

शब्दानुगमः
Indian linguistic studies
in honor of
George Cardona

Volume I
Vyākaraṇa and Śābdabodha

edited by
PETER M. SCHARF

18 December 2021

Scharf, Peter M., ed. शब्दानुगमः : *Indian linguistic studies in honor of George Cardona*, volume 1, *Vyākaraṇa and śābdabodha*. Providence: The Sanskrit Library, 2021.

Copyright ©2021 by The Sanskrit Library.

All rights reserved. Reproduction in any medium is restricted. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, except brief quotations, in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission of the copyright holder and publisher indicated above.

ISBN vol. 1: 978-1-943135-01-1

ISBN vol. 2: 978-1-943135-02-8

ISBN set: 978-1-943135-03-5

The Sanskrit Library
89 Cole Avenue
Providence, RI 02906
USA
sanskritlibrary.org

Table of contents

Preface	iii
Contributors	xv
Tables of contents	xix
भाष्यसम्प्रदायाध्यायीपाठः a work on variations in the sūtras of the <i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i> TANUJA P. AJOTIKAR, ANUJA P. AJOTIKAR, and PETER M. SCHARF	1
Rule-prioritization principles in the derivation of compound absolutives in <i>lyap</i>. PETER M. SCHARF	55
Are taddhita affixes provided after prātipadikas or after padas? PETER M. SCHARF	125
On the necessity of immediate sequence (<i>ānantarya</i>) in the <i>Aṣṭā- dhyāyī</i> SHARON BEN-DOR	171
Pāṇini's definition of the bahuvrīhi as <i>śeṣa</i> 'remainder' MASATO KOBAYASHI	217
On the formation of ekadeśisamāśas ANDREY KLEBANOV	237
<i>Sarvadarśanasamgraha</i> and <i>Vākyapadīya</i> JOHANNES BRONKHORST	297

On the construction <i>artha</i> + instrumental	
TORU YAGI	313
The Vedic subjunctive prescribed in A. 3.4.7	
EIJIRŌ DŌYAMA	323
Fragments of ancient versified Sanskrit grammars?	
HARTMUT SCHARFE	375
Singling out the place where rules apply: materials from the discussion on Pāṇini's description of substitution	
MARIA PIERA CANDOTTI and TIZIANA PONTILLO	385
Two levels of optionality in the <i>Kaccāyana Vyākaraṇa</i>	
ALEIX RUIZ-FALQUÉS	431
Sanskrit grammatical schools: a first overview	
ÉMILIE AUSSANT	467
Correct speech (<i>śabda</i>): from the perspective of the Veda and Pāṇinian grammar	
JUNICHI OZONO	481
An eccentric commentator on the <i>Mahābhāṣya</i>: Śivarāmeṇdra Sarasvatī	
PIERRE-SYLVAIN FILLIOZAT	509
Śālikanātha's theory of the sentence-referent	
KEI KATAOKA	531
Navya-nyāya views of the meaning of verbal suffixes: Gaṅgeśa and Raghunātha	
TOSHIHIRO WADA	557
व्यञ्जनायाः सर्ववाक्यसाधारणत्वम् बलराम शुक्ल	583

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xxi

Appendix: Bibliography of George Cardona's publications	601
Index of primary texts cited	629
Author index	659

Two levels of optionality in the *Kaccāyana Vyākaraṇa*

ALEIX RUIZ-FALQUÉS

Abstract: Understanding how option markers operate in Sanskrit vyākaraṇa is crucial in order to determine the scope of grammatical rules. The exact function of option markers such as *vā* or *vibhāṣā*, however, is not unproblematic. In his influential monograph on option markers, Kiparsky (1979) postulated different levels of optionality for *vā*, *vibhāṣā* and *anyatarasyām*, each one showing different degrees of preference or frequency in usage. Kiparsky's theory became highly polarising, and today we find scholars of vyākaraṇa who readily assume the three levels as a fact, and other scholars, like Cardona (1999: 162–79), who dismiss it as a misunderstanding. While it is impossible to find any trace of Kiparsky's theory in Sanskrit vyākaraṇa literature after Patañjali, something that prima facie reminds of Kiparsky's claim is found in Pāli vyākaraṇa treatises of the Kaccāyana school. According to this school, there are two basic levels of optionality: one indicates open option (*vikappa*), and the other indicates an exception to a general rule. In this article, I explain how the two levels work and what option markers are used to indicate them. I also show that, paradoxically, the theory of two levels in the Pāli Kaccāyana tradition seems to refute Kiparsky's theory, rather than to support it. This is so because the concept of optionality is clearly not related to frequency of usage, but simply to the scope of exceptions, that is, to whether specific forms always (*niccama*) adhere, or not (*na vā*), to general (*utsarga*) grammatical rules.

Keywords: vyākaraṇa, grammar, Kaccāyana, Pāli, optionality, Kiparsky

1 Introduction: optionality, between preference and possibility

1.1 Optionality in Sanskrit grammar

Optionality is one of the most important metagrammatical devices in the Indian *vyākaraṇa* tradition. Without a proper understanding of how option markers operate, the exact scope of very many grammatical rules cannot be ascertained. In Pāṇinian studies the discussion on optionality has been largely polarised, for the past few decades, between those who accept Paul Kiparsky's theory of three degrees of optionality and those who stand with the traditional understanding.

As is well known, Kiparsky (1979) hypothetically postulates that the three main option markers must express three different degrees of optionality in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. He (1979: 1) proposes that *vā* indicates 'or rather, preferably', *vibhāṣā* 'or rather not, preferably not', and *anyatarasyām* 'either way'. He also maintains that this distinction was unknown to Kātyāyana, Patañjali and their successors.

Some scholars have readily accepted Kiparsky's claims. J. D. Smith (1982: 185), for instance, says that "there is no serious possibility that Kiparsky is in error." Bronkhorst (1982: 273), in his review article, stated that "it can be said that the author has established this his [sic] thesis beyond reasonable doubt." In a recent publication, he (2019: 24–25) even goes to the extent of presenting the hypothesis as a well-established fact: "Panini [sic] used a number of terms to indicate the optional use of certain formations. ... Patanjali [sic] shows no awareness of this distinction." Deshpande (1984) gives a more cautious assessment.

As critics of Kiparsky have pointed out, however, it may well be the case that Patañjali was not aware of the distinction because there was never a distinction in the first place. George Cardona (1999: 162–79) emphatically dismisses Kiparsky's hypothesis. He (1999: 173) reiterates his previous assessment stating, "I conclude that Kiparsky's main claim fails in view of the evidence, and I consider myself fully justified

in maintaining, as before (Cardona 1989: 66), that his thesis is ‘neither cogently maintained nor acceptable.’” In his review of Kiparsky 1979, Palsule (1982: 340) observes, “The problem as to why Pāṇini should have used three different terms to convey one and the same idea did not bother the tradition because of the accepted dictum: *Paryāyaśa-bdānām lāghavagauravacarcā nādriyate.*” Devasthali was also among those who found major weaknesses in Kiparsky’s methodological assumptions. He (1983: 148) writes,

I should now like to draw the attention of the readers to one important point which P[aul] K[iparsky] seems to have totally neglected; and that is the general attitude that people like Pāṇini had toward the Veda. It is found expressed in a nut-shell in *dr̥ṣṭānuvidhiś chandasi bhavati.* (In chandas [= the Veda] what is seen is to be (only) explained or accounted for). The question of preference or otherwise simply does not exist. Hence, at least so far as Vedic is concerned, no believer in the Veda in ancient India, could have thought of using the word preferable or not preferable, with reference to a word, or phrase, or a statement in the Veda.

1.2 Optionality in Pāli grammar

When it comes to Pāli vyākaraṇa treatises, little work has been done on the role of option markers. In general, it is agreed upon that Pāli grammarians are not particularly systematic and, consequently, their use of option markers is not as precise as that of their Sanskrit counterparts. With reference to Kiparsky’s hypothesis, Mahesh Deokar (2008: 367) has observed, “such minute distinctions are not observed so rigorously by the Pāli grammarians.” Deokar also shows that *navā* is used in the sense ‘rarely’ in the *Kaccāyana* grammar (*Kacc.*) in places such as *Kacc.* 21. He (2008: 368–69) deals with other occasional technical terms for optionality as well. He seems to locate the origin of the lack of systematic use for optionality in Pāli grammars in the Sanskrit *Kātantra*

grammar because Śarvavarman would not have systematically followed Pāṇini's option system. Deokar (2008: 369) writes,

In the earliest portion of the Kātantra, i.e. in the Sandhi section, *navā* is used to denote *vikalpa* or *vibhāṣā*. According to the commentators, in the Kātantra the particle *vā* is used in two different senses, that of conjunction (*samuccayārtha*) and optionality (*vikalpārtha*).

Émile Senart (1871: 14) claimed that it is impossible to ascertain the actual meaning of *vā* in *Kacc*. He (1871) usually translates it *quelquefois* 'sometimes' or *à volonté* 'if one wills, optionally'.¹ In his translation of the *Ākhyātakappa*, D'Alwis (1863: 25–26) translated *vā* as 'optionally' and *kvaci* as 'sometimes', but unfortunately there are no further explanations. The late Ole Pind (2012: 83) too has maintained that the difference between *vā* and *kvaci* in Pāli grammars is negligible. This view is partly true, and thus we find in the most recent integral translation of *Kacc*. into English, Ashin Thitzana (2016), a scholar-monk trained in the traditional system, levels down all the four option markers in *Kacc*. to 'sometimes', but he occasionally, for example 2016: 173, leaves the option marker in the sutta untranslated.² If we examine the *Kaccāyana* commentarial tradition, however, we find abundant discussions of and insights into the specific role of option markers. Even though the principle that different option markers designate different degrees of variation does not work in all cases, as Pāli grammarians acknowledge, it is noteworthy, because it helps us to delimit the exact scope of the rules. In the present article, I look at the earliest attestation of this theory and offer a preliminary analysis of its validity.

¹See Senart (1871: 24, 25); Senart (1871: 43) notes that the *Rūpasiddhi* (*Rūp.*) provides a *vā* missing in *Kacc*. 72; (1871: 60) for *vā* in *KaccV*. regarding plural forms ending in *ā* or *e*; (1871: 69) notes the absence of *vā* when needed; (1871: 77) for *navā*; (1871: 87) *ca* for *vā*; (1871: 93) wrong use of *vā*; (1871: 142) *vā* in *Kacc*. 281 regarding the *karaṇa-kāraka*; (1871: 144, 152); (1871: 155) "*kvaci* could therefore have a double use, but there is nothing simpler than taking it as more or less equivalent to *vā*" (my translation); (1871: 259, 293).

²For a review of Thitzana's work, see Ruiz-Falqués 2018.

2 Two degrees of optionality in *Kaccāyana*

The general principle of the two degrees of optionality in the *Kaccāyana* Pāli grammar is laid out by Vimalabuddhi (Pind 2012: 71) in his *Mukhamattadīpanī* (*Mmd.*, 10th c. CE). It can be summarised as follows:

- *vā* (and *vibhāsā*) indicates an open option (*vikappa*) where two or more forms are possible.
- *kvaci* (and *navā*) indicates that only one form is possible.

The metagrammatical axiom, “indeclinables (*nipātas*) have many meanings,” seems to be the foundation on which Vimalabuddhi’s theory relies; for option markers are all *nipātas*, and *nipātas* do not have a definite meaning.

The only explicit formulation of this principle in Vimalabuddhi’s lengthy commentary derives from his analysis of the term *navā* as a single word or expression (*ekam padam*) in *Kacc.* 21 *Ivaṇṇo yam navā*.³ The laws of recurrence (*anuvutti*) lead Vimalabuddhi to the conclusion that *navā* and *na vā* are not only different expressions but even mark different degrees of optionality. The conflict of priority that triggers the discussion on option markers in *Mmd.* is between one rule in the *Sandhi* section and two rules in the *Nāma* section, whose scope overlap. The rules with examples are as follows:⁴

- *Kacc.* 21 *Ivaṇṇo yam navā* “The phoneme (*vaṇṇo*) *iḷ* [becomes] *y* [before a vowel], optionally (*navā*).” Examples: *paṭisanthāravuty assa* [← *paṭisanthāravuti assa*] ‘he will be of agreeable nature’, *sabbā vity anubhūyate* [← *sabbā vitti anubhūyate*] ‘all the happiness is enjoyed’.
- *Kacc.* 70 *Jhalānam iyuvā sare vā* “*jha* (*iḷ* masc./neut. endings) and *la* (*ulū* masc./neut. endings) [become] *iy* and *uv* [respectively] before a vowel.” Examples: *tiyantam* [← *ti antam*] ‘thus

³Note that in his critical edition Pind (2013) reads *na vā*.

⁴Perhaps these rules had the same function originally, but they became redundant once the different independent *kappas* ‘chapters’ of *Kacc.* were compiled in one single work. See Pind 1996: 71.

ending’, *pacchiyāgāre* [← *pacchi-āgāre*] ‘basket(?)–house’, *bhikkhuvāsane* [← *bhikkhu-āsane*] ‘monk’s seat’, *puthuvāsane* [*puthu-āsane*] ‘individual seat’.

- *Kacc.* 71 *Yavakārā ca* “And also [*jha* (*iṭ* masc./neut. endings) and *la* (*uṭ* masc./neut. endings) become] *ya* and *va* [respectively, before a vowel].” Examples: *agyāgāraṃ* [← *aggi-āgāraṃ*] ‘fire-house’, *cakkhvāyatanam* [← *cakku-āyatanam*] ‘eye-base’, *svāgataṃ* [← *su-āgataṃ*] ‘welcome’.

As shown in Table 1, these rules provide that a replacement (*ādeśa*) occurs in place of a substituend (*stihānin*) with varying degrees of optionality, either exceptionally (*navā*) or optionally (*vā*).

Table 1
*Degrees of optionality in Kaccāyana rules
replacing i with y or iy before a vowel*

Sutta	Substituendum	Replacement	Optionality
21	<i>iṭ</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>navā</i>
70	<i>iṭ</i>	<i>iy</i>	<i>vā</i>
	<i>uṭ</i>	<i>uv</i>	
71	<i>iṭ</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>vā</i>
	<i>uṭ</i>	<i>v</i>	

The conflict, then, is about the sandhi of *iṭ* followed by vowel. There are three possible results:

- exceptional change into *y*,
- optional change into *iy*,
- optional change into *y*.

According to Vimalabuddhi, the marker *navā* in *Kacc.* 21 overrules the *vā* of *Kacc.* 70, 71 (the relevant passage is translated in Appendix 2 §7.3 (p. 453)). This interpretation is difficult to accept if *Kacc.* is analysed as a prescriptive grammar. It makes sense, however, if *Kacc.* is

understood as a grammar that records the usage of a corpus, which in this case consists of the *Tipiṭaka* and the commentaries thereupon. What Vimalabuddhi intends is that those exceptions under *Kacc.* 21 are not affected by the alternatives offered in 70, 71. Thus, in most cases *i/ī* may be replaced with either *iy* or *y*: we are here in the realm of *vikappa* ‘open option’ marked by *vā*. But in some specific cases, *kvaci* (or as here, *navā*), it is replaced with *y* only. Here *kvaci* (*navā*) establishes a restriction to the *vikappa*, and as we can see, in the sequence of *Kacc.* suttas, the restriction appears before the general rule.

3 Option markers in *Kaccāyana*

At first sight, the two different levels of optionality in *Kacc.* do not seem to indicate any degree of preference. As Devasthali observed regarding Pāṇini’s description of Vedic language, Pāli grammarians are mostly interested in determining which forms are optional in the corpus and which forms are invariable. We shall now examine how the use of the four option markers in *Kaccāyana* compare with actual usage in the *Tipiṭaka*. Although a reliably conclusive survey cannot be conducted in the absence of a tagged critical edition of the canonical corpus, I make a preliminary analysis using the GRETIL e-texts.

3.1 (a) *navā*

The word *navā*, which according to *Mmd.* has to be read as one pada, appears four times in the *Kacc./KaccV.* text. In the *vutti* ‘gloss’, it appears as one single expression after the verb (e.g. *KaccV.* ad *Kacc.* 21 *Yakāraṃ pappoti navā*). It needs to be distinguished from *na vā*, which appears separated in the gloss (e.g. *KaccV.* ad *Kacc.* 46: *iti vuttarūpā na honti vā*). Following the principle of optionality described in §2 (p. 435), it expresses an exception in *Kacc.* 21, 392, and it also seems to mark an exception, but less clearly, in *Kacc.* 144, 147v. Here the option with *navā* seems to be the preferred one, or at any rate the most common in the canon.

3.2 (b) *vibhāsā*

If we follow Vimalabuddhi's interpretation, the word *vibhāsā* generally marks an open option that may yield two forms. It is equivalent to *vā*. It is not possible, with the materials available to us, to determine whether it indicates a more or less preferred option. The marker *vibhāsā* appears only twice in the *Kaccāyana*, and interestingly both times in the context of compound (*samāsa*) derivation: *Kacc.* 154 *Samāse ca vibhāsā*, a rule that is not based on canonical evidence,⁵ and *Kacc.* 325 *Vibhāsā rukkha-tiṇa-pasu-dhana-dhañña-janapadādīnañ ca*.⁶

3.3 (c) *vā*

The use of *vā* as a marker of *vikappa* 'open option' is widely confirmed, for instance in rules like *Kacc.* 137 *Nāmhi raññā vā* "[The word *rāja*, including its *vibhatti*, is replaced with] *raññā* optionally (*vā* in the instrumental singular (*nāmhi vibhattimhi*).]" The example given is *raññā*, which occurs 426 times in the canon, vs. *rājena*, which occurs much less frequently with just 50 occurrences. Interestingly, in *Kacc.* 135 *Rājassa rañño rājino se*, no option is offered. It seems that *rañño* and *rājino* are the only accepted forms for the gen./dat. sg. This is not true in our recension of the canon, where the frequency of these words is: *rañño* 2,112 occurrences, *rājassa* 229, and *rājino* 40. But this is explained because *rājassa* is not found alone, but as the last member of a compound: *mahārājassa*, *devarājassa*, *migarājassa*, etc. The open option is clear even in rules that yield results that are not attested in

⁵Cf. *KaccSNidd.* on *Kacc.* 64 *Tassā vā: anukaraṇasuttaṃ hi duvidhaṃ paccakkhā-paccakkhavasena* "an imitation-sutta is indeed of two types: based on evidence and not based on evidence" (*KaccSNidd.* B^e 34.25; C^e 32.8–9). The word *anukaraṇa* means 'imitation' with regard to usage, especially in the *Tipiṭaka*. *Saddhammajotipāla* compares the language of the *Tipiṭaka* with a face reflected in a mirror that is *vyākaraṇa*, cf. Ruiz-Falqués 2015: 5. *Saddhammajotipāla* further states: *yaṃ pakataṃ tad anukaraṇan* "an imitation is that which is natural (*pakataṃ*, Skt. *prakṛtaṃ*)", or perhaps "what is imitated [by grammar] is that which is natural" (*KaccSNidd.* B^e 32.2.3; C^e 30.1.2).

⁶Cf. A. 2.4.12 *vibhāsā vṛkṣamṛgatṛṇadhānyavyaṅjanapaśuśakunyaśvavaḍavapurvā-parādharottarāṅām*.

the canon, like *Kacc.* 156 *Āne simhi vā* “*āne* [is the ending of *puma*] in loc.sg., optionally,” which yields the alternative ghost forms *pumāne* or *pume*.

In some places *vā* does not mark an open option — or, if it does, it is not quite clear how. For instance, in *Kacc.* 13 *Vā paro asarūpā* “optionally, the latter [vowel is elided] after a non-homogeneous [vowel],” the only way to understand *vā* as *vikappa* is not by trying to find variants to the specific examples (*cattaro ime* can only become *cattāro ’me*, never **cattār ’ime*), but by locating variants in general sandhi: when two non-homogeneous vowels meet, either may be elided. Thus, *vā* marks a general option: when two vowels coalesce, either may be elided. For restrictions to this general optionality, *kvaci* or *navā* will be used (e.g. *Kacc.* 14).

The option taught by the rule with *vā* coincides at times with a more frequent form, and one could infer that it indicates some sort of preference, e.g. *Kacc.* 481 *Hi lopam vā* “*hi* is optionally elided”. This rule makes the 2nd sg. imperative suffix *hi* optional: *gacchāhi/gaccha*, *gamehil/gama*, *gamayāhi/gamaya*. A brief survey gives the following occurrences: *gaccha* 189 vs. *gacchāhi* 9. The pairs *gamal/gamehi* and *gamayal/gamayāhi* are not attested. In this rule *vā* expresses an open option. It could also be understood as a preferred option, but to assess the actual frequency of the use of *hi* or its deletion a much more detailed survey of the available literature would be necessary.

Similarly, *Kacc.* 622 *Tuntūnatabbesu vā* “Optionally, [*r* in *kar* ‘to do’ is replaced by *t*] when *tum*, *tūna* and *tabba* follow.” Examples: *kattum kātum*, *kattūna kātūna*, *kattabbaṃ kātabbaṃ*. Here we have to understand that the first option is *kar* + *t°* with regressive assimilation: **kar-tum* → *kattum* 3 vs. *kātum* 276. This is a case of an open option where *vā* introduces what seems to be a less frequent option.

Another example where *vā* does not indicate preference is *Kacc.* 507 *Jaramarāṇaṃ jīrajiyyamiyyā vā* “*jīra*, *jiyya* replace *jara* ‘decaying’, and *miyya* replaces *mara* ‘dying’, optionally.” The words *jarati* and *jaranti* are not attested, except in grammatical works (cf. *Sadd.* 167.9; 560.8). *PED.* s.v. *jarati* gives the form *jarayati*, but we

find *jārayetha* Ja V.501.14*, v.l. B^c S^c *jīrayetha* (cf. *DOP.* s.v. **jarati*). As to the replacements provided by this rule, the number of occurrences is as follows: *jīrati* 9, *jīranti* 8 vs. *jiyyati* 3, *jiyyanti* 0, *jīyati* 16, *jīyanti* 30; *marati* 25, *maranti* 4 vs. *miyyati* 3, *mīyati* 20, *miyyanti* 0, *mīyanti* 21; *marāmi* 3 vs. *miyyāmi* 4.

Sometimes it is not possible to determine whether a certain higher frequency in use represents any preference, because the contrast in numbers is not radical, e.g. *marāmi* 3 vs. *miyyāmi* 4. In conclusion, we can say that *vā* does generally express an open option, where two forms are acceptable, but it is not possible to observe any clear systematic indication of preference.

3.4 (d) *kvaci*

The word *kvaci* seems to indicate exception or restriction of a former general rule, but as some critics of *Kacc.* have noted, the use of this marker is not as systematic as the principle declares. In *Kacc.* 24 the sutta seems to refer to those cases where only one form is possible, as the sandhi of *ko imam̐*, which always results in *ko 'mam̐*, never **k' imam̐*. As to frequency of use, *kvaci* does not necessarily indicate a less preferred option, but it seems to indicate a more restricted option. Consider, for instance, *Kacc.* 48 *Kvaci paṭi patissa* “In some places *paṭi* is replaced by *paṭi*.” The example *paṭaggi* is not attested vs. *paṭaggi* 5 occurrences; *paṭihaññati* is only attested in the *Niddesa* vs. *paṭihaññati* 22 times. Words with *paṭi*^o 19,522 vs. *paṭi*^o 2,823. If we read *kvaci* in its strict sense of exception, that would mean that some words only accept the retroflex option. Given that Pāli manuscripts oscillate in their representation of dentals and equivalent retroflex consonants, it is impossible to determine whether the word *kvaci* here indicates exception or not. However, it seems that the examples given in *KaccV.* follow the principle. The example *paṭaggi* ‘a counteracting fire’ (*DOP.*), for instance, is a result of the restriction of *kvaci*, and it never appears as **paṭaggi* (see, however, the compound *gahapaṭaggi* ‘fire of a householder’, with dental, never *gahapaṭaggi*).

Similarly, in *Kacc.* 250 *Kvaci to pañcamyatthe* “In some places the affix *to* [is] in the sense of ablative,” the rule cannot possibly mean that the affix *to* is less frequent in general: *sabbato* 12 vs. *sabbasmā* 0,⁷ *sabbamhā* 0;⁸ *yato* 758 vs. *yasmā* 216, *yamhā* 7; *tato* 1,646 vs. *tasmā* 1,331, *tamhā* 243; *ato* 9 vs. *asmā* 40, *amhā* 69; *ito* 1,363 vs. *imasmā* 22, *imamhā* 51. If *kvaci* here means exceptionally, it must be in the sense that the ablative sense is generally not denoted with this affix, but with *nā* and other vibhattis.

For a case where *kvaci* means exception, consider *Kacc.* 308 *Kvacī dutiyā chaṭṭhīnam atthe* “In some places the accusative (*dutiyā*) [is used] in the sense of a genitive [or dative] (*chaṭṭhīnam*).” In the sentence, *api ssa maṃ aggivessana tisso upamāyo paṭibhaṃsu* “Moreover, Aggivessana, three similes occurred to me” (*M.* I.240.2.9), *maṃ* means *me* or *mama* ‘of/to me’. This usage is certainly exceptional, and *kvaci* suits the context. Furthermore, the set of paribhāsā rules traditionally known in Burma as *mahāsuttas* ‘great rules’ (*Kacc.* 405, 406, 519)⁹ mark exceptions, particularly those connected with indeclinable forms, and here *kvaci* clearly plays the role assigned by Vimalabuddhi.

4 Development of Vimalabuddhi’s principle

Vimalabuddhi’s theory of optionality evolved in subsequent commentarial interpretations of the *Kaccāyana*. Buddhapiya’s *Rūpasiddhi* (*Rūp.*, 12th century, Coḷa kingdom) represents an attempt to correct *Mmd.* in many ways, including the use of option markers. Although this may not be explicit in *Rūp.*, it is explained in the *Rūpasiddhi-tīkā* (*RūpT.*), traditionally ascribed to the same author.¹⁰ The ambivalent na-

⁷Pind cites the post-canonical *Visuddhimagga* (cf. *Vism.* 651.26).

⁸I could not count exactly how many *sabbā* masc./neut.abl.sg. there are, because *sabbā* appears many times as fem.

⁹The other mahāsutta, apart from *Kacc.* 305, 306 and 519, is *Kacc.* 393 *Yadanupapannā nipātanā sījjhanti*. I thank Ven. Kondaññakitti, PhD. cand. at Shan State Buddhist University, for providing this information to me via private communication.

¹⁰*RūpT.* 17.6; 17.19; 21.5; 26.13; 27.11; 33.22; 35.5; 140.1, see also Ruiz-Falqués 2021.

ture of the word *kvaci* is discussed in *RūpT.* ad *Rūp.* 35 (= *Kacc.* 24) *sare kvaci*, where Buddhappiya criticizes Vimalabuddhi and makes clear that the use of option markers is related to restriction:

Yaṃ pana ñāse sarā sare lopaṃ ti ādāni vatvā sare kvacī ti vuttatā kvaciggahaṇena vinā pi imass’ āniyatabhāve viññāyamāne pi puna kvaciggahaṇakaraṇe payojanam pana na katthaci hoti, katthaci na hotī ti idam eva ñāpanattham, atha kho ekekassa rūpadvayuppādanatthan ti vuttam,¹¹ tam na yujjati, aniyatabhāve siddhe puna aniyatabhāvāya kvaciggahaṇassa niratthakattā. yañ ca tatth’ eva purimasuttavaṇṇanāyaṃ sare kvacī ti ettha kvacisaddo vāttho ti ca vuttam,¹² tañ ca na gahetabbaṃ. evaṃ hi sati vā paro asarūpā ti ettha vāggahaṇam akatvā sarā sare lopaṃ ti etth’ eva vāggahaṇam kareyya, na ca kataṃ. imañ ca suttaṃ ācariyo n’ ārabheyya, āraddhañ ca. tena viññāyati na c’ āyaṃ kvacisaddo vāttho ti.¹³

In the *Nyāsa* (= *Mmd.*) we find the following statement: “Since *sare kvaci* is formulated after having stated *sarā sare lopaṃ* [*Kacc.* 12] and so forth, even without the word *kvaci* the lack of restriction (= the optionality) [of *sare*] would be understood; nevertheless, the word *kvaci* is still used, not to express the sense ‘in some places it obtains, in some places it does not obtain’, but in order to allow for the derivation of two forms for each (*ekekassa*) [concept].” Now this statement is not appropriate, because if the non-restriction was so clear, it would be pointless to use the word *kvaci* to express further non-restriction. And what is stated in the same commentary [i.e. *Nyāsa*] on the previous sutta, namely, “in *sare kvaci*, the word *kvaci* has the meaning of *vā*,” this should not be accepted either. For, if

¹¹ *Mmd.* 39.18–21.

¹² *Mmd.* 38.11.

¹³ *RūpT.* 21.5–16.

we did accept it, we would not find *vā* in *vā paro asarūpā*; we would find it instead in *sarā sare lopam*, and that is not the case; similarly, the Master [Mahā Kaccāyana] would not have introduced the present rule [*sare kvaci*], but he has actually done it. From this it is inferred that this word *kvaci* does not have the meaning of *vā*.

Buddhappiya added precision to Vimalabuddhi's principle by using a tripartite classification of rules: (1) *nicca* 'mandatory', (2) *anicca* 'not mandatory' and (3) *asanta* 'not applicable'. In his *vutti* on the *Kacc.* rules, Buddhappiya specifies the exact scope of *vā* and *kvaci*, adding layers of restriction when it is needed.¹⁴

In the 13th century, the Burmese grammarian Guṇasāgara of Pagan summarised Vimalabuddhi's principle in his *Mukhamattasāra* (ca. 13th c. CE) as follows:

*Kvaci navā ca ekatthā yebhuyyen' ekarūpakā;
vāvibhāsā samānatthā pāyen' obhayarūpakā ti.*¹⁵

Kvaci and *navā* have the same meaning, they generally (*yebhuyyena*) express one form; *vā* and *vibhāsā* have a common meaning, mostly (*pāyena*) expressing two forms. (Ruiz-Falqués 2015: 142).

This stanza was quoted in major *Kaccāyana* commentaries. Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla's *Suttaniddesa* (15th century, Pagan) quotes the stanzas, without naming the source, when discussing the word *vibhāsā* in *Kacc.* 325. This commentary, we shall remind, was the official commentary on *Kacc.* in early modern monastic education in Burma (Dhammasami 2004: 321). Mahāvijitāvī too, in his *Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā* (16th century, Pinya) quotes the same stanza, without explicit attribution, when commenting on *Kacc.* 14 (*KaccVaṇṇ.* 27.8–9.) This theory

¹⁴For a detailed explanation of optionality in Buddhappiya's *Rūpasiddhi*, see Ruiz-Falqués 2021.

¹⁵*MmdSāra.* 94 = *KaccSNidd.* B^e 154.10–11; C^e 150.13–14. The *Mukhamattasāra* has not been edited. I am currently working on the editio princeps (Ruiz-Falqués n.d.). Apart from this stanza, *KaccSNidd.* quotes the *MmdSāra.* many more times, often without attribution.

of optionality has reached our days through the Burmese commentarial tradition. It is discussed in Ven. Janakabhivamsa's *Kaccāyana bhāsā-tī-kā*, a widely circulating Burmese textbook on the *Kaccāyana*. It is also found in English translations that derive, totally or partially, from the Burmese *Kaccāyana* tradition, notably the studies of Ven. Malai (1997: 105) and Bhikkhu Nandisena (2005: 48).

5 Optionality in *Kaccāyana* and Sanskrit

A thorough study of optionality in the Pāli *vyākaraṇa* tradition remains a desideratum. But even if the present survey does not exhaust all the available material,¹⁶ it shows that Pāli grammarians do have a theory of optionality and they apply it in their interpretation of the *suttapāṭha*. In most cases the words *kvaci* and *navā* mean 'exceptionally, rarely', and they establish some sort of restriction to a more general rule, whereas the words *vā* and *vibhāsā* generally mean 'optionally' and they express an open option (*vikappa*). This is how Pāli grammarians, from Vimalabuddhi onwards, have read the *Kaccāyana* text through the centuries, but this is not reflected in most modern translations and studies of the text.

If we compare Vimalabuddhi's theory of the two levels with Kiparsky's thesis, we can see that they show certain similarities. Indeed, Pāli grammarians accept that some option markers prevent variation, rather than allowing for it. They restrict the scope of certain rules. But there is a major difference between the Pāli grammarians' view and Kiparsky's. Pāli grammarians are clearly not concerned with issues of preference. What Devasthali states regarding Vedic Sanskrit can also be applied to canonical Pāli. The role of the grammarian is simply to describe. Hence, the restrictive effect of markers *kvaci* and *navā* is directly related to the dialectics between general (*utsarga*) and particular or exceptional (*apavāda*) rules. The restriction of *kvaci* and

¹⁶For instance, in a very interesting discussion that I have left out, *MmdPṬ*. 81.1.2 classifies *kvaci* into two types: *vikārasādhaka* 'the means for a modification' and *nisedhasādhaka* 'the means for a negation'.

navā can only operate within a major level of optionality established by the marker *vā/vibhāsā*. Strictly speaking, therefore, there is only one form of optionality, which is open and allows for two or more forms as long as they are attested in the literature. Whenever the rule needs to be refined, markers such as *niccam* ‘always’ or *kvaci* ‘exceptionally’ are used. In conclusion, then, the theory of the two levels in Pāli does not support Kiparsky’s thesis and rather agrees with the view of Cardona, Devasthali and those scholars who have sought to explain the variety in option marker terminology following the evidence from the commentaries and avoiding conclusions that are impossible to substantiate.

As Pāli grammatical treatises have been crucial in the textual transmission of the canonical and exegetical literature of the Theravāda school (H. Smith 1928; Hinüber 1983; Pind 2012; Gornall 2020; Ruiz-Falqués 2019), the study of option markers could shed light on the morphology of Pāli as a language. Particularly interesting would be a study of fossilised or “frozen” forms and sandhi ligatures, that have not yet been studied in the broader context of Pāli formulae, prose style and mnemonics. What appears to be a marginal aspect of Pāli grammars, then, could potentially reveal hidden aspects of the early Buddhist literature.

6 Appendix 1: Distribution of technical terms for optionality in *Kaccāyana* and *Kaccāyana–vutti*

The following table presents the terms used in the *Kaccāyana* and the *Kaccāyanavutti*, the number of the sutta in which the term occurs (marked with ‘v’ if in the *vutti*), the number of the last sutta to which recurrence (*anuvutti* ‘Anu.’) extends or ‘ES’ if to the end of the section, the term that blocks further recurrence, and glosses of the term in the *Mukhamattadīpanī* or *Kaccāyana-vutti* and other relevant notes.

	Term	No.	Anu.	Blocker	Gloss/Note
	<i>Sandhikappa</i>				
	I.1–I.5				

	Term	No.	Anu.	Blocker	Gloss/Note
1.	<i>vā</i>	13		<i>kvaci</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
2.	<i>kvaci</i>	14	20	<i>navā</i>	<i>Mmd.: kvaci</i>
3.	<i>navā</i>	21	22	ES	<i>Mmd.: navā; Kacc-nidd: navā ti kvacatthaniddeso</i>
4.	<i>kvaci</i>	24	27	<i>ṭhāne</i>	<i>Mmd.: kvaci</i>
5.	<i>ṭhāne</i>	28	29	ES	
6.	<i>vā</i>	31	35	<i>kvaci</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
7.	<i>kvaci</i>	36	39	<i>vā</i>	<i>Mmd.: kvaci</i>
8.	<i>vā</i>	40		<i>ca(?)</i>	<i>Mmd.: vā</i>
9.	<i>kvaci</i>	42	43		<i>Mmd.: kvaci</i>
10.	<i>na vā</i>	46	<i>na</i> 47	<i>kvaci</i>	<i>Mmd. explains that this is na vā not navā. Gloss of vā Mmd.: vikappena</i>
11.	<i>kvaci</i>	48	50	<i>paribhāsā</i> 51	<i>Mmd.: kvaci. Anuvutti skips 49 byañjane.</i>
<i>Nāmakappa</i>					
II.I					
12.	<i>vā</i>	64	65		<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
13.	<i>vā</i>	68	69	<i>vā</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
14.	<i>vā</i>	70		<i>ca</i>	<i>KaccV.: vā ti vikappana-tthaṃ; Mmd.: vikappena</i>
15.	<i>vā</i>	76		<i>ca</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
16.	<i>vā</i>	80	81		
17.	<i>vā</i>	93			<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
18.	<i>vā</i>	94	95	<i>yosu</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
19.	<i>vā</i>	99		<i>na</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
20.	<i>vā</i>	105	107		<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
21.	<i>vā</i>	108	109	<i>na</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
22.	<i>vā</i>	113		<i>ca</i>	<i>Mmd.: vāggahaṇam paggaṇassa [from Kacc. 112 Pato yā] nivattanatthaṃ</i>

	Term	No.	Anu.	Blocker	Gloss/Note
23.	<i>vā</i>	117	119	ES	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
II.2					
24.	<i>vā</i>	123		<i>simhi</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena.</i> No anuvutti in 124-126, but <i>KaccV.: vā</i> again in 127
25.	<i>vā</i>	128	129	<i>amussa</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
26.	<i>vā</i>	136		<i>vā</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
27.	<i>vā</i>	137		<i>smimhi</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
28.	<i>navā</i>	144		<i>nāmhi</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
29.	<i>vā</i>	147v			<i>navā</i> is <i>anuvṛtti</i> from 144 by frog's leap: <i>Mmd.: savibhattiggahaṇañ ca tumhamhaggahaṇañ ca maṇḍukagatyā navāgga-haṇañ ca vattate.</i>
30.	<i>vā</i>	150		<i>bahuvacanesu</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
31.	<i>vibhāsā</i>	154		<i>yosu</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
32.	<i>vā</i>	156		<i>hivibhattimhi</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
33.	<i>vā</i>	158	160	ES	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
II.3					
34.	<i>vā</i>	162	163		<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
35.	<i>vā</i>	162	163		<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
36.	<i>vā</i>	165		<i>na</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
37.	<i>vā</i>	170		<i>ca</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
38.	<i>vā</i>	173v			
39.	<i>vā</i>	175	179	<i>na</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
40.	<i>vā</i>	181		<i>ca</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
41.	<i>ca</i>	185v			<i>casaddaggahaṇaṃ kvaci sakārassa' eva pasiddhatthaṃ (KaccV. 61.3)</i>
42.	<i>vā</i>	186v		<i>seseu</i>	
43.	<i>vā</i>	188v			

	Term	No.	Anu.	Blocker	Gloss/Note
44.	<i>vā</i>	195		<i>vā</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
45.	<i>vā</i>	196		<i>tu</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
46.	<i>vā</i>	201	203	<i>ca</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
47.	<i>vā</i>	210		ES	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
II.4					
48.	<i>vā</i>	216	217	<i>niccam</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
49.	<i>niccam</i>	218	219	<i>pi</i>	
50.	<i>vā</i>	231		<i>niccam</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
51.	<i>niccam</i>	232		<i>vā</i>	
52.	<i>vā</i>	233		<i>ca</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
53.	<i>vā</i>	238			<i>Mmd.: vāggahaṇaṃ pa-nānadādayo sampiṇḍeti</i>
54.	<i>vā</i>	241v			
55.	<i>kvaci</i>	244	245		
56.	<i>vā</i>	248		ES	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
II.5					
57.	<i>kvaci</i>	250			
58.	<i>vā</i>	252v			
59.	<i>vā</i>	262		<i>ca</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
II.6 kāraka					
60.	<i>vā</i>	273			Disjunctive
61.	<i>vā</i>	276			<i>Mmd.: vāggahaṇaphalaṃ sayamevavakkhati</i>
62.	<i>vā</i>	278			Disjunctive
63.	<i>ca</i>	279			<i>KaccV. casaddaggaṇaṃ vikappanatthaṃ</i>
64.	<i>vā</i>	281			Disjunctive. <i>Mmd.: vāsaddo samuccayattho</i>
65.	<i>vā</i>	302		<i>sāmisim</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappamatthaṃ</i>
66.	<i>kvaci</i>	308	311		<i>Mmd.: kvaci</i>
II.7 samāsa					

	Term	No.	Anu.	Blocker	Gloss/Note
67.	<i>vibhāsā</i>	325		<i>dvipade tulyā-dhikaraṇe</i>	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena KaccVaṇṇ.</i> : 272-4-5: <i>vibhāsā ti vikappanattha</i> [sic]. <i>Sadd.</i> 127.12ff.: read loc. sg. not acc. pl.
68.	<i>kvaci</i>	339		<i>ca</i> (?)	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>kvaci</i>
69.	<i>kvaci</i>	343v			
II.8 taddhita					
70.	<i>vā</i>	346	348		<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i>
71.	<i>vā</i>	349	354	<i>ca</i>	<i>KaccV.</i> : <i>vikappanatthena</i> ; <i>vā</i> in 352 <i>vikappanatthena</i> according to <i>KaccV.</i> ; <i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i> only by anuvṛtti of <i>ca</i>
72.	<i>tu</i>	362			
73.	<i>vā</i>	376		<i>ī</i>	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i>
74.	<i>niccam</i>	378			
75.	<i>tu</i>	382			
76.	<i>vā</i>	383v	384		
77.	<i>vā</i>	385			<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i>
78.	<i>navā</i>	392			<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>navā</i>
79.	<i>tu</i>	400			
80.	<i>vā</i>	402		<i>thāne</i>	Seems disjunctive, not glossed by <i>KaccV.</i> as <i>vā hoti</i>
81.	<i>thāne</i>	403	404	<i>kvaci</i>	
82.	<i>kvaci</i>	405	406	<i>ca</i>	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>kvaci</i>
Ākhyātakappa					
III.1					
III.2					
83.	<i>vā</i>	435	436		<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena. E^c om.</i>
84.	<i>vā</i>	444	445	<i>kattari</i>	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i>

	Term	No.	Anu.	Blocker	Gloss/Note
III.3					
85.	<i>kvaci</i>	460		<i>abbhāso</i>	<i>Mmd.: kvaci</i>
86.	<i>kvaci</i>	460		<i>abbhāso</i>	<i>Mmd.: kvaci</i>
87.	<i>vā</i>	465			<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
88.	<i>vā</i>	467	472	<i>vā</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
89.	<i>vā</i>	473		<i>chappaccayesu</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
90.	<i>vā</i>	478		<i>vacassa</i>	<i>Mmd.: kvaci</i>
91.	<i>vā</i>	481	483	ES	<i>Mmd.: vikappena.</i> <i>KaccV. 483 adds the</i> <i>clause niccaṃ for bhavi-</i> <i>ssantī ‘future’ tense</i>
III.4					
92.	<i>vā</i>	486		<i>aññesu</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
93.	<i>vā</i>	490		<i>ghe</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
94.	<i>vā</i>	493v	494	<i>tthattaṃ</i>	
95.	<i>vā</i>	501v	503		Cf. Pind 2013: 169 n.4: E ^e <i>dadhātussa dajjaṃ vā</i> = <i>Rūp. 493</i> , cf. <i>Sadd.:</i> 1005: <i>dāssa vā dajjo</i>
96.	<i>vā</i>	507v	509	<i>vā</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
97.	<i>vā</i>	510v	516	<i>kārite</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
98.	<i>kvaci</i>	519v	521	<i>brūto</i>	<i>Mmd.: kvaci</i>
99.	<i>kvaci</i>	523v		<i>vā</i>	
100.	<i>vā</i>	524v		<i>lopaṃ</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
<i>Kibidhānakappa</i>					
IV.1					
101.	<i>vā</i>	529			<i>Mmd.: vāggahaṇena</i> <i>kammādimhītimassa</i> <i>vikappanato</i>
102.	<i>vā</i>	540			<i>Mmd.: vā = sampiṇḍana</i>
IV.2					

	Term	No.	Anu.	Blocker	Gloss/Note
103.	<i>vā</i>	555	556		<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i> . <i>KaccV.</i> 183.10: <i>vā</i> changes function: <i>itthi-</i> <i>yam anitthiyam vā</i>
104.	<i>vā</i>	563		<i>ca?</i>	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vāggahaṇam du-</i> <i>tiyassapaccayassa saṃpi-</i> <i>ṇḍanattham</i>
105.	<i>vā</i>	566			
IV.3					
106.	<i>ca</i>	574	576	<i>vā</i>	<i>KaccV.</i> 189.23 <i>ṭhāne</i>
107.	<i>vā</i>	577		<i>ca?</i>	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i>
108.	<i>vā</i>	581	582		<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vāggahaṇam ava-</i> <i>dhāraṇattham. anekatthā</i> <i>hi nipātā. tena c' ettha śa-</i> <i>bdam vuttavidhānam ni-</i> <i>yatam yeva hoti</i>
109.	<i>vā</i>	584		<i>ca?</i>	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i>
110.	<i>vā</i>	588v			<i>Pind</i> 2013: 193, n.13: <i>Sadd.</i> 1190. This rule is clearly defective, but the readings are con- firmed by <i>Mmd.</i> 450.23. <i>Sadd.</i> loc. cit. adds <i>lopaṃ</i> after <i>anto</i> , and B ^e and <i>Rūp.</i> 537 substitute <i>tuṃ</i> <i>tabbādisu na</i> for <i>anto</i>
111.	<i>vā</i>	591		ES	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i>
IV.4					
112.	<i>vā</i>	594			<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i>
113.	<i>vā</i>	596	600		<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>vikappena</i>
114.	<i>vā</i>	602v		<i>ca(?)</i>	
115.	<i>kvaci</i>	608		ES	<i>Mmd.</i> : <i>kvaci</i>

	Term	No.	Anu.	Blocker	Gloss/Note
IV.5					
116.	<i>vā</i>	615	616	<i>kvimhi</i>	<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
117.	<i>vā</i>	622	623		<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
IV.6					
118.	<i>vā</i>	629		<i>samādhīhi</i>	<i>Mmd.: vā</i>
119.	<i>vā</i>	631			<i>Mmd.: vikappena</i>
120.	<i>vā</i>	668			<i>KaccV.: kvaci, Mmd.: kvaci</i>

7 Appendix 2: Vimalabuddhi on *Kaccāyana* 21

Here is presented the text of *Mmd.* 32.24–34.30 with my translation. I have adjusted the punctuation and put the page numbers to the edition in square brackets.

7.1 Gloss and general purport of the rule

Ivaṇṇo yaṃ na vā. Kimattham idam uccate. Ivaṇṇo sare pare yakāraṃ pappoti navā ti ṇāpanatthaṃ. Ivaṇṇo ti ekaṃ padaṃ. Yan ti ekaṃ padaṃ. Navā ti ekaṃ padan ti tipadam idaṃ suttam. Sareggahaṇassa nimittabhāvenānuvattanato ivaṇṇo sare pare yakāraṃ pappoti navā ty attho. I eva vaṇṇo ty atthe nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho ty adhikicca divipade tulyādhikaraṇe kammadhārayo ti samāso ca vibhattilopo ca pakatibhāvo ca nāmam iva katvā vibhatyupattādīni ca [33] vuttanayen' eva.

[*Kacc.* 21] The speech-sound *i* [when a vowel follows, *sare pare Kacc.* 12]¹⁷ takes the form *y*, exceptionally (*na vā*).

What is the purpose of this statement? It is in order to convey that the speech-sound *i*, when a vowel follows, is replaced by *y*, exception-

¹⁷*vā* in *Kacc.* 13 opens a sub-section where *sare* is blocked; *kvaci* in *Kacc.* 14 opens a sub-sub-section where *vā* is blocked; *KaccV.* §17 recovers *sare* but retains *kvaci* from *Kacc.* 14. The reason for this is unclear, but *sare pare* in *KaccV.* §21 is supposedly anuvutti from *Kacc.* 12 *Sarā sare lopaṃ*.

ally. *Ivaṇṇo* is one word. *Yaṃ* is one word. *Navā* is one word. This sutta consists of three words. The meaning is that the speech-sound *i* is replaced by *y* before a vowel, because of the recurrence (*anuvattana-to*) of the word *sare* (*sareggahaṇassa*) [from *Kacc.* 12] as a condition (*nimittabhāvena*). With regard to the meaning, “*i* itself [is] a speech sound,” on the basis of *Nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho*, “A compound is that which has the combined meaning of nouns” [*Kacc.* 318], and *Dvipade tulyādhikaraṇe kammadhārayo* “When both words have the same substratum, [that *tappurisa* compound receives the technical term] *kammadhāraya*” [*Kacc.* 326], the compound, the elision of the case ending and the nominal stem are made like a noun, and the formation of the case endings and so forth are carried out according to the rule.

7.2 Objection and refutation 1: homogeneity between *i* and *ī*

[*Codanā:*] *Ivaṇṇo ti vuttattā īvaṇṇo kathaṃ saṅgahaṃ gacchatī ti.*

[*Objection:*] Since only *ivaṇṇo* is stated, how can *īvaṇṇo* be included?

[*Parihāra:*] *Samānarūpattā. Yathā pana ajo ti vutte dīgharassakāḷakodātādibhedabhinnā pi samānarūpattā ajasaṅgahaṃ gacchati, evaṃ sampadam idarī.*

[*Refutation:*] Because they share the same form (*rūpa*). In the same way that when one says ‘goat’, this word comprises all sorts of goats, on account of having something in common, although they are different in shape: some are long, some short, some are black, some white, etc. This is how [the meaning of the sutta] is complete (*sampadam*).

7.3 Objection and refutation 2: the rule is redundant because *Kacc.* 70 and 71 already provide for the same sandhi

[*Codanā:*] *nanu jhalānam iyuvā sare vā, yavakāro ceti vuttattā imassā-niyatatā pākaṭā va. kasmā idha navāggahaṇaṃ katan ti.*

[*Objection:*] But is it not true that this non-restriction (*aniyatatā*) is

already clear from the rules *Jhalānam iyuvā sare vā* [*Kacc.* 70] and *Yavakāro ca* [*Kacc.* 71]? Why is the word *navā* used here?

[*Parihāra:*] *Payoĵanantarasaṃbhavato. Asati hi navāggahaṇe ivaṇṇassa sare pare iminā yakārādeso hoti. Puna yavakārā ceti vuttattā katthaci tena pi yakāro hoti. Puna jhalānam iyuvā sare vā ti vuttattā katthaci iyādeso hoti. Evaṃ imehi vinimuttā keci payogā kadāci pi na siyūṃ tasmā taṃnivattanatthaṃ idha navāggahaṇaṃ kataṃ. Tena ya-ttha navāggahaṇena yakāro na hoti, tattha aññena pi yakāro na hoti. Ten’ eva hoti muttacāgī anuddhato ti.*

[*Refutation:*] Because it [namely *navā* in *Kacc.* 21] serves another purpose. For, if the word *navā* were not there, the speech-sound *i*, when a vowel follows, by this rule should be [always] replaced with *y*. And because the rule *Yavakārā ca* [*Kacc.* 71] is stated, in some places the replacement *y* obtains. Again, because the rule *Jhalānam iyuvā sare vā* [*Kacc.* 70] is stated, in some places the replacement *iy* obtains. Thus, some usages [of the *y/iy* replacement] that are independent from these [*Kacc.* 70, 71] would never take place. Therefore in order to prevent that, the word *navā* is used here [in *Kacc.* 21]. Because of this (*tena*), where *y* does not obtain by *navā*, it does not obtain by any other rule either. By this method only one obtains [the counter-example (cf. *KaccV.* 7.7)] *muttacāgī anuddhato* [and **muttacāgy anuddhato* by *Kacc.* 71 and **muttacāgiy anuddhato* by *Kacc.* 70 are immediately impossible to derive].

7.4 Objection and refutation 3: why use *navā* instead of *kvaci*

[*Codanā:*] *Nanu kvaciġgahaṇenā pi tadattho viññāyati, kasmā kvaciġgahaṇaṃ anapekkhitvā idha navāggahaṇaṃ katan ti.*

[*Objection:*] But is it not true that the same purpose can be served by the word *kvaci*? Why is *kvaci* ignored here and *navā* is used?

[*Parihāra*:] *Navāsaddo pi kvacattho ti dīpanattham. Samānatthattā yeva hi attanā vattabbattham.*¹⁸ *Ettha navāggahaṇam eva vadatī ti katvā kvaciggahaṇam nivattate. Aññathā ivaṇṇaggahaṇe sati pi sareggahaṇam viya bhinnatthattā tenā pi vattitabbam siyā ti.*

[*Refutation*:] The word *navā* is [used] in order to express the meaning of *kvaci* as well. It is precisely because they have a common meaning that it [*kvaci*¹⁹] itself can serve the same purpose. Here, because the word *navā* itself is used, one understands that the word *kvaci* is blocked (*nivattate*). Otherwise (*aññathā*), if they [*kvaci* and *navā*] had different meanings, [the word *kvaci*] would be still recurring, as the word *sare* is recurring in spite of the word *ivaṇṇa* being also there.

7.5 Objection and refutation 4: why *kvaci* and *vā* do not have the same technical meaning

[*codanā*:] *Yadi evam vā paro asarūpā ti ettha sati pi vāggahaṇe kvac' āsavaṇṇam lutte ti ettha kvaciggahaṇam kataṃ. Na ca taṃ disvā tatha vāggahaṇam vattate. Tasmā vāsaddena kvacisaddo pi samānattho ti sakkā mantun ti.*

[*Objection*:] If that is so, one could argue the following (*ti sakkā mantun*): “In the rule *Vā paro asarūpā* [*Kacc.* 13], even though the word *vā* is there, in the [next] rule, [namely] *Kvac' āsavaṇṇam lutte* [*Kacc.* 14], the word *kvaci* is used. And having seen this [*kvaci*], the word *vā* does not recur there. Therefore [we can infer that] *vā* and *kvaci* have the same meaning.”

[*Parihāra*:] *Tan na. Vaggantam vā vagge ti ito hi yavamadanataralā c' āgamā ti ettha vāggahaṇe vattamāne pi kvaci o byañjane ti ettha kvaciggahaṇam kubbam ñāpayati bhinnatthā v' ime ti. Nāpi ubhinnam samānatthabhāvaṃ ñāpetun ti sakkā mantun, dvikkhattun ñāpane pajōjanābhāvā.*

[*Refutation*:] This is not so. Because even though the rule *Yavamadanataralā c' āgamā* [*Kacc.* 35] carries *vā* [by *anuvutti*] after (*ito*) the

¹⁸Read with *Nyāsa-nissaya* I.183.8. *Mmd.* 33.15, *vattabbam attham*, does not make sense.

¹⁹I also follow the *Nissaya* (*ibid.*) for the meaning of *attanā* = *kvacisaddena*.

rule *Vaggantaṃ vā vagge* [Kacc. 31], [subsequently] in the rule *Kvacī o byañjane* [Kacc. 36], by supplying (*kubbaṃ*) the word *kvaci*, he [i.e. the author, Mahā Kaccāyana] indicates (*ñāpayati*) that they [i.e. *vā* and *kvaci*] have certainly different meanings. Furthermore (*pi*), it is not possible to think that these two have a similar meaning, because when it comes to indication (*ñāpane*), it cannot apply twice [i.e. redundancy is inadmissible].

7.6 Objection and refutation 5: in one case, *kvaci* and *navā* do not mean exactly the same

[*codanā*:] *Yadi evaṃ, te navā ivaṇṇe ti ettha navāggahaṇe vijjamāne pi kvaci paṭi patissā ti ettha kvaciggahaṇena ime pi nānatthā ti sakkā mantun ti.*

[Objection:] If that is so, it is possible to conclude that *navā* and *kvaci* also have different meanings here too, since the word *navā* is found in the rule *Te navā ivaṇṇe* [Kacc. 46] and it is also found in the rule *Kvacī paṭi patissa* [Kacc. 48].

[*Parihāra*:] *Tan na. Tatth’ eva navāggahaṇassābhāvā. Na hi tattha navāggahaṇam atthi. Atha kho natthiggahaṇaṃ vāggahaṇaṃ ca. Āha ca te ca kho abhi adhi icc ete ivaṇṇe pare abbho ajjho iti vuttarūpā na honti vā ti. Ten’ eva atissa c’ antassā ti suttassa vuttiyaṃ thapetvā vāggahaṇaṃ naggahaṇam eva vattate.*

[Refutation:] That is not so, because of the absence of the word *navā* in that sutta. For clearly it is not the word *navā* that we find there, but the expression “It does not exist” (*n’ atthi*) plus (*ca*) the word *vā* ‘optionally’. And, indeed he [i.e. the author of the *Kaccāyana-vutti*] stated: *Te ca kho abhi adhi icc ete ivaṇṇe pare abbho ajjho iti vuttarūpā na honti vā ti* “And those *abhi* and *adhi*, when the speech-sound *i* follows, do not adopt the respective forms *abbho* and *ajjho*, optionally” (KaccV. 15.10–11). Because of this (*tena*), the word *vā* is excluded in the *vutti* of the sutta *Atissa c’ antassā* [Kacc. 47]; only the word *na* recurs [cf. *KaccV. 15.16 Vuttarūpā na honti*].

7.7 Refutation 5 continued

Tasmā [34] sandeham akatvā²⁰ kvacisaddo ca navāsaddo ca ime dve samānatthā. Vāsaddo ca vibhāsāsaddo ca ime dve samānatthā ti gahetabbaṃ. Tattha ādidvayaṃ hi katthaci hoti, katthaci na hoti ti dīpeti. Itaradvayam ekass’ eva rūpadvayaṃ janeti. Idam pi hi yathā hū bhū sattāyam iti. Ettha bhū t’ idam abhimaddanānubhavanapātubhavanādi-anekatthe pi yebhuyyena sattatthavācakattā hū bhū sattāyan ti vuttaṃ. Evaṃ yebhuyyavasena vuttaṃ.

Therefore, without any doubt, it has to be accepted (*gahetabbaṃ*) that both the word *kvaci* and the word *navā* have the same meaning, and both the word *vā* and the word *vibhāsā* have the same meaning. Herein, the first pair (*kvaci* and *navā*) certainly shows (*dīpeti*) that [a certain grammatical phenomenon] in some places (*katthaci*) obtains, and in some places it does not obtain. The other pair (*vā* and *vibhāsā*) produces (*janeti*) two forms (*rūpadvayaṃ*) for one single (*ekassa*) [concept]. For this is also stated in cases such as: *hū bhū sattāyam*. Here, even though the root *bhū* expresses different meanings such as ‘overpowering’, ‘experiencing’, ‘manifesting’, etc., because most commonly (*yebhuyyena*) it expresses ‘being’, it is defined as “*hū bhū* [verbal roots] in the sense of being”. In this way it is stated according to what is most common (*yebhuyyavasena*).

7.8 Conclusion of refutation 5: summary of Vimalabuddhi’s principle of two levels

Tasmā yattha ādidvayaṃ gahitaṃ, tattha vuttavidhānaṃ yebhuyyena katthaci hoti, katthaci na hoti. Ten’ ekassa rūpadvayuppādanam appakam. Yattha pana antadvayaṃ gahitaṃ, tattha vuttavidhānaṃ yebhuyyen’ ekassa rūpadvayaṃ janeti, itaraṃ pana appakan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.

²⁰This remark resonates with Patañjali’s *paribhāṣā*: *vyākhyānato viśeṣapratipattiḥ; na hi sandehāt alakṣaṇam* “[t]he understanding of something particular (among two or more possibilities should be decided) on the basis of *vyākhyāna* ‘reasoned explanation’. For (a rule should) not (be regarded as) a bad rule (simply) because of doubt (regarding its meaning).” (*MBh.* I.6.26; Joshi and Roodbergen 1986: 21, 96 ¶68).

Aññathā sirivaḍḍhako ty ādīni viya nipātā ’nekā ’nekatthavisayā ti vacanamattam siyā ti.

Therefore, it has to be considered (*daṭṭhabbam*) that where the first pair [*kvaci/navā*] is found, in most cases, the operation (*-vidhānam*) that is prescribed (*vutta-*) applies in some places, and, in some places, it does not apply. By this principle (*tena*), the double derivation of one word is rare (*appakam*). However, where the other pair [*vā/vibhāsā*] is found, the operation that is prescribed, in most cases, generates two forms for one single [word], whereas the other [possibility, namely, that only one derived form is possible], is rare. Otherwise, the principle according to which “various (*anekā*) indeclinables (*nipātā*) have various scopes in terms of meaning (*anekatthavisayā*)” would be a mere verbal [convention], like the name *Sirivaḍḍhako* (“The one who increases glory”).

7.9 Objection and refutation 6: why not merge this rule with *Kacc. 17*?

[*codanā*:] *Nanv idam pi vam odudantānan ti suttaṃ viya yam edanta-ssādeso t’ iminā ekayogaṃ katvā yam edantānan ti sakkā vattun ti.*

[Objection:] But is it not the case that this sutta too can be made one (*ekayogaṃ*) with *Yam edantass’ ādeso* [*Kacc. 17*], and one can simply say *Yam edantānam*, much in the same way as we find the sutta *Vam odudantānam* [*Kacc. 18*]?

[*Parihāra*:] *Na sakkā, ubhinnaṃ pi bhinnavisayattā. Yam edanta-ssā ti hi antass’ eva yakāro hoti. Tena e ayā ti sutte ādiss’ ekārassa asati antatthe ekārassa yakāro na hoti. Iminā pana avisesena ivaṇṇo ti vuttattā ādissa pi yakāro hoti. Tena mā yūnam āgamo ṭhāne ti ettha i ca u ce ti dvande kate ādiss’ iminā yakāro hoti. Tadattam bhinnayogakaraṇan ti.*

[Refutation:] It is not possible, because these two rules have different scopes. For, in the case of the rule which says *Yam edantassa* [*Kacc. 17*], the form *y* appears only as a replacement of an *e* that is at the end of a word. By this principle, in the sutta *E aya* [*Kacc. 516*], there is no replacement of *e* for *y*, because *e* is not in final position. By

this present rule, however, because the word *ivaṇṇa* has been used non-specifically (*avisesena*), the replacement *y* can affect the beginning of a word too. That is why in the sutta *Mā yūnam āgamo thāne*, “There is no [vuddhi] of *i* and *u* [when they are in initial position, but there is the] insertion (*āgama*) [of vuddhi vowels *e* and *o*] whenever suitable (*thāne*)” [*Kacc.* 403], *y* appears as a replacement of initial *i* in the dvanda meaning ‘*i* and *u*’. It is with this purpose that different rules are posited.

7.10 Objection and refutation 7: more on why *Kacc.* 21 is not redundant

[*codanā*:] *Nanv idam eva na vattabbaṃ. Yavakārā ca pasaṇṇassa ceti iminā va sijjhanato. Yathā c’ etaṃ, tathā yam edantassādeso vמודudantānan ti idaṃ dvayam pi na vattabban ti.*

[Objection:] But is it not true that this does not work either? Because by the two rules *Yavakārā ca* [*Kacc.* 71] and *Pasaṇṇassa ca* [*Kacc.* 72] this [namely the same object as *Kacc.* 21] is accomplished. And by the same token, the two rules *Yam edatass’ ādeso* [*Kacc.* 17] and *Vam odudantānam* [*Kacc.* 18] should not be there either.

[*Parihāra*:] *Tan na. Asati hi imasmim sandhivisaye jhalānam iyuvā sare vā ty ādinā iyuvādesā pi siyurū. Tamnivattanattham siddhe saty ārambho vidhīyate.*

[Refutation:] This is not so. Because if this [rule, namely *ivaṇṇo yam navā Kacc.* 21] were not in the *sandhi* section (*sandhivisaye*),²¹ the replacements *iy* and *uv* would also take place as the result of *Jhalānam iyuvā sare vā* [*Kacc.* 70] and so forth. In order to prevent that, as [the scope of the sutta] is well known, this operation is prescribed.²²

²¹I follow the interpretation of *Nyāsa-nissaya* 187.27.

²²*MmdPT.* 73.30-74.3: *Tattha asati hi imasmim sarasandhivisaye ti imasmim sutte asati ti yojanā. Siddhe saty ārambho vidhīyate ti siddhe sati adhippetatthe puna suttārambho vidhīyate karīyate.* Another possible reading could be *siddhe ’sati (= asati)*.

7.11 Examples

Paṭisandhāravuty āssa ty ādīni udāharaṇāni. Tesam pana paṭisandhāravutti assa sabbā vitti anubhūyate ti chedaṃ katvā byañjanam viyojetvā sarā sare lopaṃ ty adhikicc’ iminā yakāram katvā parakkharam netvā rūpasiddhi veditabbā.

*Paṭisandhāravuty*²³ *āssa* (“let him be friendly”, *Dhmp.* 376), etc. are the examples. After establishing the division of the words ([*pa-da*] *chedaṃ*) as follows *paṭisandhāravutti assa, sabbā vitti anubhūyate* “all the prosperity is enjoyed,” and having separated (*viyojetvā*) the consonant [from the vowel by *Kacc.* 10],²⁴ subsequently the rule “vowels are replaced by 0 before a vowel” [*Sarā sare lopaṃ Kacc.* 12] is applied, and then, by the present sutta [*Kacc.* 21 *Ivaṇṇo yaṃ navā*], the replacement *y* [for 0] applies [and the previous elision is cancelled], and finally we join again the ending with the following speech-sound [by *Kacc.* 11 *Naye paraṃ yutte*]. In this way the final derivation should be known.

7.12 Counterexamples

*Pañcahaṅgehī ty ādīni kimudāharaṇāni. Tesam pana pañcahi aṅgehi muttacāgī anuddhato ti chedaṃ katvā byañjanam viyojetvā iminā yakāre sampatte navāggahaṇenākatvā*²⁵ *rūpasiddhi veditabbā.*

Pañcah’ aṅgehi ‘with the five limbs’, etc. are the counter-examples. In that case, having done the analysis as *pañcahi aṅgehi* and *muttacāgī anuddhato*, and having done the separation of the consonant, by the

²³Read always *paṭisaṅṭhāra*. Vimalabuddhi also reads *vuty assa* = Pind 2013; not *vutti assa Dhmp.* E°.

²⁴It is by no means clear what Vimalabuddhi is intending here, because in theory there is no longer any consonant (*byañjana*). My understanding of the derivation is tentative: (0) *samhitā* ‘connected text’: *paṭisaṅṭhāravuttiāssa* (1) *chetvā* ‘analysing’: *paṭisaṅṭhāravutti-āssa* (2) *viyojetvā* ‘separating’ [*Kacc.* 10]: *paṭisaṅṭhāravutti āssa* (3) *lopaṃ katvā* ‘eliding’ [*Kacc.* 12]: *paṭisaṅṭhāravutt0 āssa* [*i* → 0] (4) *yakāram katvā* ‘insertion’ [*Kacc.* 21]: *paṭisaṅṭhāravutti āssa* [0 → *y*].

²⁵Read *navāggahaṇena akatvā*.

present rule the replacement *y* obtains, but due to the word *navā* it is not applied. In this way the final derivation should be known.

Abbreviations

<i>A.</i>	<i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i>	Böhtlingk 1887
<i>Dhmp.</i>	<i>Dhammapada</i>	Andersen and H. Smith 1921
<i>DOP.</i>	A Dictionary of Pali	Cone 2001–2020
<i>Kacc.</i>	<i>Kaccāyana</i>	Pind 2013
<i>KaccSNidd.</i>	<i>Kaccāyana-Suttaniddesa</i>	Dharmānanda 1931
<i>KaccV.</i>	<i>Kaccāyana-Vutti</i>	Pind 2013
<i>KaccVaṇṇ.</i>	<i>Kaccāyana-Vaṇṇanā</i>	Vijitāvī 1916
<i>M.</i>	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>	Trenckner 1888
<i>MBh.</i>	<i>Mahābhāṣya</i>	Kielhorn 1962–1972
<i>Mmd.</i>	<i>Mukhamattadīpanī</i>	Vimalabuddhi 1933
<i>MmdPT.</i>	<i>Mukhamattadīpanī-Purā- ṇa-ṭīkā</i>	Lañh 1914
<i>MmdSāra.</i>	<i>Mukhamattasāra</i>	Ruiz-Falqués n.d.
<i>PED.</i>	<i>Pali-English Dictionary</i>	Rhys Davids and Stede 1921–1925
<i>Rūp.</i>	<i>Rūpasiddhi</i>	Buddhappiya 2006
<i>RūpT.</i>	<i>Rūpasiddhi-Ṭīkā</i>	Buddhappiya 1964
<i>Sadd.</i>	<i>Saddanīti</i>	H. Smith 1930, 1949
<i>Vism.</i>	<i>Visuddhimagga</i>	Rhys Davids and Caroloine 1975

References

Andersen, Dines and Helmer Smith. 1921. *The Pāli Dhātupāṭha and the Dhātumañjūsā: edited with indexes*. Copenhagen: Royal Academy of Sciences of Denmark.

- Böhtlingk, Otto, ed. and trans. 1887. *Pāṇinis Grammatik: herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen*. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1982. "The variationist Pāṇini and Vedic: a review article." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 24: 273–82.
- . 2019. *A śabda Reader: language in classical Indian thought*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Buddhappiya, Bhadanta. 1964. *Padarūpasiddhiṭkā*. Mandalay: Padesā Piṭakat-cā-pe. [Undated reprint.]
- . 2006. *Padarūpasiddhi*. Yangon: Saccamaṇḍain Press. [3rd reprint.]
- Cardona, George. 1989. "Pāṇinian studies." *New Horizons of research in Indology: silver jubilee volume*, ed. by Vashishtha Narayan Jha, pp. 49–84. Pune: Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Poona.
- . 1999. *Recent research in Pāṇinian Studies*. 1st ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. xi, 372.
- Cone, M. 2001–2020. *A dictionary of Pāli*. 3 vols. Oxford; Bristol: Pali Text Society.
- D'Alwis, James. 1863. *An introduction to Kaccāyana's grammar of the Pali language*. Colombo: Williams and Norgate.
- Deokar, Mahesh A. 2008. *Technical terms and technique of the Pali and Sanskrit grammars*. Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Miscellaneous Series 23. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. 1984. "Review of Kiparsky and Joshi 1979." *Language* 60.1: 161–64.
- Devasthali, G. V. 1983. "Pāṇini and Vedic: a critique." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 64.1: 137–48.
- Dharmānanda, Nayaka Sthavira. 1931. *Moggallānapañcīkā with suttavutti*. Colombo: Satya Samuccaya Press.
- Dhammasami, Khammai. 2004. "Between idealism and pragmatism: a study of monastic education in Burma and Thailand from the seventeenth century to the present." PhD. dissertation. Oxford: Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford.

- Gornall, Alastair. 2020. *Rewriting Buddhism: Pali literature and monastic reform in Sri Lanka, 1157–1270*. London: University College London Press.
- Hinüber, O. von. 1983. *Notes on the Pāli tradition in Burma: Beiträge zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Buddhismus in Birma, I*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, I. Philologisch-historische Klasse 3, 68.
- Joshi, Shivaram Dattatray and Jouthe Anthon Fokko Roodbergen, eds. and trans. 1986. *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya; Paspasāhnikā: introduction, text, translation and notes*. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit. Class C 15. Pune: University of Poona.
- Kielhorn, Lorenz Franz, ed. 1962–1972. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali: revised and furnished with additional readings, references, and select critical notes*, rev. by Kashinath Vasudev Abhyankar. 3rd ed. 3 vols. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1979. *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. Current Studies in Linguistics 7; Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit B 6. Cambridge; Pune: MIT Press; Centre of Advanced Studies in Sanskrit, University of Poona.
- Lañh, Charā Mauñ, ed. 1914. *Mukhamattadīpanī-purāṇa-ṭīkā alias śampyañ-ṭīkā-pāṭh*. Yangon: Kavi Myat Hman Press.
- Malai, P. Th. 1997. “Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa: a critical study.” Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages, University of Pune.
- Nandisena, Bhikkhu. 2005. *Kaccāyanabyākaraṇam: translated into English by U. Nandisena*. Yangon.
- Palsule, Gajanan Balkrishna. 1982. “Review of Kiparsky (1982).” *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 63.1: 34–42.
- Pind, Ole H. 1996. “Saddavimala 12.1-11 and its Mūlasārvāstivādin origin.” *Saddavimala: la pureté par les mots*, ed. by F. Bizot and F. Lagirarde, pp. 67–72. Paris: École française d’extrême-orient.

- . 2012. “Pāli grammar and grammarians from Buddhaghosa to Vajirabuddhi: a survey.” *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 31: 57–124.
- . 2013. *Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti*. Bristol: Pali Text Society.
- Rhys Davids, Thomas William and A. F. Caroloine, eds. 1975. *The Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosa*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Rhys Davids, Thomas William and Wilhelm Stede. 1921–1925. *Pali-English Dictionary*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Ruiz-Falqués, Aleix. *Guṇasāgara’s Mukhamattasāra and the early Pāli scholarship of Burma*. Pune Indological Series. Pune: Department of Pali, Savitribai Phule Pune University; printed by Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi. Forthcoming.
- . 2015. “A firefly in the bamboo reed: the *Suttaniddesa* of Saddhammajotipāla and the grammatical foundations of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma.” Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- . 2018. “Review of Thitzana (2016).” *Journal of the Nāṇasaṃvara Centre for Buddhist Studies* 1: 279–304.
- . 2019. “Purifying the *Pātimokkha*: Pali grammar and Buddhist law in 17th-century Hamsāvātī.” *Buddhism, Law and Society* 4: 93–128.
- Senart, Émile. 1871. “Kaccāyana et la littérature grammaticale du Pāli.” *Journal Asiatique* VI Série. T. XVII: 193–351, 361–540.
- Smith, Helmer. 1928. *Saddanāṭi: la grammaire palie d’Aggavaṃsa*; vol. 1, *Padamālā*. Lund: Glerup. [Reprint: Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.]
- . 1930. *Saddanāṭi: la grammaire palie d’Aggavaṃsa*; vol. 3, *Suttamālā*. Lund: Glerup. [Reprint: Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.]
- . 1949. *Saddanāṭi: la grammaire palie d’Aggavaṃsa*; vol. 4, *Tables le partie: textes cités, racines, morphèmes, système grammatical et métrique*. Lund: Glerup. [Reprint: Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.]
- Smith, John D. 1982. “Review of Kiparsky (1982).” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 45.1: 185–86. University of London.

- Thitzana, Ashin U. 2016. *Kaccāyana Pāli Grammar: translated into English with additional notes, simple explanations and tables*. Vol. 2. Onalaska: Pariyatti Press.
- Trenckner, Viggo, ed. 1888. *Majjhima-Nikāya*. Vol. 1. London: Pali Text Society.
- Vijitāvī, Mahā. 1916. *Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā-pāṭh*. Yangon: Zabu Meit Swe Press.
- Vimalabuddhi. 1933. *Nyāsa-pāṭh: also known as Mukhamattadīpanī*. Rangoon: Sudhammavati Press.