

# **A History of the Pali Grammatical Tradition of South and Southeast Asia by Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti (1876), Part I**

Alastair Gornall and Amal Gunasena

## ABSTRACT

This article is a translation of a history of the Pali grammatical traditions of South and Southeast Asia written by the nineteenth-century Sri Lankan scholar-monk Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti (1876). In this first instalment, Subhūti comprehensively describes the works of the *Kaccāyana* grammatical tradition of Pali grammar. He provides important historical information about seventeen Pali grammatical works along with long excerpts from each grammar that illustrate their content and their relationship within the tradition as a whole.

## PART ONE:

### THE KACCĀYANA-VYĀKARAṆA: ITS COMMENTARIES AND MAJOR HANDBOOKS

#### INTRODUCTION

Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti (1835–1917) was one of the most prominent scholar-monks in nineteenth-century Sri Lanka and a founding figure in the academic study of Buddhism in Europe.<sup>1</sup> His two most celebrated works were an edition and translation of the *Abhidhāna-ppadīpikā*, a twelfth-century Pali lexicon, and the *Nāma-mālā*, a grammar of the Pali language. Subhūti prefaced his *Nāma-mālā* with a Sinhala introduction detailing the history of the Pali grammatical traditions of South and Southeast Asia.<sup>2</sup> In this introduction Subhūti meticulously describes over sixty Pali grammars, their authorship and historical context, and quotes

---

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed account of Subhūti's career and interactions with early European Orientalists, see Guruge 1984. See also Gornall 2015.

<sup>2</sup> The 1896 edition and its identical 2001 reprint include a rudimentary English translation of the first six pages of this introduction.

long passages from them to illustrate their content and interrelationship. In this regard Subhūti's introduction contains a lot of useful information on the intellectual history of Theravāda Buddhism in general and is much more than a mere handlist of Pali grammars.

Early Orientalists interested in Pali grammar were aware of Subhūti's work but were often unable to use it in detail since it was written in Sinhala. In what is still the most comprehensive study of the Pali grammatical tradition, R.O. Franke in his *Geschichte und Kritik der einheimischen Pāli-Grammatik und -Lexicographie* (1902) notes the existence of Subhūti's work and refers to the Rev. Richard Morris' view that it was "das beste der auf Ceylon erschienenen Bücher über Pāli-Grammatik".<sup>1</sup> Although he was unable to read Sinhala, Franke frequently refers to the work to confirm the names of the grammatical texts he discusses and further relies on Subhūti's work, among other sources, for his list of preliminary, unclassified "mostly unimportant" Pali grammatical works ("Liste der übrigen vorläufig unklassifizierbaren und meist unwichtigen Werke über Pāli-Grammatik"), the details of which, such as their affiliated grammatical tradition, he could not say anything or anything reliable ("über deren Schulzugehörigkeit etc. ich Nichts oder Nichts Verlässliches aussagen kann").<sup>2</sup> Many of these minor grammatical texts, mostly handbooks, have yet to be described in adequate detail and the third and final part of our translation of Subhūti's work, which we intend to publish soon, will describe these unexplored texts.

The first part of our translation presented here covers the first seventeen grammatical texts dealt with by Subhūti and forms an overview of the Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa, its commentaries and major handbooks. The second instalment will deal with the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa, its commentaries and handbooks, and also the Sadda-nīti. The final and third part of

---

<sup>1</sup> Franke 1902: 1.

<sup>2</sup> Franke refers to Subhūti's work nine times to either confirm the name of a particular grammatical work, to note the existence of a grammar, or, occasionally, to give some information about a text (p. 22, n. 8; p. 23, n. 13; p. 24, n. 16; p. 29; p. 30, n. 42; p. 31, n. 2a; p. 39, n. 7; p. 45, n. 1; p. 47). In his final section (1902: 53–56) on "meist unwichtigen Werke" he refers to Subhūti's introduction a further fifteen times to note the possible existence of grammatical texts he had no other information about.

Subhūti's introduction will focus on other, minor Pali grammatical handbooks. Since Subhūti's work was composed in 1876, the subsequent studies of R.O. Franke and, more recently, O.H. Pind,<sup>1</sup> have superseded Subhūti's work in terms of the historical information they provide about some of these grammars. In the footnotes we have referred to both R.O. Franke's *Geschichte und Kritik* and Pind's "Pali Grammar and Grammmarians" as well as other contemporary studies when this is the case. Subhūti's own discussion of the historical contexts of these works was based on the colophons of the manuscripts he used, the citations of other grammars contained in these works, and also on the *Sāsana-vaṃsa*, a Burmese Pali history composed in 1861.<sup>2</sup>

There are other areas, however, where Subhūti's work remains relevant and important for the study of the Pali grammatical tradition. Firstly, as mentioned, he provides details about Pali grammars that neither Franke nor Pind had access to or knew much about, such as the *Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā*, *Nirutti-sāra-mañjūsā*, *Rūpasiddhi-ṭīkā*, and *Bālāvatāra-ṭīkā* discussed below. Secondly, unlike both Franke and Pind, Subhūti quotes long Pali passages from each of the texts he discusses and always quotes their incipit and colophon. While Subhūti left these passages untranslated, we have provided readable English translations of them so that readers can get a sense of the nature of Pali grammatical writing and how the tradition developed over time. Generally speaking, Subhūti chose commentarial passages from each work on Kaccāyana's first rule of sandhi (Kacc 12, *sarā sare lopam* "vowels before a vowel are to be elided"). Finally, we might add that Subhūti's work is in itself valuable as a historical document for understanding nineteenth-century Sri Lanka's intellectual culture and as one of the first modern essays written in Sinhala.<sup>3</sup>

While translating the quoted passages of the various Pali grammars we have sometimes found it necessary to consult an available edition of a

---

<sup>1</sup> See Pind 2012.

<sup>2</sup> On the *Sāsanavaṃsa* and the historiographical problems of its use, see Lieberman 1976.

<sup>3</sup> According to Wilhelm Geiger, for instance, in contrast to other prominent scholar-monks of the nineteenth century, "Subhūti's methodology is akin to modern European ways of research" (Bechert 1977, 52).

grammar in order to correct a particular reading. The preferred reading has been kept in the main text and variants deemed to be less preferable — whether they be from Subhūti’s text or from an extant edition — are added in square brackets following the word or expression they refer to. The Pali texts of the translated passages have been placed in the footnotes. The footnotes also contain comments by us (the translators). Subhūti furthermore added his own notes and these have been translated and placed as endnotes before the bibliography. The original page numbers of Subhūti’s introduction are indicated within the translation in square brackets (e.g. [p. 2]). Subhūti’s footnotes are indicated by lower case roman numerals and are found on p. 56.

## TRANSLATION

Having paid homage to the Sugata, the greatest ornament of the three worlds, to the Dhamma, and to the taintless community, I have properly compiled this Nāma-mālā by relying upon what can be discovered in the essential thought of the ancient teachers.

*Vyākaraṇa* is the science of writing and speaking a language without fault and of understanding the intentions of texts by knowing all the divisions and syntactic relations of a language’s expressions. *Vyākaraṇa* is not exclusive to one language but is for all languages. Some languages that were used in former times, however, do not have complete grammars since the principal users of these languages were uncivilised and were of weak intellect. The existence of a very complete and pristine grammatical literature in Sanskrit and Pali, by contrast, is a testament to the sharp intellects of the users of these languages. Regardless of the relative age of the two languages, Sanskrit *vyākaraṇa* is the older of the two traditions and Pali grammatical literature reveals that it was composed using Sanskrit *vyākaraṇa* as a model.

One should not only aim to study Pali grammatical science to be able to preach the Dhamma to people in general, but one must learn it thoroughly to become proficient in understanding perfectly the subtle parts of the Buddha’s teaching that dispense his perfect knowledge.

The learned who know these two languages in detail realise that obtaining complete proficiency in the study of Pali *vyākaraṇa* is a cause of great difficulty for one who has not had much training in Sanskrit

*vyākaraṇa*. This is another indication that Pali grammatical science is modelled on Sanskrit *vyākaraṇa*. In addition, the teachers who wrote commentaries and sub-commentaries, such as the Līnattha-pakāsinī, on the Buddha’s teaching, [p. 2] and who wrote commentaries on Pali grammatical literature, display great capability in Sanskrit *vyākaraṇa*. There is no doubt that this education in *vyākaraṇa* was the main reason they were perfectly able to compose these commentaries. At the time of the great king Parākrāmabāhu I, the great Sāriputta *svāmi-pāda*, who lived in Poḷonnaruva, composed works such as the Sārattha-dīpanī, a Vinaya sub-commentary, which in size is equal to thirty thousand *granthas*; the Aṅguttara-nikāya sub-commentary, which in size is equal to twenty thousand *granthas*; the Vinaya-saṅgaha; the Abhidharmārtha-saṅgrahārtha-vyākhyāna; and the [Cāndra]-pañcīkā-ṭīkā.<sup>1</sup> The following verses reveal the extent of Sāriputta’s knowledge of Sanskrit and other subjects:

In pleasant Pulatthinagara, the emperor of cities, Sāriputta dwelt in the Jetavana, a delightful monastery with pleasant mansions and manifold groves commissioned by the strong-armed king Parakkamabhujā.

An ascetic and virtuous guru, his fame had spread far and wide. He was skilled and a repository of purity born in a completely pure lineage. He was an expert in religion and philosophy, among other subjects, and the best of ascetics....

They regard him as an essential author, like Candra, the sharpest of intellects, in the *Cāndra* [grammatical] tradition, Pāṇini in the Pāṇinian [grammatical] tradition, as like the cleverest of intellects in all of philosophy, and as like Kālidāsa — a cause of bliss in the hearts of poets — in poetic skill. May this composition of Sāriputta’s grant success to the world.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dragomir Dimitrov (2010) has recently published a facsimile edition of a manuscript of a *ṭīkā* on the Cāndra-pañcīkā. Further work is needed to determine with certainty whether this work is identical with the commentary composed by Sāriputta. On Sāriputta’s Vinaya works, see Crosby (2006) and Kieffer-Pülz (2015).

<sup>2</sup> Abhidh-s-sn (Nm 2; C<sup>e</sup> 257):  
ramme pulatthinagare nagarādhirāje | raññā parakkamabhujena mahābhujena ||  
kārapite vasati jetavane vihāre | yo rammahammīyavarūpavanābhīrāme ||  
sabbatthapatthāyāsena visāradena | suddhāsāyena parisuddhakulodayena ||  
takkāgamādīkusālena yatissarena | sārīsutena yatinā gurunā guṇena ... (10  
verses omitted, Nm) || yañ cande candabhūtaṃ nisitataramatiṃ pāṇinim

The venerable Śrī Rāhula *svānipāda* of Toṭagamuva — the lord of six languages who composed many essential works, such as the Moggallāna-pañcīkā-pradīpaya, the Buddhi-ppasādānī, and the Kāvya-sēkhara — not only studied Sanskrit but also many religions. The following verses reveal this:

I take great pleasure in attaining mastery of the many different *śāstras*,  
doctrines, languages and the entire Tipiṭaka. Long live king  
Parākramabāhu!<sup>1</sup>

We can also know that venerable commentators like Buddhaghosa studied subjects outside the Pali canon from statements in the commentaries such as “capable of grasping and diving into the depths of his own doctrine and the doctrine of others, possessing a high degree of wisdom...”<sup>2</sup> [p. 3] As such, one who has studied one of the two languages will find studying the other one a worthwhile and easy task. Some think that there are not three languages in the world as mutually similar as Pali, Sanskrit, and Prakrit. And if one thinks about it carefully, it is because of their similarity that someone who is educated in one language can understand the other two languages when they are being spoken. After a while, one can also understand a certain amount of their literature, even though it is not completely intelligible at first. Even though the difference that exists between one language and another in the world is as great as the difference between a human and an animal, these three languages can be likened to three sons born of the same father who only differ slightly in colour. The extent of the similarity of these languages is also reflected in their grammars.

The science of Pali *vyākaraṇa* is therefore divided into seven subdivisions, namely, (1) *sandhi* (euphonic junction), (2) *nāma* (nominal

---

pāṇīniye | sabbasmiṃ takkasatthe paṭutaramatayo kattubhūtaṃ va tan te [tan taṃ, C<sup>e</sup>] || maññante kālidāsaṃ kavijanahadayānandahetuṃ kavitte | sāyaṃ lokatthasiddhiṃ vitaratu racanā tassa sārīsutassa ||

<sup>1</sup> Mogg-pd (Nm 2; C<sup>e</sup> 2):

satthantare ca vividhe samayantare ca | bhāsantare ca sakale piṭakattaye ca || ācerabhāvam upagamma bhajāma pītiṃ | dīghaṃ sa jīvatu parakkamabāhu rājā ||

<sup>2</sup> As E<sup>e</sup> 430: sakasamaya-samayantara-gahaṇajjhogāhaṇa-samatthena paññā-veyyattiyasamannāgatena...

declension), (3) *samāsa* (compounding), (4) *taddhita* (nominal derivatives), (5) *ākhyāta* (verbal conjugation), (6) *kitaka* (verbal derivatives), and (7) *kāraka* (semantico-syntactic relations).

(1) *Sandhi* refers to the procedure of joining two words together in a euphonic junction. When it is understood, one is also able to separate the words in texts that have been joined together in *sandhi*. For instance, the two words *loka* and *aggo* form *lokaggo* when they are joined together according to the procedure given in the *sandhi* chapter. With this understanding one is able to separate the *sandhi* of the canonical expression *gunaggo* into its components *guṇa* + *aggo*.

(2) *Nāma* refers to the procedure of dividing a word into seven cases, the first, etc., and into singular and plural and declining it.

(3) *Samāsa* refers to the formation of one word with a single meaning from two words that have separate meanings. For instance, a word such as *nīlaṃ*, with its meaning of “blue”, and a word such as *uppalaṃ*, with its meaning of “water lily”, separately signify their meanings. When they are both made into one word (that is to say formed in a compound), the compound *nīluppalaṃ* (blue water lily) is formed denoting a single meaning.

(4) *Taddhita* refers to giving a suffix a particular meaning after a nominal stem and then combining that suffix with the nominal stem. For example, the suffix *Na* is given the sense of “being his son” after a word such as *Vasiṭṭha*. When the word *Vasiṭṭha* and the suffix *Na* are joined together, the word *Vāsiṭṭha* is formed [p. 4]. The nominal derivative *Vāsiṭṭha* means “the son of Vasiṭṭha”.

(5) *Ākhyāta* refers to the rules for forming verbs by adding suffixes to a verbal base. The word *pacati* (he cooks), for instance, is formed having added the suffixes *-a* and *-ti* to a verbal base such as *pac*, meaning “to cook”.

(6) *Kitaka* refers to the rules for producing a noun by adding a suffix to a verbal base and joining the two together. For instance, according to the rules, the noun *buddha* is formed when the suffix *-ta* is added after the verbal base *budh* and the two are joined together.

(7) *Kāraka* refers to the section that explains the grammatical meanings of subject and object, etc., the rules of employing cases in different categories of meanings, and the distinction between subject (active voice)

and object (passive voice) and the respective cases to be used in that context.

Just as the Sanskrit language has many grammars, such as Pāṇini, Cāndra, Kā-tantra, Muḡdha-bodha, and the Sārasvata, the Pali language has three principal grammars, namely, the Kaccāyana, Moggallāna, and the Sadda-nīti. Of those, there are grammatical works written for the Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa, such as the Kaccāyana-[vutti], Rūpa-siddhi, Bālāvatāra, Mahā-nirutti, Cūla-nirutti, and Nirutti-piṭaka. For the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa there are works such as the Moggallāna-vutti, Payoga-siddhi, Susadda-siddhi, and Pada-sādhana. For the Sadda-nīti-vyākaraṇa there is only the Cūla-saddanīti.

In addition to the threefold division of grammatical literature mentioned, all grammatical literature is principally of two types. These two types are as follows: (1) texts [consisting of *sūtras* (aphoristic rules)] that teach the procedure for the derivation of words and (2) texts [without *sūtras*] that teach a particular feature of grammar. Those texts that teach the procedure for the derivation of words include texts that have been already mentioned here, such as the *Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa* and its Sinhala glosses (*sannaya*), commentaries, and sub-commentaries, etc.

The texts that teach the procedure of deriving words are also of two types, namely, those that prioritise the *sūtras* and those that prioritise the grammatical examples. Those texts that prioritise the *sūtras* take a *sūtra* as their basis and provide examples that can be formed from that *sūtra*. Examples of such texts are the three grammars, the Kaccāyana[-vutti], Moggallāna-vutti and the Cūla-sadda-nīti. In both Pali and Sanskrit, the main grammatical works are those that prioritise the *sūtras*. The grammars that prioritise examples [p. 5] are texts that take a grammatical example as their basis and teach the *sūtras* that are necessary to form the words of the example. Grammars such as these are the Rūpa-siddhi, Bālāvatāra, and Pada-sādhana, for instance.

The texts that teach a particular aspect of grammar include, for instance, the Sambandha-cintā, the Sadda-sārattha-jālinī, Kaccāyanabheda, Saddattha-bheda-cintā, Kārikā, Kārikā-vutti, Vibhaty-attha, Vācakopadesa, Naya-lakkhaṇa-vibhāvinī, Nirutti-saṅgaha, Kaccāyanasāra, Vibhaty-attha-dīpanī, Saṃvaṇṇanā-naya-dīpanī, Vācca-vācaka, Sadda-vutti, Bāla-ppabodhana, Kaccāyana-dīpanī, Gūlhattha-dīpanī,



Mukha-matta-sāra, Sadda-bindu, Sadda-kalikā, Sadda-vinicchaya, and also their Sinhala glosses and their commentaries. Among the grammatical texts that have been mentioned here, some are difficult to find in Sri Lanka and a few are difficult to find in any country. As a result, some people do not know any information at all concerning some of these texts. Therefore, to introduce the aforementioned books for the benefit of novices I provide here some facts with respect to the date, general contents and authorship etc. of a large quantity of grammatical texts. Out of these, texts which teach the procedure for deriving words will be discussed first and, as Kaccāyana is the principal grammar of such texts, texts of this tradition will be dealt with first too.

#### I. KACCĀYANA<sup>1</sup>

This text, which is also widely known in the country by the name Sandhi-kappa, is the oldest and one of the most useful grammars among all Pali grammatical texts (just as Pāṇini is to the Sanskrit grammatical tradition). There are Pali grammatical texts available, such as the Sadda-nīti, however, that are more useful than this. In the Pañcīkā-pradīpaya, the text is identified by the name Kaccāyana-vutti.

It is known from other works that the Kaccāyana has several commentaries and, at present, there are extant four commentaries, two sub-commentaries, a text on the syntax of *sūtra*-wording (*padayojana*), the separation (*vigraha*) of *sūtra*-wording, and two Sinhala glosses (*sannaya*). These commentaries are the Nyāsa, Sutta-niddesa, Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā, Sandhi-kappa-ṭīkā, and the Nirutti-sāra-mañjūsā, etc. There is mention of the name *Kaccāyana* in the oldest texts and, according to other (more recent) texts, this work was composed at the time of the Buddha [p. 6]. There is also a very old Sanskrit work that bears this name too.<sup>1</sup> Many of the procedures for the derivation of words that are not mentioned in the Kaccāyana are mentioned in the Rūpa-siddhi and Sadda-nīti. The Kaccāyana also contains many more *sūtras* and word derivations than the Bālāvatāra. This grammar has already been printed in countries such as England, Germany, and France. Also, a few chapters of the work have been published in Sinhala script and in English translation by the Advocate James D'Alwis.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Franke 1902, 5–22; Pind 2012, 71–100.

It is mentioned in the texts that have been composed more recently that the author of the Kaccāyana was the venerable Mahā Kaccāyana Thera who lived at the time of the Buddha and who reached the highest position in the Saṅgha having attained the four supreme knowledges, but there is no mention of this in the Kaccāyana's two [oldest] commentaries. In addition, in the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa critical views on certain *sūtras* of this grammar have been expressed. There are also some examples in the grammar that were composed more recently, such as *kv gato si tvaṃ devānaṃ-piyatissa* (“Where are you going, Devānaṃ-piyatissa?”).<sup>1</sup> Hence, some scholars are doubtful whether Mahā Kaccāyana Thera was the author of this grammar. In the Aṅguttara-nikāya commentary, however, it is stated that Mahā Kaccāyana Thera, as a result of a previous request, taught three works in the midst of the Saṅgha, namely, the Kaccāyana, the Mahā-nirutti-ppakaraṇa and the Netti-ppakaraṇa: “*Mahā-kaccāyana-tthero pubba-patthanā-vasena kaccāyana-ppakaraṇaṃ mahā-nirutti-ppakaraṇaṃ netti-ppakaraṇaṃ cā ti pakaraṇa-ttayam saṅgha-majjhe pakāsesi.*”<sup>2</sup>

Some teachers think that only the *sūtras* were composed by Mahā Kaccāyana Thera and that the other two parts — the gloss (*vṛtti*) and examples — were composed by Saṅghanandi and Brahmadata. In this regard, it is said:

The rules were composed by Kaccāyana, the gloss by Saṅghanandi,  
the examples by Brahmadata, and the explanation by Vimalabuddhi.<sup>3</sup>

The Kaccāyana-bheda-ṭīkā, however, states that “the teachers, furthermore, say that Kaccāyana Thera composed this Kaccāyana-book, which consists of the rules, gloss, and examples” [p. 7].<sup>4</sup> The Sutta-niddesa states that the first *sūtra* in the Kaccāyana, *attho akkharasaññāto*

<sup>1</sup> ad Kacc 227 *kissa ka ve ca*.

<sup>2</sup> This quotation appears to be from the Apadāna commentary (Ap-a E<sup>o</sup> 491, Ap-a B<sup>o</sup> 2.213) rather than the Aṅguttara-nikāya commentary.

<sup>3</sup> Kacc-bh-ṭ (Nm 6):

Kaccānena kato yogo vutti ca Saṅghanandinā |  
payogo Brahmadataena nyāso Vimalabuddhinā ||

<sup>4</sup> Kacc-bh-ṭ (Nm 6): *ācariyā pana lakkhaṇavuttiudāharaṇasamkhātaṃ imaṃ Kaccāyanagandhaṃ Kaccāyanattherena katan ti vadanti.*

(“meaning is understood from sounds”), which is known as the “introductory statement” (*pūrvavākya*), was uttered by the illustrious mouth of Lord Buddha :

One monk who went forth when old, having taken a subject for meditation (*kammaṭṭhāna*) in the presence of the Buddha, began reciting the meditation subject *udabbaya* (arising and decaying) while he sat at the foot of a sāl tree on the shore of Anotatta. Upon seeing a heron walking in the water, he changed his meditation to *udakabaka* (water-heron). Perceiving this mistake, the Buddha summoned the monk who went forth when old and uttered this statement : “meaning is understood from sounds” (*attho akkharasaññāto*). Understanding the intention of the Buddha, Mahā Kaccāyana Thera placed this statement at the beginning of the book he composed. Some also say that this *sūtra* was composed by Kaccāyana [himself].<sup>1</sup>

It is difficult to be certain, however, and scholars should continue to ponder it since there is a slightly different telling of this account in the Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā and there is also no mention of it in any commentarial teaching. In any case, we can be certain that the Kaccāyana is the first and oldest of all the Pali grammatical texts and that it is a precious text composed by a first class scholar that is very useful for understanding Pali grammar.<sup>2</sup> The grammar has eight books or sections, namely *sandhi*, *nāma*, *kāraka*, *samāsa*, *taddhita*, *ākhyāta*, *kitaka*, and *uṇādi*.<sup>3</sup> *Sandhi* has five chapters, *nāma* has five chapters, *kāraka* has one chapter, [p. 8] *samāsa* has one chapter, *taddhita* has one chapter, *ākhyāta* has four chapters, *kitaka* has five chapters, and *uṇādi* has one chapter. Thus, there are twenty-three chapters. There are seven hundred and ten

---

<sup>1</sup> Kacc-s-n (Nm 7; C<sup>c</sup> 4) :

eko buḍḍhapabbajito [+ bhikkhu, C<sup>c</sup>] bhagavato santike kammaṭṭhānaṃ gahetvā anotattatīre sālārakkhamūle nisinno udabbayakammaṭṭhānaṃ [udabbaya°, C<sup>c</sup>] karoti. so udake carantaṃ bakaṃ disvā udakabakan ti kammaṭṭhānaṃ karoti. bhagavā taṃ vitathabhāvaṃ disvā buḍḍhapabbajitaṃ pakkosāpetvā attho akkharasaññāto ti vākyam āha. kaccāyanatherena pi bhagavato adhippāyaṃ jānitvā attho akkharasaññāto ti vākyam pubbe ṭhapetvā idaṃ pakaraṇaṃ katan ti kaccāyanena katasuttan ti pi vadanti.

<sup>2</sup> Pind (2012, 73) tentatively dates both the Kaccāyana and Kaccāyana-vutti to the eighth century.

<sup>3</sup> The *uṇādi sūtras* are special rules created for words that cannot be derived from the rules given in the other chapters of the grammar.

*sūtras*. There are one thousand and seven hundred verses with metrical feet of seven syllables each. In terms of the number of recitations (*bhāṇavāra*)<sup>ii</sup>, there are fifty verses short of seven recitations. There are six thousand eight hundred metrical feet, and there are fifty-four thousand four hundred letters.

Just as there is a similarity between Kaccāyana *sūtras* and certain Pāṇinian *sūtras*, such as *apādāne pañcamī*,<sup>1</sup> *bhuvādayo dhātavaḥ*<sup>2</sup> and *kartari kṛt*,<sup>3</sup> there is an even greater similarity between the *sūtras* of the Kā-tantra-vyākaraṇa and the Kaccāyana.

Kaccāyana	Kā-tantra
273. <i>yasmād apeti bhayam ādatte vā tad apādānaṃ</i>	2.4.8. <i>yato peti bhayam ādatte vā tad apādānaṃ</i>
278. <i>yassa dātu kāmo rocate dhārayate vā taṃ sampadānaṃ</i>	2.4.1. <i>yasmai ditsā rocate dhārayate vā tat sampradānaṃ</i>
281. <i>yena vā kayirate taṃ karaṇaṃ</i>	2.4.12. <i>yena kriyate tat karaṇaṃ</i>
282. <i>yaṃ karoti taṃ kammaṃ</i>	2.4.13. <i>yat kriyate tat karmaṃ</i>
283. <i>yo karoti so kattā</i>	2.4.14. <i>yaḥ karoti sa kartā</i>
284. <i>yo kāreti sa hetu</i>	2.4.15. <i>kārayati yaḥ sahetu</i>
286. <i>liṅgatthe paṭhamā</i>	2.4.17. <i>prathamāvibhaktir liṅgārthavacane</i>
291. <i>hetvatthe ca</i>	2.4.30. <i>hetvarthe ca</i>
290. <i>kattari ca</i>	2.4.33. <i>kartari ca</i>
344. <i>saro rasso napuṃsake</i>	2.4.52. <i>svaro hrasvā napuṃsake</i>
318. <i>nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho</i>	2.5.1. <i>nāmānaṃ samāso yuktārthaḥ</i>
236. <i>dvipade tulyādhikaraṇe kamma-dhārayo so napuṃsakaliṅgo</i>	2.5.5. <i>pade tulyādhikaraṇe vijñeyāḥ</i> 2.5.15. <i>karmadhārayaḥ sa napuṃsakaliṅgaṃ syāt</i>
346. <i>vā ṇ' appacce</i>	2.6.1. <i>vāṇapatye</i>

<sup>1</sup> Aśṭādgtātū 2.3.28 / Kacc 297.

<sup>2</sup> Aśṭādgtātū 1.3.1 / Kacc 459.

<sup>3</sup> Aśṭādgtātū 3.4.67 / Kacc 626.

[p. 9] The opening verses of the grammar are as follows:

Paying homage to the supreme chief Buddha — honoured by the three worlds — to the taintless Dhamma and to the highest community, I will compose here the SUSANDHI-KAPPA, which is based on the *suttas*, in order to understand well the essential meaning of the discourses of the teacher. The wise grasp the good through the reasoning taught by the Jina. They grasp it (i.e. his reasoning)<sup>1</sup> by understanding the meaning of his discourses. The undeluded grasp the meaning [of his discourses] within syllables and words. The one who desires the good should, thus, pay attention to the variety of words.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. NYĀSA<sup>3</sup>

Otherwise known as the Mukha-matta-dīpanī, this is an old commentary that was composed for the Kaccāyana by the venerable teacher Vimalabuddhi.<sup>4</sup> In the Pañcīkā, this text is also referred to as the Kaccāyana-vutti-vaṇṇanā. Apart from the Mahā-nirutti, Purāṇa-cūḷa-nirutti, and Purāṇa-kārikā, since the Nyāsa's name is mentioned in a great majority of Pali grammars, such as the Sadda-sārattha-jālinī and Kaccāyana-bheda, the Nyāsa must be older than these grammars. It also must be younger than the Cūḷa-nirutti since its name is mentioned in the Nyāsa. Apart from this, nothing is said at the end of the Nyāsa or in any other grammar to help ascertain a precise date for the work. In other works, the grammar is called the Mukha-matta-dīpanī, though there is reason to believe that there is another book by this name composed by another

<sup>1</sup> Our translation here follows the interpretation of the Nyāsa (Mmd B<sup>c</sup> p. 4): *tañ cāpī ti taṃ jineritanayam pi*.

<sup>2</sup> Kacc (Nm 9; E<sup>c</sup> 1):

seṭṭhaṃ tilokamahitaṃ abhivandīya 'ggam | buddhañ ca dhammam amalaṃ gaṇam uttamañ ca || satthussa tassa vacanattavaraṃ suboddhūṃ | vakkhāmi suttahitam ettha SUSANDHIKAPPAM || seyyaṃ jineritanayena budhā labhanti | tañ cāpī tassa vacanattasubodhanena || atthañ ca akkharapadesu amohabhāvā | seyyatthiko padam ato vividhaṃ suṇeyya ||

<sup>3</sup> See Franke 1902, 22–23; Pind 2012, 117–20. Franke (1902, 23) dates the work before 1182, when its first commentary, the Nyāsa-padīpa, was composed. Pind (2012, 118) speculates that it was composed between the tenth and eleventh centuries.

<sup>4</sup> Pind (2012, 117, n. 247) notes that Aggavaṃsa (Sadd 210, 4) uses the name “Vajirabuddhi” in preference to “Vimalabuddhi”.

teacher.<sup>1</sup> The commentary is thirty recitations long and it is the longest commentary on the Kaccāyana. There is some doubt in the Sāsana-vaṃsa concerning whether the author of the work is from Sri Lanka or India. The commentarial method of the text is as described in the following verse:

[The method] for commenting on a *sūtra* is sixfold: (1) syntactic construction, (2) the word, (3) the meaning of the word, (4) the separation of words, (5) objections, and (6) their refutation.<sup>2</sup>

The Nyāsa not only comments on the *sūtras* but also explains in detail the procedures for deriving the words in all the examples given in the Kaccāyana alongside the *sūtras*. According to the method given in the verse, the *sūtra* “*sarā sare lopam*” (Kacc 12, “vowels before a vowel are to be elided”) is commented upon as follows: [p. 10]

**sarā sare lopam**: for what purpose does he (Kaccāyana) say this? [He says this] for the purpose of eliding the preceding vowel, when there is a conjunction [of vowels]. **sarā**: this is one word; **sare**: this is one; **lopam**: this is one; this *sūtra* has three words. The meaning [of the *sūtra*] is that “vowels undergo elision before a vowel”. And in this [*sūtra*], **sarā** is defined as the agent, **sare** is the cause, and **lopam** is the grammatical operation. “They shine” (**saranti**), therefore they are **sarā**. Elision (*lutti*) is **lopo**. He states this [*sūtra*] here because *sandhi* rules for vowels are to be given first, since it is vowels that are appointed first [in the syllabary]. And in this [*sūtra*], the mention of **sare** rather than *saresu* has the purpose of indicating that [the operation should occur] one [vowel] at a time. Yet, if this is the case, why does [the author] say **sarā** and not *saro*? [He says **sarā**] for the purpose of indicating that the elision of one, two, or four vowels also occurs [simultaneously]. For instance, in [the *sūtra*] *sakhāto gass’ e vā* (Kacc 113, “Optionally, *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, and *e* replace *ga* [voc. sg.] after the word *sakhā* ‘friend’”), *e* has been separated into *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, and *e* and is understood to be a *dvanda* compound, in keeping with the governing rule *nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho* (Kacc 318, A compound of words has a unified sense) and *nāmānaṃ samuccayo dvando* (Kacc 331, “An aggregation of words is a *dvanda* compound”); and [as a *dvanda*] there

<sup>1</sup> This seems unlikely.

<sup>2</sup> Mmd (B<sup>e</sup> 7); Kacc-s-n (Nm 9; C<sup>e</sup> 3):  
sambandho ca padañ c’eva padattho padaviggaho |  
codanā parihāro ca chabbidhā suttavaṇṇanā ||

is no need to use the word *ca* since “one does not use [speech forms] whose object (*ttāna*) has already been denoted”. One should understand that in the case of *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, and *e*, there is the elision of the other vowels due to the following *e* sound.... All the *sūtras* in this chapter are operational (*kāraka*) *sūtras*.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, there are criticisms in the Rūpa-siddhi-ṭīkā concerning some of the statements in the Nyāsa here that will be discussed later on. The opening verses of the Nyāsa are as follows:

Paying homage to the pure Buddha, the bringer of purity for the impure masses, to his well-spoken Dhamma, which destroys the delusions of utterly deluded people, to the Saṅgha, which is taintless and the highest object of offerings, and to Kaccāyana, whose intelligence was praised by the Sage, I who know the judgements and resolutions that are supported by the lineage will compose a mere introduction (*mukha-matta*) to the KACCĀYANA written by him by relying upon the teachings that have been handed down.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mmd (Nm 10; B<sup>e</sup> 22):

**sarā sare lopam** : kim attham idam uccate. anantaresu pubbasarassa lopattham. sarā ti ekaṃ padam, sare ti ekaṃ, lopaṃ ti ekaṃ, tipadam idam suttaṃ. sarā kho sare pare lopam pappontī ti attho. ettha ca sarā ti kāriṇo nidasseti. sare ti nimittam. lopaṃ ti kāriyam. sarantī ti sarā. luttī lopo. sarānam paṭhamam niddiṭṭhattā paṭhamam tesam sandhividdhānam vattabban ti ihedaṃ vuttam. ettha ca saresū ti avatvā sare ti vacanam ekekasmim yevā ti nāpanattham. yadi evam saro ti avatvā kasmā sarā ti vuttam ti. ekadviticatunnam pi lopo hotī ti nāpanattham. “tena sakhāto [sakhato, B<sup>e</sup>] gass’ e vā” [Kacc 113] ti ettha a ca ā ca i ca ī ca e cā ti viggahaṃ katvā “nāmānam samāso yuttattho” [Kacc 318] ti adhikicca “nāmānam samuccayo dvando” [Kacc 331] ti dvandasamāsam katvā “vuttaṭṭhānam [vuttatthānam, B<sup>e</sup>] appayogo” ti casaddam appayogaṃ katvā a ā i ī e ti evam ṭhite ekāre pare sesasarānam lopo hotī ti daṭṭhabbam ... imasmim kappe sabbān’ eva kārakasuttāni.

<sup>2</sup> Mmd (Nm 10; B<sup>e</sup> 1):

buddham visuddham avisuddhajanassa suddhi- | sampāpakaṃ sakalaloka-  
vimohakassa | mohassa dhamsakam api ’ssa suvuttadhammam ||  
natvāna saṃgham anaghotamadakkhiṇeyyam [anaghattama°, B<sup>e</sup>] | Kaccāyanañ  
ca munivaṇṇitabuddhim assa | KACCĀYANASSA mukhamattam aham karissam ||  
pāramparābhatavinicchayanicchayaññū [°ññū, B<sup>e</sup>] | laddhopadesam avalamba  
katassa tena ||

3. NIRUTTI-SĀRA-MAÑJŪSĀ<sup>1</sup>

This is the second commentary on the Nyāsa as there is a commentary composed before it called the Nyāsa-ppadīpa. Even though it is the second commentary, it can be considered the principal commentary in terms of its usefulness and its size. Since it is a commentary (*tīkā*) on a commentary, it is a sub-commentary (*anuṭīkā*). It was composed by the venerable elder Dāṭhānāgarājaguru during the reign of Sirinanda-pavarādhipati, in the city of Ratanāpura<sup>2</sup> in the country of Tambadīpa in Burma. Its date appears to be later than the Vācakopadesa, Ekakkhara-kosa, its commentary, the Sadda-vutti, its commentary, [p. 11] the Sadda-sāra-jālinī, the Rūpa-siddhi, the Rūpa-siddhi-ṭīkā, the Sadda-nīti, the Sutta-niddesa, and the Maṇi-sāra-mañjūsā, etc., as it quotes examples from these works. There is no larger work than this among all the commentaries that were composed for Pali grammatical texts. In some other texts this work is called the Nirutti-mañjūsā, though there is also a commentary on the Purāṇa-cūḷa-nirutti called the Nirutti-mañjūsā or simply the Mañjūsā.

In the commentaries the word *buddha* is analysed as *bujjhitā saccānī ti buddho* (“Buddha: the one who realises truths”). This commentary states, however, that this analysis is an error:

In the expression *loke avagantā* (“they descend into the world”), one should understand the word *avagata* as having the [syntactic-]sense of pure agent.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, in the expression *bujjhitā saccānaṃ* (“the realiser of truths”), one should understand the word *buddho* as having the [syntactic-]sense of pure agent too. It is in this [sense], then, that they write *bujjhitā saccānī* in the texts. This is inelegant, however, and a better reading would be *bujjhitā saccānaṃ* (“the realiser of truths”), since (1) there is the statement that *yu-ṇvū-tu-paccayantasmim chatṭhi bhavati kammani* (the sixth case occurs in the sense of the grammatical object in connection with [a word] with the suffix *yu, ṇvū* or *tu*), (2) the sixth case plural suffix occurs in the sense of the grammatical object in connection with the suffix *-tu* of the word *bujjhitā* according to the

<sup>1</sup> See Franke 1902, 23. Franke does not speculate on the date of the work. Pind (2012) makes no mention of it. By quoting the work’s colophon, Subhūti allows us to now date the work to 1647/48 CE.

<sup>2</sup> That is, modern day Taungoo.

<sup>3</sup> That is, not the impelled agent of a causative construction, etc.



*sūtra dutiyāpañcamānañ ca* (Kacc 311, “Sometimes the sixth case occurs in the sense of the second and fifth cases”), and (3) there is a word suffixed with the sixth case in the sense of the grammatical object in the next example *bodhetā pajāya*<sup>1</sup> (“the one who awakens the people”).<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, its commentary on the Nyāsa’s explanation of the *sūtra* “*sarā sare lopam*” is as follows:

Now, after this, he (the author of the NYĀSA) begins “**sarā sare lopam** : **for what purpose is this said?**” in order to provide a commentary on this operational rule prescribing an elision. For an operational rule (*vidhi-sutta*) is eightfold, namely, [the operation of] elision (*lopa*), substitution (*ādesa*), lengthening (*dīgha*), shortening (*rassa*), suffixation (*paccaya*), case-suffixation (*vibhatti*), augmentation (*āgama*), and prohibition (*paṭisedha*). Furthermore, it is said:

There are eight types of operation: elision (*lopa*), substitution (*ādesa*), lengthening (*dīgha*), shortening (*rassa*), suffixation (*paccaya*), case-ending suffixation (*vibhatti*), augmentation (*āgama*), and prohibition (*paṭisedha*).

**When there is a conjunction [of vowels]**: When there is no intervening sound between two vowels, which are the cause and agent [of the grammatical operation]. **Lopo**: the verbal base *lup* in the sense of non-perception [is joined with the suffix] *na*. He (the author of the NYĀSA) does not say that there should be an agreement between singular suffixes, such as *saro sare lopam*, or between plural suffixes, such as *sarā saresu lopam*, nor does he believe that there is a contradiction in case-endings between the cause and the agent [of the grammatical operation]. In this respect, with the [statement] beginning **saresu** he shows that such proscriptive criticisms (*codanā*) are without utility and [p. 12] refutes them. **Saresu**: Here, [the meaning is] “when the vowels, which are the cause [of the grammatical operation] ...”. It is in the locative case in the sense of cause, in keeping with the *sūtra kamma-karaṇanimittatthesu sattamī* (Kacc 312, The seventh case [occurs] in the sense of object, instrument, and cause). For instance, *nāgo dantesu haññate* (“the elephant is killed for the sake of its tusks”), etc. In order to give an example of the simultaneous elision also of many vowels

<sup>1</sup> Nidd II E<sup>e</sup> § 458: buddho ti ken’ atthena buddho? bujjhitā saccānī ti buddho. bodhetā pajāyā ti buddho.

<sup>2</sup> Nir-s-mañj (Nm 11): yathā loke avagantā ti iminā vacanatthena avagato ti imassa vacanassa suddhakattu attho viññāyati. evaṃ “bujjhitā saccānan” [Nidd II E<sup>e</sup> § 457] ti ca bujjhitā saccānan ti pāṭho va sundaro.

before a vowel, which is the cause [of the grammatical operation], he (the author of the NYĀSA) makes the statement beginning “**tena sakhāto...**”. In the RŪPA-SIDDHI, however, [its author] believes that vowels are elided one at a time when followed by each single vowel and that they are not elided simultaneously when followed by a single vowel. In this connection, therefore, [the author of the NYĀSA] states that, furthermore, [**sarā**] is plural [in this *sūtra*] in order to indicate the elision of many [vowels] when preceding a single vowel. The commentary on the RŪPA-SIDDHI also states that:

the use of the plural [in the word] **sarā** has the purpose of indicating the plurality of [vowels] so that there is also the elision of all [word-]final vowels, beginning with *a*, when followed by each single vowel. One should not accept the statement in the NYĀSA that “[Kaccāyana says *sarā*] for the purpose of indicating that the elision of one, two, or four vowels also occurs [simultaneously]”, since such a usage is not found in the discourses of the Conqueror (*jinavacana*). There is no point in simultaneous elision, even in the *sūtra sakhāto gass’ e vā* (Kacc 113), since the four vowels, *a*, etc., are elided in each separate word before the *e* sound.<sup>1</sup> For it is said: *sabhāvassāpi e ti nipātanato sijjhanato* (“The nature of the *e* [sound] is established as a ready-made form [?]”).

The SADDA-NĪTI, however, agrees with the opinion of the NYĀSA [and states that]

there is the simultaneous elision of two preceding vowels followed by a single vowel in [the sentence] *nānādisaṃ yanti, disā bhanti* (“They go to the various directions; they light up the directions”). There is also the simultaneous elision of three preceding vowels followed by a single vowel [in the sentence] *na maṃ puna upeyyāsi ajjheyysī* (Ja IV 241, “visit/approach me no more!”) ... In the [word] *yanti*, the arrangement of sounds [prior to *sandhi*] was *yā + a + anti*, with three vowels in succession. [In the word] *upeyyāsi*, the arrangement of sounds [prior to *sandhi*] was *upa + i + a + eyyāsi*, with four vowels in succession. There is also a verse on this topic:

Vowels, whether one, two or even three, are elided before a vowel. The wise should learn this statement concerning *sandhis*

<sup>1</sup> The point here is that the Rūpa-siddhi-ṭīkā considers the four vowels that comprise the compound *e* as separate words, as *padas*, and not as components of a single word. This would be the case if *e* here is to be understood as a *dvandva* compound as previously stated in the Nyāsa. In this case, their *sandhis* should occur separately and not simultaneously.

associated with verbal bases as it removes the doubts of students. One should learn the examples [p. 13] *n'asi rājabhaṭo* (Vin I 93), *yanti, eyya, heyya, venti, lanti, disā bhanti* (M I 328), also *santi* and *panti*, and the examples *ajjheyysi* and *upeyyasi* too (Sadd III E<sup>e</sup> 612–13).”

In this [verse], *n'asi rājabhaṭo* (“Are you a government officer?”) is an example where there is the elision of a single vowel. After that, [the others] are examples where there is the elision of two or three vowels, and one should learn the derivation of their forms. This is the construction [of the verse]. **imasmim kappe**: in the second chapter. **kāraṅkasuttāni**: the operational *sūtras*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nir-s-mañj (Nm 11-12): idāni tadantare lopavidhisuttassa samvaṇṇanam karonto **sarā sare lopan ti kimattham idam uccate** ty ādim āha. vidhisuttam hi lopādesadigharassapaccayavibhattiāgamapaṭisedhavasena aṭṭhavidham hoti. vuttañ ca:

lopādesañ ca dīghañ ca rassapaccayam eva ca |  
vibhaty āgamo paṭisedho vidhi nāma aṭṭha siyuṃ || ti

**tattha anantaresū** ti byavadhānakkharavirahitesu dvīsu nimittakārībhūtesu saresu. **lopo** ti lupa-adassane ti dhātu ṇa. sarā sare lopan ti vā sarā saresu lopan ti vā samānekavacanantavasena vā samānabahuvacanantavasena vā avatvā sarā sare lopan ti nimittakārīnam asamānavibhattikabhāvaṃ anicchanto ettha ca **saresū** ty ādinā codanābhogaṃ dassetvā pariharati. **tattha saresū** ti nimittabhūtesu saresu. nimittatthe c’etaṃ kammakaraṇanimittatthesu sattamī ti ’minā bhūmaṃ. yathā nāgo dantesu haññate ty ādi. etasmim nimittabhūte sare bahūnam pi sarānam ekasmim vāre lopodāharaṇam dassento **tena sakhāto** ty ādim āha. RŪPASIDDHIYAM pana ekeasmim sare pare ekekass’ eva sarassa lopabhāvaṃ icchati. na ekasmim sare bahūnam sarānam ekasmim vāre lopa-bhāvaṃ. tenāha tattha bahuvacanam pan’ ettha ekasmim sare pare bahūnam lopañāpanatthan ti. TAṬṬIKĀYAṆ ca “sarā ti bahuvacanaggahaṇam ekeasmim sare pare pi antasarānam akārādīnam sabbesam pi lopo hoti ti tesam bahu-bhāvāñāpanattham. yaṃ pana nyāse vuttam ekasmim sare pare ekadvitīcatunnam pi lopo hoti ti ñāpanatthan ti tam na gahetabban ti tādissa payogassa jīnavacane adassanato ‘sakhāto gass’ e vā’ [Kacc 113] ti sutte pi ekāre pare akārādīnam catunnam pi ekeasmim pade lopusambhavana ekato lopassa nīratthakattā, tathā sabhāvassāpi e ti nipātanato sījhanato” ti vuttam. SADDANTĪYAM pana NYĀSAMATAM anujānanto “nānā disam yanti disā bhanti”<sup>iii</sup> (*disā bhanti* om., Sadd III E<sup>e</sup> 612) ayam ekasmim sare pare ekakkhane dvinnam pubbasarānam lopo. na maṃ puna upeyyasi [Ja IV 241] *ajjheyysi*<sup>iv</sup> ti ayam ekasmim sare pare ekakkhane tiṇṇam pubbasarānam lopo. tattha yanti ti yā a anti ti vaṇṇatthitam (vaṇṇatthiti, E<sup>e</sup>). ettha paṭipāṭiyā tayo sarā labbhanti. upeyyasi ti upa i a eyyasi ti vaṇṇatthiti. ettha paṭipāṭiyā cattāro sarā labbhanti. tatrāyam gāthā:

sarā yanti sare lopam eko dve pi tayo pi vā | dhātu-samsattha-sandhim hi sandhāya kathitam idam || tasmā viññūhi viññeyyam sotūnam kamkha-

Furthermore, as well as commenting on passages in the Nyāsa, this work also makes some important statements in places concerning the meaning of sections of the root text, that is, the Kaccāyana. There is also mention of some errors in the older commentary too. In this regard, the Nirutti-sāra-mañjūsā states the following concerning the gloss (*vr̥tti*) on the *sūtra* “*byañjano ca visañño*” (Kacc 41, “a conjunct consonant becomes a single consonant when a vowel is elided after a *niggahīta*”):

And in [the *sūtra*’s] gloss (*vr̥tti*) there are two different readings: (1) “The mention of *ca* (‘and’) serves [to indicate] that there is also the elision of those [consonants] that are homogeneous among (*tesaṃ*) a [conjunct] of three consonants” and (2) “The mention of *ca* (‘and’) serves [to indicate] that there is sometimes also the elision of a [conjunct] of three homogeneous consonants (*tiṇṇaṃ pi byañjanānaṃ sarūpānaṃ*)”. Out of those [two], the first reading is the older reading and the second reading is the more recent reading. [Scholars] nowadays follow this [latter] reading. This is a commentary on the first reading of the [two]: “There should be the elision of the first of the [consonants] that are homogeneous in a [conjunct] of three consonants, when there follows a single vowel in disrupting proximity (*byavadhāyaka*).” In this [commentary], **tesaṃ** has the sense of a locative of specification (*niddhāraṇa*). Furthermore, this is a commentary on the second reading: “**tiṇṇaṃ** is an adjective, **byañjanānaṃ** has the sense of a locative of specification, and this is to be construed with [the word] **sa-rūpānaṃ**. Sometimes the word [*ca*] has the purpose of [introducing] an alternative opinion (*vikappana*). [The author] shows, therefore, that there is the elision of a single homogeneous sound only in a [conjunct] of three consonants, consisting of a conjunct of two homogeneous sounds and one heterogeneous sound. There is not to be any elision in a conjunct of three heterogeneous sounds.”<sup>1</sup>

---

dhamsakaṃ | n’asi rājabhaṭo (Vin I 93) yanti eyya heyya nidassanaṃ || vanti (vanti, Sadd III E<sup>c</sup> 613) yanti (lanti, Sadd III E<sup>c</sup> 613) disā bhanti [M I 328] viññeyyaṃ santi panti ca<sup>v</sup> | ajjheyyāsi upeyyāsi iccādi ca nidassanaṃ ||” ti vuttaṃ.

tattha n’asi rājabhaṭo ti ayaṃ ekasaraḷopūdāharaṇaṃ. tato paraṃ dvinnaṃ tiṇṇaṃ sarānaṃ lopudāharaṇāni. tesam pana rūpasiddhi veditabbā ti sambandho. **imasmim kappe** ti imasmim dutiyaparicchede. **kāraḷasuttāni** ti vidhisuttāni.

<sup>1</sup> Nir-s-mañj (Nm 13):

imassa ca vuttiaṃ casaddaggahaṇena tiṇṇaṃ pi byañjanānaṃ antare ye sarūpā tesam pi lopo hoti ti ca casaddaggahaṇena tiṇṇaṃ pi byañjanānaṃ sarūpānaṃ

[The commentary] also states that with respect to the word *pañcaddasī* (“having fifteen”), which had recently come into use as an example for the *sūtra* “*paradve bhāvo thāne*” (Kacc 28, “After a vowel there is the reduplication of a consonant in the appropriate situation”), that the reduplication of the letter *d* in *dasa* (ten) should not occur after any number except *catu* (four) and *cha* (six).

The opening verses of the *Nirutti-sāra-mañjūsā* are as follows:

I pay homage to the Buddha, a source of pure compassion from whom the sacred texts are obtained; to the Dhamma, which destroys the darkness of delusion and bestows deathlessness; to the highest community, which is the epitome of perfect purity, a refuge for the three worlds, and the best object of offerings; [p. 14] and to Kaccāyana, whose intelligence was praised by the Sage, who opened the ancient path to analytical knowledge, and who was beautiful to behold, possessing a golden and even complexion. That commentary on the *NYĀSA* that was composed by the best teachers has not improved monks’ understanding and, thus, I will compose a commentary to increase [their] understanding.<sup>1</sup>

The closing statement in the *Nirutti-sāra-mañjūsā* is as follows:

This book entitled the *NIRUTTI-SĀRA-MANJŪSĀ* was composed and completed by a *thera* who had previously received the name *Saddhammasiri* from his teachers and whose official title was *Dāṭhānāga-rāja-guru*. He composed it at the time of the coronation of the righteous king who was invested with kingship in accordance with Dhamma with the name *Siri-nanda-dhamma-rāja-pavarādhpati*, that is,

---

kvaci lopo hoti ti cā ti ’me dve pāṭhā bhinnā. tesu paṭhamapāṭho va purimapāṭho dutiyapāṭho pana navapāṭho taṃ idāni paṭhanti. tesu ayam paṭhamapāṭhassa vaṇṇanā tiṇṇam pi byañjanānam antare byavadhāyake ekasmiṃ sare satī ye sarūpā tesam pi ādyakkharassa lopo hoti. ettha ca **tesan** ti niddhāraṇe bhummaṃ. ayam pana dutiyapāṭhassa vaṇṇanā **tiṇṇan** ti tabbisenam **byañjanānan** ti tiddhāraṇe bhummaṃ idam **sarūpānan** ti iminā sambandhitabban ti. kvaci saddo vikappanatto. tena sarūpakkhara-dvaya-asarūpekakkhara-samudāya-bhūtesu tīsu akkharesv eva sarūpekakkharalopo hoti na virūpakkhara-samudāya-bhūtesu tīsu akkharesu lopo ti dasseti.

<sup>1</sup> *Nir-s-mañj* (Nm 13–14):

buddhaṃ visuddhakarūṇākarapāḷipattaṃ | mohandhakāravihataṃ amataṃ  
dadañ ca || dhammaṃ sunimmalavaraṃ gaṇam uttamañ ca | natvā tiloka-  
saraṇaṃ varadakkhiṇeyaṃ || kaccāyanañ ca muṇivaṇṇitabuddhimantaṃ | natvā  
pabhinnapaṭṭisambhidatheramaggaṃ || kalyāṇadassanasuvaṇṇasamānavannaṃ |  
saṃvaṇṇanā garuvarehi pakāsītā yā || NYĀSASSA sā na yatinaṃ mativaḍḍhanā ca |  
āyācīto yativarehi hitāya tasmā | saṃvaṇṇanaṃ matipavaḍḍhanaṃ ārabhissaṃ ||

in the year 2192 (1647/8 CE) of the [Buddha's] teaching and in the year 1010 of the Burmese era.

This work was composed in the year 1010,  
And completed when the year 1012 was reached.<sup>1</sup>

#### 4. NYĀSA-PPADĪPA<sup>2</sup>

This is the first commentary on the Nyāsa. It was composed by a certain minister during the reign of King Narapati of Arimaddana (i.e. slightly before the Buddhist year 1725).<sup>3</sup> It is said in the Sāsana-vamśa that having discerned that (the author of the Nyāsa-ppadīpa) had fallen in love with a young princess who was born in the king's harem, the king declared that if he wrote a book that was comprehensive in its judgments and profound in meaning he would give the princess to him. On the completion of the Nyāsa commentary, the king gave him his daughter and also appointed him to the ministerial position of land revenue surveyor (*rajjuggāha*). Since the name of this minister was “Saṃkhyam”,<sup>4</sup> the Nyāsa commentary is also known by this name in Burma.

Even though the Nirutti-sāra-mañjūsā [p. 15] has little good to say about the commentary, it is concise, and so it is not a burden on the root text. The Nirutti-sāra-mañjūsā criticises this commentary in many places. The opening verses of the Nyāsa-ppadīpa are as follows:

Paying homage to the Buddha — who is the end of the journey for those in cyclic existence, a source of virtue, unobstructable, one who has fathomed what is knowable, and who is the protector of those who lack protection — to the Dhamma and the highest Saṅgha, resolute I

<sup>1</sup> Nir-s-mañj (Nm 14):

dāṭhānāgarājagurū ti laddhanāmalaṃchanena therena pure garūhi saddhamma-sirī ti gahitanāmadheyyena sirinandadhammarājapavarādhipatināminā yathā-dhammaṃ laddharājabhāvassa dhammarājassa rājasampatyānubhavanakāle sāsane dvānavutādhikaekavīsasatakāle sakkarāje pana dasādhikasahassakāle sampatte racitaṃ NIRUTTISĀRAMAÑJŪSANĀMIKAPAKARAṆAṃ samattaṃ.

dasādhike sahasamhi kataṃ pakaraṇaṃ idaṃ |  
sampatte tādisse niṭṭhaṃ sahasse dvādasādhike ||

<sup>2</sup> See Franke 1902, 23. The work is not dealt with in Pind 2012.

<sup>3</sup> 1180/81 CE.

<sup>4</sup> This is Subhūti's rendering of the Burmese name “Saṃ-pyañ”.

undertake the composition of the NYĀSA-PPADĪPA in the correct manner (*sādhū*).<sup>1</sup>

#### 5. SUTTA-NIDDESA<sup>2</sup>

This is a commentary on the Kaccāyana. It was composed by a venerable elder named Chapaṭa (or Chapada) who lived in Burma in around the Buddhist year 1725<sup>3</sup> (that is about seven hundred years ago). How is this date determined? King Parākramabāhu I (with the assistance of the venerable Diṃbulāgala Mahākassapa Thera) unified the *nikāyas* and purified the *sāsana* in the Buddhist year 1709,<sup>4</sup> that is in the eighteenth year of the king's reign. The venerable Chapaṭa Thera came to Lanka as a young *sāmaṇera* six years before the reforms along with his teacher the venerable Uttarājīva Thera. It is possible that he composed the Sutta-niddesa in Sri Lanka since he returned to his own country, wielding knowledge in both the sciences (*śāstras*) and Buddhist teachings (*āgamas*) after taking higher ordination in Sri Lanka and staying there for ten years. Although, if King Parākramabāhu I came to the throne in the Buddhist year 1587,<sup>5, vi</sup> as it is recorded in the Saddhamma-saṅgaha, then the Sutta-niddesa must have been composed more than seven hundred years ago. The Kalyāṇi-ppakaraṇa states, however, that “King

<sup>1</sup> Nyās-pd (Nm 15; B<sup>e</sup> 1):

samsāravantagamanantagunādhivāsam (°adhivāsam, Nm) | nīrundhiyūpagata-  
ñeyyam (nīrundhay°, Nm) anāthanātham || buddhañ ca dhammam adhiñharam  
(abhiñharam?) aggasamgham | nyāsappadipam abhinamya karomi sādhum ||

<sup>2</sup> Subhūti's discussion here about the date of the Sutta-niddesa is incorrect. His error is based on identifying Chapaṭa, author of the Sutta-niddesa, with a certain Chapaṭa who is mentioned in the Kalyāṇi inscription as bringing Lankan Buddhism to Burma during the reign of Parākramabāhu I. Franke (1902, 23) also makes the same error and, like Subhūti, dates the work to 1182. Aleix Ruiz-Falqués (2015) has provided the most recent and exhaustive discussion of the date of the Sutta-niddesa and dates Chapaṭa's trip to Sri Lanka, and thus also the approximate date of the authorship of his grammar, to the Buddhist year 1990, that is, 1445/46 CE. The first scholars to date Chapaṭa to the fifteenth-century were Buddhadatta (1957) and Godakumbura (1969).

<sup>3</sup> 1180/81 CE.

<sup>4</sup> 1164/65 CE.

<sup>5</sup> 1042/43 CE.

Parākramabāhu came to reign in the Buddhist year 1709”.<sup>1</sup> There is also the following statement in the *Vinaya-sannaya* that was written at that time by Diṃbulāgala Medhaṅkara Mahā Thera :

The great king Parākramabāhu, having taken into his control the Buddhist religion that had been split since the 456th year of the Buddha’s *parinibbāna* and that had further remained for 1256 years, removed the putrid parts of the impure fraternities, namely, of the Jetavana and Abhayagiri, [p. 16] upheld the pure *theravāda* of the residents of the Mahāvihāra, and purified and united the pure Saṅgha.<sup>2</sup>

Since this statement agrees with the Kalyāṇi-ppakaraṇa and since this date is close to that calculated by James D’Alwis from the Mahā-vaṃsa, there should be greater confidence in the date given in the Kalyāṇi-ppakaraṇa than the date given in the Saddhamma-saṅgaha. It seems, therefore, that the composition of the Sutta-niddesa must not have occurred less than five hundred and ninety years ago.

Not only was the Sutta-niddesa composed by the venerable Chapaṭa Thera, but he also composed works on the *abhidhamma*, namely, the Saṅkhepa-vaṇṇanā, which is a commentary on the Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha, and the Nāma-cāra-dīpa, and on the *vinaya*, namely, the Vinaya-guḷhattha-dīpanī and the Sīmālaṅkāra-ṭīkā.

At the beginning and conclusion of the Sutta-niddesa, the elder remembers Sri Lanka with a statement of gratitude. Even in the benedictory verses, after praising the virtues of Lord Buddha, he mentions that the Buddha visited Sri Lanka three times and established the religion there. The Kalyāṇi-ppakaraṇa states that this elder, Chapaṭa, had memorised the *tipiṭaka* and that, when he was young, he came to Sri Lanka

<sup>1</sup> Subhūti actually writes here that “the Kalyāṇi-ppakaraṇa states, however, that King Parākramabāhu came to reign in the Buddhist year 1791”. We have treated this date as a printing or typographical error, since he asserted earlier that Parākramabāhu’s reforms took place in 1709 and since the Kalyāṇi inscription actually dates the accession of the king to the year 526 of the Burmese era, that is, to the Buddhist year 1709 (see Taw Sein Ko 1892, p. 50).

<sup>2</sup> *Vinayārtha-samuccaya* (Nm 15-16): budun pitinivī sārasiya supanas havuruddak tubū budu sasna parākramabāhu maharajānan ārageṇa denānakā bagirinakā yana asuddha denakayehi vipanna tān hāra mahā vihāra vāsīvū parisuddhavū theravādayama geṇa pavatnā pirisindu tān hā suddha saṃghayā samāga koṭa.



from Burma and, after learning the sciences (*śāstras*) and Buddhist teachings (*āgamas*), he obtained the recognition of “elder” (*thera*) and achieved the status of being “one who has memorised the *tipiṭaka*” (*tipiṭaka-dhara*). He then went to Burma with four other elders from that country and established and developed a new fraternity there. I believe it is possible that some of his works were composed in Sri Lanka. The opening verses of the Saṅkhepa-vaṇṇanā are as follows:

On the invitation of Mahāvijayabāhu who crouched [in supplication], who possesses knowledge of the traditional religion and sciences, who is renowned on this island like a full moon in an autumn sky, and who desires the prosperity of the religion, I will compose the SAṅKHEPA-PADA-VANṆANĀ.<sup>1</sup>

Since “Vijayabāhu” is a Sri Lankan name, it is possible that the Saṅkhepa-vaṇṇanā was composed in this country. In some of his works, this monk also states that his work is *sīhaḷadesiya-paradesiyānaṃ atthāya* (“for the benefit of those living in Sīhaḷa country and those living in other countries”) [p. 17]. Since, in Sri Lanka, people from foreign countries are known as “*paradeśī*”, it is possible that these works were written in Sri Lanka. The Sutta-niddesa, however, does not contain such a statement and, therefore, there is reason to think that it was composed in Burma. For the most part, only the *sūtras* of the Kaccāyana are commented upon. In some places, however, there are very detailed statements about the gloss (*vṛtti*) and the examples. The Sutta-niddesa’s method for commenting on the *sūtras* is as follows:

[The method] for commenting on a *sūtra* is sixfold: (1) syntactic construction, (2) the word, (3) the meaning of the word, (4) the separation of words, (5) objections and (6) their refutation.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to commenting on each *sūtra* with this sixfold method, the

<sup>1</sup> Abhidh-s-sv (Nm 16)

āgatāgamasatthena cando va saradambare |  
pākaṭen’ idha dīpamhi mahāvijayabāhunā ||  
ukkuṭikaṃ nisīditvā sāsanaṭṭhābhikaṃkhinā |  
yācito ’haṃ karissāmi SAṅKHEPAPADAVANṆANAM ||

<sup>2</sup> Kacc-s-n (Nm 17; C<sup>e</sup> 3):

sambandho ca padañ c’eva padattho padaviggaho |  
codanā parihāro ca chabbidhā suttavaṇṇanā ||

author also explains fully the examples for the *sūtras* that were not well explained in earlier commentaries such as the Nyāsa. The Sutta-niddesa also explains statements taken from other grammatical works such as the Bālāvatāra, the Rūpa-siddhi, the Nyāsa, the Nyāsa-ppadīpa, the Kārikā, the Akkhara-mañjūsā, and the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa. The opening verses of the Sutta-niddesa are as follows:<sup>1</sup>

I bow down to the Lord of the World, who visited Sri Lanka three times and established the religion (*sāsana*), to the Dhamma and to the highest community. Upon the request of Dhammacāri, who seeks the preservation of the good Dhamma, I will write a commentary on Kaccāyana's *sūtras*, which incorporates an explanation [of the syntactic function of the words in every rule] (*niddesa*).<sup>2</sup>

The Sutta-niddesa's commentary on the *sūtra* “*sarā sare lopam*” is as follows:

**sarā**: this is one word; **sare**: this is one; **lopam**: this is one. According to the division of words on the basis of their case ending, one should understand that this *sūtra* has three words. **sarā** is defined as the agent, **sare** is defined as the cause, and **lopam** is defined as the grammatical operation. Out of the [different types of] *sūtra*, namely, (1) a rule defining a technical term (*saññā-[sutta]*), (2) a meta-rule (*paribhāsā-[sutta]*), (3) an operational rule (*vidhi-[sutta]*), (4) a rule prescribing a restriction (*niyama-[sutta]*), and (5) a rule of prohibition (*paṭisedha-[sutta]*), one should understand this to be an operational rule (*vidhi-sutta*).

There could be an objection in connection [with this *sūtra*], namely, that, if **sarā** (vowels) is plural, should not [Kaccāyana] say *saresu* (before vowels) [rather than **sare** (before a vowel)]? No, because each single vowel is the cause [of the grammatical operation]. If this is the case, then, should not [Kaccāyana] say *saro* (a vowel) since only a single vowel undergoes elision? No, because there is also

<sup>1</sup> The following translation has been adapted from Ruiz-Falqués (2015, 400). Ruiz-Falqués notes that the unique commentarial style of the Sutta-niddesa informs his translation of *niddesa* as “an explanation of the syntactic function of the words in every rule”.

<sup>2</sup> Kacc-s-n (Nm 17 ; C<sup>e</sup> 1):

tikkhattuṃ pattalaṅko yo paṭiṭṭhāpesi (paṭiṭṭhāpesi, Nm) sāsanam |  
vanditvā lokanātham taṃ dhammañ c'assa gaṇuttamam ||  
saddhammaṭṭhitikāmena yācito dhammacārinā |  
saniddesaṃ karissāmi kaccānasuttavaṇṇanam ||

the [simultaneous] elision of four vowels before a single vowel in the [sūtra] *sakhāto gass' e vā* (Kacc 113, Optionally, *a, ā, i, ī,* and *e* replace *ga* [voc. sg.] after the word *sakha* “friend”). Alternatively, [Kaccāyana] says **sarā** in order to indicate that, before each vowel, all eight vowels, whether homogeneous or not homogeneous, can undergo elision [p. 18]. It is said in the gloss (*vutti*), for instance, that “also all vowels obtain elision when a vowel follows (*pare*)”. How does one understand that the word *pare* (“follows”) in this [statement] is expressed by the general [formulation] *sarā sare*? It is understood as [the sense of *pare*] is expressed by the seventh case of [the word] *sare* denoting a cause. Alternatively, it is understood [in this *sūtra*] as [the word] *paro* was given as the agent of the previous *sūtra*.<sup>1</sup>

The closing verses of the Sutta-niddesa are as follows:<sup>2</sup>

One thousand years, plus ten times ninety-nine years, after the extinction of the Buddha (= 1990 B.E.), he (Chapaṭa) arrived from the city of Pagan in the excellent Tambapaṇṇi (Sri Lanka) and, with the support of King Siri Parakkamabāhu, had the impure religion purified and, together with very knowledgeable monks who were experts in the Vinaya, had a monastic boundary fixed, free of failure, in accordance with the Vinaya in the excellent city called Jayavaḍḍhana and had trained the community of monks in the Vinaya and Abhidhamma. He, whose heart was purified by wisdom and who was compassionate towards the people, austere, and

<sup>1</sup> Kacc-s-n (Nm 17-18; C<sup>c</sup> 9):

**sarā** ti ekaṃ padaṃ, **sare** ti ekaṃ padaṃ, **lopan** ti ekaṃ padaṃ. vibhāyanta-padaṃ vibhāgavasena tipadam idaṃ suttan (suttan *om.*, C<sup>c</sup>) ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. **sarā** ti kāriniddeso (kāri<sup>o</sup>, Nm), **sare** ti nimittaniddeso (nimittasattamīddeso, C<sup>c</sup>), **lopan** ti kāriyaniddeso. saññā-paribhāsā-vidhi-niyama-paṭisedha-suttesu vidhi-suttan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ. ettha codanā (codanaṃ, Nm) siyā. **sarā** ti bahuvacanaṃ paṭicca saresū ti vattabbaṃ ti (ti *om.*, Nm). na vattabbaṃ. ekekass' (ekass', Nm) eva sarassa nimittabhūtattā. yadi evaṃ ekassa sarassa (ekasarassa, Nm) lopattā saro ti vattabban ti. na. “sakhāto gass' e vā” [Kacc 113] ti ettha ekasmiṃ sare catunnam pi lopattā. athavā ekekasmim sare sarūpāpi asarūpāpi (athavā ekasmiṃ viya rūpāpi, Nm) sabbe aṭṭha sarā lopam pappontī ti nāpanattham **sarā** ti vuttam. tenāha (tena vuttam, Nm) vuttiyam sarā kho sabbe pi sare pare lopam pappontī ti. ettha ca sarā sare ti sāmāññavasena vuccamāne (muccamāno, Nm) pi sare ti katham nāyati ti. sare ti nimittasattamiyā (sattamiyā, C<sup>c</sup>) vuttattā nāyati. athavā uparisutte paro ti kāriyo vuttattā nāyati.

<sup>2</sup> The following translation has been critically adapted from Ruiz-Falqués 2015, 395–96.

praised for his qualities of morality and energy, rich in faith, who has compassion for the people of pure mind, who was able to understand fully the *tipiṭaka* in all its parts, he, Chapata, a learned and beloved king of monks, composed in abridgement this explanation of the beneficial *sūtras* of Kaccāyana, for the benefit of the religion of the Sage.<sup>1</sup>

#### 6. KACCĀYANA-VANṆANĀ<sup>2</sup>

This is a third commentary composed for the Kaccāyana. The author of this work was Mahāvijitāvī Mahā Thera who resided on Abhayagiri-pabbata close to Vijayapura in the province of Tambadīpa in Burma. Its date of composition is later than the Sutta-niddesa, Rūpa-siddhi, Rūpa-siddhi-ṭīkā and Sadda-nīti. Examples are taken from these works and also from the Nirutti-ppakaraṇa, the Kaccāyana-nissaya-ppakaraṇa, the Kārikā [p. 19], and Nyāsa. Also, an important commentarial method not used in the other commentaries, such as the Nyāsa and Sutta-niddesa, is applied to all the *sūtras*, that is, the Kaccāyana-vanṇanā explains the arrangement of all the *sūtras* of the Kaccāyana by elucidating the rationale behind them, having posed the questions *idaṃ suttaṃ kiṃ pabhavaṃ kiṃ nidānaṃ kuto nikkhantaṃ* (“What is the origin of this *sūtra*? What is its cause? From what does it proceed?”). It explains, for instance, that the *sūtra tath’ odantā sarā aṭṭha* (Kacc 3, “among [the sounds] there are eight vowels ending in o”) derives from the *sūtra akkharā p’ ādayo*

<sup>1</sup> Kacc-s-n (Nm 19; C<sup>e</sup> 275):

punṇe dase<sup>vii</sup> navanavutī guṇe ca (cha, Nm) vasse<sup>viii</sup> | vasse sahasaganane  
jinanibbutāyaṃ<sup>ix</sup> || iddhārimaddanapurā varatambapaṇṇiṃ (°paṇṇi, Nm) |  
patvāna so siriparakkamabāhubhūpaṃ (°bhupaṃ, C<sup>e</sup>) || nissāya sāsanaṃ  
suvisodhayitvā | bhikkhūhi nātavinayehi susaññatehi || bandhāpayī (khandhā-  
payī, Nm) puravare jayavaḍḍhanavhe (chaya°, Nm) | sīmaṃ vipattirahitaṃ  
vinayānurūpaṃ || sikkhāpayī yatigāṇe vinayābhidhamme | paññāvadātahadayo  
sadayo janānaṃ (chanānaṃ, Nm) || appicchatāviriyaṃ silagunappasattho |  
saddhādhanā vimalabuddhijanānukappī (sakalasissagaṇānukam pī<sup>x</sup>, Nm) ||  
sabbattha yuttapiṭakattayapāradasī | so chappaṭavhayasuto yatirājakanto ||  
kaccāyanassa hitasuttaniddesaṃ (yatisuttaniddesaṃ, Nm) etaṃ | saṃkhepato  
viracayī (viracayī, Nm) muni sāsanaṃ ||

<sup>2</sup> See Franke 1902, 23; Pind 2012, 121. Franke dates the work to around 1606, since that is when the author composed a commentary on his own Vācakopadesa. Pind dates the work to the “sixteenth century”.

*ekacattālīsaṃ* (Kacc 2, “there are forty-one sounds beginning with ‘a’”).

The opening verses of the *Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā* are as follows:

I pay homage to the Conqueror, who brought about the purification of impure people, to the Dhamma that destroys delusion, to the taintless Saṅgha, which was established as the highest with the [Buddha’s declaration that] “this is the highest...”, to the Mahā Thera who was the author of the NYĀSA, to the teacher Buddhappiya who composed the RŪPA-SIDDHI, to the three highest scholars (*agga-panḍita*) who composed the SADDANĪTĪ, to the author of the *nissaya*, and to the author of the [KACCĀYANA-SUTTA]-NIDDESA. It is by relying on their well-considered judgements that I will compose the KACCĀYANA-VANṆANĀ for the benefit of monks and novices.<sup>1</sup>

The *Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā*’s commentary on the *sūtra* “*sarā sare lopam*” is as follows:

**sarā sare lopam** (Kacc 12): What is the origin of this *sūtra*? What is its cause? From what does it proceed? The *sūtra* originates in connection with the *sūtras pubbam adhoḥhitam assaram sarena viyojaye* (Kacc 10, “One should separate a preceding, final consonant from its [inherent] vowel”) and *naye param yuttam* (Kacc 11, “One should join it with what follows”). These [*sūtras*] are its cause and it is from these [*sūtras*] that it (i.e. Kacc 12) proceeds. With respect to [the example] *yass’ indriyāni* (“He whose sense-organs ...”), for instance, [Kaccāyana] uttered the *sūtra sarā sare lopam* to show that, prior to *sandhi*, i.e. *yassa + indriyāni*, having separated the consonant from the vowel in accordance with *pubbam adhoḥhitam assaram sarena viyojaye* (Kacc 10), one should elide the preceding vowel when another vowel follows before joining [that consonant] with the following sound.

Why does [Kaccāyana] utter this [*sūtra*]? [He utters this *sūtra*] in order to indicate that there is to be the elision of preceding vowels before another vowel. **sarā**: this is one word; **sare**: this is one; **lopam**: this is one. This [*sūtra*] has three words. **sarā** is defined as the

<sup>1</sup> Kacc-vaṇṇ (Nm 19; B<sup>c</sup> 1):  
avisuddhassa janassa (chanassa, Nm) suddhisampāpakam jīnam | mohassa  
dhammakam (dhamkam, Nm) dhammam natvā samgham niraṅgaṇam ||  
ṭhapitam (ṭhapitam, B<sup>c</sup>) etad aggamhi eso aggo tī ādinā | natvā tañ ca mahā-  
theram NYĀSĀDIKĀRAKAM pi ca || buddhappiyācariyañ ca RŪPASIDDHI-  
VIDHĀYAKAM | SADDANĪTIKĀRAKAÑ (nissayakārakañ, Nm) ca tatiyam agga-  
panḍitam || NISSAYAKĀRAKAÑ cāpi NIDDESĀKĀRAKAM pi ca | vanditvā tesam  
ālamba nicchayam suvinicchitam | yatipotānam atthāya kassam KACCĀNA-  
VANṆANAM ||

agent, **sare** is defined as the cause, and **lopaṃ** is defined as the grammatical operation. Out of the [different types of] *sūtra*, namely, (1) a rule defining a technical term (*saññā-[sutta]*), (2) a meta-rule (*paribhāsā-[sutta]*), (3) an operational rule (*vidhi-[sutta]*), (4) a rule prescribing a restriction (*niyama-[sutta]*), and (5) a rule of prohibition (*paṭisedha-[sutta]*), one should understand this to be an operational rule (*vidhi-sutta*).

There are eight types of operation: elision (*lopa*), substitution (*ādesa*), lengthening (*dīgha*), shortening (*rassa*), suffixation (*paccaya*), case-ending suffixation (*vibhatti*), augmentation (*āgama*), and prohibition (*paṭisedha*).

Among the aforementioned types of operation, [this *sūtra*] should be understood as an operation of elision.

The wise man illumines the four types of operation: (1) an operation applicable to a preceding element (*pubbavidhi*), (2) an operation applicable to a following element (*para-vidhi*), (3) an operation applicable to an earlier element [in a word-form] (*antaraṅgavidhi*), and (4) an operation applicable to a later element [in a word-form] (*bāhirāṅgavidhi*) [p. 20].<sup>1</sup>

Among the aforementioned types of operation, [this *sūtra*] should be understood as an operation applicable to a preceding element (*pubbavidhi*). The meaning [of the *sūtra*] is that “vowels undergo elision before a vowel”. “They shine” (**saranti**), therefore they are **sarā**. The eight vowels can be the agents [of the grammatical operation] and, likewise, they can be the cause [of the grammatical operation]. Before a vowel, there is **lopa**, that is, elision (*luppana*). It is said that, on account of the *sandhi* between words, nothing is perceived between the words at the time of speaking.

Why is there the mention of **sare** rather than *saresu*? It has the purpose of indicating that the elision of many vowels can occur when followed by a single vowel in each instance. The SADDĀ-NĪTĪ states that,

in this connection, in [the sentence] *n’asi rājabhaṭo* (“Are you a government officer?”) there is the elision of a single vowel when followed by a single vowel. The division [of words prior to *sandhi*] was *na + asi*. In [the word] *yanti* (“they go”), there was the simultaneous elision of two vowels. The division [of sounds prior to *sandhi*] was *yā + a*

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed account of *antaraṅga-* and *bāhirāṅga-vidhis*, see Abhyankar & Shukla 1986, 28–29.

+ *anti*. There were three vowels, namely, the *ā*-sound component of the verbal base *yā*, the *a*-suffix that comes after the *ā* of the verbal base, and the *a*-sound that occurs at the beginning of the suffix *-anti*. Before the *a* sound at the beginning of the suffix *-anti* there was the simultaneous elision of the two preceding sounds. In [the word] *upeyya*, there was the simultaneous elision of three vowels. The division [of sounds prior to *sandhi*] was *upa + i + a + eyya*. The word *upa* is a prefix, *i* is a verbal base, the sound *a* is a suffix, and *eyya* is a [verbal] ending. In [this example], there are four vowels. Therefore, [with respect to this example] there was the simultaneous elision of the *a* sound in *upa*, the *i* sound of the verbal base, and the *a* sound of the suffix.

In the NYĀSA, furthermore, a simultaneous elision of four [vowels] is mentioned before a single vowel in the case of *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, and *e* in the *sūtra sakhāto gass' e vā* (Kacc 113, Optionally, *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, and *e* replace *ga* [voc. sg.] after the word *sakhā* “friend”). One should consider the aforementioned examples in the SADDA-NTI specifically under the rules for vowel elision [in the derivation of verbs], beginning *lopañ c' ettam akāro* (Sadd 1023; Kacc 512, “The suffix *-a* is elided or it becomes *-e*”).

The RŪPA-SIDDHI states, however, that “furthermore, in this [*sūtra*], the plural [of *sarā*] has the purpose of indicating the elision of many [vowels] before each single vowel.” And in connection [with the example] *sakhāto gass' e vā* (Kacc 113), the [RŪPA-SIDDHI] states that “in the case of *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, and *e* there is the sequential (*kamena*) elision of the four vowels” [RŪp C<sup>e</sup> 37].

The commentary on the RŪPA-SIDDHI also states that

[Kaccāyana] says *sarā* and not *saro sare* as the use of the plural [in the word] *sarā* has the purpose of indicating the plurality of [vowels] so that there is also the elision of all [word-]final [vowels], beginning with *a*, when followed by each single vowel.

And it is also said that there are eight simple [vowels] that can be the cause [of the grammatical operation] but there are many sounds (*sara*) — numbering sixty-four — that can be subject to the cause [of the operation]. Thus, the plural *sarā* is mentioned. [The SADDA-BINDU (v. 3)] states [for instance] that there are sixty-four vowels: “Sixty-four (*vācī*) sounds/vowels (*sara*) can be elided before [other] sounds, and fifty-two (*rama*) sounds can be elided following [other] sounds.”

The reasoning that is given in the NYĀSA should also be rejected since such a usage is not found in the discourses of

<sup>1</sup> Kacc-vaṇṇ (Nm 19–20; B<sup>e</sup> 23–24):

**sarā sare lopaṇ** ti (+ ādim āha, B<sup>e</sup>) idam suttam kiṃ pabhavaṃ kiṃ nidānaṃ kuto nikkhantaṃ ti. pubbam adho ṭhitam assaram sarena viyojaye naye param yuttam (yutte, B<sup>e</sup>) ti suttanvayappabhavaṃ tannidānaṃ tato nikkhantaṃ ti (+ kin nikkhantaṃ ti, B<sup>e</sup>). yass’ indriyāni ty ādisu yassa indriyāni ti chede kate pubba – pe – ye ti ’minā sarato byañjanaṃ viyojetvā sarasmiṃ pare pubba-sarassa lopaṃ katvā parakkharam netabban ti dassento **sarā sare lopaṇ** ti vuttan ti. kim attham idam uccate. sarasmiṃ pare pubbasarānaṃ lopo hotīti ñāpanatthaṃ. sarā ti ekaṃ padaṃ (padaṃ *om.*, B<sup>e</sup>). sare ti ekaṃ. lopaṇ ti ekaṃ. tipadam idam. **sarā** ti kāriniddeso. **sare** ti nimittaniddeso (nimittasattami°, B<sup>e</sup>). **lopaṇ** ti kāriyaniddeso. saññāparibhāsā vidhiniyamapatishedha-suttasu vidhisuttan ti veditabbaṃ.

lopādesañ ca dīghañ ca rassapaccayam (rassam paccayam, B<sup>e</sup>) eva ca | vibhaty āgamo paṭisedho vidhi nāma aṭṭha siyūṃ || ti.

vuttasu vidhibhedesu lopavidhī ti veditabbaṃ.

pubbavidhiparavidhi antaraṅgabāhirāpi (antaraṅgam bāhirāpi, B<sup>e</sup>) ca |

vidhibhedo catubbidho dīpeyya matimā naro || ti.

vuttasu vidhīsu (vidhibhedesu, B<sup>e</sup>) pubbavidhī ti veditabbaṃ. sarā kho sare pare lopaṃ pappontī ti attho. sarantī ti **sarā**. kāribhūtā (°bhūtā, Nm) aṭṭha sarā tathā nimittabhūtā sarā. tasmīṃ sare, luppanaṃ (lupanaṃ, Nm) **lopo**. pada-cchede vijjamānassa padasandhivasena kathanakāle anupaladdhī ti vuttaṃ hoti. saresū ti avatvā kasmā **sare** ti (sare ti kasmā, B<sup>e</sup>) vuttan ti. ekekasmīṃ sare pare bahūnaṃ sarānaṃ (sarānaṃ *om.*, B<sup>e</sup>) lopañāpanatthaṃ. ettha ca “n’asi rājabhaṭo ti ettha ekasmīṃ sare pare ekassa sarassa lopo. na + asī ti chedo. yanti iti ettha dvinnaṃ sarānaṃ ekakkhaṇe lopo. yā + a + antī ti chedo. yādhātuyā avayavo ākāro (ākāro *om.*, Nm) ca bhūvādito (antippaccayassa ādito, Nm) ā tīminā (a iti iminā, Nm) pavatto appaccayo ca, antipaccayassa ādibhūto akāro cā ti (vā ti, Nm) tayo sarā. tasmā antipaccayassa ādibhūte akāre (ādibhūta-akārasmiṃ, B<sup>e</sup>) pare dvinnaṃ pubbabhūtānaṃ (+ akāraakārānaṃ, B<sup>e</sup>) iminā ekakkhaṇe lopo. upeyyā ti ettha tiṇṇaṃ sarānaṃ ekakkhaṇe lopo. upa + i + a + eyyā ti chedo. upasaddo upasaggo i dhātu akāro paccayo eyya vibhatti cā ti ettha cattāro sarā. tasmā ekārasmiṃ pare tiṇṇaṃ pubbabhūtānaṃ pakārāvayavabhūta-akāra-dhātubhūta-ikāra-paccayabhūta-akārānaṃ (pakārāvayavabhūta-akāraṃ dhātubhūta-ikāraṃ paccayabhūta-akāraṃ, Nm) iminā ekakkhaṇe lopo” ti (ti *om.*, Nm) SADDANĪTIYAM vutto. NYĀSE pana “sakhāto gass’ e vā” [Kacc 113] ti sutte a ā i ī e ti ṭhite ekārasmiṃ pare ekakkhaṇe catunnaṃ lopo vutto. SADDANĪTIYAM vutta-udāharaṇāni (uddhaḷa-udāharaṇāni, B<sup>e</sup>) vicāretabbāni. tesam udāharaṇānaṃ (udāharaṇānaṃ, Nm) “lopaṇ c’ ettam akāro” [Sadd 1023; Kacc 512;], saralopo ty ādilakkhaṇavisesena vuttattā (lakkhaṇavisiyattā<sup>xi</sup>, Nm). RŪPASIDDHIYAM pana “bahuvacanam pan’ ettha ekekasmīṃ sare (sare *om.*, B<sup>e</sup> 37) pare bahūnaṃ (bahunnaṃ, Nm)



The closing verses of the Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā are as follows:

In the city named Vijaya, which is like a banner raised up from Lanka, there is Abhayagiri mountain, which is renowned in all quarters and is surrounded by cave-dwellings, such as the Nandamūla, ritual boundaries, rivers, mountains, ponds and fields. The grandson of the monk, Pañcasetibha, chief of Haṃsāvātipura, who was well known by the name Suruccanā, dwelt here in this pleasant place that is like [the mountain] Devasabhā. For the benefit of the religion that elder composed this KACCĀYANA-VANṆANĀ under the name Vijitāvī prefixed [with the honorific] “Mahā” (“Great”).<sup>1</sup>

### 7. RŪPA-SIDDHI<sup>2</sup>

This is the most useful and comprehensive of the works belonging to the Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa that teach the procedure for the derivation of words (*padasiddhikrama*). It was composed in Cōla country by venerable Buddhappiya, a student of the venerable Ānanda Thera who resided on the island of Lanka. They say that Buddhappiya was from Sri Lanka,

---

lopañāpanatthan” ti [Rūp C<sup>e</sup> 37] vuttaṃ. “sakhāto gass’ e vā’ [Kacc 113] ti ettha ca a ā i ī e ti [hite catunnaṃ sarānaṃ kameṇa lopo” ti (+ ca, Nm) [Rūp C<sup>e</sup> 37] vuttaṃ. TATTĪKĀYAṆ ca “saro sare ti avatvā sarā ti bahuvacanaggahaṇaṃ ekekasmim (ekasmim, B<sup>e</sup>) sare pare pi (pi *om.*, Nm) antasarānaṃ (anantarānaṃ, B<sup>e</sup>) akārādīnaṃ sabbesam pi lopo hoti (hotīti, B<sup>e</sup>) tesam bahubhāvāñāpanatthan” ti vuttaṃ. idam vuttaṃ hoti. nemittavantā (nemittantā, Nm) sarā bahavo honti catusaṭṭhimattā. nimittā (nimittantā, Nm) appakā aṭṭh’ eveti tasmā sarā ti bahuvacanaṃ vuttan ti. vuttañ ca. “sareh’ eva sarā pubbā luttā vācī parā ramā” (pareramā, Nm) [SADDA-BINDU v. 3] ti catusaṭṭhi ti vuttaṃ hoti. NYĀSE vuttanayaṇ ca tādisassa payogassa jinavacane adassanato (adissanato, B<sup>e</sup>) ti kāraṇaṃ vatvā paṭikkhittaṃ.

<sup>1</sup> Kacc-vaṇṇ (Nm 21; B<sup>e</sup> 429)

vijayābhiddhānapuramhi (Paṃyābhikhyātapuramhi, B<sup>e</sup>) ussittaddhajasannibhe (ñassittaddhajasannibho, B<sup>e</sup>) | laṅkato nandamūlādilenasīmādikehi ca (simā°, B<sup>e</sup>) ||

nadīpabbatavāpīhi khetthehi (citthehi, B<sup>e</sup>) parivārīto | nago abhayagirī ti sabbadisāsu pākato || haṃsāvātipurindassa pañcasetibhasāmino (pañcasetibha°, B<sup>e</sup>) | nattā (nattho, B<sup>e</sup>) yo suruccanā (surujanā, B<sup>e</sup>) ti nāmena pi (nāmenāsi, B<sup>e</sup>) supākato || akāsi yo etthāvasaṃ rammaṃ devasabhopamaṃ | vasati ettha yo thero sāsanassa hitāvaho || mahāsaddena sahitavijitāvī iti (sahitavijitāvīti, B<sup>e</sup>) nāminā | racitā tena therena eṣā KACCĀNAVANṆANĀ ||

<sup>2</sup> Franke 1902, 25–29. This work is not discussed in Pind 2012.

despite the fact he was the head of a number of monasteries in Coḷa country. It is not possible to give a precise date to the work, although we can say that it is earlier than the Sutta-niddesa, the Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā, the Kaccāyana-bheda, and Payoga-siddhi; later than the Cūḷa-nirutti-ṭīkā and Nyāsa; and that at the time a pure Buddhism was still in existence in Coḷa country. The Rūpa-siddhi is to the Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa what the Mahā-siddhānta-kaumudī is to the Pāṇini-vyākaraṇa (that is, the Aṣṭādhyāyī) and the Payoga-siddhi is to the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa. It is possible that this work was composed later than the Moggallāna-vutti and Saddanīti as it is not mentioned by either.<sup>1</sup> This work contains all the sūtras of the Kaccāyana, though it contains a great many procedures for word derivation not mentioned in either the Kaccāyana or Bālāvatāra.

In this work, new conditions have been added to complete certain statements in the Kaccāyana but such additions have been criticized by the author of the Payoga-siddhi. It is said in both the Kaccāyana and Bālāvatāra, for instance, that normally when there has been the elision of any preceding vowel, it is possible for a non-homogeneous (*asavarṇa*) substitute to replace the following vowel [p. 22]. In the Rūpa-siddhi, it is said that there is a non-homogeneous substitute only when the sound “a” is elided: *avaṇṇe eva lutte idha vuttavidhi hotīti daṭṭhabbaṃ* (“One should understand that the operation mentioned here only occurs when there has been the elision of the sound ‘a’”). The Payoga-siddhi, however, rejects the interpretation that it is only when the sound “a” is elided: *avaṇṇe lutte e o honti gāhanisedhanatthaṃ*... (“For the purpose of prohibiting the understanding that there are [substitutes] *e* and *o* [only] when there has been the elision of the sound ‘a’ ...”). Many statements included in the Rūpa-siddhi have also been articulated by the Mahā-siddhānta-kaumudī. The chapter on *ākhyāta* or verbal conjugation in the work is highly useful. The Nāma-varanāgilla, a work on nominal declension that is used nowadays, has also been compiled from the Rūpa-siddhi. The Rūpa-siddhi also uses mnemonic verses as examples taken

<sup>1</sup> While the Rūpa-siddhi is not mentioned in the Moggallāna-vutti, it is a source for the Moggallāna-pañcīkā and its date is therefore earlier than that of the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa (c. twelfth century). In this regard, see Gornall 2014, 520–21. Franke (1902–1903, 121) makes the same error as Subhūti and dates the Rūpa-siddhi after the Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa.

from the Cūḷa-nirutti-ṭīkā. As with the Kaccāyana, there are eight chapters in the work. The size of the work is more than seventeen recitations (*bhāṇavāra*) long. The Russian scholar named Minayeff who translated and published the Pāṭimokkha has now translated this work into his language (Russian) and is trying to get it published too.

There are a commentary and two Sinhala glosses (*sannaya*) for this work.<sup>1</sup> It appears that the commentary (no. 8) was composed later than the Sadda-nīti and yet earlier than the Nirutti-mañjūsā. The commentary has also quoted statements from the Nyāsa, Sandhi-nirutti-ppakaraṇa, and the Mahā-sandhi-ppakaraṇa and has raised objections to some of the statements in the Nyāsa. The commentary states, for instance, that one should not accept the statement in the *Nyāsa* that the plural of *sarā* in “*sarā sare lopam*” (Kacc 12) has the purpose of eliding several vowels simultaneously: *yaṃ pana nyāse vuttaṃ ekasmiṃ sare dviticitunnam pi lopo hoṭṭi nāpanatthan ti taṃ na gahetabbaṃ tādisassa payogassa jinavacane adassanato ...* (“One should not accept the statement in the *Nyāsa* that ‘[Kaccāyana says *sarā*] for the purpose of indicating that the elision of two, three, or four vowels also occurs [simultaneously]’, since such a usage is not found in the discourses of the Conqueror”). It is not said in what country or by whom the commentary was composed and there are no benedictory verses at the beginning.<sup>xii</sup>

The Sinhala gloss (*sannaya*) named Sandeha-vighātanī (no. 9) is the largest of the two Sinhala glosses but the copy that survives in the country at present only goes up to the *kāraka* chapter. Although the work is incomplete, the section that is available is more useful than the other *sannaya* and is larger than it too. The Sandeha-vighātanī explains the meaning of words and also in many places it provides an analysis of the words and the ideas behind them. In some places, it quotes from Pāṇini and the Saddattha-cintā [p. 23]. It is not possible to know at what time or by whom it was composed, though it can be ascertained that it was written after the other complete *sannaya*.

The complete *sannaya* (no. 10) was composed no more recently than four hundred years ago since it is quoted in the Pañcīkā-pradīpaya.

<sup>1</sup> See Franke 1902, 29. Franke only mentions the existence of a manuscript of the Rūpasiddhi-ṭīkā. No further information is given about this work and no mention is made of its Sinhala commentaries.

Although it is referred to as the “complete *sannaya*”, as it continues until the final section, it does not explain the meaning of all the words in the Rūpa-siddhi in order and omits explanations of some of the words in the middle of sections. The size of the complete work is forty recitations. The opening statement in the older *sannaya* is as follows:

For the purpose of giving the five (items of information about the composition)<sup>1</sup> such as its name, etc., at the beginning of the work, paying homage to the triple gem first, the venerable teacher Buddhappiya commences with two verses, the beginning of which is *visuddhasaddharmma* etc.<sup>2</sup>

The opening statement of the Sandeha-vighātānī is as follows:

In order to produce a work called the PADA-RŪPA-SIDDHI so that the dim-witted who have accumulated much merit may understand grammar, he first pays homage to the teachers for the purpose of removing the various perils, such as retribution, anger and death, which stand as impediments for the successful completion of the work as desired and for the purpose of accruing benefits such as the insight of wisdom. Praise is given at the beginning since, by means of such praise, the special virtues of teachers are established and, by the practice of such special virtues, one’s worthiness of praise is established, and, by one’s worthiness of praise, the (practice) of praise spreads, and, due to wide-spread praise, one’s duties will be fulfilled as desired. Therefore, paying homage first, [Buddhappiya] utters the verse *visuddhadhamma* etc.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Mogg-pt (B<sup>c</sup> 2, 9-12) describes the five components of an introduction as (1) paying homage to the triple gem (*ratanattayappaṇāma*), (2) mentioning the author of the work (*ganthakattu*), (3) the supports for the work (*ganthaniṣṣaya*), (4) the benefits for undertaking the work (*ganthārambhaphala*), and (5) the name of the work (*abhidheya*).

<sup>2</sup> Rūp-psn (Nm 23; C<sup>e</sup> 1):

prakaraṇārambhayehi ratnatraya praṇāma pūrvakavū saṃjñādi pañcakaya dakvanu piṇisa buddhapriyācāryyapādayanvisin visuddhasaddharmma yanādi gāthādvaya prārabdhavī.

<sup>3</sup> Sandeha-vighātānī (Nm 23; C<sup>e</sup> 1):

anupacita puṇyasamhāra āti mandabuddhīṅgē śabdalaṅkaṣaṇāva bodhaya piṇisa PADARŪPASIDDHI nam prakaraṇayak kaṭāṭi va prārambhayehi yathādhipreta prakaraṇayāgē parisamāptiyāta vibandhaka vū upapīcācāpāghātādi na-ikāntarāyangē nivāraṇaya da prajñāvagē pāṭavaya da yana evamādi prayōjana saṃsiddhiya piṇisa śāstrī praṇāmaya dakvanuvō stuti pūrvāṅgama (pūrvāṅgama,

The opening verses of the Rūpa-siddhi are as follows:

Bowing down to the Conqueror — the sole sun in the three Buddha realms, who possesses a thousand rays of pure Dhamma and has risen over the Yugandhara mountain of perfect enlightenment — to the true Dhamma and the Saṅgha, and paying homage to the teacher, Kaccāyana, I will create in the proper manner, by relying on the commentary on KACCĀYANA, a clear and well-composed PADA-RŪPA-SIDDHI for the purpose of educating beginners.<sup>1</sup>

Its closing verses are as follows:<sup>2</sup>

This correct RŪPA-SIDDHI was composed by a monk named Buddhappiya, also known as Dīpaṅkara — a student of the excellent teacher Ānanda *thera*, who was like a standard for Tambapaṇṇi (Laṅkā) — he (Dīpaṅkara) was renowned like a lamp in the Daṃḍi country, and being the chief incumbent of two monasteries including Bālādicca, caused the religion to shine forth [p. 24].<sup>3</sup>

---

Nm) praṇāmayēn śāstrhugē viśiṣṭa guṇayogaya da viśiṣṭaguṇayogayēn praṇāmārha (praṇāmārabhya, Nm) bhāvaya da praṇāmārha (praṇāmārabhya, Nm) bhāvayēn praṇāmāyāgē kṣetragata bhāvaya (prabhāvaya, Nm) da kṣetragata praṇāmayēn yathādhipreta kāryyāgē niṣṭhāva da siddha vana heyin stuti pūrvaṅgama (pūrvāgama, Nm) koṭa “visuddhasaddhamma pe” yanādi (yana, Nm) gāthāva kihū.

<sup>1</sup> Rūp (Nm 23; C<sup>e</sup> 1):

visuddhasaddhammasahassadīhitim | subuddhasambodhiyugandharoditam ||  
tibuddhahetkadvākaram jinaṃ | saddhammasaṅghaṃ sirasā hi vandiya  
(abhivandiya, C<sup>e</sup>) || kaccāyanañ cācariyaṃ namitvā | nissāya KACCĀYANA-  
vaṇṇanādiṃ || bālappabodhattham ujum karissaṃ | vyattaṃ sukaṇḍaṃ  
(sukhaṇḍaṃ, Nm) PADARŪPASIDDHIM ||

<sup>2</sup> This translation is adapted from Liyanaratne (1983, p. 115).

<sup>3</sup> Rūp (Nm 23; Rūp-ps C<sup>e</sup> 444):

vikhyātānandatheravhayavaragurūnaṃ tambapaṇṇidhajānaṃ (°bbajānaṃ,  
Nm) | sisso dīpaṅkarākhyo damilavasumatī (°ākhyaddamiḷa°, Rūp-ps C<sup>e</sup>)  
dīpaladdhappakāso || bālādiccādivāsadvitayam adhivasam (idha vasam, Rūp-ps  
C<sup>e</sup>) sāsanam jotayī yo | so ’yam buddhappiyavho yati imam ujukam  
RŪPASIDDHIM (rūpasiddhiyam, Nm) akāsi ||

11. BĀLĀVATĀRA<sup>1</sup>

This is the smallest work for the Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa that teaches the procedure for the derivation of words (*padasiddhikrama*). It is not as useful as the Kaccāyana and Rūpa-siddhi for the study of Pali grammar, since it was composed in an abridged form for ease of learning. Its *kāraka* section, however, is more useful and extensive than the *kāraka* chapters in all the other works. The work takes grammatical examples as its basis (rather than the *sūtras*) and, this being so, many of the *sūtras* of the Kaccāyana are not given as there is the inclusion of only those *sūtras* needed to form the examples. Included in the work, however, are many important and useful examples not given in the Kaccāyana. The Bālāvatāra has also quoted from the Saddattha-cintā of Ratnaśrījñāna verses such as *addabbabhūtaṃ kattādi* etc.<sup>2</sup>

The chapter on *uṇādi* suffixes given in the Kaccāyana is missing in this work. One's understanding of Pali grammar will be very limited if one only fully studies the Bālāvatāra and not the Kaccāyana, etc. This work has been used to study Pali grammar in Sri Lanka for a long time, though in Burma and Thailand it is the Kaccāyana that is used. This work has three *sannayas*, namely, the Liyana-sannaya, the Balana-sannaya, and the Gaḍalādeṇi-sannaya, a commentary on difficult words (*gūtapadaya*), and two other commentaries, though, of those, the commentary<sup>xiii</sup> that was composed in Burma is difficult to find. The **Liyana-sannaya (no. 12)** is a translation into Sinhala by a venerable Thera, who was a student of the venerable Mahā Thera Saṅgharāja Saraṇaṅkara, of the grammatical procedures given in the Bālāvatāra for deriving words and examples. Although there are a few mistakes in it, it is a very useful work for beginners. It begins as follows:

Paying homage three times to the Buddha, whose eyes are like open lotus flowers, I will compose the BĀLĀVATĀRA to aid the understanding of beginners.

<sup>1</sup> See Franke 1902, 24–25. Franke ascribes the work to a certain Dhammakitti Saṅgharāja and places this author in the reigns of Bhuvanekabāhu V and Vīrabāhu III (1372–1410). For more on this author, see Liyanaratne 1983, 52.

<sup>2</sup> On this work see, Dimitrov 2016, 565–98.

This is the opening of the work. This commentary was composed so that the good people who wish to learn the other *śāstras* and who are possessed of faithful intellect and who are devoted to and desire the growth and prosperity of the Buddha's teaching may understand without effort the grammatical procedures for the derivation of the words, in (examples) such as *lokaggo buddho*, in the book called the BĀLĀVATĀRA [p. 25]. The composition of this commentary was undertaken in accordance with grammatical science, having examined the grammatical procedures for the derivation of words in the SANDHIKAPPA [i.e. Kaccāyana] and RŪPA-SIDDHI etc., by a monk named Dhammajoti, a resident of the Okaṇḍapola monastery and pupil of the lord of ascetics, known as Vāliṅga Piṇḍapātika Saraṇaṅkara, who had risen to the position of *saṅgharāja* and who had thoroughly understood metrics, lexicography, grammar, Dhamma, and Vinaya, who possessed such virtues as moral behaviour, and who was renowned in his own country and abroad.<sup>1</sup>

The **Balana-sannaya (no. 13)** is a *sannaya* that explains the meaning of words in the Bālāvatāra. The **Gaḍalādeṇi-sannaya (no. 14)** is a precious *sannaya* composed by a venerable elder who lived in the Gaḍalādeṇi monastery, which explains the meaning of words (*padārtha*) and, in some places, the sense of the underlying ideas (*bhāvārtha*). It includes important facts from Sanskrit texts such as Pāṇini. It is also the most useful and important work among those texts that help us understand the Bālāvatāra. In the Burmese manuscripts it is said that the name of the author of the Bālāvatāra is Dhammakitti. Since the Kaccāyana-sāra-ṭīkā, the Saddattha-bheda-cintā and the Sutta-niddesa (of the venerable

<sup>1</sup> Liyana-sannaya (Nm 24–25):

buddhaṃ tidhābhivanditvā buddhambujavilocanaṃ |  
 BĀLĀVATĀRAM bhāsissaṃ bālānaṃ buddhivuddhiyā ||  
 yana mē grantha pramukha BĀLĀVATĀRAMVŪ prakaraṇayāgē lokaggo buddho  
 yanādi padasiddhi kramaya buddhaśāsanābhivṛddhi varddhanayehi tatpara  
 saddhābuddhisampannāśeṣaśāstrābhilāsī kalyāṇajanayanta nirāyāsayēn dāna-  
 gannā piṇisa svadeśa deśāntara prasiddha silācāra guṇagaṇāṅgasamgata  
 chandas nighaṇḍu vyākaraṇa dharmmavinayādyarthayan manākoṭa dattāvū  
 vāliṅga piṇḍapātika saraṇaṅkarāvhapratita saṅgharāja sthānāntarayāta prāpta  
 yatīśvarayanvahansēgē śiṣyavū okaṇḍapola āramavāsī dhammajotinam  
 bhikṣukenekunvisin SANDHIKAPPA RŪPASIDDHYĀDIYEHI padasiddhikramaya  
 vimaśā balā śabdaśāstrānukula koṭa mema vyākhyāṇaya kirīmaṭa prārambha  
 kaḷō.

Chapaṭa Thera) mention the work by name and quote verses and examples from it, the Bālāvatāra appears to be older than these works and must be more than six hundred years old.<sup>xiv</sup> We cannot be certain if it is more or less than a hundred years older than the Sutta-niddesa. I suspect that this work is older than the Rūpa-siddhi, though there are no facts to prove it. It is said in the final verses that there are seven chapters in the Bālāvatāra, namely, (1) *sandhi*, which is a combination of *sandhi* and *saññā* (technical terms), (2) *nāma* (nominal declension), (3) *samāsa* (compounding), (4) *taddhita* (nominal derivatives), (5) *ākhyāta* (verbal conjugation), (6) *kitaka* (verbal derivatives), and (7) *kāraka* (semantico-syntactic relations), and that the work is more than four recitations (*bhāṇavāra*) long:

There are seven chapters in the BĀLĀVATĀRA, namely, (1) *sandhi*, (2) *nāma*, (3) *samāsa*, (4) *taddhita*, (5) *ākhyāta*, (6) *kitaka*, and (7) *kāraka*. The complete work is in excess of four recitations long. May the BĀLĀVATĀRA increase the understanding of the people [p. 26].<sup>1</sup>

#### 15. BĀLĀVATĀRA-ṬĪKĀ<sup>2</sup>

The Bālāvatāra-ṭīkā was written in Sri Lanka but we do not know who wrote it. It is also not a very old work. It has quoted certain statements from the Nyāsa-ṭīkā, the Sadda-nīti, the Sutta-niddesa, the Kaccāyanabheda-ṭīkā, the Vinaya-vinicchaya-ṭīkā, and also from a grammatical work known as the Bījākhyā. The work's prose is not so elegant in some places. The author, though, has commented on both the words and the meanings and he has taken a lot of trouble to give extensive explanations of some of the sections of the work that he has understood clearly and to provide an analysis of the words in each *sūtra*. The size of the work is equivalent to the Bālāvatāra-sannaya, that is, not less than twenty-four recitations.

<sup>1</sup> Bālāv (Nm 25; I<sup>e</sup> 295):

sandhi nāmaṃ samāso ca taddhitākhyātikam tathā |  
kitakam kārakam kaṇḍā (ty addhā, I<sup>e</sup>) satta bālāvatār' ime ||  
sātirekehi catuḥ bhāṇavārehi niṭṭhito |  
BĀLĀVATĀRO janatābuddhivuḍḍhiṃ karotu hi ||

<sup>2</sup> Franke (1902, 24) mentions the existence of a *ṭīkā* but provides no further details.



The commentary on the *sūtra* “*nyattatā bhāve tu*” (Kacc 362, “And the [suffixes] *-ṇya*, *-tta*, and *-tā* occur in the sense of ‘condition’”) is as follows:

**nyattatā**: this is one [word], **bhāve**: this is one, **tu**: this is one. According to the division of words on the basis of their case ending, this *sūtra* should be considered to have three words. Out of the [different types of] *sūtra*, namely, (1) a rule defining a technical term (*saññā-[sutta]*), (2) a meta-rule (*paribhāsā-[sutta]*), etc., one should understand this to be an operational rule (*vidhi-sutta*). **bhāve tu**: in the sense of “condition” (*bhāva*). **nyattatā**: the meaning is “there is the suffix *-ṇya*, the suffix *-tta* and the suffix *-tā*”. In [the *sūtra*] the word *tu* has a conjunctive sense. **bhāva** is that due to which cognition (*buddhi*) and language (*sadda*) arise (*bhavanti*). **Due to which**: due to that which is the cause of the use of a word (*sadda-ppavatti-nimitta*). To explain, it is said:

A suffix in the sense of “condition” (*bhāva*) expresses whatever causes cognition (*buddhi*) and language (*sadda*) to arise.

In the RŪPA-SIDDHI, however, it is said that “*-ṇya*, *-tta*, and *-tā* designate a characteristic (*guṇa*) whose condition (*bhāva*) causes the use of a word with respect to a particular thing (*dabba*).” In this [statement], **a characteristic whose** means “a qualifier (*visesana*) whose” and **with respect to a particular thing** means “with respect to a qualified thing (*visesya*)”. It is said that “there are twelve suffixes used in the sense of a condition (*bhāva*) of a particular (*dabba*)” and, thus, with the exception of the five suffixes appointed by the *sūtras*,<sup>1</sup> the remaining suffixes, namely, *ttanaṃ*, *tthaṃ*, *tvam*, *tatvaṃ*, *ṇika*, *ṇiya*, and *ṇīla*, are to be understood from the mention of *tu* (and/but). In this connection, the BĪJĀKHYĀ states:

The *sūtra* teaches that there are five suffixes that are used with respect to nominal derivatives in the sense of “condition” (*bhāva*). The experts in nominal derivatives (*taddhita*) teach the remaining *sūtras* by means of the word *tu*.

In the KACCĀYANA, however, only the suffix *-ttana* is understood by means of implication. The NYĀSA-TĪKĀ, though, states that there are eleven suffixes, yet elsewhere it states that there are eight suffixes. The RŪPA-SIDDHI states that:

by splitting the rule into two, (thereby isolating) *nyattatā*, the suffixes *-ṇya*, etc., can also occur in the sense of the

<sup>1</sup> Namely, *ṇya-tta-tā* (Kacc 362), *ṇa* (Kacc 363) and *kaṇ* (Kacc 364).

object of an action (*kamma*) and in the sense of the nominal base (*sakattha*). With respect to the object of an action, the object of the action of heroes (*vīra*) is heroism (*virīya*). Likewise, there is “wife” (*bhāriya*), “dancing” (*nātya*), and “medicine” (*bhesajja*), etc. ... With respect to the sense of the nominal base (*sakattha*), *kāruṇṇa* (compassion) simply means *karuṇā* (compassion). Likewise, there is *pattakalla* (the right time) [p. 27] and *pāguṇṇa* (competent).

The suffix *-Nya* occurs in the sense of the nominal base among others (*ādi*) and *-tā* occurs [only] in the sense of the nominal base.<sup>1</sup>

The cause of the use of words, whether it be a name (*nāma*), universal (*jāti*), particular (*dabba*), action (*kriyā*), or quality (*guṇa*), is that condition (*bhāva*) due to which there is speech (*sadda*) and cognition (*ñāṇa*).

The syntactic construction [of the verse is as follows]: “That condition (*bhāva*) on account of which speech (*sadda*) and cognition (*ñāṇa*) arise is the cause of the use of words, whether it be a (1) name (*nāma*), (2) universal (*jāti*), (3) particular (*dabba*), (4) action (*kriyā*) or (5) quality (*guṇa*).” The import (of the verse is as follows): “that cause (*nimitta*) by which both speech and understanding arise is called a ‘condition’ (*bhāva*), and also that is fivefold, viz. name (*nāma*), universal (*jāti*), particular (*dabba*), action (*kriyā*) or quality (*guṇa*).” I will explain the details of the five-fold division, that is, name, etc., later under the topic of *kāraka*.

(1) The condition of the moon (*canda*), that is, moonness (*candatta*), [is a name (*nāma*)] and, in this connection, it is due to the name that the word “moon” refers to a particular moon. Cognition [arises] in accordance with the nature of the cause (i.e. the name). The import is that “the word ‘moon’ does not refer to a particular moon due to a universal (*jāti*), quality (*guṇa*) or action (*kriyā*) and that cognition arises only in accordance with the nature of the proper name (*saññā*), [which is the cause of the use of the word ‘moon’], and not in accordance with the nature of a universal, etc.” The cause for the use of words is called “a cause for the application of words” (*sadda-ppavatti-nimitta*). When a word refers to a particular it is called a “signifier of a particular”

<sup>1</sup> This sentence (*sakatthādīsu ṇyo sakatthe tā ca sakatthādīsu pi ṇyappaccayo sakatthe tāppaccayo ca hontī ti*), as recorded in Subhūti’s transcription, appears to restate the same information twice with the simple addition of the word suffix (*paccaya*) in the second half of the sentence. This being so, we take this to be a scribal error and we have simply given the sense of the statement in our translation without duplication.

(*dabbavācakatta*). When cognition occurs with respect to a particular it is called “arising in the sphere of a particular” (*dabbavisaye uppādo*). One should also understand it in this way later [in this work].

(2) Likewise, human-ness (*manussatta*) is due to the universal “human” (*manussajāti*), and it is in connection with that that the word “human” (*manussa*) designates a particular type of human. Cognition of the universal arises in accordance with the nature of the universal, which is a cause for the use of the [word denoting] the universal “human” (*manussa*), and it does not arise due to name, etc.

(3) By means of the *sūtra* “*yad*” etc. (Kacc 393, *yadanupapannā nipātānā sijjhanti* (“Those words that cannot be derived are to be established as given”), there is a shortening of the sound *ī* of the word *dabbī* (“he who has a particular”) [in the expression *dabbitta* “the condition of possessing a particular”]. The “condition of possessing a particular” (*dabbitta*) is due to the relationship between a particular and [another] particular, and it is in connection with that that there is the word *dabbī* (“he who possesses a particular”), since *dabbī* means “he who has a particular” (*dabbo assa atthi*). Cognition arises only with the relationship between a particular and [another] particular as its cause, in accordance with the nature of the relationship between a particular and the possessor of the particular that is a cause. It does not arise due to the name of a particular, such as a particular with the name “Devadatta”.

(4) Cook/chef-ness (*pācakatta*) is due to the relationship [between a particular] and the act of cooking (*pacana*), and it is in connection with that that there is the word “cook” (*pācaka*) since *pācaka* means “he who cooks” (*pacati*). Cognition arises with the relationship with the act of cooking as its cause, in accordance with the nature of the relationship with the act of cooking that is a cause. It does not arise due to a name, etc., [used] with respect to a particular [person], such as Devadatta, who is connected to the act of cooking (*pacana*).

(5) Blueness (*nīlatta*) is due to blue quality (*nīla-guṇa*), and it is in connection with that that there is the word “blue” (*nīla*). The cognition of blue arises in accordance with the nature of the quality blue which has become a cause, and it does not arise due to a name, etc., [used] in connection with a particular, such as a pot which has the colour blue.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bālāv-ṭ (Nm 26-27):

**ṇyattatā** ti ekaṃ, **bhāve** ti ekaṃ, **tu** ti ekaṃ. vibhatyantapadavibhāgavasena tipadam idaṃ suttam. saññā paribhāsā — pe — suttesu vidhisuttan ti daṭṭhabbam. **bhāve tu** ti bhāvatthe. **ṇyattatā** ti nyappaccayattappaccaya-tāppaccayā honṭi ti attho. idha tusaddo samuccayattho. bhavanti buddhisaddā etasmā ti **bhāvo**. **etasmā** ti saddappavattinimittato. tathāhi vuttam

The opening verses of the *Bālāvatāra-tīkā* are as follows:

Paying homage to the enlightened sun (i.e. the Buddha), who has risen

yena yena nimittena buddhisaddo ca vattate |  
taṃ taṃ nimittakaṃ bhāvapaccayena udīritan ti ||

RŪPASIDDHI-ĀDISU pana yassa guṇassa hi bhāvo dabbe saddasanniveso tadabhidhāne nyattatā ti vuttaṃ. tattha **yassa guṇassā** ti yassa visesanassa, **dabbe** ti visesye. dabbabhāve dvādasapaccayā ti vuttatā suttehi vihita-pañcapaccaye ṭhapetvā sesā — ttanaṃ, tthaṃ, tvam, tatvam, nika, ṇiya, ṇīla, ime suttapaccayā tuggahaṇena saṃgahetabbā. tenāha BUJĀKHYAM:

desitā pañca suttana paccayā bhāvataddhite |  
suttasesā tu-saddena desitā taddhitaññunā ti ||

KACCĀYANE pana upalakkhaṇavasena ttanapaccayo va gahito. nyāsaṭikāyam pana ekādasapaccayā ti vuttaṃ aññattha aṭṭhapaccayā ti. RŪPASIDDHIYAM “nyattatā ti yogavibhāgena kammani sakatthe ca nyādayo. kammani vīraṇaṃ kammaṃ viriyaṃ bhāriyaṃ nātyaṃ bhesajjaṃ” icc ādi. “sakatthe karuṇā eva kāruṇṇaṃ pattakallaṃ pāguṇṇaṃ” icc ādi. sakatthādisu nyo sakatthe tā ca sakatthādisu pi nyappaccayo sakatthe tāppaccayo ca hontī ti.

honty asmā saddaṇṇāni ti bhāvo so saddavuttiyā |  
nimittabhūtaṃ nāmañ ca jāti dabbam kriyā guṇo ||

asmā saddaṇṇāni hontī ti bhāvo so saddavuttiyā nimittabhūtaṃ nāmañ ca jāti dabbam kriyāguṇo ti yojanā. yena kāraṇena saddaṇṇaṇubho hontī so bhāvo nāma, so pi nāma jātidabbakriyāguṇavasena pañcako ti adhippāyatho. nāmādinam pañcakānam lakkhaṇam upari kārakāvattthāyam pakāsissam. yathā candassa bhāvo candattaṃ iha nāmasā candasaddo candadabbe vattate. nimittassarūpānugatañ ca ṇānam. ayam candasaddo jātito vā guṇato vā kriyato vā candadabbe na pavattati. ṇānam jātyādisarūpānusārena appavattitvā saññā-sarūpen’ eva pavattatīti adhippāyo. saddappavattinimittaṃ nāma sadda-payogassa kāraṇam. saddo dabbe pavattī nāma dabbavācakattaṃ, ṇānam dabbe pavattī nāma dabbavisaye uppādo ti. upari pi evam datṭhabbam. evam manussattan ti manussajātivāsā idha manussasaddo manussalakkhaṇadabbe. nāmādinā appavattitvā manussajātipavattinimittabhūtajātisarūpa-anugatañnam jātiyā pavattati. yadādisuttana (Kacc 393) dabbisaddassa ikārassa rasso. dabbittan ti dabbadabbasambandhā iha dabbisaddo dabbo assa atthī ti dabbī ti vuttatā. dabbena yuttadevadattādidabbanāmādinā appavattitvā dabbadabbassa sambandho yeva, nimittaṃ katvā pavattitañnam nimittabhūtaṃ dabbidabbasambandhasarūpam anuvattati. pācakattan ti pacanakriyāsambandhā iha pācakasaddo pacatī ti pācako ti vuttatā. pākakriyāya yuttadevadattādidabbe nāmādinā appavattitvā (+ pacanakriyāya yuttadevadattādidabbe nāmādinā appavattitvā, Nm) pacanakriyāya sambandhanimittaṃ katvā pavattitañnam nimittabhūtapacanakriyāsambandhasarūpānusārena pavattati. nīlattan ti nīlaguṇavasā iha nīlasaddo. nīlaguṇayuttapaṭādidabbe nāmādinā appavattitvā nīla-ñnam (nīlaguṇam, Nm) nimittabhūtanīlādiguṇasarūpam anuvattati.

in the sky of the world, to the Dhamma, a light that has struck through the darkness of delusion and spread, and to the virtuous Saṅgha, which is a source of merit etc., I will compose this commentary on the words of the BĀLĀVATĀRA [p. 28].<sup>1</sup>

16. CŪĀ-NIRUTTI<sup>2</sup>

There are two works that have this name. One of these is a very old work composed by venerable Yamaka Mahā Thera. The Cūḷa-nirutti must be even older than the Nyāsa, which is one of the oldest works among the extant Pali grammatical texts, since the Nyāsa mentions it by name. There is also a commentary on the Cūḷa-nirutti called the “Mañjūsā”, which appears to be older than the Rūpa-siddhi, since the latter quotes examples from this work, such as the following verse:

Addressing (*āmantana*) means getting the attention of an existent thing by means of a word. But there is not [the use of the vocative] when [someone] is being ordered. [For instance,] *rājā bhava* (“Become king!”).<sup>3</sup>

The older Cūḷa-nirutti states that there are only forty sounds (*akṣara*) in the Pali language and omits retroflex “ḷ”: “*akkharāni samacattālīsa ti vidham*”. Some verses from the work are as follows:

The grammarians teach that the manifest [sound] called the *niggahīta* is thought to be the connector between consonants and vowels. The sounds and the number [of sounds] are included by means of the word *api*. He (Kaccāyana) therefore uttered (*pakāseti*) the excellent word *api* in the middle [of the *sūtra*] (?).<sup>4</sup> The articulation [of sounds] is

<sup>1</sup> Bālāv-ṭ (Nm 27):

lokambare uditabuddhasahassaramsi |  
mohandhakārahatapatthaṭadhammam ābham ||  
puññākārādiguṇasamgham aham namitvā |  
BĀLĀVATĀRAPADAVANNAN’ imam karissam ||

<sup>2</sup> See Franke 1902, 29; Pind 2012, 107–10. Franke only mentions that the work is discussed by Subhūti. Pind (2012, 107) dates the work to the “second half of the ninth century”.

<sup>3</sup> Rūp (Nm 28, C<sup>e</sup> 506, 5–6):

saddenābhimukhikāro vijjamānassa vatthuno |  
āmantanaṃ vidhātābbe n’atthi rājā bhaveti tan ti (bhava iti, Nm) ||

<sup>4</sup> Ole Pind (2012, p. 107) has contended that Cūḷ-nir is a commentary on the Kacc. In support, this passage quoted by Subhūti from the Cūḷ-nir seems to be

four-fold, viz. (1) full contact (*phuṭṭhatta*), (2) slight contact (*īsaphuṭṭhatta*), (3) closed (*saṃvuta*), and (4) open (*vivaṭa*). The class consonants (*vagga*) have full contact [of the instruments] of articulation, i.e. tip of the tongue, middle of the tongue, etc., and *ya*, *ra*, *la*, and *va* have a slight contact [of the instrument of articulation]. All long [vowels] have an open [instrument of articulation] and short [vowels] have a closed [instrument of articulation]. The first of the class consonants are considered to be without breath (*anādavanta*) and very hot (*atyunha*) (?).<sup>1</sup> The second of the class consonants are considered to be with breath (*nādavanta*) and hot (*uṇhavanta*) (?). The third and fifth of the class consonants are with breath and very hot, and the fourth of the class consonants is also with breath and hot (?).<sup>2</sup>

### 17. ABHINAVA-CŪĻA-NIRUTTI<sup>3</sup>

The *Abhinava-cūḷa-nirutti*, that is, the “New” *Cūḷa-nirutti*, is a small work composed sometime after the *Nyāsa* by the venerable Sirisaddhammālaṅkāra Thera. It teaches new procedures for the derivation of words (not mentioned in the *Kaccāyana*) that are based on the

---

commenting, in part, on Kacc 2 *akkharā p’ ādayo ekacattālisaṃ*. The reference to the word *api* (*apikāra*) only makes some sort of sense in relation to the word *pi* in Kacc 2.

<sup>1</sup> As far as we are aware, the technical terms *nādavanta/anādavanta* (lit. with/without voice) and *unha/atyunha* (lit. hot/very hot, Sk. *uṣṇā*) are unique to the *Cūḷa-nirutti*. It is unclear to us in what sense these technical terms are being used.

<sup>2</sup> *Cūḷ-nir* (Nm 28):

byañjanānaṃ sarānaṃ tu sādharānaṃ idaṃ matam |  
 niggaḥitaṃ nāma jātaṃ niruttaññūhi desitaṃ ||  
 akkharāni ca saṃkhyā api-kārena gaṇhitā |  
 tasmā majjhe pakāseti api-kāram anuttaram ||  
 phuṭṭhattam īsaphuṭṭhattam saṃvutam pi tath’ eva ca |  
 vivaṭaṇ cāpi vaṇṇānaṃ karaṇam taṃ catubbidham ||  
 phuṭṭhakarāṇa siyumaṃ vaggā yaralavā tu īsakā |  
 dīghā ca vivaṭā sabbe rasso saṃvutakā ime ||  
 anādavanto atyuṇho vaggānaṃ paṭhamo mato |  
 uṇhavanto ca nādo vaggānaṃ dutiyo mato ||  
 nādavanto atyuṇho ca tatiyo pi ca pañcamo |  
 uṇho ca nādavanto ca tesam eva catutthakam ||

<sup>3</sup> Franke (1902, 29) mentions the existence of this work and also names its author as Sirisaddhammālaṅkāra Thera. See also Pind 2012, 107.

interpretation of “ca” and “vā” in the *Kaccāyana sūtras*. A few of the *sūtras* are explained in this work as follows:

**sarā sare lopam** (Kacc 12, Vowels before a vowel are to be elided): The mention of the singular [**sare**] has the purpose [p. 29] of excluding the mention of all [vowels] (?). In order to include consonants (*byañjana*), there is **sarā sare lopam** and **byañjanāni byañjane lopam** (?). For instance, *mohanassa* (“of delusion”) + *khassa* (“of a cavern”?) + *mālā* (“garland”) = *mekhalā* (“a girdle”); *bhavesu* (“among lives”) + *vantagamano* (“he who has renounced journeying”) = *bhagavā* (“the Blessed One”).

**kvacāsavaṇṇam lutte** (Kacc 14, When [the preceding vowel] has been elided, [the following vowel] sometimes turns into a non-homogeneous vowel): Why is **lutte** mentioned? The mention of **lutte** indicates that, when the preceding vowel has been elided, the following vowel turns into a non-homogeneous vowel. For instance: *muni* (sage) + *ālayo* (“abode”) = *munelayo* (“home of sages”), *īsi* (rishi) + *ālayo* (“abode”) = *iselayo* (“home of the rishis”), *rathi* (“charioteer”) + *āsabho* (“bull/chief”) = *rathesabho* (“lord of charioteers”).

**simhi gacchantādīnam antasaddo am** (Kacc 186, When the [nom. sg. suffix] *-si* follows, the *-anta* sound of *gacchanta* etc. becomes *-am*): By splitting the rule into two (i.e. by separating *simhi*), five different readings should be understood: When the [nom. pl. suffix] *-yo* follows, the *-anta* sound of *gacchanta* etc. becomes *-am*... When the [abl. sg. suffix] *-smā* follows, the *-anta* sound of *gacchanta*, etc., becomes *-am*. [For example:] “the travelling (*gacchanta* or *gaccham*) wise men meet” (nom. pl.), *gaccham* or *gacchantena* (inst. sg.), *gaccham* or *gacchantānam* (dat. pl.), “from the travelling (*gaccham* or *gacchantasmā*) person” (abl. sg.). By the mention of *ādi* (“etc.”), the *-anta* sound can also turn into *-anti*. Thus, *gaccham* or *gacchanti*.

**sesesu ntu va** (Kacc 187, When the remaining case endings follow, the sound *-anta* should be treated like *-ntu*): By splitting the rule into two (i.e. separating *sesesu*), words ending in *-anta*, except *gacchanta*, can also be treated like [words ending] in the suffix *-ntu* when the first case suffix follows. For instance: *arahā* (“worthy/Arahant”).

**kattari ca** (Kacc 288, The third case also occurs in the sense of the grammatical agent): The mention of *ca* (“and”) serves to indicate that the first case also occurs in the semantico-syntactic sense (*kāraka*) of the grammatical agent.

**tad assātthi ti vī ca** (Kacc 366, The suffix *-vī* occurs in the sense of “this is his”): The mention of *ca* (“and”) serves to indicate that the

suffixes *-so*, *-viya*, and *-iva* also occur in the sense of “this is his”. For example: “The family/clan (*kula*) is his, thus he is *kulaso* (‘possessor of the clan’); “The territory (*padesa*) is his, thus he is *padesaviyo* (‘possessor of the territory’); “The wheel (*cakka*) is his, thus he is *cakkivo* (‘possessor of the wheel’).”

**sabbato uṃ iṃsu** (Kacc 506, After all [verbal bases], there is [the substitute] *-iṃsu* for the [3rd. pl.] suffix *-uṃ*): The mention of **sabbato** serves to indicate that there are also the substitutes *-aṃsu* and *-esuṃ* for the suffix *-uṃ*. For example: *agamaṃsu* (“they went”), *adaṃsu* (“they gave”), and *pāturaheṣuṃ* (“they appeared”).

**bhujādīnaṃ anto no dvi ca** (Kacc 580, *na* occurs at the end of the verbal base *bhuj* etc. and [the suffix *-ta*] is doubled): The mention of *ca* (and) serves to indicate that *na* occurs at the end of verbal bases other than *bhuj* etc. For instance: *ramati tāyā ti ratti* (**ratti** “enjoyment”: One enjoys by means of this), *yujjati tāyā ti yutti* (**yutti** “connection”: One is connected by means of this), *vipajjati tāyā ti vipatti* (**vipatti** “misfortune”: One is hindered by means of this).<sup>1</sup>

The opening verses of the Abhinava-cūḷa-nirutti are as follows:

<sup>1</sup> Abhinav-cūḷ-nir (Nm 28-29):

**sarā sare lopam** [Kacc 12] ekavacanaggahaṇena sabbāggahaṇapayojanam kātabbam, byañjanasampiṇḍhanattham sarā sare lopam, byañjanāni byañjane lopam mohanassa + khassa + mālā, mekhalā — bhavesu vattagamano, bhagavā. **kvacāsavaṇṇam lutte** [Kacc 14] lutteggahaṇam kasmā? tena lutteggahaṇena sare pare lutte pubbo saro asavaṇṇam pappoti muni + ālayo = munelayo, isi + ālayo = iselayo, rathi + āsabho = rathesabho. **simhi gacchantādīnaṃ antasaddo aṃ** [Kacc 186] yogavibhāgena pañcavidho pāṭho ñātabbo, yomhi gacchantādīnaṃ antasaddo aṃ, nāmhi gacchantādīnaṃ antasaddo aṃ, namī ... smāhi gacchantādīnaṃ antasaddo aṃ gacchaṃ, gacchanto samāgatā paṇḍitā, gacchaṃ gacchantena, gacchaṃ, *gacchantānaṃ* gacchaṃ, gacchantasmā puggalasmā ādiggaṇena antasaddo antittam āpajjati gacchaṃ gacchanti. **sesesu ntu va** [Kacc 187] yogavibhāgasena paṭhamā-vibhattipare pi agacchantasaddo ntupaccayo va daṭṭhabbo arahā. **kattari ca** [Kacc 288] casaddaggahaṇena kattari kārake paṭhamā vibhatti hoti puriso kammaṃ karoti. **tadassāthī ti vī ca** [Kacc 366] casaddaggahaṇena so-viya-iva-paccayā honti tad assāthītye atthe kulaṃ assa atthī ti kulaso, padeso assa atthīti padesaviyo, cakkam assa atthī ti cakkivo. **sabbato uṃ iṃsu** [Kacc 506] sabbatoggahaṇena uṃvibhattissa aṃsu esuṃ ādeso honti agamaṃsu, adaṃsu, pāturaheṣuṃ. **bhujādīnaṃ anto no dvi ca** [Kacc 580] casaddaggahaṇena abhujādīnaṃ dhātūnaṃ anto no hoti ramati tāyā ti ratti, yujjati tāyā ti yutti vipajjati tāyā ti vipatti.



Having first paid homage to the three objects [of veneration] and to Kaccāyana, I will speak about language (*nirutti*). Pay attention to my words. The old work called the CŪLA-NIRUTTI composed by the ancients has been examined (*lakkhita*) by the learned Sirisaddhammā-laṅkāra Thera, who desires merit and cherishes good conduct. Through this merit, may I become a Buddha in the world. By this meritorious act, until I become a Buddha, may I have wisdom like Mahosadha, have wealth like Jotiseṭṭhi, and be charitable like Vessantara in life after life.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Abhinav-cūl-nir (Nm 29):

vatthuttayaṃ namassitvā kaccāyanaṃ ca pubbake |  
niruttim ahaṃ vakkhāmi vacanaṃ me nibodhatha ||  
puññakāmena therena sutena piyasīlinā |  
Sirisaddhammālaṅkāra itī nāmena yena hi ||  
porāṇehi kataṃ gandhaṃ CŪLANIRUTTISAÑÑITAM |  
lakkhitaṃ tena puññena sohaṃ buddho bhava loke ||  
iminā puññakamma yāva buddho bhavāṃ' ahaṃ |  
Mahosadho va ñāṇena Jotiseṭṭhi va bhoginā |  
Vessantaro va dānena hotu mayhaṃ bhavābhava ||

- <sup>i</sup> That is to say, “Kātyāyana”. This work is also called the “Vārttikapāṭha”.
- <sup>ii</sup> *aṭṭhakkharā ekapadaṃ ekā gāthā catuppadam |*  
*gāthā eko mato gantho gantho battimsatakkharo ||*  
*battimsakkharaganthānaṃ paññāsadvīsatam pana |*  
*bhānavāro mato eko aṭṭhakkharasahassako ||*  
 “Eight syllables (*akkhara*) make a metrical foot (*pada*), four metrical feet make a verse (*gāthā*), one verse is thought to be a composition (*gantha*) and one composition consists of thirty-two syllables. Two hundred and fifty compositions of thirty-two syllables are thought to be one recitation and one recitation consists of eight thousand syllables.”
- <sup>iii</sup> The example “*disā bhanti*” is not present in some manuscripts of the Saddanīti and the two examples “*vimissāsaṃ eyya paṇḍito*” and “*sace uppādo heyya*” are included.
- <sup>iv</sup> The example *ajjheyyāsi* is not found in the Sadda-nīti.
- <sup>v</sup> In some manuscripts there is the reading “*viññāyanti vadanti ca*”.
- <sup>vi</sup> *sambuddhāparinibbānāvāsse sahasatikame |*  
*sattāsītipāñcasate rājāhu parakkamabhūjo ||*  
 Saddhammasaṅgaha.
- <sup>vii</sup> In some manuscripts there is the reading “*puṇṇe gaṇe*”.
- <sup>viii</sup> In some manuscripts there is the reading “*ca vasse*”.
- <sup>ix</sup> In some manuscripts there is the reading “*nibbutā ’maṃ*”.
- <sup>x</sup> In some manuscripts there is the reading “*vikalabuddhijanānukampī*”.
- <sup>xi</sup> In many manuscripts there is the reading “*lakkhaṇavisesena yuttattā*”.
- <sup>xii</sup> They also state that Buddhappiya was the author of a smaller commentary on the *Rūpa-siddhi*.
- <sup>xiii</sup> A Burmese manuscript states that “the Bālāvatāra-ṭīkā was composed by Uttama Thera in Arimaddana city” (*bālāvatāra-ṭīkā arimaddananagare uttamatherena katā*).
- <sup>xiv</sup> It is also older than the Saddattha-bheda-cintā and the Kaccāyana-bheda-ṭīkā since the Bālāvatāra is mentioned in them as follows: “*Bālāvatāra-sambandhacintādisu napuṃsakam*”.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Dhammakaya Foundation and the Revealing Hidden Collections project, in particular Prof. Kate Crosby and Dr Andrew Skilton, for conceiving of and funding this translation. We are grateful to Dr Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Dr Aleix Ruiz-Falqués for providing critical feedback on a draft of this translation.

## ABBREVIATIONS

Abhidh-s-sn C <sup>e</sup>	Abhidharmārtha-saṅgraha-sannaya Siri Pannamoli Tissa, ed., <i>Abhidharmartha Sangrahaya with a Paraphrase</i> . Third edition. Ambalangoda: Wijaya Printing Press, 2469.
Abhidh-s-sv	Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha-saṅkhepa-ṭīkā (Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā)
Abhinav-cūḷ-nir	Abhinava-cūḷa-nirutti
Ap-a E <sup>e</sup>	Apadāna-aṭṭhakathā E. Godakumbara, ed., <i>Apadāna Commentary (Visuddhanavilāsini)</i> . Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1954.
As E <sup>e</sup>	Atthasālinī Edward Müller, ed. <i>The Atthasālinī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dhammasaṅgaṇi</i> . London: Henry Frowde, Pali Text Society, 1897.
Bālāv I <sup>e</sup>	Bālāvatāra Svāmi Dvārikādāsaśāstrī, ed., <i>Pāḷivyākaraṇa (Bālāvatāra) [Hindī Anuvādasahita]</i> . Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati, 2007.
Bālāv-ṭ	Bālāvatāra-ṭīkā
Cūḷ-nir	Cūḷa-nirutti
Kacc E <sup>e</sup>	Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa Ole Holten Pind, ed. <i>Kaccāyana</i> . Bristol: The Pali Text Society, 2013.
Kacc-bh-ṭ	Kaccāyana-bheda-ṭīkā
Kacc-s-n C <sup>e</sup>	Kaccāyana-sutta-niddesa M. Medhankara, ed. <i>The Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa</i> . Colombo: Vidyabhusana Press, 1915.
Kacc-vaṇṇ B <sup>e</sup>	Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā <i>Kaccāyana-vaṇṇanā</i> . Yankon: Zambu Meik Hswei, 1916.
Mmd B <sup>e</sup>	Mukha-matta-dīpanī <i>Nyāsapāth</i> , Yangon: Suddhammavati Press, 1933.

52	<i>Alastair Gornall and Amal Gunasena</i>
Mogg-pd C <sup>e</sup>	Moggallāna-pañcikā-pradīpaya Śrī Dharmārāma, ed., <i>Maudgalyāyana Pañchikā Pradīpaya</i> . Colombo: H.C. Cottle, Acting Govt., 1896.
Mogg-pt C <sup>e</sup>	Moggallāna-pañcikā-ṭikā Aggadharmābhivamsa Thera, ed. 1955. <i>Moggallāna- pañcikā-ṭikā</i> . Yan kon: Zambu Meik Hswei Press.
Nidd I E <sup>e</sup>	Mahāniddeśa L. De La Vallée Poussin and E.J. Thomas, eds., vol. I, London: The Pali Text Society, 1916; vol. II, London: The Pali Text Society, 1917.
Nm	Nāmamālā Vaskaḍuvē Subhūti. <i>Nāmamālā, or A Work on Pali Grammar</i> . Colombo, 1896. Reprint, New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 2001.
Nir-s-mañj	Nirutti-sāra-mañjūsā
Nyās-pd	Nyāsa-ppadīpa
Rūp B <sup>e</sup>	Rūpa-siddhi Burmese Chatṭha Saṅgāyana edition, CSCD. Igatpuri, India: Vipassana Research Institute, 1999.
C <sup>e</sup>	Baddegama Dhammaratana, ed. <i>Maharupasiddhi by Ven. Chola Buddhapriya Maha Thera with Sandehavighatani, a Sinhalese Paraphrase by an Ancient Great Scholar</i> . Weligama: Sathmina Press, 1936.
Rūp-psn C <sup>e</sup>	Rūpa-siddhi-purāṇa-sannaya Baddegama Dhammaratana, ed. <i>Maha Rupa Siddhi Sanna or Paraphrase of Maha Rupa Siddhi by an Ancient Pandit</i> . Peliyagoda: Satyasamuccaya Press, 1926.
Sadd E <sup>e</sup>	Saddanīti III Helmer Smith, ed. <i>Saddanīti: La Grammaire palie d'Aggavamsa, III Suttamālā (Pariccheda XX-XXVIII)</i> . Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1930.
Saddabindu E <sup>e</sup>	F. Lottermoser, "Minor Pāli Grammar Texts: The <i>Sadda- bindu</i> and Its 'New' Subcommentary." <i>Journal of the Pali Text Society</i> XI (1987): 79–109.
Sandeha-vighātānī C <sup>e</sup>	Baddegama Dhammaratana, ed. <i>Maharupasiddhi by Ven. Chola Buddhapriya Maha Thera with Sandehavighatani, a Paraphrase by an Ancient Great Scholar</i> . Weligama: Sathmina Press, 1936.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev and J.M. Shukla. *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1986.
- Bechert, Heinz. *Wilhelm Geiger: His Life and Works*. Colombo: M.D. Gunasena & Co, 1977.
- Buddhadatta Mahāthera, A. P. “Were there two elders by name of Chappada?” In *Corrections of Geiger’s Mahāvamsa, etc.: A Collection of Monographs*. Ambalangoda: Ananda Book Company, 1957.
- Crosby, Kate. “Sāriputta’s Three Works on the Samantapāsādikā”. *JPTS* 28 (2006): 49–59.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir. *The Bhaikṣukī Manuscript of the Candrālaṅkāra: Study, Script Tables, and Facsimile Edition*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Harvard Oriental Series 72, 2010.
- . *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind: On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati. A Philological Chronicle (Phullalocanavamsa)*. Napoli: UNIOR D.A.A.M., 2016.
- Franke, R.O. *Geschichte und Kritik der einheimischen Pāli-Grammatik und -Lexicographie*. Strassburg: Trübner, 1902.
- Franke, R.O. “Rūpasiddhi, Moggallāna, Mahāvutti, Vutti”. *JPTS* (1902–3): 113–25.
- Godakumbura, C.E. “Chapada and Chapada Saddhammajotipāla”. *JBR*, LII (Part 1) (1969): 1–8.
- Gornall, Alastair. “How Many Sounds Are in Pāli? Schism, Identity and Ritual in the Theravāda Saṅgha”. *JIP* 42.5 (2014): 511–50.
- . “Fame and Philology: R.C. Childers and the Beginnings of Pāli and Buddhist Studies”. *Contemporary Buddhism*, vol. 16, no. 2 (2015): 462–89.
- Guruge, Ananda W.P. *From the Living Foundations of Buddhism: Sri Lanka Support to Pioneering Western Orientalists*. Sri Lanka: The Ministry of Cultural Affairs, 1984.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. “Vinaya Commentarial Literature in Pali”. In *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism, vol. 1*, edited by Jonathan A. Silk, Oskar von Hinüber and Vincent Eltschinger, 430–41. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Lieberman, Victor. “A New Look at the Sāsanavamsa”. *BSOAS*, vol. 39, no. 1 (1976): 137–49.
- Liyanaratne, Jinadasa. “La Jinabodhāvalī de Devarakkhita Jayabāhu Dhammakitti: Édition du texte pāli et traduction française”. *BEFEO* 72 (1983): 4–80.
- Pind, Ole. “Pāli Grammar and Grammarians from Buddhaghosa to Vajirabuddhi: A Survey”. *JPTS* XXXI (2012): 57–124.
- Ruiz-Falqués, Aleix. “The Creative Erudition of Chapada Saddhammajotipāla, a 15th-Century Grammarian and Philosopher from Burma”. *JIP* 43.4 (2015): 389–426.
- Taw Sein Ko, ed. and trans. *The Kalyānī Inscriptions Erected by King Dhammaceti at Pegu in 1476 A.D.* Rangoon: Government Printer, 1892.



