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ABSTRACT

Since the publication of Paul Kiparsky’s *Pāṇini as a Variationist* (1979), the discussion on optionality in Indian vyākaraṇa has been largely polarised into two views: Kiparsky’s thesis defends the idea that Pāṇini used different words to indicate different degrees of optionality; others deny Kiparsky’s claim and maintain that the exact scope of grammatical options can only be determined by the context. Whereas Sanskrit grammarians do not substantiate Kiparsky’s claims, the Pali vyākaraṇa tradition of the Kaccāyana school recognises two different types of options. In this paper I will focus on the treatment of option markers in Buddhapiya’s Rūpasiddhi (South India, twelfth century). The Rūpasiddhi is based on the Kaccāyana grammar, but it takes an innovative approach towards the general structure of the rules. It also alters the mechanisms of optionality in a way that allows for higher accuracy in the process of word derivation. As a step forward in our understanding of the rich Pali grammatical tradition, this article provides a definition and classification of markers vā, kvaci, navā, and vibhāsā in the Rūpasiddhi. It also shows that the understanding of
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option markers in Kaccāyana classical scholarship differs significantly from Kiparsky’s understanding of linguistic variation.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. In the Pali language, one single word can adopt various correct forms. For instance, the ablative singular of the word buddha may be buddhā, buddhamhā, buddhasmā, or buddhato, and the third person singular optative can be care or careyya. In order to account for such multiplicity of derivations, Pali grammarians use a set of markers inherited from the Sanskrit tradition. The most prominent among them are option markers, such as vā or kvaci. Option markers delimit the domain of a rule; they draw the boundary line between what is general and what is exceptional, thus distinguishing what is allowed in terms of derivation from what is not. Therefore, understanding how option markers work is essential for the correct interpretation of classical Pali grammars.

1.2. The study of option markers has received considerable attention in Sanskrit scholarship, especially after Paul Kiparsky’s publication of Pāṇini as a Variationist (1979). In this monograph Kiparsky challenges the received opinion concerning the function of option markers in Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī:

To indicate that a rule is to be applied optionally, Pāṇini uses 106 times vā, 112 times vibhāṣā, and 93 times anyatarasyām. Why this variety, when one word would do? This question has a surprising answer, which has remained unknown for over two thousand years. Not even the oldest commentators Kātyāyana and Patañjali have any inkling of it.

1 Kahrs (1992: 233) compares Pāṇini’s grammar with a map describing a territory that is the language: “If we have a map — and I think it is justified to call the linguistic descriptions of the ancient Indian grammarians a map — it will tell us a great deal about those who made the map. A basic question is this: What features of the territory are represented on the map? If the territory is absolutely uniform, nothing would be represented on the map except the borders of the territory. Otherwise, what will be represented on the map is really differences of various kinds.”

2 Kiparsky 1979: 1.
Kiparsky’s “surprising” answer is that these three technical terms express three different levels of optionality: vā “or rather”, “preferably”; vibhāsā “or rather not”, “preferably not”; anyatarasyāṃ “either way”.¹ Kiparsky understands that preferred options reflect a wider linguistic usage, and less preferred options reflect marginal, or perhaps dialectal, usage. Among Sanskrit vyākaraṇa specialists there is a divide concerning the validity of Kiparsky’s thesis.² But regardless of our judgement, the importance of his question seems undeniable. For economy of language is one of the cardinal principles of vyākaraṇa, and if all option markers mean the same: why use many and not one?

1.3. The same question may be asked about option markers in Pali classical³ grammar, where virtually the same technical terms are used. So far, there has been little research in this area. Émile Senart, who published the first European integral edition and translation of the Kaccāyana grammar, openly condemns the manner in which Kacc uses option markers. The same goes for R.O. Franke.⁴ More constructively, Helmer Smith analyses option markers in the Saddanītī in a useful sketch in his Cospectus Terminorum (§7.3.2.3), although no further discussion is given. Ole Pind observes that, in the Kaccāyana and the Kaccāyana-vutti, the terms vā and kvaci “are apparently used interchangeably, thus making the exact scope of a rule difficult to interpret.”⁵

¹ Kiparsky 1979: 1.
³ By “classical” Pali grammar I mean the Kaccāyana, the Moggallāna, and the Saddanītī, along with their commentaries and offshoots. I use the term classical in its meaning “exemplary”. For overviews of classical grammatical scholarship in Pali, I refer to Franke 1902, Pind 2012, Deokar 2008, Gornall and Gunasena 2018, and see also von Hinüber 1983, and Gornall and Ruiz-Falqué 2019; for an overview of the Kaccāyana tradition, see Ruiz-Falqué 2016.
⁴ For Kacc sutta as lacking a systematical approach, see Senart 1871:14; see also Franke 1902: 14; for the wrong use of vā, see Senart 1871: 93.
⁵ Pind 2012: 83.
but he also notes that the Rūpasiddhi applies some corrections concerning optionality of kvaci and na vā.1 Mahesh Deokar includes optionality in his thorough comparative study Technical Terms and Technique of the Pali and the Sanskrit Grammars (2008). Deokar points out that the minute distinctions that are observed in Sanskrit grammars “are not observed so rigorously by the Pali grammarians”.2 Some translators of the Kaccāyana do not reflect any difference of meaning between different option markers,3 others are more careful and try to distinguish them, e.g. Nandisena’s translation.4 Among all translations and studies known to me, only those by Thiab Malai and Nandisena acknowledge the traditional system of reading option markers.5 The intricacies of this system, however, remain to be properly elucidated. The present article is intended as a contribution to the vastly unexplored field of Pāli byākaraṇa studies. It focuses on one of the major grammars of the Kaccāyana school, namely the Rūpasiddhi, composed in South India by Coḷa Buddhappiya6 around the twelfth century CE.7

1.4. Buddhappiya’s Rūpasiddhi is a recast of the Kaccāyana (Kacc) grammar.8 It uses practically all the suttas of Kacc, but their sequence is dramatically altered. Furthermore, the old Kaccāyana-vutti (Kacc-v) is replaced by Buddhappiya’s own commentary. In the introductory stanzas Buddhappiya briefly justifies his project. He states that he has

1 Ibid.
2 Deokar 2008: 367, 369.
3 For instance, in his notes to the ākhyāta chapter of the Rūpasiddhi, Grünwedel translates both kvaci and vā as “arbiträr”, but he is obviously aware of the levels of optionality of the vavatthitavibhāsā “bestimmte vibhāsā” (Grünwedel 1883: 52); Ashin Thitzana (2016), translates the four main option markers in Kacc vā, kvaci, na vā, vibhāsā as “sometimes”, cf. Thitzana 2016: 129 n.11.
4 D’Alwis (1863: 25–26), for instance, translates vā as “optionally” and kvaci as “sometimes.”
6 For the most up-to-date biographical sketch of Buddhappiya, see Gornall 2020: 6ff.
8 For a critical edition of Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti, see Pind 2013.
composed a work that is byattaṃ “clear” and sukaṇḍaṃ “well-arranged”. According to the commentary, “clear (byattaṃ) means that it is particularly clear, easy to see, because of its clarity both in the delimitation of the domain of the rules and the derivation of what is prescribed by the rules”.¹ This is a direct reference to Buddhappiya’s innovative system, which represents a significant improvement in the use of option markers. As for the adjective sukaṇḍaṃ it refers to a topic-wise arrangement that makes the Kacc easier to grasp, much like kaumudī grammars did with Pāṇini.² Despite the obvious advantages of the new topic-wise arrangement, the alteration of the original sequence of rules inevitably disrupts the mechanisms of anuvatti (“recurrence”) that control option markers. Buddhappiya solves this problem by explicitly indicating which words, including option markers, recur in a sutta. And more importantly, he incorporates the concept vavatthitavibhāṣā (“restricted option”) to the repertoire of option markers. In doing so, he achieves higher accuracy than his predecessor Vimalabuddhi when it comes to delimiting the domains and boundaries of options. In the following sections I will offer a preliminary examination of how this system of optionality works.

2. OPTIONALITY IN BUDDHAPPiya’S Ṛupasiddhi

2.1. Classical Pali grammarians distinguish two main levels of optionality: one for an open “alternative” (vikappa) and one for exceptions to a larger rule. The general principle to interpret optional markers in the Kaccāyana Pali grammar is laid out in Vimalabuddhi’s Mukhamattadīpanī (Mmd), otherwise known as Nyāsa, composed around the tenth century CE.³ According to Vimalabuddhi, the option markers kvaci and navā (or na vā) have the same meaning; they generally express the correctness of one form, dismissing the other. In contrast, the terms vā and vibhāṣā, which also have the same meaning,⁴ generally express an

---

¹ Rūp-ṭ B’ 4.3–5 byattaṃ lakkhaṇavisayavavattānassa, lakkhiyābhinippatthiyā ca parībyattito abhiyattaṃ supākataṃ.
² Gornall and Gunasena 2018: 34.
³ Pind 2012: 71.
⁴ For the unclear relationship between the terms bhāṣā “language” and vibhāṣā “dialect” see von Hinüber 2001: 102–103. Von Hinüber provisionally accepts
open option (vikappa) in which it is possible to derive two forms. The main issue at stake here is whether a word is correct in terms of derivation or not. In Pali, option markers have nothing to do with frequency of usage in the literature, although they are supposed to reflect forms that are attested in the literature (āgama). They are only concerned with grammatical correctness, what Sanskrit grammarians call sādhutva. Aside from the general principle that has been described, option markers do not work exactly in the same manner in every Pali grammatical treatise. But exactly how they differ, and why grammarians modify the system, is something that requires further research.

2. As a grammar belonging to the Kaccāyana school, the Rūpasiddhi uses virtually the same set of option markers: vā 154 times, kvaci 54 times, navā 6 times, vibhāṣā 4 times (5 if we include saha vibhāṣā in the vutti of Rūp §351). To this list we may also include other words Kiparsky’s conjecture that vibhāṣā could mean “zu meiden (als Alternative)” (i.e. an alternative to be avoided) versus vā “zu bevorzugen” (i.e. to be preferred).

1 Vimalabuddhi’s discussion is in the context of Kacc §21 ivaṇṇo yaṁ navā and it is about reading navā as one word (Mnd 32.24ff), see also Malai 1997: 105. Note that in his critical edition Pind reads na vā always. The principle of the two levels was synthesised by Guṇasāgara of Pagan (c. thirteenth century) in the Mukhamattasāra (unedited work), and is quoted in Kacc-nidd B1 154.10-11; C2 150.13-14, for the context, or lack of context, of this quotation, see Ruiz-Falqués 2015: 142. Guṇasāgara’s stanza is quoted by Nandisena (2005: 48) via a quotation found in the Kaccāyana-vāṇṇā (16th c. CE, Burma).

2 Pas III §§46-55; Joshi and Roodbergen 1968: 70-78. In the discussion on 1.1.44 naveti vibhāṣā, Patañjali quotes the iṣṭhi: sādhvanāsane asmin yasya vibhāṣā tasya sādhvatam “In this teaching of correct [words], correctness applies to that which is optional” (MBh I 104.8).

3 This is the interpretation of the Rūpasiddhi-ṭīkā, problematically ascribed to Buddhappiya himself (see 5.4).

4 The numbers include instances in the sutta and the gloss (vutti) properly speaking, that is to say the first line of the commentary in which the expanded formulation of the sutta is given, including the anuvutti (information recurring from previous suttas). Option markers in further sections of the vutti are excluded from this count. These sections are no doubt relevant to the study of optionality and variation, e.g. the word ca introduces a kvaci option in Rūp
that control optionality, e.g. ca (= vikappa Rūp §117 = vā; = aniyamattha = vā §664), ṭhāne (= kvaci Rūp §§40, 42), tu (= kvaci Rūp §§125, 226), vikappena (Rūp §117), niccam “always” (Rūp §§135, 195, 196) and yehhuyena “generally” (Rūp §36). Keeping with the structure of Kacc and Kace-v, the proper option markers remain vā, kvaci, navā, and vibhāsā.

2.3. Buddhappiya accepts Vimalabuddhi’s two levels of optionality, but he refines the system in the following manner:

vā “or” has two meanings:
• vikappa “open option”
• vavatthitavibhāsā1 “restricted option” (used 42 times),2 which involves three sub-domains:
  (a) nicca “mandatory” [Ø option]
  (b) anicca “not mandatory” [= vikappa]
  (c) asanta “inapplicable” [= kvaci/navā see below 4.6.]
kvaci “in some places” indicates exceptions
navā “or not” is glossed as kvaci (Rūp §21)

vibhāsā “optionally” is glossed as vā (Rūp-ṭ ad Rūp §360)

§ 27, or Rūp §488, invoked a number of times in the elaborations of the vutti, e.g. Rūp §§470, 488, 489, 492, 500. A more detailed study on option markers, including all the sections of the Rūp commentary and other Kaccāyana commentaries, is in preparation.

1 This term is known in Sanskrit grammatical literature. Patañjali uses it in his Mahābhāṣya (ad Pāṇini 2.4.56, 3.2.124 and 7.1.56). It becomes part of the system of interpretation in later works such as the Kāśikāvṛtti (cf. Kāś ad Pāṇ 1.3.70 tad asmin visaye nityam, anyatra vikalpaḥ. vyavasthitavibhāsā hi sā; or Kāś ad Pāṇ 2.3.17 vyavasthitavibhāsāvijñānād eva na bhavati). The Kātantra-vṛtti also uses this term, especially in relation with navā: Kāṭ-v 1.4.2, 1.5.5; and see Kāṭ-v 4.6.83: svariṣṭatī paratvād vikalpa na syād vyavasthitavāvacaṇāt; in Kāṭ-v 4.1.72 we can observe the triple domain used in Rūp: nityam, na syāt (= na bhavati) and vā (= vibhāsā).

2 In cases such as Rūp §207 or §259, the vutti suggests that vā is being used in the sense of vavatthitavibhāsā, but that is not explicitly stated in the main paraphrase of the sutta; therefore, we exclude such cases from the present study (see n. 24).
2.4. There are some exceptions: vā = kvaci in Rüp §676 and probably in §207; vā = sampiṇdana in Rüp §595 (alternatively interpreted as vikappa) and Rüp §187, glosses by Rüp-ṭ as pakativikappana; vā = katthactivikappanattha Rüp §190; kvaci = vavatthitavibhāsā Rüp §461. The relatively rare occurrence of anomalies shows that the general theory is quite consistently observed. In the following sections I am going to briefly examine of how these markers function.

3. VĀ AND VIBHĀSĀ

3.1. The words vā and vibhāsā express vikappa (Skt. vikalpa) “open option”. Whether these terms are explicitly glossed as vikappena or not, they indicate an option in which the alternation is unrestricted. For instance, in Rüp §30 jhalānam iyuva sare vā “before a vowel, masc. neut. endings iī and uū may optionally be replaced with iy and uv respectively”. The word vā is not glossed, but a series of free alternatives are listed as examples, e.g. bhikkhuvāsane bhikkhu āsane vā (“[one can write/say] bhikkhvāsane or bhikkhu āsane [indistinctly]”). Similarly, in Rüp §116 nāmhi raññā vā, we are given two possibilities for each word, e.g. rājena/raññā. Accordingly, we can form the sentences raññā katam or rājena katam.

The same type of option is expressed by the marker vibhāsā. For example, Rüp §360 vibhāsā rukkha-tiṇa-pasu-dhana-dhānā-jana-padādinaṁ ca allows couplets of coordinative compounds that refer, for instance, to species of trees: assatthakapitthaṁ assatthakapitthā vā (“fig and wood-apple trees”). The word vā is used as the gloss of vibhāsā.

Eventually it may be possible to derive more than two forms, e.g. Rüp §197 gives a triple option: kammunā, kammanā, kammena.

3.2. The word vā is often glossed as vavatthitavibhāsā (Skt. vyavasthita-vibhāsā), which means “restricted option”.2 Buddhapiya is the earliest

---

1 In reality, rājena only appears as part of a compound (dhammarājena, devarājena, etc.), never in a sentence such as rājena katam (cf. Oberlies §45, 2b).

2 “Option limitée” (Smith 1949: 1146, §7.3.2.3), “bestimmte vibhāsā” (Grünwedel 1983: 52).
recorded Pali grammarian to use this term. The usage may have been borrowed from the Cândra tradition of Sanskrit grammar. The standard expression of Rūp is vavatthitavibhāṣo yaṁ vāsaddo “this word vā represents a restricted option”. This means that the word vā is a vikappa only to a certain extent. This is explained in Rūp §15 vā paro asarūpā:

In the same way that the preverb ā expresses an inclusive limit or an exclusive limit, the word vā in some places expresses an open option (vikappa) and in some places expresses the delimitation (pariggaha) of certain word-forms (rūpa) according to a specific restriction (yathāvavatthita). In the present sutta, the latter applies. Therefore the word vā here illustrates a grammatical operation (vidhi) which involves [simultaneously] a mandatory (nicca) domain, a non-mandatory (anicca) domain, and an inapplicable (asanta) domain.

1 For the relative date of the Rūpasiddhi, older than the Moggallāna-byākaraṇa (1165 CE), see Gornall and Gunasena 2018: 34, n.t. As for the relative dates of the Rūpasiddhi and the Saddanīti, they are problematic. Some scholars assume that the Sāsanavamsa’s dating of Sadd, 1154 CE, is correct (e.g. Franke 1902: 25ff.; von Hinüber 2001, §62). Other Burmese sources, as little reliable as the Sāsanavamsa, point to the thirteenth century CE (cf. Tin Lwin 1991). Aggavamsa seems to rely on his predecessors for the understanding of the term: vavatthitavibhāṣāyaṁ vāsaddappayogo ācariye payirapāśītāḥ gahetabbo “The usage of the word vā in the sense of restricted option (vavatthitavibhāṣā) should be adopted respecting the teachers” (Sadd 889,2–3 and n. 2). For a detailed examination of the relative chronology: Rūpasiddhi > Nyāsappadīpa > Saddanīti, I refer to my forthcoming monograph on Guṇaśāgar’s Mukhamattasāra.

2 Gornall 2017: 479: “Au début de sa discussion du chapitre sur les kāraka, le commentaire singhalais sur la Rūpasiddhi affirme que Buddhappiya, auteur de la Rūpasiddhi, s’est appuyé sur la Cândrapaṇcikā de Ratnamati dans son interprétation du mot ‘vā’ (‘facultativement’) dans les Sūtra de Kaccāyana.” I thank Alastair Gornall for calling my attention to this important point. It is possible, too, that the term vavatthitavibhāṣā/vyavasthitavibhāṣā was borrowed from the Kātantra tradition, where it is widely used, see below §3.3.

3 Rūp 9.1–4: yasmā pana maripādaṃ ahāvīdhimhi ca vattamāno ă-upasaggo viyā vāsaddo dvīdāḥ vattate, katthaci vikappe, katthaci yathāvavatthita-rūpapariggaho. idha pana pacchime. tato niccam aniccam asantaḥ ca vidhim ettha vāsaddo dīpeti. The word asanta literally means “non-existent”, i.e.
The option prescribed by Rūp §15 is mandatory. For instance, if we apply sandhi to the expression yassa idāni, only the elision of the second vowel is allowed: yassa ‘idāni. The option yass’ idāni is not contemplated. The same holds true for cakkhu indriyaṃ, which can only undergo the ligature cakkhundriyaṃ, never *cakkhindriyaṃ. This type of option is called nicca “mandatory”. Other cases fall under the category anicca “not mandatory”, equivalent to vā = vikappa, for example: moggallāno asi or moggallāno ‘si. This is a case of “either … or …”, but note that the option is not between eliding the first vowel or eliding the second, but between eliding the second or not eliding at all. Finally, the category asanta “non-existent” or “inapplicable” is glossed as idha na bhavati (“here [the phenomenon of option 2] does not exist [i.e. does not apply]”), for example: pañca indriyāni > pañc’ indriyāni, never *pañca’ndriyāni.

3.3. Following a method that reminds us of the Kātantra tradition, Buddhappiya frequently syntheises the details of the restricted option in “versified summaries” (saṅghagāthās), a sort of ślokāvārttikas,

instances of the rule are not found. See also Rūp-ṭ 14.21–15.6: yasmā ā-upasaggo viya vāsaddo dvidhā vattate, kvaci vikappe, yathā vā napacce ti ādīsu, kathhaci yathāvavatthiānaṃ udāharamanāpānaṃ pariggahe, yathā vaggantan vā vagge ti ādīsu imasmim surte paranayena yathāvavatthiārūpāpariggahe vattati, tato niccaṁ ca aniccaṁ ca asantaṁ ca vidhim atra vāsaddo dīpeti ti yojanā “The connection (yojanā) is the following: Because like the preverb ā, the word vā operates in two ways: somewhere in the sense of option, as in vā napacce [Rūp §361, Kacc §346], and in some places as the adoption (pariggahe) of the example forms as they have been determined (i.e. restricted), as in vaggantan vā vagge [Rūp §49, Kacc §31], in this sutta it operates as adopting the restricted form by taking the following [speech-sound] (paranayena), therefore the word vā here illustrates an operation that is mandatory, and also not mandatory, and also non-existent.”

1 I have only been able to find one exception to this rule in the Burmese edition of Sāriputta’s sub-commentary on the Aṅguttara Nikāya, twelfth century CE (cf. A-ṭ B’ II 179). I could not find any instance in canonical or attvikavārttikas texts. Rūp GRETEL ed. p.15 yassadāni yassidāni, is a wrong reading for yassa dāni, yassa idāni.

2 In Sanskrit grammars we find an equivalent expression in na syāt.

3 Cf. Grünwedel 1883: 69.
supplementary rules in verse,\(^1\) apt for easy memorisation along with the *sutta*. For instance, in Rūp §15 we read:

\[
\text{bhavati ca vavathitavibhāsāya:}
\]

\[
\text{avannato saro ’dānītevādīm vinā paro,}
\]

\[
\text{na luppāt’ aññato dīgho āsevādīvajjito.}
\]

And there is also [the following stanza being the summary] of the restricted option:

After *a-vāṇṇa* [= *a*/*ā*], the vowel that follows is not elided, except in cases such as *idāni, iti, iva, eva*.

After a vowel other than *a-vāṇṇa* [i.e. after *i, ī, u, ū, e, or o*], the following long vowel is not elided. Exception is made in cases such as *āsi eva* [where no elision at all takes place].\(^2\)

We may turn now to Rūp-ṭ to clarify the purport of the stanza:

In the summary stanza, the syntax (*sambaṇḍha*) is the following:

“after *a-vāṇṇa* [= *a*/*ā*], when it is not homogeneous [with the next vowel], and when it is the cause (*hetu*) of the restricted option (*vavathitavibhāsā*), the next vowel — i.e. *i-vāṇṇa* [*i/ī*], *u-vāṇṇa* [*u/ū*], etc. — is not elided, except when [it is the first vowel] of words such as *idāni, iti, iva, eva*, etc.” Herein, the word *ādi* includes examples such as *evam kira me* [cf. M III 25,\(^3\)]. The long vowel that follows a non-homogenous vowel like *i-vāṇṇa*, etc., is not elided, except in cases such as *āsi eva* [cf. Vin IV 74 (?)].\(^3\)

Another example of a summary stanza that clarifies the scope of a restricted option is found in Rūp §69 *sabbayonīnam ā e*, “All forms *yo* (nom./acc. pl.) and *ni* (nom./acc. n. pl.) [can be optionally] replaced with *ā* and *e* [respectively].” Buddhappiya indicates in the *vuttī* that *vā* recurs. Then he continues:

\[^1\text{Cf. DSG s.v.} \text{ślokavārttika.}\]

\[^2\text{Rūp B}^\text{9} \text{9,18–20.}\]

\[^3\text{Rūp-ṭ B}^\text{15,1–6: saṅghagāthāya vavathitavibhāsāya hetunā asarūpabhūtā avannato paro ivānviṇṇādiko saro ṭhapetvā idāni iti iva eva iva evam ādikam na luppātī ti sambandho. etih’ ādisaddena evam kira me ti ādi saṅghahyati. aññasmā asarūpabhūtā ivanṇādito paro dīgho saro āsi eva iva ādivivajjito na luppāti.}\]
The word vā here has the meaning of a restricted option, that is why, with regard to this rule, it is stated:

“The word vā illustrates the operational rule in this manner: It is mandatory (nicca) in the masculine; not mandatory (anicca) in the neuter; inapplicable (asanta) in masculine/neuter i/i stems when they operate as a-endings.”

Thus we always find nom. pl. purisā and acc. pl. purise, but never nom./acc. pl. *purisayo. Neuter words replace ni with ā and e, but not mandatorily, thus: nom./acc. pl. citti, but also nom. pl. cittā, acc. pl. citte. Finally, the rule is not applicable to the masculine/neuter stems in i/i such as aggī “fire”: nom./acc. pl. aggyo, but never aggā and agge.

3.4. The option marker vā is used sometimes “for the purpose of blocking” (nivattanattha) other option markers. See for instance Rūp §190, where the term vā is not explicit in the rule, but its governance is invoked: vādhikāro katthacinivattanatto “the governance of vā is in order to prevent the application of katthaci”.3 In its equivalent rule in the Kaccāyana grammar (Kace §239), the governance of vā is missing because the author of Kacc/Kacc-v understands that the effect of optionality has already ceased, and the rule should be understood as a simple injunction.

3.5. Furthermore, in Rūp §§155, 226, and 440, ca is used also as katthacinivatthanattham; in §201 as katthaciṭisedhanivatthanattham; and in §141 as kvacini-vattanattham. The words katthaciṭ and kvacini-vattanattham appear to be synonymous. In §155, for instance, the effect of ca, glossed as katthacinivathanattham,4 is precisely to cancel the

---

1 Rūp B² 45.23ff.: vāsaddo ‘yam vavatthavibhāsattho, tena c’ etha: niccam eva ca pullinge, aniccaḥ ca napuṃsake; asantam jhe katatte tu, vāhiṃ dipetī vāsati.
2 The different meanings of vā are stated in an appendix on nipātāpadas at the end of the Nāmakāṇḍa, cf. Rūp B² 132–36.
3 Rūp B² 88,10–14.
4 With the alternative gloss noggahanānunvattanattham (“for the sake of triggering the recurrence of the ending no [from §151 yonām no]”). This is simply a different way of stating the same thing.
exceptional nature of the rule and make it open in some cases. The same rule is affected by the option marker \(\text{vā} \), recurring from the \textit{vutti} of Rūp §153. This \(\text{vā} \) yields the following \textit{vavatthitavibhāsā}:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bhikkhuppabhutito niccam} & \text{; voyonam hetu-ādito} \\
vibhāsā & \text{; na ca vo no ca amupabhutito bhave.}
\end{align*}
\]

[The ending \(\text{yo} \) for nom./acc. pl.] is mandatory in words such as \textit{bhikkhu}, etc.  
[The ending \(\text{yo} \) for nom./acc. pl.] can optionally (\textit{vibhāsā}) take \(\text{vo} \) or \(\text{yo} \) in words such as \textit{hetu}, etc.  
[The endings] \(\text{vo} \) and \(\text{no} \) [for nom./acc. pl.] do not apply to words such as the [pronoun] \textit{amu}, etc.\(^1\)

Note that the role of \(\text{ca} \) as blocker of an exception gives, as a result, the \textit{vibhāsā} described in the summary stanza: one can form the plural of \textit{hetu}: \textit{hetuyo} or \textit{hetuno}. Thus, one and the same rule can have more than one option marker in the interpretation, and these option markers have different roles.

4. \textit{kvaci} and \textit{navā} “exceptionally”\(^2\)

4.1. In the Rūpasiddhi there are fifty-six rules involving \textit{kvaci}, of which forty-five, the large majority, express exceptions of some sort. Seven more rules could be called exceptions too, but the role of \textit{kvaci} is not entirely transparent (§§43, 45, 109, 111, 260, 350, 588); in three cases \textit{kvaci} seems to mark \textit{vikappa} (§§39, 266, 502); and once it is glossed as \textit{vavatthitavibhāsā} (§461).

4.2. The function of \textit{kvaci} as exception marker is illustrated in Rūpasiddhi-ṭīkā ad Rūp §466. The commentary explains that the insertion of \(i\) is allowed in \textit{asabbadhātuka}\(^3\) verbal roots when the

---

\(^1\) Deokar 2008: 368–69 navā interpreted as “rarely”.

\(^2\) That is to say, “non-\textit{sabbadhātuka}”. In Pāṇinian grammar, \textit{sārvadhātuka} refers to a specific set of affixes marked with the letter \(s\) (DSG s.v. \textit{sārvadhātuka}). In the Kaccāyana school the term is defined in Kacc §433 (= Rūp §458) \textit{hiyattanī}\textit{attāmīpānci}\textit{vattamānī} \textit{sabbadhātukām} “the technical term \textit{sabbadhātuka} denotes the finite verbal endings of \textit{hiyattānī} (imperfect), \textit{pañcamī} (optative), \textit{paścamī} (imperative), and \textit{vattamānī} (present)” (trans.
following vibhatti begins with a consonant, but not when it begins with the vowels a or i, and he adds: “It should be understood that this distinction (vīsesa) is established by the governance of the word kvaci” (ayam pana vīseso kvaci ti adhikārato siddho ti veditabbo).\(^1\) According to this statement, the term kvaci indicates a case that is special or particular (vīsesa) as opposed to a general state of affairs. Thus, kvaci is often found as a blocker of a more general option marked with vā. It should not come as a surprise, then, that the function of the word kvaci can also be carried out by its synonym navā. It should not come as a surprise, then, that the function of the word kvaci can also be carried out by its synonym navā. It should not come as a surprise, then, that the function of the word kvaci can also be carried out by its synonym navā.

4.3. As stated above (3.5), the terms kvaci and vā (= vikappa) may both affect one and the same rule. Even in such cases they are explicitly described as performing different functions. Consider for instance Rūp § 336:

\[
na pañcamyāyam ambhāvo kvacī ti adhikārato, \text{ tatiyāsattamīchatthīnan tu hoti vikappato.}
\]

Due to the governance of kvaci, the ending am is not there before the fifth case ending, but it may be there optionally (vikappato) before the third, seventh, and sixth case endings.\(^3\)

The stanza makes clear that there are two different poles of optionality, one is kvaci, the other is vikappa. The commentary explains: “Because of the governance of the word kvaci, there is no am for the fifth vibhatti,

\[^1\] Rūp-ṭ B^2 191,ff.
\[^2\] See Kiparsky 1979: 3: “Vibhāṣā is defined by na vā in 1.1.44 na veti vibhāṣā. Na vā is not used otherwise, apart from the cases when it arises implicitly from the combination of a na continued by anuvṛtti with an overt vā stated in a rule.”
\[^3\] B^2 180,22ff.
but *am* is optional for the third, seventh and sixth *vibhatis.*”

From this statement we understand that the function of *kvaci* is to isolate an exception from the main rule, which may or may not be a *vikappa.* This makes *kvaci* different from *nicca* “mandatory”, as *kvaci* could probably be translated as “mandatorily no option is allowed”. The term *nicca* does not presuppose any previous option, whereas *kvaci* does. In the end, however, both terms lead to one single derivation pathway.

4.4. Another clear example of *kvaci* functioning as a marker of exception is found in Rūp §35 *sare kvaci.* Buddhappiya explains that *kvaci* (“in some places”), means “in those places where prosody is broken, or pronunciation is difficult, and also in those instances where sandhi is neglected. The point is that elision (lopa), replacement (ādesa), and modification (vikāra) do not obtain [in those cases].”

4.5. The term *navā* appears six times in the Rūpasiddhi (§§21, 28, 246, 247, 256). In §21 Buddhappiya explicitly glosses it as a synonym (*pariyāya*) of the word *kvaci.* This is in line with the interpretation of Vimalabuddhi (see 2.1). The other five cases of *navā* do not clearly attest to this equivalence. If it is true that *navā* and *kvaci* have the same meaning, the question naturally arises as to why Rūp §21 *iva mano yam navā (= Kacc §21) does not use the word *kvaci.* According to Vimalabuddhi, the use of *navā* in Kacc §21 serves the purpose of

---

1 Rūp-† B² 135,24-26: *kvaci ti adhikārato ambhāvo pañcamyā vibhattiyā na hoti, tatpūrṇamīchāṭhūnām ambhāvo pana vikappena hoti ti yo janā.*

2 See also the stanza in Rūp §466 (Rūp 276,19ff), where vā and *kvaci* control different domains:

   asabbadhātukena byañjanādīmhe vā ’yam āgamo
   kvacādhihikārato byañjanādo pi kvaci no siyā.

3 Rūp B² 22,5-7: *kvaci chandabheda sukheccāraṇāthaṇā sāndhičāraṇāthaṇā ca, na lopādevaśikāram āpajjante ti attho. Similarly, euphony and metre mark *kvaci*-type exceptions in Rūp §35 (Rūp 22,18ff: *kvaci ti kim? ititsim chandāmukkhānaṃ sandhi hoti*), Rūp §37 (24,18ff) *sukheccāraṇāchandarākkhānaṃ* and Rūp §38 (25,11ff) *chandāmukkhānaṃ* and see also Rūp §§53, 54, 57.

4 Rūp §21 (B² 14,6ff): *navāsaddo kvacīsaddapariyāyo;* see also Malai 1997: 104. Note that it does not say *ayam navāsaddo* “this particular navā”, but simply *navāsaddo,* “the word *navā* [in general].”
blocking a former *kvaci*. It thus marks an exception to an exception. It seems that Buddhappiya has silently accepted Vimalabuddhi’s solution, although we should keep in mind that Rūpṭ is quite critical of Vimalabuddhi’s methods regarding optionality.\(^1\)

4.6. The recurrence of *navā* can only be studied in a string of three *suttas* beginning in Rūp §234. This rule allows the pronominal replacements *tavān mama* for the acc.sg. It is followed, with “a frog’s leap” (*maṇḍūkapluti*), by §246, which allows *vo no* for acc./dat./gen. pl., and subsequently by §247, which allows *te me* for acc./dat./gen. sg. In this case the word *navā* is not blocking any other option marker. In fact, if we look at the Kaccâyana parallel (Kacc §144), *navā* is glossed by Vimalabuddhi as “*vikappena*”.\(^2\) There are reasons to believe, however, that Vimalabuddhi has missed the mark, and here *navā* is not equivalent to *vikappā*, but to *kvaci*, in accordance with the general criterion postulated by Vimalabuddhi himself. The Rūpasiddhi, once more, clarifies the point:

Why [does the sutta state] *navā*? [Consider the counter examples:] *idam civaram ityham vikappanatthāya dami* “I give these robes to you for the sake of assigning”; and: *sunātha vacanam mama* “listen to my words”.

Here [Rūp §§246–47], due to the governance of *navā* [from Rūp §234], these [pronominal] forms, namely *vo, no, te*, and *me*,

---

1 Cf. Rūpṭ B’ 21.5–16. Furthermore, in Rūpṭ ad Rūp §35, the author of the commentary disparages Mmd for understanding *kvaci* as a synonym of *vā* in the commentary upon Kacc §24 *sare kvaci*.

2 Mmd B’ 138,28.

3 It is customary in Kacc and Rūp to give counter-examples by showing how the desired result would not be there if a word was missing. The counter examples are introduced by the question tag *kim*, and thus they are called *kimudāharana* “examples of why [a certain word needs to be used in the *sutta*]”. The question could be also rephrased: “What would happen if the word X was missing in the *sutta*?” The first attestation of the term *kimudāharana* in the sense of “counter-example” is in Vimalabuddhi’s Mmd, cf. Mmd 26,23; 34,77; 35,20; 39,26, and *passim*. 
do not apply at the beginning of a verse (pāda),
or when they precede particles such as ca, vā, eva, etc.\(^1\)

The expression *na honti te* (lit. “those [instances] do not exist”) tells us that navā is here a marker of an asanta-type exception. What the word navā means in this string of rules, then, is that the cited pronominal forms are forbidden in certain contexts.\(^2\)

4.7. The last occurrence of navā is found in Rūp § 256 catūpapadassa lopo t’ uttarapadādi cassa cu-co pi navā. This rule addresses the behaviour of the numeral catu (“four”) in compounds that express other numerals, such as cuddasa (“fourteen”). Let us look at Buddhappiya’s paraphrase in order to unpack the full meaning of the rule:

When it expresses a numeral and precedes the word dasa (“ten”) in a compound, the word catu (“four”) suffers the elision of the syllable tu, and the remaining ca may exceptionally (navā) be replaced with cu or co. [Examples:] cuddasa, coddasa, catuddasa (“fourteen”).

On account of the mention of the word api, even when catu is not the first word of a compound, if it expresses a numeral, the initial syllable ca is elided; and, exceptionally (navā), cu or co are there [i.e. replace ca]. For instance: tālīsaṃ, cuttālīsaṃ, cottālīsaṃ, cattālīsaṃ (“forty”).\(^3\)

The idea here is that navā expresses an exception to the main rule formulated in the first half of the sutta. The procedure seems to have two stages: First, a mandatory elision of tu, and second, an exceptional replacement of the remaining ca with cu or co. The interpretation of api

---

\(^1\) Rūp B\(^e\) 116,3-8: navā ti kim? idam cīvaram tuyham vikappanatthāya dammi, suṇātha vacanaṃ mama.

navādhikārato c’ ettha, vo no te me ti ye ime;
pādādo ca ca-vā-evā-diyoge ca na honti te.

\(^2\) Cf. Rūp-bh-ṭ 1 276.

\(^3\) Rūp B\(^e\) 119,6-12: ganane dasassādimmhi thītassa catu icc etassa upapadassa tusaddo lopo hoti, uttarapadādimmhi thītassa catūpapadassas cakārassas cu-coādēdā honti navā, cuddasa, coddasa, catuddassa. apiggahāhena amupapaddassāpi ganane padādīcakārassas lopo, cu-co honti navā, yathā tālīsaṃ, cuttālīsaṃ, cottālīsaṃ, cattālīsaṃ.
is not relevant to our discussion, but it confirms the use of navā as a marker of a special case within a general state of affairs.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. A preliminary examination of option markers in Buddhappiya’s Rūpasiddhi has shown that the system of two levels of optionality, originally postulated by Vimalabuddhi in ca. the tenth century CE, seems to be functional on the suttas of Kaccāyana and suffers from few exceptions. The claim that Kaccāyana grammarians use option markers randomly (see 1.3), therefore, needs to be corrected. It is important to note, too, that each grammarian may tweak the system according to his needs. Thus, Buddhappiya’s system is an improved version of Vimalabuddhi’s, and the improvements have to do with the radically new approach that Buddhappiya adopted towards the sequencing of the rules. Later grammarians of the same school do not hesitate to apply Buddhappiya’s refined system to the old sequence of rules in Kacc.¹ Future studies on vernacular commentaries, such as the Rūpasiddhi-sannaya, will no doubt amplify and correct what has been stated in this paper.

5.2. To conclude, let us go back to Kiparsky’s innovative approach of option markers in Pāṇini, and how it may be related to Pali grammarians. Unlike the Pāṇinian vyākaraṇa tradition in Sanskrit, Pali grammarians openly discuss the role of different option markers. Their description of these technical terms, however, does not fit Kiparsky’s thesis, which posits different degrees of “preference”. Rather, Kaccāyana grammarians seem to favour a type of analysis that is more in line with Kiparsky’s critics.² Indeed, the distinction of option levels does not seem to be related to frequency of use, or any preference of the users of the language, but simply to a hierarchy of domains. It has nothing to do with the outside world, so to say. It has to do with the very structure of a grammatical treatise composed in the sūtra style. For the sake of

¹ Chapata Saddhammajotipāla, commenting on the old suttapātha of Kaccāyana, uses the terms nicca, anicca, and asanta, cf. Kacc-nidd B² 12.5–10; C² 10.24–11.6.
parsimony, a basic contraposition is established between the general rule (utsarga) and the particular or exceptional rule (apavāda).¹ In-between we find what is generally called an alternative or open option. To put it in other words: a general rule will state that only X form is possible. An open option will posit that both X and Y forms are possible. A particular or exception rule will state that only Y is possible. Thus, we have three different possible domains. These domains are not related to statistical occurrence, or to any preference of usage, but simply to the sheer possibility of achieving the “perfection of a [word-] form” (rūpasiddhi). Accordingly, Pali grammarians use vā and vibhāsā to derive an optional form that is as correct as a form given in a general rule previously promulgated, and they use kvaci and navā to mark an exception to the option marked by vā/vibhāsā. It is not by chance, perhaps, that Buddhapāsīya compares the option marker par excellence, namely vā, with the preverb ā in the sense of “limit” or “boundary”, both inclusive and exclusive. This comparison subtly suggests a parallel with the inclusive option-boundary (vibhāsā) and the exclusive option-boundary (kvaci). For, as we have shown in this article, option markers are not only capable of indicating variation, but they can also indicate whether the variation occurs within the general domain of a rule, or beyond its boundaries.

¹ For a detailed introduction to the dialectics between general rules and exceptions in Pāṇinian vyākaraṇa, see Cardona 1997: 404–12; for the descriptive model that combines general and particular rules in Pāṇini, see Kahrs 1992: 232–33.
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