃviññāṇo nāma yathā bahudhanam ānayā ti. iti pi rūpasiddhiyam vutto.}\)

Where the meaning, being a qualifier, is grasped with the grasping of the external referent, this is a \([bahubbīhi]\) expressing its [inherent] quality, as “bring the one of hanging ears.”

Where the meaning, however, being a qualifier, is not grasped by the grasping of the external referent, this \([bahubbīhi]\) is not expressing its [inherent] quality, as in “bring someone of much wealth.” This is also stated in the \(Rūpasiddhi\).
yattha avayavena viggaho samudāyo samāsattho so tagguṇasaṃviññāṇo nāma.
yathā lambakaṇṇo, samalā akusalā dhammā ti. yattha samudāyena viggaho
samudāyo samāsattho so atagguṇasaṃviññāṇo nāma. yathā pabbatādīni khettāni,
bahudhano ti. iti pi saddanītiyaṃ vutto.

Where the meaning of the compound [is] an aggregate [which is] the analysis by means of a
part [of the whole], this is called expressing its [inherent] quality, as for example: “the one
having hanging ears,” “phenomena with impurity, unwholesome.” Where the meaning of the
compound [is] an aggregate [which is] the analysis of the aggregate, this is called not
expressing its [inherent] quality, as for example: “the fields starting with the mountains,” “of
much wealth.”

This is also stated in the Saddanīti.

saṃghārāmo ti ayaṃ samāso kammavācako visesanabhūto hi. āgatasaddo ca
samaṇasaddo ca attano atthe appavattitvā dutīyāvibhatyatthabhūte saṃghārāma
saṃghārāmasaṃkhāte aṇṇapadatthe pavattati. tena tadatthabodhanatthaṃ
tadanantaraṃ saṃghārāmo ti vuttaṃ.

The compound “monastery of the congregation” (saṃghārāma) certainly expresses a direct
object, and it expresses a qualifier. Both the word “arrived at” and the word “ascetic,” not
functioning with regard to their own referent, function with regard to an external referent
called saṃghārāma which has the meaning of the second case ending. Because of this, the
word saṃghārāma is stated afterwards in order to explain the meaning of that [bahubbīhi,
namely āgatasamaṇo].

---

1 S om.
2 Sadd 760,8-13.
3 C avattītvā. S pavattītvā.
NOTE: The complete example in Kacc-v (114, 4) is: \( \text{āgatā samaṇā imaṃ saṅghārāmaṃ so yaṃ āgatasamaṇo saṅghārāmo} \). To the best of my knowledge this example is only found in grammatical texts. The bahubbhi is \( \text{āgatasamaṇa} \) which is a qualifier of the external referent \( \text{saṅghārāma} \), this external referent being the object of the verbal action. The full translation of the bahubbhi \( \text{āgatasamaṇa} \), therefore, would be “[the monastery of the congregation where] the ascetic has arrived.”

tato samāsapadeneva dutīyābhibhitassa kammattassa abhihitattā puna dutiyā na hoti. yady evaṃ. imasmiṃ samāse kathaṃ atthasamāso siyā. samāsapadassa attano atthaṃ jahitvā aṇṇapadatthe pavattattā ti siyā.

Therefore, since the object (\( \text{kammattassa} \)) is [already] expressed (\( \text{abhihitattā} \)) by the second case ending by means of the compound word itself, the second case ending does not appear (\( \text{na hoti} \)) again (\( \text{puna} \)) [that is, does not appear redundantly]. If that is so (\( \text{yady evaṃ} \)), how is the compound of meaning possible in this compound? It is possible, because the compound word, having abandoned its own referent, functions with regard to an external referent.

sabbasseva atthassa ajahitattā āgatasamaṇasaddā\(^1\) hi\(^2\) kattubhūtaṃ samaṇadabbam eva jahitvā.\(^3\) sakatthabhūtaṃ kiriyākammakārakasambandhaṇ ca kattukammasambandhaṇ ca gahetvā aṇṇapadatthe pavattanti\(^4\) ti.

In this way: the words \( \text{āgata} \) and \( \text{samaṇa} \), indeed, not having abandoned absolutely all of their meaning, abandon only the common substance which is the agent, but they function with regard to an external referent after taking with them the relation of the action with the direct object, and also having with them the relation of agent and direct object, which are their own [respective] meanings.

---

1 S saddo.
2 U, D ti. T om.
3 U, D vijahitvā.
NOTE: This rather cumbersome explanation is given in order to justify the inclusion of bahubbīhi in the category atthasamāsa instead of saddasamāsa — something that is not apparent, for the atthasamāsa is expressed in one word, the saddasamāsa in two or more words. The aim of this passage is to argue that, even though the bahubbīhi word is related to an external word referent, this external word referent is somehow inherent in the syntactic relationships within the compound itself. In principle, the compound āgatasamaṇa would mean “the ascetic who has come,” that is, it would refer to an individual who is the agent of the action “coming.” When the word becomes a bahubbīhi, it abandons this meaning of being an agent which is the common substratum (the samaṇa is the agent of the action coming). But the word āgata, being a verb, has not abandoned its syntactic relationship with the direct object, and the word samaṇa, being an agent, has not abandoned its syntactic relationship with the direct object of the action (for an agent is defined by the action). In this way, the direct object of the action (saṅghārāma), which is the external referent of the bahubbīhi, is inherently recognised within the bahubbīhi itself — that is to say, not by the word saṅghārāma, but by the idea of a direct object, which in this case happens to be saṅghārāma. The reason for all that is the fact that kārakas are semantically interrelated: an action presupposes an agent, a result of the action, etc., and the agent presupposes an action and a result of this action, and so forth.

evaṃ ayaṃ bahubbīhisamāso pi¹ sāmi² kammādikārakānaṃ sattannanatthānaṃ vācako ca abhidheyyaliṅgasena tiliṅgo ca hoti. na hi chavibhattiyo yeva vācakā honti. atha kho samāsataddhitākhyātakitakā pi vācakā. te³ ca antatthabāhyatthesu bāhyatthānaṃ vācakā ti.

And this bahubbīhi compound expresses the meanings of the seven kārakas, namely owner, direct object, and the rest, and it has the three genders according to the gender of what is to be designated (abhidheyya). For, not only the six case endings are able to express meaning directly (vācakā), but also compounds, secondary formations, verbs, and primary formations

1 C om.
2 B, U om. sāmi.
3 C vācakātthe.
have this ability. Among those that have an internal or an external referent, they [that is, the
type of words just mentioned] also express external referents directly.

tenāha
dutiyyā tatiyā cāpi catutthī pañcamī pi ca
chaṭṭhī ca sattamī cāpi1 cha-y-imā pi ca vācakā.
samāsataddhitākhyaṭakaṭāpi ca vācakā
vācakā dasadhā ty evaṃ2 ŋātabbā samayaṅṅunā3.

That is why he says:
Second and also third case ending, and fourth and also fifth,
as well as the sixth and also the seventh, these six [are] directly expressive (vācakā).
The compounds, secondary formations, verbs and primary formations [are] also directly
expressive. Directly expressive words [are] of ten types. Thus should be known by the expert
on the doctrine.

[159]
kattādyatthā sasāmyattho4 bhāvo ceko tathaṅṅunā5
vaccā atṭhavidhā ty evaṃ ŋātabbā samayaṅṅunā.

The [meanings] directly expressible (vaccā) by the knower of it are of eight types: the senses
of agent, and the rest, with the addition of the genitive [expressing a relation], and one [more,
namely] the sense of being [or state]. Thus should be known by the expert on the doctrine
(samayaṅṅunā).

---
1 B, U, D cāti. T pi ca.
2 C dasadhātthe va. T dasadhā ty evaṃ.
3 U saṃsaṅṅunā. T samayaṅṅunāha.
4 B, S, U, T, D chasambandho.
5 B, S, U, T, D bhāvo ceko tha viṅṅunā.
Within the four types of directly expressive word, each particular (eva) one is directly expressive: [but] it is twofold on account of expressing an internal or an external meaning.

It is considered to be of internal meaning when the referent (padattha) is the compound itself. It is considered to be of external meaning when it expresses another referent, as in bahubhihi compounds such as abhirupa “of excellent form.”

Compounds, secondary formations, verbs, and primary formations are indeed directly expressive words. They are not prescribed with reference to an internal meaning, they are only prescribed with reference to an external meaning.

1 C samāsapadatthe.
2 S kira pi.
3 B, U uttā.
sāpekkhatte sati pi gamakattā¹ samāso ti vāsitasaddassa² pupphasadda³sāpekkhatte sati pi vākye viya attanā apekkhitabbassa puphatthassa⁴ gamakattā antarikā⁵bhāvāpagame⁶ va kāraṇan ti āpakkattā anapekkhitena aṅṇena sānusaddena samāso hoti. devadattassa gurukulan ti ādīsu viya aṅṅāpekkhatte sati pi⁷ samāso na hoti.

The compound [works] because of the intelligibility (gamakattā), even when it is with expectancy. Therefore (tī) even when there is expectancy of the previous word [i.e. puppha] on the word vāsita, as in a sentence, there is a compound with a non-dependent word such as “summit” (sānu) due to the intelligibility of the word puppha that is independent by itself (attanā) and because of making known that it is the instrument in the disappearance of the separation (antarikābhāva) [i.e. when the word sānu is connected with pupphavāsita, we understand “the summit (sānu) which is fragrant (vāsita) due to the flowers (puppha, understand the instrumental pupphēhi)”]. In examples such as “the family of Devadatta’s guru,” even though there is expectancy on some other [word], there is no compound [that is to say, the compound devadattagurukulaṃ would be wrong].

NOTE: The examination of the words pupphavāsitasānū (“a mountain peak having the smell of flowers”) and the long compound formed around it is found already in Mmd (284, 2f.). The passage reads: vāsīta sānu vāsitasānu sāpekkhatte sati pi gamakattā samāso nānādumapatipupphehi vāsitasānū yassa, so yaṁ nānādumapatipupphehi vāsitasānū. ayaṁ pana bhinnādhikaraṇabahubhi “a perfumed mountain peak is [expressed with the compound] vāsitasānū. The compound [works] because of the intelligibility (gamakattā), even when it is with expectancy. That of which the peak is

¹ T gamakattā.
² C vaṃsitasaddassa.
⁴ C pupbasaddathassa. S pubbatthassa.
⁵ T anantarikā.
⁶ C bhāva.
⁷ B, S, U, T, D om.
perfumed with flowers fallen from many types of trees, that one is [expressed with the bahubhi compound] nānadumapatitapupphāvāsitasānu. Now this is a bahubhi of separated substratum.” As the present discussion shows, this passage has been interpolated in Kacc-v already at the time of Kacc-nidd. See Senart 1871: 168f.; and Pind 2013, 115, n.6. If I understood it correctly, the idea of “separated substratum” is taken up by Saddhammajoti, but he uses the concept of antarikabhāva “interval” “state of being separated,” in order to indicate that, even though the word puppha is separated from the word sānu in the compound, they are still related due to the “expectancy” of the meaning through the intervening participle vāsita “perfumed.”

devadattassa kaṇhā dantā, bakassa setāni pattānī ti ādīsu viyā ti adhippāyo. kaṇhadantā setapattānī ti samāsabhāve sati dantapattasaddā attanā apekkhitabbānaṃ devadattabakastṭhānaṃ¹ apekkhitum na sakkā. kaṇhasetasaddantarikattā. tasmā kaṇhadantā setapattānī ti samāsā na honti. nāpi devadattassa kaṇhadantā devadattakaṇhadantā. bakassa setapattānī² bakasetapattānī ti samāsā honti. kaṇhasetasaddantarikattā ca kaṇhasetasaddānaṃ ca devadattabakatṭhānaṃ³ anapekkhitattā ti.⁴

What is implied is that it is similar to [the examples] “the black teeth of Devadatta,” “the white feathers of the heron.” When the state of [being a] compound is present, as in “black teeth” or “white feather,” the words “tooth” and “feather” by themselves (attanā) cannot (na sakkā) expect (apekkhitum) the expected referents, namely “Devadatta” and “heron,” because the words “black” and “white” are in between. Therefore there is no compound in “black teeth” [and] “white feather.” Neither is there a compound “Devadatta-black-teeth” [from] “the black teeth of Devadatta,” or a compound “heron-white-feather” [from] “the white feathers of the heron.” Because of the interval caused by the words “black” and “white,” and

¹ C devadattabakasaddānaṃ.
² C setāni pattāni.
³ C devadattabakapattānaṃ.
⁴ S, U, T om.
because the words “black” and “white” do not expect the referents “Devadatta” and “heron” [respectively].

dāpiī devadattassa kaṅhā devadattakaṅhā. devadattakaṅhā ca te dantā ce ti devadattakaṅhā dantāī icc evam ādi samāsā honti. kaṅhādisaddānaṃ devadattādiatthānaṃī anapekkhitattā ti.ī

Neither is the case that there is such a compound as “Devadatta-black-teeth” (devadattakaṅhadantā) explained as “Devadatta’s black = Devadatta-black, those teeth which are Devadatta-black are [called] “Devadatta-black-teeth.” Because there is no expectancy (anapekkhitattā) for the words “black,” etc., on the meanings Devadatta, etc.

NOTE: That is to say, devadatta cannot be a qualifier of kaṅhā. This explanation seems to bridge the gap (antarikā) by creating first an artificial compound that combines two words (for instance, “Devadatta” and “black”) that otherwise could not be related, or let us say that the word “black” would not imply or “expect” the word “Devadatta.”

keci pana devadattakaṅhadantā bhariyā ti vadanti.ī  taṃ tesāṃ matimattāṃ.

Some, however, state: “Devadatta-black-teeth, i.e. [Dedavatta’s] wife”. But this is only their opinion.

1 S, U keci pana.
2 D devadattakaṅhadantā.
3 S, T attāni.
4 Com. all this paragraph.
NOTE: There are two different readings of the first line and neither of them seems to be clear. I have combined elements of both in order to obtain a reading that makes sense in this context. The “opinion” (mati) of these grammarians would be that in the bahubbihī devadattakaṇhadantā, the -ā is not a nom. pl. but a fem. nom. sing. referring to the wife of Devadatta, a woman who, allegedly, has black teeth. In this way, it is the external referent (namely bhāriyā) that is connected with the word Devadatta, and not the internal referent danta.

yadi hi kaṇhadantasaddā bhariyavācakā siyuṃ, sambandhisaddattā sambandhisaddabhūtena¹ devadattasaddena samāso siyā. rājahatthigavassakan ti ādivi viyā ti. imasmiṃ bahubbihīsamāse aṇṇapadaṃ tisu ṭhānesu ṭhitam: ādimhi majjhe ante ca. yathā yassa hatthe patto atthi soyaṃ hatthapatto. nassa anto anantaṃ. chinno hattho yassa soyaṃ chinnahaththo ty ādi.

Because if the words “black” and “teeth” would directly express the “wife,” on account of being relative terms, [then] there would be a compound with the word “Devadatta” [as well, for] it is [also] a relative term, as in examples such as “the elephants, cows, and horses of the king.” In the bahubbihī type of compound, the external referent may be situated in three different places: beginning, middle, and end, as in examples such as: “That one in whose hands there is a bowl, he is called bowl-hand;” “of that there is no end, [that is why it is] unending;” “that one whose hand is cut off, he is cut-off-hand.”

NOTE: sambandhisadda (Skt. sambandhiśabda): see DSG s.v.: “relative term; the term refers to words connected in such a way by their meaning that if one of them is uttered, the other has to be anticipated and understood.”

---

¹ S, U, T, D sambandhasaddabhūtena.
That is why he says:
The external referent is situated in a threefold manner: [it can be that] the external referent
[is situated] in the first (ādi) [member of the compound], as well as the external referent in
the middle, and also the external referent in the end.

[160]
|| nāmānaṃ samuccayo dvando || 331 ||

331. An aggregate of nouns [is a] dvanda.

tipadam idaṃ. nāmānan ti sambandhachatthī. samuccayo ti saññī. dvando ti
saññā. saññā-pe-saññāsuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

[This sutta consists] of three words. “Of nouns” (nāmānaṃ) [expresses] a genitive of relation;
“an aggregate” (samuccayo) [expresses] that which receives the technical name; dvanda
[expresses] the technical name. Among the different types of sutta, this has to be considered a
sutta [defining] a technical name.

1 Com.
nāmānan ti anuvattamānattā samuccayo dvando ti vutteś Siddhe pi kasmā nāmaggaḥaṇaṃ katan ti. Siddhe satyārambhō hi niyamāya vā atthantaraviṇṇāpanāya vā hoti ti vacanato bahutaranāmapadānaṃ viṇṇāpanatthaṃ kataṃ.

Since the word nāmānaṃ can be gathered by recurrence, it would also be sufficient [if he stated] samuccayo dvando. Why then is the word nāma included? Even though it would be sufficient, it is formulated (kataṃ) in order to make known an even greater number of noun-words [to be included in the scope of the sutta], as it is said that (vacanato) “even though it is well known, the effort (ārambhō) [of explaining it] is (hoti) [made] in order to make a restriction (niyamāya) or in order to convey another meaning (atthantaraviṇṇāpanāya).”

atthabyākhyāne pana kriyānivatthanatthan ti vuttaṃ. ekavibhattikānaṃ paṭhamādisamānavidvibhattikānaṃ bahu’nāmānaṃ yo samuccayo atthi so dvandasaṅño hoti ti attho. ekavibhattikānan ti iminā hi paṭhamādivibhattisamānattāṃ6 dasseti. na bahuvacanādisamānattaṃ7.

In the Atthabyākhyāna, however, it is stated: “in order to prevent the [inclusion] of the verb.” That is to say, the technical name dvanda applies to that aggregate (samuccayo) [which consists] of many nouns having one case ending, i.e. having a common case ending such as nominative, etc. For with the word ekavibhattikānaṃ “having one case ending” [Kacc-v 115, 9]
he shows the state of having a common case ending, such as nominative, etc., not the state of having a common [number] such as plural, etc.

tenā saddanītiyaṃ samaṇo ca brāhmaṇo ca. samaṇā ca brahmaṇā ca. samaṇo ca brāhmaṇā ca. samaṇā ca brahmaṇā ca. samaṇo ca brahmaṇo ca. ti cattāri vākyapadāṇi āharati.

That is why in the Saddanīti he bring up these four word-sentences: “ascetic and brahmin,” “ascetics and brahmins,” “ascetic and brahmins,” “ascetics and brahmin.”

NOTE: Sadd 768,29–769,3. All four, regardless of the number of the words within the compound, produce a plural dvanda. What Saddhammajotipāla is arguing here is that what grammatically ties the members of a dvanda compound cannot be the resulting number, because it will always be plural (in Sanskrit it could also be dual, but not in Pāli). For instance, let us examine the dvanda samaṇabrāhmaṇā (“ascetics and brahmins”). This word is a nominative plural. Now, as the example from the Saddanīti shows, if we analyse the word, it is not clear if we mean one ascetic and some brahmins, etc., but it is clear that both members of the compound are to be analysed as nominatives. That is why we say that what is common between the members of a dvanda compound is the case ending (vibhatti), not the number or other elements. This is a gloss of Kacc-v (115, 9: nāmānaṃ ekavibhattikānaṃ yo samuccayo sa dvandasañño hoti).

1 D samaṇo.
2 D samaṇā.
3 S, D brāhmaṇo. T brahmaṇā.
4 S samaṇo.
5 T brahmaṇo.
Aggregate is an aggregation (samuccayanaṃ), i.e. an accumulation (sampiṇḍanaṃ). This, in turn, on account of its referent, is fourfold: single aggregate (kevalasamuccayo), connecting [aggregate] (anvācayo), mutually connecting [aggregate] (itarītarayogo), and collective [aggregate] (samāhāro).

tenāha
samuccayo samāhāro tathā anvācayo pi ca
itaretarayogo ca dvando nāma catubbidho ti.

That is why he says:

“Dvanda is fourfold: aggregate, collective, as well as connecting, and mutually connecting.”

tesu catūsu kevalasamuccaye¹ ca² anvācaye³ ca samāso na bhavati. kiriyāsāpekhatāya⁴ ayuttatthabhāvato. tattha kiriyaṃ paṭicca bahukārakānaṃ samuccayanaṃ⁵ sampiṇḍanaṃ kevalasamuccayo nāma.

Among these four, there is no compound in the single aggregate and in the connecting [aggregate], because, since it depends on the verb, there is no connected meaning [of nouns]. In this regard, when it depends on the verb, an aggregation, i.e. an accumulation, of many kārakas is called a single aggregate.

---

¹ B, S, U, T, D kevalasamuccayo.
² B, S, U, D om.
³ B, S, U, T, D anvācayo.
⁴ B sāpekkhatāya.
⁵ T, D samuccayanaṃ.
The Samāsakappa of the Suttaniddesa

taṇ̄i yathā
cīvaraṃ piṇḍapātañ ca paccayaṃ sayanīsanaṃ
adāsi ujubhūtesu vippasannena² cetasā ti.³

That is, for instance:

“He offered clothes, food, drink and bedding, contented with these men of life upright.”⁴

tattha tadatthajotako casaddo eko vā bahū⁵ vā yojetuṃ vaṭṭati.

In this regard, the word “and” [of the type that] suggests its meaning is fit to connect either one or many.

sakiriyānaṃ kārakānaṃ samuccayanaṃ sampiṇḍanaṃ anvācayo nāma. vækyānaṃ samuccayanān ti pi vadanti. yathā dānañ ca⁶ dehi sīlam ca rakkhāhī ti. tadattajotaka⁷ pana casaddā bahū⁸ visuṃ visuṃ yojetuṃ vaṭṭanti.

What is called a connecting dvanda [is] the aggregation, i.e. the accumulation, of kārakas along with the verbs. They also state it is an aggregation of sentences. For instance: “And give donations and protect morality.” In this case, however, the [two] words “and” which suggest its meaning are fit to connect multiple discrete elements [not elements of the same type, as before].

1 B, S, U, T om.
2 C vippasantena.
3 These two lines come together, for instance, at Ja VI, 121cd, 122ab and other passages in Jātaka literature.
4 I have slightly edited the translation by Cowell (1907: 63) in order to be more literal.
5 C bahū.
6 D om.
7 C tattha tadattajotakā.
8 C, S bahū.
NOTE: So far Saddhammajotipāla has tried to prove that the *samuccayas* of words named *kevalasamuccaya* and *anvācaya* cannot be properly called compounds, but rather coordinated words or sentences forming an aggregate.

\[\text{itare dve dvandasamāsā bhavanti, bhinnatthānaṃ nāmānaṃ samuccayattā. tesu hi' tadatthajotakā casaddā bahū}^2 \text{ yeva visuṃ visuṃ yojetabbā}^3.\]

The other two are *dvanda* compounds [proper], for nouns with different referents are aggregated. In them, indeed, the words “and” which suggest its meaning have to be connected only in multiple discrete elements.

\[\text{tattha ca yattha napuṃsakekattaṃ natthi so samāso itaretarayogo nāma. yathā samaṇabrāhmaṇā ty ādi. yattha pana napuṃsakekattaṃ atthi so samāso samāhāro nāma. yathā gavassakan ty ādi. tasmā ayaṃ [161] dvandasamāso itaretarayogasamāhāravasena duvidho hoti.}\]

And in this regard, where there is no singleness and neuter, this compound is called “mutually connecting” (*itaretarayoga*), as *samaṇabrāhmaṇā* “ascetics and brahmins,” etc. Where, however, there is singleness and neuter, the compound is called “collective” (*samāhāra*) [being the sum of the parts], as *gavassakaṃ* “cows and horses,” etc. Therefore this *dvanda* compound is twofold on account of being mutually connecting or a collective.

---

1 C om. *tesa hi*.
2 C, T *bahu*.
3 T *yojetum vattanti*. 
That is why he says: \textit{dvanda} is twofold. A \textit{dvanda} which based (ṭhito) on pairs of meanings is a compound of meanings; a \textit{dvanda} which is based on pairs of words is a compound of words.

Alternatively, it is called a \textit{dvanda} because pairs of meanings and words meet in a single place. In this way, indeed, it is stated in the \textit{Saddanīti}: “It is called \textit{dvanda} because here pairs of words meet in one place (ekato).” In the \textit{Nyāsa}, however, it is stated: “Nouns in pairs are \textit{dvanda}. Any compound is called a \textit{dvanda} on account of its similarity with a \textit{dvanda}, i.e. a

1 D \textit{samāso}.
2 S, T \textit{eka}.
3 Sadd 768,14–15.
4 B, D reads only \textit{nā}. S, T \textit{nāvā}. = Mmd 286,1: \textit{nāvā}. U \textit{navā}.
5 U, T, D \textit{dvandā}.
6 Mmd 286,1.
7 T \textit{padā}. C add. \textit{dvandā}.
8 B, S, U, T D \textit{dvandā}.
9 S om.
10 B, D om.
11 C om.
12 Rūp 208,18–19.
pair of nouns.” And in the Rūpasiddhi it is stated: “dvandas are pairs of words, or those [words] having the meaning of pairs. Because of its similarity with a dvanda, any [type of] compound is also called dvanda with a technical name given in accordance with the sense (anvatthasaññāya).” Indeed (hi), since there is no dvanda of one single word, but only of two or more, therefore it is called a dvanda on account of the previous section (heṭṭhimaparicchedena). That is to say, both referents are equally predominant.

NOTE: That is to say, because the minimum number of words to form this type of compound is two, therefore it is called “pair” (dvanda).

nanu ca ubhayapadatthappadhānatte¹ sati kathaṃ ekatthībhāvo² siyā ti vuccate.

But, if both are equally predominant, one may ask: how is the singleness of meaning possible?

sadisādiatthe pi saddappavattisambhavana ekakkhaṇe yeva padānaṃ atthadvayān³ dīpakattā ekatthībhāvo⁴ hoti. taṇ ca tesaṃ atthadvayadīpanaṃ dvandasamāsavisaye eva, na sabbattha.

Even when the referent is similar, etc., the singleness of meaning is there because the [two] words show the two referents at the same moment (ekakkhaṇe yeva) due to the possibility of the function of the words [referring to two or more referents simultaneously]. And their showing of the two referents [happens] only in the domain of a dvanda compound, not everywhere.

2 C ekatthabhāvo.
3 C, S, T atthadvaya.
4 C ekatthabhāvo.
yathā hi bhū-saddo anubhavābhībhabhādike pavattamānehi anu-abhi-ādi-upasaggehi vinā tasmiṃ atthe na ppavattati. atha kho tehi sahito va pavattati. evam gavassakan ti ādīsu gavādisaddā assādisaddantarasahitavasena atthadlayam dipenti, na kevalā vākyasaddā. pubbadana ca attatthena sāhā parapadatthāṃ dipeti. parapadan ca attatthena sāhā pubbadatthāṃ dipeti ti adhippāyo. tasmā taddipanāṃ samāsavisaye yeva, na sabbathā ti datthhabbaṃ.

For, in the same way as the word bhū, in the absence of the preverbs anu etc. which operate in the meanings “experience” etc. does not function in those senses, but operates only with their concurrence; similarly, in words such as gavassakaṃ “cows and horses,” the words “cow,” etc., show the two meanings on account of their immediate concurrence with the words “horse,” etc., not as independent words in sentences. What is intended is that the first word, together with its own meaning, shows the meaning of the following word, and the following word, together with its own meaning, shows the meaning of the previous word. That is why it has to be understood that their showing [of the other meaning] happens only in the domain of the compound, not everywhere.

evaṃ sante pi dvinnāṃ atthāṇāṃ ekathībhāvena kathāṃ samāso syā. tesaṃ tesaṃ padatthāṇāṃ nāṇāṭṭhānesu ṭhitattā ti vuccate.

Even if that is so, how is the compound possible with a singleness of meaning of two referents? For it is said that their different referents abide in multiple discrete places.

1 C, S, T pavattamāno.
2 C tasmiṃ tasmiṃ.
3 C gavādisaṃ.
4 C atthadhayam pi. T tattha dvayaṃ.
5 T paratthan.
6 B, U, D sabbathā.
7 B, U, D datthhabba.
8 B, U nāṇāṭṭhāne. D nāṇāṭhāne.
Even though they abide in multiple discrete places, since they abide by the state of a single compound, there is a compound according to the characteristic, namely singleness of referent, as the form (rūpa) aggregate (kkhandha) and other cases. For, even as all the phenomena of form abide in an infinite variety of world spheres (cakkavāḷesu), the referent of the word “form aggregate” (rūpakkhandha) exists (hoti) after becoming one single mass (rāsī) due to the fact that it is possible to express it as one single form aggregate. Because of that, the form aggregate also ends in the singular. In the same way it has to be considered in our discussion (ettha).

evaṃ samāhāradvando hotu. itaretarayogadvando kathan ti.

Let the collective dvanda be so, but how can the mutually connecting dvanda [be so]?
The Samāsakappa of the Suttaniddesa

In this respect, also, the plural is formulated on account of the dependence on the substances [referred to by the compound], but it has only one referent by being the referent of one single compound. That is why he stated: *assatthakapitthanaṃ* “the fig tree and udumbara tree,” or *assatthakapitthana* “the fig tree and the ubumbara tree.”

casaddasahitaṃ⁷ asamāsadvandavākya⁸ kiriyābhedena sattadhā ṭhitaṃ. yathā samaṇo ca brāhmaṇo ca gacchati. samaṇaṇa ca brāhmaṇaṇa ca vadanti.⁹ samaṇena ca brāhmaṇena ca dānaṃ paṭiggahitaṃ. samaṇassa ca brāhmaṇassa ca dānaṃ deti¹⁰ ti evam ādippakārā ṭhitā. tasmā samāsavākyenāpi tathākārena [162] bhavitabbaṃ.

The *dvanda* sentence which is not a compound and is accompanied by the word “and” is (ṛthaṃ) sevenfold on account of the difference with regard to the action. As in the following examples: “The ascetic and the brahmin comes,” “They talk to the ascetic and to the brahmin,” “The offering is received by the ascetic and by the brahmin,” “He offers a donation to the ascetic and to the brahmin.” Therefore, it should be in the same way even when it is expressed in a compound.

---

1 C dabbāpekhhavacanena.  
2 C ekatthe.  
3 B hevā.  
6 S, T om.  
7 T saddasahitam ayaṃ.  
8 B, S, U, D asamāsadvandavākyam.  
9 S, U vandati.  
10 C dehī.
tathā hi samaṇabrāhmanānan ti ettha samaṇassa ca brāhmaṇassa ca samaṇabrāhmanānan ti vutte vākyāvadhikantākhyānaṃ nāma. samaṇabrāhmanānan ti pubbavākyānurūpena samāsavākyassa vuttattā.

For, in this manner, if we consider the word “to the ascetics and brahmins” (samaṇabrāhmaṇānaṃ), when “to the ascetics and brahmins” (samaṇabrāhmaṇānaṃ) is stated as “to the ascetic as well as to the brahmin,” it is called (nāma) “the analysis occurs at the end of what is limited by the phrase,” because the compound sentence is stated (vuttattā) following the original sentence samaṇabrāhmaṇānaṃ.

samaṇo ca brāhmaṇo ca samaṇabrāhmaṇā. tesaṃ samaṇabrāhmaṇānan ti vutte padāvadhikantākhyānaṃ nāma. samaṇabrāhmaṇānan ti pubbavākyānunāpekkhhitvā padatthānurūpena samāsavākyassa vuttattā.

The ascetic and the brahmin, i.e. ascetics and brahmins (samaṇabrāhmaṇā). When it is stated “of those ascetics and brahmins,” it is called “that in which [another] word indicates the inclusive limit [of the compound].” Not considering the primordial sentence samaṇabrāhmaṇānaṃ, the compound sentence is stated following the referent (padattha).

NOTE: It is difficult to understand the difference between the two previous explanations. I interpret the point as follows: in the first case, the plural samaṇabrāhmaṇānaṃ represents only a plural indicating the group consisting of one ascetic and one brahmin (if it was in Sanskrit instead of Pāli, we would have a dual and the problem would be solved). In the second case, the plural is indeterminate and does not necessarily represent the union of one ascetic and one brahmin, but it expresses a number depending on the referent to which it is making reference.

1 U, T brahmaṇassa.
2 S padādikantākhyānaṃ.
3 S vākyāṇ (om. pubba).
Thus, having explained the suttas which enjoin the technical names by enjoining composition, 
now, in order to explain an operational sutta, it begins:

332. *mahataṃ* [becomes] *mahā* before a word of common substratum.

In this regard, this sutta, namely “*mahataṃ* ... of common substratum,” consists of four 
words. *mahataṃ* is a genitive of relation [expressing] that which undergoes a grammatical 
operation; *mahā* [expresses] the grammatical operation; “of common substratum” 
(*tulyādhikaraṇe*) [expresses] its qualifier; “before a word” (*pade*) [expresses] locative in the 
sense of a cause. Among the different types of sutta this has to be considered an operational 
sutta.

*kasmā pana tulyādhikaraṇe pade ti vuttaṃ. nanu mahatiyā ghoso mahāghoso, 
mahatiyā visiṭṭho mahāvisiṭṭho, mahato buddhassa bodhi mahābodhi, mahante 
sabbaññūtaañāne satto laggo² mahāsatto, mahā te upāsakapariccāgo 
bārāṇasī³ rajjaṃ nāma mahā ti ādīsu bhinnādhikaraṇesu samāsesu ca vākyesu ca 
maḥā-ādeso hotī ti.*

---

1 Where C reads *samasaṇaṇidhānena saññāvidhāyakāni*, B, U, D read only *samaṇasamaṇaṇidhāyakāni*.
2 C add. *ti*.
3 B, U *bārāṇasīṃ*. 
But why does he say “before a word of common substratum”? Is it not true that we also find the replacement mahā in compounds and sentences when they have a different substratum, for instance, in: “the sound of the great [earth] – great-sound,” “the distinction of the great [earth] – great-distinction,” “the intelligence of the great Buddha – great-intelligence,” “the being who is immersed in great omniscience – great-being,” [or in the sentence:] “the throne of Benares is for you a great layman-renunciation indeed” [i.e. “renouncing the throne of Benares is a great renunciation indeed for a layman like you”].

saccaṃ. tathāpi tulyādhikaraṇe pade ti¹ uccāraṇaṃ niccadīpanatthāṃ. tathā² hi vuttaṃ atthabyākhyāne tulyādhikaraṇe ti kimatthāṃ. mahantaputto³ ti ādīsu nivattanatthan ti.

True. Nevertheless, the expression “after a word of common substratum” is meant to show that it is a mandatory rule. For, in the same way, it has been stated in the Atthabyākhyāna:

“What is the purpose of the word ‘of common substratum’? It is meant to exclude cases such as mahantaputto, etc.”

yady evam te payogā kena sijjhantī ti.

If that is so, how are those usages accomplished?

---

1 All read pade ti except C padena; T pade pi.
2 U yathā.
3 B māhantaputto.
mahataṃ mahā ti yogavibhāgena. tathā hi atthabyākhyāne pi vuttaṃ. mahataṃ mahā ti yogavibhāgato sati pi bhinnādhikaraṇatthe mahādeso hotī ti.

It is by means of the splitting up of the sutta as “mahantaṃ [becomes] mahā” (mahantaṃ mahā). For, in the same way, it has also been stated in the Atthabyākhyāna: “Even when there is a different substratum, on account of the splitting up the sutta as mahataṃ mahā, the replacement of mahā is effected.”

NOTE: The point of this discussion is that, sometimes, mahā replaces mahataṃ even when there is no common substratum, and that transgresses the condition of the present rule. But it is possible, the commentators say, by virtue of the mechanism known as yogavibhāga, which allows us to read mahataṃ mahā as an independent sutta, including cases where there is no common substratum.

yady evaṃ kasmā mahantaputto ti ādīsu na sijjhatī ti.

If that is so, why is it not effected (na sijjhatī) in cases such as mahantaputto?

yogavibhāgā itṭhappasiddhi1 ti paribhāsāya vuttattā na sijjhatī ti.

It is not effected because of what is stated in the metarule “By the splitting up of the sutta, [there is] the obtention of what is desired.”

mahantasaddassa ekatte pi mahatan ti bahuvacanaggahaṇe payojanaṃ dassetuṃ bahuvacanaggahaṇena ti ādim āha.

Even though there is singleness of the word mahanta, in order to show the purpose in the mention of the plural mahataṃ, he says: “With the mention of the plural...”, etc.

---

1 C itṭhappasiṭṭhi. S itṭhappasiddhi.
NOTE: This is a reference to a passage of Kacc-v that is considered an interpolation by Pind (116, n.3: “C”E add bahuvacanaggahaṇena kvaci mahantasaddassa maha ādeso hoti,” etc. The source is in Mmd 299,5-7). For instance, in the word mahapphalaṃ “[of] many fruits” [AN I 161,3] the first member of the compound, i.e. mahā, expresses a plurality of referents.

|| itthiyaṃ bhāsitapumittī pumā va ce2 || 333 ||

333. In the feminine, the feminine of a word that can be said in the masculine is treated as (va) if (ce) [it were] a masculine.

NOTE: the technical term bhāsitapuma (S. bhāṣitapuṃksa) is “a word or a noun base which has the same sense in the masculine gender as in the neuter gender; generally words of quality or adjectives like śuci, madhu, etc., fall in this category” (DSG, s.v.). Mmd takes bhāsitapumā as a feminine adjective to itthī: bhāsito pumā yassā sā bhāsitapumā “bhāsitapumā is that of which the masculine is said,” that is to say, a feminine which is bhāsitapumā is a feminine word of which the masculine gender variant is possible. For instance: the sentence kalyāṇī bhāriyā “the beautiful wife,” contains the word kalyāṇi, which has the masculine counterpart kalyāṇa, and therefore falls in the category bhāsitapumā. Following Kacc 333, the resulting compound would not be *kalyāṇībhāriyā, but kalyāṇabhāriyā (see Mmd 286, 24), and a man with a beautiful wife would be called kalyāṇabhāriyo “he whose wife is beautiful” (not *kalyāṇībhāriyo). Even though the commentaries (Kacc-v, Mmd, etc.) give only bahubbīhi examples, the rule is not necessarily limited to bahubbīhi, although Saddhammajotipāla will maintain that it is so (see the end of the argument).

2 S ceva for va ce.
chappadam idaṃ. itthiyam ti ādhārasattamī, bhāsitapumā ti tabbisesana, itthī ti kārī, pumā ti kāriya, ivā ti byapadesa, upamājotakā ti pi vadanti. ce ti samuccayattha, saṃsayatthaniddeso vā. saññā-pe-vidhisuttaṃ.

This [sutta consists] of six words. “In the feminine” (itthiyāṃ) [expresses] a locative of support (ādhāra); “a word that can be said in the masculine” (bhāsitapumā) [expresses] a qualifier; “a feminine” (itthī) [expresses] that which undergoes a grammatical operation; “a masculine” (pumā) [expresses] the grammatical operation; “as” (iva) [expresses] designation (byapadesa) — they also state that it expresses comparison (upamā); “if” [reading ca,2 expresses] aggregation, or, [reading ce] it expresses uncertainty. Among the different types of sutta, this sutta [has to be considered] an operational sutta.

itthiyāṃ vattamāne tulyādhikaraṇe pade pare idāni3 imasmiṃ samāse itthī itthivācako saddo pubbe añnasmiṃ kāle [163] idāniś bhāsitapumā atthī5 ce pumā va daṭṭabbā.

When there is a following word which has a common substratum [with the first word of the compound] and is used in the feminine gender, now, i.e. in this compound, the feminine, i.e. the word expressing a feminine [referent], if previously (pubbe), i.e. at another moment [i.e. before the process of composition], it has [also] expressed a masculine, now (idāni), it is to be considered as a masculine.

NOTE: This passage is a gloss on Kacc-v 116, 4.

---

1 B, U ti.
2 I do not know of any earlier commentary supporting this reading.
3 C om.
4 S, U, T, D om.
5 T itī.
atha vā. pubbe bhāsitapumā yo saddo idāni imasmiṃ samāse itthī itthivācako atthi ce so pumā va daṭṭhabbo.¹

Alternatively, that word which was previously expressed in the masculine, now, i.e. in this compound, if (ce) it is feminine, i.e. expressing a feminine, then it has to be considered as a masculine.

atthabyākhyāne pana ce bhāsitapumā itthī tulyādhikaraṇe uttaraliṅge pade² pumā va daṭṭhabbo³ ti vuttaṃ.

In the Atthabyākhyāna however, it is stated: “If the feminine word can be said in the masculine, the last word of the compound should be considered of the masculine gender, when it has a common substratum [with the previous word].”

rūpasiddhiyaṃ pana itthiyāṃ vattamāṇe tulyādhikaraṇe pade pare pubbe bhāsitapumā itthivācako saddo atthi ce pumā va daṭṭhabbo ti vuttaṃ.⁴

In the Rūpasiddhi, however, it is stated: “when the following word has a common substratum [with the first word of the compound] and is used in the feminine gender, if the word which expresses a feminine has previously (pubbe) expressed a masculine, it has to be considered as a masculine.”

---

¹ S daṭṭhabbā.
² S, T, D pare.
³ B, U, T, D daṭṭhabbā.
⁴ Rūp 202,17–19.
moggallāne⁴ pi uttarapade pare ti vuttaṃ.²

Furthermore, in the Moggallāna, it is stated: “when the last word [of the compound] follows.”

saddanītiyaṃ pana itthiyaṃ vattamāne tulyādhikaraṇe pubbapade sati itthivācako saddo sace³ bhāsitapumā⁴ ca bhāsitanaṃpuṃsako ca siyā yathārahaṃ⁵ pumā iva napuṃsako iva⁶ daṭṭhabbo ti vuttaṃ.

In the Saddanīti, however, it is stated: “When the previous word has the same substratum [as the following word] and is used in the feminine, if the word which expresses a feminine can express a masculine and a neuter (bhāsitanaṃpuṃsako), it should be considered as a masculine or as a neuter accordingly (yathārahaṃ).”⁷

NOTE: This quotation belongs to Sadd § 714, which is probably the corresponding rule to Kacc 333, even though Pind suggests the equivalence Kacc 333 = § 715 (2013: 116 n.4).

---

¹ S, T moggalāne.
² Mogg-v add Mogg 67.
⁴ Sadd 769,32: bhāsitapumo.
⁵ Sadd 769,32: so yathārahaṃ.
⁶ Sadd 770,1: iva ca = S, D.
⁷ Sadd 769,30–770,1.
tattha hi atthabyākhyāna'rūpasiddhiādisu ācariyānaṃ mate² dīghajhaṅgho kalyāṇabhariyo ti ādīsu pubbapade yeva pumātideso hoti, na parapade. jaṅghabhariyādisaddānaṃ puma³bhāsitābhāvā. te⁴ hi jaṅgha⁵bhariyādayo saddā aṅnapadatthappadhāno bahubbīhi ti vuttattā aṅnapadatthaliṅgavasena pulliṅgādayo honti ti.

For, in this regard, [according] to the masters in the Atthabyākhyāna, in the Rūpasiddhi, and other treatises, the extended application of the masculine applies only to the former member [of the compound], as in the examples: “of long legs,” “of beautiful wife,” etc., and does not apply to the last word [of the compound], because the words “leg” (jaṅghā) and “wife” (bhariyā) cannot be expressed in the masculine. Indeed, these words, namely “leg,” “wife,” etc., are expressed in the masculine on account of the gender of the external referent, for it has been stated that the bahubbīhi compound is that in which an external referent is predominant.

1 B, C atthabyākhyāne.
2 My conjecture. No edition or ms. read this word, but see below: nāsasaddaniścācariyānaṃ mate.
3 C pum. T pumā.
4 S, T te ca.
5 D saṅgha.
One may object (ti ce): If that is so, then a path the progress of which is easy is called “of easy progress” (sukhāpaṭipado), [then,] similarly, [it is so] also in examples such as “of difficult progress,” “of dull intuition,” etc. That meditation (jhānaṃ) the progress of which is easy [would be called] “of easy progress” (sukhāpaṭipadaṃ). Similarly, also, in the examples “of difficult progress” (dukkhāpaṭipadaṃ), “of dull intuition” (dandhābhiññaṃ), how is the designation of the masculine not possible in the former words [of the compounds]?

NOTE: The opponent is giving counterexamples that refute the rule because the resulting word is not in the masculine but in the neuter, as the Rūpasiddhi has suggested.

sukhadukkhādisaddānaṃ napuṃsakatthassa7 bhāsitapubbata8 na hoti9. parapade pana aŋnapadatthaliṅgavasena vaccaliṅgo hoti ti adhippāyo.

What is intended is that there is no expression of the sense “neuter” for the words “easy,” “difficult,” etc. However, in the following word [that is, in the last word of the compound], the gender has to be expressed on account of the gender of the external referent.
In the opinion of the masters of the Nyāsa and the Saddanīti, however, there is a statement (vyapadesa) of the masculine in the last word of the compound only. For this very reason (teneva), in the Saddanīti, the examples sukhaṇṭipado, dandhābhiṇṇo, etc., are brought up; and in the Nyāsa, the examples saddhādhanovo, brāhmaṇabandhubhariyo, etc., are stated under the governance of kammadhāraya.

NOTE: The opinion of Mnd and Sadd follows the usage of the Pāli, something that Aggavaṁsa does not forget to highlight (Sadd 769, 30: idha sāsanayuttiyā). What follows is the criticism of Saddhammajotipāla to this view, defending the previous one, which is the Kaccāyana view.

If that is so, [then] examples such as kalyāṇabhariyo, etc., would not be there. If they were there, by which sutta would the representation of the masculine be effected? For there would be absence (abhāvā) of a previous expression of the masculine. That is why the first theory only is tenable. Because it has been stated that the bahubhi has an external referent as its predominant member, the state of being masculine, etc., in the last word [of the compound]

1 C matena.
2 C, S sijjhati ti.
3 C liṅgādibhāvo.
is brought about on account of the gender of the external referent, for the *bahubbīhi* has an external referent as its predominant member.

bhāsitapume ti kimatthaṃ vuttaṃ. brāhmaṇabandhubhariyā ti ādīsu sati pi tulyādhikaraṇe pade pare¹ bandhusaddādīnāṃ bhāsitapumattābhāvā īminā tesu bandhusaddādīsu pumabyapadeso na hoti ti nāpanatthaṃ vuttaṃ.

What is the purpose of stating *bhāsitapume* “which can be expressed in the masculine” [in the *vuttī*]? It is stated in order to explain (*nāpanatthaṃ*) that, even though the last word [of the compound] has a common substratum in examples such as *brāhmaṇabandhubhariya*, etc., there is no representation (*vyapadeso*) of the masculine in words such as *bandhu*, etc., because of the absence (*abhāvā*) of a previous expression of the masculine of these words.

kesuci² potthakesu pana nāsaṃ nissāya brāhmaṇabandhubhariyā ti vadanti³. so pāṭho asundaro⁴. īminā hi suttena kammadhārayasaṅñe cā ti vakkhamānattā tulyādhikaraṇabahubbihisamāse yeva pumātideso vihito ti viññāyati.

In some books based on the *Nyāsa*, however, they state *brāhmaṇabandhubhariya* [as one of the examples in this sutta]. This reading is not acceptable. Because, by virtue of the present sutta, it is understood (*viññāyati*) that the extended application of the masculine is prescribed only for a *bahubbīhi* compound having a common substratum, for it will be stated: [Kacc 334] “and also in [a compound] to which the technical name *kammadhāraya* applies.”

---

¹ B, U, D om.
² D kesu ca.
³ C pathanti.
⁴ C sundaro. T na sundaro.
tasmā brāhmaṇabandhubhariyo¹ ti ādi udāharaṇāni² pi bahubbīhisamāsavaseneva³ vattabbāni, na kammadhārayasamāsavasena. dīghajaṃgho ti ādīni pi udāharaṇāni bahubbīhisamāsavasena vuttāni, na kammadhārayasamāsavasena⁴ ti.

Therefore (tasmā), even examples such as brāhmaṇabandhubhariyo, etc., are only applicable (vattabbāni) on account of the compound being a bahubbīhi, not on account of the compound being a kammadhāraya. Even examples such as dīghajaṃgho are stated on account of being a bahubbīhi compound, not on account of being a kammadhāraya compound.

so ca atideso sabhāvātideso⁵ ti daṭṭhabbo ti⁶. chabbidho hi atideso: byapadeso nimittātideso taṃrūpātideso taṃsabhāvātideso⁷ suttātideso kāriyātideso cā ti. vuttaṇ ca

byapadeso nimittaṇ ca taṃrūpaṇa taṃsabhāvato⁸ suttaṇ ceva tathā kāriyātideso ti⁹ chabbidho ti.

And this case of extended application has to be understood as an “extended application of the same nature” (sabhāvātideso). Indeed, extended application is of six types: designation (byapadeso), extension of the cause of application (nimittātideso), extension to that form (taṃrūpātideso), extension to that of the same nature (taṃsabhāvātideso), extension of the sutta (suttātideso), and extension of the grammatical operation (kāriyātideso). And it has

---

1 C bhariyā.
2 B, S, U, T, D kimudāharaṇāni.
3 B, S, U, T, D samāsavasena.
4 B kammadhārayasavasena.
5 C sabhāvātideso. T sabhāvataotideso.
6 B om.
7 C, T sabhāvātideso. S sabhāvādideso.
8 C, D taṃsabhāvātā.
9 B, S, U, T, D tu.
been stated: “Designation and cause, of that form, of its same nature, of the sutta as well as of the operation, thus it [atidesa] is sixfold.”

|| kammadhārayasaññe ca || 334 ||

334. Also in [a compound] to which the technical name kammadhāraya applies.

dvipadamsa idaṃ. kammadhārayasaññe ti ādhārasattamī, bhāvasattamī ti pi vadanti, ca ti anukaṭṭhana, samuccayanid desso vā. saññā-pe-vidhisuttaṃ.

This [sutta consists] of two words. “To which the technical name kammadhāraya applies” (kammadhārayasaññe) [expresses] a locative of support, they also say it is locative of state; “also” (ca) [expresses] retrieving; alternatively, it expresses aggregation. Among the different types of sutta, this has to be considered as an operational sutta.

kammadhārayasaññe ca samāse itthiyaṃ vattamāne tulyādhikaraṇe pade pare, pubbe bhāsitapumā yo itthivācako saddo imasmiṃ samāse atthi ce, so pumā va¹ daṭṭhabbo.²

Also in a compound to which the technical name kammadhāraya applies, when the following [i.e. the last] word, which occurs in the feminine, has a common substratum [with the previous one], if the word that expresses the feminine in this compound can be expressed in the masculine, it has to be considered as a masculine.

---

¹ C, B pumā.
² This is a gloss of Kacc-v 116,11–12.
Is it not true that in having simply stated *kammadhāraye* [in the sutta], the concept *kammadhārayasamāsa* would be understood? What is then the purpose of making a mention of *saṅñā*?

True, nevertheless, the mention of *saṅñā* is made in order to include those compounds with a technical name other [than *kammadhāraya*]. With this, the following examples can be formed: *tassā mukhaṃ taṃmukhaṃ*, *kukkuṭiyā andaṃ kukkuṭaṇḍan*, etc. Again (*pana*), with the mention of the word *ca* “and,” words that receive the technical name “secondary formations,” “verbs,” and “nouns” include the application (*yogaṃ*) [of this sutta]. With it [i.e. the word

---

1 C, S *kammadhārayo*.
2 B, S, U, T, D *nāyati*.
3 B, S, U, D *aṇṇasamāsasaṅñā*. T *aṇṇasamāsa*.
4 B, U *sijjhati*.
5 B, S, U, T *caggahaṇena*.
6 Instead of - *saṅñā* *yogaṃ* *gaṇhanti*: C *saṅñāyo saṅgayhanti*. S, T *saṅñāyo saṃgaṇhanti*.
7 B, U, D *taddhitam*. S, T *taddidam*.
9 T *tatra*. D *atra*.
10 S *yāyam*. T *yāyato*.
11 S, U, T, D *tassaṃ*.
12 S, T om.
ca], examples of secondary formation such as: tassā idaṃ = tayidaṃ, tassā bhāvo = tattāṃ; examples of verb such as: he behaves like a woman = itthāyati, etc.; and examples of nouns such as yassaṃ itthīyaṃ “in that woman” = yatra “there,” yāya itthīya = yato “because of that woman” = “because of that,” tāya velāyaṃ = tadā “at that time” = “then,” etc., are formed.

atthabyākhyāne pana saññāggahaṇaṃ saññāmattasaṅghahaṇatthaṃ. kim idaṃ saññāmattaṃ. samāsataddhitākhyātanāmasaññāyo ti¹ vuttaṃ.

In the Atthabyākhyāna, however, it is stated: “the mention of ‘technical name’ [is made] in order to include what[ever] is a ‘technical name.’ What does ‘only technical name’ mean? The technical names: compound, secondary formation, verb and noun.”

payogā ca te yevā ti sabbesam ācariyānaṃ matiyā. iminā suttena pubbapade yeva pumātideso hoti². vimalabuddhiācariyamatiyā pana sati pi kammadhārayatthe³ dārikāsaddassa niyatitthīvācakattā bhāsitasaddassa niyatapumattābhāvato⁴ ti vuttattā uttarapade yeva pumātideso⁵ viya dissati. yathā ce ti⁶ ativiya atthāyuttī ti⁷.

And according to the opinion of all the masters, it is these applications only. With this sutta the extended application of the masculine applies only to the former word [of the compound]. In the opinion of the master Vimalabuddhi, however, it is stated: “even when there is a

---

1 T nāma.
2 C ti.
3 C, S, T kammadhārayatthe.
4 B niyama.
5 T pumbhāvādeso.
6 C me.
7 S reads yathā ce ativiya attā ayuttī ti.
kammadhāraya, because of the invariable expression of the feminine in the word ‘girl,’ and because of the absence of invariable masculine in ‘expressed word,’ it seems that the extended application of the masculine should apply only to the last word [of the compound]. If that were so, there would be extreme incoherence (ayutti) of the meaning (attha).

NOTE: Quotation Mmd 287, 7-9. The opinion of Vimalabuddhi is that “the rule cannot apply here” (idha vuttavidhānaṃ na hoti Mmd 287, 9). The last line is difficult to understand and my translation is tentative. It reflects, I think, the opinion of Saddhammajotipala, an opinion that seems to be critical of Mmd, as we can subsequently see.

tathā hi¹ imehi dvīhi suttehi pubbapadesu yeva pumātideso hoti. bahubbīhi kammadhārayasamāse² yeva imesaṃ viseso ti. bhāsitapume ti kimattthāṃ. [165] khattiyabandhudārikā ty ādisu sati pi kammadhārayasamāse tulyādhikaraṇe pade pare bandhusaddassa bhāsitapumattābhāvā iminā pumā va na daṭṭhabbo³ ti ṇāpanatthaṃ vuttaṃ.

For in this way, with these two suttas, the extended application of the masculine applies only to the first member [of the compound]. This is a special feature of the bahubbīhi and the kammadhāraya compounds. What is the purpose of [stating the word] bhāsitapumā [in the sutta]? It is stated in order to make known that, even in a kammadhāraya compound such as khattiyabandhudārikā “the girl who is a relative of a warrior,” where the following word has a common substratum, by this [i.e. by the mention of bhāsitapumā in the sutta, the word] should not be considered as a masculine, because the word bandhu does not fall into the category of bhāsitapumā.

¹ D pi.
² B, U, D bahubbīhikammadhārayasamāso.
³ C va daṭṭhabbā. S va daṭṭhabbo.
335. In a *tappurisa*, a [replaces] *na*.

tipadam idam. attan ti kāriya, nassā ti kārī, tappurise ti nimittasattamī. saññāpe-vidhīsuttam.

This [sutta consists] of three words. “a” (*attaṃ*) [expresses] the grammatical operation; “[replaces] *na*” (*nassa*) [expresses] that which undergoes the grammatical operation; “in a *tappurisa*” (*tappurise*) [expresses] a locative in the sense of a condition. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta.

idha tappurise ti avayave samudāyūpacāro yathā samuddo hi¹ mayā diṭṭho ti. teneva vuttiyaṃ uttarapade ti vuttaṃ. nassa padassa tappurise uttarapade pare attaṃ hoti.

Here, the mention “in a *tappurisa*” is a figurative way of expressing the whole in the part, as in [the example] “I have seen the ocean” [meaning “I have seen a part of the ocean”]. For this very reason, in the *vutti*, it is stated: “in the last word [of the compound.] In a *tappurisa*, when the last word follows it, the word *na* is replaced by *a*.

---

¹ U, T, D om.
atha vā. tappurise vattamānassa nassa padassa uttarapade pare¹ attaṃ² hoti³.

Or, alternatively: the word *na* which is present in a *tappurisa*, becomes *a* before the following word.

kasmā pana tappurise ti vuttaṃ. nanu amalo ti ādi bahubbīhisamāse pi nassa padassa akarādesena bhavitabban ti.

But why is “*tappurise*” stated? Is it not true that even in a *bahubbīhi* compound such as *amala*, the word *na* has to be replaced by *a*?

saccaṃ. tathāpi yebhuyyavasena evaṃ vuttaṃ.

True. Nevertheless, it is stated thus in a general way.

yady evaṃ amalo ti ādīsu kena nassa⁴ attaṃ sijjhatī ti.

If that is so, by which [sutta] is the word *na* formed as *a* in examples such as *amala*?

attaṃ nassā⁵ ti yogavibhāgena sijjhati. tathā hi vuttaṃ atthabyākhyāne pi. yogavibhāgenā ti.

It is formed by the splitting up of the sutta as “*attaṃ nassa.*” For in this way it has also been stated in the *Atthabyākhyāna*: “by the splitting up of the sutta ...”.

---

1 B, S, T, D om.
2 S, U, T *attaṃ*.
3 C, S, T *hotī ti*.
4 U, D om.
5 B, U *attannassā*. S *atthannassā*. T *atthannassā*. 
tathā ca sati samāse ti vattabban ti.

But in this way, the [condition] “in a compound” (samāse) should be there [instead of tappurise].

na vattabbaṃ. na gacchantī ti nagā¹, rukkhā. na gacchantī ti nagā,² pabbatā iti samāse kate nassa akārādesānāpajjanato³ ca. tasmā taṁṇivattanatthaṁ tappurise ti vuttaṃ.

It should not. Because, on the other hand (ca), the word na is not replaced by a when a compound is formed in the following manner: “They do not move, therefore they are called nagā, i.e. trees,” [or] “They do not move, therefore they are called nagā, i.e. mountains.” That is why, in order to prevent that [that is, the inclusion of such examples], the word tappurise has been stated [in the sutta].

nanu ca yogavibhāgenā pi nagā⁴ ti ettha nassa⁵ attha⁶ āpajjatī ti.

But is it not true that, with the splitting up of the sutta, in the example nagā, na should be replaced [lit. is replaced] by a as well (api)?

---

1 C, T nāgā.
2 C nagaṃ. T nāgā.
4 C, T nāgā.
5 S, T om.
6 S, U atthaṁ.
nāpajjati. yogavibhāgassa icchitabbappayogavisayattā.

It is not replaced, because the scope (visaya) for the application (payoga) of the splitting up of the sutta (yogavibhāgassa) is what[ever] is to be desired (icchitabba).

tathā hi atthabyākhyāne pi vuttaṃ. yogavibhāgassa asabbavisayattā na pacasi¹ tvam sammā ty ādisu atippasaṅgo² na hotī³ ti.

For in this way also it has been stated in the Atthabyākhyāne: “because the scope for the splitting up of the sutta is not all-encompassing, [the flaw of] too general applicability (atippasaṅgo) is not there in cases such as ‘You do not cook, my dear’.”

NOTE: As we have previously seen, the yogavibhāga device serves the purpose of word formation. In this case, we cannot simply take attaṃ nassa as a general rule applicable everywhere, because then we should accept that even in the sentence na pacasi we should replace na with a and say apacasi tvam sammā, and this is incorrect.

1 S paccasi.
3 S, T hessatī.
336. Before a vowel, an [replaces na].

dvipadam idaṃ. sare ti nimittasattamī, an iti kāriya. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

This [sutta consists] of two words. “Before a vowel” (sare) [expresses] a locative in the sense of condition; an [expresses] the grammatical operation. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta.

idha pana¹ an iti avibhattikanidde. tappurise vattamānassa sabbasseva nassa padassa anādeso hoti. sabbassevā ti iminā avayavabhūtaman² saraṃ vā byañjanaṃ vā nivatteti. sabbasseva sarabyañjanaṃtasseva an³ hotī ti attho.

Here, however, the word an lacks a case ending. In a tappurisa, an is the replacement of the entire word na (sabbassa eva). The expression sabbasseva “entire” removes the vowel which is a part of it [i.e. the a of the word na] or the consonant [i.e. the n of na]. That is to say, an is a replacement of the entire [word consisting of] the vowel and the consonant.

NOTE: The point of this discussion is to make clear that an is not a replacement for the previously prescribed replacement of a for na, nor is it a replacement of n, which is what is left from na after taking the replacement a.

¹ Com.
² C avayavabhūta. T avayavabhūvan.
³ T anādeso.
nanu cānena vinā pi anissaro ty ādīsu pubbasuttena¹ nassa attaṃ² katvā ya va ma da na ta ra lā cāgamā [Kacc 35] ti suttena nakārāgame kate sijjhatī ti.

But is it not true that even without this [sutta], after replacing na with a, in cases such as in the word anissaro “without a lord” by [Kacc 35] “y, v, m, d, n, t, r, l are also insertions,” with the insertion of n [the word anissaro] is formed?

saccam³. tathāpi sace āgamasuttaṃ sandhāya idaṃ na⁴ vucceyya, aūño pi āgamo⁵ bhaveyya. taṃnivattanattham idaṃ suttaṃ ti⁶. anuttaro ti ādīsu bahubbīhisamāsesu pi anuvattanatappurisadasaddam anapekkhitvā sare an ti ettakeneva⁷ suttena nassa anādeso kātabbo ti⁸.

True. Nevertheless, if, relying on the insertion sutta [i.e. Kacc 35], he would not state this [rule], then any another insertion [for instance, v, m, etc.] would be possible. The present sutta intends to prevent that. Even in bahubbīhi compounds such as anuttaro, the replacement of na with an has to be carried out only by the force of the sutta sare an [Kacc 336], without consideration of the recurrence of the word tappurisa [from Kacc 335].

NOTE: The main point of this paragraph is that we do not need to posit two substitutions, but only one, from na to an, not from na to a, and then from a to an. Because this rule is a pradisedha sutta,⁹

---

1 T pubbasutte.
2 S atthaṃ.
3 C om.
4 C om. T va.
5 B tāgamo.
6 C om. S vuttā ti.
7 S, T ettha keneva.
8 B om.
9 See Joshi — Bhate, 1984: 39f.
the *anuvutti* of *tappurise* from the previous sutta ceases to take effect, and this rule applies also to *bahubbīhi* compounds.

[166]

|| kad¹ kussa || 337 ||

337. *kad* [is the replacement] of *ku*.

NOTE: In this sutta we have an interesting variant reading. B reads *kad*, not *kadam*. Pind (2013: 117, see also n.13) follows the reading *kadam*. Mmd (287, 18), in B, also reads *kad*. This reading seems to follow Kāt II.5.24 *koh kat*. Therefore I think the sutta has to read *kad*. The variant *kadam* is probably a contamination from the Kacc-v: *ku icc etassa tappurise kadam hoti sare pare*, where *kadam* is the accusative used to indicate the replacement. In any case, the accusative redundantly used in the sense of replacement in the sutta itself does not cause any problem of interpretation. From the point of view of the sandhi, the word *kad* is also difficult to explain.

*dvipadam idaṃ. kad² ti kāriya, kussā ti sambandhachaṭṭhīkāri. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.*

This [sutta consists] of two words. “*kad*” [expresses] the grammatical operation, “of *ku*” (*kussā*) is a genitive of relation [expressing] that which undergoes a grammatical operation. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta.

*kussā ti iminā kunipāto va gayhati. na kiṃādeso.*

With the word *kussa* only the particle *ku* is referred to, not the replacement of *kiṃ*.

---

1 C, T *kadam*.
2 C, S *kadam*.
NOTE: This is a reference to Kacc 228 *ku hishaṃsu ca*, which prescribes the “[replacement of *kiṃ*] with *ku* before the suffixes *hiṃ* and *haṃ*,” giving as a result the adverbs of direction *kuhiṃ* (“where to”) and *kuhaṃ* (“where to”). That *ku* is different from the *ku* of the present sutta.

*bahubbīhisamāsāsāpī kimudāharaṇabhāvena vuttattā idaṃ suttaṃ kammadhārayabahubbīhisamāsesu vihitāṃ.*

Because the *bahubbīhi* compound is also stated due to its appearance in the examples with *kiṃ*, this sutta is prescribed for *kammadhāraya* and *bahubbīhi* compounds.

NOTE: Because there are *bahubbīhi* compounds such as *kudārā* “those who have bad wives” in the *vutti* (Kacc-v 117, 16–17), we may rightly infer that this sutta is also prescribed for *bahubbīhi* compounds, not only for *tappurisa* compounds (Kacc-v 117, 14).

*rūpasiddhiyāṃ pana tappurise uttarapade pare ti vuttiyāṃ āgataṃ. rūpasiddhikārakena hi ācariyena idaṃ suttaṃ tappurise yeva vihitāṃ. kadannan ti ādippayogā’ pi tappurisasamāso ti gahito ti.*

In the commentary (*vuttiyāṃ*) of the *Rūpasiddhi*, however, it is recorded as follows: “in a *tappurisa* when the last word of the compound follows.”² For the master who composed the *Rūpasiddhi* has prescribed this sutta only for *tappurisa*. In the examples such as *kadannan* “bad food,” etc. [only] *tappurisa* compounds are included.

---

1 C ādipayogo.

sare ti kimatthaṃ. kudārā yesaṃ ty ādisu payogesu sati pi kusadde sarassa aparattā iminā kussa kad3 na hotī ti ūpanatthaṃ vuttaṃ.

What is the purpose of mentioning “before a vowel” (sare)? It is in order to make clear that in examples such as “of those [who have] bad wives” (kudārā), even though the word ku is present, since it is not followed by a vowel, by the present sutta there is no replacement of ku with kad.

|| kāppatthesu ca || 338 ||

338. And ka in cases where there is a sense of little.

tipadam idam. kā ti kāriya, appatthesū ti ādhārasattamī, cā ti anukaḍḍhana,3 kvacatthā ti pi vadanti. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. idam suttaṃ sabbasamāsesu vihitaṃ. kāppatthe cā ti vutte siddhe pi kāppatthesu cā ti bahuvacanena kasmā vuttan ti manasikatvā bahuvacanoccaṇaṃ kimatthan ti pucchati. tapphalaṃ dassetum ku icc etassā ti ādim āha.

This [sutta consists] of three words. kā [expresses] the grammatical operation; “in cases where there is a sense of little” (appatthesu) [expresses] a locative of support; “and” (ca) [expresses] a continued reference [to a former rule], they also state that [it expresses] optionality. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta. This sutta is prescribed for all types of compound. Considering the possible objection “Even if he had said kāppathe ca [using the locative singular,] it would work, why then is he using the plural,

3 C, T kadaṃ.
2 Kacc-v 117,14.
3 S, T anukaḍḍhana.
namely *kāpatthesu ca?*, he [the vuttikāra] asks: “What is the purpose of expressing [it] in the plural?” In order to show the result of this sutta, he stated: *ku icc etassā*, etc.

NOTE: See Kacc-v (118, 1-2): ōbhucaṇacanucāraṇaṃ kimatthāṃ. *ku icc etassa anappatthesu pi kvaci kā hoti. kucchito puriso kāpuriso, kupuriso* “What is the purpose of stating it in the plural? Sometimes the replacement kā for ku is there even in cases where there is no sense of little. [For instance:] ‘a vile man’ [may be called] *kāpurisa* [or, alternatively,] *kupurisa.*” The reasoning of Kacc-v, to which Saddhammajotipāla resorts, does not seem satisfactory to me, because the same objection could be raised against the expression *anappatthesu*. Furthermore, the word kucchito “vile”, “contemptible” is not the best example, because it belongs to the category of *appattha* in a figurative sense and therefore it is not an exception. I think it is better to understand that the plural *appatthesu* is used simply because the word is a *bahubbīhi* referring to a plurality of cases or words “of which the sense is ‘little’.” The viggaha I propose is the following: *appo attho ti appattho. appattho yesaṃ tesu saddesu appatthesu*. I think Senart (1871: 179) is right when he points out that: “L’auteur parait avoir voulu réunir en un sûtra ce qui dans Pāṇini en occupe trois (VI, 3, 104–106), et c’est dans ce but qu’il a d’abord substitué appa à īshad de Pāṇini, et puis employé le pluriel, qui reste comme signe matériel de la fusion.” The author of the *vutti* obviously has not contemplated this possibility, nor has our fifteenth-century commentator.

|| kvaci samāsantagatānam akāranto¹ || 339 ||

339. Sometimes the ending *a* [applies] to [words] at the end of a compound.

*catuppadam idaṃ. kvaci ti kvacattha, samāsantagatānan ti antāpekkhachatthī, akāro ti kāriya, anto ti kāri. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.*

This [sutta consists] of four words. “Sometimes” (*kvaci*) [expresses] optionality; “to [words] at the end of a compound” (*samāsantagatānam*) [expresses] a genitive expressing dependence on

¹ T ākāranto.
[the word] *anto* (“the ending”); “a” (*akāro*) [expresses] the grammatical operation; “the ending” (*anto*) [expresses] that which undergoes the grammatical operation. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta.

iminā suttena visālakkho ti ādīsu antassa ikārassa akārādeso hotu.¹ devarājasamāsādīsu antassa akārassa akārādeso² kiṃ payojanaṃ attih ti.

With this sutta, let there be the replacement of *i* with *a* in words such as *visālakkho* [i.e. *visāla* + *akkhi* = *visālakkha*]. But what is the purpose of the replacement of *a* [instead of the last vowel] in compounds such as *devarāja* “king of gods”?

atthi payojanaṃ. sy ā cā ti hi iminā suttena sivacanassa ākārādesesampatte taṃnivāraṇattham idaṃ suttaṃ vuttaṃ.

There is a purpose. This sutta has been stated in order to block the *ā* replacement of the *si* [case ending, that is nom. sing.] that would be obtained by the sutta *sy ā ca* “and *ā* is the replacement for *si*” [Kacc 189].

NOTE: The sutta Kacc 189 affects words such as *rājā*, *brahmā*, *attā*. Without Kacc 339, the compound *devarāja* would become *devarājā*, which is considered ungrammatical. The opponent is proved wrong in assuming that a word like *devarāja* has not suffered a replacement.

yady evaṃ so ti suttassa nivāretuṃ kasmā na sakkā ti.

If that is so, why is it [i.e. this sutta] not able to block the rule *so* [read *sī o*, Kacc 104]?

---

1 C *hoti*.
2 C *akārādesa*.
3 S *akārādesa*. U *ākārādesetvā*. D *ākārādesa*. 
na sakkā. sāmaññavisesesu visesassa balavatattā. sy ā cā ti suttam hi
akārantasāmaññe yeva vihitam. so ti suttam pana pullīṅgākārante yeva vihitam ti.

It is not able to do so, because the specific [grammatical rules] are stronger than the general
ones. For the sutta sy ā ca [Kacc 189] is prescribed only for those words that have the general
characteristic of ending in a. The sutta so [Kacc 104], however, is prescribed only with regard
to masculine words ending in a.

NOTE: Since Kacc 104 is more specific (visesa) than Kacc 189, it is stronger, that is to say, in case of
conflict, it prevails. That is why Kacc 104 is not affected by Kacc 189.

evam hotu. pañcāhan ty ādisu payogesu2 kim payojanaṃ atthi ti.

Let it be so. What is the purpose in examples such as pañcāham “five days”?

tesu pana pajjunnagati3nyāyajānanatthaṃ akārassa akāradoso vihitam ti.4

In these examples, however, the replacement of a for a is prescribed in order to learn (jānana)
the [so-called] “rule of the rainfall.”

NOTE: In this passage Saddhammajotipāla resorts to the rule (nyāya) that is known as “the rule of
the rainfall”5 in order to justify the application of the present rule in cases where it is redundant. The
point is that this redundancy is simply a by-product of the real purpose of the sutta. In the same way

---

1 C, S, T balavattā.
2 B, S, U, D om.
3 T pajjunnagatika.
4 S, U om.
5 See DSG sv. parjanyavallakṣanyaapraṇvṛtti: the application of a grammatical rule or operation like the rains
which occur on dry land as also on the sea surface; cf. kṛtakāri khalvapi śāstraṃ parjanyavat. tadyathā,
parjanyo yāvadānaṃ pūrṇam ca sāvamabhivarṣati (Mbh on P. 1.1.29)."
that the rain falls in dry land as well as in the ocean, its function of watering the dry land is no less important only because the rainfall in the ocean is “redundant.”

apare ācariyā pana tesu appaccayo ti vadanti. tathāpi rūpaviseso natthi. yathāvuttam eva payojanan ti.

Other masters, however, state: “In them [there is] the suffix a.” Nevertheless, the [resulting] form is not different, and the purpose is as it has been stated.

aññe ācariyā pana tāni na āharanti. rājādiggahaṇam eva āharanti.

Other masters, however, do not record these [examples]; they only record [the examples] rājā, etc.

attan ti vutte yeva siddhe pi kāraggahaṇassa vacane [167] payojanaṃ dassetuṃ kāraggahaṇaṃ kimatthan ti ādim āha. tena kāraggahaṇena ukārādesam pi saṅgaṇhāti. teneva hi cittagu tiḷagū digū ti payogā sijjhanti.

Stating simply attan [the sutta] would work as well, therefore, in order to show the purpose of the word kāra in the sentence, he [the vuttikāra] says “what is the purpose of saying kāra?” etc. With that expression of kāra, the replacement of u is also included. Because with this [expression] the examples cittagu, tiḷagū, digu are formed.

1 T tattha.
2 S rūpavisesā.
3 U bhāni.
4 T rājādigiṇaṃ.
5 S, T atthaṃ.
6 C om. T tiṭṭhagu. D tiṭṭhagu.
7 T sijjhanti ti.
upasaggā nipātā ca paccayā ca ime tayo

neke nekathavisayā iti neruttikā bravun ti

vuttattā puna pi kārappaccayassa¹ phalaṃ dassetuṃ nadī antā cā ti ādim āha.

However, because it has been stated that

“Preverbs and particles, and suffixes – those three

have many different meanings. Thus state the neruttikas”

he added: “also nadī endings” and so forth in order to show the result (phalaṃ) of the suffix

kāra.²

tattha kappaccayo ti ettha ka appaccayo ti padacchedāṃ katvā puna sandhiṃ
katvā tena appaccayo pi gahito. tena pañcagavan ti ettha pañcagosaddato
appaccayaṃ katvā o sare cā [Kacc 78] ti avādese³ kate rūpasiddhi veditabbā.

In this regard, after making the division of words of kappaccayo as ka-appaccayo, and making
the ligature (sandhiṃ) again, the affix a is also included. With this [method], the word
formation in pañcagavan (“five cows”) has to be understood after making out (katvā) the
affix a of the word pañcago, and replacing o with ava by the sutta o sare ca [Kacc 78].

NOTE: The example of pañcagavan is given by Saddhammajotipāla himself as an instance of the
result of the affix a that has to be read in kappaccayo (Kacc-v 119, 1). I think the underlying
reasoning is the following: according to Kacc 78, o is replaced with ava in the word go before a vowel.
Now, in the case of pañcagavan, first we have pañcago, then we add the affix a, and we obtain
pañcago-a, because a vowel follows o, we can apply Kacc 78 o sare ca, and we obtain pañcagava-a, and
finally, we apply the present rule, namely Kacc 339, and we obtain pañcagava, with a regular a
ending, not the ā resulting from a plus a (*pañcago-a > *pañcagava-a).

¹ T kāraggahanassa.
² Kacc-v 119,1-3.
³ C, S gavādese. T gavādeso.
samāsante ti sāmaññena vutte pi bahubbīhisamāsanto va₁ gahetabbo.

Even though the word samāsanta [in the sutta] has been stated in a general sense (sāmaññena), it should include only (va) the ending of a bahubbīhi compound.

|| nadimhā ca || 340 ||

340. Also after nadī.

dvipadam idaṃ. nadimhā ti avadhi, cā ti anukaḍḍhana. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. idha caggahaṇena visayavisayino ākaḍḍhati. samāsante bahubbīhisamāsante nadimhā ca nadisaddamhā² itthivācakikārūkāramhā³ kappaccayo hoti. nadī ti hi īd u itthikhyā⁴ nadī ti iminā aṇṇattha suttena itthivācakānaṃ īkārukānaṃ parāsamaññā ti.

This [sutta consists] of two words. “After nadī” (nadimhā) [expresses] the left boundary; “also” (ca) [expresses] a continued reference [to a former rule]. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta. In this sutta (idha) the mention of “and” refers back to the [relationship] between the scope [of a rule] and the rule itself (visayavisayino). At the end of a compound, i.e. at the end of a bahubbīhi compound, there is the ka suffix also after nadī, i.e. after the word [of the type called] nadī, i.e. any word expressing feminine and ending in i [and ī] or u [and ū]. nadī is an external common technical

---

1 C, S, U, T read va. B, D read pi, which yields an entirely different interpretation.
2 S, U, T, D nadisāññāmabhā.
3 S itthivācakikārūkārambhā. U itthivācakikārūkārambhā. D itthivācakikārūkārambhā.
4 I follow C īd u itthikhyā; B, U, D īrustrākkhyā. S īrustrākkhyā. T īrustrāsākkhyā. The Burmese textual tradition clearly tries to follow the Sanskrit original from Kāt 4.1.9, see n.11 below.
term for i [and ī] or u [and ū] expressing a feminine [which is given] by the sutta in another treatise (aññattha), namely, īd u itthikhyā nadi.¹

|| jāyāya tudaṃjāni patimhi || 341 ||

341. tudaṃjani [is a replacement] of jāya before the word pati.

tipadam idaṃ. jāyāyā ti kārī, tudaṃjāni² ti kāriya, patimhi ti nimittasattamī. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. jāyāyatudaṃjāni ti ayaṃ aluttasamāso ti pi vadanti.³

This [sutta consists] of three words. “of jāya” (jāyāya) [expresses] that which undergoes the grammatical operation; tudaṃjāni [expresses] the grammatical operation; “before the word pati” (patimhi) [expresses] a locative in the sense of condition. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta. They also state: “jāyāyatudaṃjāni is a [single] compound where the case endings have not been elided.”

NOTE: The strange interpretation of this sutta as a long compound is probably the result of the awareness that there was something wrong with its formulation. Indeed nothing is wrong with the formulation per se, but the Kacc-v (119, 9–10) has taken the words tu and daṃ as a single and non-existing word tudaṃ in the ghost word tudaṃpati, instead of reading jāyāya tu daṃjāni patimhi. Aggavaṃsa apparently did not notice anything strange with this rule, for he accepts the ghost word tudaṃpati in Sadd § 731).⁴ This word has been perpetuated in other commentaries such as Mmd (ad

¹ Kāt 4.1.9 īdūt stryākhyo nadi.
² S dujaṃjani. T dudamjāni.
³ In the Sinhalese edition (Kacc-nidd 167, n.1) we read a note on this rule: etthāyaṃ mati na ruccate ekacce. “some are not satisfied with this opinion.”
⁴ For an analysis of the ghost word tudaṃpati see Deokar, 2008: 378.
Kacc 341). The word tu “on the other hand” is simply an adverb that may express an exception or an alternative in the sutta, and the word domjani means “wife”.

|| dhanumhā ca || 342 ||

342. Also ā after the word dhanu.

tipadām idaṁ. dhanumhā ā cā ti padacchedo, dhanumhā ti avadhi, ā ti visayī, cā ti samuccaya. saññā-pecidhiṣuttan ti daṭṭhabbañ. idha casaddena paccakkha’dhammādito pi3 āppaccayo hoti. dvipadām idan ti pi vadanti. evaṃ sati caggahaṇaṃ ākārānukaḍḍhanatthaṃ4.

This [sutta consists] of three words. The division of the words is dhanumhā ā ca. “After the word dhanu” (dhanumhā) [expresses] the left boundary; ā [expresses] that which has the domain; “also” (ca) [expresses] an aggregation. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta. In this sutta (ida), the word “also” (ca) includes the affix ā from paccakkhadhammā and similar words. They also state: “This [sutta consists] of two words.” If that is so, the mention of “also” is in order to refer back to [the affix] ā.

---

3 S, T, D cāpi.
4 U, D akārānukaḍḍhanatthaṃ.
343. *aṃ* [is the replacement] of the case endings after an *avyayībhāva* ending in *a*.

tipadam idam. catuppadam vā. an ti kāriya, vibhattīnaṃ ti sambandhachāṭṭhīkārī, akārantā ti tabbisesana, abyayībhāva ti avadhi. saññā-peedhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. tesaṃ vibhattiyọ lopā ca ti ito vibhattiviparināmaṃ katā anuvattamāne siddhe pi puna vibhattiggahaṇaṃ ālapanaṭṭhavibhattīsaṅgahaṇatthan¹. idam pana suttaṃ sim icc evam ādīnam apavādo² ti atthabyākhyāne vuttaṃ.

This [sutta consists] of three words. Alternatively, [it consists] of four words. “*aṃ*” [expresses] the grammatical operation; “of the case endings” (*vibhattīnaṃ*) is a genitive of relation [expressing] that which undergoes the grammatical operation; “ending in *a*” (*akāranta*) [expresses] its qualifier; “after an *avyayībhāva*” (*avyayībhāva*) [expresses] the left context. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta. Even though the *anuvutti* is established after applying (*katvā*) the [corresponding] change to the case endings from the sutta *tesaṃ vibhattiyọ lopā ca* [Kacc 319], the mention of “case endings” [is made] again (*puna*) is in order that the case endings in the sense of vocative (*ālapana*) are included. In the *Atthabyākhyāna* it is stated: “This sutta, however, is an exception (*apavādo*) to [suttas] such as *sim* [read *si aṃ*, Kacc 219], etc.”

¹ C, S add. *ti*.
² U *āvādo*.
344. Short vowel in the neuter.

This [sutta consists] of three words. “Vowel” (saro) [expresses] that which undergoes the grammatical operation; “short” (rasso) [expresses] the grammatical operation; “in the neuter” (napuṃsake) [expresses] a locative (sattamī) [expressing] the place (ādhāra) [where the grammatical operation occurs]. Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta.

But is it not true that only by saying rasso napuṃsake the word saro is understood? What is the purpose then of mentioning saro?

True. Nevertheless, if the mention of saro were not there, because of the absence of the object of the operation, there would be doubt as to whether all other [previous] objects of

---

1 U, D kārīno.
2 S ihānuvattate. U, D ihānuvattante.
3 C, S om.
grammatical operations [apply or not]. The mention of saro is made in order to prevent that [doubt].

idha abyayībhāvaggahaṇaṃ nānuvattate. tasmā sāmaññabhūtena napuṃsake ti vacanena abyayībhāvadigudvandabahubbihimhi¹ napuṃsake² vattamāne³ samāsantasarassa⁴ rassattaṃ siddhaṃ hoti. atthabyākhyāne pana atisirī atilakkhī ti ādīsu rassattanivattanatthaṃ napuṃsakaggahaṇaṃ katan ti vuttaṃ.

In this sutta (idha) the mention of abyayībhāva does not recur. Therefore, because napuṃsake is stated in a general sense, the shortness of the last vowel of the compound is established when the neuter applies in [the context of] an abyayībhāva, digu, dvanda, or bahubbīhi [compound]. In the Atthabyākhyāna, however, it is stated: “The mention of the neuter is made in order to cancel the shortness [of the last vowel of the compound] in words such as atisirī, atilakkhī, etc.”

|| aṅnasma lopo ca || 345 ||

345. And elision after any other.

tipadam idaṃ. aṅnasma ti avadhinniddeso, lopo ti kāriyaniddeso, cā ti anukaḍḍhananiddeso. saṅṇādhikāraparibhāsāvidhisuttesu vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabban⁵.

1 C, S, T bahubbīhi.
2 S sunapuṃsake.
3 S vattamāna.
5 C om. niddeso in all three cases. But since it is the last sutta of the chapter, we expect it to be complete in the commentary, without abbreviations. The same applies to the determination of the type of sutta. This is how we find it in B.
This [sutta consists] of three words. “After any other” (añṇasmā) expresses the left boundary; “elision” (lopo) expresses the grammatical operation; “and” (ca) expresses a continued reference [to a former word]. Among the different types of sutta, namely: technical name, governing sutta, interpretation sutta, and operational sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta.

idha caggahaṇena abyayībhāvasamāsaṁ ākaḍḍhati. abyayībhāvasamāsa-akārantato añṇasmā anakārantā abyayībhāvasamāsamhā parāsaṁ vibhattīnaṁ lopo hoti. abyayībhāvasamāso hi² duvidho akāranto anakārantō ca ti. tattha akārantato abyayībhāvasamāsato parāsaṁ sabbāsaṁ vibhattīnaṁ pubbasuttena³ amādeso. anakārantato abyayībhāvasamāsato parāsaṁ sabbāsaṁ vibhattīnaṁ iminā suttena lopo hotī⁴ ti adhippayo.

In this sutta, with the mention of “also,” the abyayībhāva compound recurs. After any [compound] other than the abyayībhāva ending in a, i.e. after an abyayībhāva compound not ending in a, there is elision of the following case endings. For the abyayībhāva compound is twofold: ending in a and not ending in a. In this regard, what is implied is: after an abyayībhāva compound ending in a, all the following case endings take the replacement amī according to the previous sutta; after an avyayībhāva compound not ending in a, all the following case endings are elided.

---

2 C pi. S, T om.
3 D pubbena suttena.
4 B, S, U, D om.
pubbaparabhaya añatthapadānattā catubbidho
samāso ca digukammadhārayehi ca chabbidho.
duvidho abyayībhāvo chabbidho kammadhārayo,
digu dvidhā tappuriso aṭṭhadhā sattadhā bhave
bahubbīhi dvidhā dvando pabhedā sattavīsatā ti.

A compound is fourfold on account of the predominance of the first, the last, both or an external [word]. If we add the *digu* and the *kammadhāraya*, it is sixfold. The *abyayībhāva* is twofold. The *kammadhāraya* is sixfold. The *digu* is twofold. The *tappurisa* is eightfold. The *bahubbīhi* is sevenfold. The *dvanda* is twofold. All together, there are twenty-seven [types of compound].

rūpasiddhiyam pana
duvidho abyayībhāvo navadhā¹ kammadhārayo
digu dvidhā tappuriso aṭṭhadhā navadhā bhave
bahubbīhi dvidhā² dvando samāso caturaṭṭhadhā³
ti vuttaṃ.⁴

In the *Rūpasiddhi*, however, it has been stated:

“The *abyayībhāva* is twofold. The *kammadhāraya* is ninefold. The *digu* is twofold. The *tappurisa* is eightfold. The *bahubbīhi* is ninefold. The *dvanda* is twofold. [Thus] the compound has thirty-two types.”

---

1 B, S, U, T navavidho.
2 S *devīhi*.
3 T *caturatthaṭṭhā*.
4 Rūp 215,3–5.
iti nāmakappe¹ samāsakappassa suttaniddeso² nāma³ sattamo kaṇḍo.⁴

Thus [ends] the Seventh Part of the *Suttaniddesa*, called the *Samāsakappa* (Section on Nominal Composition), within the [second book of Kaccāyana, called] the *Nāmakappa* (Section on Nominal Morphology).

saddhammaṭṭhitikāmena⁵ samāsasutta⁶niddesan karontena mayā pattam yam puññam hitadāyakaṃ.
tena puññena ijjhantu⁷ sabbasatta⁸manorathā
rājano pi ca rakkhantu dhammena sāsanaṃ pajan ti.

I composed the *Samāsasuttaniddeśa* (“Explanation of the suttas on compounds”) wishing for the preservation of the good Dhamma. By the welfare-giving merit that I obtained, may all beings prosper with gladdened mind, and may also the kings lawfully (*dhammena*) protect the *sāsana* and the people.

iti samāsakappassa suttaniddeso niṭṭhito.⁹

Thus ends the *Suttaniddesa* of the *Samāsakappa*.

---

1 C om.
2 B, U suttaniddeśe.
3 B, S, D om.
4 C add. taddhitakappo nāma aṭṭhamo kaṇḍo.
5 B, U, T, D saddhammahitakāmena.
6 T samāsasuttaṃ.
7 T icchantu.
8 B sabbasattā.
9 C, S om. the entire sentence.
yattha yattha bhave jāto
puriso homi paṇḍito
ekaṃ padakkharaṃ disvā
sabbaṃ jānāmi so aham. ²

Wherever I’ll be born in this existence
may I become a man of understanding,
the sort of man who knows it all
by seeing a single letter in a word.

² Colophon of Ms T, folio ṭhāḥ, lines 6-7.
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