PARIYATTI

STUDIES IN PĀLI LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

EDITORS

BIMALENDRA KUMAR
UJJWAL KUMAR

PARIYATTI
STUDIES IN PĀLI LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
EDITORS
BIMALENDRA KUMAR
UJJWAL KUMAR

Bimalendra KUMAR started his academic career as a Lecturer in the Department of Indo-Tibetan Studies, Visva Bharati University, Santiniketan (W.B.). At present, he is Professor of Pali, Department of Pali and Buddhist Studies, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi (U.P.). His publications include over eighty articles in various scholarly journals published from India and abroad. He has edited and authored nine books namely, *Theory of Relations in Buddhist Philosophy* (1998), *Gandhavaṃsa: A History of Pali Literature* (1992), *Perspectives of Tibetan and Buddhist Studies (2005), Paṭṭhānuddesadīpanī* (2005), *Dāhtuvaṃso* (2006), *Dhammadesanā: A Buddhist Perspective (Prof. Mahesh Tiwari Commemoration Volume)* (2007) (jointly edited), *Buddhism and Social Ideals* (2009) (jointly edited), *Meghadūta: Critical Edition with Sanskrit and Tibetan Index* (2011) (jointly edited) and *Bhesajjamañjusā* (Devanagarī Edition): 1-18 Paddhati (2015), *Bodhi: Recent Studies in Pāli Buddhism* (2016) (jointly ed. with U. KUMAR). He is the editor of *Dharmadoot* Journal (Sarnath), published by Maha-Bodhi Society of India.

E-mail: bimal_bhu_60@yahoo.co.in

Ujjwal KUMAR started his academic career as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Pali, University of Pune, Pune, Maharashtra in 2006. At present, he is Assosiate Professor in the Department of Buddhist Studies, University of Calcutta, Kolkata, West Bengal. In his credit, three books and number of articles are published. His area of research is Pāli Nīti Literature. His major publication includes *Lokanīti: Devanāgarī Edition with Hindi Translation* (2015), *Bodhi: Recent Studies in Pāli Buddhism* (2016) (jointly edited with Prof. B. KUMAR).

E-mail: ujjwal1980@gmail.com

PREFACE

The present volume entitled "*Pariyatti: Studies in Pāli Language and Literature*" contains some valuable essays of the Pāli scholars of the world representing all the Theravada Buddhist countries and highlighting different divisions of Pāli literature like *Sutta, Abhidhamma, Vyākaraṇa* etc. It is said that '*Pariyatti*' (thought) and '*Paṭipatti*' (practice) are the two aspects of Pāli Buddhism, which move together side by side, just like the two wheels of a chariot for righteous and smooth way faring in the life. The *Pariyatti* (thought) does not refer to mere imaginative flight but as real fact moving pace to pace with the process of life. It unfolds the nature of reality (*dhamma-svabhāva*), eradicates the ignorance (*moha*) and presents admonition for visualization of truth face to face.

The thought revealed through Pāli literature has occupied an enormous value in the discipline of Buddhist Studies. The main tenets of Buddhism like Four Noble Truths, Eight-fold Path, Law of Dependent Origination, Karma and Rebirth, Nirvāṇa etc. have been explicated in Pāli literature, which plays an important role in critical exposition of all teachings of the Buddha. Hence, an effort has been made to show the wider role of Pāli literature in interpreting the thoughts available in the teachings of the Buddha through the research papers in this volume. The present volume consists of sixteen papers altogether. Four papers in the beginning of this volume are directly related to the profound and excellent teachings of the Buddha namely *Abhidhamma*. Next four papers are dealing with the literary and critical analysis of

the *sutta-s* available in the *Sutta Piṭaka* as well as in the post-canonical texts. Other papers in the third section attempt to reveal various aspects of Kātantra and Kaccāyana Grammars along with some methodological reflections in translating *sutta-s* from Pāli to English. The research papers of the last section are devoted to many aspects of Buddhism with special reference to philosophical and historical expansion of Buddhism.

In this way, this volume covers all aspects of thoughts available in Pāli literature and will be helpful to the researchers in Pāli Studies. We take this opportunity to put on record our sincere thanks to all the contributors for their papers. Finally, we express our thanks to Shri Aditya Goel, Proprietor, Aditya Publishers, New Delhi for his full cooperation in bringing out the present volume in time.

Varanasi
Kolkata   Editors

Contents

On the Authorship of *Kaccāyana*, the Oldest Pāli Grammar

A. RUIZ-FALQUÉS[*]

1. Single or multiple authorship of *Kaccāyana*

The *Kaccāyana* (Kacc) Pāli grammar was composed around the sixth century CE, most probably in India, for it was unknown in Sri Lanka until a later date. This work, partly original and partly based on Pāṇini and Kātantra (Kā) is the oldest extant Pāli grammar. It is also the most influential *vyākaraṇa* text in the history of Theravāda Buddhism. The authorship of this text, however, remains disputed. An old Sinhalese tradition identifies Kaccāyana with Mahā Kaccāyana, the disciple of the Buddha and alleged author of the *Nettippakaraṇa* and the *Mahānirutti* (Ap-a 491, $_{17-21}$ (ad Ap 531); A I 23, $_{16-28}$). This view is today dismissed by most scholars. Even orthodox Theravādin-s find it difficult to accept that an imperfect treatise such as Kacc could have been written by an impeccable *arahant* such as Mahā Kaccāyana. The name Kaccāyana, therefore, must represent a different author. PIND suggests that Kacc could be the work of one or more compilers rather than authors: "Kacc is a compilation of various hands" (PIND 2012: 75). This is the reason that scholars have described it as chaotic and devoid of any systematic arrangement. Now, when we say "various hands" it is not clear whether we mean a definite or indefinite number of authors. A more or less established consensus among scholars, after D'ALWIS (1863:

---

[*]   Ph.D. University of Cambridge. E-mail: ar607@cam.ac.uk

104–105), divides the work in three layers of text. In the Pāli grammatical tradition, each layer is ascribed to a particular author. Thus, the *sutta* text, that is to say, the grammatical aphorisms, are ascribed to a certain Kaccāyana, the *vutti* ("gloss", Kacc-v) is ascribed to a certain Saṅghanandin, and the *payoga* ("examples") section is ascribed to a certain Brahmadatta. These three texts make the Kacc proper. The *Nyāsa* of Vimalabuddhi, otherwise known as *Mukhamattadīpanī* (Mmd) is considered the fourth layer of the corpus, but I will not concern myself with this work, as it has a textual tradition of its own.

In order to illustrate the threefold nature of Kacc, let us examine Kacc 336 *sare an* "[when deriving a compound], before a vowel *an* [replaces *na*]". The following is the text that we would find in a manuscript:

> *sare an. nassa padassa tappurise uttarapade sabbasseva anādeso hoti sare pare. anasso. anissaro. anariyo. aniṭṭho.*[1]

Here we can distinguish three sections. The main rule, *sare an*, is the first. What follows is a gloss giving the context that applies to the rule, that is to say, conditions from previous *sutta*-s that implicitly "recur" (*anuvattanti*) or "are still valid" (*vattanti*), that is why this second section is called *vutti*. Finally, we have a series of words that exemplify the "application" (*payoga*) of the rule.

Some *sutta*-s in Kacc include even another type of section at the end. This section consists of questions and answers about the purpose and scope of the words used in the previous sections. For instance, Kacc 9 *parasamaññā payoge*:

> *parasamaññā payoge. yā ca pana sakkataganthesu samaññā ghosā ti vā aghosā ti vā tā payoge sati ettha pi payuñjante. ga gha ṅa ja jha ña ḍa ḍha ṇa da dha na ba bha ma ya ra la va ha ḷa iti ghosā. ka kha ca cha ṭa ṭha ta tha pa pha sa iti*

---

[1] I follow the PTS critical edition (= PIND 2013).

> *aghosā. ghosāghosa icc anena kv attho. vagge ghosāghosā-*
> *naṃ tatiyapaṭhamā* (Kacc 3,₁₋₈).

The initial statement *parasamaññā payoge* is the *sutta*, which means "Concepts of others [should be used] when they apply". The *vutti* explains that concepts, such as *ghosa* "aspirate" and *aghosa* "unaspirate", defined in Sanskrit treatises, are to be used when there is occasion to apply them (*payoge sati*). We subsequently find a list of *ghosa* and *aghosa* consonants. This part already belongs to the *payoga*. The last section consists of a question about the purpose of saying "*ghosāghosā*" and the answer giving the place in Kacc where these two concepts are used [i.e. Kacc 29]. That type of section could also be considered *payoga*, for it specifies the scope for the application of the *sutta*. In this case and in other cases, it is very important to observe how the *payoga* does not comment upon the *sutta* (allegedly composed by Kaccāyana) but upon the *vutti* (allegedly composed by Saṅghanandin). In his critical edition of the text, Pind establishes a simpler division that overlooks this fact. He separates the *sutta* text, that is Kacc, from the rest, which he calls *Kaccāyanavutti* (Kacc-v). According to Pind, it is practically impossible to determine the authorship, single or multiple, of Kacc. That is why, I think, he has adopted a straightforward and practical policy when editing the text.

In this paper I do not intend to solve the question of the Kacc authorship. I will simply problematise it taking into consideration some facts that have so-far been overlooked.

2. Origin of the fourfold division of the *Kaccāyana* system

James D'Alwis was the first modern scholar to raise the question of the triple authorship of Kacc. In his essay on this grammar, he quotes a passage from the "*Kaccāyanabheda-ṭīkā*", actually meaning, as Pind already pointed out, the *Kaccāyanabheda-navaṭīkā* (Kacc-bh-nṭ, not to be confused with the old *Kaccāyanabheda-porāṇaṭīkā*). D'Alwis quotes the entire

passage, which deals with the number of *sutta*-s in every chapter of Kacc and it basically contains a quotation of an older work, now lost, called *Kaccāyana-dīpanī*. Ariyālaṅkāra, the author of Kacc-bh-nṭ points out that the number of *sutta*-s according to *Kaccāyana-dīpanī* does not match the number of Kacc *sutta*-s embedded in the *Nyāsa*. And he adds the famous passage, including another quotation that may come from *Kaccāyana-dīpanī* as well:

> *imāni suttāni mahā kaccāyanena katāni vutti ca sanghanandi sankhātena mahā kaccāyaneva katā payogo brahmadattena kato ti. vuttañ cetaṃ:*

> *kaccāyanakato yogo vutti ca sanghanandināpayogo brahmadattena nyāso vimalabuddhinā ti* (Kacc-bh-nṭ 129, 15-30).

D'Alwis translates:

> These aphorisms were composed by Mahā Kaccāyana. The *Vutti* were [*sic*] composed by *Mahā Kaccāyana* himself, (who was also) called Saṅghanandi; – and the illustrations by Brahmadatta.

> So it is expressly stated – that 'The aphorisms were made by Kaccāyana, the *vutti* by Sanghanandi, the illustrations by Brahmadatta and the *nyāsa* by Vimalabuddhi' (D'Alwis, 1863: 105).

D'Alwis adds, in a footnote, that the interpretation of the author of Kacc-bh-nṭ, identifying Mahā Kaccāyana and Sanghanandi, is probably a misunderstanding of the source, where clearly four layers of text are implied. D'Alwis therefore believes that Kacc-bh-nṭ is wrong. Other scholars, such as Malalasekera, Vidyabhusana, Deokar and Pind,[2] have also

---

2   Malalasekera (1958: 180) says: "In the *Kaccāyanabheda*, written by Mahāyasa Thera of Thatōn about the thirteenth century, there occurs a memorial verse: 'The aphorisms were made by Kaccāyana, the *Vutti* by Saṅghānandi. The illustrations by Brahmadatta. And the *Nyāsa* by Vimalabuddhi.'" To the best of my knowledge, that verse is

dismissed the interpretation of Kacc-bh-nṭ and prefer what they consider to be the original meaning of the quotation given in Kacc-bh-nṭ, that is, they do not identify Kaccāyana with Saṅghanandin, and they do not believe that the *sutta* and the *vutti* are the work of the same author.

A tradition similar to the one quoted by Ariyālaṅkāra is found in the *Saddhammasaṅgaha* (Saddhamma-s IX, 18-20, 35). This work is a "bibliography" written in the fourteenth century by the Thai monk Dhammakitti (or maybe by Ñāṇakitti, fifteenth century[3]). The passage reads as follows:

> *kaccāyano kato yogo saṃghanandi pavuttikā,*
> *ṭīkā vimalabodhī ca brahmaputto ca kārakā.*
> (SADDHĀNANDA, 1890: 63)

> Kaccāyana composed the *yoga* ["rule"], Saṅgha-nandin the *pavuttikā* ["notes"], and Vimalabodhī the *ṭīkā* ["commentary"], and Brahmaputto the *kāraka* ["section on factor of action"].

The author of Saddhamma-s had allegedly studied at the Mahāvihāra of Laṅkā (*laṅkāramamahāvase*[4]) and it is likely that the stanza ultimately comes from Laṅkā, not Burma, but this is difficult to ascertain.

Nandapañña's *Gandhavaṃsa* (Gv), a Burmese catalogue

---

not found in Kacc-bh. VIDYABHUSANA (1901: xxvi) says: "'The Yoga (*Sūtra*) was written by Kaccāyana, the commentary by Saṅghanandī, the examples were added by Brahmadatta and the gloss by Vimalabuddhi.' From the manner in which the *sutta*, *vutti*, *payoga* and *nyāsa* are intimately connected with one another, I am inclined to believe that the entire work was written by Kātyāyana himself. At any rate the *sutta*, etc. were written simultaneously." Even though VIDYABHUSANA is clearly not aware that the *Nyāsa* is a different text, it is important to keep in mind that this great scholar had the intuition of a single authorship. DEOKAR (2008: 7) and PIND (2012: 71) also distinguish four authors in that quotation.

[3]   NYANATUSSITA, 4.3.1.
[4]   SADDHĀNANDA, 1890: 90.

written probably around the seventeenth century[5] but sour-ce of many other bibliographies and one of the most consul-ted in modern Pāli, mentions Kaccāyana as the author of the "Kaccāyanagandho". Gv does not mention Saṅghanandin, nor Brahmadatta (or Brahmaputta). It however mentions Vimalabuddhi as the author of Mmd.[6]

Ariyālaṅkāra probably had some reasons to believe that Kacc and Kacc-v are the work of the same author, and to consider the *payoga* as a different work, a latter addition. It seems as if he already expected three authors, and that is why he forces the meaning of the stanza in such a counterintuitive way. Indeed he is quoting the stanza in order to back up his judgement. He might be wrong in his interpretation, but he might still be right in seeing three, and not four, authors in the core text of the Kacc System.

In Western scholarship FRYER argued, as early as in 1882, in favour of Ariyālaṅkāra's position (although he ascribes the stanza to Ariyālaṅkāra himself). VIDYABHUSANA also mainta-ined that the text known as *Kaccāyana* was the work of a single person (see previous note). In the following section I will examine some features of Kacc and Kacc-v that can explain why some scholars tend to believe in a single author or editor.

3. Points of structure

It is necessary in the first place to examine the structure of the text as a whole. The structure of Kacc *sutta* is the same as Kātantra and many other grammars of the so-called Aindra class. Originally the work consists of four books: *Sandhi, Nāma, Ākhyāta* and *Kibbidhāna*[7]. Introductory verses are found in the beginning of the 1st, the 3rd and the 4th books. Those in the 3rd

---

[5]   NYANATUSSITA, 4.3.3.

[6]   Gv, 60: *vimalabuddhi nāmācariyo mukhamattadīpanī nāma nyāsapakara-ṇaṃ akāsi.*

[7]   For the so-called Aindra System see BURNELL, 1885 *passim.*

book, according to PIND (2013: 146), are later additions. Kacc structure is based on the complete version of *Kātantra*, including the last book on *kṛt* suffixes, allegedly authored by a certain Kātyāyana, not by Śarvavarman (SAINI 1999: 18). The title *Sandhikappa*, which should be the title of the first book only, is found in Kacc manuscript colophons at the end of every chapter (*... sandhikappo niṭṭhito*), the fact is that tradition consistently refers to this grammar as *Kaccāyana* (DEOKAR 2008: 10). Taking the title from the introductory stanzas, with slight variations, is a normal practice.

As early as in Vimalabuddhi's *Mukhamattadīpanī* (probably around the 10ᵗʰ century CE) we find that Kacc is treated a compilation of four treatises. The original fourfold sectioning developed into an artificial eightfold division already recognised by Vimalabuddhi. Furthermore, Vimalabuddhi's recension of Kacc (and Kacc-v) is not exactly the same as the recension of the text called simply *Kaccāyana* in Sri Lanka and Burma. But the textual transmission of Kacc and Kacc-v is the same. They are consistently called Kaccāyana in mss.

The commentarial pattern or method of Kacc-v is the same throughout the four books. We find the same set of (optional) fields:

(1) A paraphrase (*vutti*)

(2) Examples introduced by *tamyathā* or equivalent

(3) Counter examples introduced by *kasmā* or equivalent

(4) Purpose or scope of the *sutta* introduced by *kv attho* or equivalent

(5) Comments on *anuvṛtti*, meaning of *ca* or *vā*, etc. for instance: Kacc-v ad Kacc 35: *casaddaggahaṇena iheva makārassa pakāro hoti.*

Regarding the text of PIND's Kacc-v specifically, it is

considered that:

> 1) It is made of different layers in Kacc/-v, each layer is the work of one single author.

> 2) It is made of different sections in Kacc/-v, each section is the work of one author.

According to PIND, it is questionable that Kacc-v is the work of a single author and he gives the following explanation:

> [T]he *sandhi* chapter differs from the other chapters in the way it paraphrases each *sutta*. In contrast to the other chapters which use the verb *āpajjate* to indicate that a grammatical operation obtains, the *sandhi* chapter invariably uses *pappoti*, e.g. *lopaṃ pappoti* or *papponti* at Kacc-v 12 through 17, contrasting with *lopaṃ āpajjate* or *āpajjante*, e.g. at Kacc 220. They also differ with respect to the formulation of the contrastive sections of the exegesis of Kacc: in the *sandhi* chapter this section is invariably introduced by *kasmā*, elsewhere by *kimatthaṃ*. This difference in style seems to indicate that the commentary on the *sandhi* chapter has a different author from the rest of the work (PIND 2012: 90).

The difference in terminology seems obvious. But the difference of style in Kacc-v I and II-IV is merely lexical. The meaning of the technical terms is the same. The method of grammatical analysis is also the same. In fact, the only differences PIND accounts for are:

Kacc-v, book I	Kacc-v books II-IV
pappoti	*āpajjate*
kasmā	*kimatthaṃ*

In this context, *pappoti* and *āpajjate* are synonyms. Furthermore, there are other formulae to express the same idea in

Kacc-v. For instance, even within the *Sandhikappa*, the obtaining of a substitute can be expressed in different ways:

Kacc-v ad. Kacc 32: *ekāre hakāre ca pare niggahītaṃ kho <u>ñakāraṃ pappoti</u> vā*

Kacc-v ad. Kacc 34: *niggahītassa kho sare pare <u>makāradakārādesā honti</u>.*

Sandhikappa probably translates Kā's *āpadyate* either with acc. + *pappoti* or with *(x)-ādesa hoti* or simply *(x) hoti*. Compare:

Kā, I.4.60 *mo 'nusvāraṃ vyañjane*

Kā-v *makāro punar anto vyañjane pare anusvāram āpadyate.*

Kacc, 30 *aṃ byañjane niggahītaṃ*

Kacc-v *niggahītaṃ kho byañjane pare aṃ iti hoti.*

This does not necessarily imply that the commentary is written by two different authors. Variation might be a feature of the author's style, a mixed style that reminds us of the Sanskrit commentator Kātyāyana or the Kātantra commentators. The same applies to *kasmā* and *kimattham* which seem to be synonyms.

Finally, Kacc-v uses the expression *kv attho* "where is it used?" in order to exemplify the scope of a rule. This expression (*kv attho*) is not different in books I, II and III, but interestingly, it changes to *kimpayojanaṃ* in book IV.

Compare the examples:

	I Sandhi	II Nāma	III Ākhyāta	IV Kibbidhāna
A) Introduce	kv attho	kv attho	kv attho	kimpayo-janaṃ

s examples of scope of a sutta				
B) Introduces examples from the canon	kasmā	kimatthaṃ	kimatthaṃ	kimatthaṃ

From this we could conclude that Kacc-v is an aggregate of layers, every layer being the work of different authors according to the section. But despite some variations in terminology, I think Kacc-v proves fairly consistent as a commentary. In fact, VIDYABHUSANA, who was well versed in logic and grammar, had the impression that "the entire work was written by Kaccāyana himself". We should also take into account that variations and variant readings occur also in Kā and Kā-v, and in other commentaries of long tradition. That may be the result of a textual tradition that transmitted the text in separate books, not as a whole, as it is the case with Kacc/-v. Orality, in the handing down of these treatises, can also be an important factor of lexical variation.

4. Author of what?

The question, however, still remains: author of what? PIND assumes a clear cut difference between *sutta* and the rest – which is conventionally called Kacc-v. But, as I have shown, this is not what an internal analysis of Kacc-v reveals and this is not the opinion of other grammarians. Ariyālaṅkāra, for instance, sees a unity in the *sutta* and the *vutti* "gloss", whereas he considers the rest as a *payoga* – and obviously he knows that Mmd is a different work. I think that some features point to a singularity of author of the *sutta* and the *vutti*,

if not the *sutta* together with *vutti* and *payoga*. I will subsequently offer some examples of the way *sutta* and *vutti* are intimately connected and could be considered the work of the same author, an author that was creating a Pāli version of *Kātantra* and *Kātantravṛtti* (or perhaps a version of some Buddhist *Kātantra* such as the *Kaumāravyākaraṇa*) (see Lüders, 1930). I will also show some problems with this view.

Alleged misunderstandings of Kacc-v:

[A] Misunderstanding of *vā*

Example 1 – *vā* in Kacc 273

The beginning of the *kāraka* section in Kacc starts with the definition of *apādāna*:

> Kacc 273 *yasmād apeti bhayaṃ ādatte vā tad apādā-naṃ*

Kacc-v comments upon the *sutta*:

> *yasmā vā apeti yasmā vā bhayaṃ jāyate yasmā vā ādatte taṃ kārakaṃ apādānasaññaṃ hoti.*

Etc. Senart, ignoring the *vutti*, translates:

> On apelle *apādāna* (*ablatio*) [la relation syntactique où se trouve] l'objet dont on s'éloigne ou dont on s'effraye (Senart 1871: 125).

Senart skips the translation of *ādatte*, and remarks:

> Malgré le scholiaste, suivi par M. Kuhn, je ne crois pas possible de dédoubler l'expression *bhayaṃ ādatte*; il faudrait dans ce cas un premier *vā* après *bhayaṃ* (Senart 1871: 125).

Senart also points out that this extra *vā* in Kacc-v is not to be found in Pāṇini's or *Kātantra*'s *sūtrapāṭha*. He is right: in Kā II.214 there is only one *vā*. But this missing *vā* is implicit in Durgasiṃha's Kā-v. It is evident that Kacc and Kacc-v follow the same text:

> Kā II.214 *yato 'paiti bhayam ādatte vā tad apādānaṃ*

> Kā-v ad Kā II.214 *yasmād apaiti, yasmād bhayaṃ bhavati yasmād ādatte vā tat kārakam apādāna-saṃjñaṃ bhavati.*

Kacc-v follows the interpretation of Kā-v. This example shows the three different contexts where *apādāna* is applied, and they are the ones we find in Kacc-v. This instance seems to indicate that Kacc *sutta* and *vutti* are composed together following the model Kā and Kā-v.

Example 2 – *vā* in Kacc 281

A similar example is found again in the *kāraka* section (although there are instances of this alleged "over interpretation" all over the work).

> Kacc 281 *yena vā kayirate taṃ karaṇaṃ*

> That with which something is, for instance (*vā*), done, is the instrument (*karaṇaṃ*).

My translation follows the interpretation of Kacc-v, where this *vā* has usually the meaning of "for instance":

> Kacc-v ad Kacc 281 *yena vā kayirate yena vā passati yena vā suṇāti taṃ kārakaṃ karaṇasaññaṃ hoti.*

SENART (1871: 142) says: "Il est difficile de croire que le *vā* du *sūtra* ait réellement le sens que semble lui attribuer le scholiaste" ("It is difficult to believe that the *vā* of the *sūtra* actually has the meaning that the commentator seems to ascribe to it") and later on, in the same comment: "Le grammarien pāli aurait cherché à rendre par la particule *vā* l'intention contenue dans le superlatif du grammarien sanskrit" ("The Pāli grammarian would have tried to express, by means of the particle *vā*, the intention that is implied in the superlative of the Sanskrit grammarian"). This *vā* is not found in the Kā or Kā-v. But we know that Kacc and Kacc-v, in the *kāraka* section, are a faithful copy of Kā and Kā-v. Why

should Kacc add a particle devoid of information? A closer look reveals that the particle *vā* in Kacc 281 actually reflects Kā-v ad Kā II.218: *dātreṇa dhānyaṃ lunāti. manasā meruṃ gacchati. tatha paśunā rudraṃ yajate*, etc. The author of Kacc knows that the verb *kayirate* (S. *krīyate*) means actually any action, as the examples in Kā-v indicate. That is why he adds *vā*. Kacc *sutta* seems to be based not on Kā but on Kā through its *vṛtti*.

[B] Misunderstanding of *ca*

Example 3 – *ca* in Kacc 20

> Kacc 20 *do dhassa ca*
>
> Kacc-v *dha iccetassa sare pare kvaci dakārādeso hoti. ekaṃ idāhaṃ bhikkhave samayaṃ.*
>
> "And *dh* becomes *d*"
>
> "*dh*, when followed by vowel, becomes *d* sometimes [*ca* triggers *vā= kvaci* from Kacc 13]"

The commentary goes on with a list of other instances of consonantic change (*vikāra*). This is, according to Senart, an "overuse" of the particle *ca*: "cet abus, que nous rencontrerons fréquemment par la suite, d'un mot ou d'une particule qu'il étend et dénature au point de faire dire à l'auteur une foule de choses, souvent fautives, qui n'étaient nullement dans sa pensée" (SENART 1871: 18). But if we think of the *vutti* as the gloss only, we realize there is no "abus". The gloss sticks to the meaning of the *sutta*. The flaw is in the *payoga* layer, where the list of extensions ("foule de choses … fautives" i.e. "many wrong things") is found. If this is a mistake, then, it should not be ascribed to the *vuttikāra*.

Example 4 – *ca* in Kacc 366

> Kacc 366 *tad assatthī ti vī ca*
>
> Kacc-v *tad ass atthī ti icc etasmiṃ atthe vīpaccayo*

263

hoti.

medhā assa atthi tasmiṃ vā vijjatī ti medhavī. evaṃ māyāvī.

casaddaggahaṇena sopaccayo hoti. sumedhā assa atthi tasmiṃ vā vijjatī ti sumedhaso.

Again, we can observe that the "abus" of the particle *ca* is not found in the *vutti* "gloss" proper, but in a sort of *vārttika* comment at the end, which should be considered part of the *payoga*. This example shows clearly two different layers in what is conventionally called Kacc-v. In one of them we find a rigorous gloss of the *sutta*, with proper examples. In the second layer we find a correction or extension of the *sutta*. This correction (called "abus" by SENART) is based on the extension of the rule triggered by the particle *ca*. Vimalabuddhi (Mmd 317, 8) explains the examples derived from *ca* separately: *caggahaṇaphalaṃ sayam eva vakkhati* "the results of the use of *ca* will be explained independently". I think it is clear that the first layer of the *vutti* does not trespass the rule.

[C] Problematic passages

Example 5 – *tudampatī* in Kacc 341

> Kacc 341 *jāyāya tu daṃ jāni patimhi*
>
> Kacc-v *jāyāya icc etāyaṃ tu daṃ jāni ete ādesā honti patimhi pare. tudampati. jānipati.*

This passage has been presented as the proof that Kacc-v misunderstands the text of Kacc and therefore they cannot be the work of the same author or editor. Indeed, the *vutti* reads *tu* with *daṃ*, and the result is the artificial word *tudampatī*. This word is accepted in CHILDERS Dictionary and PED sv. *tudampatī* as a dual, *tu > du* (!), and also in other grammars such as DUROISELLE and MULLER. Moggallāna (Moggp 187: 26-28) says: *yam pana kaccāyanavuttiādisu tudampatī ti*

udāharan ti nāyam payogo āgame niruttiyañ ca tādisassa payogassāsambhavato, "the example *tudampatī* that we find in the *vutti* and other commentaries is not found in the scriptures, because there is no such a usage in the language (*nirutti*)". We do find, however, variant readings without *tu*:

Cᵉ(1) *jāyāya pati dampati*

Cᵉ(2) *jāyā ca pati ca dampati*[8]

These Sinhalese variants may be corrections based on Mogg criticisms.

Alternatively, the word *tu* could be an interpolation fruit of the contamination of the lexicon *Abhidhānappadīpikā* 242 *padas ab*:

jāyāpatī janipatī jayampatī <u>tu dampatī (or tudampatī ?)</u>

The *Abhidhānappadīpikā-ṭīkā* refers to Kacc 341 as an authority:

catukkaṃ patipatinīnaṃ yuge "dārā pume bahutte ca, daṃ kalatre napuṃsake"ti [Cintāmaṇiṭīkā 16.38] *amaramālā, jaṃsaddo tvabyayo dāravacano. tasmā "jampati, dampatī"ti pi bhavitabbaṃ, idha pana <u>kaccāyanamatenodāhatā.</u> jāyā ca pati ca jāyāpati. itarītarayogadvando. jāyā ca pati ca jānipati, tathā jāyampatiādayo, jāyāsaddassa patimhi pare jāni, <u>tudañ ca, jāyañ ca yadādinā.</u>*

The particle *tu* could be an old interpolation into both *sutta* and *vutti*. If we remove it, the text makes perfect sense:

*Kacc 341 *jāyāya daṃ jāni patimhi*

*Kacc-v *jāyāya icc etāyaṃ daṃ jāni ete ādesā honti patimhi pare. dampati. jānipati.*

---

[8]   Pɪɴᴅ, 2013: 119 fn 19.

It is nevertheless striking that the tradition has accepted the "wrong" reading without doubts. Even Vimalabuddhi reads the example *tudampatī.* This may point to some meaningful solution that I cannot see. In any case, this faulty example could have survived until today precisely because Vimalabuddhi did not purge it in his edition. *Rūpasiddhi* and its *ṭīkā* also accept it. The case is, no doubt, problematic, but in my opinion this example is not enough to prove that Kacc and Kacc-v are the work of a different authors.

Example 6 – *mantā* in Kacc 7

The following is an instance of Kacc using material not from Kā but from Kā-v.

Kacc 7 *vaggā pañcapañcaso <u>mantā</u>,*

The word *mantā* is not found in the Kā equivalent Kā I.1.10 *te vargāḥ pañca pañca pañca*, but it is actually found in Kā-v *ad loc. te kādayo <u>māvasānā</u> varṇāḥ pañca pañca pañca bhūtvā pañcaiva te vargasaṃjñā bhavanti,* followed by Kacc-v ad Kacc 7: *tesaṃ kho byañjanānaṃ kakārādayo <u>makārantā</u> pañcapañcaso akkharavanto vaggā nāma honti.* Notice how Kacc-v translates Kā-v using synonyms: *māvasanā = makārantā*; *vargasaṃjñā = vaggā nāma*; *varṇāḥ = akkhara-.* The word *mantā* in the *sutta* and *vutti* of Kacc seems to derive from Durgasiṃha's *vṛtti.* Again, it seems that the author of Kacc and Kacc-v was working directly not only from Kā but Kā-v.

5. Conclusions

Even though it is at present impossible to determine whether the author of Kacc *sutta* and the *vutti* is the same, I have shown in this article that there are some reasons to follow the Burmese savant Ariyālaṅkāra and postulate a single authorship for these two works. For two things are clear: first, the text called Kacc-v in PIND's edition is made, at least, of two layers (identified by the tradition), and second, not only the *vutti,* but also the *sutta* text follows the text of

Kātantra-vṛtti. It makes sense, therefore, to think that if the author of Kacc *sutta* had the *Kātantra-vṛtti* in front, he could have adapted this text as well. This would explain the great consistence of *sutta* and *vutti*, a consistence that is lost when we move to the *payoga*, probably written, as the tradition maintains, by some other grammarian, conventionally known as Brahmadatta.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Kacc	*Kaccāyana* = PIND, 2013.
Kacc-v	*Kaccāyanavutti* = PIND, 2013.
Kā	*Kātantra* = DWIVEDI, 1997–2005.
Kā-v	*Kātantra-vṛtti* = DWIVEDI, 1997–2005.
Gv	*Gandhavaṃsa* = KUMAR, 1992.
Mmd	*Mukhamattadīpanī*= *Nyāsapāṭh*, Yangon, Sudhammavatī cā pum nhip tuik Press, 1933.
Saddhamma-s	*Saddhammasaṅgaha* = SADDHĀNANDA, 1890.

Secondary Sources

D'ALWIS, J.
(1863). *An introduction to Kachchāyana's grammar of the Pāli language, with an introduction, appendix, notes, etc.* London

BURNELL, A. C.
(1875). *On the Aindra School of Sanskrit grammarians.* Mangalore.

DEOKAR, M. A.
(2008). *Technical terms and technique of the Pali and the Sanskrit grammars.* Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.

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.

KUMAR, B.

(1992). *The Gandhavaṃsa: A History of Pali Literature.* Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.

MALALASEKERA, G. P.

(1960). *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names.* London: Luzac and Co.

NYANATUSITA.

(2008). *Reference Table of Pali Literature*, electronic edition by the author: http://gretil.sub.unigoettingen.de/gretil_elib/

PIND, O. H.

(2013). *Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti.* Bristol: PTS.

(2012). Pāli Grammar and Grammarians from Buddhaghosa to Vajirabuddhi: A Survey. XXXI, 57-124. *Journal of Pali Text Society.*

SADDHĀNANDA, N.

(1890). Saddhamma Samgaho. 21–90. *Journal of Pali Text Society,* IV.

SAINI, R. S.

(1999). *Post-Pāṇinian systems of Sanskrit grammar.* Delhi: Parimal Publications.

SENART, E.

(1871). *Kaccàyana et la littérature grammaticale du Pâli.* Paris: Journal Asiatique.

VIDYABHUSANA, S. C.

(1901). *Kaccayana's Pali Grammar: Edited in Devanagari Character and Translated into English.* Calcutta: Mahabodhi Society.