

Pāli Grammar and Grammarians from Buddhaghosa to Vajirabuddhi: A Survey

I. Introduction

§ 1. Since the publication of R.O. Franke's study *Geschichte und Kritik der einheimischen Pāli-Grammatik und -Lexicographie (PGL)* in 1902 which constitutes the first and so far only attempt at writing an outline of the history and development of indigenous Pāli grammars, little research has been carried out in this vast and largely unexplored field.¹ When Franke wrote his monograph he did not consider historically important grammars like Vajirabuddhi's *Mukhamattadīpanī* (Mmd) mainly basing his study on Kaccāyana (Kacc) and Kaccāyanavutti (Kacc-v), Rūpasiddhi (Rūp), Moggallāna (Mogg), Moggallānavutti (Mogg-v), and fragments of Saddanīti (Sadd), nor did he attempt a more thorough study of the literature he chose to focus upon. Thus the limited textual basis of Franke's study sometimes made him draw conclusions which are no longer valid. Now that all important surviving grammars have been published, there is reason to make another attempt at writing a survey of the indigenous Pāli grammars in a historical perspective: first of all, Helmer Smith has published his monumental edition of Aggavaṃsa's *Saddanīti* which in many ways constitutes the culmination of centuries of indigenous Pāli philology. Other historically important works like Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa (Kacc-nidd) and Moggallānapañcīkā (Mogg-p) have also been published as well as a substantial number of minor grammatical works together with their commentaries.²

¹For studies in various aspects of the Pāli grammatical tradition, see von Hinüber, 1987; Kahrs, 1992; Pind, 1989; "Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I", *JPTS* XIII: 33–81; Pind, 1990; Pind, 1992; Pind, 1995; Renou, 1957. This article is a revised version of one first published under the same title in *Bukkyō Kenkyū* (Buddhist Studies), 26 (1997), pp. 23–88.

²For details, see *CPD* Epilegomena, 5. Philology (incomplete).

Consequently, the basis for evaluating the extant Pāli grammars has been widened considerably: it is now possible to study the statements of the Pāli grammarians in a more comprehensive historical context. This is especially important for a correct evaluation of their descriptive method: as a rule they would either formulate new rules or re-formulate the rules embodied in Kacc and Kacc-v so as to improve upon their grammatical description of the many phonological, morphological, and syntactical features of the Pāli. This was done on the basis of a comprehensive collection of examples from canonical and post-canonical literature.³ Thus the study of the Pāli grammars from a historical perspective is likely to shed light upon the transmission of the canonical and post-canonical literature.

§2. A substantial part of post-Kaccāyana grammatical literature is no longer extant. Thus we are only informed about important works through grammars like Mmd (see IV.3.1), Rūp, Rūp-ṭ, Mogg, Mogg-p, and Sadd which occasionally quote or discuss statements found in Mahānirutti (Mahā-nir) (see IV.2.2), Niruttiṭṭaka (Nir-ṭṭ) (see IV.2.4), Cūlanirutti (Cūl-nir) (see IV.2.5), Mañjūsā (Mañj) (see IV.2.6), Saṅgha (Sgh) (see IV.2.7), Mahāsandhippakaraṇa (Mahā-s) (see IV.2.8), Cūlasandhi (Cūl-s) (see IV.6.9), etc. Without these references it would have been impossible to form an idea of the history and development of Pāli grammar. Direct as well as indirect evidence indicates that these works have exerted a great influence on subsequent Pāli grammarians. Thus, for instance, Mañj affected the description of the *kāraka* system in Rūp, which in turn was used by Aggavaṃsa who copied verbatim several of the relevant paragraphs from Rūp.⁴ In those circumstances — there are many other examples — it is clear that the Pāli grammars have to be studied from a historical perspective, otherwise the context of certain of their statements or discussions remains incomprehensible.

³See Pind 1995.

⁴See, e.g. Sadd 714.10 (with insignificant variations in formulation) = Rūp 92.19ff.

§ 3. In addition to main works like Kacc, Kacc-v, Mmd, Rūp, Mogg, and Sadd, Pāli grammarians mention or quote many other treatises. Thus, for instance, Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa (Kacc-nidd) — no doubt the most important source of information on grammatical literature in the fifteenth century A.D. — quotes as many as twenty-five grammatical treatises in addition to well-known works like Nyāsa (= Mmd), Rūp, Sadd, and Mogg: 1. Akkharapadamañjūsā,⁵ 2. Akkharasamūha,⁶ 3. Aṭṭhakathā-atthadīpanī,⁷ 4. Atthajotaka,⁸ 5. Atthavinicchayaṇṇanā,⁹ 6. Atthavyākhyāna,¹⁰ 7. Atthavaṇṇanā,¹¹ 8. Kaccāyananissayappakaraṇa,¹² 9. Kārikā,¹³ 10. Ṭikāvyaḅhyā,¹⁴ 11. Therapotthaka,¹⁵ 12. (Mahā)-

⁵See Kacc-nidd 202,¹⁴⁻¹⁷: *Akkharapadamañjūsāyañ ca ekākhyaṭo padacayo siyā vākyam sakārako āmeṇḍitan ti viññeyyam dvattikkhattum udṭritam bhaye kodhe pasamsāyam turite kotūhalacchare hāse soke pasāde ca kare āmeṇḍitam budho*

tī vuttam; the second verse is quoted by Buddhaghosa from an unknown source in his cts.; see Pind 1989: 74–75; if the verse is part of the original work and not just quoted from the Aṭṭhakathās, the Akkharapadamañjūsā must antedate Buddhaghosa; perhaps it is an old Pāli kośa.

⁶See Kacc-nidd 155,¹⁷.

⁷See Kacc-nidd 126,¹⁷; the subject matter of this work appears to be the case system of Pāli; it is related to the Saṅgha (see IV.2.7); Kaccāyanasāraṭṭikā mentions it together with Mmd (*paramatthavinicchayo pana Aṭṭhakathādīpanīto Nyāsato ca gahetabbo*, 48,⁹⁻¹⁰) immediately after having quoted the relevant verses from Mañj (for which, see § 93) as a work dealing with the question of *paramatthavinicchaya*, presumably in the light of Mañj and the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās which occasionally quote verses defining the nature of the Two Truths, on which, see O.H. Pind, “The Pāli Verses on the Two Truths” (forthcoming).

⁸See Kacc-nidd 210,²⁰⁻²¹.

⁹See Kacc-nidd 188,³⁴.

¹⁰See Kacc-nidd 25,¹¹ and *passim*.

¹¹See Kacc-nidd 225,¹⁷⁻²⁰.

¹²See Kacc-nidd 187,¹⁵⁻²⁰.

¹³See Kacc-nidd 223,⁷.

Nirutti,¹⁶ 13. Niruttijotaka,¹⁷ 14. Niruttijotakavaṇṇanā,¹⁸ 15. Nirutti-
bījākyāna (= Bījākyāna ?),¹⁹ 16. Nyāsaṭṭikā,²⁰ 17. Nyāsapadīpaṭṭikā,²¹
18. Nyāsappadīpappakaraṇa,²² 19. Bālāvatāra,²³ 20. Bījākyā,²⁴
21. Bījākyāna,²⁵ 22. Bhassakārī,²⁶ 23. Mañjūsāṭṭikā²⁷ 24. Mukha-
mattasāra,²⁸ and 25. Saṅgahakāra.²⁹

§4. Among these grammatical treatises, Gandhavaṃsa only mentions
Atthavyākhyāna by Cūlavajira and Mukhamattasāra by Guṇasāgara.³⁰
However, the Pagan Inscription from 1442³¹ A.D. mentions not only
Atthavyākhyāna,³² Kaccāyananissaya,³³ Bālāvatāra,³⁴ Bījākyā,³⁵ and

¹⁴See Kacc-nidd 222,26.

¹⁵See Kacc-nidd 169,31-32.

¹⁶See Kacc-nidd 223,17.

¹⁷See Kacc-nidd 173,12.

¹⁸See Kacc-nidd 177,8.

¹⁹See Kacc-nidd 268,23.

²⁰See Kacc-nidd 103,27.

²¹See Kacc-nidd 40,22.

²²See Kacc-nidd 29,30.

²³See Kacc-nidd 135,9.

²⁴See Kacc-nidd 177,27-28.

²⁵See Kacc-nidd 245,15.

²⁶See Kacc-nidd 222,23.

²⁷See Kacc-nidd 138,20.

²⁸See Kacc-nidd 85,28-30.

²⁹See Kacc-nidd 126,4-6.

³⁰See Gandhavaṃsa: 60, 70 and 63, 73.

³¹List of works reproduced in M. Bode, *Pāli Literature of Burma*: 102-107.

³²See list no. 225.

³³See list no. 183.

³⁴See list no. 143.

³⁵See list no. 178: *Bījakkhyam*.

Mukhamattasāra,³⁶ but also other important Pāli and Sanskrit grammars.³⁷ Especially Athavyākhyāna must have been an important work, because Chapaṭa either quotes from, or refers to it twenty-eight times in Kacc-nidd. Particular interest is also attached to Bījākhyā, from which Kacc-nidd cites a verse, which has been interpolated in Kacc-v (see § 64).

§ 5. Faced with this overwhelming number of works and the regrettable fact that virtually no research has been carried out in this vast field, it is obvious that a selection has to be made in the context of a brief survey. Since there is no hope of understanding the history and development of Pāli grammar without knowledge of the works that in one way or another shaped the tradition, it seems justified in the present case to focus primarily, although briefly, on those works that belong to the formative period of Pāli grammar, that is to say, the period that stretches from the time of composition of Buddhaghosa's Aṭṭhakathās through the complicated history of Kacc and Kacc-v to the completion of Vajirabuddhi's Mmd, presumably in the tenth century A.D. The treatment is not intended to be exhaustive.³⁸ The main purpose has been to shed light upon important aspects of the early history and development of indigenous Pāli grammars.

II. Grammar in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās

II.1. Grammatical Terminology of the Aṭṭhakathās

§ 6. Buddhaghosa (fifth century A.D.) occasionally focuses on points of grammar in Visuddhimagga and the Aṭṭhakathās in order to explain a syntactical problem, a particular construction, or the derivation of a particular word or the like. The interesting thing about these grammatical analyses is that certain of the technical terms Buddhaghosa uses are without parallel in Sanskrit grammar. It is possible to show, how-

³⁶See list no. 151.

³⁷See list nos. 138, 141–80, 210, 220, 226–27, 245, 273, 290.

³⁸The author is preparing a comprehensive history of Pāli grammar to which interested readers are kindly referred when it is published.

ever, that in substance the analyses found in Visuddhimagga and the Aṭṭhakathās presuppose Pāṇinian grammar. Consequently there is no reason to assume with R.O. Franke³⁹ that these terms constitute the vocabulary of an old Pāli grammatical system used by the compiler(s) of the Aṭṭhakathās.⁴⁰ In fact, the rudimentary character of the vocabulary would seem to indicate that it was established for exegetical purposes, its nature being dictated by its relevance for the canonical exegesis and the wish to use a distinct Pāli terminology for this purpose, rather than with the intention of establishing a comprehensive Pāli grammatical system.

§7. The grammatical vocabulary that is specific to the Aṭṭhakathās is limited to (a) a peculiar phonological terminology, (b) a remarkable case terminology, (c) a term denoting the syntactical category of adverb, (d) terms denoting the four parts of speech, (e.a, e.b) two sets of terms defining four types of nominals, and (f) terms denoting words, sentences, and syllables.

(a) Certain of the phonological terms differ from Sanskrit terminology. They occur in a verse which is quoted and commented on at Sp 1399,19ff.⁴¹ where the question of correct articulation of the Pāli is discussed in the context of the *kammavācā*. Among the individual technical terms *sithila* “unaspirated”, *dhanita* “aspirated”, *niggahīta* “nasalized”, and *vimutta* “oral”, are without parallel in Sanskrit terminology; *dīrgharassa* “long and short”, *garuka* “heavy” and *lahuka* “short”, however, are common to Pāli and Sanskrit grammar, whereas *sambaddha* “bound together” and *vavatthitaṃ* “separated” merely relate to the connected or disjoint articulation of the words in a sentence. The term

³⁹See PGL: 2; 20.

⁴⁰See Pind 1989: 33ff.

⁴¹*sithilaṃ dhanitaṃ ca dīrgharassaṃ | garukaṃ lahukaṃ ca niggahītaṃ | ambaddhaṃ vavatthitaṃ vimuttaṃ | dasadhā vyañjanabuddhiyā pabhedo ti* (= Sv 177,1-4 = Mp II 289,17-20). For a study of this interesting passage, see von Hinüber, 1987.

niggahīta, which denotes a nasalized vowel articulated by checking the organs of articulation (*karaṇāni*) and without opening the mouth (*avivaṭena mukhena*), has been adopted by Kacc and post-Kaccāyana grammarians as a technical term equivalent to Sanskrit *anusvāra*. The grammarians, however, differ in their interpretation of *niggahīta*. Vajirabuddhi, the author of Mmd, interprets the term as (*saram*) *nissāya gayhati*, i.e., grasped by means of a vowel.⁴² Buddhappiya propounds the same view, but in addition he reproduces the definition of the Aṭṭhakathā, quoting a verse at Rūp 10⁴³ which defines *niggahīta* in such a way as to suggest that it is a versification of the definition at Sp. In contrast to Vajirabuddhi he also refers to *sithila*, *dhvanita* and the other terms at Rūp 1 (= Kacc 1),⁴⁴ thus evidently interpreting the remarks at Kacc-v 1 about *akkharavipatti*, i.e., failure to articulate the letters correctly, in terms of the *kammavācā*, which in the final analysis may have been the *raison d'être* of Kacc 1;⁴⁵ moreover, he uses *sithila* and *dhanita* at Rūp 11.⁴⁶ Aggavaṃsa appears to be the first Pāli grammarian who has integrated all the terms into his grammar.⁴⁷

⁴²See Mmd 17,3.

⁴³See Rūp 4,26–27:

*karaṇaṃ niggahetvāna mukhenāvivaṭena yaṃ. |
vuccate niggahītaṃ ti vuttaṃ bindu sarānugaṃ ||*

Quoted Mogg-p 9,22–23; cf. Sp 1399,30–32: *niggahītaṃ ti yaṃ karaṇāni niggahetvā avissijetvā avivaṭena mukhena anunāsikaṃ katvā vattabbaṃ.*

⁴⁴See Rūp 1,12: *sithiladhaniṭṭhādiakkharavipattiyaṃ hi atthassa dunnayatā hoti.*

⁴⁵Kacc-nidd 8,5ff. quotes three verses that connect the articulation of *niggahīta* with *kammavācā* and *ñatti*:

*padamajjhe padante vā patiṭṭhitaṃ anussāraṃ
ñattiyaṃ kammavācāyaṃ bhane niggahītaṃ vā
dutiyaḍo makāraṇaṃ upajhaggahaṇādisu
vaggantaṃ niggahītaṃ ti yathārahaṃ udīraye
saraṇagamanadāne niggahītaṃ makāraṇaṃ
avaggesu ñakārassa nādayo n' atthi sāsane.*

⁴⁶Rūp 5,5: *ettha ca vaggānaṃ dutiyacattuthā dhanitā ti pi vuccanti, itare sithilā ti.*

⁴⁷See Sadd §§ 14–21.

(b) The Pāli Aṭṭhakathās use the following set of terms to denote the individual case forms:⁴⁸ nom. *paccatta*, acc. *upayoga*, instr. *karāṇa*, dat. *sampadāna*, abl. *nissakka*, gen. *sāmi*, loc. *bhumma*, voc. *ālapana*. The term *ālapana* is the only one that has canonical status: it is used in the Vinaya⁴⁹ to denote the voc., and as such it has been adopted by the grammarians since Kacc, although they also use the term *āmantaṇa* (see § 70) in the same sense. As for the remaining terms they consist mainly of terms that are either innovations based upon canonical Pāli or terms derived from Sanskrit grammatical terminology. Thus the use of *paccatta* to denote the nom. is no doubt motivated by the semantics of Pāli *paccattaṃ* (Skt *pratyātmaṃ*), evoking the idea of the nom. as denoting any given thing individually, i.e., its character as such, and thus roughly corresponding to the concept of *liṅga*. The term for the abl., *nissakka*, is a verbal noun derived from *nis* + √*sak*, “to move away” — evidently coined as a counterpart to Skt *apadāna* — and is only recorded in Pāli as a grammatical term. However, the term expressing the loc., *bhumma* (n.) < Skt *bhaumya* or *bhūmya*, the case that relates to place, is recorded both as an adjective and a noun in the Pāli canon.⁵⁰ The remaining terms are related to Sanskrit terminology: *karāṇa* (ts.) (cf. Pāṇ I 4:42), *sampadāna* < Skt *sampradāna* (cf. Pāṇ I 4:32); the use of *sāmi* < Skt *svāmin* to denote the gen. has a counterpart in the discussion in Mahā-bh on Pāṇ II 3:50, where the expression *svāmitva* is used of the gen. relation *rajñah puruṣaḥ*. It is difficult to determine what motivated the use of the term for the acc., namely, *upayoga*, which means “use, utility” and hence “thing used” denoting what is useful from the perspective of the agent. There is no clear parallel in contemporary Sanskrit grammar.⁵¹ According to Aggavaṃsa (Sadd § 632) the term *ubbāhana* is used in the *sāsana* to designate the

⁴⁸For references, see the indexes in Sp VII, Spk III, and Mp V s.vv.

⁴⁹See Vin III 73.33.

⁵⁰See *PED* s.v.

⁵¹For the use of *upayoga* in the sense of “use, utility”, see Pāṇ I 4:29 and Mahā-bh ad loc.; for the use of *upayoga* in late sources, see Kāśikā on Pāṇ I 4 5:1.

partitive gen. or loc. (Skt *nirdhāraṇa*), but it has not been possible to trace it to any known Aṭṭhakathā or *īkā*.

(c) The origin and exact meaning of the term *bhāvanapumsaka*, which denotes the adverb, is obscure; the most likely suggestion is that it denotes a term in the neuter (qualifying) an action (*bhāva*), alternatively it might denote an action noun (*bhāva*) in the neuter. In the discussion at Sadd §590, Aggavaṃsa observes that it is used in the *sāsana*, i.e., the Aṭṭhakathās, etc., as the equivalent of *kiriyaṅvisesana* < Skt *kriyāviśeśana* denoting the adverb in Skt grammar.

(d) The Aṭṭhakathās divide the parts of speech (*padavibhāga*) into four categories, namely, *nāmapada*, *ākhyātapada*, *upasaggapada* and *nipātapada*. Most of them reproduce this division with minor variations in connection with the exegesis of the well-known canonical stereotype *evaṃ me sutam*, etc. Thus Sv 26,9ff. (on D I 1,4) identifies *evaṃ* as a *nipātapada*; *me*, etc., as *nāmapada*; *paṭi* (of the pp. *paṭipanno*) as *upasaggapada*; and *hoti* as *ākhyātapada*.⁵² There is reason to believe that this vocabulary belongs historically with the other terms. They occur in a similar classification of the parts of speech in Mahā-bh,⁵³ and may thus have been inspired by the Sanskrit grammatical tradition.

(e.a) This fourfold division of nominals is only found in Vism 209,29 from which it was copied verbatim at Sp 122,19ff. The four types of nominals are 1. *āvattthika*, referring to a specific state (in the existence of an entity) (< Skt *āvasthika*; cf. Buddhist Skt *avasthā*), e.g. *vaccho*, *dammo*, *balivaddo*; 2. *liṅgika*, referring to, based upon a characteristic mark (< Skt *laiṅgika*), e.g. *daṇḍī*, *chattī*, *sikhī*; 3. *nemittika*, referring to, based upon an attribute (of a person) (< **naimittika*, cf. Pāli *nimitta*), e.g. *tevijjo*, *chaḷabhiñño*; 4. *adhiccasamuppanna*, spontaneous (= *yadicchika*, cf. Skt *yadṛcchika*) like proper nouns, e.g. *Sirivaḍḍhaka*. The origin of this terminology is not known. It only occurs in a discussion of the word *Bhagavat* and therefore probably originated in an exegetical

⁵²For similar analyses, see Ps I 3,1ff.; Spk I 4,5ff.; Mp I 4,4ff.

⁵³See Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ I 1:1 (*Paśpāsāhnikā*): I 3,17; Renou, *Terminologie*: 383 s.v. *ākhyāta*.

context with the intention to establish a distinct Pāli vocabulary for this particular purpose. It would seem to combine features from Sanskrit sources and canonical Pāli.

(e.b) The same tendency comes through in the analogous division of names at As 390,²⁹ quoted in Paṭis-a 306,²³ ≠ Moh 110,³⁶. The terms are 1. *sāmaññānāma*, a name given by general assent, e.g. *Mahāsammato* (cf. D III 93,¹¹); 2. *guṇanāma*, a name expressing an attribute, e.g. *Bhagavat*; 3. *kittināma*, a name expressing honour, i.e., a proper noun given at the birth ceremony; 4. *opapāṭikanāma*, original name, i.e., a name that is unalterably the same in time and space: *purimakappe pi cando etarahi pi cando yeva*, As 391,¹³. The term *guṇanāma* is analogous to *na-imitikanāma* of the above list. However, except for the term *opapāṭikanāma*, which presumably imitates Skt *autpattika*, “original” — used, e.g. in Mīmāṃsā of the original relation (*sambandha*) between a word and its denotation⁵⁴ — the remaining terms cannot be assigned to any known context. Although this peculiar terminology is hardly ever used, it seems to belong in the Aṭṭhakathā tradition because it is also found at Spk I 95,^{7–8}.

(f) Sp 223,^{22–24} quotes a passage presumably from the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā,⁵⁵ which defines a rule of conduct (*sikkhāpada*) in terms of the collection of words (*nāmakāya*), sentences (*padakāya*) and syllables (*vyañjanakāya*) constituting it: *vuttam pi c’ etaṃ: “sikkhāpadan (Vin III 21,¹⁶) ti yo tattha nāmakāyo, padakāyo, niruttikāyo, vyañjanakāyo ti”*. The true meaning of this terminology was clearly not understood by Sāriputta who interprets them at Sp-ṭ II 33,^{23–25} as synonyms of *nāma* with reference to Dhs § 1306.⁵⁶ The terminology stems from Buddhist Skt literature and can be traced to Vaibhāṣika theories of language

⁵⁴See Oberhammer, Terminologie 2 s.v. *autpattikasambandha*.

⁵⁵See Sp-ṭ II 33,^{22–23}: *yo tattha nāmakāyo padakāyo ti idaṃ Mahā-aṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttan ti vadanti*.

⁵⁶*padaniruttibyāñjanāni nāmavevacanān’ eva “nāmaṃ nāmakammaṃ nāmaniruttī” ti ādīsu viya*.

which Vasubandhu criticizes in Abhidharmakośabhāṣya.⁵⁷ It is not clear why the term *niruttikāya* (= *nāmakāya*) has been inserted in the list.⁵⁸

II.2. Grammatical Analysis in the Aṭṭhakathās

§8. The most interesting grammatical analyses found in the Visuddhimagga and the Aṭṭhakathās are based upon Pāṇinian grammar. Their main interest is that they identify syntactical or other features of Pāli with similar features of the Sanskrit *bhāṣā* described by Pāṇini in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. In spite of the importance of these grammatical observations, the Pāli grammarians were slow at absorbing them. Only some of the exegetical remarks about certain uses of the cases were incorporated into the literature (see IV.2.7). However, as the grammatical tradition developed, some of the analyses were adopted by the tradition. Thus, for instance, Buddhaghosa's analysis of the syntactical constraints on the tense of the verb when constructed with the sentence complements *atthi nāma*, *kathaṃ hi nāma*, and *yatra hi nāma* are only treated by Moggallāna and Aggavaṃsa (see § 13), and in both cases in a polemical context with special reference to its treatment in Buddhaghosa's Aṭṭhakathās.

§9. Other interesting discussions were not noticed by the grammarians. Thus, for instance, the analysis at Sp 211,3-5⁵⁹ of *pitāmaha* as an adj. with elided *taddhita* suffix (= *petāmaha* < Skt *paitāmaha*) presupposing Pāṇ IV 3 74 + 77: *vidyāyonisaṃbandhebhyo vūñ*,⁶⁰ was never adopted by the grammarians. Nor did the analysis of the commonly used particle

⁵⁷See the debate with the Vaibhāṣikas recorded by Vasubandhu at Abhid-k-bh II 47ff.; see the translation by La Vallée Poussin, 1923-31, Vol. I: 238ff.

⁵⁸If, in fact, we are dealing with a quotation from the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā, it sheds an interesting light on this allegedly Sinhalese Aṭṭhakathā of the Mahāvihāra.

⁵⁹*pitāmahan ti taddhitalopaṃ katvā veditabbaṃ, petāmahan ti vā pāṭho* = Ps III 299,25-26.

⁶⁰See Sp-ṭ II 10,5-8: *taddhitalopaṃ katvā veditabban ti ... pitāmahato āgataṃ pitāmahassa vā idaṃ = petāmahaṃ*.

tena hi (= *vibhattipatirūpako nipāto*) at Sp⁶¹ find its way into the description of the Pāli particles at Rūp and Sadd.⁶² The sophisticated grammatical analyses, e.g. at Sp 204,25–32 and Sp 480,26–81,⁶³ apparently also went unnoticed, as well as many other interesting grammatical observations.⁶⁴

§ 10. Buddhaghosa's analysis at Vism 216,4ff. of a string of derivatives in *ika* occurring in the well-known canonical formula *svākkhāto Bhagavatā dhammo sandiṭṭhiko akāliko ehipassiko opanayiko paccattaṃ vedītabbo viññūhī ti*⁶⁵ is one of the few which has left its mark on the grammatical literature. The derivation *sandiṭṭhiyā jayatī ti sandiṭṭhiko* is based upon Pāṇ IV 4:2: *tena dīvyate khanati jayati jitam*; the alternative derivation *sandiṭṭhaṃ arahatī ti sandiṭṭhiko* is indebted to Pāṇ V 1:63: *tad arhati*; this is also the case with the derivations *ehi*, *passa imaṃ dhamman ti evaṃ pavattaṃ ehipassavidhiṃ arahatī ti ehipassiko* and *upanayanaṃ arahatī ti opanayiko*, whereas the analysis of *akālika* presupposes Pāṇ V 1:108: *prakṛṣṭe thañ*. Of these derivations Buddhapiya and Moggallāna only quote those on *sandiṭṭhika* and *ehipassika* at Rūp 360⁶⁶ and Mogg-v IV 29, respectively. Aggavaṃsa, on the other hand, quotes most of the analysis at Sadd §764 (≠ Kacc 352, 353).⁶⁷

⁶¹See Sp-ṭ II 211,16–17; Skt *vibhaktisvarapratirūpaka* at Mahā-bh (ad Pāṇ VIII 3 1): *vibhaktisvarapratirūpakāś ca nipātā bhavanti*.

⁶²See the *nepātikapada* at Rūp 88,20ff.; Sadd 886,22ff.

⁶³See Pind 1989: 54–56; 61–63.

⁶⁴For an overview, see Pind 1989 and 1990.

⁶⁵For a study of this formula, see H. Bechert, "A Metric 'varṇaka' in the Pāli Scriptures", in *Studies in Buddhism and Culture in Honour of Professor Dr. Egaku Mayeda on his Sixty-fifth Birthday*: 751–58, Tokyo 1990.

⁶⁶Rūp 151,23–24: *saṃdiṭṭhaṃ arahatī ti saṃdiṭṭhiko, ehi passā ti imaṃ vidhiṃ arahatī ti ehipassiko* (i.e.) *dhammo*.

⁶⁷See Sadd 787,15ff.

§ 11. Moggallāna and Aggavaṃsa are also the first grammarians to have taken notice at Mogg IV 74 and Sadd § 783, respectively, of the derivation of *kammaniya*, *kammañña*. They rely presumably on the Pāli *ṭikās* for their information, but the analysis itself presupposing Pāṇ IV 4 98: *tatra sādhu* is already found in As.⁶⁸

§ 12. As mentioned above Buddhaghosa describes the constraints of the complements *atthi nāma*, *kathaṃ hi nāma*, and *yatra hi nāma* on the tense of the verb which almost invariably occurs in the Pāli in the future tense, when constructed with them. He deals with (a) *atthi nāma* + fut. in Sp (= Ps), and Mp, (b) *kathaṃ hi nāma* + fut. in Sp, and (c) *yatra hi nāma* + fut. in Sv, Ps, and Spk.

(a) Buddhaghosa claims in two slightly different analyses at Sp 209,13–10,1 (= Ps III 297,14ff.) and Mp III 298,18–99,3⁶⁹ that the complement *atthi nāma* is constructed with the future tense according to whether the meaning is that something is not likely to take place, or is not to be tolerated. The analysis presupposes Pāṇ III 3 (145+) 146: *kiṃ-kilāstyarthesu lṛt*.

(b) Buddhaghosa states at Sp 288,12–15⁷⁰ that the future is used in the sense of the past in a sentence introduced by *kathaṃ hi nāma*. The analysis would seem to depend on Pāṇ III 3 143 (+ 142): *vibhāṣā kathami liṅ ca*.⁷¹ Sāriputta's commentary, however, shows that he identified the source with Pāṇ III 3 144: *kiṃvṛtte liṅlṛtam*.⁷²

⁶⁸See As 151,7: *kammaññatā ti kammasādhuṭā* (so read).

⁶⁹On which, see Pind 1989: 57–58; Pind 1992: 150–53.

⁷⁰On which, see Pind 1989: 58–60.

⁷¹Kāś, for instance, allows on the interpretation of *vibhāṣā* the construction *kathaṃ nāma* + fut. in the commentary ad loc.: *kathaṃ nāma tatrabhavān vṛṣalam yājaiṣyati*.

⁷²See Sāriputta ad loc.: *saddasatthavidūhi kiṃsaddayoge anāgatavacanassa icchitattā vuttam “tassa lakkhaṇam saddasatthato pariyesitabban” ti* (Sp-ṭ B^e 1960 II 117,14–16).

(c) Buddhaghosa addresses this complement twice in Sv, once each in Ps and Spk. In Sv 425,26ff.: *yatra hi nāmā ti acchariyatthe nipāto ... anussarissatī ti idaṃ yatrā iti nipātavasena anāgatavacanāṃ*, and Ps III 327,16: *yatra hi nāma vimhayatthe nipāto*, he underlines that it is the construction with the particle *yatra hi nāma* when expressing wonder that entails future tense of the verb, whereas Sv 569,15ff.: *yatrasadda-yuttattā* (so read) *pan' etaṃ anāgatavasena vuttaṃ* (cf. Sv-pt II 219,20–22) and Spk I 209,4–5: *yatrā ti nipātayogena pana anāgatavacanāṃ katam*, merely attribute the future to the particle *yatra*. These remarks can only allude to Pāṇ III 3 (+ 147: *yaccayatrayoḥ*) 150: *citrīkaraṇe ca*: “the affixes denoted *liṅ* (= optative) are used in construction with *yacca* and *yatra* also when the implied sense is wonder”. In these cases, the Pāli invariably substitutes the future for Skt optative, but the syntactical constraint is the same.

§ 13. Moggallāna defines the syntactical constraints of these constructions at Mogg VI 3: *nāme garahā-vimhayesu*: “[the future occurs] in construction with the particle *nāma* to express reproach or wonder”, quoting in the *vutti* the relevant examples from the canon.⁷³ It is clearly written in opposition to Buddhaghosa because in the *Pañjikā* he criticizes him, claiming that it is only the presence of the particle *nāma* as such that entails future.⁷⁴ Aggavaṃsa in turn criticizes Moggallāna’s view in his own analysis of *kathaṃ hi nāma* at Sadd § 893 on the grounds that it can be shown that *nāma* in itself has no restrictive force (*niyama*) on the tense of the verb. He thus appears to defend Buddhaghosa on linguistic grounds.⁷⁵ It is notable, however, that he does not deal with the other two complements.

⁷³Mogg-v VI 3 quotes in the following order: (illustrating reproach) Vin III 42,12–14; Vin III 16,5; (illustrating wonder) D II 130,33–131,3.

⁷⁴See Mogg-p 346,26; at 346,3–15 he quotes Sp 209,13–27 ad Vin III 16,5.

⁷⁵See Pind 1995: 295–97.

III. Kaccāyana (Kacc)

III.1 Authorship of Kacc

§ 14. Kacc undoubtedly represents the first attempt ever made at writing a Pāli grammar.⁷⁶ Its author, or rather compiler(s) (see § 17), is not known. The fact that the Sinhalese tradition claims that Kacc is composed by Buddha's disciple Mahākaccāyana is rather an indication of a fundamental uncertainty as regards its origin and authorship. This tradition can be traced back to the Apadāna-aṭṭhakathā (Ap-a), the only work among the Aṭṭhakathās and *ṭīkās* which mentions and quotes Kacc.⁷⁷ It is there claimed that Mahākaccāyana “expounded the three treatises Kaccāyanappakaraṇa, Mahānirutti-ppakaraṇa, and Nettippakaraṇa in the midst of the Saṅgha”.⁷⁸ It is not possible to determine when this tradition originated: it is taken for granted by Vajirabuddhi (tenth century A.D.), who quotes in Mmd a well-known canonical

⁷⁶The only quotation from the grammar attributed to Bodhisattamahāthera at Padasādhanaṭīkā 402,29–30 (*Bhadanta-Bodhisattamahāthero “naravaravacanōpakārāni cattālīs’ akkharānī” ti āha*), and the two quotations from the Māgadhissaddakalikā attributed to Sabbaguṇākara at Padasādhanaṭīkā 396,1–8 (*vuttañ cācariya-Sabbaguṇākarena Māgadhikasaddakalikāyaṃ “suttaṃ vyākaraṇaṃ ussuttābhidhānenādeyyattā, suttaṃ eva vyākaraṇasarīraṃ saddavippaṭṭipattiyāṃ pavattā yaṃ suttaṃ vinā agathitapuppharāsīmhi viya atthākyāne karīyamāne yāva suttaṃ na dassitaṃ, tāvad anuppādeyaṃ vacanaṃ bhavati, tasmā kāraṇā ti attho lakkiyalakkhaṇāni vyākaraṇaṃ añño ubhayāni samuditāni vyākaraṇaṃ nāmā ti Kaccāyano maññate iti*”) and Padasādhanaṭīkā 403,1–2 (*Sabbaguṇākaramahāthero “siddhakkamādādayo vaṇṇākkharā tiṭṭhisā” ti āha*), do not suggest that they are pre-Kacc grammars as assumed by Franke, *Geschichte und Kritik*, p. 2.

⁷⁷Ap-a quotes Kacc 406 at Ap-a 102,16–24.

⁷⁸Ap-a 491,17–21 (ad Ap 531): *thero ... puna satthu santikam eva āgato attano pubbatthanāvasena Kaccāyana-ppakaraṇaṃ, Mahānirutti-ppakaraṇaṃ, Nettippakaraṇaṃ ti pakaraṇattayaṃ saṅghamajjhe byākāsi*. In the study by James d’Alwis, *An Introduction to Kaccāyana’s Grammar of the Pāli Language*, Colombo 1863, the author cites a passage from Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā (Introduction: xxii) ascribing this passage to Mp-ṭ where it is not found; nor has it been possible to trace the passage to Kacc-vaṇṇ.

statement concerning Kaccāyana in explanation of his authorship.⁷⁹ A somewhat different account is found in Kacc-nidd according to which Kacc 1: *attho akkharasaññāto* was enunciated by the Buddha on hearing a bhikkhu mispronouncing *udayabbayaṃ* as *udakabakaṃ*;⁸⁰ it is subsequently put by Kaccāyana at the beginning of his grammar. The emphasis here is on the correctness of the pronunciation of Pāli, and thus ultimately on *sandhi*, the subject matter of the first chapter.

III.2. The Title of Kacc

§ 15. The question of the authorship of Kacc is not the only problem surrounding the grammar; the title is also a major problem. In general the work is quoted by the grammarians as *Kaccāyana*. Vajirabuddhi claims in his discussion of the title that the grammar is called *Kaccāyana* (n.) because it is the work of Mahākaccāyana, but then he adds that the grammar is also called *Sandhikappa*. He explains this by referring to a line of the introductory verse of the *sandhi* chapter: *vakkhāmi ... susandhikappaṃ*: “I shall set forth ... the chapter on excellent *sandhi*.” The reason is, he claims, that the title of the first chapter has been transferred to the grammar as a whole. The correctness of Vajirabuddhi’s remarks is confirmed by the fact that the phrase *sandhikappa niṭṭhito* is found at the end of mss,⁸¹ whereas the title Kaccāyana is conspicuously absent. It is not possible to decide whether originally the introductory verse was an integral part of the *sandhi* chapter or whether it was added later on. However, Vajirabuddhi’s remarks indicate that at least in the tradition they were considered to be

⁷⁹See A I 23,16–28: *etadaggaṃ ... mama sāvakaṇaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ saṃkhittena bhāsitaṃ vitthārena atthaṃ vibhajanānaṃ yadidaṃ Mahākaccāyano*.

⁸⁰For the cpd, see Dhṃ 113, 374; for the narrative, see Kacc-nidd 3,24ff.; this narrative offers a striking parallel to the story that is narrated in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin about a certain monk mispronouncing the cpd *udaya-vyayaṃ* at Dhṃ 113 as *udakabakaṃ*; for a discussion of the Mūlasarvāstivādin story, see GDhp, Introduction: 45ff.

⁸¹See Senart’s ed. of Kacc and Kacc-v 338: *sandhikappa niṭṭhito*.

Kaccāyana's own, otherwise it is difficult to explain why the work as a whole came to be known as *Sandhikappa*.

III.3. The Date of Kacc

§ 16. It is impossible to date Kacc with any degree of certainty, first of all because there is hardly any internal evidence that would give a clue as to when the work was compiled. Since the rule at Kacc 69: *ādito ca o* stating that after *ādi o* is substituted for the locative morpheme *smim*, only seems to apply to post-Buddhaghosa Pāli,⁸² this rule must have been composed at a time when this Sanskritism,⁸³ which is recorded in the Vin-vn,⁸⁴ had been well established, presumably in the sixth–seventh centuries A.D. If it is true that Kacc presupposes the Kāśikā (seventh century A.D.) (see § 28) it may have been composed in the eighth century A.D. This assumption would not seem to leave sufficient time for the comprehensive commentarial literature, namely, Kacc-v, Mahā-nir, Sudatta-nir, Nir-piṭ, Cūḷ-nir, and Mañj, to develop between the eighth and the tenth–eleventh century A.D., which is the approximate date of Mmd (see § 108). Since Kacc-v sometimes misinterprets Kacc (see § 52) it is reasonable to assume that it was composed at a time when the purport of certain rules was no longer clearly understood. Moreover Kacc-v presupposes the Kāśikā and thus presumably belongs to the eighth century A.D. (see § 49 below). Consequently it is more likely that the approximate date of Kacc is the seventh century A.D.

III.4. Composition of Kacc

§ 17. According to the account of Mmd, Kacc comprises four treatises (*pakaraṇāni*): 1. *sandhippakaraṇa*, 2. *nāmappakaraṇa*, 3. *ākhyāta-ppakaraṇa*, 4. *kibbidhānappakaraṇa*, divided into twenty-three sections (*paricchedā*): five *sandhiparicchedā*, eight *nāmaparicchedā*, four *ākhyātaparicchedā*, six *kibbidhānaparicchedā*.⁸⁵ The division of the

⁸²See CPD s.v. *ādo*.

⁸³See von Hinüber, 1986, § 327.

⁸⁴See CPD s.v. *ādo*.

⁸⁵Mmd 5,22–24.

standard text differs slightly: it consists of four main chapters (*kappa* = *pakaraṇa*), some of which are subdivided into sections and sub-chapters. Thus the *nāmakappa* is divided into five sections (*kaṇḍa*) and three sub-chapters: *kāarakakappa*, *samāsakappa*, and *taddhitakappa*.⁸⁶ This is also the case with the chapter on verbal derivatives, the *kibbidhānakappa*, of which the final section is called *uṇādikappa*. Mmd apparently presupposes the same division.⁸⁷ We must assume that this division reflects the history of transmission of Kacc. At the time when Dhammasenāpati composed his *Kārikā* it was customary to divide Kacc into eight chapters as appears from *Kārikā* 49: *sandhināmañ ca kāarakam, samāsataddhitākhyātakitañ ca uṇādikam*.

§ 18. Assuming that the verse introducing the first chapter of Kacc is an integral part of it, the grammar as a whole is marked by a conspicuous lack of compositional coherence. Thus the second chapter (*nāmakappa*) has no introductory verse. This contrasts with chapters three (*ākhyātakappa*) and four (*kibbidhānakappa*), which are introduced by verses in different metres in the standard version of Kacc. Of these verses, Vajirabuddhi only knows those introducing chapter four: the prefatory verses of chapter three have been added later on.⁸⁸ Unlike the other chapters, chapter three concludes with a verse in which the anonymous writer asks the learned readers to judge his attempt at making a short exposition of the verb for the sake of the (Buddha's) teaching,⁸⁹ the

⁸⁶See, e.g. *iti nāmakappe kāarakakappo chaṭṭho kaṇḍo*, Kacc 317 at Mmd 260.9; (E^c reads *iti kāarakakappe* (sic) *chaṭṭho kaṇḍo*).

⁸⁷See Mmd 265.39–40: *samatto Mukhamattadīpaniyaṃ kāarakakappo chaṭṭho paricchedo*.

⁸⁸Kacc-vanṇ 297.31–32: *imā gāthā hi Nyāsa-Rūpasiddhisu avaṇṇittā pacchāpaṇḍitehi thapitā ti vadanti*; the interpolation must have taken place before the time of Chapaṭa (fifteenth century A.D.) since he quotes them at Kacc-nidd 200.4.

⁸⁹ *sāsanatthaṃ samuddiṭṭhaṃ mayākhyātaṃ samāsato ||
sakabuddhivisesena cintayantu vicakkhaṇā ||*

verse is quoted and explained in Mmd.⁹⁰ Such haphazard composition would indicate that Kacc is a compilation by various hands.⁹¹

III.5. The Number of Suttas of Kacc

§ 19. There is considerable uncertainty about the actual number of suttas constituting Kacc. Vajirabuddhi claims that Kacc consists of 710 suttas: *suttāni ... dasādhikāni sattasatāni honti*.⁹² He quotes and explains 708, of which he considers 34 to be interpolations. According to this account, 674 suttas are supposedly genuine. He relates that “stupid persons⁹³ whose minds are confused by abridgements have interpolated some suttas here from Sudattakisivanirutti (see IV.2.3) and Mahānirutti (see IV.2.2), thinking that this sutta (i.e. Kacc 317) is deficient”. And he adds that “they do not appear in an absolutely clean copy of the original book”.⁹⁴ In the light of this information it is somewhat surprising that he incorporates interpolations in his account. Thirty-three suttas are interpolated in the *kāraka* section: three between Kacc 285 and 286, 287 and 288, and 301 and 302; twenty-nine between Kacc 317 and 318; one between Kacc 320 and 321 (see § 68). Vajirabuddhi also considers Kacc 245 to be an interpolation.⁹⁵

§ 20. The standard text of Kacc upon which Kacc-v comments comprises 675 suttas in the Sinhalese and Siamese versions, and 673 in the Burmese version which omits Kacc 244–45 from the *nāmakappa*.⁹⁶ This

⁹⁰Mmd 407,18–19.

⁹¹It is, of course, possible that the verses were added later on; but in that case it is difficult to understand why it was not done systematically. The unsystematic way in which they are added seems to indicate that Kacc is a compilation.

⁹²See Mmd 5,28–29.

⁹³Namely, the interpolators (*suttapakkepa*), see e.g. Mmd 264,34, 265,10.

⁹⁴Mmd 243,20–23: *evaṃ hi sūyate saṅkhepōpajanitavibbhantabuddhīhi mandehi ūnam idan ti maññamānehi Sudattakisivanirutti-Mahāniruttito kānici suttāni idha pakkhittānī ti. na ca tāni suparisuddhe purimapothake sandissantī ti.*

⁹⁵See Mmd 197,38–39: *na ... eso purimapāṭho.*

⁹⁶Probably influenced by Vajirabuddhi, who considers Kacc 244 to be unauthentic; see n. 83.

deviation from the other versions is no doubt reflected in Dhammasenāpati's account according to which there are 51 suttas in the *sandhi* chap., 218 in the *nāma* chap., 35 in the *kāraka* chap., 28 in the *samāsa* chap., 62 in the *taddhita* chap., 118 in the *ākhyāta* chap., 100 in the *kit* chap., and 50 in the *uṇādi* chap.,⁹⁷ in all 672 suttas. Three suttas are missing from the *nāmakappa*, which comprises 221 suttas in the Sinhalese version. No doubt Kacc 244–45 had already been omitted in those days, presumably on the basis of Vajirabuddhi's remark about Kacc 244. We are left to speculate, however, about the identity of the third missing sutta.

III.6. Variant Readings of Kacc

§ 21. There are hardly any recorded variants of individual suttas. The readings that Mmd presupposes differ only in a few cases from the standard text of Kacc, e.g. Kacc 356 reads: *samūhatthe kaṇ-ṇā*. Mmd and Kacc-nidd, however, presuppose the reading *samūhatthe kaṇ-ṇā ca*.⁹⁸ Mmd and the Burmese version omit *ca* at Kacc 436. Rūp, on the other hand, reads *ca*.⁹⁹ In fact, the often illogical use of the conjunction *ca* is a major problem for the interpretation of Kacc. One cannot exclude the possibility that some of the problems arise from a badly transmitted version of the original. In the case of Kacc 501 the original reading *dāssa dajjaṃ* which has survived in some manuscripts and editions¹⁰⁰ was changed so as to conform to Kacc-v which reads an optional *vā* into

⁹⁷Dhammasenāpati: (*suttaṅgaṇanavinicchaya*) 50–52: *sandhimhi ekapaññāsaṃ | nāmamhi dvisataṃ bhava || aṭṭhārasādhikaṃ c' eva | kārake pañcatālisaṃ || samāse aṭṭhavāsaṃ ca | dvāsaṭṭhi taddhite mataṃ || aṭṭhārasasatākhyāte | kite suttasataṃ bhava | uṇādimhi ca paññāsaṃ suttam etaṃ pakāsitaṃ Kaccāyanena therena ||*

⁹⁸See Mmd 313,26: *tipadam idaṃ*, cf. Kacc-nidd ad loc.: *cā ti samuccaye*.

⁹⁹See Mmd 359,18: *dvipadam idaṃ* (scil. *suttam*); Kacc-nidd 218,30-32: *katthaci potthake "bhujā ... pe ... atthesu cā" ti cakārasahitam pi atthi, evaṃ sati caggahaṇenā ti iminā sameti Rūpasiddhiyaṃ cakāro atthi; Nyāse pana n' atthi*.

¹⁰⁰See Mmd 394: "*dāssa dajjaṃ*" *kimatthaṃ idaṃ* (scil. *suttam*).

the sutta: *dā icc etassa dhātussa sabbassa dajjādeso hoti vā*. Both Mmd and Rūp follow this interpretation.¹⁰¹ Thus Buddhapiya has substituted *dādhātussa dajjaṃ vā* (Rūp 493) for the original reading. This was later on substituted for Kacc 501 in some manuscripts.¹⁰² Burmese and some Sinhalese manuscripts read *dādhātussa dajjaṃ* which clearly is an edited version of Rūp 493.¹⁰³

III.7. Kacc and Jinavacana

§ 22. The language which Kacc describes is, according to Kacc 50, Jinavacana, a term which is also used of the Buddha's sermons in Buddhaghosa's *Aṭṭhakathās*, in the essay devoted to the exegesis of the canonical phrase *evaṃ me suttaṃ*.¹⁰⁴ Kacc does not refer to the language of the Buddha as Māgadhī. This tradition, which can be traced to Vism 441,30ff. and Vibh-a 387,24ff., is summarized by Buddhapiya in a verse in Rūp.¹⁰⁵ However, grammarians before Buddhapiya may have used Māgadhā of the language of the Buddha. Thus Śrī Rāhula quotes in *Padasādhanaṭīkā* two verses from *Niruttiṣaṃvaṇṇanā* (= Mañj?) stating

¹⁰¹See Mmd 394,1ff.: *dā icc etassa dhātussa dajjādeso hoti vikappēnā ti nāpanatthaṃ. tipadaṃ (sic) idaṃ. maṇḍūkagativasena "haviṃpariyāyo lo vā"* (Kacc 490) *ti ito vāggahaṇam ihānuvattate*.

¹⁰²See E^e and J. d'Alw. *dādhātussa dajjaṃ vā* (= Rūp 493), cf. Sadd § 1005: *dāssa vā dajjo*.

¹⁰³This is, for example, the reading of B^eC^e2.

¹⁰⁴See Sv 31,7 = Ps I 7,16 = Mp I 10,17; Vibh-a 388,10: *Buddhavacana*; Ap 606,6: *Jinavākya*.

¹⁰⁵Quoted at Rūp 60:

*sā Māgadhī mūlabhāsā narā yāy' ādikappikā
brahmāno c' assutālāpā sambuddhā c' āpi bhāsare.*

This tradition is also reflected in an interesting Sanskrit verse which is quoted from an unknown source in Vism-sn 1037,37-38 explaining the term *nirutti*:

*niruktir māgadhī bhāṣā sā cārthān nāma saṃvṛtiḥ
keci dhvāna iti prāhur vijñaptiyākārasaṃyutaḥ.*

saṃvṛti = Pāli *sammuti*; for *dhvāna* and *vijñapti*, cf. *vāgvijñapti*.

that the Jina did not propound the Dhamma except in Māgadha.¹⁰⁶ Moggallāna, as is well known, refers to his own grammar as *Māgadhaṃ saddalakkhaṇaṃ*.

III.8. Kacc and Writing

§ 23. As appears from the description at Kacc 10: *pubbaṃ adhoṭhitam assaram sarena viyojaye*, of how to isolate words within continuously written text, Kacc presupposes the graphic practice of writing the final consonant in a conjunct below the line. Vararuci's Prākṛtaprakāśa¹⁰⁷ takes the same practice for granted.

III.9. Kacc and the Letters of Pāli

§ 24. Kacc 2: *akkharā p' ādayo ekacattālīsam*, enumerates 41 letters of the Pāli, although the rules only make use of 40 letters: Kacc does not use the letter *ḷ* (< *ḍ*) which is represented by *l*, also *ḷh* (< *ḍh*) by *lh*. Although most Kacc mss and editions are inconsistent as regards the representation of *l/ḷ* and *lh*, it is clear that Kacc did not count *ḷ* as a letter of Pāli, because Vajirabuddhi explicitly remarks at Mmd 10,38ff. that the author of the suttas (*suttakāra*) uses *l* in place of *ḷ*: *suttakāro pana tassa* (scil. *ḷakāra*) *ṭhāne lakāram eva paṭhati. dissati hi* “yavamadanataralā c' āgamā” (Kacc 35), “dahassa do lam- (Kacc 616) iccevamādīsu.¹⁰⁸ It is thus possible to deduce that Kacc 2 was compiled at a time when the distinction between *l* and *ḷ* was not preserved, and later on reformulated

¹⁰⁶Padasādhanaṭṭikā 401,13-17:

*dhammo Jinena Māgadhenā vinā na vutto
neruttikā ca Māgadhaṃ vibhajanti tasmā
neruttam eva munino vacanānukulam
icc ādaraṃ matimatā karaṇīyam etthā ti.*

Aggavaṃsa quotes the first verse at Sadd 924,4-5.

¹⁰⁷See Prākṛtaprakāśa III 1-2: *uparilopaḥ kagaḍatadapaśasām, adho manayām*.

¹⁰⁸For other examples, see, e.g. Kacc 381: *la da-rānaṃ*; Kacc 490: *havipariyāyo lo vā*; Kacc 591: *hantehi ho hassa lo vā adahanānaṃ*; see Sadd §§ 980, 1049-50; only one sutta, Kacc 267, uses *ḷ*: *bāḷhassa sādho*, which is probably a later correction to make the reading conform to later orthographic standards.

so as to correspond with the graphic practice of a later age. In those circumstances it is something of a paradox that the editors forgot to make the necessary changes to the relevant suttas so that the work as a whole would reflect the new orthography. It is an open question when this reformulation was made, but it is apparently an established fact by the time of the composition of Kacc-v. Other Pāli grammars, like Cūḷ-nir (see IV.2.5), evidently an old commentary on Kacc, and the grammar attributed to Bodhisattamahāthera,¹⁰⁹ state that there are forty letters in Pāli, and thus reflect the old version of Kacc.

§ 25. Since the use of *ḷ* is no longer preserved in northern India after the fourth century A.D.,¹¹⁰ whereas it is retained in southern India, it is difficult to explain why it is not used in Kacc if one assumes that it is a southern Indian or Sinhalese compilation. Since Kacc like Vararuci's Prākṛtaprakāśa uses *l* to represent the phoneme *ḷ*, it is possible that Kacc is not a Sinhalese or southern Indian compilation, but that it originated elsewhere.

III.10. The Sanskrit Sources of Kacc

§ 26. It is a well-known fact that Kacc is modelled on the Kātantra, a recast of Kaumāralāta, of which approximately 215 rules are reproduced in a more or less edited form in Kacc. In addition there are almost 300 suttas (including the overlap with Kātantra) that appear to be edited versions of Pāṇini sūtras.¹¹¹ It is thus obvious that the anonymous compiler(s) of Kacc have attempted to amalgamate Kātantra and Pāṇinian grammar. There may have been other sources. Thus one cannot exclude the possibility that Kaumāralāta, which occasionally describes Buddhist Sanskrit under the heading of *ārṣe*,¹¹² was known to the compiler(s) of Kacc. One also wonders why Kacc in a few cases

¹⁰⁹See n. 76.

¹¹⁰See von Hinüber, 1986, § 199.

¹¹¹See the concordances in Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa, ed. and trsl., by L.N. Tiwari and B. Sharma, Varanasi 1962 : 443ff.

¹¹²See H. Lüders, "Kātantra und Kaumāralāta", in Lüders, 1940, 546–61.

describes Prakritisms (see §39). Whatever the sources of Kacc may have been, the fact of the matter is that more than half the rules of Kacc are without obvious parallels in Sanskrit grammar, and in spite of occasional Sanskritisms, the grammar as a whole does not reflect Sanskrit usage and vocabulary.

§27. R.O. Franke has shown that several of the suttas that constitute the *kāraka* chapter presuppose Pāṇinian sūtras.¹¹³ This tendency is pervasive. There are, however, interesting examples of innovations where rules that evidently are based on Pāṇini sūtras have been reformulated so as to include instances that are not presupposed by Pāṇini, like, for example, Kacc 324: *tathā dvande pāṇi-turiya-yogga-senaṅga-khudda-jantuka-vividha-viruddha-visabhāg'-atthādīnañ ca*, which combines in one sutta Pāṇ II 4:2: *dvandvaś ca prāṇitūryasenāṅgānām*, 8: *kṣudra-jantavaḥ*, and 9: *yesaṃ ca virodhaḥ śāśvatikaḥ*. However, the terms *yogga* (“to be yoked”) and *visabhāga* (“different”) are commonly used Pāli words that have been adopted from Pāli literature to describe compounds that are specific to Pāli like *phālapācanaṃ* (Sn 77), *yuganaṅgalaṃ* (Sn 77), and *sīlapāññānaṃ* (M II 210), *samatha-vipassanaṃ* (A I 157,15), and *vijācaraṇaṃ* (Sv 268).¹¹⁴

§28. It is questionable whether Franke¹¹⁵ is correct in assuming that Kacc 302: *gati-buddhi-bhujā-paṭha-hara-kara-sayādīnaṃ kārīte vā*, which combines Pāṇ I 4:52+53: *gati-buddhi-pratyavasānārtha-śabdakarmākarmakānaṃ aṅīkartā sa ṇau, hṛkror anyatarasyām*, would seem to be based upon the Kāśikā, on the grounds that Kacc follows the Kāśikā by substituting \sqrt{bhuj} and $\sqrt{paṭh}$ and \sqrt{say} for the Pāṇinian *pratyavasānārtha*, *śabdakarma*, and *akarmaka*, respectively. However,

¹¹³PGL: 17ff.

¹¹⁴See Kacc-v 324.

¹¹⁵See PGL: 17–18.

Kāś also mentions other verbs that belong to each of the three categories,¹¹⁶ so it remains uncertain if, in fact, Kacc presupposes Kāś.

III.II. Technical Terms of Kacc

§ 29. Kacc uses a highly restricted number of technical terms. Some of them are evidently copied from the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās, like, for instance, *niggahīta* (see § 7 (a)) which denotes a nasalized vowel, e.g. at Kacc 8, 30, 37, 82, 379, but apparently also any given nasal, e.g. at 448, 468, 539. The phonological term *viparīta* is used at Kacc 79: *tabbiparīt' upapade byañjane ca*, 406: *tesu vuddhi-lopāgama-vikāra-viparītādesā ca*, and 519: *kvaci dhātu-vibhatti-ppaccayānaṃ dīgha-viparītādesa-lopāgamā ca*, to denote the phoneme *o* < *ava*, as well as *u* < *o*. According to Vajirabuddhi *viparīta* is an old technical term for *o* (< *ava*)¹¹⁷ which Kacc 50: *o avassa* describes as a substitute for *ava*. On the other hand it is also used of *u* < *o* before conjunct consonants.¹¹⁸ It is perhaps borrowed from □gveda *prātiśākhya* XIV.17 where it denotes the change of *r* into *i*.

§ 30. The case terminology is partly identical with the one used in the Aṭṭhakathās. Kacc uses *sampadāna* to denote the dative at 278, 295, and 313; and *sāmī* to denote the gen. at 285 and 303; *ālapana* denotes the voc. at 57, 116, 153, and 287. However, instead of *bhumma*, Kacc uses *okāsa* to denote the locative at 280: *yo 'dhāro taṃ okāsaṃ* and 304: *okāse sattamī*. This has no parallel in Sanskrit grammar and the Aṭṭhakathās and is probably an innovation. It is uncertain what might have motivated its use. It is likely, however, that it is based upon canonical usage. Thus, for instance, *okāsa* is used in the Vinaya, e.g. at

¹¹⁶The first category comprises, in the following order, √*bhuj*, √*ś*, √*ad*, √*khād*, and √*bhakṣ*; the second, *adhi* + √*i*, √*paṭh*.

¹¹⁷Mmd 338,35: *viparīto nāma okārassa porāṇakasāññā*.

¹¹⁸See Mmd 94,11-14: *tassa avasaddassa tassa okārassa viparīto hotī ti okārassa viparīto ti ukāro idha gahito, okāro hi dīgho tasmā tassa rassabhūto ukāro viparīto, tassa ca ukārokāro. akārādīnam pi es' eva nayo*.

Vin I 94,9,¹¹⁹ in the sense of place which is semantically parallel to the Aṭṭhakathā term *bhumma* (see §7 (b)). The remaining case terms are related to Skt: *liṅga* denotes the nom. at Kacc 286, *kamma* the acc. at Kacc 282 and 299, *karāṇa* the instr. at Kacc 281 and 288, and *apādāna* the abl. at Kacc 273.

§31. Kacc has coined a set of algebraic terms denoting inflectional classes of nominals: *jha* denotes masculine stems in *i* and *ī* (Kacc 58), *la* masculine stems in *u* and *ū* (Kacc 58); *pa* denotes fem. stems in *i*, *ī* and *u*, *ū* (Kacc 59); *gha* stands for fem. stems in *ā* (Kacc 60), and *ga* denotes voc. sg. (Kacc 57).

III.12. The Descriptive Technique of Kacc

§32. As one would expect, Kacc as a whole imitates the standard descriptive technique of the Kātantra. The substitution of an item or the final element of an item is expressed by gen. (X-nom. replaces Y-gen.), e.g. Kacc 48: *kvaci paṭi patissa* and Kacc 76: *āvass' u vā*. In a few cases substituend and substituendum are simply juxtaposed in the nom., e.g. at Kacc 44: *abbho abhi*. Phonemic or morphophonemic changes are usually expressed by means of the acc. (X-nom. replaces Y-acc.), e.g. Kacc 21: *ivaṇṇo yaṃ na vā* and Kacc 220: *sesato lopam ga-si pi*. In rare cases such changes are formulated by juxtaposition of the elements in question, e.g. at Kacc 470: *ṭhā tiṭṭho*. The loc. denotes operations applying to what precedes, e.g. Kacc 24: *sare kvaci*, the abl. denotes operations that apply to what follows, e.g. Kacc 452: *gahādito ppa-ṇhā*.

§33. Although Kacc uses the descriptive technique of the Kātantra, the logical ordering and formulation of the suttas cause numerous problems of interpretation. Very often a problem is caused by non-standard use of the conjunction *ca* or the disjunction *vā*. Thus, for instance, the use of *ca* at Kacc 20: *do dhassa ca*, is incomprehensible as the rule is without relation to Kacc 19: *sabbo can ti*. The technical use of *vā* is normally to express an option. However, at Kacc 13 *vā* is apparently used as

¹¹⁹ *amumhi okāse tiṭṭhāhi*; for other references, see CPD s.v. ¹okāsa I.a.

equivalent with *kvaci* which occurs in the following rule. In fact, the two terms are apparently used interchangeably, thus making the exact scope of a rule difficult to interpret. For instance, the supposed option expressed by *na vā* at Kacc 21: *ivaṇṇo yaṃ na vā*, is correctly interpreted by Rūp 21 as synonymous with *kvaci*,¹²⁰ in spite of Kacc-v which takes it as “optional”, which clearly makes no sense in the context of the examples. In other cases *vā* appears to have no precise value at all, such as Kacc 281: *yena vā kayirate taṃ karaṇaṃ*, which is modelled upon Kāt II 4:12: *yena kriyate tat karaṇaṃ*, and 285: *yassa vā pariggaho taṃ sāmī*.¹²¹ In the first case Kacc-v takes *vā* to mean “optionally” adding *yena vā passati* and *yena vā suṇāti* to *yena vā kayirate*, but ignores the *vā* of Kacc 285.

§ 34. In some cases the suttas are inconsistent in the way they refer to the Pāli roots. For instance, \sqrt{gam} is referred to in the form *gamu* (< Skt *gamḷ*, cf. Skt Dhāthup I 1013) at Kacc 503, *gami* at 478, and *gama* at 546, 588, 598; and \sqrt{dis} (< Skt *ḍṛś*) also occurs in the form \sqrt{dus} at Kacc 644.

III.13. Kacc and the Description of Pāli

III.13.1. The Grammatical Rules of Kacc

§ 35. Considering the modest scope of Kacc it is surprising how many linguistic features of Pāli it describes. The *sandhi* chapter deals with the main junctional features of the language, even a comparatively rare instance of *sandhi* like, e.g. the one described at Kacc 17: *yaṃ edantass' ādeso*, stating that “[in some cases] *y* is substituted for final *e*”. Kacc-v illustrates this rule by quoting two canonical examples: *adhigato kho my āyaṃ dhammo* (Vin I 4,33) and *ty āhaṃ evaṃ vadeyyaṃ* (M I 13,1). Sometimes a rule appears to describe features that, quite apart from the fact that they are misunderstood, hardly ever occur. Thus Kacc 36: *kvaci o byañjane* is supposed to describe the word *atippago* at D I 178,10, which is analysed *atippag + o + C*, *o* being

¹²⁰*navāsaddo kvacisaddapariyāyo*.

¹²¹Senart has discussed most of the cases in his edition and translation.

interpreted as *āgama*. Kacc-v quotes *parosahassam* (sic) at S I 192,30 as another example.

§ 36. Most of the nominal and pronominal paradigms as well as the various case forms of the numerals have been dealt with in the *nāma-kappa*; even forms that are comparatively rare are recorded. Thus, for instance, the gen. pl. of the numeral *ti* viz. *tiṇṇannaṃ* is described at Kacc 87: *iṇṇaṃ iṇṇannaṃ tīhi samkhyāhi*. Only 11 canonical instances of this form have been recorded.¹²² It is therefore surprising that another rare canonical form like *tissannaṃ*, fem. pl. of *ti*, is not described. In the chapter on verbs Kacc describes most of the inflectional classes including present stems in *e* at Kacc 512 (*lopañ c' ettam akāro*) and records at Kacc 501 (*dā-dhātussa dajjam vā*) and 502 (*vadassa vajjam*) new present stems like *dajja* and *vajja*. A rule like Kacc 472: *ñāssa jā-jana-nā*, stating that “*jā*, *jan*, and *nā* are substituted for the root *ñā*” is surprising. Kacc-v quotes the form *nāyati* as an example of the substitute root *nā*. Only two canonical examples of this form are recorded, namely, at Ja II 442,16 and Vin V 86,6.¹²³

§ 37. It is remarkable that Kacc describes the Vinaya technical term *āgantuka* and its antonym *gamika* which are addressed in two consecutive rules at Kacc 571–72: *āgamā tuko, bhabbe ika*. The interesting point is that *gamika* (secondary < *gamin* + *ka* ?) is defined in accordance with the semantic value it has in the Vinaya where it denotes a *bhikkhu* who intends to leave to go somewhere else.¹²⁴ It is semantically related to Skt *gamin* to which Pāṇ III 3:3 (*bhaviṣyati gamyādayaḥ*) ascribes the same value. Although the context indicates that Kacc 572 is to be interpreted with reference to the semantical value of *gamika*, the awkward formulation of the rule avoiding any reference to the fact that *ika* is added to *gam*, perhaps indicates that it has been copied from another

¹²²See *PTC* s.v.

¹²³See the form *panāyati* at D II 21,2, 3 (= *jānāti passati nāyati vā pavattetī ti attho*, Sv 454,6), probably an eastern form from *pra* + √*jñā*.

¹²⁴See Abh 424 *aññattha gantum icchati gamiko*; see *BHSD* s.v.

grammar in the context of which this was made clear. A possible model would be Kaumāralāta.

III.13.2. Rules Describing Forms That Are Not Instantiated

§ 38. Since the grammar to a large extent describes the language of the canon, it is somewhat of a paradox that Kacc occasionally formulates rules describing forms that are not instantiated. Thus, for instance, Kacc 42 (*go sare puthass' āgamo kvaci*) states that “in some cases the final *a* of *putha* gets the augment *g* before a vowel”. The *vutti* quotes the example *puthag eva* which is recorded neither in the canon nor in the *Aṭṭhakathās*. It is difficult to believe, however, that Kacc describes occurrences that are not instantiated. Rūp quotes the following example in another context: *ariyehi puthag evāyaṃ jano*,¹²⁵ which defines the term *puthujjana* in terms that are well known from Sv, although Sv uses *puthu* for *puthag*.¹²⁶ This or similar examples may have been the *raison d'être* of this rule. The related rule Kacc 49: *puthass' u byañjane* “*u* is substituted for final *a* of *putha* before a consonant” evidently addresses forms like *puthujjana* = Skt *prthagjana*. Like Kacc 42 it is only understandable on the assumption that the analysis *putha(g)* or *puthu*^o < Skt *prthag* was known to the anonymous author of the *sandhi* chapter. Instances like these leave the impression that the notion of Jinavacana covers more than just the canon. The same observation also applies to the Sanskritism *ādo* loc. of *ādi* recorded at Kacc 69. This form is not found in Buddhaghosa's *Aṭṭhakathās*. According to Kacc 95: *aggiss' ini, ini* is substituted for the final *i* of *aggi* > *aggini*. The *vutti* quotes examples that are not recorded elsewhere.

§ 39. A few rules describe Prakritisms that are not attested in the extant literature. Kacc 452: *gahādito ppa-ṇhā* states that “after the roots *gah*, etc., follow *pp* and *ṇh*”, and Kacc 491: *gahassa ghe ppe* that “*ghe* is

¹²⁵Rūp 106,2; cf. Sadd 703,19–21 ad § 564: *visumputhuyoge*.

¹²⁶See, e.g. Sv 59,29: *puthu ... ariyehi janehī ti puthujjano*; Mogg: III 69: *jane puthass' u. jane uttarapade puthussa u hoti: ariyehi puthag evāyaṃ jano ti puthujjano*.

substituted for *gah* before *pp*".¹²⁷ A similar rule is found in Vararuci's Prākṛtaprakāśa VII 58: *graher gheppaḥ*.¹²⁸ Another Prakritism is described at Kacc 503: *gamussa ghammaṃ* (= Rūp 427 ≠ Sadd § 1013)¹²⁹ teaching that \sqrt{ghamm} is substituted for \sqrt{gam} .¹³⁰ Kacc 392 formulates the rule that *cu* or *co* is optionally substituted for *catu* in composition. The vutti quotes as examples the forms *cuddasa*, *coddasa*, *catuddasa*. Although the form *cuddasa* is attested in the canon (see PTC s.v.) there are no examples of *coddasa*. The latter, however, is common in Prakrit.¹³¹ It is uncertain how to interpret these isolated instances, but they indicate, together with the other examples, that the historical background of Kacc is extremely complicated.

III.13.3. Kacc and the grammatical Annotations of the Aṭṭhakathās

§ 40. Although Kacc has borrowed a couple of its case designations from the Aṭṭhakathās, there is no clear indication that the work as such is written in the tradition of the Aṭṭhakathās. On the contrary, it seems to have been written more or less independently of the commentarial literature. For instance, the peculiar sutta Kacc 20: *do dhassa ca*, "and *d* is substituted for *dh*", has apparently been composed, according to Kacc-v, with the sole intention of explaining the canonical phrase *ekam idāhaṃ ... samayaṃ* at, e.g. M I 326,6, *idāhaṃ* being analysed as *idha* + *ahaṃ*, although Buddhaghosa interprets *idāhaṃ* at D I 91,11 as *idaṃ* + *ahaṃ*, claiming that *idaṃ* is a mere particle (*nipātamattaṃ*).¹³² The interpretation of Kacc probably rests on a wrong identification of *idā*

¹²⁷Rūp 503 and 505, Sadd §§ 931 and 981, as well as Mogg V 179 (*gahassa gheppo*) mention it, without quoting instances from the literature.

¹²⁸See Pischel § 548.

¹²⁹Also mentioned at Mogg V 177.

¹³⁰On this Prakritism, see Pischel § 188.

¹³¹See Pischel §§ 166, 439, and 443.

¹³²See Sv 256,22: *idan ti nipātamattaṃ; ekam ahan ti attho*.

(Vedic *id*□; cf. *EWA* s.v.) with *idha* which occurs in the expression *idhāham*, e.g. at M I 12,30 and S III 2,14.

§ 41. The *kārika* chapter is to a large extent indebted to Kātantra and Pāṇini, although there are suttas that are not to be explained on the basis of Kātantra, Pāṇini, Mahā-bh, or the Kāśikā. In general the description of the case system does not appear to be influenced by the annotations in the Aṭṭhakathās, although there are cases where there are parallels between Kacc and the Aṭṭhakathās. Thus for instance Kacc 292: *sattamyatthe ca*, “and the instr. is used in the sense of the loc.” appears to have been composed exclusively with a view of explaining canonical phrases like *tena kālena* (Ap 38,2), *tena समयेना* (Vin I 1,4), *tena kho pana समयेना* (Vin I 15,1), as indicated by Kacc-v. This particular usage is commented upon by Buddhaghosa in a lengthy discussion at Sv 33,2ff., which concludes with a quotation from the old ones (*porāṇā*) claiming that whether the reading is *tasmim समये*, *tena समयेना*, or *taṃ समयam*, the meaning is in each case locatival (*sabbattha bhummam eva attho*).¹³³

§ 42. There is also a parallel between the annotations of the Aṭṭhakathās and the sutta at Kacc 309: *tatiyā-sattamīnañ ca*, stating that “the acc. is also used in the sense of the instr. and the loc.” The vutti cites as illustrations of the instrumental usage of the acc.: *sace maṃ samaṇo Gotamo nālapissati*,¹³⁴ *tvañ ca maṃ nābhibhāsasi* (Ja VI 561,20), and as examples of the locatival usage: *pubbaṇhasamayam nivāsetvā* (Vin III 6,23), *ekaṃ समयam Bhagavā* (D I 1,4). The syntactical analysis underlying the first two examples is obscure and, quite apart from being wrong, is not supported by the Aṭṭhakathās. As in the case with the phrase *tena समयेना*, Buddhaghosa comments on the Dīgha phrase at Sv 33,2ff., and he addresses the Vinaya phrase at Sp 177,8ff., where he

¹³³Sv 33,31; for an analysis of this passage, see O.H. Pind 1990: 181ff.

¹³⁴This quotation is based upon S I 177,27–28: *sace maṃ samaṇo Gotamo ālapissati ... no ce maṃ samaṇo Gotamo ālapissati*.

analyses *pubbaṅhasamayam* as *pubbaṅhasamaye*,¹³⁵ thus supporting the interpretation of Kacc and Kacc-v. However, the alternative explanation which analyses the term as *pubbaṅhe samayam* with reference to Pāṇ II 3.5: *kālādhvanor atyantasaṃyoge* is not treated in Kacc-v on Kacc 300: *kāladdhānam accantasam̐yoge*. There is therefore no clear indication that Kacc presupposes the grammatical observations of the Aṭṭhakathās.

§ 43. In other cases there is no detectable connection to the Aṭṭhakathās. Thus, for instance, Kacc 312 states that the loc. is used in the sense of the instr. This rule describes according to Kacc-v constructions like (*naggā*) *hatthesu piṇḍāya caranti* (Vin I 90,11, 20; 91,1). Neither Sp nor Sp-ṭ and Vmv address this usage. Since the Aṭṭhakathās occasionally interpret the loc. in the sense of the instr.,¹³⁶ one cannot, of course, exclude the possibility that the compiler of Kacc composed this sutta with reference to this type of annotations. On the other hand, since there is no clear indication that they were known to or considered by the author(s) of Kacc-v, it is not possible to decide with any degree of certainty whether the compiler(s) of Kacc actually relied on the Aṭṭhakathās. Another sutta — Kacc 308: *kvaci dutiyā chaṭṭhīnam atthe* — states that “in some cases the acc. is used in the sense of the gen.” Kacc-v illustrates this rule by quoting M I 240,29: *api ssu maṃ Aggivessana tisso upamāyo*¹³⁷ *paṭibhamsu*. Buddhaghosa does not address this usage in Ps. Thus the general impression is that both Kacc and Kacc-v were composed independently of the Aṭṭhakathās. This conclusion would seem to be corroborated by the absence in Kacc and Kacc-v of important grammatical analyses found in the Aṭṭhakathās (cf. §§ 7–13).

¹³⁵So also at Spk I 246,32–33.

¹³⁶See, e.g. Sv 669,13: *karaṇatthe vā bhummaṃ mantāya boddhabban ti mantāya bujjhitabbaṃ ñāṇena jānītabban ti attho*.

¹³⁷M I 240,29 reads *upamā* for *upamāyo*; reading of Kacc-v confirmed by Kacc-vaṇṇ 234,23; cf. the variant *upamāyo* quoted by Trenckner at M I 550 (ad sutta 36 line 30).

IV. Post-Kaccāyana Pāli Grammars and Commentaries

IV.I. Kaccāyana-vutti (Kacc-v)

IV.I.I. The Authorship of Kacc-v

§ 44. Kacc-v is no doubt the oldest extant commentary on Kacc and therefore of particular importance for the history and development of Pāli grammar. Since post-Kacc Pāli grammarians never mention any, it is unlikely that there were other commentaries before it.¹³⁸ The Sinhalese grammarians attribute Kacc-v to Saṅghanandin, whose name occurs only in this context. It is not possible to trace this tradition further back than Saddhammasaṅgaha¹³⁹ (the end of the fourteenth century A.D.)¹⁴⁰ and Śrī Rahula's Padasādhanaṭīkā (fifteenth century A.D.),¹⁴¹ but one cannot, of course, exclude the possibility that it is older. The Burmese tradition as reflected in Gv obviously regarded Mahākaccāyana as the author of both Kacc and Kacc-v.¹⁴² In general

¹³⁸The word *mahāvutti* is not the name of an old commentary (*vutti*) on Kacc as Franke assumed (Franke 1978, 335ff.). It is used of Kacc 406: *tesu vuddhi-lopāgamavikāraviparītādesā ca*, whose scope is so wide that it can be used to explain a large number of forms that are otherwise not accounted for by any Kacc sutta. This also explains why the sutta is referred to in the instrumental form *mahāvuttinā* or *mahāvuttisuttena*, i.e., in accordance with the sutta that has a wide application, but not in the loc. as is common practice. See Rūp-san 37,16–18: *mahāvuttisuttena ... mahantesu visayesu pavattanato mahantī, mahantī vutti pavatti etissā ti mahāvutti, mahāvutti ca taṃ suttaṃ cā ti mahāvuttisuttaṃ*. Buddhapiya refers to it as *mahāvutti* (at Rūp 30, 189, 371, and Rūp-ṭ 146,18) or *mahāvuttisutta* (Rūp 34). Kacc-nidd 198,17 calls it *mahā-sutta*. See also the term Mahāpadesasutta: *mahāpadesasuttehi vā sarūpassa parasarassa lopo vutto ti daṭṭhabbam*, Sadd 43,26.

¹³⁹Saddhamma-s IX 18: *Kaccāyano kato yogo Saṅghanandi pavuttikā*.

¹⁴⁰Norman, *Pāli Lit.*: 179ff.

¹⁴¹See Padasādhanaṭīkā 395,11: *Kaccāyana-Saṅghanandi-Vimalabuddhimahā-therādihi katesu suttavuttinyāsādīsū*.

¹⁴²See Gv 59.

the Pāli grammarians refer to the author of Kacc-v as *vuttikāra*¹⁴³ as opposed to the *suttakāra*.

§ 45. It is questionable whether Kacc-v as a whole is composed by the same person because the *sandhi* chapter differs from the other chapters in the way it paraphrases each sutta. In contrast to the other chapters which use the verb *āpajjate* to indicate that a grammatical operation obtains, the *sandhi* chapter invariably uses *pappoti*, e.g. *lopam pappoti* or *papponti* at Kacc-v 12 through 17, contrasting with *lopam āpajjate* or *āpajjante*, e.g. at Kacc 220. They also differ with respect to the formulation of the contrastive sections of the exegesis of Kacc: in the *sandhi* chapter this section is invariably introduced by *kasmā*, elsewhere by *kimattham*. This difference in style seems to indicate that the commentary on the *sandhi* chapter has a different author from the rest of the work.

IV.1.2. Date of Kacc-v

§ 46. Internal evidence indicates that the compiler(s) of the *kāraka* chapter of Kacc-v must have known the Kāśikā (seventh century A.D.), which therefore is the *terminus post quem* of this part of Kacc-v. In fact, part of the commentary on Pāṇ I 4:57: *cādayo 'sattve*, which defines the particles, has absurdly been added to Kacc-v 286 as an illustration of the meaning of the nom., which is defined at Kacc 286: *liṅgatthe paṭhamā*. After quoting examples of the use of nom. like *puriso purisā eko dve*, Kacc-v continues by adding the particles *ca vā ha aha*, etc.,¹⁴⁴ the order of which corresponds exactly to the order in which they are quoted in Kāśikā. The inclusion of particles as instances of *liṅgattha* is incomprehensible. If one assumes that Kacc-v as a whole was finalized after the seventh century A.D., it may belong to the first half of the eighth century A.D.

¹⁴³See, e.g. Mogg-p I 15,23; 125,19; 179,4; 180,14; 187,28.

¹⁴⁴The readings that follow *ha* are uncertain; cf. Mmd 240,21: *puriso ti ādikāni tīṇi suviññeyyāni*; Mmd 240,25: *ca vētyādāni*.

IV.1.3. The Standard Versions of Kacc-v

§ 47. The question of the authorship of Kacc-v is not crucial in the light of the fact that Mmd comments upon a version of Kacc-v which in many respects is markedly different from its present-day Sinhalese and Burmese versions (see IV.1.2). To complicate matters even more: they are mutually different. Thus the Burmese version differs from the Sinhalese not only with respect to the purely exegetical parts of the commentary, but also as regards the number, order and occasional analysis (*viggaha*, Skt *vigraha*) of the examples illustrating each rule. Even Sinhalese manuscripts differ among themselves.¹⁴⁵

§ 48. The main cause of the complicated textual transmission of Kacc-v is that indigenous scholars read the text in the light of the comprehensive grammatical literature and commentarial literature devoted to the explication of Kacc and Kacc-v. In certain cases scholars would simply add a new paragraph to the explanation of any given sutta based upon the works of post-Kacc Pāli grammarians. This has given rise to numerous interpolations that were added to the text at different periods of time during its transmission. All extant versions derive from the same archetype because they all share one scribal mistake: Kacc-v 35 quotes Ja II 316,22 with the reading *vijjā* instead of *vijjāmayam*.¹⁴⁶

§ 49. If one compares the version of Kacc-v on which Mmd depends with the one known to Chapaṭa, the author of Kacc-nidd, it becomes abundantly clear that already by the beginning of the fifteenth century A.D. Kacc-v had become inflated by massive interpolation. Chapaṭa mentions some of the sources, but he may not have been aware of all of them. Most of the interpolations consist of far-fetched interpretations of any given *ca* of a sutta, which were added to the original text.

¹⁴⁵These problems will be addressed in a new edition of Kacc and Kacc-v in preparation.

¹⁴⁶The correct reading has been preserved in Sadd 618,23.

IV.1.4. Reformulations of Kacc-v

§ 50. In a few cases Mmd quotes readings that are not found in the standard Burmese and Sinhalese versions of Kacc-v. Thus, for instance, in the annotations on Kacc-v 41, Mmd¹⁴⁷ reproduces the following passage: *tiṇṇaṃ vyañjanānaṃ antare ye sarūpā tesam pi ādissa lopo hoti*: “among three consonants [constituting a consonant cluster] the first of those that are identical is elided”. In spite of the fact that this formulation is the only one that is meaningful in the context, the standard editions have different readings. Thus E^e reads *tiṇṇaṃ pi byañjanānaṃ antare sarūpānaṃ kvaci lopo hoti*. The same passage in C^e (1904) reads: *ca-saddaggahaṇena tiṇṇaṃ pi byañjanānaṃ sarūpānaṃ kvaci lopo hoti*, whereas B^e and C^e (1898) read *tiṇṇaṃ byañjanānaṃ antare ye sarūpā tesam pi lopo hoti*. An interesting quotation from Dāṭhānāga’s *Niruttiśāramañjūsā* in Subhūti’s *Nāmamāla*¹⁴⁸ shows that scholars differentiated between the original and the new reading (*purimapāṭha* and *navapāṭha*) of this passage. Except for minor discrepancies the old one is identical with B^e and C^e (1898), whereas C^e (1904) and E^e have adopted the new reading, except that E^e retains *antare*, thus apparently merging the old and the new one.

§ 51. Another interesting quotation which shows that the standard text has been edited is found at Mmd 440,19–20: “*ekassa ekā hoti dasassa ca raso hotī*” *ti ādim āha*, i.e., “*ekā* is substituted for *eka* and *rasa* is substituted for *dasa*”. This has been reformulated in the standard versions of B^e and C^e as *ekassa ekā*¹⁴⁹ *hoti dasassa ca dakārassa ro ādeso hoti*: “*ekā* is substituted for *eka* and the phoneme *r* is substituted for the phoneme *d* of *dasa*”.

¹⁴⁷Mmd 55,8–9.

¹⁴⁸Quoted at *Nāmamāla* xiii, 11–12: *imassa ca vuttiyaṃ “ca-saddaggahaṇena tiṇṇaṃ pi byañjanānaṃ antare ye sarūpā tesam pi lopo hotī” ti ca “ca-saddaggahaṇena tiṇṇaṃ pi byañjanānaṃ sarūpānaṃ kvaci lopo hotī” ti cā ti ’me dve pāṭhā bhinnā, tesu paṭhamapāṭho va purimapāṭho, dutiyapāṭho pana navapāṭho, taṃ idāni paṭhanti*.

¹⁴⁹E^e *eko*.

IV.1.5. Kacc-v as Interpreter of Kacc

§ 52. The obscure formulation of certain rules in combination with the uncertainty caused by *sandhi* must have caused the compiler of Kacc-v many problems. In some cases it is questionable whether the interpretation reflects the intention of the original. Thus for instance Kacc-v 49 quotes both *puthujjano* (D I 3,32) and *puthubhūtaṃ* (D II 106,10) under Kacc 49 (see § 42) in spite of the fact that in the cpd *puthubhūtaṃ puthu* is < Skt *pr̥thu*. Another instance, according to Kacc-v 73 the sutta *gāva se* means that *āva* is substituted for the final element of *go* before the gen. sg. ending. This indicates that the scholiast interpreted *gāva* as < *go* + *āva* meaning *āva* is substituted for the vowel *o* of *go*. Although the interpretation is sensible it is syntactically difficult to defend: the sutta can only mean *gāva* occurs before the termination of the gen. sg. viz. *gāvassa*. However, this form is not recorded in the canon, only *gavassa* occurs. This would indicate that the reading *gāva* might be a sandhi form *go* + *ava* > *gāva*. On the other hand, the following suttas presuppose the morpheme *āva*. There is evidently no obvious solution to this problem. In one case it appears that the scholiasts have misinterpreted the *sandhi* form *namh' āni* at Kacc 647: *akkose namh' āni*, as *namhi* + *āni*. The suffix, however, is *ani*, cf. Pāṇ III 3 112, of which Kacc 647 is a verbatim reproduction.¹⁵⁰ The anonymous commentator also misinterprets Kacc 246, which has given rise to the ghost word *tudampati* (see § 87).

§ 53. Kacc-v often takes the opportunity to complement the rules of Kacc so as to enlarge their scope. In the majority of cases it is done on the interpretation of any given *ca*. For instance, Kacc 67: *no ca dv'-ādīto namhi* states that the numerals *dvi*, etc., take an additional *n* (*āgama*) before the endings of gen. pl. Kacc-v adds on the interpretation of *ca* an additional *ssa*, quoting two examples, one of which is canonical: *catassannaṃ itthīnaṃ* and *tissannaṃ vedanānaṃ* (S V 21,23). There is only one recorded canonical example of the use of *catassannaṃ* at

¹⁵⁰Both Rūp and Sadd follow Kacc-v on this point.

A II 154,33. Examples like this are not uncommon and indicate the wish to improve upon Kacc so that it describes more fully recorded usage. An interesting case is the annotation on Kacc 69: *ādito o ca*. The *vuttikāra* interprets this to mean that *m̐* and *o* are optionally substituted for the loc. morpheme of *ādi*. The substitute *m̐* is wrongly read into the rule from Kacc 68: *am-ā pato smim-smānaṃ vā*. The example *ādim̐* is certainly not to be interpreted as loc.; the other example, *ādo*, is recorded. The interpretation may have been motivated by the concluding paragraph which, on the interpretation of *ca*, claims that *ā*, *o*, and *m̐* are used as substitutes for the loc. morpheme after other words;¹⁵¹ the examples are *divā ca ratto ca haranti ye baliṃ* (Sn 223) and *Bārānasiṃ ahu*¹⁵² *rājā* (Ja V 68,28). The last example is interesting because the recorded reading is *Bārānassaṃ ahū*, not the problematic *Bārānasiṃ ahu*¹⁵³ which would seem to stem from a different manuscript tradition. However, the underlying intention of the exegesis is clear: it aims at complementing Kacc so as to bring its description in line with recorded usage.

IV.1.6. Canonical and Non-canonical Quotations in Kacc-v

§54. There are close to 200 canonical quotations in Kacc-v, which shows that the commentator(s) who compiled the *vutti* took pains to illustrate the rules by means of examples taken from the Pāli canon. So far it has been possible to identify approximately 23 quotations from Dīgha, 21 from Majjhima, 13 from Saṃyutta, 10 from Aṅguttara, and 34 from Vinaya. From the Khuddaka there are, not surprisingly, 44 quotations from Dhammapada, 15 from Suttanipāta, 6 from Khuddakakāṭha, 20 from the Jātaka, 2 from Udāna, 3 from Itivuttaka, and 3

¹⁵¹Kacc-v ad loc.: *ca-saddaggaṇena aññasmā pi smimvacanassa ā o aṃ ādesā honti vā*.

¹⁵²C^{e1} *āhu*; B^eC^{e2}E^e *ahu*.

¹⁵³Ja V 68,28 reads *Bārānassaṃ* (v.l. *ṇasyaṃ*) *ahū*; cf. Sadd 204,13ff.; Sadd 644,5: *aññasmā ā ca: aññasmā saddato smim-vacanassa aṃ-o-ā-ādesā honti: ... Bārānasiṃ ahū rājā* (Ja V 68,28). *vā ti kiṃ? Bārānasyaṃ mahārāja* (Ja II 435,14). *Bārānassan ti pi pāṭho*.

quotations from Apadāna. In addition, there is one quotation from Vibhaṅga, as well as a number of unidentifiable quotations from Pāli literature that must be considered lost. To these examples we may add all those instances — most of them canonical — where no context is quoted.

§ 55. Most of the quotations are found in the *sandhi* chapter and the *kāraka* chapter. Other illustrations occur unsystematically, which leaves the impression that they have been added more or less at random. Thus, for instance, Kacc-v 57 quotes *bhoti Kharādiye* (Ja I 160,3)¹⁵⁴ as an example of voc. of fem. in *ā*, but omits quoting examples to illustrate the subsequent rules, although this could easily have been done.

§ 56. What is particularly interesting about these quotations is the fact that they rarely deviate from the transmitted text of the canon. When they do, it raises the interesting question of which exemplars were used by the compiler(s). Thus, for instance, the quotation from M I 240,29 at Kacc-v 308: reads *upamāyo* for *upamā* of B^eE^e.¹⁵⁵ Kacc-v 312 quotes Vin III 212,6 as an example of the use of the loc. in the sense of the direct object with the remarkable reading *bhikkhūsu* for E^e *bhikkhū*. B^e, on the other hand, reads *bhikkhūsu*, so we must conclude that this reading was actually found in some manuscripts or that B^e was edited on the basis of Kacc-v.¹⁵⁶

§ 57. Some of the examples were no doubt quoted from memory, which has caused slight distortions of the original. In most cases it is possible to identify the canonical source. Thus the quotation at Kacc-v 18: *te*

¹⁵⁴B^eC^{e2} and v.l. at E^e *Khar°*; E^eC^{e1} *ghar°*, cf. Kacc-nidd 26,34–35: *bhoti gharādiye* (sic) *ti bhaginināmena ālapatī ti ekanipāte vuttam*; Kacc-vaṇṇ 78,29–30: *gharādiye* (sic) *ti bhagini-m-nāmenālapatī ti ekanipāta-aṭṭha-kathāyaṃ* (so read for *ettha nipāta°*) *vuttam*; Ja I 160,6' reads: *Kharādiye* (B^eC^eE^e so) *ti taṃ nāmena ālapati*.

¹⁵⁵Trenckner records the variant *upamāyo* and refers to Kacc-v at M I 550 (ad sutta 36 line 30).

¹⁵⁶The reading is confirmed by all sources.

'*nāgatā* is probably based upon Vin V 221,14: *te anāgatā honti*, and the source of the quotation at Kacc-v 20: *idh' eva maraṇaṃ bhavissati* would seem to be Vin III 13,17: *idh' eva me maraṇaṃ bhavissati*. The two odd quotations at Kacc-v 27: *sa ve muni jātibhayaṃ adassī* and *eso dhammo padissati* are most probably distorted versions of Sn 209: *sa ve munī jātikhayantadassī* and Ja V 195,21: *eso dhūmo padissati*. The grammatically impossible quotation at Kacc-v 36 *parosahassaṃ bhikkhusataṃ* is a distorted version of S I 192,30*: *parosahassaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ*.¹⁵⁷ The original of Kacc-v 38: *ahaṃ eva nūna bālo* must be Vin IV 331,14: *ahaṃ eva nūna bālā*, and the quotation *dhammaṃ vo bhikkhave desissāmi* at Kacc-v 147 is probably based upon Vin I 23,25: *dhammaṃ vo desessāmi*. The quotation *sahāpi Gaggena saṅgho uposathaṃ kareyya* at Kacc-v 289 reads like a slightly edited version of Vin I 123,24: *saṅgho saha vā Gaggena vinā vā Gaggena uposathaṃ kareyya*. The quotation *sace maṃ samaṇo Gotamo nālapissati* at Kacc-v 309 is based upon S I 177,27–28: *sace maṃ samaṇo Gotamo ālapissati ... no ce maṃ samaṇo Gotamo ālapissati*. In one case a wrong quotation is due to scribal error (see § 47).

IV.1.7. Interpolations in Kacc-v

§ 58. The main source of interpolation is no doubt Mmd, from which the main part of the commentary on Kacc 330 has been taken, as well as his remarks on the interpretation of any given *ca* or the like. Another important source is Rūp, but there are also other sources, some of which cannot be identified with any degree of certainty.¹⁵⁸ In some cases, commentators were aware of the source of a particular interpolation and identified it. A few examples will suffice to show the character of such interpolations.

¹⁵⁷C^{e1}–2E^e *bhikkhusataṃ*, B^e om., so also Rūp-v; Sadd § 130 substitutes *bhikkhusaṅghaṃ* (sic!); the readings *bhikkhusataṃ* and *bhikkhusaṅghaṃ* are grammatically impossible to construe.

¹⁵⁸All interpolations in Kacc-v will be dealt with in a new edition of Kacc and Kacc-v in preparation.

§ 59. After the examples quoted at Kacc-v 182, C^{e1-2} (1898 and 1904) add *casaddaggahaṇena abyaggamanaso naro* (A I 130,1) *ti ādisu manasaddato sissa okārādeso hoti*. The source is Mmd 165,5–8. This interpretation is not in B^e (1974) or E^e, but very early on it had become part of the exegetical tradition as appears from Sadd, Kacc-nidd, and Kacc-vaṇṇ.¹⁵⁹

§ 60. After the counter-example *brahmā* quoted at Kacc-v 198, C^{e1-2} as well as E^e interpolate: *uttamaṃ iti bhāvaniddeso* (E^e °ena) *katthaci abhāvaṃ dasseti: brahmassa*. The source is Rūp 123: *uttamaṃ iti bhāvaniddeso katthaci abhāvadassanattho: brahmunā, brahmehi brahmebhi*. B^e does not contain this interpolation. However, in the paragraph that follows the counter-examples at Kacc-v 200 all versions share the same interpolation: *ārattaggahaṇena katthaci aniyamaṃ* (E^e w.r. ni°) *dasseti: satthussa, pitussa, mātussa, bhātussa*. The source is Rūp 159: *ārattamaṃ iti bhāvaniddesena katthaci aniyamaṃ dasseti*.

§ 61. An example from Kacc-v 277 may illustrate the extent to which the text sometimes has been altered. The concluding paragraph interpreting *ca* reads: *casaddaggahaṇena sesesv api ye mayā nōpadiṭṭhā apādānappayogikā te payogavicakkhaṇehi yojetabbā*. Mmd neither quotes nor paraphrases this paragraph, and, moreover, interprets the use of *ca* otherwise: *caggahaṇena aññathā pi pañcamīvibhattiñ ca chaṭṭhī-dutiyā-tatīyāvibhattiyo ca saṅgaṇhāti*.¹⁶⁰ It is presumably an interpolation made by post-Buddhapiya grammarians, although it is difficult to trace the formulation to any particular grammar. Aggavaṃsa has written

¹⁵⁹See Kacc-nidd 70,14–17: *idha caggahaṇena abyaggamanaso naro* (see supra), *Kassapassa vaco sutvā* (Ja VI 227,5*) *ti ettha sivacanassa ca aṃvacanassa ca okārādeso hoti*; Kacc-vaṇṇ 180,4–8: *abyaggamanaso naro* (see supra), *Kassapassa vaco* (see supra) *ty ādīni caggahaṇaphalāni; tattha ca abyaggamanasaddato simhi kate caggahaṇena siss' okāraṃ katvā sakārāgame kate rūpaṃ, Kassapassa vaco ti vacasaddato amhi kate caggahaṇena aṃvacanassa okāraṃ katvā sese kate rūpaṃ*; for the second example, see Sadd 663,27 and § 377: *aṃvacanass' o*.

¹⁶⁰Mmd 218,33–34; cf. Rūp 107,7: *casaddena yathāyogaṃ dutiyā chaṭṭhī ca*.

a similar paragraph at Sadd 708,23–24, not related to the interpretation of *ca*, but to *ādi* (sic): *ādisaddena ye amhehi anupadiṭṭhā apādāna-ppayogā te payogavicakkhanehi yojetabbā*. It is possible that the source of interpolation is Kacc-nidd, which, in addition, quotes the interpretations of Mmd and its *ṭikā*.¹⁶¹

§62. Kacc-v 358 is an extreme instance of interpolation. It is possible to deduce from Mmd that the version of the commentary that was known to Vajirabuddhi must have read: *tad assa ṭṭhānaṃ icc etasmiṃ atthe ĩya-ppaccayo hoti. madanassa ṭṭhānaṃ madanīyaṃ, bandhanassa ṭṭhānaṃ bandhanīyaṃ, mucchanassa¹⁶² ṭṭhānaṃ mucchanīyaṃ.¹⁶³ *evaṃ rajanīyaṃ, kamanīyaṃ.¹⁶⁴ After the first paragraph E^e and C^{e1} interpolate: *dassanassa ṭṭhānaṃ dassanīyaṃ upādānassa ṭṭhānaṃ upādānīyaṃ*; C^{e2} *dassanīyaṃ, upādānīyaṃ*; B^e *gamaniyaṃ, dussanīyaṃ, dassaniyaṃ*. These interpolations are based upon Mmd 314,22–24: *caggahaṇena hitādyatthe pi ĩya-ppaccayo hoti, tena upādānānaṃ hitā ti atthe idha caggahaṇena ĩya-ppaccaye kate upādānīyā ty ādīni sijjhanti.¹⁶⁵***

¹⁶¹See Kacc-nidd 103,21–29: *caggahaṇena dūrantikaddhānādīhi sesesu atthesu ye apādānapayogikā saddappayogā mayā nōpadiṭṭhā te saddappayogā vicakkhanehi paṇḍitehi yathāyogaṃ nāmūpasagganipātakiriyaṃ padānurūpaṃ yojetabbā ti. Nyāse pana “casaddaggahaṇena aññattha pañcamī vibhatti ca chaṭṭhī-dutiyā-tatīyā-vibhattiyo ca saṃgaṇhātī” ti vuttaṃ. Nyāsaṭṭikāyaṃ ca “caggahaṇena karaṇabhūtena suttāgatappayogato aññatthappayoge pañcamīvibhatti ca apādānakārake chaṭṭhī-dutiyā-tatīyā-vibhattiyo ca saṃgaṇhātī” (= Mmd-pt 133,28f.) ti vuttaṃ; — Kacc-vaṇṇ 218,17–22: *caggahaṇena sesesv api ye mayā nōpadiṭṭhā apādānasaññā ca chaṭṭhī-dutiyādayo vibhattiyo ca kātabbā ty attho. caggahaṇen’ eva saññāvidhānañ ca hotī ti adhippāyo.**

¹⁶²Read *mucchanassa* with B^e and Rūp.

¹⁶³Read *mucchanīyaṃ* with B^e and Rūp.

¹⁶⁴See, e.g. *amataṃ rāgaṭṭhānīyaṃ rajanīyaṃ kamanīyaṃ madanīyaṃ bandhanīyaṃ mucchanīyan ti*, Kv 401,31ff. ≠ Kv 222,15ff. which represent the only canonical instances where all these terms are used in the neuter.

¹⁶⁵See Rūp ad 366: *madanassa ṭṭhānaṃ madanīyo, madanīyaṃ, bandhanassa ṭṭhānaṃ bandhanīyaṃ, evaṃ mucchanīyaṃ, rajanīyaṃ, gamanīyaṃ,*

§ 63. Vajirabuddhi's annotation was, in turn, utilized by Aggavaṃsa at Sadd 789,29 (§774): *upādānādito iyo hitatthādisu*. However, the reading *dussaniyaṃ* of B^e would seem to be based upon Mogg-p ad Mogg IV 69.¹⁶⁶ finally, the vutti in E^eC^{e1-2} concludes with the following interpolation: *ca-saddaggaṇena iya-ila-ppaccayā honti. rañño idaṃ thānaṃ, rājiyaṃ, evaṃ rājilaṃ*; the examples quoted in this paragraph are mentioned neither at Mmd nor at Rūp or Sadd 789,27ff.; the paragraph stems from Cūl-nir as indicated by Kacc-bh-nt¹⁶⁷: *Cūla-niruttyādīpakaraṇe tad assa thānaṃ iyo cā ti sutte casaddena ila-iyapaccayā hontī ti*. It thus appears that Cūl-nir, in contrast to Mmd, for example, interpreted *ca* so as to include the suffixes *iya* and *ila* which are not recorded in Pāli.

§ 64. In a few cases the anonymous editors of Kacc-v have copied verses from Rūp and the Bījākyā and inserted them in the relevant section of the vutti. Thus all versions quote the following *kārikā* from Rūp:¹⁶⁸

*yo vadeti sa kattā ti yaṃ vuttam kamman ti vuccati
yo paṭiggāhako tassa sampadānaṃ vijāniyā*

It is not mentioned in Mmd, but it must have been interpolated before Chaṭa's time because he quotes the beginning of it at Kacc-nidd

dassanīyaṃ, upādānīyaṃ, pasādanīyaṃ. casaddena hitādiatthe pi — upādānānaṃ hitā upādānīyā icc ādi.

¹⁶⁶*madanīyādīppasiddhiyā Kaccāyane "tad assa thānaṃ iyo cā" ti suttitaṃ. tam iha (evaṃ maññate) karaṇe 'dhikaraṇe vā anīyena siddhan ti āha (madanīyan tīccādi. itisaddo vā ādyattho; tato bandhanīyaṃ mucchanīyaṃ rajanīyaṃ) kamanīyaṃ dussanīyan ti ādīni pi daṭṭhabbāni. Kacc-vaṇṇ ad loc. interprets dassanīyaṃ arahatthe: dassanaṃ arahati dassanīyaṃ; cf. Kacc-nidd ad loc. quoting Mmd ad 358 and Rūp ad 366: tattha ādiggaṇena arahatthaṃ saṃgaṇhāti.*

¹⁶⁷Kacc-bh-nt 168.

¹⁶⁸Rūp 102,21–22.

109,1: “yo vadeti” ādim āha.¹⁶⁹ A verse from Bījākhyā (see §§ 3–4) has been interpolated in Kacc-v 354:

*na vuddhi nīlapītādo paccaye saṅakārake
phakāro phussasaddassa siro ti sirasaṃ vade*¹⁷⁰

IV.2. Post-Kaccāyana Pāli Grammars and Grammarians as Reflected in the Grammatical Literature

IV.2.1. The Question of Chronology

§ 65. The chronology of post-Kacc Pāli grammars, quite apart from the problems attached to Kacc-v, constitutes a serious problem which cannot be resolved satisfactorily: most of the literature is no longer extant and has to be studied on the basis of a few fragments quoted in Pāli grammars written at a later date. The following grammars are treated in the order suggested by internal evidence. Some of the works like the Saṅgaha, and the two *sandhi* treatises which Buddhapiya utilized, cannot be fitted into any relative chronology.

IV.2.2. Mahānirutti (Mahā-nir)

§ 66. The Mahā-nir is, like Kacc and Nir-piṭ, attributed to Buddha’s disciple Mahākaccāyana (see § 14). It is described in Mmd-pt (see § 112) as a particular grammar of someone belonging to a different school (*nikāyantavāsīn*),¹⁷¹ which would indicate that it differs from the school of Kacc. However, since Cūl-nir comments on Kacc it may not be wrong to assume that Mahā-nir also comments upon it. Within the relative chronology the work belongs to the period after Kacc-v, whose existence it seems to presuppose, and it is thus datable to the second half of the eighth century A.D.

§ 67. It is possible to deduce from the limited number of references to and quotations from Mahā-nir in other Pāli grammars that the treatise

¹⁶⁹It is also quoted at Kacc-vaṇṇ 220,32–33.

¹⁷⁰Quoted and identified at Kacc-nidd 175,21–23.

¹⁷¹Mmd-pt 168,6: *Sudattakisivanirutti-Mahāniruttī ti nikāyantavāsīnaṃ byākaraṇavisesāni.*

was composed in the form of suttas and a prose commentary accompanied by *kārikās*.

§68. Vajirabuddhi identifies Mahā-nir and Sudattakisivanirutti as two sources of interpolations made in Kacc (see § 18). The interpolated suttas show a marked dependence on Pāṇini. In a few cases they depend on the Kātantra, and a couple of suttas seem to presuppose knowledge of Kacc-v (see §69). Since it is not possible to distinguish between suttas from Mahā-nir and Sudattakisivanirutti they are quoted and identified in the context of Mahā-nir. All of the them except sutta 33 are interpolated in the *kāraṅka* section. As indicated by Mmd they must have been accompanied by a prose commentary:

1. *tesaṃ param ubhayappattimhi* (Mmd 237,14), cf. Kāt II 4:16¹⁷²
2. *sesā kammakaraṇasampadānāpadānasāyādiniddesesu* (242,38), cf. Kāt II 4:19¹⁷³
3. *gatyatthe ca* (251,37), cf. Pāṇ I 4:52
4. *tatiyāya ca dutiyā* (260,14), cf. Pāṇ II 3:31
5. *sar'-isvādīnaṃ kammani chaṭṭhī* (260,21), cf. Pāṇ II 3:52
6. *karotissa patiyatne* (260,28), cf. Kāt II 4:39 < Pāṇ II 3:53
7. *kattukammānaṃ kiti* (260,33), cf. Pāṇ II 3:65
8. *yajassa karaṇo* (Mmd 261,3), Pāṇ II 3:63
9. *na tiṭṭhādīsu* (261,8), cf. Pāṇ II 3:69
10. *āhutikāladhānesu dutiyā tatiyā ca* (261,19), cf. Pāṇ II 3:3+5
11. *kimalamatthe chaṭṭhī catutthī ca* (261,34)
12. *kattur icchitatamaṃ kammaṃ* (262,7), cf. Pāṇ I 4:49
13. *yutte cānicchite* (262,17), cf. Pāṇ I 4:50
14. *upānvajjhāvassa* (262,22), Pāṇ I 4:48
15. *antarādīhi yutte* (262,32), cf. Pāṇ II 3:4
16. *abhitoparotomhi* (262,37), cf. Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ II 3:2, Cand II 1:52
17. *tappānācāratthe* (263,3)

¹⁷²See Mmd 238,19: *na ... eso purimo pāṭho*.

¹⁷³See Mmd 243,12: *na c' etaṃ porāṇakasuttaṃ*.

18. *hetuppayoge chaṭṭhātīyā ca* (263,7), cf. Pāṇ II 3:26
19. *sādhunipunayutte sattamī* (263,12), cf. Pāṇ II 3:43
20. *gottanāmajātisippavayesu tatiyā* (263,17), cf. Kacc 294
21. *ubhayappatte kammani* (263,21), cf. Pāṇ II 3:66
22. *katassa ca vattamāne* (263,29), cf. Pāṇ II 3:67
23. *tulyupamāne tatiyā ca* (263,34), cf. Pāṇ II 3:72
24. *gahādīnaṃ kammani sattamī* (264,3)
25. *karaṇatthe bhikkhācāre* (264,8)
26. *pañcamiyā yutte* (264,14)
27. *ūnapuṇṇehi dutiyā tatiyā ca* (264,19), cf. Pāṇ II 1:31
28. *vupāssa ca* (264,26)
29. *kammatthe paṭhamā* (264,31)
30. *ākhyātōpayoge pañcamī* (265,1), cf. Pāṇ I 4:29
31. *jātyākhyāyaṃ bahuvacanam ekasmiṃ kvaci* (265,7), cf. Pāṇ I 2:58
32. *attani garusu ca kvaci* (265,27), cf. Pāṇ I 2:59
33. *siyāliṅgassa ca* (285,14).¹⁷⁴

§69. Aggavaṃsa has based a number of paragraphs in Sadd on these suttas, incorporating the relevant examples into them: sutta 8 is utilized for Sadd §636, sutta 11 for Sadd §638, sutta 20 for Sadd §604, sutta 23 for Sadd §638, sutta 31 for Sadd §670, and sutta 32 for Sadd §670. Some of them are particularly interesting because they describe uses of the cases in Pāli which are also dealt with by the Saṅgahakāra (see IV.2.7). Thus the examples that illustrate 24: “the locative in construction with *√gah*, etc., is used in the sense of the acc.”, namely (*Bodhisattassa*) *muddhani ... cumbitvā* (Ja VI 291,2–3, and (*purisassa*) *nānābhāsu gahetvā* (M I 365,19), are also quoted in Mmd as illustrations of the view of the Saṅgahakāra.¹⁷⁵ Neither Kacc nor Kacc-v describes this usage. However, the examples that illustrate 25: “[the locative] is used in the sense of the instrument in the context of begging

¹⁷⁴Cf. *n’ edaṃ porāṇakaṃ*, Mmd 285,15.

¹⁷⁵Mmd 255,16.

for alms”, viz. *naggā hatthesu piṇḍāya caranti* (Vin I 90,20), *samaṇā pattesu piṇḍāya caranti* (...), are quoted at Kacc-v 312. Sutta 29: “the nominative is used in the sense of the accusative” is based upon a peculiar analysis of the well-known canonical phrase *yena bhagavā ten’ upasaṅkami*. According to this, *Bhagavā* is used in the acc. because the underlying sentence structure is assumed to be *yattha Bhagavantaṃ adakkihi*.¹⁷⁶ This analysis is not supported by the Aṭṭhakathās.

§ 70. Buddhapiya concludes the *kāraka* chapter of Rūp by quoting a verse from Mahā-nir summarising the case terminology of the Aṭṭhakathās:

*paccattam upayogañ ca, karaṇaṃ sampadāniyaṃ.
nissakkaṃ sāmivacanaṃ, bhummālapanaṃ aṭṭhaman ti.*¹⁷⁷

Aggavaṃsa quotes it as a summary (*uddāna*) of a prose passage propounding the Niruttillakkaṇa, i.e., the definition (of the cases) of the (Mahā)nirutti. This indicates that already at the time of the composition of Mahā-nir, grammarians attempted to integrate the terminology and grammatical tradition of the Aṭṭhakathās into their grammars. It is remarkable that the Niruttillakkaṇa substitutes *āmantana* “the act of addressing, inviting” (Skt *āmantraṇa*¹⁷⁸) for *ālapana*.¹⁷⁹ The same term is used to denote the voc. in Rūp, presumably because it was used in Buddhapiya’s main sources Mahā-nir, Cūḷ-nir, and Mañj.¹⁸⁰ It may have been introduced from the Kātantra.¹⁸¹

§ 71. According to Aggavaṃsa Mahā-nir differs from Kacc with respect to the definition of the tense (*kāla*) of the verb which is described as

¹⁷⁶Mmd 264,34.

¹⁷⁷See Rūp 116,20–21; identified as coming from Mahā-nir at Rūp-ṭ 127,24.

¹⁷⁸See Pāṇ III 3:161.

¹⁷⁹See CPD s.v. *āmantana*.

¹⁸⁰See the verse quoted at Rūp 93,16–18 from Mañj defining the voc. in terms of *āmantana*; (see § 94).

¹⁸¹*āmantraṇa* is used by the Kātantra II 4:18 to denote the voc.

sixfold as opposed to Kacc where it is defined as fourfold.¹⁸² Both Mmd and Rūp quote a verse from Mahā-nir defining the nature of the verb:

*yan tikālam tipurisaṃ kriyāvāci tikāraḥkaṃ
atiliṅgaṃ dvivacanaṃ tad ākhyātan ti vuccati.*¹⁸³

§ 72. Gv 70 mentions an abridgement of Mahā-nir called *Mahānirutti-sāṅkhepa* about which nothing is known.

IV.2.3. Sudattakisivanirutti (Sudatta-nir)

§ 73. Mmd is the only Pāli grammar that mentions this treatise. Nothing is known about it except that certain scholars copied suttas from it and interpolated them in Kacc. Like Mahā-nir, the author of Mmd-pt considers it a particular grammar by someone belonging to a different school (see § 66). It cannot be excluded, however, that it is a commentary on Kacc. Perhaps it is composed at the time of Mahā-nir.

§ 74. Formally it consisted of suttas and a commentary. Since it is not possible to separate the suttas of Sudatta-nir from those that have been copied from Mahā-nir, they have been treated together (see § 68).

IV.2.4. Niruttiṭṭaka (Nir-ṭṭi)

§ 75. The Nir-ṭṭi is, like Mahā-nir, attributed to Mahākaccāyana.¹⁸⁴ The way in which the work is quoted or referred to in grammars like Mogg and Sadd would indicate that it is composed after Mahā-nir. It is not possible to determine whether it is based upon Kacc or related to Kacc. Presumably it emulates Kacc and Kacc-v like Mahā-nir. One may tentatively date it to the first half of the ninth century A.D.

¹⁸²Sadd 50,23–31: *nanu Kaccāyane ganthe | kālo vutto catubbidho || ... || tathā hi chabbidho kālo | Niruttimhi pakāsito: || atītānāgato paccu|ppanno āṇatti-m-eva ca || parikappo ca kālassa | atipattī ti chabbidho*; cf. Sadd 56,3–58,2.

¹⁸³The verse is identified at Rūp-san 298,29; cf. Sadd 50,20: “*yan tikālan*” *ti vuttam ācariyehi*, occurring in the context of a discussion of the views expressed in the Nirutti, i.e., Mahā-nir.

¹⁸⁴See Sadd 168,34ff.: *Niruttiṭṭakaṃ nāma pabhinnapaṭisambhidena mahā-khīṇāsavena Mahākaccāyanena katan ti loke pasiddhaṃ.*

§ 76. It appears from the quotations in Sadd and Mogg that Nir-piṭ was composed in prose and *kārikās*.

§ 77. Like Cūḷ-nir (see IV.2.5), Nir-piṭ must have listed paradigms for all Pāli nominals because Aggavaṃsa often contrasts the various nominal and adjectival paradigms established in Nir-piṭ with those of Cūḷ-nir and Kacc.¹⁸⁵ Thus, for instance, he mentions in the discussion of the paradigm of the present participle *gacchaṃ · gacchanto*, etc., that the Nir-piṭ claims that such forms as *mahanto*, etc., exclusively are used as nom. and voc. pl., and, moreover, that the Nir-piṭ establishes this after quoting a *gāthā* summarizing a series of such participles in the nom. sg.: *mahaṃ bhavaṃ caraṃ tiṭṭhaṃ*.¹⁸⁶ A similar *gāthā* is quoted in Rūp.¹⁸⁷ It is likely that Nir-piṭ contained such verses enumerating a series of words belonging to a particular inflectional category. This is also the case with Rūp, which may have utilized Nir-piṭ for this purpose.

§ 78. In his discussion of the pronominal inflection, Moggallāna claims that Nir-piṭ authorizes the inflectional endings *ā*, *e*, and *āya* in abl., loc., and dat., respectively, except in the case of the pronominal stems *ta*, *eta*, and *ima*.¹⁸⁸ However, Mogg maintains that this exception is meaning-

¹⁸⁵For a list of references, see Sadd 1010 5.0.1 Niruttiṭṭaka.

¹⁸⁶Sadd 168,3ff.: *Niruttiṭṭake paccattālapanaṭṭhāne mahanto bhavanto caranto ti ādīnaṃ bahuvacanattam eva kathitaṃ na ekavacanattam, tathā hi tattha “mahaṃ bhavaṃ caraṃ tiṭṭhan” ti gātham vatvā mahaṃ tiṭṭhati mahanto tiṭṭhanī ti ca bho mahā bhavanto mahanto ti ca bhavaṃ tiṭṭhati bhavanto tiṭṭhanī ti ca ādī vuttam.*

¹⁸⁷Sadd 37,26–27.

¹⁸⁸See Mogg-p 82,19ff.: *Niruttiṭṭake hi ta-eta-ima-vajjitānaṃ sabbādīnaṃ īā-īe-āyā dassitā va āgame ca ya-saddassa catutthiyā ta-saddassa ca sattamiyaṃ ādeso dissati.* — The discussion in Sadd indicates that Cūḷ-nir did not make such exceptions; for Aggavaṃsa’s sceptical remarks on this problem, see Sadd 267,19, 27–30; 652,1–4.

less as it is contradicted by the canon, which he proves by quoting relevant examples.¹⁸⁹

§ 79. Aggavaṃsa quotes a couple of interesting passages from Nir-piṭ. One of them is the definition of the *dvandva* compound,¹⁹⁰ which he must have used when reformulating Kacc 331 at Sadd § 709. The author of Nir-piṭ must have utilized Pāṇinian grammar for the description of the various types of *dvandva* compounds because Moggallāna reproduces at Mogg-v III 19 his definition showing dependence on Pāṇ II 4:2 foll. and Mahā-bh ad loc.¹⁹¹

§ 80. It is possible to deduce from another quotation in Sadd¹⁹² that Nir-piṭ like Cūl-nir contained a chapter on the Pāli *nipātas*: *vuttaṃ hi Niruttiṭṭake Nipātapadaparicchede: “tuṃ iti catutthiyā” ti.*¹⁹³ Rūp follows Nir-piṭ in this regard.¹⁹⁴ Sadd has also preserved the def. of the verb: *vuttaṃ h’ etaṃ Niruttiṭṭake “kiriyaḷakkhaṇaṃ ākhyātikaṃ aliṅgabhedam”*, which is related to the verse which both Mmd and Rūp quote from Mahā-nir (see § 71).¹⁹⁵

¹⁸⁹See Mogg-v II.46: *asmā lokā paramhā ca ubhayā dhaṃsate naro* (= D III 184,25*); *tyāhaṃ mante paratthaddho* (Ja VI 182,1*); *yāy’ eva kho pan’ atthāya āgaccheyyātho, tam ev’ atthaṃ sādhukaṃ manasikareyyātho* (= D I 90,19–20).

¹⁹⁰Sadd 767,20–68,3: *Niruttiṭṭake c’etaṃ vuttaṃ: “kathaṃ dvando bhavati: dvando nāma dvinnaṃ padānaṃ ekavibhattikānaṃ nānāliṅgānaṃ pubbapadam appakkharaṃ uttarapadam tulyaṃ vā bahvakkharaṃ vā ekatthasamodhānaṃ gacchatī ti dvando” ti.*

¹⁹¹*tatrāyaṃ visayavibhāgo Niruttiṭṭakāgato: pāṇi-turiya-yogga-senaṅgānaṃ, niccaverīnaṃ, saṅkhyāparimāṇasaññānaṃ, khuddakajantukāmaṃ, pacāna-caṇḍālānaṃ, caraṇasādhāraṇānaṃ, ekajjhāyanapāvacaṇānaṃ, liṅga-visesānaṃ, vividhaviruddhānaṃ, disānaṃ, nadīnaṃ niccaṃ samāhārekatthaṃ bhavati.*

¹⁹²Sadd 310,8–10.

¹⁹³Quoted Sadd 894,3.

¹⁹⁴Rūp 89,16: *tave-tuṃ-paccayantā catutthiyā.*

¹⁹⁵Op. cit. 26,2–6.

§ 81. It appears from another passage that Nir-piṭ defines the term *nirutti* in accordance with its canonical definition: *Niruttipiṭake pana “saṃkhā samaññā paññatti vohāro nāmaṃ nāmakammaṃ nāmadheyyaṃ nirutti vyañjanaṃ abhilāpo (= Nidd I 127,12–14; Dhs § 1306; As 390,13–91,20)” ti imehi dasahi vuttā dhammajāti nirutti nāma.*¹⁹⁶

IV.2.5. Cūḷanirutti (Cūḷ-nir)

§ 82. The Burmese and Sinhalese grammarians attribute Cūḷ-nir to Yamakamahāthera.¹⁹⁷ The treatise appears to be lost, but it is possible to form an idea of its nature through quotations and references to it in Mogg-p and Sadd. (Abhinava)-Cūḷanirutti which is still extant in manuscripts is apparently based upon Cūḷ-nir and may thus give an idea of its character.¹⁹⁸ Cūḷ-nir was probably composed after Nir-piṭ (see § 75) and may thus belong the second half of the ninth century A.D.

§ 83. It appears from the few identifiable quotations found scattered in post-Kaccāyana grammatical literature that Cūḷ-nir is a commentary on Kacc. Together with its commentary (*vaṇṇanā*), the Mañjūsā (see IV.2.6), it is undoubtedly one of the most influential post-Kaccāyana Pāli grammars. Aggavaṃsa often refers to it together with Kacc and Nir-piṭ in the Padamālā,¹⁹⁹ when discussing the nominal, pronominal, or other paradigms of the Pāli, occasionally contrasting its paradigms with those of Kacc and Nir-piṭ.

§ 84. It is somewhat confusing that quotations from it are often ascribed to the Nirutti, but it is possible to deduce from the information contained in later lit. that they must stem from Cūḷ-nir. Most of them are *kārikās*. Vījitāvī quotes in Kacc-vaṇṇ a verse from the Nirutti (= Cūḷ-nir) interpreting Kacc 14 followed by a few examples:

¹⁹⁶See Sadd 911,23–26.

¹⁹⁷See Sadd *passim*; Pada-sādh-ṭ: 395,10.

¹⁹⁸See Nāmamāla xxiv: *porāṇehi kataṃ gandhaṃ Cūḷaniruttan ti saññitaṃ*.

¹⁹⁹For references, see Sadd 1010: 5.0.2 Cūḷanirutti.

*vuttañ ca Niruttiyaṃ
pubbavikāro aparō vikāro duvidho mato
kvaci ty ādinā suttenā vikāro aparō mato.
tath' eva luttasaddena pubbavikāro vidhīyate iselayo munelayo
rathesabho ti ādisu.*²⁰⁰

Aggavaṃsa has based Sadd § 35 on this interpretation and copied the examples.²⁰¹ Vijitāvī also quotes a verse from the Nirutti interpreting Kacc 35. The verse adds on the interpretation of *ca* sixteen additional consonantal *āgamas* to the eight defined at Kacc 35:²⁰²

*yavamadādisuttēna t̥habyañjana-m-āgamo
casaddena pana sesā catuvīsati byañjanā.*²⁰³

These *āgamas* are rejected as not instantiated in the Pāli.²⁰⁴ Although post-Kaccāyana grammarians regard them as fictions, we find them quoted in Saddasāratthajālīnī 270.

§ 85. Moggallāna refers several times to Cūl-nir in Mogg-p. Thus his remark that the *sandhi* form *yatha-r-iva* < *yathā eva* is found in the section on particles (*nipāta*) in the Cūl-nir,²⁰⁵ shows that, like Nir-piṭ, the work devoted a chapter to the description of the particles. This

²⁰⁰Kacc-vaṇṇ 30,9–12; Kacc-nidd on Kacc 14 quotes at 10,30–31 this verse:

*lutte ti punuccāraṇena asavaṇṇaṃ paralope
munelayo iselayo rathesabho ti ādisū ti.*

This is probably a verse from Cūl-nir: it is paraphrased in the prose passage explicating the verse at Kacc-vaṇṇ 30,9–12.

²⁰¹Sadd 613,26ff. (≠ Kacc 16): *sare pubbo: parasare lutte pubbo saro kvaci
asavaṇṇaṃ pappoti: munelayo rathesabho, sotthi — muni + ālayo, rathi +
usabho su + itthī ti chedo.*

²⁰²See Kacc-vaṇṇ: 53,18–23.

²⁰³See Kacc-bh-ṇṭ 36,27: ... *Cūlaniruttiyañ ... casaddena catuvīsati byañjana-
āgamā honti.*

²⁰⁴See Kacc-vaṇṇ 53: *udāharaṇāni pana atthikehi Niruttiyaṃ oloketabbāni,
mayaṃ pana pāḷi-aṭṭhakathāpāthass' eva abhāvato na uddharāma.*

²⁰⁵Kacc-vaṇṇ 23,13–14: *yathā eva > yatha-r-iva Niruttiyaṃ nipātamajjhe pāṭhā.*

tradition is followed by Rūp which quotes the same *sandhi* form in the chapter on particles,²⁰⁶ as well as later grammarians like Sadd and Pay, both of which are dependent on Rūp.

§ 86. Moggallāna mentions at Mogg-v II 52 the following two forms of voc. sg. of *kaññā*: *bhoti kaññe · bhoti kaññā*. He justifies the form *kaññā* by referring to the fact that it is mentioned in the Nirutti (= Cūḷ-nir) although it is not described in Kacc.²⁰⁷ There is no reason to doubt that Nirutti in this case = Cūḷ-nir because Aggavaṃsa quotes the same forms in Sadd referring to Cūḷ-nir.²⁰⁸

§ 87. In another context he criticizes the author of Kacc-v for permitting the unwarranted Sanskritism *sugandhi*, pointing out that it is found neither in the canon nor in the Nirutti.²⁰⁹ Moreover, he observes that the ghost word *tudampati* is not found as an example in the Nirutti, as is the case with Kacc-v 246 and other commentaries.²¹⁰ In one case he has formulated his description of the suffixes *la* and *īya* at Mogg IV 58: *tena datte l'-iyā*, with reference to their definition in the Nirutti. In the discussion of this sutta at Mogg-p he quotes a fairly long passage from

²⁰⁶See Kacc-vaṇṇ 90,14.

²⁰⁷Mogg-p 87,16–18: *yadi pi kaññā ti rūpam idaṃ na niddiṭṭhaṃ Kaccānena tathā pi Niruttiyaṃ niddiṭṭhattā etthā pi saṅgahitaṃ tathā brahmā ti.*

²⁰⁸Mogg-p 197,18.

²⁰⁹Mogg-p 180,14–19: *Kaccāyanavuttikārena “kvaci samāsantagatānaṃ akāranto” (= Kacc 339) ettha kāraggaṇena sugandhi duggandhi pūtigandhi surabhiḅgandhī ti ye te payogā sakkatānusāreṇa sādhitā na te payogā idha sādhitā ti dassento āha sugandhī ccādi iti-saddo ādyattho payogo “na dissatī” ti āgame Niruttiyaṃ na dissati.*

²¹⁰See Mogg-p 187,26–28: *yam pana Kaccāyanavutti-ādisu tudampatī ti udāharan ti nāyam payogo āgame Niruttiyaṃ ca tādisassa payogassāsambhavato* (ad Mogg-v ad Mogg III 70 (= 74)).

the Nirutti which is related to Mahā-bh on Pāṇ V 3:83 (cf. Kāś ad loc.).²¹¹

§88. Both Rūp²¹² and Sadd²¹³ quote a prose passage from Cūḷ-nir defining the nature of the verb: *kālakārapurisaparidīpikaṃ kriyā-lakkhaṇam ākhyātikaṃ*.²¹⁴ Sadd quotes another passage concerning the pronominal forms *te-me, tava-mam, tuyhaṃ-mayhaṃ*.²¹⁵

§89. As mentioned above (see §63), unknown scholars have interpolated a passage in Kacc-v 358 based upon Cūḷ-nir.

IV.2.6. Mañjūsā (Mañj)

§90. Sinhalese grammarians attribute the commentary on Cūḷ-nir, Cūḷaniruttivaṇṇanā or Mañj, to a certain Patañjali. Gv 60, on the other hand, attributes it to an old ācariya (*pubbācariya*). The Mañj was known to Vajirabuddhi, who apparently elaborates the views of Patañjali concerning the reality of the *kāraṅkas* in an interesting digression on Kacc 283 (see §93).²¹⁶ It is thus reasonable to assume that Mañj was written in the ninth century A.D. It is regrettable that this interesting work appears to be lost²¹⁷ because it has exerted a major influence on most Pāli grammarians who quote from it. In contrast to the majority of other Pāli

²¹¹Mogg-p 225,3ff.: *iha tu Niruttiyaṃ "kathaṃ kattukaraṇatthe bhavati?": devehi datto > devadatto devadattiko deviyo devalo; brahmunā datto > brahmadatto, brahmadattiko, brahmiyo, brahmalo; sivena datto > sivadatto, sivadattiko, siviyo, sivalo; nāgehi datto > nāgadatto, nāgadattiko, nāgiyo, nāgalo ti sāmāññena vuttattā avisesena vuttaṃ.*

²¹²Rūp 171,9-10.

²¹³Sadd 20,22-23.

²¹⁴Quotation identified at Rūp-ṭ 179,14.

²¹⁵Sadd 292,4-6: *Cūḷaniruttiyaṃ hi Yamakamahātherena catutthī-chaṭṭhīnaṃ anaññarūpattaṃ vuttaṃ: "catutthī-chaṭṭhīnaṃ sabbattha aññaṃ, tatiyā-pañcamīnaṃ bahuvacanañ cā ti.*

²¹⁶Mmd 231,18ff.

²¹⁷Mañj is mentioned in the Pagan inscription; see the list no. 226 in Bode: *PLB*: 107.

grammars, the Mañj is influenced by contemporary philosophy of language and apparently also by Buddhist philosophy.²¹⁸

§91. The extant fragments show that Mañj was composed in the form of *kārikās* accompanied by explicating prose.

§92. Buddhapiya quotes several verses from the Mañj. Most of them occur in the chapter of Rūp devoted to the description of the *kāraḥas*. They show that Patañjali to some extent has based his description of Pāli's case grammar on Bhartṛhari's Trikaṇḍī (TK). In fact, some of the verses are almost verbatim reproductions of the TK. Thus, for instance, the verse defining the *apādāna kāraḥa* is a version of TK III 7:136, except that it substitutes *anumeyavisayañ ca* for *apekṣitakriyaṃ ceti* of TK:

*niddiṭṭhavisayaṃ kiñci upāttavisayaṃ tathā
anumeyavisayañ cā ti apādānan tidhā matam.*²¹⁹

Other verses substitute semantically equivalent Pāli terms for the terms used by Bhartṛhari, like, for instance, the verse defining the *sampadāna kāraḥa*, which is based upon VP III 7: 129:

*anirākaraṇārādhanabbhanuññavasen' idha
sampadānam tidhā vuttam rukkhayācakahikkhavo.*²²⁰

§93. In the commentary on Rūp 288 (= Kacc 284) Buddhapiya quotes two verses stating that the domain of words is defined by convention (*voḥāraḥasaya*) and is without ultimate reality (*nekantaparamatthika*); the denotation of a word is something imagined (*buddhisamkappita*) and thus also the syntactic relation, which therefore only has an imaginary existence (*vijjamāno va*).²²¹ This argument is closely related to the ideas

²¹⁸This seems obvious on a prima facie reading of the passage on *voḥāra* (Buddh. Skt *vyavahāra*), quoted at Rūp 98,15; see below, §93.

²¹⁹Rūp-v 104,34-35; quoted from Mañjūsā according to Rūp-ṭ 110,5.

²²⁰See Rūp 100,33-34; quoted Mog-p 55,19-20; according to Mog-pd 64,9 and Rūp-sn (170(=174),²¹ = Mañj.

²²¹Rūp 98,15-18:

which Bhartṛhari propounds in the introductory section of *Sādhanaśāstra* TK III 7:1ff. The assumption of a connection between Mañj and this part of the TK is corroborated by the parallel section of Mmd 231,18ff. which evidently elaborates on ideas expressed in Mañj. In this excursus Vajrabuddhi uses the terms *satti* (Skt *śakti*) and *vyatti* (Skt *vyakti*) according to Bhartṛhari.²²²

§94. Apart from these examples, Buddhapiya quotes verses defining (1) the voc. (*āmantaṇa*),²²³ (2) the syntactical concepts of *kamma*,²²⁴ (3) *karaṇa*,²²⁵ (4) *kattā*, *kammakattā*, *hetukattā*,²²⁶ (5) *sambandha*,²²⁷

*vohāraṇisayo saddo nekantaparamāthiko
buddhisamkappito attho tass' attho ti pavuccati
buddhiyā gahitattā hi samyogo jāyate iti
samyogo vijjamāno va kattā bhavati jātiyā*

²²²See, e.g. VP III 7:1ff.

²²³Rūp 93,16-18:

*saddenābhimukhikāro vijjamānassa vatthuno
āmantaṇaṃ vidhātābhe n' atthi rājā bhavēti tan ti*

Identified at Rūp-ṭ 92,1.

²²⁴Rūp 94,8-9:

*nibbattivikattippattibhedena tividhaṃ matam.
kattukriyābhigammaṃ taṃ sukha'-ṅgāraṃ nivesanan ti.*

This verse is not identified as coming from Mañj; but its dependence on VP III 7:45 is obvious: *nivāryaṃ ca vikāryaṃ ca prāpyaṃ ceti tridhā matam.*

²²⁵Rūp 97,3-4:

*yassa sabbavisesena kriyāsaṃsiddhihetutā
sambhāvīyati taṃ vuttaṃ karaṇaṃ nāma kāraṇaṃ ti*

Identified at Rūp-ṭ 99,8; cf. VP III 7:93ff.

²²⁶Rūp 98,1-4:

*attappadhāno kiriyaṃ yo nibbatteti kāraṇaṃ.
appayutto payutto vā sa kattā ti pavuccati.
hetukattā ti kathito kattuno yo payojako.
kammakattā ti sukaro kammabhūto kathīyate ti.*

Identified at Rūp-ṭ 101,19; Rūp-sn 165(=170),36.

and (6) the morphologico-semantic concept of *samāsa*.²²⁸ In addition he quotes a verse defining the two types of negation *pariyudāsa* and *pasajjapaṭisedha*.²²⁹

§ 95. There are two prose passages from Mañj quoted in Sadd. The first deals with the vocative *bho* which is correctly described as being used with nouns in the voc. sg. and pl.²³⁰ The other is a long passage discussing the concept of *liṅga* which is indebted to Mahā-bh II 195,25ff.²³¹ Thus the verse that is part of this quotation is a Pāli version of a *kārikā*

²²⁷Rūp 110,7–10:

*kriyākāraḥkaṣaṅjāto assēdaṃbhāvahetuko
sambandho nāma so attho, tatha chaṭṭhī vidhīyate.
pāratantyam hi sambandho tatha chaṭṭhī bhavē tito
upādhiṭṭhānā gamito na viśesyādito tito ti.*

Identified at Rūp-sn 191,14.

²²⁸Rūp 118,1–2:

*samāso padasaṅkhepo, padappaccayasaṃhitam.
taddhitam nāma hot' evam viññeyyam tesam antaran ti*

Identified at Rūp-sn 208,32.

²²⁹Rūp 124,31–32:

*pasajjapaṭisedhassa lakkhaṇam vatthunatthitā
vatthuto aññatra vutti pariyudāsālakkaṇan ti*

Identified at Rūp-sn 226,34.

²³⁰Sadd 171,10–14: *tathā hi Niruttimañjūsāyam vuttam: "bho t' idaṃ
āmanāṇatthe nipāto, so na kevalam ekavacanam eva hoti atha kho bahu-
vacanam pi hoti ti bho purisā ti bahuvacanappayogo ti gahito, bhavanto t'
idaṃ pana bahuvacanam eva hoti ti purisā puna vuttan" ti.*

²³¹See Sadd 221,25ff.: *tathā hi ayam Niruttimañjūsāyam vutto: "kiṃ pan' etaṃ
liṅgam nāma: keci tāva vadanti:*

*thanakesavatī itthī, massuvā puriso siyā,
ubhinnaṃ antaraṃ etaṃ itarōbhayamuttako ti*

*... apare vadanti: na liṅgam nāma paramatthato kiñci atthi, lokasaṃketarūlho
pana vohāro liṅgam nāma ti etc.*

found in Mahā-bh II 196,4–5.²³² Vajirabuddhi quotes it in Mmd; he may have taken it from Mañj.²³³

IV.2.7. Saṅgaha (Sgh)

§ 96. The author of this treatise is referred to as the Saṅgahakāra (both in the sg. and pl.), perhaps in imitation of the name Saṅgrahakāra known from Sanskrit grammar. The Sgh is only known from a few quotations in Vajirabuddhi's Mmd and Chapāṭa's Kacc-nidd. It is not possible to date the work with any degree of certainty. However, it must have been composed before the tenth century A.D., which is the approximate date of Mmd, and after Kacc-v, which it appears to know, thus perhaps between the eighth and tenth centuries A.D.

§ 97. The quotations show that the treatise is composed in the form of *kārikās* with an explicating prose commentary. Since they are confined to the *kāraka* chapter of Mmd and Kacc-nidd, there is reason to believe that the treatise is exclusively devoted to the description of Pāli's case syntax.

§ 98. Vajirabuddhi quotes in Mmd four prose passages from the Saṅgaha.²³⁴ With the exception of the third one, the quotations are each

²³² *stanakeśavatī strī syāl lomaśaḥ puruṣaḥ smṛtaḥ |*
ubhayor antaram yac ca tadabhava napuṃsakam ||

²³³ Mmd 239,13–14.

²³⁴ See I. Mmd 240,28–29: (ad Kacc 285: *liṅgatthe paṭhamā*) *Saṅgahakāro pana "liṅgakattukammakaraṇasampadānasāmibhummadisāyogaālapanesu paṭhamā hotī" ti āha*; 2. Mmd 243,34–38: *Saṅgahakāro pana "karaṇakattukammaṇācamīsattamyatthe nipātappayoge paṭikkhepe paccatte kucchitatthe itthambhūte kiriyāpavagge pubbasadisamānūnakalahanipuṇamissakasakhilādīyoge hetvatthe kāladdhāne visesane maṇḍitussake tatiyā hotī" ti āha*; 3. Mmd 249,9–11: *Saṅgahakāro pana "kammatthe tatiyācaṭṭhīsattamyatthe c' enayoge catuthyatthe kāladdhānam accantasaṇyoge kammavacanīyayutte ca dutiyā hotī" ti āha*; 4. Mmd 255,5–8: *Saṅgahakāro pana "bhummatthe sāmīssarādhīpatidāyādasakhipatibhūpasutakusalesu niddhāranānādarakammakaraṇanimittasampadānāpadānapaccattopā-*

followed by a large number of illustrative examples compiled by the Saṅgahakāra. Chapaṭa reproduces the second prose passage at Kacc-nidd 126,30–34 but in addition he quotes a verse whose subject matter is identical with the one formulated in the first prose passage quoted at Mmd 240,28–29.²³⁵

§ 99. The majority of the examples are quoted from unidentifiable post-canonical Pāli literature. However, there are also a number of interesting canonical quotations. In a few cases Mmd reproduces canonical quotations which are found in Kacc-v in a slightly edited version. Thus, for instance the Vinaya quotation at Kacc-v 312: *hatthesu piṇḍāya caranti* (Vin I 90,11) is quoted as *naggā hatthesu piṇḍāya caranti* (Vin I 90,20).²³⁶ The quotations show that the case terminology of the Saṅgaha is influenced by the terminology of the Aṭṭhakathās, which he must have utilized. Thus, for instance, he quotes D I 63,22–23: *idam pi 'ssa hoti sīlasmin ti* as an example of the use of the loc. in the sense of the nom. Since Buddhaghosa mentions in Sv that the Mahāṭṭhakathā interprets the loc. as the nom. (*paccattavacanatthe ... etaṃ bhummaṃ*),²³⁷ the interpretation is no doubt indebted to Sv.

§ 100. There are other examples of the Saṅgahakāra's use of the Pāli commentaries. For instance, he quotes Vin I 103,11: *āvikatā hi 'ssa phāsu hoti*, as an example of the use of the nom. in the sense of the instr. (*sic*). The exegesis that justifies this amazing statement is found in Kkh 26,25f.: *āvikatā ti āvikatāya, pakāsītāyā ti attho; alajjitā ti ādisu viya*

dhyadhikissaravacanamaṇḍitussukkakālabhāvesu sattamī vibhatti hotī" ti āha.

²³⁵Kacc-nidd 126,4–6: *vuttañ ca Saṅgahakārehi:*

*liṅgatthe kattukammatthe karaṇe sampadāniye
nissakke sāmibhummatthe disatthālapane tathā*

²³⁶Rūp 114,31 has the same reading, but Sadd 727,21 reproduces the reading of Kacc-v.

²³⁷Rūp 182,16ff.

idam pi karaṇatthe paccattavacanam.²³⁸ The interpretation of D II 230,2: *ajjhāsayam ādibrahmacariyam* in the sense of the instr. is based upon the gloss on this construction at Sv: *karaṇatthe paccattavacanam*.²³⁹ It is thus clear that the Saṅgahakāra attempted to integrate the grammatical annotations of the Aṭṭhakathās into his own work.

§ 101. Aggavaṃsa composed Sadd § 559: *paṭhamatthe tatiyā-sattamiyo*, and § 660: *tatiyatthe paṭhamā*, with particular regard to the above interpretation of D I 63,22–23 and D II 230,2. Though it cannot be excluded that he knew the Sgh, it is more likely that he copied the description from Mmd, of which he was a careful reader.

IV.2.8. Mahāsandhi (Mahā-s)

§ 102. Mahā-s is only referred to once in Buddhapiya's Rūp-ṭ.²⁴⁰ In the remarks on the introductory verse of Rūp he mentions that he utilized the *sandhi* treatises, i.e., Mahā-s and Cūḷ-s (see IV.2.9).²⁴¹

§ 103. The discussion in Rūp-ṭ of the views expressed in Mahā-s shows that it was a revised version of the *sandhi* chapter of Kacc.

§ 104. It appears from Rūp-ṭ that the author has interpolated a restrictive *tu* in Kacc 29: *vagge ghosāghosānam tatiyapaṭhamā*, so as to exclude the unwanted consequence of the imprecise formulation of the sutta that the voiced nasals belonging to each of the five groups (*vagga*) receive the third letter in the group of sonants as doubling. Buddhapiya rejects this interpolation on the grounds that since the *ṭhāne* of Kacc 28 is the governing rule (*adhikāra*) such a problem does not arise.²⁴²

²³⁸Rūp 17,4–5.

²³⁹Rūp 658,13.

²⁴⁰Rūp 25,15–18.

²⁴¹Rūp-ṭ 4,1: *ādisaddena* (scil. of *Kaccāyanavaṇṇanādiṃ* of the introductory verse) *sandhiniruttippakaraṇādikaṃ*.

²⁴²See Rūp-ṭ 25,15–18: *yaṃ pana Mahāsandhippakaraṇe “vagge ghosāghosānam tatiyapaṭhamā” (= Kacc 29) ti vaggapañcamānam tatiyadvebhāva-*

IV.2.9. Cūlasandhi (Cūl-s)

§ 105. This anonymous treatise on *sandhi* is, like Mahāsandhi, only known from a couple of quotations in Rūp-ṭ. Like Mahā-s Buddhapiya utilised it for the elaborate *sandhi* chapter of Rūp.

§ 106. Like Mahā-s the work appears to be an edited version of Kacc.

§ 107. The discussion recorded in Rūp-ṭ²⁴³ shows that the author reformulated Kacc 11 so as to read *assaraṃ byañjanaṃ parakkharaṃ naye*, excluding the word *yutte* on the grounds that the phoneme *ṃ* (*niggahīta*) is not a consonant. The other quotation states that “when a preceding [vowel] is elided, a following *i* and *u* become *e* and *o*, respectively”.²⁴⁴ This statement has probably been part of the elaboration of Kacc 14. Buddhapiya quotes it to justify his formulation of the comment on Rūp 16 (= Kacc 14).²⁴⁵

IV.3. Extant Post-Kaccāyana Grammars and Commentaries

IV.3.1. Mukhamattadīpanī (Mmd)

§ 108. Mmd or *Nyāsa*, also called *Kaccāyanavuttivaṇṇanā*,²⁴⁶ is the oldest extant commentary on Kacc and Kacc-v. It is attributed to Vajirabuddhi²⁴⁷ or Vimalabuddhi who is also claimed to have composed

*ppasaṅgato nivattanatthaṃ tu-saddapakkhepanaṃ kataṃ, taṃ niratthakam
eva ṭhānādhikārato ca tannivattiyā siddhattā ti.*

²⁴³Cūlasandhiyaṃ niggahītaṃ byañjanasaññāya avihitattā “assaraṃ byañjanaṃ parakkharaṃ naye” (≠ Kacc 11) ti sutte yuttaggahaṇaṃ akatan ti veditabbaṃ.

²⁴⁴Rūp-ṭ 24,17–20: Cūlasandhiyaṃ pi “pubbalope paro ikāro ekāraṃ ukāro okāran” ti ca vuttaṃ.

²⁴⁵Rūp 7,13–14: *ivaṇṇabhūto ukārabhūto ca paro saro asarūpe pubbassare lutte kvaci asavaṇṇaṃ pappoti.*

²⁴⁶ See Mogg-p 6,30: *vuttaṃ Kaccāyanavuttivaṇṇanāyaṃ* (= *Nyāsa*, i.e., *Mukhamattadīpanī*, Mogg-pd 18,31).

²⁴⁷Aggavaṃsa uses the name Vajirabuddhi in preference to Vimalabuddhi, e.g. at Sadd 210,4.

a *īkā* on Abhidhammāvatāra.²⁴⁸ The date of Vajirabuddhi cannot be fixed with absolute certainty as Mmd contains no colophon containing a clue as to when it was composed. The work itself presupposes knowledge of Pāli grammars that are no longer extant. Vajirabuddhi mentions Sudattakisivanirutti (see IV.2.3) and Mahānirutti (see IV.2.2) from which he quotes a number of suttas interpolated in Kacc (see § 68), and he quotes from the work of the Saṅgahakāra (see IV.2.7). Internal evidence shows that he knows Patañjali's Mañjūsā (see IV.2.6). Since he quotes from an Abhidharma treatise ascribed to the *īkākāra*,²⁴⁹ whom the Mmd-pt²⁵⁰ identifies with Ānanda, the *Mūlaīkākāra*, who is traditionally placed in the eighth or ninth century A.D. (see DPPN s.v. 11. Ānanda), he is to be placed between the *Mūlaīkākāra* and Buddhapiya who refers to *Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā* (= Nyāsa) in the introductory verse of Rūp²⁵¹ and several times in Rūp-ṭ. Rūp was written before Mogg and Mogg-p (second half of the twelfth century A.D.) because Mogg-p 6,23–24 quotes Rūp 3,25–26: *kvaci saṃyogapubbā, ekārōkāra rassā iva vuccante. yathā: ettha, seyyo, ottho, sotthi*. Mmd was thus probably composed in the tenth–eleventh centuries A.D. Because of its thoroughness Mmd has exerted a powerful influence on most Pāli grammars written in the tradition of Kacc.

§ 109. Vajirabuddhi is a meticulous exegete of Kacc and Kacc-v, almost to the point of being pedantic. The general structure of each paragraph is that he first quotes and paraphrases each sutta, isolating and counting the number of words (*pada*) that constitute it, a practice that was imitated by Chapaṭa and Viṅṭāvi in Kacc-nidd and Kacc-vaṇṇ, respectively. Then he comments on its interpretation in Kacc-v, carefully noticing if the author himself is going to add a paragraph on the interpretation of any given *ca* or the like of Kacc. It is thus possible to deduce that if any

²⁴⁸See SVD 1223.

²⁴⁹Mmd 273,31.

²⁵⁰Mmd-pt 197,26.

²⁵¹See Rūp-ṭ 3,28: *Kaccābyākaraṇaṇ ca tabbaṇṇanābhūtaṃ Nyāsaṃ*.

such paragraph is not mentioned, it has most probably been interpolated at a later date. Finally, Vajirabuddhi comments on the examples and counterexamples illustrating the sutta in question. In some cases he quotes short passages from Kacc-v, some of which differ from the transmitted versions (see IV.1.4). In addition, he makes an effort to distinguish between original and interpolated suttas in Kacc (see § 18). It is thus clear that Mmd is an invaluable source of information on the actual text of Kacc and Kacc-v at the time of the composition of Mmd.

§ 110. Mmd is in many ways an exegetical tour de force, whose main intention is to show how the individual suttas of Kacc and the explanations of the vutti in the final analysis can be derived by applying relevant rules from Kacc to the problem under discussion. Thus, for instance, in his comment on Kacc-v 44: *abhi icc etassa sare pare abbhādeso hoti*: “*abbh* is substituted for *abhi* before a following vowel”, he explains that since the use of the word *sare* from Kacc 42 applies by way of recurrence (*anuvattana* = Skt *anuvṛtti*) and since the use of the word *ādesa* (substitute) is enunciated in the nominative, the substituend *abhi* is to be stated in the genitive, as the *vuttikāra* does. But then he continues by explaining that it is possible to take *abhi* as a genitive with elided genitive suffix on the interpretation of Kacc 221 (+ 220) stating that prefixes do not have any case markers.²⁵² This, however, is an extreme case of commentarial ingenuity. On the other hand, Vajirabuddhi’s exegetical practice shows that he regards Kacc as a synchronous system of rules from which it is possible to pick any rule that can be used to explain any given form.

§ 111. Usually Vajirabuddhi makes use of well-known exegetical devices, which he defines in connection with the exegesis of Kacc-v 48: *pati etassa sare vā byañjane vā pare kvaci paṭi ādeso hoti*: “before a following vowel or consonant *paṭi* is sometimes substituted for *pati*”. Since the interpretation *sare vā byañjane vā* is not warranted by Kacc

²⁵²Mmd 56,24–26: *sareggahaṇassānuvattanato ādesaggahaṇassa paṭhamāya niddiṭṭhattā abhissā ti vattabbe abhisaddam* (so read) *chaṭṭhiṃ katvā*.

48 which only states that in some cases *paṭi* is substituted for *pati*, Vajirabuddhi takes the opportunity of explaining how certain governing rules either apply in the manner of a jumping frog (*maṇḍūkagatika*, cf. Skt *maṇḍūkagati*), i.e., from a preceding rule to the rule in question, or in the manner of the lion's gait (*sīhagatika*, cf. Skt *siṃhāvalokitanyāya*), i.e., from the immediately preceding rule to the rule in question. This makes it possible to explain the interpretation of the *vuttikāra* with reference to Kacc 42: *go sare* etc. (*maṇḍūkagativasena*), and Kacc 49 *puthass' u byañjane* (*sīhagativasena*).²⁵³ It is, of course, questionable if this analysis represents the actual intention of the *vuttikāra*, but it illustrates the tendency of Mmd to exhaust every possibility of explaining Kacc-v as consistently based upon Kacc.

IV.3.2. Mmd Commentaries and Grammars based upon Mmd

§ 112. When Chapaṭa wrote Kacc-nidd, presumably in the first half of the fifteenth century A.D., several works related to Mmd were in circulation. Thus he quotes two passages from Nyāsaṭṭikā, which are identical with passages in Mmd-pt,²⁵⁴ as well as Nyāsappadīpappakaraṇa,²⁵⁵ and Nyāsappadīpaṭṭikā,²⁵⁶ of which a fragment is still extant.²⁵⁷

§ 113. Gv 63 attributes a Mahāṭṭikā on Mmd to Vimalabuddhi (= Vajirabuddhi) which may be identical with Mmd-pt. Nothing is known about the authors of the other two works. Since they antedate Kacc-nidd, they may have been composed in the twelfth century A.D.

²⁵³See Mmd 59,25ff.

²⁵⁴Kacc-nidd 103,27f.: *Nyāsaṭṭikāyaṃ ca "caggahaṇena karaṇabhūtena sutāgatappayogato aññatthappayoge pañcamīvibhatti ca apādānakāraṇe chaṭṭhī-dutiya-tatiya-vibhattiyo ca saṃgaṇhātī"* (= Mmd-pt 133,28f.) *ti vuttam*; Kacc-nidd 234,10: *ayaṃ ghaṭṭadigaṇo adhikāraṇo ti attho* (= Mmd-pt 253,8-9) *ti Nyāsaṭṭikāyaṃ vutto* (reading *ghaṭṭadidhātugaṇo*).

²⁵⁵Kacc-nidd 29,30.

²⁵⁶Kacc-nidd 40,22-25.

²⁵⁷Fausbøll, "Cat. Mand. MSS", no. 153, *JPTS* IV (1896), p. 48.

§ 114. Mukhamattasāra,²⁵⁸ “The Essence of Mmd”, is attributed to Guṇasāgara who is also credited with a *ṭīkā* on his work.²⁵⁹ It may have been composed in the beginning of the thirteenth century A.D.²⁶⁰ Chapaṭa quotes two verses from Mukhamattasāra²⁶¹ which he notices are composed under the influence of Vimalabuddhi,²⁶² as well as a prose passage.²⁶³ A late work like Vjīṭāvī’s Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā (Kacc-vaṇṇ) (sixteenth century A.D.) is to a large extent an abbreviated recast of Mmd and should therefore be included among the grammars written in the tradition of Mmd.

O.H. Pind

²⁵⁸Mentioned in the Pagan Inscription as no. 151; see *PLB*: 105.

²⁵⁹Gv 63.

²⁶⁰Bode, *PLB*: 25.

²⁶¹Kacc-nidd 31,11–14.

²⁶²Kacc-nidd 31,15: *Vimalabuddhi-ācariyādhippāyavasena vuttaṃ*.

²⁶³Kacc-nidd 85,28f.

ABBREVIATIONS

abl.	ablative
BHSD	<i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary</i>
chap.	chapter
CPD	<i>A Critical Dictionary of Pāli</i>
ÉVP	<i>Études védiques et paninéennes</i>
EWA	Manfred Mayhofer, <i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen</i> , Heidelberg, 1986–2001.
GDhp	<i>The Gāndhārī Dharmapada</i> , ed. John Brough, London, 1962.
inst.	instrumental
loc.	locative
nom.	nominative
PGL	see Franke 1902 under References
PED	<i>Pali–English Dictionary</i>
PTC	<i>Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance</i>
StII	<i>Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik</i>
ts.	tatsama
voc.	vocative
VP III	Vākyapadīya
w.r.	wrong reading

ABBREVIATIONS OF GRAMMATICAL TEXTS

Abbreviations of other texts follow *CPD* Epilegomena

Abhid-k-bh	Vasubandhu, Abhidharmakośabhāṣya
Cūl-nir	Cūḷanirutti
Cūl-s	Cūḷasandhi
Gv	Gandhavamṣa
Kacc	Kaccāyana
Kacc-nidd	Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa
Kacc-v	Kaccāyanavutti
Kacc-vaṇṇ	Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā
Kāś	Jayāditya and Vāmana, Kāśīkā-vṛtti
Mahā-bh	Patañjali, (Vyākaraṇa-)Mahābhāṣya
Mahā-nir	Mahānirutti
Mahā-s	Mahāsandhippakaraṇa
Mañj	Mañjūsā
Mogg	Moggallāna
Mogg-p	Moggallānapañcikā
Mogg-v	Moggallānavutti
Mmd	Mukhamattadīpanī
Mmd-pt	Mukhamattadīpanī-purāṇatīkā
Nir-piṭ	Niruttipiṭaka
Pāṇ	Pāṇini
Rūp	Rūpasiddhi
Rūp-ṭ	Rūpasiddhiṭkā
Sadd	Saddanīti
Saddhamma-s	Saddhammasaṅgaha
Sudatta-nir	Sudattakisivanirutti
Sgh	Saṅgaha
TK	Trikaṇḍī
VP	Vākyapadīya

REFERENCES

- Alwis, James d'. 1863. *An Introduction to Kachchāyana's Grammar of the Pāli Language*, Colombo.
- Bechert, H. 1990. "A Metric 'varṇaka' in the Pāli Scriptures", in *Studies in Buddhism and Culture in Honour of Professor Dr. Egaku Mayeda on his Sixty-fifth Birthday*: 751–58, Tokyo.
- Franke, Rudolf Otto. 1902. *Geschichte und Kritik der einheimischen Pāli-Grammatik und -Lexicographie*, Strassburg: Trübner.
- . 1978. *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Hintüber, O. von. 1986. *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
- . 1987. "Das buddhistische Recht und die Phonetik des Pāli", *StII* Heft 13/14 : 101–27.
- Kahrs, E.G. 1992. "Exploring the Saddanīti", *JPTS* XVII : 1–212.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de, tr., 1923–31. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, 6 vols. Paris: P. Geuthner.
- Lüders, Heinrich. 1940. *Philologica Indica*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard. *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien : ein Begriffswörterbuch zur altindischen Dialektik, Erkenntnislehre und Methodologie*, 3 vols. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991–2006.
- Pind, O.H. 1989. "Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I", *JPTS* XIII: 33–81.
- . 1990. "Studies in the Pāli Grammarians II.1", *JPTS* XIV : 175–218.
- . 1992. "Buddhaghosa: His Works and Scholarly Background", *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyo Kenkyu)* Vol. XXI: 150–53.
- . 1995. "Pāli and the Pāli Grammarians : The Methodology of the Pāli Grammarians", in *Sauḥṛdyamaṅgalam, Studies in Honour of Siegfried Lienhard on his 70th Birthday*, Stockholm: 281–97.
- Pischel, R. 1900. *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Strassburg.
- Renou, L. 1957. "Kaccāyana et le Kātantra", in *ÉVP* III: 127–33.
- . 1942. *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit*, Paris: Champion.