A Firefly in the Bamboo Reed

The *Suttaniddesa* of Saddhammajotipāla

and the Grammatical Foundations of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma

Aleix Ruiz-Falqués

Hughes Hall

PhD Degree, South Asian Studies

Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies

University of Cambridge

Supervisor: Dr. Eivind Kahrs

This dissertation is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

September 2015

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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the line of acknowledgements I would like to mention, first of all, my dear colleagues in Cambridge, for their good friendship and comradeship: Paolo Visigalli, Giovanni Ciotti, Charles Li, Camillo Formigatti and Alastair Gornall; I have also received help and encouragement from Eisel Mazard. I have also benefited from the fellows of the Pali Mailing-List and especially Jim Anderson and his kind advice. I am extremely obliged to William Pruitt, who has helped me in almost everything, to Petra Kieffer-Pülz, for her help, her patience and encouragement. I have learned what it is to be a true Pali scholar reading with Dr Margaret Cone and knowingly or not she has set the standard that I think I should aim to meet. John Okell was extremely supportive with my Burmese from the very first moment and was kind enough to read passages of the Nyāsanissaya with me, and also the Chapaṭa Pagoda Inscription. I am also grateful to Justin Watkins from SOAS for his support. I am also indebted to Lilian Handlin, Charles Hallisey and Charles Cartstens at Harvard; Kate Crosby, Andrew Skilton, Pyi Phyo Kyaw at King's College London; Professor Malhar Kulkarni, Anuja Ajotikar and Tanuja Ajotikar in IIT Mumbai; Mahesh Deokar, Lata Deokar, Ujjwal Kumar in the Pali Department, Pune University; Shailaja Katre and the staff at the Sanskrit Department, Pune University; Aung Moe and family, U Sundara, U Indachariya at the Sitagu Academy, Florent Robert in Myanmar; Harnpol Tippayamonta ("Tor") in Bangkok; D.C. Lammerts, Alexey Kirichenko, Patrick Pranke and Tilman Frasch, for all have given me good advice on historical matters; Yumi Ousaka, Yutaka Kawasaki and Sunao

CONTENTS

Contents

Preface: Focus and Aim of this Work

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 *sabhāvanirutti* "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."[1]

This passage goes on with the other three *mahāpadesas* "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 *aṭṭhakathā* ("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

---

1 D II, 124,3*f.* Translation by Walshe (2012: 255).

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*. Aggavaṃsa concludes his encyclopedic grammar with the statement: "the study of the texts is the root of the (Buddha's) teaching."[2]

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 *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 *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 *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 (12th century A.D.). During my research I have discovered that this assumption was false, because the author of the *Suttaniddesa* was not the 12th 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.

Preface

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*),[3] 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: 287*f*.

I

The Mirror of the Tipiṭaka

The Role of Pāli Grammar in Pagan Burma

1. INTRODUCTION

Grammar is a species of Philosophy[1]

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 (*nirutti*), lexicography (*abhidhāna*), and similar types of philological sciences.[2] 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.[3]). 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 *nirutti* 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

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 *Mukhamattadīpanī* 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 Tipiṭaka 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 Tipiṭaka 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-dwìn-gyì, who was selected by King Naung-daw-gyì 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 *Sāsanālaṅkāra*; 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 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 *Sāsanavaṃsa* 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.

grammar 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.[1]

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 (*pariyatti*). 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,"[2] 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.[3] Sanskrit Buddhism in its Mahāyāna, Tantra, Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin[4] 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

---

1 PLB, xiii.

2 Bode, 1908: 88.

3 Aung-Thwin, 2012: 71.

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 Hīnayāna.

as a Buddhist sub-discipline.[5] 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-mraṅ-nhaṁ-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]

---

5 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."

1 Frasch, 1996: 332: "Es ist sicherlich kein Zufall, daß es sich bei einem Großteil der hier genannten Pāli-Literatur aus Pagan um Grammatiken handelte. Pāli war für die Mönche und Gelehrten Pagans eine Fremdsprache, deren Struktur und Regeln erst transparent gemacht werden mußten. Aus diesem Grunde wurden Kommentare gewöhnlich in *nissaya*-form verfaßt, wobei sich kurze Pāli-Abschnitte mit der direkten birmanischen Übersetzung abwechselten. Gegenüber dem Altbirmanischen war das Pāli zweifelsohne eine Hochsprache und übte einen entsprechend starken Einfluß aus. Dies offenbare sich nicht nur in einer großen Zahl von Lehnworten, sondern auch Lehnübersetzungen. Worte wie *attaññ-may* ("Vergänglichkeit", Pāli *anicca*) sind zwar rein birmanisch, können aber ihre Herkunft aus dem Pāli nicht verleugnen. Als gut gelungen kann auch die Lehnübersetzung *si-cap-mraṅ-nhaṁ -so* ("alles wissen und rundum sehen") für Pāli *sabbaññuta* (Allwissenheit) angesehen werden. Die Anpassung an das Pāli ging so weit, daß an einigen wenigen Stellen auch das Deprivans *a-* anstelle der gewühnlichen birmanischen Negation *ma* verwendet wurde. Vor diesem Hintergrund wird verständlich, warum sich Gelehrten und Mönche Pagans fast ausschließlich mit grammatischen Werken beschäftigten."

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 *Niruttisāramañjūsā* 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 12^me siècle et le début du 13^me 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*[1]–, 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[1]) 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.[2]

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*[3] and were very much attracted to what Collins defines as "ancillary sciences."[4] 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 Saṅgha, as an organized institution."

2 Collins, 1998: 72.

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?[1]

---

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.

1 Kahrs, 1992: 6.

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."[1] The commentary *Kaccāyanavutti* (Kacc-v) clarifies: "others," here, does not mean other Pāli grammars but the "Sanskrit books" (*sakkataganthesu*).[2] 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: Pāṇini'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 Pāṇini *sūtras*."[3] 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*,[4] 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 Mimamsaka, push it back to the 7th century.

2 Katre, 1987: xvii.

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."[1]

Moreover, *vyākaraṇa* is not the only *vedāṅga* that deals with language, for *śikṣā* 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]."[2] 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: $vi + \bar{a} + \sqrt{kr}$ "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.[3]

---

1 Scharfe, 1977: 87 and n.

2 Scharfe, 1977: 83.

3 Scharfe, 1977: 83.

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.

6 Kahrs, 1998: 14.

7 Nir I, 15. Kahrs, 1998: 32.

semantic content of a word, not its linguistic history.[1] 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 *Ṛgvedaprātiśākhya* (Ṛg-Pr).[2] 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.[3] 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 *Niruktaślokavārttika*, who states: *nirvacanaṃ nāma śabdasya yathārthaṃ vyutpattiḥ*, '*nirvacana* means the derivation of a word according to its meaning.'"

2 Ṛg-Pr, I, 2.8.

3 Scharfe, 1977: 84. Kahrs, 1998: 57*f*.

frequently resorts to *vyākaraṇa*.[1] It is noteworthy that the words *neruttika* "semantic analyst" and *akkharacintaka* "phonetician" or "grammarian" are synonymous in Pāli. Both, together with the word *veyyākaraṇa*, can be conventionally translated as "grammarian." But this blend is not exclusive to the Pāli grammatical tradition. The conflation of *vyākaraṇa, śikṣā* 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.[2] henceforth Mbh). But Patañjali does not comment on absolutely every *sūtra*. Intensive Pāṇinian scholarship and criticism was certainly current before the time of Patañjali,[3] 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]."[4] 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.[5]), 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 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.

2 Scharfe, 1977: 153.

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."[1] The word *bhāṣya* normally means "commentary" and *Mahābhāṣya* "the great commentary." According to Scharfe, this Kātyāyana is most probably the author of the *Vājasaneyī Prātiśākhya* (henceforth VāPr) otherwise known as the *White Yajurveda Prātiśākhya* or *Kātyāyanaprātiśākhya*.[2] This point is relevant for the study of Kacc. For Kacc seems to have been conceived originally as a *sandhikappa* "chapter on phonetics."[3] 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.[4] 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

---

1 Scharfe, 1977: 135.

2 Scharfe, 1977: 134.

3 Kacc Introductory stanzas, ka, *pāda d*: *vakkhāmi suttahitam ettha susandhikappaṃ* "Here [in this treatise] (*ettha*) I will expose (*vakkhāmi*) the good (*su-*) chapter on *sandhi* (*sandhikappaṃ*) arranged in *sūtra* style (*suttahitaṃ*)."

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.

3 Saini, 1999: 7.

Kaiyaṭa (11th century A.D.) in his commentary upon A 1.1.29, states that among Pāṇini, 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.

3 Scharfe, 1977: 160.

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[1]

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.[2] 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.[3]

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.[4] The second level of influence is the arrangement of the topics. Kacc reproduces the general structure of Kāt in four sections: Sandhi, Nāma, Ākhyāta, Kṛt. The influence is visible even in sub-sections.[5] 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, 101*f*; 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.

5 Saini, 1999: 26.

of the rules dealing with the Vedic Sanskrit and the accents."[1] In this respect, Scharfe remarks that Kāt, although it goes back to Pāṇini in terms of terminology, uses much less metalinguistic determinatives, and contractions are absent:

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

This feature brings Kāt and Kacc closer to the Prātiśākhyas than to Pāṇini. The *Kātantraṭīkā* of Durgasiṃha (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 *sūtra*s of Aṣṭ, Kāt 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 Kāt is meant to be an essential grammar, easy to learn by all sorts of people.[5] The target audience of Kāt 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.

2 Scharfe, 1977: 163.

3 Kāt-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 Kātantra 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 tradition[4]). 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:

chāndasaḥ svalpamatayaḥ śāstrāntararatāś ca ye

īśvarā vyādhiniratās tathā lasyayutāś ca ye

vaṇiksasyādisaṃsaktā lokayātrādiṣu sthitāḥ

teṣāṃ kṣipraṃ prabodhārtham anekārthaṃ kalāpakam.

2 Saini, 1987: vii.

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 *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, *Kathāpīṭha*, 3, 48 (ed. Pāṇḍuraṅga, Śivadatta and Kāśinātha, Bombay, 1901).

6 Saini, 1987: x; Lüders, 1930: 20.

7 Lüders, 1930: 14–15.

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 Kātantra[4]) 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 Dwivedi[6]). 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."

3 Pollock, 2006: 62.

4 Saini, 1999: 19.

5 Pollock, 2006: 171, n. 14.

6 Dwivedi, 1997: 8–9.

7 Belvalkar, 1915: 88.

8 Belvalkar, 1915: 88.

9 Deokar, 2012: 151–152.

10 Deokar, 2012: 152; Saini, 1987: 152:

   vṛkṣādivadamī ruḍhā kṛtinā 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."[1]

According to Lüders, a different commentarial tradition is attested in two Eastern Turkestan manuscripts of Kāt: one from Śorcuq, 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.).[2] The introduction of a *Dhātupāṭha* (modelled on Candragomin) and an *Uṇādipāṭha* in the Kāt school was created by Durgasiṃha the *vṛttikāra*. The *Liṅgānuśāsana* was composed by Durgasiṃha the *ṭīkākāra*.

There is scholarly consensus that the *Kātantra* has always been a popular grammar among Buddhists.[3] It has enjoyed recognition not only in Central Asia, but also in Bengal, Kashmir, South India, Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia.[4] 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"[5]) 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[6] and were edited by Lüders in

---

kātyāyanena te sṛṣṭā vibuddhipratibuddhaye.

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: 21*f.*

3 Deokar, 2012: 152.

4 Belvalkar, 1915: 89–91. For a detailed survey of commentarial literature on *Kātantra*, see Saini, 1999: 20–21. For *Kātantra* in Burma see PLB, 101.

5 Lüders, 1930: 53; Lüders (1926) has also edited fragments of Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*.

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 6R3[2] we find the line "….*rmavinaye a[p] (rama)tto vihariṣyati*," which corresponds to *Udānavarga* IV 38: *yo hy asmin dharmavinaye tv apramatto bhaviṣyati*,[3] and to *Gāndhārī Dharmapada* and Pāli canonical texts:

G. Dh. 125 (Brough)   **Pāli (DN ii. 121; SN i. 157; Thg 257)**

yo imasma dhama-viṇa'i   *yo imasmiṃ dhammavinaye*

apramatu vihaṣidi   *appamatto vihessati*

praha'i jadisatsara   *pahāya jātisaṃsāraṃ*

dukhusada kariṣadi.   *dukhassantaṃ karissati.*

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 Ārṣa und die im Kommentar dazu angeführten Beispiele sind für die Beurteilung des Textes des Sanskritkanons nicht ohne Wert."

2 Lüders, 1930: 29.

3 Bernhard, 1965: 138. Bernhard gives a full list of parallels.

4 Lüders, 1930: 53.

5 Pind, 2012: 79.

thinks that the differences between *Kaumāra* and Kāt are due to Buddhist additions.[1] 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.*[2]

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.[3]

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.[4] 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.[5] 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,"[6] a translation that is quite difficult to accept. Furthermore, according to Burnell, non-brahmanical movements such as Buddhism or Jainism, and even the *kaumudī* 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.

3 Shen, 2014: 24.

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* (51*f.*) 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*). (*Taittirīyasaṃhitā* 6.4.7.3)[1]

What Burnell supposes is what ancient Indians probably supposed. It is to be suspected, however, that the reality was much more complex.[2] 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 *Māgadhasadda-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.*

2 Pind, 2012: 71–75.

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*).[1] 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*.[2]

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's *ṭīkā* written in the late 19th century. This *ṭīkā* follows the style of the *Nyāsa* and the *Suttaniddesa* of Saddhammajotipāla. It has never been published.[3]

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.[4] 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.[5]

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).[6]

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[7]; 2) Kacc-v, a concise commentary ascribed to

---

1 Gornall, 2012: 229.

2 For the influence of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* on Mogg see Gornall, 2012 and Gornall, 2014.

3 Ruiz-Falqués, 2014b. Paññasāmi's *ṭīkā* 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 *Mukhamattadīpanīporāṇaṭīkā* (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 *vyākaraṇa* and the scholastic style, for this commentary clearly explains when the *pūrvapakṣa* 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 Mahāvijitāvī's *Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā* (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 *Niruttisāramañjusā*, 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.[1] Their inclusion would be beyond the scope of this study.

Furthermore, there are a number of so-called "minor"[2] 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).[3] 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.

2 http://Pāli.hum.ku.dk/cpd/intro/vol1_epileg_bibliography.html (accessed 7/5/15).

3 Piṭ-s 78*f.*

sometimes two or three *ṭīkās* 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 (*ṭīkās*) 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."[1] 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."[2] 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."[1] We cannot draw general conclusions about Pagan Buddhism (which was an amalgam of different traditions and lineages[2]) 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"[3] 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:

> *kaccay* [*kaccāyana pāṭha*?]
>
> *ññay* [*nyāsa*]
>
> *ṭīkā mahāther{a}*
>
> *ṭikā saṃbyaṅ*
>
> *cuḷasandhi*
>
> [manuscript containing:] {*sandhivisodhanā*
>
> {*ku ṭīkā mahānamakkār* [*mahānamakkāra ṭīkā*]

The inscription goes on with a second donation of *piṭakas* ("books") by the son of Siṅghavīr Sujjabuil. The second list contains the following grammatical works:

> *kāccāy mahānirut* [*kaccāyana mahānirutti*]
>
> *ṭīkā mahāther*
>
> *ṭīkā mahāsampeṅ*

---

1 Lammerts, 2010: 117.

2 Handlin, 2012: 171*f.*

3 Lammerts, 2010: 117.

mahārupasiddhī [*mahārūpasiddhī*]

ṭīkā mahārūpasiddhī

mañ̃ñjūssaṭīkā

byākhyan mahānirut [*vyākaraṇa mahānirutti*]

ṭikā byākhya (...) [*ṭīkā vyākaraṇa*]

nirut [*nirutti*]

cūlasandhi

sandhivisodhanā ku ṭīkā

mahānamaggār (...) [*mahānamakkāra*]

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 byākhya*(...)" 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): *thero ... puna satthu santikam eva āgato attano pubbapatthanāvasena Kaccāyanappakaraṇaṃ Mahāniruttippakaraṇaṃ Nettippakaraṇaṃ 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).

2 Lammerts, 2010: 119.

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 Thūpavaṃsa, 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 *Sudattakisivanirutti* and the *Mahānirutti*, 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* (*nikāyantaravāsīnaṃ byākaraṇavisesanāni*[4]).

---

1 Lammerts, 2010: 121.

2 Pind, 2012: 100–101.

3 Mmd 231,1–2.

4 Pind, 2012: 100, n.171.

A work called the *Cūlanirutti* and ascribed to Yamakathera is quoted in Sadd and *Padasādhana-ṭīkā*.[1] It is allegedly lost. The *Cūlanirutti* we find today in manuscripts is a new version composed in Burma. The *Mañjūsā* or *Mañjūsā-ṭīkā* is the commentary on the *Nirutti* (or *Cūlanirutti*) 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.

2 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 *Śabdārthacintā* and written by the Sinhalese scholar named Ratnaśrījñāna.[2]

Aside from Dimitrov's (unpublished) study on the *Śabdārthacintā*, 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 *Sāsanavaṃsa* tells us that

---

1 PLB 20; Piṭ-s 395.

2 Dimitrov, 2015: 594*f.*

3 For instance, in the *Pugaṃ-sāsanā-vaṅ* 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 commited 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 *porāṇaṭīkā*, 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.

the *Dīpanī* was composed in the 14th century in the Shwe Gu Kyi monastery of Pagan.[1] Abhayathera's commentary seems to be older and, according to a certain tradition, it was composed in the same monastery.[2] 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 conspicous 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-nṭ 247,22–25: *suvaṇṇamayakūṭādīhi virocamānaguhāhi samannāgatattā rhvegū ti pākaṭanāmadheyye mahāvihāre vasatā mahātherena katāyaṃ saddatthabhedacintatthadīpanī catuvīsādhikasattasatasakkarāje kattikamāsassa kāḷapakkhuposathe gurudine niṭṭhaṃ pattā* "this Elucidation of the Meaning of the *Saddatthabhedacintā* 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-porāṇaṭīkā* 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:

saddo hi dubbidho cittajo kārādotujodare

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 *Saddatthabhedacintā*] 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-pṭ (51, 27*f.*). Abhaya, the author of the *porāṇatīkā* on SBC, will quote the original passage of Mmd-pṭ 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]

---

1 SBC-pṭ 5,5–8: *idhādisaddena vātasaṅkhabherisaddaṃ saṅgaṇhāti. purisādyatthassa kathane upakārattā cittajassa. tabbasena cānupakārattā utujassa 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),[1] how the sound that is originated from the mind becomes meaningful:

> *so ca kaṇṭhādiṭhāne bhibyattito tattha cittaja-*
>
> *pathavīsatti[2]viññattibhūsaṃghaṭṭanajo mato || 3 ||*

> 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: 187*f.*

[2] SBC-pṭ 5,27: *pathavīsaddaviññattī ti paṭhanti keci.*

element originated from the mind against the kind produced by *kamma*, i.e. the earth element originated from [past] *kamma*, due to the [former's] capacity of communication.[1]

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 *sadda* (Skt. *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 *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 *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

---

1 SBC-pṭ 5,9–13: *idāni paramatthato cittajuppattikāraṇaṃ dassetum āha so c' icc ādi. so cittajasaddo ca kaṇṭhādimhi ṭhāne abhibyattito abhipākaṭattā tattha kaṇṭhādiṭṭhāne cittajapathavīdhātussa sattibhūtaviññattito kammasambhūtena kammajapathavīdhātunā saha ghaṭṭanato jāto ti mato ty attho.*

commentary called the *Sampyaṅ-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 (*cittaṃ*) arises, and this thought produces a sound which is adequate to the meaning that is to be expressed. When it [*viz.* 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 *avinibbhogarūpaṃ* "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 samuṭṭhāpakaṃ cittam uppajjati. tam uppajjamānam evattanoppādakkhaṇe pathabyāpotejo-vāyovaṇṇogandhorasoojā ty aṭṭharūpāni kaṇṭhādīsu aññatarasmiṃ ṭhāne samuṭṭhāpeti. tatreva ṭhāne laddhokāsaṃ purimānuciṇṇaṃ kammañ ca jīvitindriyarūpena saha tānevaṭṭharūpāni nibbatteti. atra cittajapathavīdhātu kammajapathavīdhātuṃ ghaṭṭety evaṃ dvīsu kalāpesu samabhiniviṭṭhānaṃ dvinnaṃ pathavīdhātūnaṃ aññamaññaṃ ghaṭṭanena kaṇṭhādīsu so saddo jāyati.* This a gloss on Mmd 10,29–11,3; the commentary begins in Mmd-pṭ 52,27*f.*: *duvidho hi saddo cittajotujovasena. tatra saṅkhapaṇavādibāhirasaddo utujo. akārādivaṇṇabyatirekayuttasaviññattisaddo cittajo. tesu cittajasaddassuppattiyā hetubhūtamūlasamuṭṭhā-pakacittaṃ puggalādhiṭṭhānavasena dassento anuvitakkayato anuvicārayato ty āha.* 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 *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*, 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 (*kāyaviññatti*). 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. *Vibhāvinī-ṭīkā* 201,13–15: *vacībhedakaracittasamuṭṭhānapathavīdhātuyā akkharuppatti-ṭṭhānagataupādinnarūpehi saha ghaṭṭhanapaccaya-bhūto eko vikāro vacīviññatti.*

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 counsciousness 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."[1] Others, however, say that the consciousness [impulsions] that are gathered in one single impulsion [i.e., the seventh] produce one single speech-sound.[2]

---

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 paṭhamajavanādīsu pi labbhate 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 cekavīthiyaṃ pathamajavanādihi sattakkhattum evuppajjatī ti taṃnibbatta-kkharāpi satte vā ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. apare ca chahi javanehi nibbattitaghaṭṭanaṃ dubbalabhāvato nākkharaṃ nibbatteti. laddhāsevanena sattamajavanena nibbattitaghaṭṭanam eva balavabhāvato ekaṃ paribyattakkharaṃ nibbattetī ti vadanti. yathā mātā kammanibbattassa dārakassa nissayo hoti. tadupādāya mātā dārakaṃ nibbattetī ti vuttaṃ. tathā bhūsaṃghaṭṭanaṃ pi cittajakkharānaṃ nissayo hoti. tadupādāya saṃghaṭṭanam akkharaṃ nibbattetī ti vuttaṃ. cittāny eva tu sattajavanāni bhūtaghaṭṭanāvatthāyaṃ sattakkharāni nibbattentī ti. apare tv ekajavanavārapariyāpannāni cittāny ekakkharaṃ nibbattentī 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 *javana* produces one speech-sound.

When commenting upon SBC 3, the *Dīpanī*, is, as usual, more succint in saying basically the same thing as the *Porāṇaṭīkā*. But this time the *Dīpanī* explicitly brings up the concept of *viññatti* "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: *saviññāṇakasaddasaṅkhātavācāya adhippāyaṃ viññāpeti sayañ ca tāya viññāyatī ti vacīviññatti.*

(*kāyaviññatti*) or verbally (*vacīviññatti*).[4] This is how the concept of *viññatti* appears in the *Dīpanī* 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 (*vacīviññatti*) 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 *satti* (Skt. *śakti*) 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 kaṇṭhādiṭṭhāne abhibyattito pākaṭabhāvato so ca cittajasaddo vacīviññattikāraṇā bhūsaṃghaṭṭnanato tattha kaṇṭhādiṭṭhāne jāto ti mato kathito ācariyehī ti. ayaṃ pana padasambandho — tassa cittajasaddassa ṭhānavasena bhedaṃ dassetuṃ so ca-pa-mato ti āha. cittajapathaviyā sattisamatthabhāvocittajapathavīsatti. sā eva viññatticitta-japathavīsattiviññatti. vacīviññattī ti vuttaṃ hoti. bhūnaṃkammajapathavīcittajapathavīdhātūnaṃ saṃghaṭṭanaṃ bhūsaṃghaṭṭanaṃ. cittajapathavīsattiviññattikāraṇā bhūsaṃghaṭṭanaṃ cittajapathavīsatti-viññattibhūsaṃghaṭṭanaṃ. tato jāto cittajapathavīsattiviññattibhūsaṃghaṭṭanajo 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-century[1] 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*
>
> *saṃghaṭṭanorakaṇṭhādi 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*

---

1 Scharfe, 1977: 174.

2 SBC-pṭ 6,24–25: *apare ti jinindabuddhyādikā* ("[Here] 'others' means Jinendrabuddhi, etc.").

adhippeto[1]). 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,

---

1 SBC-pṭ 6,22–23.

2 SBC-nṭ 140,19–22: *kaṇṭhajo na kaṇṭhe yeva jāto. nābhimhi ure sire ca. tālujo na tālumhi yeva jāto. nābhimhi ure kaṇṭhe sire ca jāto. evaṃ muddhajadantajaoṭṭhajāpīti vuttaṃ hoti.*

3 SBC 6:

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:

> *paṭiññā upamā hetu udāharaṇa nigama-*
>
> *vasenāvayavā pañcavidhā vākye yathārahaṃ || 14 ||*

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

> *yathā mahānase evam aggi dahanadhūmato*
>
> *manyate kattha dhamminosiddhito[1]calamatthake || 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 (*asiddhito*) what bears the sign (*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 *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 *upamā*, which is a peculiar Pāli rendering of the Sanskrit term *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

---

aniṭṭhite pade vaṇṇo paramattho suniṭṭhitaṃ

padaṃ paññattisaddo ti saddo bhavati dubbidho.

SBC 13:

aniṭṭhite pade vaṇṇo vākkharaṃ niṭṭhite padaṃ

vākyaṃ tassamudāyo tamaññoññāpekkhalakkhaṇaṃ.

1 SBC-pṭ 12,18–19: *asiddhito ti byatirekahetunidassanaṃ.* SBC-nṭ 143,15–16: *dhammino siddhito ti dhammino asiddhito ti chedo.*

2 Matilal, 2005: 1. Cf. *Nyāyasūtra*, 1.1.32—1.1.39.

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 preceive 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]

---

1 SBC-pṭ 12,19–22: *idha ca — (ka) mahānase aggī ti paṭiññātabbe sati pabbataggi dahanadhūmato aggi manyate ti paṭiññā katā. (kha) pabbataggibhūte upameyye sati mahānasaggibhūtā upamā (katā). bhāvapākaṭā nūpameyyaṃ. tasmā katthasaddo vutto.*

2 SBC-pṭ 12,22–26: *upamā ca upamitam ārocetvā pavattattā apadhānā va. upamitupamāya upametabbattā padhānaṃ. tasmiṃ padhāne pavatto aggisaddo apadhāne mahānase pi sambandhitabbo. sadisabhūtupamādhammasahitopamitadhammino ādhārena asijjhanato ti nivāraṇattā.*

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 (*ti*), 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 (*sabhāvañāpaka*) 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) asiddhito ti byatirekahetu. anuṇhattā asatī ti phale sati kato. idha tu bījaṃ rukkhakkhandhassa janakattā janakahetu. ariyamaggo sujane nibbānaṃ pāpetabbattā sampāpakahetu. dhūmo dhūmaṃ passante jane aggiṃ avabodhāpetabbattā ñāpakahetū ti vuttesu tīsu majjhe ñāpakahetu. so ca sabhāvabyatirekakāriyañāpakavasā 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].[1]

The *Dīpanī*, 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.[2]

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 *sādhya* ("what is to be demonstrated") is found. Abhaya comments:

---

1 SBC-pṭ 14,1–5: *tattha mahānase pavattaggino ñāpako. uṇhaggi uṇhattā atthī ty avabodhakattā uṇhaggino (uṇhaṃ aggino) sabhāvañāpakahetu. anuṇhattā tassa natthī ty avabodhakattā taṃ (anuṇhaṃ) byatirekañāpakahetu. aggito pavattadhūmassa diṭṭhattā taṃñāpako phaladhūmo kāriyañāpakahetū ty udāharaṇaṃ veditabbaṃ.*

2 SBC-nṭ 143,22–26: *aggi atthi natthī ti ñātuṃ uddhanaṭṭhāne hatthena parāmasante yena uṇhena aggi atthī ti jānāti. taṃ uṇhaṃ sabhāvañāpakahetu. parāmasante yena sītena aggi natthīti jānāti. taṃ byatirekañāpakahetu. dhūmassa agginā kāriyattā kattabbattā aggissa phalattā ca dhūmo kāriyañāpakahetu.*

(4) When that which is to be exemplified is there as "where?", the example is [also] there as "at the top of the mountain."[1]

What that means is namely that the word "where?" in SBC 15 is a rethorical 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 senteces 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 lopaṃ* ("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 (*iminā*), he shows the result (*phalaṃ*) accordingly (*yathārahaṃ*).[2]

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 (*udaharaṇa*), 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) katthā ti udāharaṇīye sati acalamatthake ty udāharaṇaṃ.*

2 SBC-pṭ 13,9–15: *(ṅa) yathā mahānase aggī ti niggamaniye sati evaṃ tathā ti niggamanaṃ kataṃ. kathaṃ — sarā sare lopan ti ādisuttaṃ paṭiññā. yassindriyāny ādikam udāharaṇaṃ. puriso maggaṃ gacchatī ti ādikā ekā paṭiññā. sesaṃ vuttanayam eva. iti iminā yathārahaṃ phalaṃ 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."[1]

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-eternality 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 udāharaṇaṃ. upameyya aggissa nidassanattā. yathā mahānase aggi dahanadhūmato manyate. kattha aggī ti. acalamatthake ti vākye pana cattāro avayavā. evan ti niggamanassa hīnattā.*

atthe sādhuttamattena niccatte pi karīyate

niccena sadisāniccaṃ raṅgahatthādayo yathā || 20 ||

Even though there is permanence on acount of the mere correctness [of the speech-sound] regarding the meaning, it [*viz.* sound] is made [i.e. is 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 *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 *vārttika* 3: *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.[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 *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 *sutta*, *vutti*, and examples of Kaccāyana are made as [something] impermanent, [but] similar to the word[2] (*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

---

1 Translation by Joshi & Roodbergen, 1986: 90.

2 Where I translate *sadda* as "word" in this passage one may as well read "speech-sound".

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 nigguhitaṃ siddhedam uccate

marū va marubimbamhā 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 sati pi atthe ñātabbatthe sādhubhāvamattena suttādikaṃ karīyate. yathā kiṃ. raṅgena cittīkārena likhitā hatthyādayo yathā niccena piṭakattayasaddena sadisaṃ aniccaṃ kaccāyanakaṃ suttavuttiudāharaṇattayaṃ karīyate ti yojjaṃ. pakatihatthyādīnaṃ hi rūpaṃ disvā cittīkāro vikati hatthyādayo likhati yathā. pakatipiṭakattayaṃ saddarūpaṃ kaccāyano vikatirūpabhūtaṃ 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 *Porāṇaṭīkā* and the *Dīpanī* differs. In the *Porāṇaṭīkā* Abhaya maintains that the simile expresses the relationship between the permanent sound, which is the word of the Tipiṭaka and the *aṭṭhakathā,* 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" (*siddhaṃ*). 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-nṭ 145,23: *siddhasaddo niccatthā.*

2 SBC-pṭ 15,21–22: *idha ca niccasaddo gilitaguḷena sadiso. anicco tu niguhitenā ti vuttaṃ hoti.*

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 tesaṃ buddhi. guḷakīḷaṃ kīḷanto ekaṃ guḷaṃ gilatvā ekañ ca niggūhitvā puna passantu bhonto gilitaṃ me guḷaṃ nābhito nīharitvā dassemī ti vatvā nābhito taṃ nīharitaṃ viya katvā niggūhitam eva dasseti. aveti ca taṃ loko acchariyaṃ bho gilitaṃ guḷaṃ nāma nābhito nīharitvā dassetī ti. evaṃ saddappatirūpakaṃ kiñci viggahavākyaṃ vikappetvā vibhattilope nābhisaṅkhate tasmiṃ samāsavākyam abhisaṅkhan tan ti vadanti. bhavati ca tena tesam atthappaṭipatti. viggahavākye ca tappatirūpake vibhattilopaṃ katvā puna luttavibhattikam idan ti samāsapadaṃ dassenti. aveti ca taṃ loko luttavibhattikam etaṃ samāsapadan 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 *Dīpanī*, 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 pamāṇaṃ. vuttañ hi saṅketavacanaṃ saccaṃ. lokasammutikāraṇan ti. na hi paramatthato gopatirūpakaṃ hantvā goghātako hotī 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*), [that is, among those masters,] 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 khaṇikavādīnām. purimavādino santativādīnāmā ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.*

2 SBC-nṭ 146,12–14: *saddo cittasahabhūcittānuparivattittā anicco ekacittakkhaṇayutto 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:

> *niccatte piṃsalādīnaṃ*[2] *saññā rūḷhī va manyate*
>
> *aniccavādinaṃ vāde anvatthāpi patīyate* || 23 ||

According to the school of eternalists such as Piṃsala (?) and the like, a name (*saññā*) is only understood as a convention (*rūḷhī*). According to the theory of the non-eternalists, [however[3], a name] is also (*pi*) understood according to the meaning (*anvatthā*) [that is to say, according to its etymology].

Abhaya considers that Saddhammasiri is positing the *codanā* "objection" in this stanza. "Piṃsala" seems to be a proper name of one of the defenders of eternalism, for Abhaya glosses: *tattha piṃsalādīnaṃ niccavādīnaṃ vāde.*[4] And the *Dīpanī*: *satthakāresu tesu piṃsalādīnaṃ niccavādiācariyānaṃ 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 *saññā*, which means "name" or "designation," but in grammar it means a "technical name." If we read *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 *saññā* as "technical name" in grammar, eternalists believe that *saññās* based on convention (*rūḷhī*), for instance, as we

---

1 See, for instance, Mmd-pṭ 11,4: *kattā nāma sakalakalāpabyākaraṇānucaritabuddhi 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 *pi salādīnaṃ*, which does not match with the commentary.

3 I follow Abhaya's gloss: *aniccavādīnaṃ vāde tu.*

4 SBC-pṭ 16,12–13.

5 SBC-nṭ 146,16–17.

have seen, Pāṇini uses the convention *ac* in order to say "all vowels." The non-eternalists, however, believe that *saññās* should be meaningful (*anvattha*) designations. For instance, *svara* "vowel" actually means "vowel." Exceptionally, non-eternalists can also resort to conventions, as Abhaya reminds us:

> [The stanza] is to be construed [as follows]: with the word "also," even [technical] names (*saññā*) such as *ga, gha, jha, la* and *pa* are understood.[1]

He is clearly describing the practice of the Kaccāyana School.

If we follow the interpretation of the *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 *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.[2]

nicco nikkāraṇonicco kāraṇānugatorito

nāyaṃ kaṇṭhādivuttittā nicco vuḍḍhe tu vuttito || 24 ||

---

1 SBC-pṭ 16,15–16: *pisaddena gaghajhalapaiccādiruḷhīsaññāpi patīyate ti yojjaṃ.*

2 SBC-nṭ 146,21–26: *idaṃ vuttaṃ hoti — samasanaṃ samāso ti samāsasaññā ekasmiṃ yeva pade na kattabbā. chinnahatthādisaddo tu chinnahatthādinā yeva ekapadattena paramparā paveṇi āgato. tasmā tattha samāsasaññā ruḷhī yeva niccavādīnaṃ vāde. aniccavādīnaṃ vāde pana niggahavākyaṃ katvā vibhattilopaṃ katvā samāsassa katattā anvatthasaññā. gasaññādayo pana vādadvaye pi ruḷhī yevā 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 *chinnahattha* '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 *ga*, etc. are merely conventional." The word *saññā* (Skt. *saṃjñā*) "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 *paramparā pavaṇi āgato* is problematic. I have translated it as a compound: *paramparāpaveṇiāgato.*

saṅketena ca vuttittā nāpy anicco ti vuccate

tena satthan tu saṅketakaraṇatthaṃ karīyate ti || 25 ||

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 taṃsabhāvo na nivassate so vatthu nicco*[1]). 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 paraṃparā 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 (*sammutisacca*) 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 wordly 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 purimavādadvayaṃ vadanti. kalāpaganthe tu pacchimavādaṃ vadanti.*

2 SBC-nṭ 147,3: *iti vacanaṃ aññehi ācariyehi vuccate.*

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:

---

1 Aung-Thwin, 2012: 87*f.* Handlin, 2012: 165: "Sometime in the eleventh century, in one cautious formulation, Pagan's rulers adopted a Theravādin idiom." See also Lieberman, 1987: 169; Huxley, 1990: 70; Skilling, 2009: 61–93.

2 PLB 15.

3 Guillon, 1985: 24-25; Strong, 1992: 4.

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-pṭ, a certain *saṃ-pyaṅ* "higher officer" of the royal court. Apart from Kār and Kār-ṭ, Dhammasenāpati allegedly composed two other works: the *Etimāsamidīpanī* and the *Manohāra*, both written at the request of a certain Ñāṇagambhīra 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 *ṭīkā*. Perhaps they are a later addition. But I think it is more plausible that the *ṭīkā* and verses were composed simultaneously, in such a way that the verses were the colophon of the two works combined.

---

1 PLB 16.

2 Ñāṇagambhīra is perhaps the author of the *Tathāgatuppatti*. Cf. PLB 16.

3 *Kārikā* 567–568:

tambadīpavhaye raṭṭherimaddanapure vare
mahātherānam āvāse nandānāmavihārake
vasatā thiracittena jinasāsananandinā
dhammasenāpatināmatherena racitā ayaṃ.

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:

> *iminā lekhapuññena miteyyajinasantike*
>
> *ehibhikkhupaṭisambhidāhi saddhiṃ labheyya taṃ.*
>
> *piṭakattayaṃ catubbedaṃ jivhāgge mama tiṭṭhatu*
>
> *diṭṭhaṃ sutañ ca nissesaṃ sabbaṃ sippaṃ samijjhatu.*
>
> *anena hatthakammena saṃsaranto bhavābhave*
>
> *paṇḍiteheva saṃvāso na bālena samāgamo.*
>
> *paṇḍitehi saṃvāsohaṃ satthuvādaṃ vinicchayaṃ*
>
> *yāva jīvaṃ saritvāna jinapathaṃ gacchām ahaṃ.*
>
> *ciraṃ tiṭṭhatu saddhammo sampuṇṇāsamasaṅkappā*
>
> *yaṃ yaṃ paṭhanti taṃ sabbaṃ labhatu pāṇino sadā.*[1]

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" (*piṭakattayaṃ catubbedaṃ jivhāgge mama tiṭṭhatu*), which means "may I know the Tipiṭaka and the Four Vedas by heart" and indicates some close relatioship 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 s*addānusāsanappayojanavinicchayo* "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 ||[1]

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-ṭ, 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 bījapūrā ti vacanaṃ 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-ṭ 338,17– 27: *idāni saddānusāsanaṃ dassetum āha —* **kākadantaparikkhā** *ti. kākā sadantā kiṃ udāhu adantā ti puṭṭho keci sadantā adiṭṭhā ti vadanti. keci mukhatuṇḍamattā adantā ve ti vadanti. iti kākānaṃ sadantaadantabhāvaupaparikkhāvicāraṇānippayojanā iva.* **na cettha nippayojan** *ti ettha saddānusāsanasaṅkhāte kaccāyanabyākaraṇe piṭakattayānukūlanipphādanahitaatthappakāsa udāharaṇa-sādhakalakkhaṇattā nippayojanaṃ nipphalanaṃ na. cakāro upanyāsattho. upanyāso nāma vākyārambho.* **dasatāḷimavākyaṃ vā** *ti dasa janā tāḷimā bījapūrā ti vacanaṃ viya. cakāro samuccayattho.* **etthā** *ti saddānusāsane.* **anabhidheyyakaṃ** *nisambandhaṃ aññamaññasambandha ekatthapaṭipādaka padasamudāyūpagavākyattā.*

jarassa haro takkhakacūlāmaṇyopadesanaṃ

yathā asakkānuṭṭhānaupadeso pi ettha na || 20 ||[1]

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 maṇī.* ***upadesanaṃ yathā*** *ti ayan tu jarārogo takkhakanāmanāgarājassa cūḷāyaṃ jaraharamaṇin ti laddhetu pasamissatī ti upadesanaṃ yathā.* ***asakkānuṭṭhānaupadeso*** *ti ettha anu uṭṭhātuṃ asamattho upadeso.* ***api****saddo samuccayattho.* ***ettha nā*** *ti etasmiṃ kaccāyanabyākaraṇe natthi.*

mātuvivāhupadeso yathā nettha asammato

lahupāyantaraṃ ettha na cettha anupāyanaṃ || 21 ||[1]

Here there is no blameworthy instruction as "marry your own mother." Here the method is quick, and here there is no lack of method.

pañcapakaraṇe dosā ganthakārena vajjitā

susatthaṃ dosavigataṃ sasambandhapayojanaṃ || 22 ||[2]

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.

satthaṃ payojanañ ceva sambandhassa siyuṃ ubho

tesu antogadho tasmā bhinno nutto payojanā || 23 ||[3]

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 asammato viya.* **nettha asammato** *ti ettha kaccāyanabyākaraṇe viññūhi asammato upadeso na.* **lahupāyantaran** *ti yattha pariggahena attho sijjhati, gahito pi ca haniyo upāyo evaṃ lahuka-upāyanānatthaṃ ettha atthi.* **na cettha anupāyanaṃ** *upameyyassa anipphannahetubhūtaatthaggahaṇaṃ ettha natthi.*

2 Kār-ṭ 339,14–21: *eke eva pakaraṇadosā ti dassetum āha —* **pañcapakaraṇe** *ty ādi. tattha* **pañcā** *ti gaṇanaparicchedo.* **pakaraṇe** *ti yaṃ kiñci ganthe.* **dosā** *ti paricchinnadhammanidassanaṃ.* **ganthakārenā** *ti pakaraṇadosaṃ jānitvā niddosapakaraṇakattunā kenaci ācariyena.* **vajjitā** *ti vajjanīyā ti attho.* **susatthan** *ti viññūhi pasaṃsanīyaṃ.* **sasambandhapayojanan** *ti sambandhena payojanena sahitaṃ. ettha ca sambandho ti satthappayojane bhinnassito anusaṅgitappayojanasaṅkhāto sambandho payojanaṃ satthe nipphādanīyamukhyapayojanaṃ. tehi sahitaṃ satthaṃ susatthaṃ nāma.*

3 Kār-ṭ 339,22–28: *sambandhe satthappayojanaṃ sannihitabhāvaṃ tesu ca sambandhassa antogadhabhāvaṃ dassetum āha —* **satthan** *ty ādi. tattha* **satthan** *ti vaṇṇo akkharaṃ. akkharasamudāyo padaṃ. padasamudāyo vākyaṃ. vākyasamudāyo saddasannajjhosatthaṃ* **pakaraṇan** *ti attho.* **siyuṃ** *ti ubho satthappayojanā sambandhaāsayā siyuṃ.* **tesū** *ti satthappayojanesu yasmā sambandho* **antogadho**, **tasmā** *payojanato bhinnaṃ katvā* **na vutto.**

vutte payojane yeva sambandho vihito siyā

payojanam pi vihitaṃ sambandhe vihite tathā || 24 ||[1]

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.

sabbasseva hi satthassa kammuno vā pi kassaci

yāva payojanaṃ nuttaṃ tāva taṃ tena gayhate || 25 ||[2]

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.[3] The following stanzas insist, yet again, on the same idea:

ñātatthaṃ ñātasambandhaṃ sotā sotuṃ pavattati

aviññātatthasambandhaṃ satthaṃ nābhyūpagamyate || 26 ||[4]

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

When the purpose and the relationship of the *sattha* are not known, the *sattha* is not grasped.

---

1 Kār-ṭ 339,29: *tato paraṃ silokam ekaṃ uttānattham eva.*

2 Kār-ṭ 339,30—340,4: *sakalakammassa phale vijjamāne yeva taṃ kenaci gayhate ti dassetum āha — sabbasseva ty ādi.* **sabbasse** *ti sakalassa satthassa* **kammassa vā yāva** *yattakaṃ* **payojanaṃ vuttaṃ.** *kenaci pi puggalena na sūratena tāva tattakaṃ kālaṃ taṃ satthaṃ vā kammaṃ vā gayhate sikkhate ti attho.*

3 Kār-ṭ 339,30: *sakalakammassa phale vijjamāne yeva taṃ kenaci gayhate.*

4 Kār-ṭ 340,5–9: **sotā** *puggalo* **ñātatthaṃ ñātasambandhaṃ** *sotukāmo hotī ti dassetum āha — ñātatthaṃ ñātasambandhan ti ādi. viññātasambandhaṃ ganthaṃ.* **sotā** *ti sotukāmo sikkhitukāmo.* **sotuṃ** *ti suṇituṃ. savanatthan ti attho.* **nābhyūpagamanyate** *ti na abhiupagamyate. aviññātatthasambandhaṃ ganthaṃ na sikkhatī ti attho.*

satthādimhi tato vutto sambandho sappayojano

sappayojanasambandhaṃ satthaṃ utvā udīraye || 27 ||[1]

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.

saddānusāsanassa kiṃ payojanan ti ce vade

rakkhohāgamalahupāyāsandehattham eva ca || 28 ||[2]

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."

---

1 Kār-ṭ 340,10–14: **satthādimhi** *sahitaganthassa ādimhi* **tato** *yasmāpayo janasahito sambandho vattabbo hoti. tasmā sappayojanasambandho ti payojanena phalena saha anugato sambandho vutto timinā sambandhitabbaṃ.* **utvā udīraye** *ti payojanasahitaṃ sambandhasahitañ ca ganthaṃ jānitvā* **udīraye** *katheyya.*

2 Kār-ṭ 340,15–20: **saddānusāsana**-*la*-**iti ce** *ti* **saddānusāsanassa payojanaṃ** *sarūpavasena* **kiṃ iti ce** *sakavādī vadeyya. ettha* **iti**saddo *vacanālaṅkāramattaṃ.* **rakkhohāgamalahupāyāsandehatthan** *ti rakkhanatthaṃ uhanatthaṃ āgamatthaṃ lahu-upāyatthaṃ asandehatthaṃ.* **eva cā** *ti ettha evakāro avadhāraṇattho. tena rakkhanādyattham evā ti sanniṭṭhānaṃ karoti. cakāro nipātamattaṃ.*

These five purposes of grammar are taken directly from Pasp in its commentary upon Kātyāyana's Vārttika 2: *rakṣohāgamalaghvasaṃdehāḥ prayojanaṃ.*[1] Let us now examine them one by one.

<div align="center">

RAKKHĀ — PROTECTION

</div>

> *tattha rakkho ti atthassa nupāyaparihārakā*[2]
>
> *suttantarakkhaṇatthaṃ hi sikkhitabbaṃ sudhīmatā* || 29 ||[3]

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.[4]

---

1 I follow Joshi & Roodbergen, 1986: v.

2 *anupāyahārikā* in the commentary. The meaning remains the same. See the following note.

3 Kār-ṭ 340,21–28: **rakkhā** *ti atthavibhāvanaṃ kātuṃ tatthā ti ādim āha. tattha* **tatthā** *ti tesu rakkhādīsu pañcasv atthesu.* **anupāyahārikā** *ti atthassa anupāyaparihārikā. atthassa anupāyatthaṃ parimāṇe bhāvo rakkhā nāmā ti vuttaṃ hoti.* **suttantarakkhanatthan** *ti suttantassa piṭakattayassa cirakālaṃ avināsanāya rakkhanatthaṃ.* **hī** *ti daḷhīkammattho. saccam evetan ti vuttaṃ hoti.* **sikkhitabban** *ti saddānusāsanakaccāyanabyākaraṇaṃ* **sudhīmatā** *sikkhākāmena kulaputtena sikkhanīyaṃ sikkhituṃ yuttam evā ti attho.*

4 My translation. Pasp 3: *rakṣārthaṃ vedānām adhyeyaṃ vyākaraṇaṃ. lopāgamavarṇavikārajño hi samyag vedān paripālayiṣyati.*

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 sakāraādinaṃ*
>
> *yathayidan ti ādimhi yakārādīnam āgamo || 30 ||*[1]

> [For instance:] in the case of *evaṃ sa te*, there is elision (*lopo*) of the syllable *sa*, etc. In the case of *yathayidaṃ*, there is augment (*āgamo*) of the syllable *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 *evaṃ sa te* is the result of sandhi after *evaṃ assa te*, following Kacc 41 *byañjano ca visaññogo*. The first example is *evaṃ sa te āsavā* [M I 9, 28].[2] Kacc 40 *paro vā saro* tells us that, after *niggahīta* (= *ṃ*), a vowel is optionally elided. By Kacc 41, if the vowel is elided and the next consonant forms a cluster (*saññogo*) with the previous *niggahīta*, this cluster is to be dissolved (*visaññogo*).

The second line of the stanza is easier to explain: *yathā idaṃ* takes an augment *-y-* , a glide that can be justified by Kacc 35 *yavamadanataralā cāgamā*, which allows for the intervocalic insertion of *y, v, m, d, n, t, r, l* and even other consonants. For, according to Kacc-v, followed by Kār-ṭ, the word *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 *ca* in the rule.[3] But what is important here is to note that Kār-ṭ follows

---

1 Kār-ṭ 340,29—341,6: *suttantarakkhanassa udāharaṇaniyamaṃ dassetum āha — evan ty ādi.* **evaṃ sa te** *ti ādimhi evaṃ sate iti* **ādimhi** *payoge* **lopo sakāra-ādīnaṃ.** *evaṃ assa te ti ādipadacchede kate byañjano ca visaññogo* [Kacc 41] *ti suttena lopo adassanaṃ anuccāraṇan ti attho.* **yathayidan ti ādimhi** *payoge udāharaṇe.* **yakārādīnam āgamo** *ti yathā idan ti ādi padacchede kate yavamadanataralā cāgamā* [Kacc 35] *ti suttena yakārādīnaṃ aṭṭhannaṃ byañjanānam āgamo. caggahaṇena avasesa byañjanānam āgamo vā.*

2 Kacc-v 13,21.

3 Kacc-v 11,9f. Kacc-v understands the word *ca* in the sutta as *vā*. The *vutti* subsequently elaborates on the

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":

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 (*vikāraṇaṃ*) such as *ārisyaṃ*, *ajjavaṃ*, etc.

The examples of this stanza are two words in which we can see the effect of *vikāraṇa* (or *vikāra*) "mutation." The long *ā* of *ārisyaṃ* (Skt. *ārṣeya*, "the state of being a seer") is originally short, and the short *a* of *ajjavaṃ* (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:

---

scope of *vā*, but also of the scope of *ca* in the sutta. Both words allow for other augments apart from *yavamadanataralā*. The real purpos of ca in the sutta, however, is the *anuvutti* of *sare* ("before a vowel") from the previous sutta, Kacc 34.

1 Kār-ṭ 341,7–13: **ārisyaṃ ajjavan ty ādi vikārakaraṇam pi cā** *ti ārisyaṃ ajjavan ty ādi payoge ivaṇṇuvaṇṇānaṃ ākārakaraṇaṃ. akārikārukārānaṃ āīūdīghakaraṇaṃ. ākārīkārūkārānaṃ aiurassakaraṇañ ca saṅgayhate.* **icc ādī** *ti evam ādi vikārādikaraṇan ti attho.* **pakāsitā** *ti vinā saddasatthena lopavikārādikaraṇassa asiddhito suttena lopavikārādikaraṇaṃ* **suttaganthassa ārakkhā ti** *dīpitā.*

yadi hi na gatoṭṭhāne kāyaduccaritādinā

mantaṃ pulliṅganiddiṭṭhaṃ yadā itthī siyā tadā || 32 ||

yadi hi na gatoṭhāne itthiliṅgena uhate

mante niddiṭṭham ekattaṃ bahuttena pi uhate || 33 ||

sampādehī ti ādīnaṃ sampādethā ti ādinā

suttantassa uhanañ ca saddānusāsanasādhanaṃ || 34 ||

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 *suttantas*.[1]

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 commited a fault, he will recite a mantra. However, if it is a nun who has commited 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-ṭ 341,14–24: **mantaṃ pulliṅganiddiṭṭhan ti gato** *ti ādi pulliṅge niddiṭṭhamantaṃ paramatthabhūtaṃ buddhavacanaṃ.* **yadā itthī siyā** *ti yasmiṃ kāle kāyaduccaritādinā paṭipannā itthī bhaveyya. tadā na gato.* **itthiliṅgena uhate** *ti itthiliṅgasaddena vitakkayate.* **mante niddiṭṭham ekattan** *ti ekavacanantena niddiṭṭhānaṃ.* **sampādehī ti ādīnan** *ti sāmaññabhūtakiriyāpade payujjamānavisesapadatthassa ekattā ekavacanantena niddiṭṭhānaṃ sampādehī ti ādīnaṃ kiriyāpadānaṃ.* **sampādethā ti ādinā** *ti sāmaññabhūtakiriyāpade payujjamānavisesapadatthassa bahutte sati bahuvacanantena niddiṭṭhānasampādethā ti ādinā uhate ti vuttaṃ hoti.* **suttantassa** *piṭakattayassa pulliṅgādiekavacanabahuvacanādi* **uhanañ ca** *saddānusāsanena* **sādhanaṃ** *nipphādanaṃ.*

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-grammarian 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:

> *naccagītassa ādīnaṃ naccagīte ti ādinā*
>
> *sattamyantādi uhanaṃ uhanan ti pakāsitaṃ || 35 ||*[3]

> *Uhana* is illustrated (*pakāsitaṃ*) 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 sarvairliṅgair na ca sarvābhirvibhaktibhirvede mantrā nigaditāḥ. te cāvaśyaṃ yajñagatena yathāyathaṃ vipariṇamayitavyāḥ. tān nāvaiyākaraṇaḥ śaknoti yathāyathaṃ vipariṇamayitum. tasmād adhyeyaṃ vyākaraṇam.*

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

3 Kār-ṭ 341,25–28: ***naccagītassā ti ādīnaṃ*** *chaṭṭhyantavasena niddiṭṭhānaṃ padānaṃ kusalā ti saddantarikasanniṭṭhānassa chekā ti atthāyattanayato naccagīte ti sattamyantena* ***uhanaṃ*** *vitakkanaṃ.* ***uhanan ti pakāsitan*** *ti uhanaṃ iti uhanānāma iti pakāsitaṃ.*

koṭisatasahassiyo parivāressanti acch *arā*

kusalā naccagītassa vādite pi padakkhiṇā.

Thousands of millions of *apsarases*, 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 *aṭṭhakathā* or *ṭīkā* commentary upon it. Dhammasenāpati 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.

ĀGAMA — TRADITION

paramparānavacchinnaupadeso va āgamo

nikkāmajinadhammo so navaṅgajinasāsanaṃ || 36 ||[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[2]). 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 jñeyaḥ* "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.[3]

---

1 Kār-ṭ 341,29—342,4: ***paraṃparānavicchinnaupadeso va āgamo*** *ti paresaṃ ācariyānaṃ santatiyā paveṇiyā avacchinno upadeso va āgamissati ito ti atthasambandhena āgamo nāmā ti uccate. ettha upadeso nāma pekkhāpanaṃ purimapurimehi pacchimānaṃ saddassanaṃ.* ***ikkāmajinadhammo*** *ti nikkāmassa kilesakāmarahitassa jinassa vijitakilesassa buddhassa pariyattidhammo.* ***so*** *vedo* ***navaṅgajinasāsanan*** *ti vuccati.*

2 Sp 28,4: *kathaṃ [buddhavacanaṃ] aṅgavasena navavidhaṃ, sabbam eva hidaṃ suttaṃ geyyaṃ veyyākaraṇam gāthā udānaṃ itivuttakaṃ jātakaṃ abbhutadhammaṃ vedallan ti navappabhedam hoti.* Cf. DOP sv *aṅga.*

3 Joshi — Roodbergen's translation. Pasp 19: *āgama khalv api brāhmaṇena niṣkāraṇo dharmaḥ ṣaḍaṅgo vedo'dhyeyo jñeya iti. pradhānaṃ ca ṣaṭsvaṅgeṣu vyākaraṇam. pradhāne ca kṛto yatnaḥ phalavān bhavati.*

Dhammasenāpati 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 *jina*, called the *pariyattidhamma*, is a *vedo* "Veda" with nine *aṅgas* (instead of six).

> *tadāgamajānanatthaṃ sikkhitabbaṃ hitesinā*
> *veyyākaraṇanāmetaṃ niruttisaddalakkhaṇaṃ || 37 ||*[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: **tadāgamajānanatthan** *ti tassa sammāsambuddhato paṭṭhāya yāvajjatanā anavacchinno-padesassa navaṅgajinasāsanabhūtassa āgamassa jānanatthaṃ.* **hitesinā** *ti diṭṭhadhammikasamparāyika-attatthaparatthasaṅkhātahitagavesinā kūlaputtena.* **veyyākaraṇanāmetaṃ niruttisaddalakkhaṇan** *ti māgadhikabhāsābhāvato aviparītaniruttisaddānaṃ sādhakalakkhaṇasahitaṃ etaṃ kaccāyanaveyyākaraṇaṃ* **sikkhitabban** *ti vuttaṃ hoti.*

asaddikam anajjhānaṃ milakkhavacanaṃ yadi

anuvaditavākyattā[1] *bhikkhunā nopagamyate* || 38 ||[2]

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 anajjhāyaṃ acintanīyaṃ.* **milakkhavacanan** *ti sassirīkamukhapadumavivarato niggatabuddha vacanānanukūlapaccantade savacanaṃ. māgadhikāya bhāsāya bahi bhūtan ti attho.* **yadī** *ti saṃsayatthe nipāto. ce ti attho.* **anugahitavākyattā** *ti punappunaṃ gahitabhāvena pavattavākyattā.* **bhikkhunā nopagamyate** *ti sāsane yuttapayuttena bhikkhunā nopagamyate na sikkhate.*

3 Pasp 4*f.*

LAHŪPĀYO — BREVITY OF METHOD

ato saddāpi ñātabbā tesaṃ ñāṇe niruttito

natthi añño lahupāyo sikkheyya saddalakkhaṇaṃ || 39 ||[1]

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] *brāhmaṇenāvaśyaṃ śabdā jñeyāḥ* "a brahmin must necessarily understand the [correct] words." And without [the help of] grammar words cannot be understood by any easy means.[2]

One simply needs to replace *brāhmaṇena* with *bhikkhunā*. The idea of *lahūpaya* ("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 yasmā milakkhavacanaṃ apasaddattā bhikkhunā na sikkhate. tasmā* ***saddāpi ñātabbā*** *ti ete milakkhavacanabhāvato apasaddā ete na sabhāva****nirutti****bhūtamāgadhikabhāvato yatī hi sotabbāpanetabbavibhāgaṃ katvā saddā ñātabbā.* ***ñāṇe*** *ti tesaṃ saddānaṃ jānane.* ***natthī*** *ti niruttisatthato añño lahu upāyo na yujjati.*

2 Pasp 20: *laghvarthaṃ cādhyeyaṃ vyākaraṇam. brāhmaṇenāvaśyaṃ śabdā jñeyā iti. na cāntareṇa vyākaraṇaṃ laghunopāyena śabdāḥ śakyā jñātum.*

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

ASAṂDEHO — REMOVAL OF DOUBT

daṇḍīnam āhareyyā ti sandeho jāyate tadā

daṇḍīnaṃ dhanam āhara iti vutte na saṃsayo || 40 ||[1]

When doubt arises, as in an example such as *daṇḍīnam 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 *daṇḍī* ("policeman").[2] This type of suffix follows the declension of the so-called *jha* endings (*i/ī* non-feminine endings).[3] After the *jha* stem *daṇḍī*, the suffix *aṃ* of the acc. sing., by Kacc 84 *agho rassaṃ ekavacanayosu 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 *sunaṃhisu 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 *sunaṃhisu ca* [Kacc 89] is retrieving the long *ī* prescribed in previous suttas, in which case even acc. sing. could be optionally derived as *daṇḍīnaṃ*.[4] This is not the case. A grammarian will gloss the sentence *daṇḍīnaṃ āhareyya* as follows: *daṇḍīnaṃ dhanam āhara* "bring the

---

1 Kār-ṭ 342,24–29: **sandeho jāyate tadā** *ti* **daṇḍīnaṃ āhareyyā ti vutte sandeho jāyate**. *tasmā katarassato jhato aṃvacanassa namādesakaraṇena. sunaṃhisu ce ti ettha sutte caggahaṇanivattana- sunaṃhivibhattinimittarūpena missakattā.* **na saṃsayo ti daṇḍīnaṃ dhanam āharā ti vutte** *saṃsayo sandeho natthi. kasmā. sambandhivisesanadassanato.*

2 According to Kacc 368 *daṇḍādito ikā ī* "the suffixes *ika* and *ī* after words [of the group] beginning with *daṇḍa* [express the one who possesses it]." E.g. *daṇḍa* means "stick," *daṇḍī* 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: *caggahaṇamavadhāraṇatthaṃ* "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 *daṇḍīnaṃ* 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 (*dhanaṃ*) and this is given to someone (*daṇḍīnaṃ.*).

In theory, however, only knowing that *daṇḍīnaṃ* 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 *aṃ* vibhatti after the stem *daṇḍin-* can be confused with the *naṃ* vibhatti after the stem *daṇḍi-*. A grammarian will now that, in the second case, the *i* will be lengthened: *daṇḍīnaṃ.*

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:

yam adhītam aviññātadupadeso na vijjate

anaggimhi va sukkhindho na taṃ jalati katthaci || 41 ||[1]

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 ācariyupadesena gammate ti dassetukāmāha — yam adhītan ti ādi* **yam adhītaṃ**-*la*-**vijjate** *ti* **yaṃ aviññāta***pubbaṃ* **adhītaṃ** *sikkhitaṃ. te pubbācariyupadesena* **vijjate** *dissati. pubbācariyupadesena padantarena vijjatī ti attho. kim iva.* **na aggimhī** *ti sukkhe upanīte bāhira-aggimhi asati* **sukkhindho** *ti sukkhaṃ kaṭṭhādi-indhanaṃ* **jalati iva. na taṃ jalati katthacī** *ti tatheva taṃ anadhītaṃ aviññātaṃ katthaci ṭhāne 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 (*sikkhitaṃ*) 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[1]), 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 adhītam avijñātaṃ 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: *aviññātad* has to be restored, as the *ṭīkā* suggests, to *aviññātam*. A copyist might have thought that the *m* was a glide, and he replaced it with another glide, *d*, as is frequently the case. The Sanskrit *nigadena* ("with mechanical recitation") has been replaced with *upadesena* (if we follow the *ṭīkā*, not the *mūla*, which is wrong). *Upadesa* literally means "by instruction." The verb *śabdyate* ("is uttered") is changed to *vijjate* ("is found" or simply "is"; or perhaps from √*vid* "is known" "is learnt"). The emended text would read:

yaṃ adhītaṃ aviññātam upadesena vijjate ...

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

---

1 Translation by Joshi — Roodbergen, 1986: 42.

2 *Nirukta* reads *gṛhītam* for *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:

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 extraodinarily 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 Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla

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.[1] 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).[2] This is not a monolithic type of school or sect, but rather a network of lineages

---

[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.

[2] Blackburn, 2001: 12; Charney, 2006: 39.

that share the same orientation "by and toward shared texts," even though "their interpretations of these texts are not homogeneous."[1]

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*[2] 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 (= Laṅkādīpa) 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 *sīmā* ("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 intellct, 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.[3]

---

1   Blackburn, 2001: 12.

2   The same colophon is repeated, with the appropriate changes, at the end of the *Suttaniddesa*, the *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā* and *Sīmālaṅkāra-ṭīkā*.

3   I translate the Pāli text of the Sinhalese edition, Kacc-nidd 279,5–24:

> *puṇṇe dase navanavutiguṇe ca vasse*
> *vasse sahassagaṇane jinanibbutāyaṃ,*
> *iddhārimaddanapurā varatambapaṇṇiṃ*

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 *aṭṭhakathā*s, and the *ṭīkā*s.[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

patvāna yo siriparakkamabāhubhūpaṃ.
nissāya sāsanamalaṃ suvisodhayitvā
bhikkhūhi ñātavinayehi susaññatehi,
bandhāpayī puravare jayavaḍḍhanavhe
sīmaṃ vipattirahitaṃ vinayānurūpaṃ.
sikkhāpayī yatigaṇe vinayābhidhamme
paññāvadātahadayo sadayo janānaṃ,
appicchatāviriyasīlaguṇappasattho
saddhādhano vimalabuddhijanānukappī.
sabbattha yuttapiṭakattayapāradassī
so chappaṭavhayasuto yatirājakanto,
kaccāyanassa hitasuttanidesam etaṃ
saṅkhepato viracayī munisāsanatthaṃ.
saddhammaṭṭhitikāmena kaccānasuttaniddesaṃ,
karontena mayā pattaṃ yaṃ puññaṃ hitadāyakaṃ.
tena puññena ijjhantu sabbasattamanorathā
rājāno pi ca rakkhantu dhammena sāsanaṃ pajaṃ.

1 PLC 247*f.*

2 Pranke, 2004: 22.

decay of the religion.[1] The work of Saddhammajotipāla may therefore be understood as his own contribution to the preservation of the *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 *Moggallānapañcikāpradīpaya* (in Sinhalese and Pāli), Śrī Rāhula quotes, among other grammatical works, the *Suttaniddesa*.[2] This provides us with a reliable *terminus ante quem* for Saddhammajotipāla.

1.3. The Chapada Pagoda Inscription

The verse colophon I have quoted above states that Saddhammajotipāla wrote the *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.[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

---

1 Frasch, 2011: 387–388.

2 PLC 252.

3 Frasch, 1996: 331.

lineage of Pagan.[4] Whereas this assumption is not totally implausible, there is evidence that the pagoda was actually built in the 15th century.

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.[1]

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

---

4 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 Pagán." 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*).

1 Duroiselle, 1921 (*A list of inscriptions found in Burma*), § 931 = *Inscriptions Copied from the Stones Collected by King Bodawpaya and Placed near the Aracan Pagoda* II: 729. Published by the Archaeological Survey of Burma (1897).

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.

2 Aung-Thwin, 2012: 111.

3 *Yazawinkyaw* 146*f.*

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].[1]

There is another version of the *nigamana*,[2] which includes a mention of the monastery of Pagan where Chapaṭa allegedly lived: *arimaddana-nagara-gocara-gāma-pācīnadisā-bhāgaṭṭhita-tiloka-nayana-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."[3] This version of the

---

1 Kacc-nidd 278,24–32: *paramavicittanayakovidapaññājavanasamannāgatena suvisuddhabuddhiviriyasīlācāra-guṇasamannāgatena aparimitapāraminā sambhūtapaññānubhāvajanitatipiṭakadharena arimaddananagara-gocaragāmakena diṭṭhadhammasamparāyikatthānusāsakasatthuno sāsanahitakāmānaṃ laṅkādīpajambudīpa-vāsīnaṃ sotujanānaṃ pariyattiṃ pariyāpuṇantena chappaṭo ti vissutena suvisuddhabuddhiviriya-sīlācāraguṇasamannāgatatipiṭakadharagarūhi gahitasaddhammajotipālo ti nāmavuyhena therena katoyaṃ kaccāyanasuttaniddeso nāma.*

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

3 This is the full version of the second type of *nigamana* according to Saddhātissa's edition (*JPTS*, 1990): *paramavicitta-nayakovida-paññājavana-samannāgatena suvisuddha-buddhi-viriya-sīlācāraguṇasamannāgatena aparimitapāramitāsambhūta-paññānubhāvajanita-tipiṭakadharena Arimaddana-nagara-gocaragāma-pācīna-disābhāgaṭṭhita-tilokanayana-sabbaññudhātu-uṇhīsacetiyaṃ nissāya vasantena diṭṭhadhammikasamparāyika-hitatthānusāsaka-satthuno sāsanahitakāmeṇa Laṅkādīpa-paradīpavāsīnaṃ sotujananaṃ pariyattiṃ pariyāpuṇantena suvisuddha-buddhi-viriya-sīlācāraguṇa-samannāgata-tipiṭakadharagarugahita-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, Ñāṇābhivaṃsa, 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

---

jotipālo ti nāmavhayena therena kato sotūnaṃ pītivaḍḍhanako Nāmācāradīpako nāma niṭṭhito.

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 Ñāṇābhivaṃsa "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).

5 HPL §442. Ed. Minayeff, *JPTS* 1885.

6 Minayeff, 1885: 28: *laṅkādīpe anuruddhattherena kataṃ abhidhammatthasaṃgahaṃ, tatth' eva sumaṅgala-sāmittherena kataṃ abhidhammatthavibhāviniṃ nāma ṭīkaṃ. jambudīpe arimaddanāpure chapadattherena kataṃ saṃkhepavaṇṇanaṃ nāma ṭīkañ ca amhākaṃ dhammadānatthāya sīhaḷabhikkhusaṃghassa 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

---

sāsanamūlabhūtaṃ imaṃ pakaraṇattayaṃ sādhūkaṃ vācetha dhāretha. sabbaṃ pi ca vinayābhidhammasuttantapabhedaṃ gandhajātaṃ rājānucchavikadūte pesite amhākaṃ mahārājā dassati. mayam pi ussāhaṃ karoma. idam pi sāsanapaṭisaññuttavacanaṃ satataṃ sāsanahitakāmena manasi kātabban ti.

1 The *Suttaniddesa*, the *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā* 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,[1] but important from the point of view of the Buddhist textual tradition.[2] Indeed the greatest merit of Saddhammajotipāla is the vast erudition displayed in his commentaries.

In Nandapañña's *Gandhavaṃsa* (Gv)[3] eight books are ascribed to the master Saddhammajotipāla: (1) the *Mātikaṭṭhadīpanī* ("Illustrating the meaning of the *mātikā*") (2) a *ṭīkā* on the *Sīmālaṅkāra* ("Treatise on Monastic Boundaries") (3) the *Gandhasāra* ("Essence of the book/s [of the Tipiṭaka (?)]") (4) the *Paṭṭhānagaṇanānaya* ("A method for counting (?) [the dhammas in] the *Paṭṭhāna* [book of the Abhidhamma]") (5) The *Saṃkhepavaṇṇanā* ("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]").[4]

---

1 For instance, in his edition of the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*, Bodhi considers the *Vibhāvinī-ṭīkā* and Ledi Sayadaw's *Paramatthadīpanī-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 Kaccāyanavutti* (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 sīmālaṃkārassa ṭīkā vinayasamuṭṭhānadīpanī gandhasāro paṭṭhānagaṇanānayo abhidhammatthasaṃgahassa saṃkhepavaṇṇanā navaṭīkā kaccāyanassa suttaniddeso pāṭimokkhavisodhanī ceti aṭṭha gandhe saddhammajotipālācariyo akāsi.* Another list in Gv 74: *mātikaṭṭhadīpanī abhidhammatthasaṃgahavaṇṇanā sīmālaṃkārassa ṭīkā gaṇḍhisāro paṭṭhānagaṇanāyo cā ti ime pañca pakaraṇāni attano matiyā saddhammajotipālācariyena katā. saṃkhepavaṇṇanā parakkamabāhunāmena jambudīpissarena raññā āyāciteneva saddhammajotipālācariyena katā. kaccāyanassa suttaniddeso attano sissena dhammacārittherena āyācitena saddhammajotipālācariyena kato. vinayasamuṭṭhānadīpanī nāma pakaraṇaṃ attano gurunā saṃghattherena āyāciteneva saddhammajotipālācariyena katā. sattā pakaraṇāni pana tena pukkāmanagare katāni saṃkhepavaṇṇanā yeva laṅkadīpe katā.* For some reason, Nandapañña is inaccurate in this passage and mentions the (6) *Saṃkhepavaṇṇanā* (= (2) *Abhidhammattha-saṃgahavaṇṇanā*) twice. Instead of this title, we would expect the *Pāṭimokkhavisodhanī* 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: *arimaddananagare sīhaḷadīpaṃ gantvā paccāgato chapado nāma saddhammajotipālathero saddanaye chekatāya suttaniddesaṃ akāsi, paramatthadhamme ca chekatāya saṃkhepavaṇṇanaṃ nāmacāradīpakañ ca, vinaye chekatāya vinayagūḷhatthadīpaniṃ sīmālaṃkārañ ca akāsi. attano katānaṃ gandhānaṃ nigame saddhammajotipālo ti mūlanāmena vuttaṃ* "In Arimaddanapura, having gone to and returned from Sīhaḷadīpa, Saddhammajotipāla, called Chapada, wrote a grammatical work called *Suttaniddesa*; on the

Paññāsāmī 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.

---

highest reality (= Abhidhamma) he wrote the *Saṃkhepavaṇṇanā* and the *Nāmacāradīpaka*; on the Vinaya he wrote the *Vinayagūḷhatthadīpanī* and the *Sīmālaṅkāra*. In the colophon[s] of the works written by him the root name (*mūlanāma*) Saddhammajotipāla is stated." I have corrected the PTS edition, which reads "*Saṃkhepavaṇṇanaṃ nāma cāradīpakañ ca Vinaye chekatāya.*" Godakumbura (1969: 2) also missed this detail, for he translates: "He wrote also the *Sakhepavaṇṇanā*, or *Caradipakā.*" The word *nigame* ("in the town") in Sās should be read *nigamane* ("in the colophon").

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 *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā* 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-ṭīkā[1] 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-saṅ:*) in Burma.[2] 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."[3]

---

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-ṭīkā* is by "Rhaṅ Saddhammajotipāla of Pugaṃ city." I have not found any manuscript of this work.

2 The other eight "Little finger manuals" are: Anuruddha's *Paramatthavinicchaya*, Anuruddha's *Nāmarūpapariccheda*, Buddhadatta's *Abhidhammāvatāra*, Buddhadatta's *Rūpārūpavibhāga*, Dhammapāla's *Saccasaṅkhepa*, Mahākassapa's *Mohavicchedanī*, Khema's *Khemappakaraṇa* and Anuruddha's *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* (commented upon by Saddhammajotipāla, see under *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā*).

3 Nāmac 2:

racayissaṃ samāsena nāmacārassa dīpakaṃ

paṭṭhānanayagāhaṃ taṃ taṃ suṇātha samāhitā.

1.6.2. *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā*[1]

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 Dimbulagala[3] (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 Laṅkā. A latter commentary on the same work is the monumental *Maṇisāramañjūsā* by Ariyavaṃsa 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 commentaries:

---

1 Nyan 3.8.1.4. The *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā* has been published in a Sinhalese edition under the title *Abhidhammatthasaṅgahasaṅkhepavaṇṇanā*, 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.

2 Bodhi, 2000: 26.

3 Saddhātissa, 1989: 14.

4 Wijeratne and Gethin, 2007: xiii.

5 *Maṇisāramañjūsā* II 580,13–14: *ayaṃ vaṇṇanā aṭṭhavīsādhika-aṭṭhasatasakkarājamhi* "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.[1]

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.[2] 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 1,5–14:

tikkhattuṃ pattalaṅko yo patiṭṭhapesi sāsanaṃ
vanditvā lokanāthaṃ taṃ dhammaṃ saṃghañ ca pūjitaṃ
āgatāgamasatthena cando va saradambare
pākaṭe nīdha dīpamhi mahāvijayabāhunā
ukkuṭikaṃ nisīditvā sāsanatthābhikaṅkhinā
yācito 'haṃ karissāmi saṅkhepapadavaṇṇanaṃ.
porāṇehi katānekā santi yā pana vaṇṇanā
etā veḷādigabbhesu ajotacandarūpamā,
tasmā khajjotantupamaṃ karissaṃ kiñci vaṇṇanaṃ
sādhavo taṃ nisāmetha sāsanassa 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 *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā*"; 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*[1]

The work is also known as *Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgahavaṇṇanā.* 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 *coḷiyabhikkhus* 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: "Sīmalaṅkāraṭīkā, Sīmalaṅkāravaṇṇanā (B or C, Chappaṭa, 15th c.) (Maybe identical with 1.5.2.1. Sīmalaṅkāravaṇṇanā is given on the title page in the NA though in the text it clearly is called Sīmālaṅkārasaṃgahavaṇṇanā.). 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."[2]

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

1.6.4. *Vinayasamutthānadīpanī*

This work is not known to survive in any manuscript. It is probably a confusion with the *Vinayaguḷhatthadīpanī.*

1.6.5. *Vinayaguḷhatthadīpanī*

I have not found any manuscript of this work. The Piṭ-s (no. 277) ascribes it to Saddhammajotipāla. 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 Saddhammajotipāla.

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).[2] Some

---

2 UPT 509, jhò_v 1–2:

  namassitvāna jinādiccaṃ bodhiyugandharoditaṃ

  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 *Sīmābandhanī-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 *pannarasa* ("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 īdīso 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.

---

sambuddhaparinibbānā dvinnaṃdasasatāna ca

pañcasattativīsādhi catassā pi ca mattake.

tena gutādhikena va sate tu sakkarājako

haṃsāvatīvhayapūrassa *pūraseṭṭhassa uttare.*

nātidūre naccāsande janasaṅkaravijjate

ramme addhāre dasasampanne ānā ceyyā ti maṇḍite.

pariyattibahusuta therādivāsasammate

āyatane gahaṭhānaṃ dānasīlābhiyogīnaṃ.

dhammasavanasaṃkhuṭṭhe haṃsapūrādhibhūsane

vasatāvaraṭṭhānamhi **ariyaliṅkāranāmikā**.

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 Ṇ*āyana* and Ṇ*āna* after words such as *vaccha* etc. [are inserted in the sense of descendance]:"

---

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 Maṇiratanā Charā-tō, who resided at Maṇiratanā monastery (Manoramma in the verses). He was a native of Ne-raṅ: village, Pakhan:-krī 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-kuiṅ:). Our author is one of those rare scholars who did not write a draft of his work (Kelāsa 1980: 60)." 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: *kalyāṇippakaraṇādisu* "In the *Kalyāṇi* manual, and others"). The Thai edition was published by the Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, without printing the date of publication.

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

Indeed, even though in this case the sutta could have been formulated as *ṇāyanaṇānā 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 *ā*.[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 ṇāyanaṇānā vacchādito ti vattabbe pi avibhattikanidesavasena evaṃ vuttan ti duvidho hi suttaniddeso savibhattikaniddeso avibhattikaniddeso cā ti. apare pana 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 kurute* 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 ñāse oloketabbā. 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 (= Mmd 7,26–27):

   sambandho ca padañ ceva padattho padaviggaho

   codanā parihāro ca chabbidhā suttavaṇṇanā 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 *Nyāsappadīpaṭīkā* (=Mmd-pṭ), a work that we can easily consult in the Burmese edition:

---

1 Pind, 2012: 59–60: "*Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa* (Kacc-nidd) –no doubt the most important source of information on grammatical literature in the fifteenth century A. D.– quotes as many as twenty-five grammatical treatises in addition to well-known works like Nyāsa (= Mmd), Rūp, Sadd, and Mogg: 1. Akkharapadamañjūsā, 2. Akkharasamūha, 3. Aṭṭhakathā-atthadīpanī, 4. Atthajotaka, 5. Atthavinicchayavaṇṇanā, 6. Atthavyākhyāna, 7. Atthavaṇṇanā, 8. Kaccāyananissayappakaraṇa, 9. Kārikā, 10. Ṭīkāvyākhyā, 11. Therapotthaka, 12. (Mahā-)nirutti, 13. Niruttijotaka, 14. Niruttijotakavaṇṇanā, 15. Niruttibījākhyāna (Bījākhyāna?), 16. Nyāsaṭīkā, 17. Nyāsapadīpaṭīkā, 18. Nyāsappadīpappakaraṇa, 19. Bālāvatāra, 20. Bījākhyā, 21. Bījākhyāna, 22. Bhassakārī, 23. Mañjūsāṭīkā, 24. Mukhamattasāra, and 25. Saṅgahakāra."

2 Pind, 2012: 61.

nyāsappadīpaṭīkāyam pana ammo ti paṭhamāpayogavasena vuttaṃ. aṃvacanassa makārassā ti

sambandhavasena vuttan ti vuttaṃ.[1]

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

tasmā aṃmoniggahitan ti kārikāriyānaṃ paṭhamupayogavasena sutte niddiṭṭhe pi aṃvacanassa

makārassa niggahītaṃ hotī ti sampadānapaccattavasena vuttiniddeso pi ādesādesividhānam eva

gamayatī ti na koci virodho 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 *Atthabyākhyana* (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 *vutti*. 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 *Atthabhyākhyāna*, 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]

---

4 *anuvutti* (Skt. *anuvṛtti*) "recurrence [of a word]" is the automatic retrieval, in one sutta, of words that have been stated in previous suttas. The mechanism allows for greater concision, but the interpretation of these particles generates long controversies in exegetical literature. For the mechanisms of *anuvṛtti* in Sanskrit *vyākaraṇa* see Joshi and Bhate, 1984.

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 tavetunādippaccayantanipātato pī ti vuttaṃ.*

3 Kacc-nidd 39,28–31: *idaṃ anantarasuttena ekayogaṃ katvā, goṇa naṃsuhināsu cā ti vattabbe evaṃ vacanaṃ garubhāvanivattanatthan ti atthabyākhyāne vuttaṃ.*

4 For instance, Kacc-nidd 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 Saddhammajotipāla's words:

> Indeed this sutta is explained in many different ways [i.e. in great detail] in the *Atthabyākhyāna* and the *Saddanīti*. 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.

---

sāmaññataddhite ceva ekasaṭṭhi ca paccayā

abyaye aṭṭhavīsati bhāve aṭṭha vibhāvinā ti

vuttaṃ.

"In the *Atthabyākhyāna*, however, it is stated:

According to the examiner, in the common *taddhita* there are 61 suffixes,

in the *abyaya* [*taddhita*] 28 suffixes, in the *bhāva* [*taddhita*] 8 suffixes."

1   Kacc-nidd 125,10–12: *atthabyakhyāne pana liṅgatthasaṅkhāte pāṭipadikatthiliṅgaparimāṇavacanamatte paṭhamā hotī ti vuttaṃ.*

2   Kacc-nidd 197,13–15: *idaṃ hi suttaṃ atthabyākhyānasaddanītisu ca bahudhā papañcenti, taṃ kāmakehi 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:

vuttañ ca

nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsaṃ taddhitaṃ tathā

kitanāmañ ca nāmaññū nāmaṃ pañcavidhaṃ vade ti.[2]

The verses are practically identical to *Kaccāyanabheda* 27:

nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsaṃ taddhitaṃ tathā

kitanāman ti viññūhi nāmaṃ pañcavidhaṃ mataṃ.

---

1 Kacc-nidd 222,8–10: *evaṃ dassetuṃ atthaggahaṇenā ti ādim āha idaṃ vacanaṃ porāṇakaccāyanapāṭhe natthi ṭīkābyākhyānavacanaṃ gahetvā ṭhapitan 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*, *Sambandhacintā*, *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:

> *kriyānissayabhūtāni kattukammāni tiṭṭhare*
>
> *yatthokāso ti so yeva paramparupacārato ti.*[3]

But subsequently this other verse is quoted:

> *kiriyākattukammānaṃ yattha hoti patiṭṭhitā*
>
> *okāso ti pavutto so catudhā byāpikādito.*[4]

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

> *ādhāro kattukammānaṃ kiriyā yatthakārake*
>
> *sa adhāro ti viññeyyo catudhā byāpikādito.*

---

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:

> *sambandhi viya sambandho rūpato na kudācanaṃ*
>
> *daṭṭhuṃ sakko ti viññūhi ñāyate anumānato*
>
> *asambhavā tu sambandhe sambandhasahacārini*
>
> *jātisaṅkhyāsamāhārakiriyānam iva sambhavo ti.*[1]

Only the first *siloka* is from the *Jālinī*.[2] The second one is not found in the *Jālinī*, and I have not been able to trace it.

2.4.4. *Saṅgaha*

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

> *vuttañ ca saṅgahakārehi*
>
> *liṅgatthe kattukammatthe karaṇe sampadāniye*
>
> *nissakke sāmibhūmatthe disatthālapane tathā.*[3]

---

1 Kacc-nidd 123,9–12.

2 *Saddasāratthajālinī* 234:
   sambandhi viya sambandho rūpato na kudācanaṃ
   daṭṭhuṃ sakko ti viññūhi manyate sonumānato.

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 (*saṅgahakārehi*) 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-saṃsaṭṭhaṃ ṇiko ti pi vuttaṃ.*[2]

Leaving aside the textual problem between the Bᵉ and Cᵉ, 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 saṃsaṭṭhaṃ tarati carati vahati ṇiko*
>
> **Niruttijotaka** *yena vā tarati [carati vahati] saṃsaṭṭhaṃ ṇiko*

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 taddhitavaṇṇanāyam pi yena vā tarati-pe-yena vā saṃsaṭṭhaṃ sajjitaṃ yojitaṃ vā. tasmā yenā ti niddiṭṭhanāvādivatthuto paresu atthesu tarati-pe-saṃsaṭṭhan ti niddiṭṭhesū ti vuttaṃ.*[3]

---

1 For a full-fledged discussion on *kārakas* "participants in the action" both in Sanskrit and Pāli grammar, see Kahrs, 1992: 10*f* and Gornall, 2014: *passim*.

2 I follow Bᵉ 181,20–21. Cf. Kacc-nidd 173,12–13; *niruttijotake pana yena vā karīyati-pe-saṃsaṭṭhaṃ ṇiko.*

3 Kacc-nidd 173,22–25. Compare with Bᵉ 181,29–182,2: *tenāha niruttijotake taddhitavaṇṇanāyam pi yena vā tarati-pa-yena vāsaṃsaṭṭhaṃ sajjitaṃ yojitaṃ vā. tasmā yenā ti niddiṭṭhanāvādivatthuto parabhūtesu atthesu tarati-pa-saṃsaṭṭhan ti niddiṭṭhesu atthesū ti vuttaṃ.* Cf. Kacc-v 124,8–9: *yena vā saṃsaṭṭhaṃ. yena vā*

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 *vutti* 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."[1]

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.[2] Bode speculates on the content of the work called the "Bījakkhyam, 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 derivates. 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:

---

tarati. yena vā carati. yena vā vahati icc etesv atthesu ṇikapaccayo hoti vā.

1 Kacc-nidd 176,21–23: *teneva niruttijotakataddhitavaṇṇanāya ca upamatthe ti sadisatthe ti vuttaṃ. atthabyākhyāne pana upamīyati attho etāyā ti upamā upamāyeva attho upamattho ti vuttaṃ.*

2 PLB 106.

In the *Bījakhyā*, however, it is stated:

There is no *vuddhi* (Skt. *vṛddhi*) 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*.[1] The replacement for *siro* ("head") is *sirasaṃ*.[2]

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

That is why he stated in the *Bījākhyā*:

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 *taddhita*.[3]

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 *Bījākhyā*.[4]

---

1 Because it is derived, allegedly, from √*spṛś* "to touch" which becomes √*phas* (*phassati*) in Pāli.

2 Kacc-nidd 175,21–24:

bījakhyāyaṃ pana

na vuddhi nīlapītesu paccaye saṇakārake

salopo phussasaddassa sirassa sirasaṃ vade ti

vuttaṃ.

3 Kacc-nidd 177,26–28:

tenāha bījākhyāyaṃ:

desitā pañcasuttehi paccayā bhāvataddhite

tattha sesā tusaddena desitā taddhitaññunā 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 *Niruttibījākkhyāne*, which is also in verse and I think it is simply the *Bījakkhyā*, even though Pind lists it as a different title:

> In the *Niruttibījākhyāna* however it is said: "These six are called suffixes (*paccayā*): *tabba anīya ṇya ricca ririya 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*']":

---

tayo paccayā viññeyyā kitakā kiccakā tathā

kitakiccakanāmā ca saddasatthe pakāsitā

kitakā kattariññeyyā bhāvakammesu kiccakā

kitakiccā tu sabbattha yebhuyyena pavattare ti.

bījākhyāne pi vuttaṃ.

1 Kacc-nidd 268,25–29:

niruttibijākkhyāne pana tabba anīyaṇya ricca ririya kha ime chappaccayā kiccā nāmā ti vatvā

kitapaccayāterasa kiccā honti cha paccayā

kitakiccā paṇṇarasa catuttiṃsa samāsato ti

vuttattā kitappaccayo kitakiccā ti ca khappaccayo kiccā ti ca veditabbā.

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 saṅkhyāne* "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 *āṇattyāsiṭṭhe 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 *parikappitasaññaṃ* 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 sabbaṃ saṅgahitaṃ.*

2 Kacc-v 136,22.

3 Kacc-nidd 211,27–28: *bhassakāri-ādisu pana āṇattisaññaṃ parikappitasaññaṃ 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 *ritu*[3] [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: 310*f.*

2 Kacc-nidd 227,5–7:

bhassakārīnā ca vuttaṃ

attano ti suviññeyyaṃ bhāve kammani kattari

dhātuyā kammakā bhāve paṭhamekavacanaṃ tathā ti.

3 The *ritu* affix is equivalent to the Sanskrit -*itṛ* ending that we find in *pitṛ* "father." According to Kacc-v 186,17: *puttaṃ pālayatī ti pitā* "he protects the son that is why [he is called] 'father' (*pitā*)." The nominative of *pitu* is *pitā* according to Kacc 199 *satthupitādīnaṃ ā sismiṃ silopo ca* "after the words of the group beginning with *satthu, pitu,* etc. *ā* [ending is prescribed] in the nominative singular and the *si* 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*."[1]

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 *Uṇādisūtra* 1.1. *kṛpāvājimisvadisādhyaśūbhya uṇ*. Do we need to understand, therefore, that the work called *Bhassa* is simply Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*? Although it is a temptin 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."[2]

The expression *sabhāvaniruttibyākaraṇe* is found in Cᵉ and Bᵉ. If the original reading was *sakāyanirutti*, it would be a reference to the well-known, and controversial, Vinaya passage about the language of the Buddha's discourses[3] in which the expression *sakāyaniruttiyā* "in his own expression" is used. Perhaps *sabhāvanirutti* means the same, or it is a corruption of *sakāyanirutti*. 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.[4] This idea is also found in the *Rūpasiddhi*.[5]

---

1 Kacc-nidd 267,33–268,2: *bhassakāripakaraṇe pana uṇapaccayaṃ ādimhi ṭhapetvā karavāpājimisv adisādhya subhi uṇa icc evam ādim āha.*

2 Kacc-nidd 278,14–16: *bhassakāriye pi imaṃ kappaṃ aṭṭhamaṭṭhāne ṭhapetvā sabhāvaniruttibyākaraṇe uṇādiniddeso nāma aṭṭhamo kaṇḍo parisamatto ti vuttaṃ.*

3 Vin. II 139,1*f.*

4 Cf. Vism 441,34: *māgadhikāya sabbasattānaṃ mūlabhāsāya* "[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 *Kaccāyanavutti*, 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 a 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 *vutti*]?"

"– 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]

---

brahmāno ca'ssutālāpā sambuddho cāpi bhāsare.

1 Kacc-nidd 11,30–36: *bho ācariya, kvacī ti padaṃ kasmā ācariyena vuttaṃ. bho sissa, tenāgatātyādisu sati pi parasare kvacīsaddena nivāritattā ekārassa yakārādeso na hotī ti ñāpanatthaṃ kvacī ti padaṃ vuttaṃ. nettha ne etthā ti padacchedo, ekāradvayassa sutisamānabhāve pi asamānā ti kalāpavacanaṃ nissāya asamānabhāvato vā paro asarūpā ti suttena paralopo hoti.*

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[e] *īsadussūhi kha*). Here Saddhammajotipāla informs us that there is also a different reading: *īsadususaddaparehi* (C[e] *īssadususaddāparehi*). Surprisingly, he does not object to this alternative reading with the formula *ti pāṭho na sundaro*.

---

1 Kacc-nidd 12,29–30.

2 Kacc-nidd 218,30–31: *katthaci potthake bhuja-pe-tthesu cā ti cakārasahitam pi atthi, evaṃ sati caggahaṇenā ti iminā sameti.*

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 sīhalapotthakādīsu 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 (*ādīsu*), and not the examples *ārādho me rājā* and *ārādho maṃ rājā.*

Then Kacc-nidd also gives the following examples: *ārādho haṃ rañño ti 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.

2 Kacc-nidd 106,34–35.

3 Kacc-nidd 107,4–5.

4 Kacc-nidd 107,8.

5 Rūp 102,8*f.*

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 ṭhāne* allows for the doubling of a consonant after a vowel when suitable (*ṭhāne*); and subsequently Kacc 29 *vagge ghosāghosānaṃ 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 ghosāghosānaṃ tatiyapaṭhamā ti sāmaññena vutte pi vagge catutthadutiyānaṃ tabbagge tatiyapaṭhamā ti viññāyati. tena ca pañcame tatiyappasaṅgo natthi, pubbasuttena dvebhāvasāmaññena paribhāsaṃ katvā iminā suttena asadisadvebhāvo kātabbo. keci pana iminā suttena paribhāsaṃ katvā pubbasuttena dvebhāvo kātabbo ti vadanti. tam pana "idaṃ hi na sampattaṃ vidadhāti, atha kho pubbasuttena sampannaṃ niyametī" ti vacanena virujjhati.* So reads the quoted text in Mmd 43,1. Kacc-nidd Cᵉ wrongly reads *nāsampattaṃ vidadhāti*. The Burmese edition of Kacc-nidd (Bᵉ 19,8–9) skips part of the quotation: *taṃ pana idaṃ hi pubbasuttena sampattaṃ niyametī ti vacanena virujjhati.*

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: *puggalaṃ.* 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 lakārādeso hoti.*

In the example *puggalaṃ,* 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 *niggahītañ ca* [Kacc 37], we apply the augment *ṃ.* 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 *satthunāttañ 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 va*[2]). 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 niggahītādhikarattā aṃvibhatti upalakkhaṇavasena vuttā. puggalo ty ādisu pugga iti liṅgaṃ ṭhapetvā sivacanassa okarādesaṃ katvā niggahītañ cā ti suttena niggahītāgamaṃ katvā iminā vāsaddena niggahītassa lakāre kate puggalo ti rūpasiddhi. evaṃ sesesu pi.*

2 Mmd 168,5.

case ending" (*nan ti ettha sattamīlopo*[1]). 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 nontheless 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 nāmetī ti nāmaṃ. yadā hi atthasaṅkhātaṃ dabbaṃ passati tadā atthe namati nāma, yadā nāmasaddaṃ suṇāti tadā attani atthaṃ nāmēti nāma.*

illuminating itself and also the power of illuminating other substances.[3] If not directly from Sanskrit sources, I think at least the *Rūpasiddhi* may be the direct source of Kacc-nidd:

> The designation of a substance is called *nāma* because it points towards the objects or to its own meaning.[1]

2.9.1. Philosophy embedded in *paribhāsā* suttas

In the *Suttaniddesa* we find frequent references to *paribhāsā* suttas, that is to say "metarules."[2] It has to be stated in the first place that there is not a canon of *paribhāsās* in Pāli. Inherited from the Sanskrit tradition, these maxims are immanent in the Pāli grammatical tradition. Some *paribhāsās* encapsulate a way of thinking that implicitly represents the philosophy of the grammarians. For instance, a very oft-repeated *paribhāsā* is *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 *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, l.4: *dviśaktiḥ śabda ātmaprakāśane 'rthaprakāśane ca samarthaḥ. yathā pradīpaḥ ātmānaṃ prakāśayan nidhyarthān prakāśayati. yas tv ādhyātmikaḥ indriyākhyaḥ prakāśaḥ sa ātmānam aprakāśayan bāhyārthaṃ prakāśayatīti.*

1 Rūp 41,3–4: *atthābhimukhaṃ namanato, attani catthassa nāmanato nāmaṃ dabbābhidhānaṃ.*

2 Apart from some *paribhāsās*, the *Suttaniddesa* also resorts to well known grammatical techniques as old as the time of Patañjali. The threefold *adhikarasutta*, namely *mandukagatika* "frog's way," *sīhagatika* "lion's way," *yathānupubbika* "according to sequence." They are for the first time defined in Pāli in Mmd 62,12–13. The *maṇḍūkagati* is used throughout the work, in the same way as in Mmd. The *sīhagati* is used but twice in Kacc-nidd, the two lion's gaze suttas being Kacc 52 *jinavacanayuttaṃ hi* and Kacc 463 *dhātuliṅgehi parā paccayā*. In Mmd the *sīhagatika* device is referred to in Kacc 48, Kacc 52 and Kacc 297. There is no *yathānupubbikā adhikara* in Kacc-nidd, but Kacc 52 is recognised alternatively as a *yathānupubbikaparibhāsā* if we follow Rūp 41,22–23. In Mmd also there is no *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 *paribhāsā: vuttaṭṭhānam appayogo.* It is called a *sutta,*[1] although it is not a sutta of the Kaccāyana grammar. This *paribhāsā* is frequent also in Mmd.[2] The meaning of *vuttaṭṭha* (Skt. *uktārtha*) is "a word or expression whose sense has been already expressed." The metarule *uktārthānām aprayogaḥ* is frequently used in the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *vārttikas,* and it is cited in many grammars as a principle against the repetition of words that have already been stated.[3]

Some of the *paribhāsās* in Kacc-nidd, however, have no precedent in Mmd. For instance:

antaraṅgabāhiraṅgesu antaraṅgo va balavataro hotī ti vuttattā[4]

Because it has been stated: "Among *antaraṅga* and *bahiraṅga* [suttas], *antaraṅga* is stronger."

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

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 *jāti* and the *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

---

1 Kacc-nidd 145,19.

2 For instance, Mmd 22,6–7.

3 DSG sv *uktārtha*.

4 Kacc-nidd 131,13–14.

itself. These two views replicate the division between *ākṛti* and *dravya* that we find in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*.[1] 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. *ekaśeṣa*[2]). 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 For a discussion of these terms in Patañjali see Joshi 1968: 29*f.* 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: 306*f.*

3 Kacc-nidd 28,7–10: *etthāpi sati pi catutthīchaṭṭhīsakāradvaye jātipadatthakācariyamatena se ti ekavacanaṃ kataṃ, dabbapadatthakācariyamatenāpi* vā *so ca so ca so ti ekasesanayena ca ekavacanaṃ kataṃ.*

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 disctinction 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 dvinnaṃ jātipadatthakadabbapadatthakācariyānaṃ matiyānulomena kadāci jātyapekkhāya kadāci dabbāpekkhāya suttaṃ katan ti. tasmā ācariyassa vatticchānupubbikā saddappavattī ti. nālaṃ atippapañcenā 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.[1] 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 *mamaṃ* [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.[2]

In his well-known study *Pāṇini as a variationist*, Paul Kiparsky[3] 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: 367*f.* 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 absurden Angaben gelangt (Beispiele: g in puthag [= Skt. pṛthak] und in pageva [aus Skt. prāk oder vielleicht praga] soll ein eingeschobener Laut, āgama, 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 navāggahaṇaṃ katan ti. navāsaddo kadāci vibhāsattho ti ñāpanatthaṃ kataṃ. 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 vā akkharā ti vutte akārādīnaṃ ñāpanattham idaṃ suttaṃ vuttan ti vadatha. kiṃ tesv akāro yeva akkhare vadati. tathā khakāro tathā rakāro udāhu sabbe vā ti. kiñc' ettha. yadi tāva akāro va akkhare vadati. niratthakam itaresaṃ vacanaṃ. yadi pana na vakkhati. yathā sakkharakaṭhalā telaṃ paṭicca avayave niratthakā va rāsiṃ katvā pīḷitā pi niratthakā va honti. evaṃ avayave pi vattuṃ asamatthatāya samuditā pi asamatthatā va bhaveyyun ti codanā. yathā pana rathacakkanemikubbarādayo gamanaṃ paṭicca avayave kiñcāpi niratthakā. tathāpi samuditā sātthakā va sambhavanti evaṃ sampadam idaṃ daṭṭhabbaṃ. ayañ hi tesaṃ sabhāvo. samudāye va sātthakatā ti parihāro* "But when you say *akkhara* and according to this rule [Kacc 1] sounds express the meaning: Is it that the sound *a* means *akkhara*, and also the letter *kh*, and also the letter *r*... or is it all of them together that express the word *akkhara*? Because if the sound *a* alone can function as the other sounds [to express the meaning of *akkhara*], 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 (*daṭṭhabbaṃ*) 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 (*samuditā*) them, they move and become useful. This is their nature: assembled (*samudaye*), they become useful."

2 Mmd 15,6–16: *yady evaṃ tumhehi suttam eva na vattabbaṃ. kadāci pi tesaṃ samudāyābhāvato. tathā hi akāraṃ sutvā khakārassa savanakāle akāro nassati. khakāraṃ sutvā rakārassa savanakāle khakāro nassati. evaṃ samudāyassa anupaladdhi hoti. evañ ca sati atthāvabodho na hotī ti codanā. yathā pana paribbhamānam ādittam alātaṃ passato taṃ cakkaṃ viya dissati. na ca tadā ekakkhaṇe sabbatthopalambhati. evaṃ sante pi taṃ saṭṭhānam āgataṃ ārammaṇaṃ katvā pavattesu nānācittasantānesu niruddhesu tehi gahitākāraṃ sabbaṃ sampiṇḍetvā cintayantassa alātaṃ cakkaṃ viya dissati. sabbatthopalabbhamānaṃ viya ca atilahuparivattitāya cittasantānassa* "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] (*ārammaṇa*) 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 (*atilahuparivattitāya*) flux of mind (*cittasantānassa*)."

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.

---

aniṭṭhite pade vaṇṇo paramattho suniṭṭhitaṃ

padaṃ paññattisaddo ti saddo bhavati dubbidho.

"Sound is twofold: when a word is not yet formed, it is a speech-sound (*vaṇṇa*) [which is] the ultimate reality; a formed word is called concept sound."

1 Mmd 11,11–18: *tattha ca avaṇṇakavaggahakārā kiñcāpi kaṇṭhe va jāyanti. tathā pi kālasutibhedehi bhinnā ti veditabbā. yathā hi ekissāyeva itthiyā gambhe uppajjamānā dārakā vaṇṇādibhedena bhinnā honti. evam imāni pi daṭṭhabbāni. yadi panekasmiṃ ṭhāne visadisakkharā pi jāyanti. aññe pi visadisakkharā tattheva kasmā nuppajjantī ti codanā. tassa sabbesam akheṭṭattā. yathā hi ekissāyeva itthiyā gambhe vaṇṇādivisadisesu dārakesu jāyantesu pi na añño kukkuṭagoṇapotakādayo uppajjanti. evaṃ sampadam idaṃ daṭṭhabbaṃ.*

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 mahīruhacchāyā 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 mahīruhachāyā viya puna pakatibhāvo āgacchati. yathā hi suriyālokanimitte āgate sati mahīruhachāyā atthi vigate sati chāyā natthi. tathā ādesasaranimitte sati pakati saralopo hoti, tasmiṃ pubbasuttena vigate puna pakati hotī ti. na hoti. nemittikassa phalassa tathā niyamābhāvā yathā hi candakantamaṇiādayo paṭicca udakādayo pavattanti tesu vigatesu pi udakādayo tiṭṭhanti. tathā satthādīsu pi vibhattinimitte sati ukārassa akārādeso 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:

yathā aṅgulimattānaṃ na sakkā masituṃ paraṃ

evaṃ nāmavidhiṃ kātuṃ yogo yoge na vattatī ti.

Bᵉ reads *yogo yoge na mattānaṃ*. The general meaning of the stanza remains the same.

2 Kacc-nidd 91,22–25:

ālokañ ca nidasseti nāseti timiram pi ca

pariyādīyati telañ ca vaṭṭiṃ jhāpeti ekato

padipo va tidaṃ suttaṃ veditabbaṃ vibhāvinā ti

parihāro.

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 *śakti* 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 *sammutisaccaṃ* "conventional truth." But sometimes the reality of the "world" is simply understood as common sense and

---

1 Kacc-nidd 92,10–13:

yathā koci paṭo sukkarattādiguṇayogato

sukko paṭo tathā rattapaṭādi samudīrito.

tathevam etaṃ daṭṭhabbaṃ yuttaṃ kārakasattinā

kattukammādibhedena nānattham upapajjate.

2 Karunadasa, 2010: 22: "The inter-connection and inter-dependence of these dhammas 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 *vibhattis -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 *etissaṃ* and the instr. abl. *etissā*, and not *etassaṃ* and *etassā* respectively. Now the question arises:[2] why does the sutta say *etimāsaṃ* and not *etimānaṃ*? Indeed, objects the *pūrvapakṣa*, according to the sutta 166 *nāññaṃ 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 naṃ saṃsānaṃ* ("after every [pronoun, the suffix] *naṃ* replaces [the suffixes] *saṃ* and *sā*") precludes the ending *etimāsaṃ* 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 paṭipajjitabbato na evarūpaṃ avagantabbaṃ. loke pi hi rukkhasmiṃ asati na bījena bhavitabbaṃ. bījasmiṃ 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 (*paṭipajjitabbato*) that in grammar (*saddasattha*) 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 29,15*f.*

through Kacc 89 *sunaṃhisu ca* ("and also before the case endings *su, naṃ* 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 itthiliṅgaṃ eva ñāpetuṃ*). Furthermore, this rule overwrites the general rule *nāññaṃ sabbanāmikaṃ.*

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 sabbanāmikaṃ* is a "non-permanent prohibition sutta" (*nāññaṃ sabbanāmikan ti idaṃ paṭisedhasuttaṃ aniccaṃ*). 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 lakkhaṇattāya*), 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 sabbanāmikaṃ* 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 naṃ saṃsānaṃ* [which prescribes the suffix *-naṃ* 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 porāṇakācariyānaṃ samānādhippāyo*).[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 hotī ti ñāpeti*). 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 piṭakattaye āgatā etā imāsaddā mukhaṃ viya ekantasabbanāmikā honti. sutte pana tesaṃ lakkhaṇattāya bhadantamahākaccāyanattherena ṭhapitattā ādāse mukhanimittaṃ viya anukaraṇaṃ nāma anukaraṇañ ca nāma suddhanāme antogadhaṃ. pāliyaṃ āgatasaddapadatthakattā udāharaṇavasena ānītā pana etimāsaddā atthapadatthakā honti. idañ ca nāññaṃ sabbanāmikan ti suttaṃ ekantasabbanāmadvande nivāretuṃ samatthaṃ, na anukaraṇabhūte suddhanāme. tasmā etimāsan ti vuttaṃ. yady evaṃ kathaṃ sabbato naṃ saṃsānan ti suttena saṃ kāriyaṃ siyā. suddhanāmattā ti. yaṃ pakataṃ tad anukaraṇan ti vuttattā ekantasuddhanāmābhāvā sabbanāmasadisattā ca saṃkāriyaṃ hoti.*

2 Kacc-nidd 31,1.

3 Kacc-nidd 31,10–14:

mukhamattasāre pana

avatvā etimānan ti etimāsam udīriṇaṃ

saṃsānaṃ visayasseva paridīpetuṃ īritaṃ

yadā hi etimāsaddā sasmiṃ yadi siyuṃ parā

tadā tāsam pi saṃsāttaṃ hoti niccaṃ na caññathā ti.

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, ī, u, ū* ending feminines, the vibhattis *smiṃ* and *sa* are replaced with *saṃ* and *sā* respectively" is not obligatory (*niccaṃ na hoti*). 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 nattaṃ sabbatthā ti ito hi adhikāravāsaddena ghapato smiṃsānaṃ saṃsā ti suttaṃ niccaṃ na hoti. vuttañ ca etāyaṃ imāsaṃ etāya imāsā ti tasmā etimāsaddā paraṃ saṃsāttaṃ niccaṃ hotī ti adhippāyo na sundaro. yadi niccaṃ na hoti aññathā pi hotī ti atthaṃ vadeyya evam pi attho na yujjati, saddayutti-abhāvato ti. ācariyā pi hi idaṃ vādaṃ chaḍḍitapakkhe ṭhapentī 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 *abbuta*, but how many years are in an *abbuta* is a matter of dispute.[1] The Mmd does not discuss much on this topic and simply refers to the Kacc-v. The *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 Aggavaṃsa: *ettha va pālinayo va sārato paccetabbo sabbaññubuddhassa aññātabhāvābhāvato 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: *kamo kaccāyane eso pāḷiyā so virujjhati* "this is the sequence [of numerals] in *Kaccāyana*, but this is contradicted by the canon."[3] A latter work such as the Kacc-vaṇṇ, for instance, leaves the topic of big numerals practically untouched. Kacc-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 *ayaṃ imasmiṃ 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 192,32*f.*

2 Kacc-nidd 192,12–14. Bᵉ 201,19–21: *ettha ca pālinayo va sārato paccetabbo, sabbaññubuddhassa aññathābhāvā-bhāvato ti vuttan ti.* This is an almost verbatim quotation from Sadd 803,3–4: e*ttha pāḷinayo yeva sārato paccetabbo. sabbaññubuddhassa aññātaduññātādibhāvābhāvato.*

3 Sadd 802,17.

4 Kacc-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. Saddhammajotiāla 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 (7,19*f.*) for the discussion about the stages of the human embryo according to the canon (*pāḷiṃ 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:
   ākhyātasāgaramathajjatanītaraṅgaṃ
   dhātujjalaṃ vikaraṇāgamakālamīnaṃ
   lopānubandhariyam atthavibhāgatīraṃ
   dhīrā taranti kavino puthubuddhināvā.

4 Kār-ṭ 436,29–437,13.

2.16. The revealed aphorism

A very old Indian tradition predating Saddhammajotipāla 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 consitute 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.[1] 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,[2] and "it is subsequently put by Kaccāyana at the beginning of his grammar."[3] Pind has discovered a parallel of this narrative in Vimalakīrti's *Saddavimala* (12, 1–11), a speculative grammatical text of the Mūlasārvastivāda School,[4] and has given a full translation of it.[5] The

---

1 Saini, 1987: viii: "it is difficult to say that the origin of the *Kātantra-vyākaraṇa,* as given in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* [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] *ti idaṃ bhagavato mukhapāṭhabhūtaṃ pubbavākyaṃ, na kaccāyanena vuttavākyaṃ; tathā hi eko buddhapabbajito bhagavato santike kammaṭṭhānaṃ gahetvā anottatatīre* [sic] *sālarukkhamūle nisinno udayabbayakammaṭṭhānaṃ karoti, so udake carantaṃ bakaṃ disvā udakabakan ti kammaṭṭhānaṃkaroti, bhagavā taṃvitathabhāvaṃ disvā buddhappabbajitaṃ pakkosāpetvā attho akkharasaññāto ti vākyam āha. kaccāyanattherena pi bhagavato adhippāyaṃ jānitvā attho akkharasaññāto ti vākyaṃ pubbe ṭhapetvā idaṃpakaraṇaṃ katan ti. kaccāyanena katasuttan ti pi 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 opportunely 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

---

sentence that was spoken by Kaccāyana. This is how it came about: an old recluse received a meditation subject from Bhagavat and sitting at the foot of a Sāl tree by the bank of the lake Anotatta [*sic*] recited his meditation subject 'origination and decay' (*udayabbayakammaṭṭhāna*). As he noticed a heron (*baka*) walking around in the water (*udaka*) he pronounced his meditation subject as *udakabaka*. Bhagavat observed that it was wrong, summoned the old recluse and told him that 'the meaning is expressed by means of the syllables.' The elder Kaccāyana, however, has composed the treatise by putting the sentence 'the meaning is expressed by means of the syllables' at the beginning [of the treatise] as he knew Bhagavat's intention. However, they also claim that the sutta is composed by Kaccāyana."

1 Pind 1996: 67.

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 Subhuti, *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-vaṇṇanā* 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 *ghaṭapaṭa* ("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 7,26*f.*: *idaṃ suttaṃ kena vuttaṃ. bhagavatā vuttaṃ. kadā vuttanti. yamauppalanamakādve brāhmaṇākhayavayakammaṭṭhānaṃ gahetvā gacchantā nadītīre khayavayanti kammaṭṭhāne kayiramāne eko udake macchaṃ gaṇhituṃ carantaṃ bakaṃ disvā udakabako ti virajjhati. eko ghaṭe paṭaṃ divsā ghaṭapaṭoti virajjhati. tadā bhagavā obhāsaṃ muñcitvā attho bhikkhave akkharasaññāto ti vākyaṃ thapeti. tesañ ca kammaṭṭhānaṃ tiṭṭhati. tasmā bhagavatā vutanti vuccati. taṃ ñatvā mahākaccāyano bhagavantaṃ yācitvā himavantaṃ gantvā manosilāteledakkhiṇadisābhāgaṃ sīsaṃ katvā puratthimadisābhimukho hutvā attho akkharasaññato tyādi kaṃ kaccāyanappakaraṇaṃ racitaṃ. tasmā pubbavākyanti vuttaṃ. therena thapitattāparibhāsāti pi vuttaṃ. vuttañ ca.*

pubbavākyanti daṃ suttaṃ vadantācariyāpare

suttanāmānurūpena paribhāsātinomatī ti.

anotattatīre sālarukkhamūle nisinno ekaṃ vuḍḍhapabbajitaṃ sandhāya vuttan ti pi vadanti. ayam imassa atthuppatti.

3 *Saddabhedarāsi* 17–19:

anotattasamīpe 'ko karonto udakabbayaṃ

udake gocaraṃ disvā bakaṃ bhikkhudakaṃ bakaṃ

virodheti kammaṭṭhānaṃ pattadvijaṃ ghaṭena so

udakedhovanaṃ disvā tathā hi udakaṃ ghaṭaṃ.

pakkosetvā jino bhikkhuṃ attho tyādi idaṃ āha

ādo vuttaṃ ṭhapetvā 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 millennialism, 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, Aggavaṃsa'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 *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā*. 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

163

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 *ti*; *pariṇāma* for *parināma*, and similarly with retroflex option *ṇ/n*; 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*; *paṭhamā* for *pathamā*; *disantarāḷa* 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

C = Sinhalese Printed Edition, Colombo, 1964

B = Burmese Printed Edition, Yangon, 1933

D = Thai Printed Edition, Bangkok, 2012 (?)

MANUSCRIPTS

T = Thar Lay Ms. 326, cf. U Thaw Kaung and U Nyunt Maung, *Palm-Leaf Manuscript Catalogue of Thar-Lay (South) Monastery, Myanmar Book Centre*, Yangon, 2006.

U = U Pho Ti Ms. 534, cf. Pruitt, Kasamatsu et al., *Manuscripts in the U Pho thi Library, Sadhammajotika Monastery, Thaton, Myanmar*, Chuo Academic Research Institute, Tokyo, 2014.

S = Staatsbibliothek Berlin Hs.or.3180. The title in the margins is "*Saddāniddesa.*"

2. TEXT AND TRANSLATION

|| namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa ||[1]

[141] evaṃ sattavibhatyantānaṃ[2] dvinnaṃ nāmapadānaṃ chakkārakā[3]diatthabhedaṃ[4] dassetvā atha[5] taṃ vācakabhāvena aññaṃ nāmappakāraṃ dassetuṃ

|| nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho || 318 ||

ity ādi āraddhaṃ.

Honour to him, the Bhagavā, the Arahat, the fully Elightened 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.*

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 samāsādiṃ[1] tato[2] kare

samāsādo kate pacchā atthaṃ niyātha[3] paṇḍito[4] ti

vuttattā nāmānan ti ekaṃ padaṃ. samāso ti ekaṃ padaṃ. yuttattho ti ekaṃ padaṃ. vibhatyantapadavibhāgavasena tipadam idaṃ suttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ[5].

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 *suptiṅantaṃ 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 *nīyyātha.* D *niyyātha.*

4 B, U *paṇḍitā.*

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"[1] 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, *Niruttisāramañjusā*, Sadd-ṭ.

nāmānan ti sambandhachaṭṭhīniddeso[2]. niddhāraṇachaṭṭhī ti pi vadanti.[3] samāso ti saññāniddeso. yuttattho ti saññīniddeso. 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 (*saññī*). Among the [different types of] sutta, *viz.* sutta of technical name (*saññā*), governing sutta (*adhikāra*), 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 *adhikāra* 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 *sambandhachaṭṭhīkārīniddeso*.

3 Kacc-vaṇṇ (219,8–9) add. *sahatthatatiyā niddeso vā*. Probably based on Kacc-nidd (see below).

4 Sharma, 1987: 89.

sutta that prescribes a certain operation (replacement, augment, deletion, etc.).[1] 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.

kathaṃ pana ayaṃ saññā ayaṃ saññī ti ñāyatī ti.[2] ācariyaparamparāya samāsapakaraṇan ti vohārassa pakaṭattā[3] viññāyati.[4]

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 ti*).

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 *nāmānaṃ 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 (*nāmānaṃ*)." As Saddhammajotipāla 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 ādaic*, 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

---

1 For a more detailed study on sutta types in the Pāṇinian tradition: Sharma, 1987: 89*f.*; Cardona, 1988: 3–93.

2 T, S, U, D *kathaṃ pana ayaṃ saññī ayaṃ saññā ti ñāyatī ti.*

3 S *pākaṭattā.*

4 C *ñāyati.*

vārttika by Kātyāyana: *ācāryācārāt saṃjñāsiddhiḥ* "the technical name is established from the usage of the teachers."[1]

samāso ti garusaññākaraṇaṃ[2] saññīsabhāvaparidīpanatthan ti pi vadanti.[3]

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

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 tesaṃ nāmānaṃ yo yuttattho atthi[4] so samāsasañño hotī ti attho. ettha tesaṃ 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 *tesaṃ* has to be inferred in the sutta.

---

1 The passage is Mbh 37,7–24. Patañjali's conclusion is that *saṃjñā* and *saṃjñī* are determined "by the usage of the teachers only" (*ācāryācārād eva*).

2 S *garusaññaṃ 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 *tesaṃ* 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 aniyataniddesavacanaṃ. tassa sarūpena avuttenāpi atthato siddhena yāni ti iminā bahuvacanena paṭiniddeso kātabbo. tasmā yāni nāmāni upasagganipātapubbako[1] abyayībhāvo [Kacc 321] ti ādīhi[2] suttehi samasyante[3] tesaṃ nāmānan ti sambandho kātabbo. atthayogachaṭṭhyāyaṃ.[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 *tesaṃ*], 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 (*tesaṃ*) nouns, [i.e. those nouns] which (*yāni*) become compounds (*samasyante*) through suttas beginning with *upasagganipātapubbako abyayībhāvo* [Kacc 321]." This [*viz.* the word *tesaṃ*] has a sixth case ending that connects the meanings [of *yāni* and *nāmānaṃ*].

NOTE: According to this alternative interpretation, the implied word *tesaṃ* 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, *tesaṃ* means *tesaṃ nāmānaṃ* "of those [words that are] nouns;" in the present interpretation, *tesaṃ* 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 *atthayogachaṭṭhyantoyaṃ.* T *atthayogachaṭṭhyantāyaṃ.*

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 ca[1] atthakkamena[2] nāmānaṃ yuttattho samāso ti suttena bhavitabbaṃ. kasmā antarikenāpi[3] 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, 14*f.*). 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 vibhaktayaḥ*
[Kāt 261] *prakṛtiś ca svarāntasya* [Kāt 262] *vyañjanāntasya yat supoḥ.*

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 252,14*f.*

saccaṃ bhavitabbaṃ.[1] **tathāpi saddakkamenāpi bhavitabbaṃ. nāmaggahaṇassa antarikenāpi yuttaggahaṇena**[2] **sambandhattā ca kiñcipayojanasambhavato**[3] **ca. samāsa**[4]**saddantarikenāpi hi**[5] **sirasā pasuṃ abhidhāvantam āvahantī**[6] **ghaṭam addakkhī ti ādīsu viya**[7] **nāmaggahaṇassa yuttatthaggahaṇena sambandho bhavatī ti.**

True, it should be [as you say]. Nevertheless (*tathāpi*), it can also follow the sequence of the words (*saddakkamena*). Because there is a [semantic] relationship (*sambandhattā*) between the mention of *nāma* and the mention of *yutta*, even with a separation (*antarikenāpi*) [in between], and also because this kind of usage is possible. For, even with the word *samāsa* as a separation (*antarikena*), there is [still] a relationship between the mention of *nāma* 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 *nāma* 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: *ayañ h' ettha attho sirasā ghaṭam āvahantī pasuṃ abhidhāvantam addakkhī ti* "This is the meaning: while carrying a pot on her head, she sees a running animal."[8]

---

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 *yogavibhāga* application (see below). Saddhammajotipāla seems to follow the same argument.

2 S, U *yuttatthaggahaṇena*. T *yuttattatthaggahaṇena*.

3 S *kiñcipayojanasabhāvato*. D reads separately *kiñci payojanasambhavato*.

4 S *samāsaṃ*. T *samā*.

5 S *ti*.

6 U, D *āvahanti*.

7 T om.

8 = Mmd 252,21.

vuttañ ca

yena yassa hi sambandho dūraṭṭhaṃ pi ca tassa[1] taṃ,

atthato hy[2] asamānānaṃ āsannattam akāraṇan ti[3]

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 atthasambhavena[5] sambandho bhavati.[6] tasmā taṃ nāmādiggahaṇaṃ dūre ṭhitam pi tassa yuttatthādiggahaṇassa āyattaṃ[7]. hi[8] saccaṃ atthato asamānānaṃ āsannattaṃ akāraṇaṃ na ñāpakahetū 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 (*ñāpaka*).[9]

---

1 S *tasmā*.

2 U *ty*.

3 = Mmd 252,23–24, introduced by *vuttam pi cetam*.

4 = Mmd-pṭ 176,11: *ettha hi iti kāraṇatthe nipāto*.

5 C *atthasambandhena*.

6 S *bhavataṃ*.

7 C reads *āgatattā*, which does not make sense syntactically. U *āyatthaṃ*, cor. *āyattaṃ*.

8 C *ti*. S *hi*.

9 *na ñāpakahetu* is Saddhammajotipāla's gloss to *akāraṇaṃ*. According to Kahrs (1998: 216 n.98): "The

yenā ti nāmādinā. yassā [142] ti yuttatthādino.[1] tan ti yuttatthādikaṃ. tassā ti nāmādikassā ti pi atthaṃ vadanti.

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.

yadi atthakkamena nāmānaṃ yuttattho samāso ti vucceyya, acandamullokikāni mukhāni[2] assaddhabhojī[3] alavaṇabhojī[4] ti ādīni na sijjheyyuṃ. evaṃ[5] vutte pana nāmānaṃ samāso ti yogavibhāgavasena tāni ayuttatthāni pi sijjhantī ti.

If one would say *nāmānaṃ 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," *assaddhabhojī* "not eating during the *saddhā* period," *alavaṇabhojī* "not eating salty food," etc. But being stated in this way, by means of splitting

---

technical term *jñāpaka* [P. *ñāpaka*] 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.*

3 S *asaddabhojī.* U *asaddabhoji.* D = Mmd 252,28–29: *asaddhabhoji.*

4 = Mmd 252,29.

5 B, U *eva.*

up the sutta (*yogavibhāgavasena*) as *nāmānaṃ samāso*, even those [words] that do not have a combined meaning (*ayuttatthāni*) would be formed [as compounds].

NOTE: The hermeneutic device known as *yogavibhāga* "splitting up [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 *yogavibhāga*, we obtain the sutta *nāmānaṃ samāso* "a compound [is] of nouns," which would probably function as a governing rule (*adhikārasutta*), and would allow for word-composition where the meaning of the members is not necessarily combined (*ayuttatthāni*), as is the case in the examples *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: *apunageyyā gāthā*). Saddhammajotipāla seems to understand that, because of the privative *a-*, these words cannot express "combination" or "union" (*yoga*), but the opposite (see Mmd 252, 27–28: *ayuttatthānam pi samāsasañño hoti*). And yet, they are to be treated as compounds. That is possible if we read *nāmānaṃ samāso* as an independent sutta. This explanation, though far fetched, solves a semantic problem, and it is helpful in describing the Pāli usage.[1] Kātantra commentators do not resort to this argument, probably because in Kāt the equivalence Pāṇini *samartha* = Kāt *yuktārtha* is still operative. The defense of *yogavibhāga* in this rule is found already in Mmd 252, 25*f.*: *atthānukkamānurūpavasena cāvacanaṃ yogavibhāgatthaṃ* "And, due to the sequence of the meaning, the aim (*atthaṃ*) of splitting up the sutta is implicit (*avacanaṃ*)." The concept *avacanaṃ* "implicit" in Vimalabuddhi is probably related to the concept of *ñāpakaṃ* "indicator" that we find in Saddhammajotipāla's gloss to the verses beginning with *yena yassa hi* etc.

---

1 A similar adjustment against the system of the grammarians but following "the view of the Jina" (*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 namanti[1] attani ca atthe nāmentī ti nāmāni.[2] yadā hi dussadabbādīni passitvā dussan ti voharanti tadā atthesu namanti nāma[3]. yadā dussan ti savaṇakāle dussadabbādīni jānanti tadā atthe[4] 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 "referent." The semantic analysis of *nāma* is based on the root √*nam* "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 dhīrā nāmentu mānasaṃ.

   mānasaṃ tesu nāmentā ñatvā pāḷinayuttamaṃ

   nāmadhammesu vindeyyuṃ 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 dabbabhidhānaṃ.* The idea is repeated in Sadd 878,14–15: *tatra nāman ti atthābhimukhaṃ namatī ti nāmaṃ attani ca atthaṃ nāmetī ti nāmaṃ. ghaṭapaṭādiko yo koci saddo so hi sayaṃ ghaṭapaṭādiatthabhimukhaṃ namati. atthe sati tadabhidhānassa sambhavato tan taṃ atthaṃ attani nāmeti. asati abhidhāne atthāvabodhanass' eva asambhavato.*

3 U om.

4 S *atthaṃ.*

tesaṃ nāmānan[1] ti[2] iminā

nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsa[3]taddhitaṃ tathā

kitanāman ti nāmaññū nāmaṃ pañca pi niddise[4] ti

vuttāni[5] pañca nāmāni gahitāni.[6]

With [the expression] *tesaṃ nāmānaṃ*, 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[e] *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*.

4 B, S, U, D *pi niddese*. C *viniddise*. T *pāda d* reads: *nāmam pañcavidhaṃ niddise ti*. I follow Kacc-vaṇṇ 219,17–18:

   nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsataddhitaṃ tathā

   kitanāmañ ca nāmaññū nāmaṃ pañca pi niddise ti.

5 S *vuttattā tāni*.

6 Kacc-nidd 21,13–15: *api ca nāmanāmasabbanāmasamāsanāmataddhitanāmakitakanāmavasena pañcavidhaṃ hoti. vuttañ ca*

   nāmanāmaṃ sabbanāmaṃ samāsaṃ taddhitaṃ tathā

   kitanāmañ ca nāmaññū nāmaṃ pañcavidhaṃ vade ti.

kasmā pana ākhyātapadaṃ na gaṇhāti. nanu anaññātaññassāmītindriyan[1] ti etthāpi ākkhyātena 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 *anaññātaṃ ñassāmi*, 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 taṃ[3] padaṃ nipātapakkhaṃ hutvā samāsapadattaṃ[4] 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 *nipāta* ("indeclinable"). A compound that has as one of its members an *iti* clause, therefore, should be analysed as a regular *avyayībhāva*, according to Kacc 320 *upasagganipātapubbako avyayībhāvo* (see below).

---

1 T *aññataññassāmītindriyan*.

2 It 53, 3 (It-a) = SN V 204, 19 (Spk).

3 C *sambandhatthānaṃ*.

4 C, S *samāsapadatthaṃ*. U *samāsapadatthaṃ*, cor. *samāsapadattaṃ*.

samasyante[1] **vibhattilopena vā ekattūpagamanena**[2] **vā ti samāso. so duvidho saddasamāso atthasamāso ca. duvidho ca**[3] **so luttasamāse**[4] **va labbhati. aluttasamāse**[5] **pana atthasamāso va labbhati. alutte pi vā ekapadabhāvūpagamanato ubhayam pi tasmiṃ upalabbhati**[6].[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.

atthasamāso[1] **ca saddasamāso viya atthadvayassa**[2] **ekattakaraṇaṃ.**[3] **tañ ca mahāpuriso ti ādīsu ekatthabhāvato**[4] **kathaṃ labbhatī ti.**

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 (*taṃ*) [i.e. singleness] from something that already has a single meaning (*ekatthabhāvato*) 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.

labbhati. vacanīyatthassa ekattenāpi vacanatthabhūtānaṃ mahantaguṇapurisa-jātīnaṃ[5] **ekato**[6] **karaṇato.**[7]

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,

---

1 C *atthasamāse.*

2 C *atthañ ca yassa.*

3 C *ekatthakaraṇā.* U *ekatthakaraṇa*, cor. *ekatthakaraṇā.* D *ekatthakaraṇaṃ.*

4 C *ekatthabhāvo.*

5 T *mahantapurisaguṇajātinaṃ.*

6 U, D *ekato va.*

7 S reads *ekaguṇato* for *ekato karaṇato.*

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 labhituṃ na sakkā. ekatthabhāvānūpagamanato 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 *samaṇabrāhmaṇā*. In other words, what mathematicians call a set.

evaṃ duvidho pi samāsavasena[1] pākaṭo hoti. vuttañ ca

samāso padasaṃkhepo padappaccayasaṃhitaṃ[2]

taddhitaṃ nāma kitakaṃ[3] dhātuppaccayasaṃhitan[4] 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 sattavīsatibhedo hoti[6]. 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 *padappaccayasahitaṃ.*

3 T *kitthakaṃ.*

4 S, T *dhātuppaccayasahitaṃ.*

5 See Rūp 178,9–10:

 samāso padasaṅkhepo padappaccayasaṃhitaṃ

 taddhitaṃ nāma hot' evaṃ viññeyyaṃ tesam antaran ti.

6 C *sattavīsatibhedā hontī.*

vuttañ ca

chadhā samāso[1] saṃkhepā[2] vitthārā sattavīsati

niccāniccavasā[3] ceva luttāluttavasā dvidhā

tatra dvidhābyayībhāvo chabbidho kammadhārayo

dīgu dvidhā tappuriso aṭṭhadhā sattadhā bhave

bahubbīhi 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[5] or not, or on account of being with or without elision. Therein, *abyayībhāva* is twofold, *kammadhāraya* is sixfold, *dīgu* is twofold, *tappurisa* is eightfold, sevenfold is the *bahubbīhi*, the *dvanda* is twofold. By this subdivision, [they are] twenty-seven."

[143] paṭhamātappurisena vā saddhiṃ aṭṭhavīsatividho hotī ti[6] vadanti.

They also state: "Optionally, with the addition of nominative-*tappurisa* (*paṭhamātappurisena*), they are twenty-eight."

NOTE: Most grammarians do not consider the nominative-*tappurisa* a *tappurisa*, for it can be called simply a *kammadhāraya*. Indeed, it is impossible to distinguish a nominative-*tappurisa* from a *kammadhāraya*, for instance *nīluppalaṃ* "blue water-lily."

---

1 S *samāsā.*

2 U *saṅkhepo.*

3 T *niccāniccavaso.*

4 S, U, D *sattavīsatī ti.*

5 Abhyankar: "invariably effective compound." Cf. DSG s.v. *nityasamāsa.*

6 C *ti pi.* U add. *aṭṭhavīsatī ti* before *paṭhama,* and then the entire sentence.

tesaṃ pana sarūpaṃ taṃ taṃ ṭhāne yeva vakkhāma.

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

rūpasiddhiyaṃ   pana   kammadhārayabahubbīhī   va[1]   navadhā   gahetvā[2] caturaṭṭhadhā[3] ti vuttaṃ.

In the *Rūpasiddhi*, however, it is stated: "thirty-two," the *kammadhāraya* and the *bahubbīhi* being taken as ninefold.[4]

niccasamāso[5]   kumbhakāro[6]   atrajo   kupuriso   abhidhammo   icc[7]   ādi   ca[8], abyayībhāvasamāso cā ti[9]. aniccasamāso ca[10] mahāpuriso[11] 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 aṭṭhadhā navadhā bhave

   bahubbīhi dvidhā dvando samāso caturaṭṭhadhā ti.

4 See Rūp 214,2–6: *atha kammadhārayasamāso vuccate. so ca navavidho. visesanapubbapado visesanuttarapado visesanobhayapado upamānuttarapado sambhāvanāpubbapado avadhāraṇapubbapado nanipātapubbapado kupubbapado pādipubbapado cā ti.*

5 U *niccasamāso ti.*

6 T *kumbhakāro ca.*

7 C *icc evaṃ.*

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 vibhattilopasamāso. aluttasamāso ti urasilomo 'cc ādi vibhattialopasamāso 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: *urasi* is an inflected form, the locative singular of *uras*, meaning "chest".

yutto attho yuttattho.[1] yutto attho[2] yassa padasamudāyassā 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 yukto'rtho yasmin samudāye sa yuktārtho nāmnām iti sambandhaḥ*; but also Mmd 254,2–3: *yutto attho yuttattho. atha vā yutto attho yassa soyaṃ yuttattho ti.* In Mmd the possibility of *yuttattho* signifying simply "a combined meaning" is accepted, and therefore the concept of *samāsa* "compound" becomes semantic.

4 S, U, D om.

identity. And identity (*sarūpo*) is fourfold, on account of it being [identity] in: word (*sadda*), meaning (*attha*), both of them (*tadubhaya*), [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 kuṭilā[1] ti ādi atthasarūpo nāma. puriso ca puriso cā ti purisā ti ādi ubhayasarūpo nāma. nāmañ ca rūpañ ca nāmarūpan ti[2] ādi ekadesasarūpo[3] nāma[4].

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 saddatthobhayāvayavā[5]

māsā ca kuṭilā[6] ceva purisā nāmarūpañ cā ti.

---

1 I follow C, D *kuṭilā*. B, S, T read *kuṭilo*. U om.

2 U repeats *nāmañ ca rūpañ ca nāmarūpan ti*. T reads *nāmarūpañ cā ti nāmarūpan ti ādi*.

3 S *ekasesarūpo*.

4 S, U, D *nāmā ti*.

5 All read *saddatthobhayavayavā*, perhaps *metri causa*, but wrong in terms of sandhi (*ubhaya + avayava = ubhayāvayava* "both members").

6 B, S, U, T *kuṭilo*.

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 saddasarūpo[2] va adhippeto ti.

Here [in the example *yuttattho*], however, only identity in word is intended.

ayam ettha yojanā. yāni pañcappakārāni nāmāni santi, tesaṃ payujjamānapadatthānaṃ nāmānaṃ yo yuttattho padatthasamudāyo vā atthi,[3] so samāsasañño[4] 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 padatthāpekkhāya atthayogasambandhachaṭṭhī. padāpekkhāya[5] 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.*

3 Instead of *vā atthi*, S reads: *vā dasasamudāyo vā atthi*. U, T read: *padasamudāyo vā padasamudāyo vā atthi*. D reads: *padatthasamudāyo vā padasamudāyo vā atthi.*

4 T *samāsasarasā*. The word *sarasā* is probably a misreading of *sañño* in the Burmese script.

5 C, B, S, U, T *padapekkhāya.* D *padāpekkhāya.*

compound]; with regard to the word (*pada*), is a genitive of relation that connects the members (*avayava*) [of the compound].

rūpasiddhiṭīkāyaṃ[1] **pana yāni nāmāni heṭṭhā amhehi dassitāni ācariyena**[2] **payujjamānapadatthānaṃ visesanādippakāravasena aññamaññapayujjamāna**[3]**-padatthānaṃ, tesaṃ sy**[4]**ādivibhatyantānaṃ rañño puriso ti ādi vākye**[5] **bhinnatthānaṃ nāmānaṃ, yo**[6] **yuttatthabhūto**[7] **rañño puriso ti ādiko padasamudāyo atthi, so padasamudāyo samāsasañño hotī ti yojanā katā.**

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: *payujjamānapadatthānan ti visesanādippakāravasena aññamaññaṃ sampayujjamānapadatthānaṃ tesaṃ syādivibhattyantānaṃ rañño puriso ti ādivākye bhinnatthānaṃ nāmānaṃ yo yuttatthabhūto rājapuriso ti ādiko padasamudāyo so samāso nāmā ti attho.*

2 C *ācariyā yena.*

3 B, U, D *payujjamānānaṃ.*

4 C *ty.*

5 C *vākye pi.*

6 B om. S has *yo* inserted in pencil.

7 C *yo yuttattho yo yuttatthabhūto.*

mahātheraṭīkāyañ[1] **ca yāni pubbe dassitāni nāmāni tesaṃ ācariyena payujjamānapadatthānaṃ nāmānaṃ yo yuttattho so samāsasañño hotī ti yojanā katā.**

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."

nānācariyāpi nāmānan ti padassa niddhāraṇatthaṃ vā sahatthatatīyatthaṃ vā sambandhatthaṃ vā gahetvā bahuppakārena[2] **yojanaṃ karonti.**

But (*pi*) many teachers make the connection in manifold ways, taking the word *nāmānaṃ* in the sense of a partitive [genitive] (*niddhāraṇatthaṃ*), or as an instrumental with a comitative sense (*sahatthatatiyatthaṃ*), or as denoting a relation (*sambandhatthaṃ*).

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 *mahātaraṭīkāyaṃ.*

2 C *bahudhā kārena.*

kaṭhinassa dussan ti[1] kaṭhinassa ābhataṃ dussan ti attho. majjhe lopī cāyaṃ[2] catuṭṭhītappurisasamāso.

The cloth (*dussaṃ*) for the *kaṭhina* (*kaṭhinassa*) means the cloth carried (*ābhataṃ*) for the *kaṭhina*. This is a dative-*tappurisa* (*catuṭṭhītappurisa*) compound with an elision in the middle.

NOTE: the *kaṭhina* 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 *kaṭhina*" cf. DOP s.v. *kaṭhina*. Saddhammajotipāla, following Mmd (268, 15*f.*) understands *kaṭhina-* as meaning *kaṭhinassa*, and not *kaṭhine*, and therefore we have to understand the elliptical participle *ābhataṃ* "brought" "carried."

ñāsādīsu kaṭhinassa dussan ti ādīnam[3] atthesu *amādayo[4] parapadebhī* [Kacc 329] ti ādinā[5] padasamasanañ ca tappurisādivisesa[6]saññañ ca katvā pacchā *nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho* [Kacc 318] timinā sāmaññasamāsasaññaṃ karonti. samāsasaññā nāma padānaṃ samasane[7] sati labbhatī ti[8] 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 *lopāyaṃ.*

3 T, D *ādi.*

4 T *samādayo.*

5 T *ādināma.*

6 B, U, D *tappurisādivasena.* S *tappurisādivisesasaññañ ca.* T *tappurisādivisesasañ ca.*

7 T *samassane.*

8 C om.

afterwards (*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 *kaṭhinadussaṃ* is interpreted by means of several suttas that do not follow the original sequence of Kacc. What Saddhammajotipāla intends to explain is that Mmd, Mmd-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.

[144] aññe pana ācariyā sāmaññasaññaṃ[1] katvā pacchā[2] tappurisādivisesasaññaṃ karonti. te ācariyā hi sāmaññavisesasaññāsu sāmaññasaññā va paṭhamaṃ vattabbā ti vacanato sāmaññasaññaṃ paṭhamaṃ karonti.

Other masters, however, make the particular definition of *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 (*vattabbā*) first (*paṭhamaṃ*)."

NOTE: This *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 Saddhammajotipāla.

---

1 C *sāmaññasamāsasaññaṃ.*

2 C *pacchā pi.*

kaccāyana[1]suttakkamaṃ nissāya pana sāmaññasaññā va paṭhamaṃ kātabbā[2] 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, 15*f.*). 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[3] yuttatthe,[4] sabbesaṃ nāmānaṃ abhāvā, iminā suttena yuttatthasamāso na hotī ti ñāpanatthaṃ 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 (*ñāpanatthaṃ*) that, in examples such as "Devadatta cooks" (*devadatto pacati*), 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 *kātabbaṃ*.

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 kimatthaṃ 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 ñāpanatthaṃ 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 samāsantagatānam 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 Sadhammajotipāla 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 sabbasādhāraṇasaññānantaraṃ sati pi visesasaññānaṃ paṭhamaṃ[2]-vattabbabhāve[3] sabbasādhāraṇavidhiṃ[4] 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 *sabbasādhāraṇavidhi.*

|| tesaṃ vibhattiyo lopā ca || 319 ||

iti vuttaṃ.[1]

it says:

319. And the case endings of them [are] elided.

NOTE: Kāt reads only *teṣāṃ vibhaktayaḥ lopyāḥ*, which constitutes the second *pāda* 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*).

tattha tesan ti ekaṃ padaṃ. vibhattiyo ti ekaṃ padaṃ. lopā ti ekaṃ padaṃ. cā ti ekaṃ padaṃ. vibhatyantapadavibhāgavasena catuppadam idaṃ suttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. tesan ti sambandhachaṭṭhīniddeso[2]. vibhattiyo ti kārīniddeso. lopā ti kāriyaniddeso. cā ti avadhāraṇaniddeso. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

Therein, *tesaṃ* ("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. *tesaṃ* expresses a genitive of relation, *vibhattiyo* expresses the object of the operation (*kārī*), *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.

---

1 B, S, U *vuttaṃ*. C *āraddhaṃ*. T, D *ti ādi vuttaṃ*.

2 C *sambandhachaṭṭhī*. D *sambandhachaṭṭhīkārīniddeso*.

yuttatthānaṃ samāsānan ti imāni pubbasuttena[1] ekavacanena vutte pi tesan ti bahuvacanabhāvena paramāsitattā bahuvacanena vipariṇāmā hutvā anuvattanti.

The words *yuttatthānaṃ samāsānaṃ*, even though they have been stated in the singlular 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].

kasmā pana pubbasutte ekavacane[2] vutte pi tesan ti bahuvacanaṃ katan[3] ti. tesaṃ nāmānaṃ chabbidhappakāradassanatthaṃ kataṃ. ettha hi *pakati cassa sarantassā* [Kacc 320] ti vakkhamānattā vibhattiyo ti iminā vibhattādesā yeva gahetabbā.

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.

---

1 U, D *pubbasutte.*

2 U, T, D *ekavacanena.*

3 T *kathaṃ.*

kalāpādisakkataganthesu[1] pana pakatisuttassābhāvā ādesaṃ akatvā[2] pakativibhattīnam eva lopaṃ karonti. tehi ca ubhayehi sesaṃ[3] saṅgaṇhāti. sati pi yuttatthasamāsānaṃ anuvattane[4] kasmā sutte tesaṃgahaṇaṃ katan[5] ti codanaṃ manasikatvā āha tesaṃgahaṇenā ti ādi.

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 *tesaṃ* is included in the sutta?", he says "with the mention of the word *tesaṃ*," 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: *tesaṃgahaṇena samāsataddhitākhyātakitakappānaṃ paccayapadakkharāgamānañ ca lopā honti* "with the mention of *tesaṃ*, 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 Bᵉ and Sadd read only *samāsataddhitākhyātakitānaṃ*.

---

1 B *kalāpādisakkataganthesu*. S *kalāpāṭisakaṭagandhesu*. U *kalāpādisakkatagantesu*. C *kalāpādisakkataganthe*. T *kalāpādisakkaṭagandhesu*.

2 D *katvā*.

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.

rūpasiddhiatthabyākhyānesu pi[1] idam evādhippāyaṃ vadanti.

In the *Rūpasiddhi* and the *Atthabyākhyāna* they also state exactly (*eva*) this implied meaning.

[145] samāso yuttattho ti pubbasutte ekavacanassa vuttattā tassa vibhattiyo lopā cā ti vattabbe, kasmā tesan ti bahuvacanaṃ katan ti codanaṃ manasikatvā tesaṃgahaṇenā ti ādi vuttiṃ[2] pi vadanti.

They also (*pi*) state that, anticipating the objection, namely: "Because in the previous sutta he has said *samāso yutatttho* 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 (*vutti*) "with the mention of *tesaṃ* ...", etc.

yady evaṃ, *bahuvacanesu vo no* [Kacc 151] ti ādīsu viya bahuvacanaggahaṇenā ti vattabbaṃ na tesaṃgahaṇenā ti ce, abhinnapadavasena[3] evaṃ vuttaṃ. ganthassākaḍḍhanaṃ[4] viyā ti tesam adhippāyo.

If it is so, we should find the mention of the word *bahuvacana* 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 samāsānaṃ*]. Their implication is that it is like dragging in the entire book.

---

1 C om.

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 *vyākaraṇa*. There is an alternative reading *hatthassa* "dragging of the hand" which, in my opinion, makes lesser sense.

tattha samāsā ti mahanto ca so puriso cā ti mahāpuriso icc ādayo saṃgaṇhāti, taddhitā ti vasiṭṭhassa apaccaṃ vāsiṭṭho icc ādayo saṃgaṇhāti, ākkhyātā ti cicciṭam[1] iva attānam ācaratī ti cicciṭāyati, saṃgho pabbatam iva attānam ācaratī ti pabbatāyati icc ādayo saṃgaṇhāti. kitakappānan ti kumbhaṃ karotī ti kumbhakāro, rathaṃ karotī ti[2] rathakāro icc ādayo saṃgaṇhāti.[3] atthabyākhyāne pi imān' eva āharati[4].

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: Vāsiṭṭha;" 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 soādipadakkharānam[5] eva[6] lopo. vibhattīnaṃ pana suttena lopo. atthabyākhyāne pana vibhattilopo ti vutto. tenāha kaṭhīnadussan ti evam ādi samāse ti.

---

1 B, S, U *cicciṭṭam.* T *cicciṭaṃ.*

2 B, U, D om. *rathaṃ 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]

rūpasiddhibhassādīsu[2] 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 vibhatti-ppaccayalopo labbhati. catūsu hi ṭhānesu tesaṃgahaṇena vā vuttaṭṭhānam[3] appayogo ti suttena vā[4] 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 *Bālāvatāra*. 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 *bhattakariādīsu.*

3 U *vuttatthānam.*

4 B, U, D om. *suttena vā.*

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 Saddhammajotipāla is going to explain that the *Nyāsa* works only with the *paribhāsā*, 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 vuttaṭṭhānam[1] appayogo ti suttam eva lañcheti.[2] kaṭhinassa dussan ti ādi samāsavākyesu vā kumbhakāro ti[3] ādi kitantasamāsavākyesu vā samāsasaññā tappurisādi[4]visesasaññā katā[5] yeva. suttena vā tesaṃgahaṇena vā yathānurūpaṃ vibhattippaccayapadakkharānaṃ 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 dussaṃ* [= *kaṭhinadussaṃ*], 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 vibhattiādilope kate samāsādisaññā katā pi yujjatī ti vadanti.

Others, however, state that it also holds good (*yujjati*) 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 *vuttatthānam.*

2 B, U, D *vaḷañjeti.* S, T *vaḷañceti.*

3 U, T, D read *kumbhaṃ karotī ti.*

4 T *tappurisā ti.*

5 B, S, U, T, D *kate.*

taṃ tesaṃ vibhattiyo lopā ce ti iminā virujjhati.

That is forbidden by the [sutta Kacc 319] "And the case endings of them [are] elided."

ākhyāte cicciṭam[1] iva attānam ācaratī[2] ti ettha *āya nāmato kattupamānād ācāre* [Kacc 437] ti iminā cicciṭa[3]nāmato āyappaccayaṃ katvā idha sutte tesaṃgahaṇena aṃvibhattipadakkharānaṃ lopaṃ katvā *pakati cassa sarantassā* [Kacc 320] ti ettha caggahaṇena cicciṭāya iti[4] pakatiṃ katvā parakkharaṃ netvā dhātuppaccayehi vibhattiyo ti paribhāsaṃ katvā tivibhattiṃ katvā cicciṭāyatī[5] 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 *cicciṭa*, the affix *āya* is added. In the present sutta, with the mention of *tesaṃ*, the elision of speech sound [or] word, and the case ending *aṃ* 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 *cicciṭāya* 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 *cicciṭāyati* is formed.

---

1 B, S, U *cicciṭṭaṃ*. T *ciciṭaṃ*.

2 C *āvacaratī*.

3 B, S, U *cicciṭṭa*. T *ciciṭa*.

4 B, U *cicciṭṭāyāti*. T *ciciṭa āya ti*. D *cicciṭa āyā ti*.

5 B, D *cicciṭṭāyatī*. T *ciciṭāyati*.

kitake kumbhaṃ karotī ti vākyaṃ katvā idha tesaṃgahaṇena aṃvibhattiṃ ca oppaccayañ ca tivibhattiṃ ca lopaṃ[1] katvā pakatisutte caggahaṇena kumbhakārā ti[2] pakatiṃ katvā kumbhasaddūpapada kara karaṇe tīmassa dhātusaññaṃ ca dhātvantassa lopañ ca katvā kumbhasaddato [146] aṃvibhattiṃ katvā karadhātuto ca *sabbato ṇvutvāvīvā* [Kacc 529] ti appaccayaṃ katvā kitattā[3] nāmam iva katvā syuppattādikaṃ[4] katvā kumbhaṃ karotī ti atthe samāsa[5]tappurisādisaññañ ca katvā iminā suttena[6] aṃsiādesavibhattilopaṃ[7] katvā kumbhakārā ti[8] pakati katvā[9] samāsattā nāmam iva katvā syuppattādimhi kate[10] rūpasiddhi hoti.

In a primary derivative (*kitake*), the sentence "he makes a pot" is made. Here, with the mention of *tesaṃ* [in the present sutta], one makes the elision of the nominal ending *aṃ* [in *kumbhaṃ*], the affix *o* [in *kar-o-ti*], and the verbal ending *ti*. 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, ṇvu, 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

---

1 C *lopaṃ va.*

2 C *kumbhakārī.* B om.

3 B, U *kitakattā.* S *tilakattā.*

4 U, D *syuppattādiṃ.*

5 B, U, D *samāsaṃ.* T *samāsana.*

6 C om.

7 C *aṃādesavibhattilopaṃ.* B *aṃsiādayovibhattilopañ ca.* D *aṃsiādesavibhattilopañ ca.*

8 T *kumbhakārādi.*

9 B, U, D om. *kumbhakārā ti pakati katvā.*

10 D *te.*

tappurisa compound, etc., in the sense of *kumbhaṃ 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. *tṛ*) (e.g. *kattā* "doer"), and *āvī* (e.g. *dassāvī* "one who sees"), see Senart, 1871: 268.

caggahaṇaṃ pabhaṅkaro amatandado medhaṅkaro ty ādīsu avadhāraṇatthaṃ vuttaṃ[1]. avadhāraṇaṃ[2] hi[3] duvidhaṃ sanniṭṭhāpanaṃ[4] 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 vidhinivattanam[5] pi ca

duvidhaṃ avadhāraṇaṃ kaccāyanena[6] 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 *sanniṭṭhāpakaṃ.*

5 U *vidhinivattaṃ naṃ.* T *vidhinivattānaṃ.*

6 U, D *kaccānena.*

idha pana nivattāpanāvadhāraṇam adhippetaṃ. tattha pabhaṃ karotī ti vākyaṃ ṭhapetvā tesaṃgahaṇena vibhattippaccayalopaṃ katvā pakatisutte caggahaṇena pabhaṃkarā[1] ti pakatiṃ katvā pabhasaddūpapadassa kara karaṇe tīmassā ti ādi rūpasiddhi ñāse oloketabbā.[2]

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 √*kara* in the sense of "instrument" with reference to the preceeding 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 *pabhaṃkarī.*

2 T *oloketabbo.*

|| pakati cassa sarantassa || 320 ||

320. And the [original] base of the [nominal base[1]] that ends in a vowel.

catuppadam idaṃ. pakatī ti kāriya, cā ti samuccaya, assā ti sambandhachaṭṭhīkārī, sarantassā ti tabbisesana. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. idha caggahaṇena rūpasiddhimate kiṃsamudayo[2] idappaccayatā ty ādīsu byañjanantassa pakatibhāvaṃ samuccinno ti.[3] atthabyākhyāne pana caggahaṇaṃ taddhitādipakatibhāvaṃ sampiṇḍetī ti vuttaṃ. apare pana[4] lopānukaḍḍhanan ti vadanti.

This [sutta consists of] four words. "Base" (*pakati*) 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 (*sampiṇḍeti*) 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 *vutti*: *assa sarantassa liṅgassa* (Kacc-v 108,6).

2 S *kiṃsamudaya*. See Rūp 179,17–18: *casaddena kiṃsamudaya idappaccayatādīsu.* Compare with Sadd 745,22–23: *ko samudayo etassā ti kiṃsamudayo.*

3 U, T, D *samuccinoti.*

4 S, T *pada.* C *para.*

NOTE: The following is the full passage in Rūp: *luttāsu vibhattīsu sarantassa assa yuttatthabhūtassa tividhassa pi liṅgassa pakatibhāvo hoti. casaddena kiṃsamudaya-idappaccayatādīsu 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 *paribhāsā*. 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 *tesaṃ vibhattiyo lopā cā* ti viya pakati ca tesaṃ sarantānan ti vattabbaṃ. kasmā ekavacanantena vuttan[2] ti.

But is it not true that this sutta, as the sutta *tesaṃ vibhattiyo lopā ca*, should be *pakati ca tesaṃ sarantānaṃ* [and not *pakati cassa sarantassa*]? Why is it formulated (*kataṃ*) in the singular?

ekatthībhāvo[3] samāsalakkhaṇan ti katvā tathā vuttaṃ.

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 (*saññā = lakkhaṇaṃ*) 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 evaṃ kasmā lopasuttaṃ ekavacanena na[1] vuttan ti.

If it is so, why then is the sutta on elision [i.e. Kacc 319 *tesaṃ vibhattiyo lopā ca*] not formulated in the singular?

sappayojanattā vuttaṃ hi[2] tattha tesaṃgahaṇenā ti ādi.

It is stated there mentioning *tesaṃ* [and not *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 *tesaṃ* and not the singular *tassa*. This is how I understand Saddhammajotipāla's comment.

evaṃ hotu, kasmā vuttiyaṃ pakatirūpāni[3]hontī ti bahuvacanantena vuttan ti.

Let it be so, why [then], in the *vutti*, is it stated, in the plural: "they are (*honti*) the forms of the nominal base (*pakatirūpāni*)"?

pakatibhāvassa samāsato pubbe vākya[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 (*ṭhitattā*) with reference to the words that are previous to the compound which is a nominal base. But in the *Rūpasiddhi* and other treatises it is formulated with a singular ending (*ekavacanantena*).

---

1 B, U, D *ekavacanantena*. S, T *ekavacanantena na*.

2 T *ti*.

3 C *pakatāni rūpāni*. See Kacc 108,6; Pind emends C, cf. Kacc 108 n.12: "Cf. Kacc-nidd 146,25: *kasmā vuttiyaṃ 'pakatirūpāni* (so read) *honti' bahuvacanena vuttaṃ?*"

4 B, U *vākyaṃ*.

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[1]lokanimitte āgate sati[2] mahī ruhachāyā atthi vigate sati chāyā natthi.[3] tathā ādesasaranimitte[4] sati pakatisaralopo[5] hoti, tasmiṃ pubbasuttena vigate puna pakati hotī 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 vibhattīsu*), 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 *ādesassaranimitte.*

5 B, U, D *pakatissaralopo.*

na hoti. nemittikassa[1] phalassa tathā niyamābhāvā. yathā hi candakantamaṇiādayo paṭicca udakādayo pavattanti tesu vigatesu pi udakādayo tiṭṭhanti, tathā satthādīsu pi vibhattinimitte [147] sati ukārassa akārādeso hoti. tasmiṃ lope pi ukāra[2]pakatibhāvo na hoti. nemittikabhūto[3] ākāro va tiṭṭhatī ti. tasmā tādisassa attappasaṅgassa[4] nivattanatthaṃ idaṃ 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*.

moggallānakalāpapakaraṇādīsu pana mahīruhachāyānayaṃ gahetvā idaṃ 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.*

4 My emendation. C, T, D *atthappasaṅgassa.* B *atthappasaṅkassa.* S, U *atthappasaṅkassa.*

5 U, T, D *anuvattattā.*

6 Kāt-v ad Kāt 340: *svarāntasya liṅgasya yuktārthasya luptāsu vibhaktiṣu prakṛtiś ca bhavati.*

case endings [prescribed by the previous *sūtra* in *Kātantra* 339 *tatsthā lopyā vibhaktayaḥ* "the case endings that are in such a place are to be elided"].

sarantassa pubbe sarantabhāvena ṭhitassa[1] assa samāsabhūtassa liṅgassa pakatirūpāni[2] sarantāni[3] 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.

kasmā[4] sarantassā ti vuttaṃ. nanu kiṃsamudayo[5] ti ādīsu byañjanantassāpi 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 *pakati pakatirūpāni.*

3 C, S *saravantāni.*

4 U, T, D *kasmā pana.*

5 D *samudayo.*

**saccaṃ. tathāpi sarantassa pakatibhāvena kvacatthassa anicchitattā *pakati cassā*
ti ettakam[1] avatvā sarantassā ti vuttaṃ. byañjanantassa pana[2] pakatibhāvo
katthaci hoti, katthaci na hoti. tathā hi kiṃsamudayo ti ādīsu pakatibhāvo hoti.
ko nāmāyaṃ[3] 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 vibhattilope pakati hotī ti ca. kvacī ti kiṃ[1]. konāmāyaṃ bhante[2] 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?"

idappaccayatā ti etaṃ rūpasiddhiādīsu idasaddo[4] niggahitanto ti gahetvā byañjanantassa pakatibhāvena gahitaṃ. saddanītiādīsu pana ida[5]saddo saranto ti gahetvā, sarantassa pakatibhāvena[6] gahitaṃ.[7] ettha hi ida[8]saddo niggahitanto vā hotu saranto vā nipāto ti daṭṭhabbo. na imasaddassādeso. imesaṃ paccayā idappaccayā ti hi[9] aññapadena viggaho niccasamāsattā ti.

The word *idappaccayatā* is included in the *Rūpasiddhi* and other treatises [because] the word *ida* is taken as ending in ṃ, 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

---

1 C om.

2 C om.

3 The quotation is not literal. Cf. Sadd 745,21–26: *kvaci vyañjanantassa. vibhattilope kate vyañjanantassa liṅgassa kvaci pakatirūpaṃ hoti: ko samudayo etassā ti kiṃsamudayo. kvacī ti kiṃ: konāmāyaṃ bhante dhammapariyāyo, ettha ca kiṃ nāmaṃ etassā ti konāmo ti viggaho, ettha tu kiṃsaddassa ko icc ādesavasena pakatirūpaṃ na bhavati.*

4 C *idasaddo va.* T *idaṃ saddo.*

5 T *idaṃ.*

6 T *pakatibhāve.*

7 C om. *niggahitanto ti gahetvā byañjanantassa pakatibhāvena gahitaṃ. saddanītiādīsu pana idasaddo saranto ti gahetvā, sarantassa pakatibhāvena gahitaṃ.*

8 C, S, T *idaṃ.*

9 B, S, D om.

indeclinable (*nipāto*) ending in a vowel. It is not a replacement of *ima*. Because (*hi*), since it is an obligatory compound (*niccasamāsattā*), the word separation (*viggaha*) [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.** *vyāsapadānaṃ vibhattilope kate sarantassa liṅgassa pakatirūpaṃ hoti: cakkhusotaṃ, rājaputto, imesaṃ paccayā idappaccayā icc evam ādi. imasmiṃ ṭhāne pakatirūpaṃ nāma luttasarassa punānayanavasena ca katimādesassa idasaddassa puna attano pakatiyaṃ ṭhitabhāvena 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 *cakkhusotaṃ* "eye and ear" [not **cakkhuṃsotaṃ*], *rājaputto* "son of the king" [not **rañño putto*], *imesaṃ paccayā* [=] *idapaccayā* "conditioned by those" [not **imappaccayā*], etc. In this case (*ṭhāne*) [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 *viggaha* seems to reveal. The *viggaha* is arrived at with the pronoun *ima* in want of an alternative.

evaṃ sāmaññasaññāvidhayo dassetvā visesasaññāyo[1] dassetuṃ

|| upasagganipātapubbako abyayībhāvo || 321 ||

iti āraddhaṃ.

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] *avyayībhāva.*

tattha dipadam[2] idaṃ suttaṃ. upasagganipātapubbako ti saññīniddeso, abyayībhāvo ti saññāniddeso. saññā-pe-vidhisuttesu saññāsuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

Therein, this sutta consists of two words. "Preceded by a preverb or a particle" (*upasagganipātapubbaka*) expresses that which receives the technical name; *abyayībhāva* expresses the technical name. Among the different types of *sutta*, this is a sutta [defining a] technical name.

upasagganipātapubbako yo yuttattho samāso hoti[3] so abyayībhāvasañño hoti.

That compound of combined meaning which is preceded by a preverb or by a particle receives the technical name *abyāyībhāva* ("[compound] of indivisible nature").

NOTE: The *avyayībhāva* 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

---

1 D *idāni visesasaññāvidhayo.*

2 T, D *dvipadam.*

3 C om.

first term, being an indeclinable, plays the role of the principal word (DSG). Renou translates *avyayībhāva* as "accession à l'état d'invariant."[1]

idaṃ[2] 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 *avyayībhāva* 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[3] 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.

niccasamāsattā niccasamāso cāyaṃ yebhūyyena, saddappadhānena pi[1] aniccasamāso atthi. yathā majjhesamuddasmiṃ tiropabbatan ti ādi atthappadhānena.

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 *tiropabbataṃ* "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.

upasagganipātāpubbako[2] yassa[3] soyaṃ upasagganipātapubbako upasagganipātatthapadhāno ti vuttaṃ hoti. tena nerañjarapati[4] vanapatī ti[5] ādīsu uttarapadatthappadhānesu[6] ummattagaṅgan[7] ti ādīsu aññapadatthappadhānesu ca[8] abyayībhāvasamāso hoti.

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

---

1 C *appakena pi.*

2 U, D *upasagganipātāpubbakā.*

3 C *ssaya.* S *rassa.*

4 C *nerañjapati.*

5 So U, T. B *vanapatī.* S *vanapati.* C, D *vanappati.*

6 T, D add. *ca.*

7 C *ummattagahaṃ.* S *ummattaṅgo.* U *sammatthagaṅgaṃ.* T *ummattagaṅgā.*

8 C om.

the particle is predominant. By the same principle it is [considered] an *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" (*nerañjarapati*), "towards the forest" (*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" (*ummattagaṅgaṃ*).

abrāhmaṇādīsu[1] yaṃ hi pubbapadatthappadhāno [148] abyāyībhāvo ti vuttaṃ, taṃ yebhuyyavasena vuttaṃ.

With regard to examples such as "non-*brāhmaṇa*" (*abrāhmaṇa*), because it is stated that an *avyayībhāva* compound is the one in which the meaning of the first member is predominant, therefore this one is generally stated [as *avyayībhāva*].

sabbaliṅgavibhattī[2] vacanesu na byayanti[3] na nassantī ti abyayā. liṅgādīsu sabbe[4] sadisā ti attho. ke te. upasagganipātā. tesaṃ abyayānam atthaṃ vibhāveti, tehi vā saddhiṃ bhavati tadatthappadhānavasenā ti abyayībhāvo. abyayatthappadhānattā nānārūpaṃ na hotī ti attho.

"Indivisible" (*abyayā*) [means that] they are not divided, i.e. they are not lost (*nassanti*) in expressions (*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 (*sadisā*). What are these [indivisibles]? The preverbs (*upasagga*) and the particles (*nipāta*). It is called "indivisible [compound]" (*avyāyībhāvo*) because it explains (*vibhāveti*) the meaning of those that are indivisible; or, alternatively, because it appears (*bhavati*) with them [that is with *upasaggas*

---

1 B, S, U, D *na abrāhmaṇo ti ādīsu*. T *na brahmaṇo ti ādisu*.

2 U, T, D °*vibhatti*.

3 C, T *abyayan ti*.

4 C *sabbesaṃ*.

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 sabbasaṅgāhavasenā[1] ti.

In examples such as "in the middle of the ocean," it is stated as individisble 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 *sabbasaṅgahavasenā.*

tenāha: tatra dvidhābyayībhāvo[1] ti.

That is why he says: "in this respect, the *avyayībhāva* compound is twofold."

akkharasamūhādīsu pana pubbapadatthappadhānādivasena vā[2] tividho ti vuttaṃ.

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].

tattha   pubbapadatthappadhāno   yathā   upanagaraṃ   ty   ādi. uttarapadatthappadhāno   yathā   nerañjarappati   vanappati[3]   ty   ādi. aññapadatthappadhāno yathā ummattagaṅgaṃ[4] tuṇhīgaṅgaṃ[5] lohitagaṅgan[6] ty ādi. ummattā gaṅgā yasmiṃ janapade[7] ti ummattagaṅgaṃ. evaṃ sesesu pī ti. upanagaran ti ettha[8] upasaddo sasādhanaṃ[9] samīpa[10]pavattanakiriyaṃ[11] joteti. tasmā nagarassa samīpe pavattati[12] kathā iti upanagaran ti vuttaṃ.

In this respect, predominance of the first member, for instance: *upanagaraṃ* "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 abyayibhāvo*.

2 C om. T *vā ti*.

3 B, U *nerañjarapati vanapatī*.

4 U, T *ummatthagaṅgā*.

5 T *tuṇhigaṅgā*.

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 *vattanakiriyaṃ*.

12 C *vattati*.

ummattagaṅgaṃ "[in] the Ummatta [part] of the Gaṅgā," *tuṇhīgaṅgaṃ* "[in] the Quiet [part] of the Gaṅgā," or *lohitagaṅgaṃ* "[in] the Red [part] of the Gaṅgā," etc. The word *ummattagaṅgaṃ* expresses the country where the Gaṅgā river is wild (*ummattā*). 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 *upanagaraṃ* "near the city."

tathā hi abhidhammaṭīkāyaṃ adhisaddo samāsavisaye adhikāratthaṃ[1] **pavattati**[2] **atthañ**[3] **ca gahetvā pavattatī**[4] **ti attānaṃ adhi ajjhattā**[5] **ti vuttaṃ.**

Because in the same way, in the *Abhidhamma-ṭīkā*, it is stated: "towards (*adhi*) 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 pavatt[at]i atthañ ca gahetvā pavattatī ti attānaṃ adhikicca uddissa pavattā ajjhattā.*[6]

---

1 C *adhikāratthe.* S, D *adhikāratthaṃ.*

2 T *pavatta.* D *pavatti.*

3 C *adhikatthañ.*

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.

ayaṃ hi niccasamāsattā aññapadatthena[1] viggaho hoti[2]. esa nayo sesesu pi daṭṭhabbo.

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 atthasamāso siyā. dvinnaṃ atthānam abhāvā ti.

How is it possible for this very [type of] compound (*ettha samāse*) to be a compound of meanings (*atthasamāso*)? Because there is absence of the two referents.

siyā. vākye bhinnatthānaṃ upanagarasaddānaṃ ekatthavācakattā[3] ti.

It is possible (*siyā*). Because the words *upa* and *nagara*, which have different meanings in a sentence (*vākye*), express one single referent [in the compound *upanagaraṃ*].

---

1 C *aññapadena.*

2 C *ti.*

3 C *ettha vācakattā.* U *ekatthavācakatthā.*

|| so napuṃsakaliṅgo || 322 ||

322. This [*avyayībhāva* compound is] of the neuter gender.

dvipadam idaṃ. so ti kārīniddeso, napuṃsakaliṅgo ti kāriyātidesaniddeso[1].
saññā-pe-vidhisuttaṃ ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

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 abyayībhāvasamāso napuṃsakaliṅgo va daṭṭhabbo. napuṃsakaliṅge kāriyaṃ va
daṭṭhabban ti attho. napuṃsakaliṅgo[2] ti hi kāriyātidesaniddeso[3]. yathā mañcaṭṭhā
mañcā ti vuccantī[4] ti[5].

This *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*)."[6]

---

1 C *kāriyaṃ.*

2 C *napuṃsakaliṅge.*

3 B, S, U, D *kāriyātideso.*

4 T *vuccatī.*

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: *napuṃsakaliṅgo ti kāriyātideso. yathā mañcaṭṭhā mañcā ti vuccanti. tathā napuṃsakaliṅgaṭṭhaṃ kāriyaṃ napuṃsakaliṅgan ti vuccati. teneva viññāyati. so napuṃsakaliṅgakāriyabhāvo hotī ty attho* "the word *napuṃsakaliṅgo* is an extended application of the operation to be carried out. In the same way that those staying on cots are called *cots*, similarly, an operation to be effected in the neuter gender is called of neuter gender (*napuṃsakaliṅgaṃ*). It has to be understood only through this [reasoning]. The meaning is: this [i.e. the *avyayībhāva* compound] has the nature (*bhāva*) of being what has to be effected (*kāriya*) in neuter gender (*napuṃsakaliṅga*)." This digression in Mmd tries to justify that the word *napuṃsakaliṅgo* is the grammatical operation, and not a definition. The concept *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 *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 *vatī* prescribed in the sense of 'like there or of that' by P. 4.1.116. In grammar *vat* means *vadbhāva* 'treatment like.' Compare *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 *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.

idha ivasaddassa adassanato kathaṃ atidesasuttan ti viññāyatī ti.

How is it possible to recognise that this is a sutta of extended application (*atidesa*) if the word "as" (*iva*) is not seen here (*ettha*) [that is, in the sutta]?

saro rasso napuṃsake [Kacc 344] ti vakkhamānattā viññāyati. tenāha vuttiyaṃ: napuṃsakaliṅgo[1] vā ti.

---

1 C *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 *vutti*: "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 *ti*, 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 anantare[2] vuttattā abyayībhāvaggahaṇaṃ anuvattatī 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 *avyayībhāva*], the mention of the word "*avyayībhāva*" recurs (*anuvattati*) [and there is no need to specify subject]?

saccaṃ, tathāpi soggahaṇena abyayībhāvaggahaṇaṃ uttaranivattanatthan ti.

True. Nevertheless, with the mention of "this," the exclusion of a further recurrence of the mention of "*avyayībhāva*" is intended.

---

1 C *na gahitaṃ.*

2 S *antare.*

atthabyākhyāne pana siddhe saty[1] ārambho ñāpanāya hoti kiriyāvisesanānañ[2] ca napuṃsakattam[3] īritaṃ[4]. yathā muduṃ pacati,[5] visosanaṃ[6] pacatī[7] ti[8] vuttaṃ.

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 ekattaṃ[9] na karotī ti.

But why is it formulated in the singular (*ekattaṃ*)?

NOTE: That is, as in the *digu* case. See Kacc 323 *diguss ekattaṃ*, where *napuṃsakaliṅgaṃ* 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 *avyayībhāva* compounds.

---

1 B *sāty.*

2 C *kriyāvisesanañ.*

3 C *napuṃsakattham.*

4 B, U, T, D *iti taṃ.* S *ītitaṃ.*

5 C *paccati.*

6 B, U, D *sobhaṇaṃ.* T *visosaṇaṃ.*

7 C *paccatī.*

8 D om.

9 D *etattaṃ.*

samāharabyayībhāvassābhāvā.[10]

Because of 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.

cittam adhikicca pavattanti dhammā adhicittan[2] **ti ettha hi aṃvibhattīnam** [149] **akārantā abyayībhāvā** [Kacc 343] **ti suttena**[3] **yovacanassa**[4] **amādeso ti**[5] **daṭṭhabbaṃ.**

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 S *samāharabyayībhāvassānabhāvā.*

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 *adhicittaṃ*, not for the complete analysis.

3 T *abyayībhāvasuttena.*

4 C *sovacanassa.*

5 S *hoti.*

kaccāyane pana itthīliṅgappayogo va āharīyati. upanagaran ti ādippayogo pi āharitabbo. tathā⁶-atthassa vācakattā ti.

In *Kaccāyana*, however, only the exemplification (*payogo*) in the feminine is brought up (*āharīyati*). An example such as the word "near the city" (*upanagaraṃ*) 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 (*vidhi*). 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.

|| digussekattaṃ || 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 *ekattaṃ* is not the same as *ekavacanaṃ*, although the second is somehow implied in the first. The word *ekattaṃ* 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 *ekattaṃ*. 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*.

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 *pañcapūlī* 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 *digu* 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. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. digussa samāsassā ti[1] atthasamāsassa. atthabyākhyāne pana[2] digussatthassā[3] ti vuttaṃ.

This [sutta] consists of two words. "Of the *digu*" (*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 *digu* 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 *digu*."

nanu ca ekatthībhāvo samāsalakkhaṇan 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[1] 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 (*ekatthibhāvo*) 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, *ekatthibhāva* 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.

nanu[2] anekatthābhidhāyino[3] saddassa ekatthābhidhāyakattaṃ[4] kattuṃ na sakkā. saddānam atthābhidhānassa sabhāvasiddhattā[5] ti.

---

1 D adds *ekapadatthānaṃ*.

2 C om. *na ekavacanena vattabbatthabhāvena karaṇan ti nanu.*

3 U *anekattābhidhāyino.*

4 C *ekatthābhidhāyitattaṃ.* S, T *ekatthābhidhāyitaṃ.*

5 C *bhāvasiddhattā.* S *sabhavasiddhatthā.*

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[1] ekattam[2] iva hoti napuṃsakaliṅgattañ[3] 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 *samarthaḥ 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 *napuṃsakaliṅgatthañ.*

'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 pāṇituriyayoggasenaṅgakhuddajantuka-vividhaviruddhavisabhāgatthādīnañ ca || 324 ||

324. And similarly, in a *dvanda* compound, [when reference is made] to parts of the body (*pāṇi[aṅga]*), 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 Pāṇinian sūtras (P. 2.4.2-8-9).

catuppadam idaṃ. tathā ti upamājotaka[2]. dvande ti ādhārasattamī. pāṇi-pe-dīnan ti sambandhachaṭṭhīkārī. cā ti samuccaya. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

This sutta consists of four words. "Similarly" (*tathā*) suggests[3] a comparison; "in a *dvanda* compound" (*dvande*) is a locative of support (*ādhāra*); "parts of the body, ... , etc." (*pāṇi-pe-dīnaṃ*) is a genitive of relation [expressing] that which undergoes a grammatical operation;

---

1 Translation, Joshi 1968: 52–54. Samarth IV, 41–46: *atha kriyamāṇe 'pi samarthagrahaṇe samartham ity ucyate kiṃ samarthaṃ nāma.* [**Vārttika 1**] ***pṛthagarthānam ekārthībhāvaḥ samarthavacanam.*** *pṛthagarthānāṃ padānām ekārthībhāvaḥ samartham ity ucyate. kva punaḥ pṛthagarthāni kvaikarthāni. vākye pṛthagarthāni, rajñaḥ puruṣa iti. samāse punar ekārthāni rājapuruṣa iti. kim ucyate pṛthagarthānīti yāvatā rājñaḥ puruṣa ānīyatām ity ukte rājapuruṣa ānīyate rājapuruṣa iti ca sa eva. nāpi brūmo 'nyasyānayanaṃ bhavatīti.*

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 *napuṃsalakiṅgatta* from the previous sutta] (*samuccaya*). Among the different types of sutta, this is to be considered an operational sutta.

yathā[2] digusamāhārasamāse ekattañ ca napuṃsakaliṅgattañ ca hoti tathā dvande[3] samāhārasamāse pi pāṇi-pe-ādīnaṃ 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 avuttasamuccayattho. tena assamahiṃsan ti ādiṃ[1] saṅgaṇhāti[2]. tathā hi atthabyākhyāne pi vuttaṃ. idha cakāro samuccayattho. tena kiṃ sijjhatī ti ce. assamahiṃsa[3] icc evam ādīnaṃ saṅgahaṇatthaṃ. tatra hi pasvatthe[4] assamahiṃsassa[5] vibhāsāsampatte, ettha[6] casaddena niyamekattaṃ hoti napuṃsakaliṅgattañ cā ti.

Alternatively, [the word "and"] expresses accumulation of what has not been stated. With that (*tena*), it includes examples such as "horse-buffalo" (*assamahiṃsaṃ*), 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*)."

---

1 S *ādi.* T om.

2 C om. *tena assamahiṃsan ti ādiṃ saṅgaṇhāti.*

3 C, S, U, T *mahisaṃ.*

4 B, D *pasutthattā.* S, U *pasuttattā.* T *sugathattha.*

5 C, S, T *mahisassa.*

6 S *ekattha.*

pāṇyaṅgatthe ti pāṇisaṅkhātassa[1] sattassa avayavatthe. turiyaṅgatthe ti[2] 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 ceva[3] ātatavitataṃ ghanaṃ
susiraṃ ceti[4] turiyaṃ pañcaṅgikam 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 (*vitatam*), a drum completely covered with leather (*ātatavitataṃ*), a cymbal (*ghanaṃ*), and a hollow (*susiraṃ*).

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 *pāṇasaṅkhātassa.*

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 ākaḍḍitvā[1] onaddhaṃ ekataḷaturiyaṃ. vitataṃ nāma ubhato ākaḍḍhitvā onaddhaṃ ubhayatalatūriyaṃ. ātatavitataṃ nāma ubhato[2] ca majjhato ca sabbato[3] pariyonaddhaṃ tūriyaṃ. ghanaṃ nāma samatāḷādi.[4] susiraṃ nāma vaṃsādī ti[5].

Herein, *ātataṃ* means (*nāma*): among the drums which are covered by leather, that instrument (*turiya*) which is tied up (*ākaḍḍhitvā*) and covered (*onaddhaṃ*) on one side (*ekataḷa*) [only]; *vitataṃ* means that instrument which is covered and tied up on both sides; *ātatavitataṃ* means that instrument which is covered all around, on both sides and in the middle; *ghanaṃ* means cymbal (*sammatāḷa*), etc.; "hollow" (*susiraṃ*) means "flute" (*vaṃsa*), etc.

|| vibhāsā rukkhatiṇapasudhanadhaññajanapadādīnañ ca || 325 ||

325. And optionally [in the case] of trees (*rukkha*), grasses (*tiṇa*), animals (*pasu*), wealth (*dhana*), crops (*dhañña*), countries (*janapada*), etc.

tipadam idaṃ. vibhāsā ti vikappanattha. rukkha-pe-dīnan ti sambandhachaṭṭhīkāri. cā ti anukaḍḍhana. saññā-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." (*rukkha-pe-dīnaṃ*) is a genitive of relation [expressing] that which

---

1 S, T *ākaḍḍhetvā*.

2 C, T *ubhato ca*.

3 S om. T *sabba*.

4 S, T read *ghanaṃ nāma sammatāḷādi* after *vaṃsādi ti*.

5 C, S om.

undergoes a grammatical operation; "and" (*ca*) [expresses] recurrence (*anukaḍḍhana*). Among the different types of sutta, this one is to be considered an operational sutta. Here, the word "optionally" (*vibhāsā*) has the same meaning (*samānattho*) as the word "alternatively" (*vāsaddena*).

vuttañ ca

kvaci navā ca ekatthā yebhuyyenekarūpakā[1]

vā vibhāsā[2] **samānatthā pāyenobhayarūpakā**[3] **ti.**

And it has been stated:

"[The words] 'sometimes' and 'preferably not,' having one single meaning (*ekatthā*) [that is, both having the same meaning], generally (*yebhuyyena*) [accept] one form (*ekarūpakā*); [the words] 'or' (*vā*) [and] 'optionally' (*vibhāsā*), having a common meaning (*samānatthā*), generally (*pāyena*) [accept] both forms (*ubhayarūpakā*).

NOTE: It is interesting that Saddhammajotipāla explicitly states the similarity of meaning between *vibhāsā* (Skt. *vibhāṣā*) and *vā*. This equation is disputed in Sanskrit grammatical literature after the different interpretations of Pāṇini 1.1.44 *na veti vibhāṣā*. Kiparsky has interpreted this rule in the sense that *vibhāṣā* does not simply express option, but an option (*vā*) that is not (*na*) preferable. Kiparsky has inferred that *vā* expresses an option that is preferable. According to the same scholar, the formula *anyatarasyām* in Pāṇini expresses a neutral optionality. The situation seems to be quite diferent in Pāli grammar. The technical expression *kvaci* means literally "in some places" and *navā* means literally "or not." According to this stanza, if, in expressing an alternative, we use *kvaci* or *navā*, that alternative is considered as not preferable. If we, conversely, use *vā* or *vibhāsā*, the alternative is free and we can opt for any of the two possible forms as equally valid (see Chapter 2).

---

1 U *yebhuyyenanekarūpakā*.

2 T *vā ti vibhāsā*. Remarkable resemblance with P. 1.1.44.

3 S, T *yebhūyenobhayarūpakā*.

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 (*anantarasuttena*) 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. sutte[1] 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 ti*) 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 (*dutiyā*), 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.

rūpasiddhiyaṃ pana bhāvasattamībhāvena vuttaṃ.

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 hotī 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[1]vidhāyakañ ca saññāvidhāyakañ ca hoti. kasmā imasmiṃ samāsappakaraṇe kāriyabhūtaṃ samasanaṃ va[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 tadā[3] so samāso ti[4].

That is why he says: "When they [i.e. words] are combined (*samasyante*), then that is a compound."

---

1 D *samasana.*

2 C om.

3 C, S om.

4 T *hotī ti.*

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 kammadhārayasañño hoti*).[5]

tattha[4] tulyaṃ adhikaraṇaṃ yesaṃ tāni[5] tulyādhikaraṇāni. yesaṃ padānaṃ bhinnappavattinimitte pi adhikaraṇaṃ attho tulyaṃ samānaṃ[6] eko iti tasmā tulyādhikaraṇānī ti attho. bhinnappavattinimittānaṃ hi padānaṃ ekasmiṃ [151] atthe pavatti tulyādhikaraṇatā[7] ti.

Herein (*tattha*), those [words] for which the substratum (*adhikaraṇaṃ*) is the same, they are "of the same substratum." That is to say (*ti attho*), of those words, even if they are different regarding the cause of application, the substratum, that is the referent (*attho*), [is] the same, i.e. common, i.e. one. That is why [they are called] "of the same substratum." Because equality of substratum (*tulyādhikaraṇatā*) [is] the application (*pavatti*) on one object (*atthe*) of words that are different regarding their cause of application.

NOTE: The word *pavuttinimitta* (Skt. *pravṛttinimitta*) means, according to the DSG: "cause of the application of a word which is shown by the word when the affix *tva* or *tā* is added to it (...). There are given four such causes: *jāti, guṇa, kriyā* and *saṃjñā*." For instance, in a word such as *mahāpuriso* ("great person"), both *mahā* and *puriso* refer to the same reality, a particular person. But the reason or cause (*nimitta*) that makes us call this person *mahā* is his *mahatta* "greatness," which is a quality (*guṇa*), and what makes us call him *puriso* is his *purisatta* "humanness." These two qualities are the cause of application (*pavattinimitta*) of the words *mahā* and *purisa* respectively. For a discussion of this philosophical term in Sanskrit grammatical and philosophical literature, see Matilal 2005: 78.

---

5 Kacc-v 112,8–9: *dve padāni tulyādhikaraṇāni yadā samassante tadā so samāso kammadhārayasañño hoti.*

4 C om.

5 B, U *ye santā ti.* D *yesaṃ tānī ti.*

6 U *samānānaṃ.*

7 S *tulyādhikaraṇā.* T *tulyadhikaraṇi.*

kammam iva dvayaṃ dhāretī[1] ti kammadhārayo. yathā[2] hi kaṭaṃ karotī ty ādīsu kaṭādikaṃ kammaṃ karaṇakiriyañ ca kaṭādinā sādhetabbaṃ nisīdanādikaṃ kiriyāya payojanañ ca dhāreti, kaṭādike kamme sati taṃdvayassa sambhavato[3]. tathāyaṃ pi samāso ekatthassa jotakāni bhinnapavattinimittāni dve nāmapadāni dhāreti. tasmiṃ samasane sati ekasmiṃ atthe visesanavisesitabbabhūtassa nāmadvayassa[4] sambhavato ti.

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 *dhārayatī*. C *dārayati*.

2 U *tathā*.

3 D *sambhavanato*.

4 C *dvayassa*.

so ca samāso chabbidho: visesanapubbapado visesanobhayapado upamānapubbapado[1] upamānuttarapado sambhāvano avadhāraṇo 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 nīluppalaṃ sītuṇhan ty ādi. upamāpubbapado yathā saṅkhapaṇḍaran ty ādi. upamānuttarapado[2] yathā nayanuppalaṃ narasīho ty ādi. sambhāvano yathā guṇabuddhī ty ādi. avadhāraṇo yathā paññāratanaṃ guṇadhanaṃ 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

visesanapubbubhayo 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.

visesanobhayapadaṃ[2] **vajjetvā pañcavidho ti pi vadanti.**

They also say that it is fivefold, rejecting the [category] "with both words being qualifiers."[3]

nanipātapubbapado kupubbapado[4] **pādipubbapado cā ti imehi tīhi saddhiṃ navavidho ti pi**[5] **rūpasiddhiyaṃ 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:

  visesanapubbapado visesanobhayapado

  upamānapubbapado upamānuttaro pi ca

  sambhāvanovadhāraṇo chabbidho kammadhārayo ti.

  They all express the same meaning.

2 T *visesanubhayaṃ.*

3 This is a reference to Mmd-pṭ 174,21*f.*

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*
> *upamāvadhāraṇañ ca kunapādipubbaṃ 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 purisasaddaṃ[1] 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 *nimittaṃ kampurisasaddaṃ* for *-nimittakaṃ purisasaddaṃ.*

saddānaṃ visesanavisesitabbabhāvena tadatthānam pi visesanavisesitabbabhāvo 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.

tulyādhikaraṇabhāvappasiddhatthaṃ[1] payutto tasaddo. so yeva mahā.[2] so yeva puriso. nañño mahā.[3] nañño[4] puriso[5] ti mahāsaddassa ca purisasaddassa ca ekaṃ atthaṃ dīpeti. casaddadvayaṃ pana[6] ekasmiṃ atthe pavattāni bhinnappavattinimittāni dve nāmapadāni samuccino ti. esa[7] nayo cata[8]saddayogakammadhārayavākyesu sesesu pi[9] 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 *ppasiddhattha.* S *paṃsiddhatthaṃ.*

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] kathaṃ atthasamāso siyā. ekatthībhāvato[2] ti siyā. vākyesu[3] bhinnappavattinimittatthānaṃ[4] ekasmiṃ dabbe ṭhitabhāvato ti. nīluppalaṃ sītuṇhan ti ettha ca[5] nīlañ ca nīlaguṇayuttañ ca taṃ uppalañ ca uppalajātiyuttañ cā ti nīluppalaṃ. sītañ ca sītalakkhaṇayuttañ ca taṃ uṇhañ ca uṇhalakkhaṇañ[6] cā ti sītuṇhaṃ. tejodhātu. atha vā. sītaguṇayuttañ ca[7] uṇhaguṇayuttañ cā 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" (*nīluppalaṃ*) 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 (*lakkhaṇa*) "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 *bhinnappavattitthānaṃ.*

5 C om.

6 S *uṇhalakkhaṇayuttāni.* U *uṇhayuttalakkhaṇañ.* T, D *uṇhalakkhaṇayuttañ.*

7 C, T *ca taṃ.*

tattha   nīlaguṇasaddappavattinimittako   nīlasaddappavattinimittaṃ setarattuppalasādhāraṇattā jātisaddappavattinimittaṃ[1] uppalasaddaṃ viseseti, tehi nivatteti. taṃnimittako uppalasaddo ca bhamaraṅgārādinīlasādhāraṇattā[2] taṃnimittaṃ[3]   nīlasaddaṃ   viseseti,   tato   nivatteti.   tasmāyaṃ   samāso visesanobhayapado   nāma.   catasaddatthā[4]   heṭṭhā   vuttanayā   va.   evaṃ sītuṇhasamāse[5] pi suddhasītasuddhuṇhasādhāraṇaṃ katvā veditabbaṃ.

Herein, the word "blue" as a cause of application, which has as the cause of its application the word expressing the quality "blue," qualifies (*viseseti*) 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 (*viseseti*) 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 *taṃnimittaṃ*. 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 *catasaddā*.

5 S, T *sītuṇhasamāso*.

of this passage is that a *kammadhāraya* in which one word is expresses a quality and the orther word a substance, involves mutual qualification, and therefore we have to understand that even *jāti* is somehow *visesana*. In this way we avoid assimilating *guṇa* to *visesana*. 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. naroyaṃ sīho vīyā ti. ettha vākyesu pubbapade 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 *guṇasambhavananidassanatthena.*

4 C, T *sambhāvana.*

NOTE: Sadd gives the example *dhammo ti buddhi dhammabuddhi* (Sadd 752, 2–3).

guṇo eva dhanan ti ettha vākye niyamanivattanatthena avadhāraṇabhūtena[1] evasaddena yuttattāyaṃ samāso avadhāraṇakammadhārayo nāma. ettha hi evakāro puggalassa[2] dhanatthaṃ aññehi[3] aguṇehi[4] suvaṇṇarajatādidhanehi[5] 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 saddhādīsu[6] sattasu dhanesu[7] niyāmeti[8] accantaṃ yojeti dhanasaddassa aññehi suvaṇṇādīhi sādhāraṇañ ca anujānāti citto dhanudharo[9] evā ti ettha viya.

And it restricts (*niyameti*), that is it relates (*yojeti*) completely (*accantaṃ*), the individual person (*puggalaṃ*) in the [domain of the] seven wealths that are faith, etc.; and it recognises what is common (*sādhāraṇaṃ*) between the word "wealth" (*dhanasaddassa*) and other [types

---

1 S *athāguṇabhūtena.*

2 S *pubbalassa.* T *pussalassa nimittaṃ.*

3 C reads *aññehi guṇehi asādhāraṇañ ca anujānāti.*

4 S reads *guṇehi*, pencil correction adds *a-*.

5 D *suvaṇṇarajātādidhanehi.*

6 C *saṅgādisu.*

7 C om.

8 U *niyameti.* 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 (*dhana-uddhara* "increaser of wealth") and follower of the Buddha. He is mentioned in some canonical texts (see DPPN sv. *citta*[1]). For the "seven wealths" (*satta dhanāni*), see A IV 4, 28–5, 1: *sattimāni, bhikkhave, dhanāni. katamāni satta. saddhādhanaṃ, sīladhanaṃ, hirīdhanaṃ, ottappadhanaṃ, sutadhanaṃ, cāgadhanaṃ, paññādhanaṃ. imāni kho, bhikkhave, satta dhanānī ti.* For *saddhādhana*, see also Sadd 752, 8–16.

tividho hi evakāro. ayogavyavacchedo[1] aññayogavyavacchedo[2] accantayogabyavacchedo[3] cā ti.

For the word *eva* is of three types: distinction (*vyavaccheda*) through non-union (*ayoga*) [i.e. exclusion]; distinction through union with another (*aññayoga*) [i.e. association]; distinction through complete union (*accantayoga*) [i.e. identification].

tenāha[4]
citto dhanuddharo[5] eva pāttho[6] eva dhanudharo[7]
nīlaṃ sarojaṃ bhavat[8]eva udāharaṇam assidan[9] ti.

---

1 B *aññāyogabyavacchedo.* S *ayogābyavacchedo.* U, T om.

2 S *aññayogābyavacchedo.* U repeats the word.

3 B, U *accantasaṃyogābyavacchedo.* S *accantasaṃyogā.*

4 C *vuttañ ca.*

5 B, T, D *dhanudharo.*

6 B, U, D *pāṭho.* C *pātho.* S *pādho.*

7 C, T *dhanuddharo.*

8 S *pāda c* reads *nilo sarojaṃ bhavito,* corrected to *bhavite.*

9 S *idhaṃ.*

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 dhanuddharo[3] evā ti ettha visesanato paranipāto evakāro cittassa yo[4] dhanuddharabhāvo[5] tassa cittaṃ vinā aññehi puggalehi ayogattaṃ[6] nivatteti. aññehi sambandhaṃ anujānātī ti attho. cittanāmakaṃ[7] puggaladabbañ ca dhanuddharabhāvaguṇe[8] niyameti.

---

1 *Payogasiddhi* ad Mogg 67:

byavacchedaphalaṃ vākyaṃ tato citto dhanuddharo

pāttho dhanuddharo nīluppalam atthī ti taṃ yathā.

ettha nipāto ti eva iti nipāto. appayutto pi evasaddo evaṃ yojetabbo. citto dhanuddharo evā ti visesanena yutto ayogavivacchedako. dhanunā yoge patiṭṭhāpanato. pāttho eva dhanuddharo ti visessena yutto aññayogavivacchedako. dhanuddharattassa pātthasaṃkhātaajjune eva patiṭṭhāpanato. nīluppalam atth' evā ti kriyāya yutto accantāyogavivacchedako. nīlu-ppalassa sabbhāve yeva patiṭṭhāpanato.

2 Jhalakīkar, 2011: 191.

3 S, T, D *dhanudharo.*

4 T *yogassa.*

5 U, T dhanudharabhāvo.

6 S *ayogatthaṃ.*

7 C om.

8 U *dhanudharabhāvaguṇe.* T *dhanudhabhāvaguṇe.*

In the example "Citta is the only [person] that increases wealth," the meaning is: the enclitic particle (*paranipāto*) *eva* after the qualifier (*visesanato*) exludes (*nivatteti*) 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 (*niyameti*) 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.

pāttho[1] eva dhanudharo[2] ti ettha[3] visessato[4] paranipāto evakāro pātthaṃ[5] vinā aññehi[6] saddhiṃ dhanudharabhāvassa[7] saṃyogattaṃ[8] nivatteti. taṃ pātthasmiṃ[9] yeva niyametī ti attho. pātthapuggaladabbassa[10] pana aññaguṇehi sādhāraṇattaṃ[11] 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 *pāṭho.* T *pādho.*

2 B, C, D *dhanuddharo.* S *dhanudhanuro.*

3 B, U om.

4 B, S, U, T, D *visesyato.*

5 My emendation. B, C, D, *pāṭhaṃ.* S, T *pādhaṃ.* U *pāṭhaṃ.*

6 S, U, D *aññehi puggalehi.*

7 U, T *dhanuddharabhāvassa.*

8 S, T *ayogattaṃ.*

9 B, C, U, D *pāthasmiṃ.* S, T *pādhasmiṃ.*

10 S, T *pādhapuggaladabbassa.* U, D *pāṭhapuggaladabbassa.*

11 C *asādhāraṇattaṃ.*

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.*

nīlaṃ sarojaṃ bhavatevā ti ettha kriyāya[1] paranipāto evakāro sarojassa uppalassa accantaṃ nīlaguṇavirahattaṃ[2] nivatteti. sabbakālaṃ sarojadabbe nīlaguṇassa [153] atthibhāvaṃ niyametī ti attho. nīlaguṇassa pana aññehi bhamarādidabbehi sādhāraṇattañ ca sarojajātiyā añña[3]setādiguṇasādhāraṇattañ[4] ca anujānātī ti ayam attho saddasatthavidūnaṃ[5] 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 *virahatthaṃ.*

3 B, U, D *aññaṃ.*

4 U *setādiguṇasādhāraṇatthañ.* T *setādiguṇadhāraṇattañ.*

5 I follow D. B, C, U *saddatthavidūnaṃ.* S *saddhatthavidhūnaṃ.* T *saddavidūnaṃ.*

atha vā. dhanuddharo[1] evā ti ettha evakāro cittadabbaṃ aññaguṇehi nivattetvā dhanuddharabhāvaguṇe[2] yeva niyamaṃ karoti. dhanuddharabhāvaguṇassa[3] 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.

pāttho[4] evā ti ettha evakāro dhanudharaṇattaṃ guṇaṃ[5] aññehi dabbehi[6] nivattetvā pāthadabbe[7] yeva niyamaṃ karoti. pāthassa[8] 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 *dhanudharobhāvaguṇe*.

3 B, S, U, T *dhanudharo bhāvaguṇassa*. D add. *pana*.

4 S, T *pādho*. U, D *pāṭho*.

5 B, S, U, T, D *dhanudharattaguṇaṃ*.

6 B, S, U, T, D *aññadabbehi*.

7 S, T *pādhadabbe*. U, D *pāṭhadabbe*.

8 S, T *pādhassa*. U, D *pāṭhassa*.

bhavatevā ti ettha evakāro nīlaguṇassa bhavanakriyaṃ abhavanakriyato nivattetvā sarojadabbe yeva[1] niyamaṃ karoti. nīlaguṇassa pana bhamarādi[2]aññadabbehi sādhāraṇattaṃ ca sarojajātiyā[3] aññaguṇehi sādhāraṇattañ ca anujānātī ti. ayaṃ[4] attho ganthakārakānaṃ[5] 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*).

evaṃpakāro cāyaṃ samāso niccāniccavasenāpi duvidho. tattha niccasamāso yathā abhidhammo kupuriso ty ādi. aniccasamāso yathā mahāpuriso ty ādi.

And such a type of (*evaṃpakāro*) 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.*

2 B, U *bhamaraṅgārādi.* S, D *bhamaraṅgādi.* T *bhaparaṅkārādi.*

3 S *saro va jātiyā.*

4 B, S, U, T, D *ayañ ca.*

5 S, U, T *gandhakārakānaṃ.*

|| saṅkhyāpubbo digu || 327 ||

327. [A *kammadhāraya*] in which the first member is a number [is called] *digu.*

dvipadam idaṃ. saṃkhyāpubbo ti saññī. digū ti saññā. saññā-pe-saññāsuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. saṃkhyā pubbo padhāno yassa soyaṃ saṃkhyāpubbo.

This [sutta consists] of two words. "In which the first member is a number" (*saṃkhyāpubbo*) 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 ādiṃ saṅgaṇhāti. dve gāvo digu. saṃkhyāpubbavasena ca tulyādhikaraṇavasena ca digusadisattā ayam pi samāso digu nāma. tehi vā dvīhi yathāvuttalakkhaṇehi gacchati pavattatī ti digu. saṃkhyāpubbattanapuṃsake-kattasaṃkhātehi dvīhi lakkhaṇehi gato avagato ti digū ti pi vadanti. idaṃ lakkhaṇaṃ asamāhāradigumhi 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 (*pavattati*), with those two (*dvīhi*) aforementioned characteristics [namely a numeral preceeding 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.

ayaṃ hi digusamāso duvidho samāhārāsamāhāravasena. tattha samāhāradigu yathā tayo lokā samāhaṭā[1] ti[2] tilokan ty ādi. asamāhāradigu yathā puggalo[3] catuddiso[4], dasasahassacakkavāḷānī ty ādi. ekabhāvianekabhāvivasena pi duvidho.

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[5] 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 dvipadhāno[2] pakāsito

vatthuttayaṃ pubbapadhāno tilokaṃ uttarapadhāno[3] 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*: *pubbapadatthapadhāno digu. saṅkhyāparicchinnattā uttarapadatthassa. tilokan ti yathā. uttarapadatthapadhāno tappuriso.*

---

2 B, U *dvipaṭṭhāno.* 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.*

[154] tasmā tilokaṃ ty ādīsu samāsasaññā saṃkhyāsaddassa saṅkhyeyyavācakattā kammadhārayasaññā, saṃkhyāpadhānattā digusaññā, uttarapadatthapadhānattā tappurisasaññā ca[1] hoti.

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). *vatthuttayaṃ* is apparently treated as an exception that is best explained if included in the category *digu*.

---

1 B, U, D om.

|| ubhe tappurisā || 328 ||

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 saṃgaṇhāti.[1] tassa puriso tappuriso. yathā hi ayaṃ tappurisasaddo uttarapadatthappadhānattā uttarapadatthe yeva vattati, tathā bhūmigato ty ādi samāso pī ti[2]. 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 disolved 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 *gaṇhāti.*

2 C om. S *pi ti.*

yakkhasadisattā yakkho ti vohāro viya. ime hi[1] **dve digukammadhārayasamāsā uttarapadatthappadhānabhāvena tappurisekadesasadisattā tappurisā ti vuccanti. yathā samuddo**[2] **hi mayā**[3] **diṭṭho ti ādi. keci pana ime dve samāsā**[4] **ubhayatappurisā ti ekanāmaṃ katvā iminā saddhiṃ dutīyatappurisādayo sattā**[5] **ti vadanti. tasmā**[6] **taṃ**[7] **saddanītiādīsu ubhayatappurisasaññā nāma natthī ti vatvā paṭikkhipanti**[8]**.**

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 homogeneus, 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-ṭ (174, 29*f.*). Saddhammajotipāla seems to share the opinion of those who reject this interpretation of Mmd-ṭ, because this analysis is not found either in Sadd or in other grammars. Although some consider Sadd later than Mmd-ṭ (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 *tesaṃ.*

8 S *paṭipakkhipanti.*

abrāhmaṇo ti ādīsu nasaddattho duvidho. pasajjapaṭisedho pariyudāsa[1]paṭisedho cā ti. tattha pasajjapaṭisedho nāma uttarapadatthasseva paṭisedhamattaṃ. vatthuno natthibhāvo. pariyudāsa[2]paṭisedho nāma uttarapadatthato[3] aññatrasadisādivatthumhi pavattanaṃ jotanañ ca.

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.[4]

tenāha

pasajjapaṭisedhassa lakkhaṇaṃ vatthunatthitā

vatthutoññatra[5] yā vutti pariyudāsassa[6] lakkhaṇan ti.

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 *uttarapadato.* U *uttarapadatho.*

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.*

tattha assaddhabhojī akatvā ti ādīsu nasaddo pasajjappaṭisedhattho. abrāhmaṇo ti ādīsu nasaddo pariyudāsa[1]ppaṭisedhattho. na brāhmaṇo ti ādivākye samāsasaññā ca nasaddabrāhmaṇasaddānaṃ[2] ekassa brāhmaṇasadisatthassa vācakattā tulyādhikaraṇavasena kammadhārayasaññā ca jotakajotitabbabhūtattā[3] ca visesanavisesitabbabhūtattā[4] ca uttarapadatthappadhānattā ca tappurisasaññā ca hoti.

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 committment [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 *jotakajotitabbabhūtatthā.*

4 B, S, T, D *visesanavisesitabbattā.* U *visesitabbattā.*

apañcavassan ti ettha na[1] pañcavassan[2] ti vākye samāsasaññā ca. tulyādhikaraṇattā kammadhārayasaññā ca. saṃkhyāpubbattā digusaññā ca. uttarapadatthappadhānattā tappurisasaññā ca hoti. yathā ca[3] na pañcavassan ti vākye samāsasaññā ca[4] kammadhārayasaññā ca[5] tappurisasaññā ca hoti. evaṃ sesasamāsesu pi daṭṭhabbaṃ.

With regard to the example *apañcavassaṃ* "not lasting five years," in the sentence "[it does] not last five years" the technical name "compound" receives the [specific] technical name *kammadhāraya* because of the common substratum [of the two members]; and receives the [specific] technical name *digu* because of the predominance[6] of the numeral; and receives the [specific] technical name *tappurisa* because of the predominance of the last referent. And in the same way that in the sentence *na pañcavassaṃ* "[it does] not last five years" the technical name "compound" receives the [specific] technical name *kammadhāraya* and the [specific] technical name *tappurisa,* similarly it has to be considered in the rest of the compounds.

---

1 B, S, T om.

2 B, S, U, D *pañcavassānī.*

3 B, S, U, T, D om. *yathā ca.*

4 B, S, U, T, D om.

5 S, U, T, D om.

6 I follow the interpretation of *pubbako* as meaning *padhāno* given previously.

[155]

|| amādayo parapadehi[1] || 329 ||

329. [When words ending in case endings] *aṃ*, etc. [are combined] with the following words, [the technical name *tappurisa* applies].

dvipadam idaṃ. amādayo ti kammattha, parapadehī ti sahatthatatīyā. saññā-pe-saññāsuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

This [sutta consists] of two words. "*aṃ*, etc." (*amādayo*) [expresses] the object; "with the following words" (*parapadehi*) [expresses] a comitative instrumental (*sahattha*). Among the different types of sutta, this has to be considered a sutta that provides a technical name.

amādayo ti idaṃ saññī ti pi vadanti. taṃ na yuttaṃ. idaṃ hi suttaṃ samāsa[2]vidhāyakañ[3] ca saññāvidhāyakañ ca hoti. tasmā kāriyabhūto samāso va saññī. na kārībhūtā[4] amādayo ti viññāyati. tenāha yadā-pe-so samāso[5] ti. amādayo ti[6] tā vibhattiyo parapadehi nāmehi saddhiṃ yadā samasyante tadā so samāso tappurisasañño hoti. ettha hi amādayo ti idaṃ vibhattippadhānavasena

---

1 = Kacc. B, S, T, D *parapadebhi*. The meaning remains the same and I will not note the variant in the commentary.

2 B, U, T, D *samasana*. S *samasanaṃ*.

3 S *vidhividhāyakañ*.

4 C, T *kāribhūto*.

5 Kacc-v 113,13–14: *yadā samāsante tadā so samāso tappurisasañño hoti*.

6 B, U, T, D om.

vuttaṃ. amādivibhatyantāni pubbapadānī[1] ty attho daṭṭhabbo. teneva ca[2] rūpasiddhiyaṃ amādivibhatyantāni yuttatthāni[3] padānī[4] 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: *saraṇaṃ gato* becomes *saraṇagato*, 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: *amādivibhatyantāni yuttatthāni pubbapadāni nāmehi parapadebhi saha vibhāsā samasyante so samāso tappurisasañño hoti.*

6 Kacc-v 113,13–14.

amādayo ti iminā paṭhamātappurisaṃ nivatteti. *ubhe tappurisā* [Kacc 328] ti ettha sutte paṭhamātappurisassa gahitattā.

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[1] pipphaliyā aḍḍhapipphalī.[2] aḍḍhaṃ kosā takiyā[3] aḍḍhakosā takī[4] ti ādīsu paṭhamapadaṃ uttarapadabhāvena parivattanaṭṭhānesu ca. buddhasaraṇaṃ gato[5] ti ādīsu iti lopaṭṭhānesu ca paṭhamātappuriso labbhatī 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 *pipphalī* = *aḍḍhapipphalī*," "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: *pipphalī* (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 *aḍhapippali*.

3 B *tatīyā*. U *takīyā*.

4 S *takiṃ*.

5 Sadd 754,22: *saraṇagato*. 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 *paṭhamātappurisa*, 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 (*saṃkhepato*), 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 tatīyā catutthī pañcamī tathā

chaṭṭhī ca sattamī ceti[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.*

2 Cf. Sadd 759,16–19: *saṃkhepato suddhatappuriso kammadhārayatappuriso digutappuriso ti tayo tappurisā, vitthārato pana paṭhamātappuriso dutiyātappurisādayo cha cā ti satta tappurisā bhavanti.*

3 C *ceti.* U *co.*

4 B, S, U, T *ubhayatappuriso.*

rūpasiddhiyaṃ pana. āmalakassa aḍḍhaṃ[1] aḍḍhāmalakaṃ.[2] pipphaliyā[3] aḍḍhaṃ aḍḍhapipphalī[4] ti chaṭṭhītappurisaṭṭhāne āharitvā paṭhamā[5]tappuriso ti vuttaṃ.[6]

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*.'"[7]

NOTE: *āmalaka* is emblic myrobalan, i.e. its seed (CPD s.v.).

vuttañ ca tattha. kvaci accantādīsu amādivibhatyantaṃ pubbapadaṃ bhavati[8] parapadaṃ[9] bhavati. yathā antaṃ atikkantaṃ accantaṃ, rattiyā aḍḍhaṃ aḍḍharattaṃ ty ādi[10].

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, 5*f.* reads: *kvaci accantādīsu amādivibhatyantaṃ pubbapadaṃ paraṃ sambhavati. yathā antaṃ atikkantaṃ accantaṃ [...] rattiyā aḍḍhaṃ aḍḍharattaṃ.*

---

1 T *aḍhaṃ.*

2 T *aḍhāmalakaṃ.*

3 B, S, T *pippaliyā.* U *pipaliyā.*

4 B, S *aḍḍhapippalī.* U *aḍḍhapipalī.* T *aḍhapippali.*

5 B *paraṃ.* U, D *para.*

6 I have not found the *pipphalī* example in Rūp.

7 Rūp 198,19–22: *āmalakassa addhaṃ addhāmalakaṃ. āmalakaddhaṃ vā. kahāpaṇassa aḍḍha aḍḍhakahāpaṇaṃ. aḍḍamāsakaṃ rattiyā aḍḍha aḍḍharattaṃ. rattiyā pubbaṃ pubbarattaṃ. rattiyā pacchā paccharattaṃ.* This passage is included in the *sattamī tappurisa* section.

8 S, U, D om.

9 C *paraṃ.*

10 B, U, T, D om.

tappuriso ti[1] tassa puriso ti[2] tappuriso. tappurisasadisattā ayam pi samāso tappuriso nāma. yakkhasadisapuggale yakkhavohāro viya.[3] yathā hi[4] tappurisasaddo uttarapadatthappadhānattā uttarapadatthe yeva pavattati. tathā ayam pi samāso uttarapadatthe yeva pavattati. pubbapadassa atthaṃ muñcitvā parapadatthe[5] yeva labbhatī ti attho.

tappuriso [is disolved as] *tassa puriso* "his man." Because of the similarity with [the compound] *tappurisa*, a compound is also called *tappurisa*, in the same way as one is called *yakkha* out of being similar to a [real] *yakkha*. For, as the word *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 saṃkhepato duvidho. suddhatappuriso missakatappuriso cā ti. vitthārato pana aṭṭhavidho hoti. dutīyātappurisādayo ca dve kammadhārayadigutappurisā cā ti.

And this [type of compound, namely] *tappurisa*, in short, is twofold: pure *tappurisa* and mixed *tappurisa*. In detail, however, it is eightfold: accusative *tappurisa*, and the other [five case endings], plus the other two, namely *kammadhāraya tappurisa* [otherwise known as nominative *tappurisa*] and *digu tappurisa*.

---

1 C om. *tappuriso ti.*

2 S, U, T om.

3 See Mmd-pṭ 173,21–23: *tassa puriso ti tappuriso, tappurisasadisattā ayam pi samāso tappuriso ti vuccati, yakkhasadisassa yakkho ti vohāro viya.*

4 S, T *hi ayaṃ.*

5 B *pubbapadatthe.* C *parapadattho.* I follow the Mss.

tenāha [156]

dutīyādisattamyantā chadhā[1] tappurisā tathā

dve kammadhārayadigu cā[2] 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.

imasmiṃ hi samāse kathaṃ atthasamāso siyā. samāsasaddena uttarapadatthasseva gahitattā[3] ti siyā. sabbasseva[4] pubbapadatthassa[5] ajahitattā.[6] rājapuriso ti ettha hi rājasaddo rājadabbam[7] eva jahitvā[8] taṃ[9]sambandhasakatthaṃ gahetvā uttarapadatthe[10] pavattatī ti.

In this compound, indeed (*hi*), 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 *sabbasse.* U *sabbassa.*

5 C, T add. *ca.*

6 C *agahitattā.*

7 C, S, T *rājadabbam.*

8 S *hitvā.*

9 C *taṃsambandhasakatthaṃ.*

10 C add. *yeva.*

|| aññapadatthesu bahubbīhi || 330 ||

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. bahubbīhī ti saññā. saññā-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 samāsapadabhūtāni[1] yadā samasyante tadā so samāso bahubbīhisañño 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 vīhayo yassa soyaṃ[1] bahubbīhi. aññapadatthappadhānabhāvena ca[2] bahubbīhisadisattā ayam pi samāso bahubbīhī ti vuccati.[3] yathā hi bahubbīhisaddo aññapadatthappadhānabhāvena[4] 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. sattavibhatyantānaṃ[5] vā[6] 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-pṭ 173,30–174,2.

4 D *aññapadatthapadhānabhāve.*

5 S *sattavibhatyatthānaṃ.*

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 dutīyā tatīyā catutthī pañcamī tathā

chaṭṭhī ca sattamī ceva bahubbīhi sattavidho ti.

That is why he stated:

The *bahubbīhi* is sevenfold: [expressing the] first, second, third, fourth as well as the fifth and sixth, and also the seventh case ending.

akkharasamūhe pana chabbidho va[1] bahubbīhī ti vuttaṃ. vuttaṃ hi tattha. dvipado. bahuppado.[2] saṅkhyobhayapado.[3] sahapubbapado.[4] byatihāra[5]lakkhaṇo. disantarāḷalakkhaṇo ti.

In the *Akkharasamūha*, however, it is stated: "the *bahubbīhi* is indeed sixfold." For, there, it is stated: "of two words (*dvipado*), of many words (*bahuppado*), with two words being numerals (*saṅkhyobhayapado*), preceeded by *saha* (*sahapubbapado*), characterized by reciprocity (*byatihāralakkhaṇo*), characterized by an intermediate direction (*disantarāḷalakkhaṇo*)."

tattha dvipado vibhattilopavasena chabbidho. paṭhamāchaṭṭhīupamāvasena ca[6] duvidho.

---

1 C om.

2 S *bahupado ceva.* U, D *bahupado.*

3 C *saṅkhyāhaya.* S *saṅkhyobhayapado tathā.*

4 S, T *sahapubbapado ceva.*

5 T *byatihārassa.*

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 [*bahubbīhi*] 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 upamā ceva chaṭṭhī ca upamā tathā

duvidho dvipado vutto liṅgattayavibhāvito ti.

The [*bahubbīhi*] 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 [*bahubbīhi*] of two words, similarly the one of many words.

saṃkhyobhayapado yathā dve vā tayo vā vācā dvitivācā[1]. cha vā pañca vā vācā ti[2] 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 uddhaṭo[1] samūluddhaṭo.[2] taru.[3] sabhikkhusaṃgho [157]. bhagavā.

The [*bahubbīhi*] preceeded by *saha* [is] like: "of which the root has been pulled out (*samūluddhaṭo*)" i.e. a tree; "[accompanied by] the community of monks," i.e. the Bhagavā.

byatihāralakkhaṇo yathā. musalehi musalehi[4] gahetvā idaṃ yuddhaṃ[5] pavattatī ti musalāmusalī. evaṃ daṇḍādaṇḍī.[6]

Marking reciprocity (*byatihāra*), like "this fight is carried out with clubs (*musalehi*) against clubs, therefore it is called *musalāmusalī*". Similarly with "[a fight] stick [against] stick" (*daṇḍādaṇḍī*).

disantarāḷalakkhaṇo yathā dakkhiṇassā[7] ca pubbassā[8] ca disāya[9] yad antarāḷaṃ 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 *samūlena uddhato*. D *saha mūlena uddhato*.

2 C *samūladdhato*. S *samuddhato*.

3 S *dhāru*. T *tarū*.

4 B, U, D *amusalehi*. S *amusilehi*. It must be *musalehi musalehi*, as *daṇḍehi daṇḍehi*. Cf. Sadd 763,6: *daṇḍehi daṇḍehi paharitvā idaṃ yuddhaṃ pavattatī ti daṇḍādaṇḍī*.

5 S *yuttaṃ*.

6 C *daṇḍādaṇḍa*.

7 U, T *dakkhiṇassa*.

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
cā[2] 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 ti[4] disānaṃ antaro
anudiso[5] 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 paccanīkakiriyāya[1] 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 assā[2] puṇṇamiyā ti aparajjugatā. māso jātassa assa[3] 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 uttarapadaṃ samāsapadato aññena padena samānādhikaraṇaṃ bhavati. aññapadattha[1]uttarapadaṃ ākaḍḍhitvā pavattati.[2] samānādhikaraṇabhāvena tena saddhiṃ sampajjatī[3] ti ayam pi[4] 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 (*pavattati*) 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.

atathābhūtā[5] sesā abāhiratthā[6] nāma bahubbīhī ti[7] ayaṃ saddasatthavidūnaṃ[8] mati.   amhākaṃ   matiyā   pana   aññassa   padassa[9]   samāsapadena samānādhikaraṇattā   aññatthabahubbīhi[10]   nāma.   saddanītiyaṃ   pana bāhiratthabahubbīhī ti vatvā pacchā bāhiratthasamāso pi abāhiratthasamāso[11] hotī ti vuttaṃ.

---

1 B, S, U, D *aññapadañ ca.*

2 B, S, U, T, D *vattati.*

3 B *sampajjhatī.* S *sammajjatī.* U *sambajjhatī.*

4 U, T om.

5 C *atha vā bhūtaṃ.* T *tathābhūtā.*

6 B, S, U, T, D *abāhirattho.*

7 B, U, D om.

8 B, C, S, T *saddatthavidūnaṃ.* U *saddasattavidūnaṃ.*

9 B, S, U, D *aññapadassa.*

10 C *aññatthabahubbīhi.* 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. *anyārtha*[2]). There is a possible influence of *Cāndravyākaraṇa* in Saddhammajotipāla's opinion. This influence is probably related to the influence of the Laṅkan Mahāvihāra in Saddhammajotipāla's education. The grammatical tradition of the Mahāvihāra after Moggallāna is mainly based on Candragomin and other Nālandā erudites (see Gornall, 2012: 68*f.*).

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 aññapadatthassa 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 saddanītīyaṃ[2] 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 *saddanītiyā.*

evaṃ nānappakāro bahubbīhisamāso tagguṇasaṃviññāṇātagguṇasaṃviññāṇa-
vasenā pi duvidho. tattha hi yattha tassa[1] aññapadatthassa visesanabhūto
samāsapadattho aññapadatthena guṇakriyādabbasamavāyavasena viññāyati so
[158] tagguṇasaṃviññāṇo nāma. yathā sasīlo sapañño[2] saputto sathulo[3]
saputtadāro āgāto.[4] buddhappamukhassa saṃghassa mahādānaṃ deti. saputto
gomā dhanimā ti. so pi[5] tagguṇasaṃviññāṇabhāvo[6] guṇakriyādabbavasena
samavāye sambandhe sati hoti, na aññathā ti.

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 aññapadatthena[7] guṇādisamavāyavasena na
viññāyati, so atagguṇasaṃviññāṇo nāma. yathā bahudhanam ānaya, pabbatādīni
khettāni kassati, amalo lokuttaradhammo[8] ti.

---

1 C *yattakassa* for *yattha tassa*.

2 B, S, U, T, D *sa sisso paññavā*.

3 B, S, U, T, D *thūlo*.

4 U, T *āgato*.

5 B, S, U *hi*.

6 D *tagguṇasaṃviññāṇe bhāvo*.

7 B, U, T, D om.

8 S *amalokuttaradhammo*.

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."

ñāse pana payogakriyāhi viññāyatī[1] ti vuttaṃ.

In the *Nyāsa*, however, it is stated: "it is known by the way usages are done (*payogakriyāhi*)."[2]

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.

yattha[3]   visesanabhūto   attho   aññapadatthaggahaṇena   gayhati,   so tagguṇasaṃviññāṇo   nāma.   yathā   lambakaṇṇam   ānayā ti.   yattha   pana visesanabhūto attho aññapadatthaggahaṇena na gayhati so atagguṇasaṃviññāṇo nāma yathā bahudhanam ānayā ti. iti pi rūpasiddhiyaṃ 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*.[4]

---

1 C *ñāyatī.*

2 Mmd 10,11–12: *ettha   ca   tagguṇasaṃviññāṇabahubbīhi   ettha   ca   atagguṇasaṃviññāṇabahubbīhī   ti payogavasena avagantabbaṃ.*

3 S *yassa.* U *yatha.*

4 Rūp 200,11–15.

yattha avayavena viggaho samudāyo samāsattho so tagguṇasaṃviññāṇo nāma. yathā lambakaṇṇo, samalā akusalā[1] 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."[2] This is also stated in the *Saddanīti*.

saṃghārāmo ti ayaṃ samāso kammavācako visesanabhūto hi. āgatasaddo ca samaṇasaddo ca attano atthe appavattitvā[3] dutīyāvibhatyatthabhūte saṃghārāma saṃghārāmasaṃkhāte aññapadatthe 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 *avattitvā*. S *pavattitvā*.

NOTE: The complete example in Kacc-v (114, 4) is: *āgatā samaṇā imaṃ saṅghārāmaṃ so yaṃ āgatasamaṇo saṅghārāmo*. To the best of my knowledge this example is only found in grammatical texts. The *bahubbīhi* is *āgatasamaṇa* which is a qualifier of the external referent *saṃghārāma*, this external referent being the object of the verbal action. The full translation of the *bahubbīhi āgatasamaṇo*, therefore, would be "[the monastery of the congregation where] the ascetic has arrived."

tato samāsapadeneva dutīyābhihitassa kammatthassa abhihitattā puna dutiyā na hoti. yady evaṃ. imasmiṃ samāse kathaṃ atthasamāso siyā. samāsapadassa attano atthaṃ jahitvā aññapadatthe pavattattā ti siyā.

Therefore, since the object (*kammatthassa*) is [already] expressed (*abhihitattā*) by the second case ending by means of the compound word itself, the second case ending does not appear (*na hoti*) again (*puna*) [that is, does not appear redundantly]. If that is so (*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 kiriyākammakārakasambandhañ ca kattukammasambandhañ ca gahetvā aññapadatthe pavattanti[4] ti.

In this way: the words *āgata* and *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.*

4 B, S, T, D *vattantī.* U *pavattantī.*

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 pressuposes an action and a result of this action, and so forth.

evaṃ ayaṃ bahubbīhisamāso pi[1] sāmi[2]kammādikārakānaṃ sattannaṃ atthānaṃ vācako ca abhidheyyaliṅgavasena tiliṅgo ca hoti. na hi chavibhattiyo yeva vācakā honti. atha kho samāsataddhitākhyātakitakā pi vācakā. te[3] 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

dutīyā tatiyā cāpi catutthī pañcamī pi ca

chaṭṭhī ca sattamī cāpi[1] cha-y-imā pi ca vācakā.

samāsataddhitākhyātakitakā pi ca vācakā

vācakā dasadhā ty evaṃ[2] ñātabbā samayaññunā[3].

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 sasāmyattho[4] bhāvo ceko tathaññunā[5]

vaccā aṭṭhavidhā ty evaṃ ñātabbā samayaññunā.

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 (*samayaññunā*).

---

1 B, U, D *cāti*. T *pi ca*.

2 C *dasadhātthe va*. T *dasadhā ty evaṃ*.

3 U *samasaññunā*. T *samayaññunāha*.

4 B, S, U, T, D *chasambandho*.

5 B, S, U, T, D *bhāvo ceko tha viññunā*.

catūsu vācakesv eva ekeko yeva vācako

antatthabāhiratthānaṃ vasenattho dvidhā ṭhito.

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.

samāsapadattho[1]ntattho aññattho bāhyattho mato

bahubbīhisamāsesu abhirūpo ti ādīsu.

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 *bahubbīhi* compounds such as *abhirūpa* "of excellent form."

samāsataddhitākhyātakitakā kira[2] vācakā

antatthaṃ anuttā honti vuttā[3] bāhyattham eva hī ti.

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 gamakattā[1] samāso ti vāsitasaddassa[2] pupphasadda[3]sāpekkhatte sati pi vākye viya attanā apekkhitabbassa pupphatthassa[4] gamakattā antarikā[5]bhāvāpagame[6] va kāraṇan ti ñāpakattā anapekkhitena aññena sānusaddena samāso hoti. devadattassa gurukulan ti ādīsu viya aññāpekkhatte sati pi[7] samāso na hoti.

The compound [works] because of the intelligibility (*gamakattā*), even when it is with expectancy. Therefore (*ti*) 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 *pupphehi*)"]. 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 *pupphavāsitāsānū* ("a mountain peak having the smell of flowers") and the long compound formed around it is found already in Mmd (284, 2*f.*). The passage reads: *vāsitā sānū vāsitasānū sāpekkhatte sati pi gamakattā samāso nānādumapatitapupphehi vāsitasānū yassa, so yaṃ nānādumapatitapupphavāsitasānu. ayaṃ pana bhinnādhikaraṇabahubbīhi* "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 *gammakattā.*

2 C *vaṃsitasaddassa.*

3 My conjecture. C *pubbasadda.* B, U, D *pupphasaddaṃ.* S, T *pubbasaddaṃ.*

4 C *pubbasaddatthassa.* 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 *bahubbīhi* compound] *nānādumapatitapupphavāsitasānu*. Now this is a *bahubbīhi* 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: 168*f.*; and Pind 2013, 115, n.6. If I understood it correctly, the idea of "separated substratum" is taken up by Saddhammajotipāla, but he uses the concept of *antarikābhāva* "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 devadattabakastthānaṃ[1] apekkhituṃ na sakkā. kaṇhasetasaddantarikattā. tasmā kaṇhadantā setapattānī ti samāsā na honti. nāpi devadattassa kaṇhadantā devadattakaṇhadantā. bakassa setapattāni[2] bakasetapattānī ti samāsā honti. kaṇhasetasaddantarikattā ca kaṇhasetasaddānañ ca devadattabakatthānaṃ[3] 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 (*apekkhituṃ*) 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].

nāpi[1] devadattassa kaṇhā devadattakaṇhā. devadattakaṇhā ca te dantā ce ti devadattakaṇhā dantā[2] icc evam ādi samāsā honti. kaṇhādisaddānaṃ devadattādiatthānaṃ[3] anapekkhitattā ti.[4]

Neither is the case that there is such a compound as "Devadatta-black-teeth" (*devadattakaṇhadantā*) 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 *kaṇhā.* 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 devadattakaṇhadantā bhariyā ti vadanti.[5] taṃ tesaṃ matimattaṃ.

Some, however, state: "Devadatta-black-teeth, i.e. [Dedavatta's] wife". But this is only their opinion.

---

1 S, U *keci pana.*

2 D *devadattakaṇhadantā.*

3 S, T *atthāni.*

4 C om. all this paragraph.

5 My conjecture. C *keci pana devadattakaṇhabhariyā ti vadanti.* B, U, T, D *keci pana devadattassa kaṇhā bhariyā dantā bhariyā ti vadanti.* S *keci pana devadattassa kaṇhā bhiriyā dantābhiriyā ti vadanti.*

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 *bahubbīhi 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 sambandhisaddabhūtena[1] **devadattasaddena samāso siyā. rājahatthigavassakan ti ādīsu viyā ti. imasmiṃ bahubbīhisamāse aññapadaṃ tīsu ṭhānesu ṭhitaṃ: ādimhi majjhe ante ca. yathā yassa hatthe patto atthi soyaṃ hatthapatto. nassa anto anantaṃ. chinno hattho yassa soyaṃ chinnahattho 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 *bahubbīhi* 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*.

tenāha[1]

ādiaññapadañ ceva majjhe aññapadaṃ tathā

anta-aññapadañ cāpi tidhā aññapadaṃ ṭhitan ti.

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 sambandhachaṭṭhī. 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 C om.

nāmānan ti[1] anuvattamānattā samuccayo dvando ti vutte[2] siddhe pi kasmā nāmaggahaṇaṃ katan ti[3]. siddhe saty ārambho hi niyamāya vā atthantaraviññāpanāya vā hotī ti vacanato bahutaranāmapadānaṃ viññāpanatthaṃ 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 (*ārambho*) [of explaining it] is (*hoti*) [made] in order to make a restriction (*niyamāya*) or in order to convey another meaning (*atthantaraviññāpanāya*)."[4]

atthabyākhyāne pana kriyānivattanatthan ti vuttaṃ. ekavibhattikānaṃ paṭhamādisamānavibhattikānaṃ bahu[5]nāmānaṃ yo samuccayo atthi so dvandasañño hotī ti attho. ekavibhattikānan ti iminā hi paṭhamādivibhattisamānattaṃ[6] dasseti. na bahuvacanādisamānattaṃ[7].

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]

---

1 B, S, U, T, D om. *nāmānan ti.*

2 S, T om.

3 C, S om.

4 Mmd 272,4*f.*

5 S, T *bahutaṃ.*

6 S, T *samānatthaṃ.*

7 S *samānatthaṃ.* T add. *ti vuttan.*

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.

tena saddanītiyaṃ samaṇo ca brāhmaṇo ca. samaṇā[1] ca brahmaṇā ca. samaṇo[2] ca brāhmaṇā[3] ca. samaṇā[4] ca brahmano[5] cā ti cattāri vākyapadāni 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.*

samuccayanaṃ sampiṇḍanaṃ samuccayo. so pana samuccayo atthavasena kevalasamuccayo anvācayo itaretarayogo samāhāro cā ti catubbidho.

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 kevalasamuccaye[1] ca[2] anvācaye[3] ca samāso na bhavati. kiriyāsāpekkhatāya[4] ayuttatthabhāvato. tattha kiriyaṃ paṭicca bahukārakānaṃ samuccayanaṃ[5] 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 *samuccayaṃ.*

taṃ[1] yathā

cīvaraṃ piṇḍapātañ ca paccayaṃ sayanāsanaṃ

adāsi ujubhūtesu vippasannena[2] 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 bahū[5] 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. vākyānaṃ samuccayanan ti pi vadanti. yathā dānañ ca[6] dehi sīlaṃ ca rakkhāhī ti. tadattajotakā[7] pana casaddā bahū[8] 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, 121*cd*, 122*ab* 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 *bahu.*

6 D om.

7 C *tattha tadatthajotakā.*

8 C, S *bahu.*

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.

itare dve dvandasamāsā bhavanti, bhinnatthānaṃ nāmānaṃ samuccayattā. tesu hi[1] tadatthajotakā casaddā bahū[2] 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.

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 *samaṇabrahmaṇā* "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 accound of being mutually connecting or a collective.

---

1 C om. *tesu hi.*

2 C, T *bahu.*

3 T *yojetuṃ vattanti.*

tenāha. dvidhā dvando ti. dvīsu dvīsu atthesu ṭhito dvando atthasamāso. dvīsu dvīsu padesu ṭhito dvando saddasamāso.[1]

That is why he says: *dvanda* is twofold. A *dvanda* which based (*ṭhito*) on pairs of meanings is a compound of meanings; a *dvanda* which is based on pairs of words is a compound of words.

atha vā. dve dve atthā ca padāni ca ekasamodhānaṃ ettha gacchantī ti dvando. tathā hi saddanītiyam pi vuttaṃ. dve dve padāni ekato[2] **samodhānam ettha gacchantī ti dvando ti.**[3] **ñāse pana dve dve nāmāni**[4] **vā dvando**[5] **dvandasadisattā ayam pi samāso dvando ti vuccatī ti vuttaṃ.**[6] **rūpasiddhiyañ ca dve dve padāni**[7] **dvandaṭṭhā vā dvando**[8] **dvandasadisattā ayam pi**[9] **samāso pi**[10] **anvatthasaññāya dvando ti vuccatī ti vuttaṃ**[11].[12] **yasmā hi ekapadassa dvando nāma natthi dvinnaṃ vā bahūnaṃ vā hoti, tasmā heṭṭhimaparicchedena dvando ti vuttaṃ. ubhayapadatthappadhāno ti attho.**

Alternatively, it is called a *dvanda* because pairs of meanings and words meet in a single place. In this way, indeed, it is stated in the *Saddanīti*: "It is called *dvanda* because here pairs of words meet in one place (*ekato*)." In the *Nyāsa*, however, it is stated: "Nouns in pairs are *dvanda*. Any compound is called a *dvanda* on account of its similarity with a *dvanda*, i.e. a

---

1 D *samāso.*

2 S, T *eka.*

3 Sadd 768,14–15.

4 B, D reads only *nā.* S, T *nāvā.* = Mmd 286,1: *nāvā.* U *navā.*

5 U, T, D *dvandā.*

6 Mmd 286,1.

7 T *padā.* C add. *dvandā.*

8 B, S, U, T D *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 ubhayapadatthappadhānatte[1] **sati kathaṃ ekatthībhāvo**[2] **siyā ti vuccate.**

But, if both are equally predominant, one may ask: how is the singleness of meaning possible?

sadisādiatthe pi saddappavattisambhavena ekakkhaṇe yeva padānaṃ atthadvayaṃ[3] **dīpakattā ekatthībhāvo**[4] **hoti. tañ 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.

---

1 My emendation. B, U *paṭṭhānatte*. C *ubhayapadatthappadhānatthe*. S, T *ubhayapadatthappadhānatthe*.

2 C *ekatthabhāvo*.

3 C, S, T *atthadvaya*.

4 C *ekatthabhāvo*.

yathā hi bhū-saddo anubhavābhibhavādike pavattamānehi[1] anu-abhi-ādi-upasaggehi vinā tasmiṃ[2] atthe na ppavattati. atha kho tehi sahito va pavattati. evaṃ gavassakan ti ādīsu gavādisaddā[3] assādisaddantarasahitavasena atthadvayam[4] dīpenti, na kevalā vākyasaddā. pubbapadañ ca attatthena saha parapadatthaṃ dīpeti. parapadañ[5] ca attatthena saha pubbapadatthaṃ dīpetī ti adhippāyo. tasmā taddīpanaṃ samāsavisaye yeva, na sabbatthā[6] ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.[7]

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 dvinnaṃ atthānaṃ ekatthībhāvena kathaṃ samāso siyā. tesaṃ tesaṃ padatthānaṃ nānāṭṭhānesu[8] 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 *gavādissaṃ.*

4 C *atthadvayam pi.* T *tattha dvayaṃ.*

5 T *paratthan.*

6 B, U, D *sabbathā.*

7 B, U, D *daṭṭhabbā.*

8 B, U *nānāṭṭhāne.* D *nānāṭhāne.*

nānāṭṭhānesu   tiṭṭhantesu   pi   ekasamāsapadabhāvena[1]   ṭhitattā ekatthībhāvalakkhaṇena samāso hoti. rūpakkhandhādayo yathā. yathā hi sabbe rūpadhammā anantacakkavāḷesu ṭhitā pi ekarūpakkhandhavacanīyabhāvena[2] ekarāsīhutvā[3] rūpakkhandhapadassa attho hoti, tadapekkhāya rūpakkhandho ti[4] ekavacananto pi[5] hoti. evam etthāpi daṭṭhabbo ti.[6]

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.[7] itaretarayogadvando kathan ti.

Let the collective *dvanda* be so, but how can the mutually connecting *dvanda* [be so]?

---

1 S, U, D *padatthabhāvena.*

2 C *ekarūpakkhandhabhāvena vacanīyā.*

3 C *ekarāsībhūtva.* U, D *ekarāsi hutvā.*

4 T *hoti.*

5 T om.

6 T reads *evam attho pi daṭṭhabbo.*

7 C *hoti.*

tatthāpi dabbāpekkhavasena[1] bahuvacanaṃ kataṃ. ekasamāsapadatthabhāvena pana ekattho[2] yevā[3] ti. tenāha assatthakapitthanaṃ[4] assatthakapitthanā[5] vā[6] ti.

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 *assatthakapitthanā* "the fig tree and the ubumbara tree."

casaddasahitaṃ[7] asamāsadvandavākya[8]kiriyābhedena sattadhā ṭhitaṃ. yathā samaṇo ca brāhmaṇo ca gacchati. samaṇañ ca brāhmaṇañ ca vadanti.[9] samaṇena ca brāhmaṇena ca dānaṃ paṭiggahitaṃ. samaṇassa ca brāhmaṇassa ca dānaṃ detī[10] ti evaṃ ādippakārā ṭhitā. tasmā samāsavākyenāpi tathākārena [162] bhavitabbaṃ.

The *dvanda* sentence which is not a compound and is accompanied by the word "and" is (*ṭhitaṃ*) 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 *dabbāpekkhavacanena.*

2 C *ekatthe.*

3 B *hevā.*

4 S *asattakapiṭhaṃ.* U assa*piṭhanaṃ.* T *asatthapiṭhaṃ.* D *assatthakapiṭṭhanaṃ.*

5 S *asatthakapiṭhanā ti ca.* U *assatthapiṭhaṃ.* T *asatthapiṭhaṃ.* D *assatthakapiṭṭhanā.*

6 S, T om.

7 T *saddasahitam ayaṃ.*

8 B, S, U, D *asamāsadvandavākyaṃ.*

9 S, U *vandati.*

10 C *dehī.*

tathā hi samaṇabrāhmaṇānan ti ettha samaṇassa ca brāhmaṇassa[1] ca samaṇabrāhmaṇānan ti vutte vākyāvadhikantākhyānaṃ nāma. samaṇabrāhmaṇānan ti pubbavākyānurūpena samāsavākyassa vuttattā.

For, in this manner, if we consider the word "to the ascetics and brahmins" (*samaṇabrahmaṇānaṃ*), 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[2] nāma. samaṇabrāhmaṇānan ti pubbavākyam[3] anapekkhitvā 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 *vākyaṃ* (om. *pubba*).

evaṃ samasanavidhānena saññāvidhāyakāni[1] suttāni dassetvā idāni vidhisuttaṃ dassetuṃ

|| mahataṃ mahā tulyādhikaraṇe pade || 332 ||

iti suttam āraddhaṃ.

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.

tattha mahataṃ-pe-pade ti catuppadam idaṃ suttaṃ. mahatan ti sambandhachaṭṭhīkārī, mahā ti kāriya, tulyādhikaraṇe ti tabbisesana, pade ti nimittasattamī. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

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 sabbaññūtañāṇe satto laggo[2] mahāsatto, mahā te upāsakapariccāgo bārāṇasī[3]rajjaṃ nāma mahā ti ādīsu bhinnādhikaraṇesu samāsesu ca vākyesu ca mahā-ādeso hotī ti.

---

1 Where C reads *samasanavidhānena saññāvidhāyakāni*, B, U, D read only *samāsasamasanavidhāyakāni*.

2 C add. *ti.*

3 B, U *bārāṇasiṃ.*

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 disctinction 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 ti[1] uccāraṇaṃ niccadīpanatthaṃ. tathā[2] hi vuttaṃ atthabyākhyāne tulyādhikaraṇe ti kimatthaṃ. mahantaputto[3] 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 evaṃ 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 sijjhati*) in cases such as *mahantaputto*?

yogavibhāgā iṭṭhappasiddhī[1] 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 bahuvacanaggahaṇenā 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 *iṭṭhappasiṭṭhī*. S *iṭṭhappasiddhi*.

NOTE: This is a reference to a passage of Kacc-v that is considered an interpolation by Pind (116, n.3: "C^{e}E^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 bhāsitapumitthī pumā va ce[2] || 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 *kalyāṇī*, 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. itthiyan ti ādhārasattamī, bhāsitapumā ti tabbisesana, itthī ti kārī, pumā ti kāriya, ivā ti byapadesa, upamājotakā ti pi vadanti. ce ti samuccayattha, saṃsayatthaniddeso vā[1]. saññā-pe-vidhisuttaṃ.

This [sutta consists] of six words. "In the feminine" (*itthiyaṃ*) [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.

itthiyaṃ vattamāne tulyādhikaraṇe pade pare idāni[3] imasmiṃ samāse itthī itthivācako saddo pubbe aññasmiṃ kāle [163] idāni[4] bhāsitapumā atthi[5] 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 *iti.*

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 pade[2] **pumā va daṭṭhabbo**[3] **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 itthiyaṃ vattamāne 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.

moggallāne[1] 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 sace[3] bhāsitapumā[4] ca bhāsitanapuṃsako ca siyā yathārahaṃ[5] pumā iva napuṃsako iva[6] 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 (*bhāsitanapuṃsako*), 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.

3 C *ce.* Cf. Sadd 769,31.

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[1]rūpasiddhiādīsu ācariyānaṃ mate[2] dīghajhaṅgho kalyāṇabhariyo ti ādīsu pubbapade yeva pumātideso hoti, na parapade. jaṅghabhariyādisaddānaṃ puma[3]bhāsitābhāvā. te[4] hi jaṅgha[5]bhariyādayo saddā aññapadatthappadhāno bahubbīhī ti vuttattā aññapadatthaliṅgavasena pulliṅgādayo hontī 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: *ñāsasaddanītiācariyānaṃ mate.*

3 C *pum.* T *pumā.*

4 S, T *te ca.*

5 D *saṅgha.*

yady evaṃ sukhā paṭipadā yassa so[1] sukhāpaṭipado[2] maggo. evaṃ dukkhāpaṭipado dandhābhiñño ti ādīsu ca. sukhā paṭipadā yassa taṃ sukhāpaṭipadaṃ jhānaṃ. evaṃ dukkhāpaṭipadaṃ dandhābhiññan[3] ti ādīsu ca pubbapadesu[4] puma[5]byapadeso kathaṃ na hotī[6] ti ce.

One may object (*ti ce*): If that is so, then a path the progress of which is easy is called "of easy progress" (*sukhapaṭipado*), [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" (*sukhapaṭipadaṃ*). 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 napuṃsakatthassa[7] bhāsitapubbatā[8] na hoti[9]. parapade pana aññapadatthaliṅgavasena vaccaliṅgo hotī 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.

---

1 B, U, D *vasā*. Surely a misreading of the Burmese alphabet where *so* and *vasā* can be easily confused.

2 C, S *sukhapaṭipadā*. T *sukhapaṭipado*.

3 S *dandhābhiññā*.

4 C om.

5 C *na puma*. S *pumā*.

6 C *hotī* for *na hotī*. C reads *na* before.

7 C *napuṃsakattassa*. S *na sakatthassa*. U *napuṃsakatthassā*.

8 My conjecture. C, B *bhāsitapubbattā*. U *sitapubbatta na hoti*. T *bhāsitapubbo*.

9 B, D *hotī ti*.

ñāsasaddanītiācariyānaṃ mate[1] pana parapade yeva pumabyapadeso hoti. teneva saddanītiyaṃ sukhapaṭipado dandhābhiñño ti ādīni udāharaṇāni ābhatāni. ñāse ca saddhādhano brāhmaṇabandhubhariyo ti ādi udāharaṇāni kammadhārayavasena vuttānī ti.

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 *sukhapaṭipado*, *dandhābhiñño*, etc., are brought up; and in the *Nyāsa*, the examples *saddhādhano*, *brāhmaṇabandhubhariyo*, etc., are stated under the governance of *kammadhāraya*.

NOTE: The opinion of Mmd and Sadd follows the usage of the Pāli, something that Aggavaṃsa 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.

yady evaṃ. kalyāṇabhariyo ti ādi udāharaṇāni na bhaveyyuṃ. yadi bhaveyyuṃ, kena suttena pumabyapadeso sijjhati[2] bhāsitapumattābhāvā ti. tasmā purimavādo yeva sundaro. aññapadatthappadhāno bahubbīhī ti vuttattā parapade aññapadatthaliṅgavasena pulliṅgādibhāvo[3] sijjhatī ti.

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 *bahubbīhi* 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 *sijjhatī 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 pare[1] bandhusaddādīnaṃ bhāsitapumattābhāvā iminā tesu bandhusaddādīsu pumabyapadeso na hotī ti ñāpanatthaṃ vuttaṃ.

What is the purpose of stating *bhāsitapume* "which can be expressed in the masculine" [in the *vutti*]? It is stated in order to explain (*ñāpanatthaṃ*) 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.

kesuci[2] potthakesu pana ñāsaṃ nissāya brāhmaṇabandhubhariyā ti vadanti[3]. so pāṭho asundaro[4]. iminā hi suttena kammadhārayasaññe cā ti vakkhamānattā tulyādhikaraṇabahubbīhisamāse 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 *paṭhanti.*

4 C *sundaro.* T *na sundaro.*

tasmā brāhmaṇabandhubhariyo[1] **ti ādi udāharaṇāni**[2] **pi bahubbīhisamāsaveneva**[3] **vattabbāni, na kammadhārayasamāsavasena. dīghajaṃgho ti ādīni pi udāharaṇāni bahubbīhisamāsavasena vuttāni, na kammadhārayasamāsavasenā**[4] **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 sabhāvātideso[5] **ti daṭṭhabbo ti**[6]**. chabbidho hi atideso: byapadeso nimittātideso taṃrūpātideso taṃsabhāvātideso**[7] **suttātideso kāriyātideso cā ti. vuttañ ca**

byapadeso nimittañ ca taṃrūpaṃ taṃsabhāvato[8]

suttañ ceva tathā kāriyātideso ti[9] **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 *kammadhārayavasenā.*

5 C *sabhāvatātideso.* T *sabhāvatotideso.*

6 B om.

7 C, T *sabhāvatātideso.* S *sabhāvādideso.*

8 C, D *taṃsabhāvatā.*

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.

dvipadam idaṃ. kammadhārayasaññe ti ādhārasattamī, bhāvasattamī ti pi vadanti, cā ti anukaḍḍhana, samuccayaniddeso 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 va[1] 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.

nanu kammadhāraye[1] ti vutte yeva kammadhārayasamāso viññāyati.[2] atha kimatthaṃ saññāggahaṇaṃ katan ti.

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 *saññā*?

saccaṃ. tathāpi saññāggahaṇaṃ aññasamāsasaññāya[3] saṅgahaṇatthaṃ kataṃ. tena tassā mukhaṃ taṃmukhaṃ. kukkuṭiyā aṇḍaṃ kukkuṭaṇḍan ti ādi ppayogā sijjhanti[4]. casaddaggahaṇena[5] pana taddhitākhyātanāmasaññā yogaṃ gaṇhanti.[6] tena tassā idaṃ tayidaṃ[7]. tassā bhāvo tattaṃ icc ādi taddhitappayogā ca. taṃ itthim iva attānaṃ ācarati itthāyati[8] icc ādayo ākhyātappayogā ca. yassaṃ itthīyaṃ yatra[9] yāya[10] itthiyā yato, tāya[11] velāyaṃ tadā icc ādayo nāmappayogā ca[12] sijjhanti.

True, nevertheless, the mention of *saññā* 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 aṇḍaṃ = kukkuṭaṇḍaṃ*, 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 *ñāyati.*

3 B, S, U, D *aññasamāsasaññā.* T *aññasamāsa.*

4 B, U *sijjhati.*

5 B, S, U, T *caggahaṇena.*

6 Instead of -*saññā yogaṃ gaṇhanti*: C *saññāyo saṅgayhanti.* S, T *saññāyo saṃgaṇhanti.*

7 B, U, D *taddhitaṃ.* S, T *tadidaṃ.*

8 My conjecture. C *ācarati tāya ti.* B, U *ācarati titthāyati.* S *āratī ti tāyati.* T *ācaratī titāyati.*

9 T *tatra.* D *atra.*

10 S *yāyaṃ.* T *yāyato.*

11 S, U, T, D *tassaṃ.*

12 S, T om.

ca], examples of secondary formation such as: *tassā idaṃ = tayidaṃ, tassā bhāvo = tattaṃ;* 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 itthiyā = yato* "because of that woman" = "because of that," *tāya velāyaṃ = tadā* "at that time" = "then," etc., are formed.

atthabyākhyāne pana saññāggahaṇaṃ saññāmattasaṅgahaṇatthaṃ. kiṃ idaṃ saññāmattaṃ. samāsataddhitākhyātanāmasaññāyo ti[1] 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 hoti[2]. vimalabuddhiācariyamatiyā pana sati pi kammadhārayatte[3] dārikāsaddassa niyatitthīvācakattā bhāsitasaddassa niyatapumattābhāvato[4] ti vuttattā uttarapade yeva pumātideso[5] viya dissati. yathā ce ti[6] ativiya atthāyuttī ti[7].

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 Saddhammajotipāla, an opinion that seems to be critical of Mmd, as we can subsequently see.

tathā hi[1] imehi dvīhi suttehi pubbapadesu yeva pumātideso hoti. bahubbīhikammadhārayasamāse[2] yeva imesaṃ viseso ti. bhāsitapume ti kimatthaṃ. [165] khattiyabandhudārikā ty ādīsu sati pi kammadhārayasamāse tulyādhikaraṇe pade pare bandhusaddassa bhāsitapumattābhāvā iminā pumā va na daṭṭhabbo[3] ti ñāpanatthaṃ 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.*

|| attan nassa tappurise || 335 ||

335. In a *tappurisa, a* [replaces] *na.*

**tipadam idaṃ. attan ti kāriya, nassā ti kārī, tappurise ti nimittasattamī. saññā-
pe-vidhisuttam.**

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 hi[1] 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 pare[1] attaṃ[2] hoti[3].

Or, alternatively: the word *na* which is pressent 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 nassa[4] attaṃ sijjhatī ti.

If that is so, by which [sutta] is the word *na* formed as *a* in examples such as *amala*?

attaṃ nassā[5] 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 *atthaṃ.*

3 C, S, T *hotī ti.*

4 U, D om.

5 B, U *attannassā.* S *atthaṃnassā.* 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 nagā[1], rukkhā. na gacchantī ti nagā,[2] pabbatā iti samāse kate nassa akārādesānāpajjanato[3] ca. tasmā taṃnivattanatthaṃ 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 nagā[4] ti ettha nassa[5] attaṃ[6] 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.*

3 C, S, U, T *akārādesāpajjanato.* D *akārādesānāpajjato.* See CPD sv. *anāpajjana.*

4 C, T *nāgā.*

5 S, T om.

6 S, U *atthaṃ.*

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 pacasi[1] tvaṃ sammā ty ādīsu atippasaṅgo[2] na hotī[3] 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.*

2 S *satippasaṅgo.* U *atippasaṅko.* T *abhipasaṅgo.*

3 S, T *hessatī.*

|| sare an || 336 ||

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 pana[1] an iti avibhattikaniddeso. tappurise vattamānassa sabbasseva nassa padassa anādeso hoti. sabbassevā ti iminā avayavabhūtaṃ[2] saraṃ vā byañjanaṃ vā nivatteti. sabbasseva sarabyañjanasseva an[3] 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 C om.

2 C *avayavabhūta*. T *avayavabhūvaṃ*.

3 T *anādeso*.

nanu cānena vinā pi anissaro ty ādīsu pubbasuttena[1] nassa attaṃ[2] 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?

saccaṃ[3]. tathāpi sace āgamasuttaṃ sandhāya idaṃ na[4] vucceyya, añño pi āgamo[5] bhaveyya. taṃnivattanattham idaṃ suttaṃ ti[6]. anuttaro ti ādīsu bahubbīhisamāsesu pi anuvattanatappurisasaddam anapekkhitvā sare an ti ettakeneva[7] suttena nassa anādeso kātabbo ti[8].

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: 39*f.*

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. Bᵉ reads *kad*, not *kadaṃ*. Pind (2013: 117, see also n.13) follows the reading *kadaṃ*. Mmd (287, 18), in Bᵉ, also reads *kad*. This reading seems to follow Kāt II.5.24 *koḥ kat*. Therefore I think the sutta has to read *kad*. The variant *kadaṃ* is probably a contamination from the Kacc-v: *ku icc etassa tappurise kadaṃ hoti sare pare*, where *kadaṃ* 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 sambandhachaṭṭhīkārī. 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 *kadaṃ*.

2 C, S *kadaṃ*.

NOTE: This is a reference to Kacc 228 *ku hiṃhaṃsu 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.

bahubbīhisamāsassāpi   kimudāharaṇabhāvena   vuttattā   idaṃ   suttaṃ kammadhārayabahubbīhisamāsesu vihitaṃ.

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).

rūpasiddhiyaṃ   pana   tappurise   uttarapade   pare   ti   vuttiyaṃ   āgataṃ. rūpasiddhikārakena hi ācariyena idaṃ suttaṃ tappurise yeva vihitaṃ. kadannan ti ādippayogā[1] pi tappurisasamāso ti gahito ti.

In the commentary (*vuttiyaṃ*) 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 *kadannaṃ* "bad food," etc. [only] *tappurisa* compounds are included.

---

1 C *ādipayogo.*

2 Rūp 189,11–12. The entire passage of Rūp (189,10–14) reads: [246] *kad kussa. ku icc etassa nipātassa tappurise uttarapade kad hoti sare pare. kadannaṃ. evaṃ kadasanaṃ. sare ti kiṃ. kudārā, kuputtā, kudāsā, kudiṭṭhi kussā ti vattate.*

sare ti kimatthaṃ. kudārā yesaṃ ty ādīsu payogesu sati pi kusadde sarassa aparattā iminā kussa kad³ na hotī ti ñāpanatthaṃ vuttaṃ.

What is the purpose of mentioning "before a vowel" (*sare*)²? 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 idaṃ. kā ti kāriya, appatthesū ti ādhārasattamī, cā ti anukaḍḍhana,³ kvacatthā ti pi vadanti. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. idaṃ suttaṃ sabbasamāsesu vihitaṃ. kāppatthe cā ti vutte siddhe pi kāppatthesu cā ti bahuvacanena kasmā vuttan ti manasikatvā bahuvacanoccāraṇaṃ 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 *anukaḍhana.*

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): *bahuvacanuccāraṇaṃ kimatthaṃ. 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 resoning 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 Pâṇini en occupe trois (VI, 3, 104–106), et c'est dans ce but qu'il a d'abord substitué *appa* à *îshad* de Pâṇini, 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 akāranto[1] || 339 ||

339. Sometimes the ending *a* [applies] to [words] at the end of a compound.

catuppadam idaṃ. kvacī ti kvacattha, samāsantagatānan ti antāpekkhachaṭṭhī, akāro ti kāriya, anto ti kārī. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

This [sutta consists] of four words. "Sometimes" (*kvaci*) [expresses] optionality; "to [words] at the end of a compound" (*samāsantagatānaṃ*) [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 akārādeso[2] kiṃ payojanaṃ atthī 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 ākārādese[3] sampatte taṃnivāraṇatthaṃ 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 *si o*, Kacc 104]?

---

1 C *hoti.*
2 C *akārādese.*
3 S *akārādese.* U *ākārādesetvā.* D *ākārādesa.*

na sakkā. sāmaññavisesesu visesassa balavatarattā¹. sy ā cā ti suttaṃ hi akārantasāmaññe yeva vihitaṃ. so ti suttam pana pulliṅgākārante yeva vihitan 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.

evaṃ hotu. pañcāhan ty ādīsu payogesu² kiṃ payojanaṃ atthī ti.

Let it be so. What is the purpose in examples such as *pañcāhaṃ* "five days"?

tesu pana pajjunnagati³nyāyajānanatthaṃ akārassa akārādeso vihito 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. parjanyavallakṣaṇapravṛtti*: 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 yāvadūnaṃ pūrṇaṃ ca sarvamabhivarṣati* (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[1] rūpaviseso[2] 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[3] na āharanti. rājādiggahaṇam[4] eva āharanti.

Other masters, however, do not record these [examples]; they only record [the examples] *rājā*, etc.

attan[5] ti vutte yeva siddhe pi kāraggahaṇassa vacane [167] payojanaṃ dassetuṃ kāraggahaṇaṃ kimatthan ti ādim āha. tena kāraggahaṇena ukārādesam pi saṅgaṇhāti. teneva hi cittagu tiḷagū[6] digū ti payogā sijjhanti.[7]

Stating simply *attan* [the sutta] would work as well, therefore, in order to show the purpuse 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.[8]

---

1 T *tattha.*

2 S *rūpavisesā.*

3 U *bhāni.*

4 T *rājādigaṇaṃ.*

5 S, T *atthaṃ.*

6 C om. T *ṭiṭṭhagu.* D *tiṭṭhagu.*

7 T *sijjhanti ti.*

8 Kacc-v 118,11: *kāraggahaṇaṃ kimatthaṃ. ākārikāranto ca hoti.* Kacc-v 119,1: *nadīantā ca kattuantā kappaccayo hoti samāsante.*

upasaggā nipātā ca paccayā ca ime tayo

neke nekatthavisayā iti neruttikā bravun ti

vuttattā puna pi kārappaccayassa[1] **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 padacchedaṃ katvā puna sandhiṃ katvā tena appaccayo pi gahito. tena pañcagavan ti ettha pañcagosaddato appaccayaṃ katvā *o sare cā* [Kacc 78] ti avādese[3] **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 *pañcagavaṃ* ("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 *pañcagavaṃ* 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 *pañcagavaṃ*, 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 *kāraggahaṇassa.*

2 Kacc-v 119,1–3.

3 C, S *gavādese.* T *gavādeso.*

samāsante ti sāmaññena vutte pi bahubbīhisamāsanto va[1] 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 nadīsaddamhā[2] itthivācakikārūkāramhā[3] kappaccayo hoti. nadī ti hi īd u itthīkhyā[4] nadī ti iminā aññattha suttena itthivācakānaṃ īkārukārānaṃ 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 *nadīsaññāmhā*.

3 S *itthavācakiṃkārukāramhā*. U *itthivācakakārukāramhā*. D *itthivācakaīkārukāramhā*.

4 I follow C *īd u itthīkhyā*; B, U, D *īrusatrākkhyā*. S *īrūstrakkhyā*. T *irustrāsākkhyā*. 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 itthīkhyā nadī*.[1]

|| jāyāya tudaṃjāni patimhi || 341 ||

341. *tudaṃjani* [is a replacement] of *jāya* before the word *pati*.

tipadam idaṃ. jāyāyā ti kārī, tudaṃjānī[2] ti kāriya, patimhī ti nimittasattamī. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. jāyāyatudaṃjānī 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: "*jayāyatudaṃjānī* 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 patiṃhi*. Aggavaṃsa apparently did not notice anything strange with this rule, for he accepts the ghost word *tudampati* in Sadd § 731).[4] This word has been perpetuated in other commentaries such as Mmd (ad

---

1 Kāt 4.1.9 *īdūt stryākhyo nadī*.

2 S *dujaṃjani*. T *dudaṃjāni*.

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 *tudampati* 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 *daṃjani* means "wife".

|| dhanumhā ca || 342 ||

342. Also *ā* after the word *dhanu.*

tipadam idaṃ. dhanumhā ā cā ti padacchedo, dhanumhā ti avadhi, ā ti visayī, cā ti samuccaya. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. idha casaddena paccakkha[2]dhammādito pi[3] āppaccayo hoti. dvipadam idan ti pi vadanti. evaṃ sati caggahaṇaṃ ākārānukaḍḍhanatthaṃ[4].

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 (*idha*), 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.*

---

2 B, S, U, T, D om.

3 S, T, D *cāpi.*

4 U, D *akārānukaḍḍhanatthaṃ.*

|| aṃ vibhattīnam akārantābyayībhāvā || 343 ||

343. *aṃ* [is the replacement] of the case endings after an *avyayībhāva* ending in *a*.

tipadam idaṃ. catuppadam vā. aṃ ti kāriya, vibhattīnan ti sambandhachaṭṭhīkārī, akārantā ti tabbisesana, abyayībhāvā ti avadhi. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. tesaṃ vibhattiyo lopā cā ti ito vibhattiviparināmaṃ katvā anuvattamāne siddhe pi puna vibhattiggahaṇaṃ ālapanatthavibhatti-saṅgahaṇatthan[1]. idaṃ pana suttaṃ sim icc evam ādīnam apavādo[2] 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 *abyayībhāva*" (*abyāyībhāvā*) [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 vibhattiyo 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.*

|| saro rasso napuṃsake || 344 ||

344. Short vowel in the neuter.

tipadam idaṃ. saro ti kārī, rasso ti kāriya, napuṃsake ti ādhārasattamī. saññā-pe-vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

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.

nanu ca rasso napuṃsake ti vutte yeva saro ti viññāyati. atha kimatthaṃ saroggahaṇaṃ katan ti.

But is it not true that only by saying *rasso napuṃsake* the word *saro* is understood? What is the purpose then of mentioning *saro*?

saccaṃ. tathāpi asati saroggahaṇe kārino abhāvā sabbe kārī[1] ihānuvattane[2] ti[3] sandeho siyā ti. taṃnivattanatthaṃ saroggahaṇaṃ katan ti.

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 *kārino.*

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 abyayībhāvadigudvandabahubbīhimhi[1] napuṃsake[2] vattamāne[3] samāsantasarassa[4] 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."

|| aññasmā lopo ca || 345 ||

345. And elision after any other.

tipadam idaṃ. aññasmā ti avadhiniddeso, lopo ti kāriyaniddeso, cā ti anukaḍḍhananiddeso. saññādhikāraparibhāsāvidhisuttesu vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ[5].

---

1 C, S, T *bahubbīhi.*

2 S *sunapuṃsake.*

3 S *vattamāna.*

4 B *samāsantassa sarassa.* U *samāsantassa rassaṃ rassattaṃ.* D *samāsantassarassa.*

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" (*aññasmā*) 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 abyayībhāvasamāsaṃ ākaḍḍhati. abyayībhāvasamāsa-akārantato aññasmā anakārantā abyayībhāvasamāsamhā parāsaṃ vibhattīnaṃ lopo hoti. abyayībhāvasamāso hi[2] duvidho akāranto anakāranto cā ti. tattha akārantato abyayībhāvasamāsato parāsaṃ sabbāsaṃ vibhattīnaṃ pubbasuttena[3] amādeso. anakārantato abyayībhāvasamāsato parāsaṃ sabbāsaṃ vibhattīnaṃ iminā suttena lopo hotī[4] 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 *aṃ* 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.

pubbaparobhayaññatthapadhānattā catubbidho

samāso ca digukammadhārayehi ca chabbidho.

duvidho abyayībhāvo chabbidho kammadhārayo,

digu dvidhā tappuriso aṭṭhadhā sattadhā bhave

bahubbīhi dvidhā dvando pabhedā sattavīsatī 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].

rūpasiddhiyaṃ pana

duvidho abyayībhāvo navadhā[1] kammadhārayo

digu dvidhā tappuriso aṭṭhadhā navadhā bhave

bahubbīhi dvidhā[2] dvando samāso caturaṭṭhadhā[3]

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 *dvīhi.*

3 T *caturatthaṭṭhā.*

4 Rūp 215,3–5.

iti nāmakappe[1] samāsakappassa suttaniddeso[2] nāma[3] 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).

saddhammaṭṭhitikāmena[5] samāsasutta[6]niddesaṃ

karontena mayā pattaṃ yaṃ puññaṃ hitadāyakaṃ.

tena puññena ijjhantu[7] sabbasatta[8]manorathā

rājāno pi ca rakkhantu dhammena sāsanaṃ pajan ti.

I composed the *Samāsasuttaniddesa* ("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 *suttaniddese.*

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 ahaṃ.[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.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

-a = *-aṭṭhakathā*

AN = *Aṅguttaranikāya*

Abhidh-s = *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*

Abhidh-s-mṭ = *Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī*

Abhidh-s-sv = *Abhidhammatthasaṅgahasaṅkhepavaṇṇanā*

Athb = *Atthabyākhyāna*

As-mṭ = *Atthasālinī-mūlaṭīkā*

Aṣṭ = *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

Bāl = *Bālāvatāra*

Cf. = Compare

DN = *Dīghanikāya*

DOP = *A Dictionary of Pāli* = Cone, 2001–2010.

DPPN = *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* = Malalasekera, 1960.

DSG = *Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar* = Abhyankar, 1961.

Gv = *Gandhavaṃsa*

It = *Itivuttaka*

Jā = *Jātaka*

Kacc = *Kaccāyana*

Kacc-v = *Kaccāyanavutti*

Kacc-nidd = *Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa, Suttaniddesa*

Kacc-vaṇṇ = *Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā*

Kāt = *Kātantra*

Kāt-v = *Kātantra-vṛtti*

Kāt-ṭ = *Kātantra-ṭīkā*

Kār = *Kārikā*

Kār-ṭ = *Kārikā-ṭīkā*

KI = *Kālyāṇī Inscriptions*

MN = *Majjhimanikāya*

MBD = *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*

Mbh = *Mahābhāṣya*

Mmd = *Mukhamattadīpanī*

Mmd-pṭ = *Mukhamattadīpanī-porāṇaṭīkā*

Mogg = *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*

Mogg-v = *Moggallāna-vutti*

MW = Monier-Williams Sanskrit Dictionary = Monier-Williams, 1872.

n. = footnote

Nāmac = *Nāmacāradīpikā*

Nāmac-ṭ = *Nāmacāradīpikā-ṭīkā*

Nir = *Nirukta*

Nyan = Nyanatusita

P. = Pāṇini

Pasp = *Paspaśāhṇika* = Joshi and Roodbergen, 1986.

Piṭ-sm = *Piṭaka-tō-samaing* = Nyunt, 2012.

PLB = Bode, 1909.

Pr = *Prātiśākhya*

PTS = Pali Text Society

Rūp = *Rūpasiddhi* = *Padarūpasiddhi*

Rūp-ṭ = *Rūpasiddhi-ṭīkā*

Ṛg-pr = *Ṛgveda-prātiśākhya*

Sadd = *Saddanīti*

Sadd-ṭ = *Saddanīti-ṭīkā*

Samarth = *Samarthāhṇika* = Joshi, 1968.

SBC = *Saddatthabhedacintā*

SBC-pṭ = *Saddatthabhedacintā-porāṇaṭīkā* = Abhaya Mahāthera *ṭīkā*

SBC-nṭ = *Saddatthabhedacintā-navaṭīkā* = *Saddatthabhedacintā-dīpanī*

Sīmal-v = *Simālaṅkāra-ṭīkā*

Skt. = Sanskrit

SN = *Saṃyutta Nikāya*

Sp = *Samantapāsādikā*

s.v. = *sub voce*

Sv-pṭ = *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-porāṇaṭīkā*

UPT = U Pho Thi Library of Thaton

VāPr = *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*

Vism = *Visuddhimagga*

Primary sources

Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha = Bodhi, 2010.

Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī = *Ṭīkā-kyaw pāṭh*, Haṃsavatī Press, Yangon, 1953.

Abhidhammatthasaṅgahasaṅkhepavaṇṇanā   =   *Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā*   *sameto*
        Abhidhammatthasaṅgaho, Vijjatthappakāsa Press, Colombo, 1930.

Atthasālinī-mūlaṭīkā = *Atthasālinī-mūlaṭīkā* B^e, together with Vibh-a-mṭ and Ppk-a-mṭ, I—
        III, Suddhammavatī Press, Yangon, 1924–26.

Aṣṭādhyāyī = Katre, 1987.

Cāndravyākaraṇa = Liebich, 1902.

Gandhavaṃsa = Kumar, 1992.

Kaccāyana = Pind, 2013.

Kaccāyanavutti = Pind, 2013.

Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa C^e = *Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa*, Vidyabhusana Press, Colombo, 1915.
        Online pdf version available at gretil.sub.uni-   goettingen.de/gretil_elib/

Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa B^e = *Suttaniddesapāṭh*, Zabu Meit Swe Press, Yangon, 1912.

Kātantra = Dwivedi, 1997–2005.

Kātantra-vṛtti = Dwivedi, 1997–2005.

Kātantra-ṭīkā = Dwivedi, 1997–2005.

Kathāsaritsāgara = Mallinson, 2007.

Kārikā = *Saddā-ṅay 15-coṅ-pāṭh*, Icchāsaya Press, Yangon, 1964.

Kārikā-ṭīkā = *Saddā-ṅay-ṭīkā-pāṭh*, Vol. III, Sudhammavatī Press, Yangon, 1929: pp. 333–442.

Nyāyasūtra = Gautama Nyāyasūtra with Vatsyāyana's Nyāyabhāṣya, edited by Taranatha Nyāya Tarkatīrtha, Calcutta Sanskrit Series 18–19, Calcutta, 1936–1944.

Mahābhāṣya = Kielhorn 1962; 1965.

Majjhimanikāya = The Majjhima-Nikāya, Vol. I edited by V. Trenckner, London, PTS, 1888; Vol. II and III edited by R. Chalmers, PTS, London, 1898–99;

Maṇisāramañjūsā-ṭīkā, by Ariyavaṃsa Dhammasenāpati, Piṭakat tō pran pvāḥ reḥ ṭhāna Press, Mandalay, 1930.

Moggallāna = Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa CSCD *Tipiṭaka* (*Roman*).

Moggallāna-vutti = Moggallāna-vutti CSCD *Tipiṭaka* (*Roman*), s.v. *Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa*.

Mukhamattadīpanī = Nyāsapāṭh, Yangon, Sudhammavatī cā pum nhip tuik Press, 1933.

Mukhamattadīpanī-porāṇaṭīkā (= Nyāsappadīpa = Thanbyin-ṭīkā) = Saṃpyaṅ-ṭīkā-pāṭh, Kavi Myat Hman Press, Yangon, 1914.

Nāmacāradīpikā = Saddhātissa, 1990.

Nirukta = Sarup, 1921.

Payogasiddhi = Śrī Ñānāloka (ed.), *A Pali Grammar based on the Moggallāna System by Medhaṅkara Vanaratana Mahā Thera*, The Cultural Council of Sri Lanka, Colombo, 1974.

Rūpasiddhi = Padarūpasiddhi, Saccāmaṇḍuiṅ Books, Yangon, 1964.

Rūpasiddhi-ṭīkā = Padarūpasiddhi-ṭīkā, Padesā Books, Mandalay, 1965.

Saddanīti = Smith, 1928–1956.

Saddatthabhedacintā = Saddā-ṅay 15-coṅ-pāṭh, Icchāsaya Press, Yangon, 1964.

Saddatthabhedacintā-porāṇaṭīkā = Saddā-ṅay-ṭīkā-pāṭh, Vol. I, Sudhammavatī Press, Yangon, 1928: pp. 1–138.

Saddatthabhedacintā-navaṭīkā (= Dīpanī) = Saddā-ṅay-ṭīkā-pāṭh, Vol. I,   Sudhammavatī
    Press, Yangon, 1928: pp. 139–248.

Sumaṅgalavilāsinī-purāṇaṭīkā Bᵉ: I—III, Sudhammavatī Press, Yangon, 1924.

Uṇādisūtra = The Uṇādisūtras with the vṛtti of Svetavanavāsin. Edited by T. R. Chintamani,
    New Delhi, 1992

Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya = Sharma, V. 1934

Visuddhimagga = The Visuddhimagga *of Buddhaghosa*, edited by C.A.F. Rhys Davids, Pāli
    Text Society, London, 1920–1921.

Yazawinkyaw = The Yaza Win Gyaw by Shin Thilawuntha, edited by Pe Maung   Tin, Rā
    Pyañ Cā Aup Tuik, (4ᵗʰ reprint of Haṃsavatī Press edition,   1969), Yangon, 2010.

Bibliography

Abhyankar, K.V. and Shukla, J.M. *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, Baroda, 1961.

Allen, W.S. *Phonetics in Ancient India*, New York, 1953.

d'Alwis, J. *An introduction to Kachchāyana's grammar of the Pāli language, with an introduction, appendix, notes, etc*, London, 1863.

Aung-Thwin, M. *The Mists of Rāmañña. The Legend That Was Lower Burma,* University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, 2005.

Aung-Thwin, M. and Aung-Thwin, M. *A History of Myanmar since Ancient Times. Traditions and Transformations*, London, 2012.

Belvalkar, S.K. *An Account of the different existing systems of Sanskrit grammar*, Pune, 1915.

Bernhard, F. *Udānavarga. Band 1, Einleitung, Beschreibung der Handschriften. Textausgabe. Bibliography*, Goettingen, 1965.

Blackburn, A.M. *Buddhist Learning and Textual Practice in Eighteenth-Century Lankan Monastic Culture*, Princeton, 2001.

Bode, M.H. *The Pali Literature of Burma*, London, 1909.

_____ "Early Pali Grammarians in Burma", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* VI: 81–101, London, 1908.

_____ *Sāsanavaṃsa*, PTS, London, 1898.

Bodhi, Bh. *A Comprehensive Manual of Abhidhamma. The Abhidhammattha Sangaha of Ācariya Anuruddha*, BPS Pariyatti Editions, 2010.

Braun, E. *The birth of insight: meditation, modern Buddhism, and the Burmese monk Ledi Sayadaw,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2014.

BUDDHADATTA MAHĀTHERA, A.P. "Where there two elders by name Chappada?" in
    Corrections of Geiger's Mahāvaṃsa, etc. A   collection of monographs, Ananda
    Book and Co., Ambalagoda, 1957: 198–209.

BURNELL, A.C. *On the Aindra School of Sanskrit grammarians*, Mangalore, 1875.

CARBINE, J. *Kālyāṇī Inscriptions: Pāli Text and English Translation,* [forthcoming].

CARDONA, G. *Recent Research in Pāṇinian Studies*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 2004.

_____   *Pāṇini, his work and its traditions: Background and Introduction*, Motilal
    Banarsidass, 2nd revised edition, Delhi, 1997.

_____   *Pāṇini: A Survey of Research*, Mouton, The Hague–Paris, 1976.

CHARNEY, M.W. *Powerful Learning. Buddhist Literati and the Throne in Burma's Last
    Dynasty, 1752—1885*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2006.

CIOTTI, G. *The Representation of Sanskrit Speech-Sounds: Philological and Linguistic
    Historiographies*, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2012.

CLOUGH, B. *A compendious Pali grammar with a copious vocabulary in the same language*,
    Colombo, 1824.

COLLINS, S. "What is Literature in Pali?" in *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions
    from South Asia*, edited by Sheldon Pollock, University of California Press, Berkeley,
    2003: 649–688.

_____   *Nirvana and other Buddhist felicities*, Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 1998.

CONE, M. *Dictionary of Pali*, vols. I and II, PTS, Oxford, 2001–2010.

COWELL, E.B. (Ed.) *The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, Vol. VI*,
    Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1907.

DENIS, E. *La Lokapaññatti et les idées cosmologiques du bouddhisme ancien* (2 vols.),
    Paris, 1977.

DEOKAR, M.A. "Some Probable Sanskrit Sources of the Pali Grammarians with special
    reference to Aggavaṃsa", in *Saṃskṛta-sādhutā, Studies in Honour of Professor*

Ashok Aklujkar, edited by Chikafumi Watanabe, Michele Desmarais and Yoshichika Honda, Printworld Publishers, New Delhi, 2012: 150–171.

_____ *Technical terms and technique of the Pali and the Sanskrit grammars*, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Varanasi, 2008.

DESHPANDE, M.M. "Evolution of the Notion of Authority of the Pāṇinian Tradition", *Histoire Epistemologie Langage* 20, Paris, 1998: 5–28.

_____ "Who inspired Pāṇini? Reconstructing the Hindu and Buddhist Counter-Claims", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* Vol. 117, No. 3, 1997: 444–465.

DIMITROV, D. *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind. On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati. A Philological Chronicle (Phullalocanavaṃsa)*, [forthcoming], 2015.

DUROISELLE, C. *A List of Inscriptions Found in Burma,* Archaeological Survey of Burma, Yangon, 1921.

_____ "The Ari of Burma and tantric buddhism", *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India*, 1915-1916.

DWIVEDI, J. 1997—2005 *Kātantravyākaraṇa of Ācārya Śarvavarmā, with four commentaries: Vṛtti and Ṭīkā by Śri Durgha Singh; Kātantravṛttipañjikā by Śri Trilocanadāsa; Kalāpacandra by Kavirāja Suṣeṇaśarmā; Samīkṣā by the editor*, Sarnath, Varanasi, 1997–2005.

FRANKE, R.O. *Geschichte und Kritik der einheimischen Pāli-Grammatik und Lexico-graphie*, Strassburg, 1902.

FRASCH, T. "Across the Salween: Buddhist and other Exchanges between Bagan and Angkor in the 12th and 13th Centuries" [forthcoming].

_____ "The making of a Buddhist Ecumene in the Bay of Bengal", in *Pelagic Passageways: The Northern Bay of Bengal Before Colonialism*, edited by Rila Mukherjee, Primus Books, Delhi, 2011: 383–408.

_____ *Pagan: Stadt und Staat*, Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 1996.

GEIGER, W. *Pāli literature and language. Authorised English translation by Batakrishna Ghosh.* Oriental Books Reprint Corp., Delhi, 1968.

GODAKUMBURA, C.E. "Chapada and Chapada Saddhammajotipala", *Journal of the Burma Research Society* LII, 1969: 1–8.

GORNALL, A.M. "*Kārakas* in Cāndra Grammar: An Interpretation from the Pāli Buddhist *Śāstras*", *Puṣpikā, Tracing Ancient India through Texts and Traditions, Vol. 2*, edited by Giovanni Ciotti, Alastair Gornall, Paolo Visigalli, Oxbow Books, Oxford, 2014: 87–114.

_____ *Buddhism and Grammar, The Scholarly Cultivation of Pāli in Medieval Laṅkā*, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambrdige, 2012.

GRÜNWEDEL, A. *Das sechste kapitel der Rūpasiddhi: nach drei Singhalesischen Pali-handschriften*, Schade's Buchdruckerei, Berlin, 1883.

GUILLON, E. *L'armée de Mara au pied de l'Ananda (Pagan, Birmanie)*, Editions Recherches sur les Civilisations, Paris, 1985.

HANDLIN, L. "The King and his Bhagavā: The Meanings of Pagan's Early Theravādas", in P. Skilling et al. (eds.) *How Theravāda is Theravāda? Exploring Buddhist Identities*, Silkworm Books, Chiang Mai, 2012: 165–240.

VON HINÜBER, O. *A handbook of Pali literature*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1996.

_____ "Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma", B*eiträge zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Buddhismus in Birma, I*, Göttingen, 1983.

HUXLEY, A. "How Buddhist is Theravada Buddhist law? A Survey of Legal Literature in Pali-land", *The Buddhist Forum*, 1, London, 1990: 41–85.

JAYAWARDHANA, S. *Handbook of Pali Literature*, Colombo, 1994.

JHALAKĪKAR, B. *Nyāyakośa or Dictionary of Indian Philosophy, Revised And Re-edited by Vāsudev Shāstri Abhyankar*, Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan, Varanasi, 2011.

JOSHI, S.D. *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Samarthāhṇika (P. 2.1.1.)*, University of Pune, 1968.

JOSHI, S.D. and ROODBERGEN, J.A.F. *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Paspaśāhnika*, Pune, 1986.

Joshi, S. D. and Bhate, S. *The Fundamentals of anuvṛtti*, Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Pune, Pune, 1984.

Kahrs, E.G. *On the Study of Nirukta*, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune, 2005.

_____ *Indian Semantic Analysis: The* nirvacana *tradition*, Cambridge, 1998

_____ "Exploring the *Saddanīti*", *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* XVII, Oxford, 1992: 1–212.

Karunadasa, Y. *Theravāda Abhidhamma, its Inquiry into the Nature of Conditioned Reality*, Centre of Buddhist Studies, The University of Hong Kong, 2010.

_____ *The Dhamma Theory, Philosophical Cornerstone of the Abhidhamma*, The Wheel Publications, Kandy, 1996.

Katre, S.M. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, University of Texas Press, Austin, 1987.

Kelāsa, Ven. *Pugaṃ-sāsanā-vaṅ*, reprint of the 1973 edition, Yangon, 2005.

Kieffer-Pülz, P. "Quotatives Indicating Quotations in Pāli Commentarial Literature, *iti/ti* and Quotatives with *vuttaṃ*", *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 43, 2014: 427–452.

_____ *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭīkā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*, 3 Vols., Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2013.

_____ *Die Sīmā: Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*, Reimer, Berlin, 1992.

Kielhorn, F. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Vol. 2 – Adhyayas 3 – 5*, Pune, 1965.

_____ *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Vol. 1 – Adhyayas 1 and 2*, Pune, 1962.

Kiparsky, P. *Pāṇini as a variationist*, Centre of Advanced Studies in Sanskrit, Pune, 1979.

KIRICHENKO, A. Atula Hsayadaw Shin Yasa: A Critical Biography of an Eighteenth-Century Burmese Monk, (version 1.1.), online publication: http://www.grad.niu.edu/Burma/publications/jbs/vol15.2/

KUHN, E.W.A. *Kaccāyanappakaraṇae specimen alterum*, Halle, 1870.

_____ *Kaccāyanapakaraṇae specimen*, Halle, 1869.

KUMAR, B. *The Gandhavaṃsa (A History of Pali Literature)*, Eastern Book Publishers, Delhi, 1992.

KYAW, P.P. *Paṭṭhāna (Conditional Relations) in Burmese Buddhism*, unpublished PhD dissertation, King's College London, University of London, 2014.

LAMMERTS, D.C. *Buddhism and Written Law: Dhammasattha Manuscripts and Texts in Premodern Burma*, unpublished PhD dissertation, Cornell University, 2010.

LAW, B.C. *A History of Pāli Literature*, London, 1933.

LIEBERMAN, V. *Strange Parallels*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

_____ "Reinterpreting Burmese History", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 29, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

_____ "New look at the *Sāsanavaṃsa*", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39, London, 1976: 137–149.

LIEBICH, B. *Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft,* C. Winter Verlag, Heidelberg, 1919.

_____ *Cāndravyākaraṇa: die Grammatik des Candragomin: sūtra, uṇādi, dhātupāṭha*, Brockhaus, Leipzig, 1902.

LUCE, G.H. *Old Burma–Early Pagan*, Artibus Asiae, New York, 1969.

LÜDERS, H. *Kātantra und Kaumāralāta*, Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1930.

_____ *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen*, Georg Reimer, Berlin, 1911.

MALALASEKERA, G.P. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, Luzac and Co., 1960.

_____ *The Pāli Literature of Ceylon*, London, 1928.

MALLINSON, J. *The ocean of the rivers of story by Somadeva*, New York University Press, JJC Foundation, New York, 2007.

MATILAL, B.K. *Epistemology, Logic, and Grammar in Indian Philosophical Analysis, New Edition,* ed. Jonardon Ganeri, Oxford, 2005.

MINAYEFF, J. "The *Gandhavaṃsa*", *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 1886: 54–80.

_____ "*Sandesakathā*", *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 1885: 17–29.

MONIER-WILLIAMS, M. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Clarendon, Oxford, 1872.

NORMAN, K.R. *Pāli Literature. A history of Indian literature Vol. VII, Fasc. 2*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1983.

NYANATUSITA. *Reference Table of Pali Literature*, electronic edition by the author: http://gretil.sub.unigoettingen.de/gretil_elib/, 2008.

NYUNT, P. *Catalogue of the Piṭaka and Other Texts in Pāḷi, Pāḷi-Burmese, and Burmese (Piṭakat-tō-sa-muiṅ:) by Maṅ:-krī: Mahāsirijeya-sū*, PTS, Bristol, 2012.

OUNG, T.D. *A grammar of the Pali language:(after Kaccâyana); in 4 volumes*, London, 1899–1902.

PIND, O.H. *Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti*, PTS, Bristol, 2013.

_____ "Pāli Grammar and Grammarians from Buddhaghosa to Vajirabuddhi: A Survey", *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* XXXI, Bristol, 2012: 57--124.

_____ "Saddavimala 12.1-11 and its Mūlasārvāstivādin origin", in F. Bizot and F. Lagirarde, *Saddavimala. La pureté par les mots*, EFEO, Paris, 1996: 67–72.

_____ "Pāli and the Pāli grammarians: The methodology of the Pāli grammarians", in *Sauhṛdyamaṅgalam: Studies in Honour of Siegfried Lienhard on his 70th Birthday*, The Association of Oriental Studies, Stockholdm, 1995: 281–297.

_____ "Buddhaghosa – His Works and Scholarly Background", *Buddhist Studies* (*Bukkyo Kenkyu*) XXI, 1992: 135–156.

_____ "Studies in the Pāli Grammarians II", *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* XIII, 1990: 175–218.

_____ "Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I", *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* XIII, 1989: 33–82.

POLLOCK, S. *The language of the gods in the world of men : Sanskrit, culture, and power in premodern India*, Berkeley, 2006.

_____ "The Sanskrit Cosmopolis, A.D. 300–1300: Transculturation, Vernacularization, and the Question of Ideology", in *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the history of the Sanskrit Language* (Brill's Indological Library, 13), ed. Jan E.M. Houben, Leiden, 1996: 197–247.

PRANKE, P. " 'Bodawpaya's Madness': Monastic Accounts of King Bodawpaya's Conflict With the Burmese Samngha, Part One," *Journal of Burma Studies*, 12, 2008: 1–28.

_____ *The 'Treatise on the Lineage of the Elders' (*Vaṃsadīpanī*): Monastic Reform and the Writing of Buddhist History in Eighteenth-Century Burma*", PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 2004.

RAY, N. *An Introduction to the Study of Theravada Buddhism in Burma*, Calcutta, 1946

RENOU, L. "Kaccāyana et le Kātantra" in *Études Vediques et Pāṇinéennes*, Vol. 3, E. De Boccard, Paris, 1959: 127–133.

_____ *Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit*, Champion, Paris, 1957.

RUIZ-FALQUÉS, A. "Two Treasures of Pāli Literature from the U Pho Thi Library in Thaton: the *Saddanīti-ṭīkā* and the *Mukhamattasāra*", *Philosophica Asiatica Monograph Series 1: Manuscripts in the U Pho Thi Library, Saddhammajotika Monastery, Thaton, Myanmar*, edited by William Pruitt, Sunao Kasamatsu, Aleix Ruiz-Falqués, Yumi Ousaka, Tokyo, 2014. [2014b]

─────── "The creative erudition of Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla, a 15th-Century Grammarian and Philosopher from Burma", *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 42, No.

4, September 2014. [2014a]

SADDHĀTISSA, H. *Pāli Literature of South-East Asia*, Buddhist Cultural Centre, Dehiwala, 2004.

_____ "*Nāmacāradīpaka*", *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, 1990: 1–28.

SAINI, R.S. *Kātantra-vyākaraṇa*, Bharatiya Viya Prakashan, Delhi, 1987.

_____ *Post-Pāṇinian systems of Sanskrit grammar*, Parimal Publications, Delhi, 1999.

SARUP, L. *The Nigaṇṭhu and the Nirukta: the oldest Indian treatise on etymology, philology and semantics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1921.

SCHARFE, H. *Grammatical Literature. A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. V, Fasc. 2, edited by Jan Gonda, Wiesbaden, 1977

SEIN KO, T. *The Kalyani inscriptions erected by King Dhammaceti at Pegu in 1476 A.D.*, Yangon, 1892.

SENART, E. *Kaccàyana et la littérature grammaticale du Pâli*, Journal Asiatique, Paris, 1871.

SHARMA, R.N. *The* Aṣṭādhyāyī *of Pāṇini, Volume 1, Introduction to the* Aṣṭādhyāyī *as a Grammatical Device*, New Delhi, 1987

SHARMA, V. *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya with the commentaries of Uvaṭa and Anantabhaṭṭa*, Madras, 1934.

SHEN, Y. *A Study on the Nominal Declension in the Kātantra System*, MPhil dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2014.

SKILLING, P. "Theravāda in history", *Pacific World*, Third Series, 11, 2009: 61–93.

SKILLING, P. et al. *How Theravāda is Theravāda: Exploring Buddhist Identities*, Silkworm Books, Chiang Mai, 2012.

SMITH, H. *Saddanīti: la grammaire palie d'Aggavaṃsa*, C.W.K. Gleerup, Lund, 1928–1956.

STARGARDT, J. "The Oldest Known Pāli Texts, 5th-6th Century: Results of the Cambridge Symposium on the Pyu Golden Pāli Text from Śrī Kṣetra", *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* XXI, 1995: 199–213.

STRACHAN, P. P*agan: Art and Architecture of Old Burma. With numerous illustrations in both colour and monochrome*, Kiscadale, London, 1996.

STRONG, J. *The legend and cult of Upagupta: Sanskrit Buddhism in north India and Southeast Asia*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1992.

SUBHUTI, W. *Padamālā*, Eglish Translation by Alastair Gornall and Amal Gunasena [forthcoming].

THAN TUN, W. *Myanmar Buddhism of the Pagan Period (AD 1000–1300)*, unpublished PhD dissertation, National University of Singapore, 2002.

TIN LWIN. "The *Saddanīti*", in *Studies in honour of Mingun Sayadaw*, Yangon, 1991: 117–126.

VĀSEṬṬHĀBHIVAṂSA, Ven. *Saddatthabhedacintā-kyàmḥ, cā-koiy, ṭīkā, dīpanī (3) kyamḥ-tvè*, Mandalay, 2008.

VIDYABHUSANA, S.C. *Kaccayana's Pali grammar: edited in Devanagari character and translated into English*, Mahabodhi Society, Calcutta, 1901.

WALSHE, M.O'C. *The Long Discourses of the Buddha: a translation of the Dīgha Nikāya*, Wisdom Publications, Boston, 2012.

WHITNEY, W.D. "The *Atharva-veda prātiśākhya*, or *Śaunakīya Caturādhyāyikā*: text, translation and notes", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 7, 1862: 333–615.

_____ "The *Taittirīya-prātiśākhya* with its commentary, the *Tribhāṣyaratna*", *Journal of the american Oriental Society* 9, 1871: 1–469.

WIJERATNE, R.P. AND GETHIN, R. (trans.) *Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma (*Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*) by Anuruddha. Exposition of the Topics of Abhidhamma*

*(*Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī*) by Sumaṅgala being a commentary on Anuruddha's Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma*, Pāli Text Society, Lancaster, 2007.