

STUDIES IN THE PĀLI GRAMMARIANS

I

Buddhaghosa's References to Grammar and Grammarians

Introduction

It is not known when and under what circumstances a distinct Buddhist grammatical literature devoted to the description of the language of the Pāli canon originated. It is reasonable to assume that, throughout the development of the Buddhist tradition, basic knowledge of the morphology and vocabulary of the canonical language was handed down in some form or another, even though it may never have been based upon any distinct grammatical tradition. The Niddesa, with its strings of glosses and morphological substitute forms may be considered an early instance of the level of sophistication of such basic knowledge.

Strange as it may seem, there is no indication at all in the extant *aṭṭhakathās* and *ṭīkā*s that the commentators knew of any Pāli grammar prior to the well-known grammar ascribed to Kaccāyana.¹ This would indicate that Kaccāyana's grammar may well have been the first recorded instance of a Pāli grammar. Although it is not known precisely when it was written, it is no doubt late. Perhaps it dates from the 7th—8th century A.D. since it is not referred to in any of the *aṭṭhakathās* except for Ap-a, a fairly late commentary.² It is there ascribed to Kaccāyana along with the *Mahānirutti* and *Nett*.³

R.O. Franke, who devoted a study — to the best of my knowledge the only one in existence — to the history and criticism of the

¹For the nature of this grammar cf. Franke, *Gramm.*, pp. 14-20 and Norman, *Pāli Literature* p. 163.

²Cf. Norman, *op. cit.* pp. 146-147.

³Cf. Ap-a 491,20.

indigenous Pāli grammar and lexicography, claimed that certain of the grammatical terms found in the commentaries ascribed to Buddhaghosa reflected an old Pāli grammatical system.⁴ This claim is questionable since the available evidence can hardly be said to justify the assumption of a full-fledged system of Pāli grammar before Kaccāyana. Apart from the fact that Buddhaghosa invariably uses a peculiar terminology for denoting the individual case relations, and that he uses the term *bhāvanapum̐saka*⁵ to denote the adverb, there is hardly a single grammatical term of any importance found in Buddhaghosa's works that does not have a parallel in Sanskrit grammatical terminology.

Franke⁶ assumed that the following verse which is often quoted by the Pāli grammarians originally belonged to a Pāli grammar antedating Buddhaghosa:

*paccattaṃ upayogaṃ ca karaṇaṃ sampadāniyaṃ
nisakkaṃ sāmivacanaṃ bhummaṃ ālapanaṭṭhamaṃ.*⁷

⁴Cf. Franke, op. cit. pp. 3-5.

⁵This term is not mentioned among the terms quoted by Franke, op. cit. pp. 3-4. Aggavaṃsa has devoted a whole paragraph to it in the Saddanīti [cf. Sadd 717,15 foll.] because, as he says, it is the designation that is used in the scriptures (*sāsane vohāro*) in contrast to the term *kiriyaṅviśeṣaṇa* [= sa. *kriyāviśeṣaṇa*] which is used in grammar (*saddasatthe*). The meaning of this peculiar term is probably "a term in the neuter that qualifies a verbal action". The term *bhāva* is borrowed from Sanskrit grammar.

⁶Op. cit. p. 4.

⁷Cf. e.g. Rūp-ṭ 116,20; Sadd 60,32. In the context of the case terminology it is interesting to note that the term for the vocative, *ālapanaṃ*, is used in the same sense in the Niddesa section of the Vinaya [cf. Vin III 73,33]. Unfortunately we are not in a position to trace the other terms back to the canon. It therefore remains uncertain when and under what circumstances they came to be an integral part of the exegetical and grammatical terminology of the Pāli.

On the contrary, according to Buddhapiya's Rūp-ṭ⁸ it is quoted from the Mahānirutti which, from the available evidence, appears to be an old commentary on Kacc.⁹ The verse was probably conceived by the author of the Mahānirutti as a summary of the terminology used in the *aṭṭhakathās*.

There is therefore no reason to believe that the few grammatical terms that have no parallel in Sanskrit grammatical terminology reflect an old system of Pāli grammar. They probably represent part of a terminology that originated with the attempt to establish a canonical exegesis. Buddhaghosa and subsequent generations of Theravāda scholars no doubt continued to use this peculiar terminology because it had become an inseparable part of the Theravāda heritage.

An instance of such canonical exegesis is found in the verse that Buddhaghosa invariably quotes in connection with his interpretation of the canonical stereotypes "*ekaṃ samayaṃ*" and "*tena samayena*":

*taṃ taṃ atthaṃ apekkhivā bhummena karaṇena ca
aññatra samayo vutto upayogena so idhā ti.*¹⁰

With regard to this or that motive [the word] "*samaya*" is used elsewhere [in the Pāli] in the locative and the instrumental. In this context, however, it is used in the accusative.

⁸Cf. Rūp-ṭ Be 1965 127,25.

⁹An analysis of the available fragments of Mahānirutti will be treated in *Studies in the Pāli Grammarians II*.

¹⁰Cf. Sv 33,27-28; Ps I 9,31-32; Spk I 11,32-33; Mp I 13,25-26. In order to make the verse fit the context, Buddhaghosa quotes it in a slightly edited version in his comment on "*ekena samayena*" in Sp 108,13-14.

Whenever Buddhaghosa quotes this verse, it is followed by a grammatical quotation which he ascribes to the porāṇās. In Buddhaghosa this normally means the aṭṭhakathācariyas:

*porāṇā pana vaṇṇayanti: “tasmim samaye ti vā, tena samayenā ti vā, taṃ samayan ti vā abhilāpamattabhedo esa. sabbattha bhumam eva attho” ti.*¹¹

The old ones, moreover, make the comment that “*tasmim samaye*”, or “*tena samayena*”, or “*taṃ samayan*” is merely a difference of expression. In all [three] cases the sense is nothing but locative.

This prose fragment is the only instance of a grammatical reference in Buddhaghosa where he expressly ascribes views on points of grammar to the aṭṭhakathācariyas. This would seem to support the conclusion that the peculiar case terminology was in use in the lost aṭṭhakathās. But this, of course, cannot be taken as an indication of the existence of a complete system of Pāli grammar. The verse and the prose fragment are clearly context-bound in the sense that they specifically deal with the interpretation of certain irregularities of canonical usage.

The fact that Buddhaghosa makes extensive use of this seemingly archaic terminology contrasts with the fact that his grammatical terminology in general consists of Pāli translations of Sanskrit technical terms. The Samantapāsādikā, which may be considered representative of Buddhaghosa’s grammatical vocabulary,¹² contains

¹¹Cf. Sv 33,29–31; Ps I 10,1–3; Spk I 12,1–3; Mp I 13,27–29; Sp 108,15–17.

¹²Cf. Sp VIII [indexes]. For unknown reasons the terms *bhāva* and *bhāvalakkhaṇa* [e.g. at Sp 108,1] are not recorded in the indexes. The terms

among others the following important technical terms: *accantasamyoga* = sa. *atyantasamyoga* [cf. Pāṇ II 1 29], *ādesa* = sa. *ādeśa* [cf. Pāṇ I 1 56], *itthambhūtakkhyāna* = sa. *itthambhūtākhyāna* [cf. Pāṇ I 4 90], *itthambhūtalakkhaṇa* = sa. *itthambhūtalakṣaṇa* [cf. Pāṇ II 3 21], *upapada* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ II 2 19 and passim], *upasagga* = sa. *upasarga* [cf. Pāṇ I 4 59 and passim], *nipāta* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ I 1 14 and passim], *nimitta* [= *nimittasaptamī*; ts.; cf. Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ II 3 36],¹³ *bhāva* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ I 2 21 and passim], *bhāvalakkhaṇa* = sa. *bhāvalakṣaṇa* [cf. Pāṇ II 3 37], *liṅga* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ II 4 26], *lopa* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ I 1 60], *vipariṇāma* [ts.], *viparyāya* [= *vipallāsa*] = sa. *viparya(-ā-)ya*, *vibhatti* = sa. *vibhakti*.

Examples such as these show clearly that Buddhaghosa’s grammatical vocabulary was largely made up of terms derived from Sanskrit grammar with the addition of a few terms which we may deduce were in use in the aṭṭhakathās, the historical background and development of which remain unknown.

In several instances, however, Buddhaghosa explicitly refers his readers to grammar (*saddasattha* = sa. *śabdaśāstra*) or grammarians (*saddalakkhaṇavidū*,¹⁴ *saddavidū*, *akkharacintakā*) for information about points of grammar that will justify his own grammatical analyses of the

accantasamyoga and *nimitta* (v. s.v. *nimittattha*) have erroneously been omitted from the index of grammatical terms. They are found, however, in the index of words and subjects.

¹³It is interesting that Vjb [Be 1960 57,26–27] on Sp 189,25 (*nimittatthe*) quotes a Pāli version of a Sanskrit verse which is quoted in Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ II 3 36 as an illustration of *nimittasaptamī*.

¹⁴The actual meaning of this term is “those who know the rules of grammar”, i.e. grammarians. “*saddalakkhaṇa*” stands for grammar in Buddhaghosa’s works; cf. the usage of *śabda* and *lakṣaṇa* in Sanskrit grammar; v. Renou, *Vocabulaire* s. vv.

Pāli. This gives rise to the rather interesting problem of trying to identify the grammatical source or sources to which Buddhaghosa refers.

In the following analysis a number of such references found in Buddhaghosa's works will be addressed. Since there is uncertainty about the actual authorship of some of the works ascribed to Buddhaghosa, the analysis has been limited to those works for which the authorship is beyond doubt: Visuddhimagga [Vism], Samantapāsādikā [Sp], and the commentaries on the āgamās: Sumaṅgavilāsini [Sv], Papañcasūdanī [Ps], Sāratthappakāsinī [Spk], and Manorathapūraṇī [Mp].¹⁵ Sp is especially rich in grammatical references, but the other commentaries also contain interesting material. In a few instances grammatical statements where Buddhaghosa does not explicitly refer to grammar have been analysed. Such instances are included here either because of their general interest or because they belong to the same set of problems which Buddhaghosa analyses in similar contexts with reference to grammar or grammarians.

The sources to which Buddhaghosa refers have in almost every instance been identified as Pāṇinian grammar, and although the present study does not claim to be exhaustive, it should certainly present sufficient evidence of the pervasive influence of Sanskrit grammar on Buddhaghosa's grammatical analyses. It would thus seem that a reconsideration of the role of Sanskrit in the formation and history of the Pāli grammatical literature is necessary. This will be addressed further in the conclusion.

Visuddhimagga

1 [Vism 8,2-6]

¹⁵For an analysis of the works ascribed to Buddhaghosa, v. Norman, *Pāli Literature* pp. 120-130.

In the first example from Visuddhimagga, Buddhaghosa comments upon the meaning of the word "sīla" as it is defined by the grammarians (*saddalakkhaṇavidū*), in contrast to those "etymologists" who derive the word from "siras" (head) and "sītala" (cool).¹⁶

*ken' atthena sīlan ti. sīlanatthena sīlaṃ. kiṃ idaṃ sīlanam nāma. samādhānam vā: kāyakammādinam susīlyavasena avippakinnatā ti attho; upadhāraṇam vā: kusālānam dhammānam paṭiṭṭhānavasena [so read with v.l.] ādhārabhāvo ti attho. etad eva h' ettha [v.l. hi ettha] athadvayaṃ saddalakkhaṇavidū anujānanti.*¹⁷

In what sense is it virtue? It is virtue in the sense of discipline. What does discipline mean? It means either composure (*samādhānam*), that is, the quality of not being scattered because the acts of the body, etc., are well disciplined, or supporting (*upadhāraṇam*), that is, being a support due to its being the basis of good dhammas. These two are the only meanings which the grammarians admit in this case.

The grammarians to which Buddhaghosa refers here cannot without further evidence be identified with any particular grammatical school. But we are probably justified in assuming that they belong to Pāṇini's school since the two meanings which Buddhaghosa ascribes to *√sīl* are identical with those recorded in the collection of roots which is

¹⁶Cf.: *aññe pana "sirattho sīlattho sīlatattho sīlattho" ti evamādinā nayan' ev' ettha attham vaṇṇayanti*, Vism 8,8-10. This is probably a reference to Vimuttimaggā. For a translation of the passage in question see *The Path of Freedom* p. 8.

¹⁷Qu. Paṭis-a 15,30-35.

traditionally ascribed to the Pāṇinians. Cf. sa-Dhātup I 556: *śīla samādhau* and sa-Dhātup X 332: *śīla upādharāṇe*.¹⁸

2 [Vism 210,21–28]

This interesting passage is part of the paragraph where Buddhaghosa brings the canonical “etymologies” of the word “*bhagavan*” into focus. After closing the first section of the paragraph with a reference to the Niddesa for detailed information on the method of analysing (*naya*) its various derivations and meanings,¹⁹ he continues by quoting a verse that exemplifies an alternative method of analysing (*apara nayo*) the word “*bhagavan*”:

*bhāgyavā bhaggavā yutto bhagehi ca vibhattavā
bhattavā vantagamano bhavesu bhagavā tato ti.*

Before he continues discussing each of these “etymologies”, Buddhaghosa presents a concise description of the rules of derivation upon which they are based.²⁰ He writes:

*tattha, vaṇṇāgamo vaṇṇavipariyayo ti ādikaṃ niruttī-
lakkhaṇaṃ gahetvā, saddanayena vā pisodarāḍḍipak-
khepalakkhaṇaṃ gahetvā, yasmā lokiyalokuttara-
sukhābhiniḍḍattakaṃ dānasīlāḍḍipārappattaṃ bhāgyam*

¹⁸ Cf. Sadd 434,30 foll.; 435,7 foll.; 564,25.

¹⁹ Cf. Vism 210,19 and Nidd I 142,25 foll.

²⁰ Buddhaghosa and other commentators often refer to or quote Vism on this verse for detailed information on its analysis; cf. Sp 123,13 foll.; Sv 34,10; Ps I 10,15; Spk I 12,16; Mp I 14,13; Ud-a 24,21; It-a I 6,15; Pj I 107,27 foll.; II 444,8; Paṭi-a 532,12; only Nidd-a I 264,7 foll. elaborates on Buddhaghosa’s analysis; cf. note 23 infra.

*assa atthi, tasmā bhāgyavā ti vattabbe bhagavā ti
vuccatī ti ṅātabbam.*

In this case it should be known — either by adopting the rule of etymology (*niruttilakkhaṇaṃ*) which runs: “letter insertion, letter metathesis”, etc., or by adopting, according to the method of grammar (*saddanayena*), the rule that consists in interpolating [the word in question] in [the word class] beginning with “*pisodara*”²¹ — that since he is blessed with having been perfected with regard to charity and morality, etc., which gives rise to mundane and trans-mundane happiness, he is called “*bhagavan*”, although [in actuality] he ought to be called “*bhāgyavan*”.

In this passage Buddhaghosa quotes the beginning of a Pāli version of the first pada of a Sanskrit verse summarizing five principles of etymological analysis, in order to identify the scope of the rule of etymology (*niruttilakkhaṇaṃ*). The Sanskrit version is found in Kāśikā ed Pāṇ VI 3 109²²:

²¹ Cf. Dhammapāla’s commentary: *ādikaṃ ti ādisaddena vaṇṇavikāro, vaṇṇalopo, dhātuatthena niyojanaṃ cā ti imaṃ tivīdhaṃ lakkhaṇaṃ saṅghāṭi. saddanayenā ti byākaraṇanayena. pisodarāḍḍinaṃ saddānaṃ ākatigaṇabhāvato vuttaṃ piso ... pe ... gahetvā ti pakkhipanaṃ eva lakkhaṇaṃ. tappariyāpannatākaraṇaṃ hi pakkhipanaṃ* [Vism-mḥ Be 1960 I 253,16-20]. Cf. also Vism-mḥ Be 1960 II 252,3-4: *vaṇṇāgamavipariyayavikāraṇināsadhātuatthavisesayogehi paṭṭhavidhassa nirutilakkhaṇassa vasena*, and see next.

²² The original Sanskrit version was identified by H.C. Warren; cf. Vism (ed. HOS) p. 173,30.

*vaṇṇāgamo vaṇṇaviparyayaś ca dvau cāparau vaṇṇa-
vikāranāśau dhātos tadarthāṭṭisayena yogas tad ucyate
pañcavidham niruktam.*

Letter insertion, letter metathesis, and the following two, namely, letter modification and letter elision, [plus] connecting the root with a meaning surpassing its [own] meaning — these are called the five ways of etymological analysis.²³

²³The first complete Pāli version of this verse is, to the best of my knowledge, found in Upasena's commentary on the Niddesa, which often refers to, or quotes, Buddhaghosa's Vism. The passage where the verse occurs is nothing but an elaborate version of the present section of Vism. It is important because it illustrates how the various principles of etymological analysis were applied to Pāli words. Cp. Nidd-a I 264,7–265,3:

*vaṇṇāgamo, vaṇṇaviparyāyo,
dve cāpare vaṇṇavikāranāśā,
dhātūnam athāṭṭisayena yogo,
tad uccate pañcavidham niruttan ti*

*evaṃ vuttanirutilakkhaṇaṃ gahetvā padasiddhi veditabbā. tattha:
“nakkhattarājā-r-iva tārakānan” [= Ja V 148,9; Pj II 146,6] ti ettha rakārāgamo
viya avijjamānassa akkharassa āgamo vaṇṇāgamo nāma. hiṃsanā hiṃso ti
vattabbe siho ti viya vijjamānakkharānaṃ heṭṭhupariyavasena parivattanaṃ
vaṇṇavipariyāyo nāma. “navacchādake dāne diyatī” [= Ja III 288,13 (cf. v.ll.)] ti
ettha akārassa ekārāpajjanatā viya akkharassa aññakkharāpajjanatā vaṇṇavikāro
nāma. jīvanassa mūto jīvanamūto ti vattabbe jīmūto ti vakāranakārānaṃ vināso
viya vijjamānakkharavināso vaṇṇavināso nāma. “phārusāhi vācāhi pakubbamāno
āsajja maṃ tvam vadasī kumārā” [= Ja IV 47,12] ti ettha pakubbamāno-padassa
abhibhavamāno ti atthapaṭipādanam viya tattha tattha yathāyogam
visesathayogo dhātūnaṃ athāṭṭisayena yogo nāma. evaṃ nirutilakkhaṇam
gahetvā, saddanayena vā piṣodarādipakkhepalakkhaṇam gahetvā yasmā
lokiyalokuttarasukhābhiniḥḥattakam dānasilādipārapattam bhāgyam assa atthi,
tasmā bhāgyavā ti vattabbe bhagavā ti vuccatī ti ṇatabbam. The verse is quoted
in Ap-a 102,17-18 (incomplete version), a comparatively late commentary, and is*

The grammatical method (*saddanaya*) consists in analysing the word “*bhagavan*” as if it were a member of the class of word forms (*ākṛtigana*)²⁴ belonging to the *gaṇapātha* “*pr̥ṣodarādī*”, to which Pāṇini refers in Pāṇ VI 3 109: “*pr̥ṣodarādīni*” *yathopadiṣṭam*: [the elision, insertion and modification of letters that are observed in such cases as] “*pr̥ṣodara*”, etc., follows the way in which they are stated [by the experts in etymology].

There is clearly no absolute contrast between the two methods since the words that are members of the *gaṇapātha* are subject to much the same rules of derivation as those defined in the verse quoted by the *Kāśikā* and Buddhaghosa.²⁵ The reason why they are contrasted in this case is probably the fact that “etymology” as such is not within the scope of Pāṇinian grammar, but belongs to a separate branch of grammatical *śāstra*.

It is not possible to identify the source from which Buddhaghosa quotes, nor are we in a position to decide whether he himself is responsible for translating the Sanskrit original into Pāli, or whether he was simply adopting an already existing Pāli version. It is highly unlikely that he should have quoted the verse from the *Kāśikā* since this important commentary is generally supposed to have been written in the 7th century A.D. All we can safely say is that

often quoted by the Pāli grammarians; cf. e.g. Rūp 277,13-16; Mogg-p 29,5-8 [cf. Mogg-p 29,9 foll. and Mogg-pd pp. 38-39 ad loc.]; Sadd 877,9-11.

²⁴The *ākṛtigana* is by definition an open list of words to which other words undergoing the same operations may be added. Cf. Renou, *Vocabulaire* and *DSG* s.v.

²⁵Cf. *Kāś* ad Pāṇ VI 3 109: *pr̥ṣodaraprakārāṇi śabdārūpāni, yeṣu lopāgama-vaṇṇavikārāḥ śāstreṇa na vihitāḥ dṛṣyante ca, tāni yathopadiṣṭāni sādḥūni bhavanti. yāni yāni yathopadiṣṭāni, śiṣṭair uccāritāni prayuktāni, tāni tathāivānigantavyāni*; cf. also Mahā-bh ad loc.

Buddhaghosa and the authors of the Kāśikā were conversant with a grammatical tradition where the verse was somehow attached to this specific Pāṇini sūtra as part of its commentary. Patañjali does not quote the verse ad loc., but this, of course, does not exclude the possibility that it belongs to a grammatical tradition antedating Patañjali.

In any case, it clearly appears from Buddhaghosa's concise description of the two methods that he was assuming that his readers would easily be able to identify the full scope of the analytical principles involved, on the basis of a summary reference.

3 [Vism 310,18–22]

In this example Buddhaghosa discusses briefly the etymology of the word *satta* (= sa. *sattva*) as it occurs in the passage (= Paṭis II 130,26 foll.: *sabbe sattā averā abyāpajjhā ... attānaṃ parihantu*, etc.) upon which he is commenting. First he quotes S III 190,2–6²⁶ where the word is defined in terms of a human being who is attached to (*satta* = sa. *sakta*) and clings to (*visatta* = sa. *viṣakta*) the khandhas. He continues:

*rūḷhisaddena pana vitarāgesu pi ayaṃ vohāro vattati
yeva, vilivamaye pi vijānīvisese tālavaṇṭavohāro viya.
akkharacintakā pana atthaṃ avicāretvā nāmamattaṃ
etan ti icchanti. ye pi atthaṃ vicārenti te sattayogena
[so read for Ee satvāyogena] sattā ti icchanti.²⁷*

However, because it is a conventional term (*rūḷhi-sadda*), this designation also applies to those who are

²⁶*rūpe kho Rādha yo chando yo rāgo yā nandī yā taṇhā tatra satto tatra visatto tasmā satto ti vuccati. vedanāya saṅghāya saṅkhāresu viṅghāne yo chando yo rāgo yā nandī yā taṇhā tatra satto tatra visatto tasmā satto ti vuccatī ti.*

²⁷Qu. Paṭis-a 604,36-38 and 57,20-22.

without desire, just as the word “palm fan” [*tālavaṇṭa* = sa. *tālavṛnta*] applies to a particular kind of fan, although it is made of split bamboo. But the grammarians (*akkharacintakā*) maintain that it is a mere name (*nāmamattaṃ*) without considering its meaning. Some people who take its meaning into consideration maintain that beings are called “*sattā*” [= sa. *sattva*, mfn.] because they are possessed of “*satta*” [= sa. *sattva*, n.], intelligence.

It is uncertain which grammarians Buddhaghosa refers to in this context. The reference is too concise to enable us to trace it to any specific grammatical work. What is important in this context is that he contrasts the idea that the term as such can be derived [although it can be applied in other meanings than the one which is supported by the etymology] with the grammarians' claim that it is a mere name for which no etymology can be adduced. There is no reason to doubt that the origin of this discussion is to be found in the Sanskrit grammatical tradition. Unfortunately Dhammapāla's commentary does not offer any clue to what Buddhaghosa's sources might have been.

4 [Vism 423,23–25]

In this paragraph Buddhaghosa explains why the “eye of knowledge” (*ñānacakkhu*) has the epithet “divine” (*dibbaṃ*). He presents inter alia the following two explanations followed by the remark that they should be known according to grammar:

*ālokapariggahena mahājutikattā pi dibbaṃ, tiro-
kuḍḍādigatarūpadassanena mahāgatikattā pi dibbaṃ.
taṃ sabbam saddasatthānusārena veditabbaṃ.*²⁸

It is both “divine” because it is of great splendour (*mahājutikattā*) due to its possessing light, and “divine” because it has an enormous range (*mahāgatikattā*) due to its seeing objects that are far removed in space and the like. All this should be known according to grammar.

As in the first example from Vism, Buddhaghosa’s commentary deals with a question of semantics: the meaning of the root √*div*. Since he uses the terms *mahājutikatta* and *mahāgatikatta* in order to define the meaning of the epithet “*dibba*”, one would assume that this grammatical reference too is to sa-Dhātup where the two meanings *juti* (to light) and *gati* (to move), among others, are ascribed to √*div*. Cf. sa-Dhātup IV 1 *divú*: *krīḍāvijigīṣāvvyavahāradyutistutimodanamadasvapakāntigatiṣu*. Dhammapāla’s *īkā* supports the assumption²⁹.

5 [Vism 518,27–32]

²⁸An identical passage is found in Sp 163,7-9 ad Vin III 5,1: *so dibbena*.

²⁹*evaṃ vihāravijayicchāvohārajutigatisaṅkhātānaṃ athānaṃ vasena imassa abhiññānassa dibbacakkhubhāvasiddhito. saddavidū ca tesu eva atthesu divú-saddam icchanti ti vuttam “taṃ sabbam saddasatthānusārena veditabban” ti [Vism-mhṭ Be II 56,27-57,2 ad loc.]; cf. also mahājutikattā mahāgatikattā ti etesu “saddasatthānusārenā” ti vuttam [Vjb Be 1960 51,27-28 ad Sp 163,7-9]; ke ci pana jutigatiatthesu pi saddavidū divú-saddam icchanti ti mahājutikattā mahāgatikattā ti idam eva dvayaṃ sandhāya vuttam. tasmā “saddasatthānusārena veditabban” ti idam dibbati jotayati ti dibbam [Sp-ṭ Be 1903,10-12 ad Sp 163,7-9]; Sadd 475,24 foll.*

In this passage Buddhaghosa analyses the meaning of the suffix *-tā*, when used in the compound “*idappaccayatā*”. He writes:

*yathā vuttānaṃ [i.e. in S II 25,17] etesaṃ
jarāmarañādinam paccayato vā paccayasamūhato vā
idappaccayatā ti vutto. tatrāyaṃ vacanatho: imesaṃ
paccayā idappaccayā; idappaccayā eva idappaccayatā;
idappaccayānaṃ vā samūho idappaccayatā. lakkhaṇaṃ
pan’ ettha saddasatthato pariyesitabbaṃ.*³⁰

The term “*idappaccayatā*” is used either in terms of the conditions of these, or in terms of the collection of conditions of these, such as they have been explained [above], namely, old age, death and the rest. The meaning of the expression in this case is as follows: “*idappaccayā*” means “conditions of these”; “*idappaccayatā*” means “exclusively (*eva*) conditions of these”. Or, “*idappaccayatā*” means “a collection of conditions of these”. In these cases, moreover, the rule should be sought in grammar.

The grammatical rules to which Buddhaghosa in this case asks his reader to refer are two Pāṇini sūtras. The one which justifies the first alternative is Pāṇ V 4 27: *devāt tal*: the suffix “*tā*”, when attached to the word “*deva*” [means “*deva*” as such].³¹ In order to make the delimitative force of the suffix clear Buddhaghosa uses the particle “*eva*” to which Indian grammar traditionally ascribes a delimitative and restrictive force (*avadhāraṇa*).³² The second is Pāṇ IV 2 [37+] 43: *grāmajanabandhu-*

³⁰This text is identical with Spk II 41,7 foll., q.v.

³¹Cf. *devasabdāt svārthe talpratyayo bhavati. deva eva devatā* [Kāś ad loc].

³²On this term cf. Renou, *Terminologie* s.v.

sahāyebhyas tal: the suffix “*tā*”, when attached to the words “*grāma*”, “*jana*”, “*bandhu*”, and “*sahāya*” [denotes “a collection thereof” (*tasya samūhaḥ* = 37)].³³ Dhammapāla’s *ṭīkā* corroborates in both cases the assumption of Pāṇinian grammar as Buddhaghosa’s source with implicit references to *Kāśikā ad loc.*³⁴

For purely doctrinal reasons Buddhaghosa does not refer his reader to the well-known Pāṇini sūtra V 1 119 defining the other more general function of the abstract suffixes “*tva*” and “*tā*”: *tasya bhāve tvatalau*: the abstract suffixes “*tva*” and “*tā*” are used in the sense of the essence or quality of the thing [denoted by the term to which the two suffixes are attached]. But it is clear that there must have been some Buddhist scholars who did actually interpret *idappaccayatā* with reference to this function of the suffix “*tā*”, because Buddhaghosa refers briefly to their view, but only to refute it.³⁵

6 [Vism 519,34–520,6]

In this section Buddhaghosa presents and rejects the interpretation of some Buddhists who maintain that the term “*paṭiccasamuppāda*” denotes mere arising (*uppādamattam*), in the sense

³³Cf.: *grāmādibhyah talpratrayo bhavati, tasya samūhaḥ ity etasmīn viṣaye. grāmānām samūhaḥ grāmātā, janātā, bandhitā, sahāyatā* [Kāś ad loc].

³⁴Cf.: *idappaccayā eva idappaccayatā ti tā-saddena padam vaddhitam; na kiñci athantaram; yathā devo eva devatā ti. idappaccayānam vā samūho idappaccayatā ti. samūhattham tā-saddam āha, yathā janānam samūho janatā ti* [Vism-mhṭ Be 1960 II 228,19-22 = Spk-pt Be 1960 II 50,22-26; Be om. *na kiñci athantaram* and reads *samūhattho tā-saddo*; and adds *imam aṭham sandhāyāha: lakkhaṇam ... pe ... vedītabban ti*]. Vism-sn 1250,15-16 refers correctly to Pāṇ IV 2 37 and 43, but does not identify the other source, i.e. Pāṇ V 4 27.

³⁵Cf.: *ye pi maññanti: idappaccāyam bhāvo idappaccayatā, bhāvo ca nāma yo ākāro āvijjādīnam saṅkhārādīpātubhāve hetu, so tasmim saṅkhāravikāre paṭiccasamuppādasamaññā ti, tesam tam na yujjati*, Vism 520,15-18.

that it means arising dependently (*paṭicca*) and correctly so (*sammā*), that is, without reference to such causes as those which the heretics imagine, namely, Primordial Matter (*pakati*), The Person (*purisa*) and the like.³⁶

The final argument of the four which Buddhaghosa presents for rejecting this idea is that it is not justified because according to their interpretation the term “*paṭicca*” becomes semantically disjointed from the rest of the compound and is therefore virtually meaningless (*saddabhedato*).³⁷ The argument is developed in the following paragraph. Buddhaghosa does not explicitly refer to grammar in this instance, but the nature and importance of the argument are such that it would seem natural to include it among his grammatical references. He writes:

saddabhedato ti paṭiccasaddo ca pan' āyaṃ samāne kattari pubbakāle payujjamāno atthasiddhikaro hoti. seyyathidaṃ: “cakkhuñ ca paṭicca rūpe ca uppajjati cakkhuvīññānan” [= S II 72,4] ti. idha pana bhāva-sādhanena uppādasaddena saddhim payujjamāno

³⁶Cf.: *keci pana paṭicca sammā ca titthiyaparikkappitapakatipurisādikāraṇanirapekkho uppādo paṭiccasamuppādo ti evaṃ uppādamattam paṭiccasamuppādo ti vadanti*, Vism 518,33-35. It is not clear to whom Buddhaghosa refers. The emphasis is on arising as such without particular reference to its causes and conditions provided that heretical ideas of causes, such as the *prakṛti* of Sāṃkhya, etc., are excluded. Could it be that Buddhaghosa briefly presents the view of Sthavira Vasuvarma, which is referred to in Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* as follows: *ahetunīyāhetuvādapratiśedhārtham ity apare* [= Sthaviravasuvarmā, Sphuṭārtha ad loc.]. *nāsati hetau bhāvo bhavati, na cānutpattimato nityāt prakṛtipuruṣādīkāt kiñcid utpadyata iti*, AkBhāṣ 47,7-8 ? Perhaps Vasuvarma interpreted “*pratīyasamutpāda*” in the light of the other canonical explanation of arising “*asmīn satīdam bhavati, asyotpādād idam utpadyate*”, to which the quotation relates. In any case it has this generalised form which appears to be the idea underlying the view which Buddhaghosa rejects.

³⁷Cf. Dhammapāla’s *ṭīkā*: *saddabhedato ti saddavināsato saddāyogato* [Vism-mhṭ Be 1960 II 230,20-21].

samānassa kattu abhāvato saddabhedam gacchati, na ca kiñci attham sādhetī ti saddabhedato pi na uppādamattam paṭiccasamuppādo ti.

“Because of word disjunction”: again, when the word “*paṭicca*”, provided that the agent is the same (*samāne kattari*), is used in the sense of [the action expressed by the verb to which the absolutive suffix is added] being anterior in time [to the action expressed by the finite verb], it achieves its meaning (*atthasiddhikaro*). As, for instance, [in the following sentence]: “After having come into contact with the eye and the sense objects, eye consciousness arises [= S II 72,4]”. In the present case, however, when [the word “*paṭicca*”] is used together with the word “*uppāda*” which is an action noun (*bhāvasādhanena*),³⁸ it leads to word disjunction since the agent is not the same, and so it does not achieve any meaning at all. Therefore, also because of word disjunction, *paṭiccasamuppāda* is not mere arising.

What is important for Buddhaghosa to point out in this connection is that, in order for the term “*paṭiccasamuppāda*” to be meaningful, it is necessary for the two actions expressed by the absolutive form “*paṭicca*” and the action noun “*samuppāda*” to have the same agent (*kattā*). If this were not the case, there would be no connection between them in terms of their having the same agent. To illustrate this point Buddhaghosa quotes a well-known passage from *Samyuttanikāya* where *cakkhuvīññāṇa*, by implication, represents the

³⁸On this technical term of grammar cf. Renou *Vocabulaire* and *DSG* s.v.

identical agent of the successive verbal actions expressed by “*paṭicca*” and “*uppajati*”.³⁹ The opponent, however, generalizes the scope of meaning of “*paṭiccasamuppāda*” to such an extent that it becomes virtually impossible to interpret it with reference to specific agents and specific causes and conditions. Consequently, the action expressed by the term “*paṭicca*” would not at all relate, by virtue of identity of agent, to the action expressed by “*uppāda*”.

In order to clarify this idea he makes an implicit reference to Pāṇini’s definition of the usage and meaning of the absolutive suffix (*ktvā*), which is found in Pāṇ III 4 21: *samānakartṛkayoḥ pūrvakāle*: [when two verbal actions] have the same agent [the absolutive suffix attached to the verb expressing one action] is used in the sense of being anterior in time [to the action expressed by the other verb].⁴⁰

Buddhaghosa’s interpretation, of course, entails the obvious paradox that in order for *cakkhuvīññāṇa* to arise it must first be dependent and thus already existent, which makes its arising illogical. Perhaps the underlying intention of the opponent’s thesis was exactly to avoid this paradox by emphasising the notion of origination, in which case Buddhaghosa stands out as a conservative defender of what he considered to be the correct Theravāda tradition, while at the same time adhering strictly to the original Pāṇinian definition of the semantical function of the absolutive suffix.

We know from a parallel discussion with grammarians recorded in Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* about the correct interpretation of “*paṭiccasamuppāda*”,⁴¹ that the Buddhists tried to avoid the unwanted

³⁹On the paradox which this interpretation entails see the following.

⁴⁰Cf.: *samānaḥ kartā yayoh dhātvarthayos tatra pūrvakāle dhātvarthe vartamānād dhātoḥ ktvā pratyayo bhavati* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁴¹Cf. the grammarians’ objection: *na yukta esa padārthaḥ. kiṃ kāraṇam ? ekasya hi kartur dvayoh kriyayoh pūrvakālāyām kriyāyām ktvāvidhir bhavati. tad*

implications, pointed out by the grammarians, of a strict Pāṇinian interpretation of “*paṭicca*”, by taking the absolutive suffix as indicating an action that takes place simultaneously with the action expressed by the action noun “*samuppāda*”. For this interpretation they could refer to one of Katyāyana’s vārtikas on Pāṇini’s sūtra, which allows for interpreting “*paṭicca*” as expressing an action that is simultaneous with the action expressed by “*samuppāda*”.⁴²

We do not find any trace of this discussion in Buddhaghosa’s works, but it was well-known to subsequent generations of Pāli writers.⁴³ Dhammapāla, who was conversant with this discussion and the relevant Sanskrit grammatical literature, as appears from his *ṭīkā*, is evidently embarrassed by the implications of Buddhaghosa’s criticism and tries to avoid them by claiming that Buddhaghosa only refers to Pāṇini’s definition of the usage of the absolutive suffix in general terms (*yebhuyyena*), whereas in the present case the term “*paṭicca*” can only be interpreted as expressing an action that is simultaneous with the action expressed by “*samuppāda*”.⁴⁴

yathā: snātvā bhūṅkta itī. na cāsau pūrvam utpādāt kaścid asti, yaḥ praiṭhyottarakālam utpadyate. na cāpy akartṛkāsti kriye ti, AkBhāṣ 454,1-4.

⁴²Cf.: *vyādāya svapitṭy upasaṅkhyānam apūrvakālarvāt, vārt. 5 ad loc. Vasubandhu refers to this vārtika in his reply to the grammarians: sahabhāve ’pi ca kṛvāsti dīpaṃ prāpya tamo gatam; āsyaṃ vyādāya śete vā, paścāc cet kiṃ na samvrte, AkBhāṣ 455,7-8. Cf. Vism-sn p. 1254,12: dīpaṃ prāpya tamo vigacchati.*

⁴³Cf. the following passage from Mahānāma’s [first half of the sixth century A.D.] commentary on Paṭis: *nimittaṃ paṭisaṅkhā ṅānaṃ uppajjati* [Paṭis II 63,34-35], *kāmaṅ ca na paṭhamam jānītvā pacchā ṅānaṃ uppajjati; vohāravasena pana “mānaṅ ca paṭicca dhamme ca uppajjati manoviññānaṃ” ti ādini viya evam vuccati. Saddasatthavidū ’pi ca “ādiccaṃ pāpūnītvā tamo vigacchati” ti ādisu viya samānakāle ’pi imaṃ padaṃ icchanti [= Paṭis-a 567,12-16 ad loc.]; for the reference to grammarians cf. the parallel passage from AkBhāṣ quoted supra.*

⁴⁴Cf.: *samāne kattari ti ekasmim yeva kattari uppajjanakiriyāya yo kattā, tasmim yeva paccayanakiriyāya ca katubhūte ti attho. yathā “nhatvā bhūṅjati; bhutvā*

It would be interesting to know whether Buddhaghosa relied on Sanskrit sources for the elaborate discussion of “*paṭiccasamuppāda*” in Chapter 17 of Visuddhimagga, which from a doctrinal point of view is one of the most complex sections of the work. It is not unlikely, but only a detailed investigation of the chapter as a whole will make it possible to reach a conclusion on this point.

The present context is sufficient to conclude that the references to grammar and grammarians in Visuddhimagga clearly indicate that

*sayati” ti. pubbakāle ti idaṅ ca tvā-saddānaṃ padānaṃ yebhuyyena purimakālakiriyāya dīpanato vuttam. na idha paṭiccasaddassa purimakālatthattā. evaṅ hi “cakkhuṃ paṭiccā” ti nidassanavacanaṃ nidassitabbena saṃsandeyya. atha vā, kāmaṅ c’ ettha ubhinnaṃ kiriyānaṃ samakālatā uppajjanakiriyāya pubbe paccayanakiriyāya asambhavato. tathā pi phalakitiriyāya hetukiriyā purimakālo viya voharituṃ yuttā evam ettha hetuphalavavattānaṃ supākāṣaṃ hotī ti upacārasiddhaṃ purimakālaṃ gahervā vuttam pubbakāle ti. atthasiddhikaro ti vākyatthapaṭivīññatikaro. paṭiccasamuppādo ti hi ettha vākyatthāvabodho idha atthasiddhī ti adhippeto. payujjamāno paṭiccasaddo uppādasaddena vuccamānassa samānassa kattu abhāvato ti padaṃ ānetvā yojeiappaṃ. ayaṅ h’ ettha attho “cakkhuṃ ca paṭicca rūpe ca uppajjati cakkhu- viññānaṃ” ti ādisu paccayanakiriyāya, uppajjanakiriyāya ca viññānaṃ eva kattā ti samānakattujatā labbhati. paṭiccasamuppādo ti ettha pana uppādasaddassa bhāvasādhanatāya kiriyā va vuttā ti samānakattulakkhaṇo saddappayogo na sambhavati ti. tenāha “saddabhedam gacchati” ti. apasaddappayogo hotī ti attho. na c’ ettha parāparayogo [≠ Pāṇ III 4 20] “appatvā nadim pabbato, atikamma pabbataṃ nadī” ti ādisu viya; nāpi lakkhaṇahetuādīpayogo “sihaṃ disvā bhayaṃ hoti, ghaṭaṃ pivitvā balaṃ jāyate, ‘dhan’ ti katvā daṇḍo patito” ti ādisu viya. n’ ev’ ettha saddabhedo. na hi hatthatale āmalakam viya sabbaññeyyaṃ paccakkham katvā ṭhitānaṃ mahesinaṃ vacane akkharacintakānaṃ vipplāpo avasaram labhati. labhatu, vākyatthena saddasiddhito “nhatvā gamanaṃ, bhutvā sayanaṃ” ti ādisu viyā ti. evam pi na ca kiṅci attham sādheti. yadi pi paccakam padattho labbhati, vākyatthe pana na yujjati, tasmā dasadādimādivākyāni viya asambandhatthatāya niratthakam hotī ti adhippāyo [Vism-mhṭ Be 1960 II 231,18–232,17 ad loc.]; cf. also ibid. p. 238,1-4: *samānakāle tāva: andhakāraṃ nīhantvāra, udito ’yaṃ dipākaro ... keci pana “mukhaṃ byādāya sayati”*, which is an echo of the discussion in AkBhāṣ, for which v. note 42 supra.*

Buddhaghosa was conversant with the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, which in all likelihood is identical with Pāṇinian grammar. This conclusion is furthermore corroborated by the evidence found in the *aṭṭhakathās* ascribed to Buddhaghosa. In the following a number of references to grammar and grammarians found in these works will be analysed.

Samantapāsādikā

1 [Sp 204,25–32 ad Vin III 13,5–6]

In the Vinaya passage which Buddhaghosa comments upon: *na tvam tāta Sudinna kiñci dukkhassa jānāsī ti*, it would seem natural to construe *na ... kiñci jānāsī* with *dukkhassa*, in the sense: “you, good Sudinna, know nothing of misery”.⁴⁵ This is apparently what he had in mind, as is evident from the following paraphrase: *tvam tāta Sudinna kiñci appamattakam pi kalabhāgaṃ dukkhassa na jānāsī*: “you, good Sudinna, know nothing, i.e., not even the slightest fraction of a fraction, of misery”. But in addition to this straightforward exegesis, he offers two more complex alternative interpretations of the clause:

athavā kiñci dukkhena nānubhosī ti attho: karaṇatthe sāmivacanam anubhavanatthe ca jānanā. athavā kiñci dukkham na sarasī ti attho: upayogatthe svāmivacanam saraṇatthe ca jānanā. vikappadvaye pi purimapadassa uttarapadena samānavibhattilopo

⁴⁵This interpretation presupposes that *kiñci* is used substantivally and is to be construed with *dukkhassa*. It is, of course, also possible to construe *kiñci* adverbially, in which case *dukkhassa* has to be construed with *jānāsī* in the sense suggested by Buddhaghosa in the following.

daṭṭhabbo. taṃ sabbam saddasatthānusārena ñātabbam.

Either the meaning is: “you do not suffer from any misfortune”, the genitive (*sāmivacanam*) being used in the sense of the instrumental (*karaṇatthe*) and *√jñā* in the sense of “experiencing, suffering” (*anubhavanatthe*), or the meaning is: “you do not remember any misfortune”, the genitive being used in the sense of the accusative (*upayogatthe*) and *√jñā* in the sense of “remembering, recalling” (*saraṇatthe*). In either alternative (*vikappadvaye*), however, one should take into consideration that the case morpheme which the preceding word (*purimapadassa = kiñci*) has in common with the subsequent word (*uttarapadena = dukkhassa*) is elided (*samānavibhattilopo*). All this should be known in accordance with grammar (*saddasatthānusārena*).

According to this interpretation, it is obvious that *kiñci* becomes difficult to construe unless it is assumed that it is in agreement with *dukkhassa*. Buddhaghosa therefore postulates that *kiñci* is actually in agreement with *dukkhassa*, when it is assumed that *kiñci = kassaci* because the genitive case morpheme which indicates the agreement has been elided from *kiñci*.

It has not been possible to find any justification in traditional Indian grammar for adding supposedly elided case morphemes in the way suggested by Buddhaghosa, but the grammar which justifies his interpretation of *√jñā* constructed with the genitive in the sense indicated above can easily be identified. In both cases it is based on the application of two Pāṇini sūtras. The first alternative is undoubtedly based on Pāṇ II

3 [50+] 51: *jñō* 'vidarthasya karaṇe: the verb √jñā, when not used in the sense of "to know", is constructed with the genitive in the sense of the instrument *kāraṇa*.⁴⁶ The second is based on the subsequent sūtra Pāṇ II 3 [50+] 52: *adhīgarthadayeśāṃ karmaṇi*: verbs, when used in the sense of "remembering" [cf. sa-Dhātup II 38] ... , are constructed with the genitive in the sense of the object *kāraṇa*.⁴⁷

There is no reason to doubt that the grammar (*saddasattha*) Buddhaghosa refers to is identical with Pāṇinian grammar. But the grammatical source which justifies *samānavibhattilopo* remains unknown. If there were any identifiable grammatical tradition justifying *samānavibhattilopo* in the way suggested by Buddhaghosa, it is unlikely that an eminent scholar like Sāriputta would have failed to identify it. Under such circumstances the possibility cannot be excluded that it represents Buddhaghosa's own contribution to the grammatical analysis of the Pāli. Sāriputta corroborates, however, the assumption of Pāṇinian grammar as Buddhaghosa's main source through implicit references to Kāśikā ad loc.⁴⁸

⁴⁶Cf. Kāś ad loc.: *jānāter avidarthasyājñānārthasya karaṇe kārake ṣaṣṭhī vibhaktir bhavati: sarpiṣo jānūte; madhuno jānūte.*

⁴⁷Cf. Kāś ad loc.: *adhīgarthāḥ smaraṇārthāḥ ... eṣāṃ karmaṇi kārake śeṣatvena vivakṣite ṣaṣṭhī vibhaktir bhavati ... mātuḥ smarati.*

⁴⁸Cf. Sāriputta ad loc.: *yadā jānāti-saddo bodhanattho na hoti, tadā tassa payoge "sappino jānāti, madhuno jānāti" ti ādisu viya karaṇatthe sāmivacaṇaṃ saddasatthavidū icchanī ti āha: "kiñci ... pe ... " ti. tenāha: "karaṇa-° ... pe ... " ti. ettha ca "kiñci ... pe ... " ti kenaci dukkhena karaṇabhūtena visayaṃ nānubhosī ti evam attho veditabbo. "kiñci" ti etthāpi hi karaṇatthe sāmivacaṇassa lopo kato. ten' eva ca vakkhati "vikappa-° ... pe ... " ti. yadā pana jānāti-saddo saraṇattho hoti, tadā saraṇatthānaṃ dhātusaddānaṃ payoge mātu sarati, pitu sarati, bhātu jānāti ti ādisu viya upayogatthe sāmivacaṇaṃ saddasatthavidū vadanti ti āha: "athavā ... pe ... " ti. kassaci dukkhassa ananubhūtattā atanaṃ anubhūtaṃ appamattakam pi dukkhaṃ pariyesamāno pi abhāvato yeva na sarati ti attho. "vikappadvaye pī" ti anubhavana-saraṇatthavasena vutte dutiyatīyavikappadvaye. "purimapaḍassā" ti = kiñci ti padassa. "uttarapadenā" ti dukkhassā ti padena. "samānavibhattilopo" ti*

2 [Sp 209,27–210,1 ad Vin III 16,5]

After having quoted the passage in question: *atthi nāma tāta Sudinna ābhidosikaṃ kummāsaṃ paribhuñjissasī ti*: "Is it possible, dear Sudinna, that you are eating last evening's barley-gruel?", Buddhaghosa continues:

akkharacintakā pan' ettha imaṃ lakkhaṇaṃ vadanti: anokappanāmarisanatthavasena etaṃ atthi-nāma-sadde [so read for Ee atthi nāma sadde] upapade paribhuñjissasī ti anāgatavacaṇaṃ kataṃ. tassāyaṃ attho: atthi nāma — pe — paribhuñjissasī ti idaṃ paccakkhaṃ pi ahaṃ na saddahāmi, na marisayāmi [so read with v.l. for Ee parisayāmi] ti.

In this case, moreover, the grammarians (*akkharacintakā*), set forth the following rule (*lakkhaṇaṃ*): according to whether the meaning is that something is not likely to take place, or is not to be tolerated (*anokappanāmarisanatthavasena*), the future *paribhuñjissasī* is employed, when the expression "is it possible?" is a sentence complement (*atthi-nāma-sadde upapade*). The meaning of the [sentence] "Is it possible...?" is as follows: "I do not believe it, even though it is evident, nor do I tolerate it".

uttarapadenasamānassa sāmivacaṇassa lopo. kassaci dukkhassā ti vattabbe vikappadvaye pi purimapade sāmivacaṇassa lopaṃ katvā kiñci dukkhassā ti niddeso kato [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 4,17–5,6].

In this grammatical analysis, Buddhaghosa focuses on a syntactical peculiarity of the sentence complement (*upapada*) “*atthi*”, which systematically requires construction with the future tense, whereas, from a semantical point of view, the implied tense in such a context is to be interpreted as present.⁴⁹ The grammarians mentioned by Buddhaghosa in this case are undoubtedly identical with the Pāṇinians since the analysis is based on Pāṇ III 3 [145+] 146: *kiṃkilāstyarthesu lṛṭ*: the future (denoted *lṛṭ*) is used when [the words] “how comes it?” (*kiṃkila*) or [the words] meaning “is it possible?” (*asti*) [are syntactically constructed with it, and the action is either not likely to take place, or not to be tolerated].⁵⁰

3 [Sp 288,12–15 ad Vin III 42,13–14]

kathaṃ hi nāma so bhikkhave moghapuriso sabbamattikāmayam kuṭikam karissatī [= Vin III 42,13–14] ti idaṃ atītatthe anāgatavacanam akāsi ti vuttaṃ hoti; tassa lakkhaṇam saddasatthato pariyesitabbam.

With regard to the [sentence]: “How can it be, monks, that this foolish man has made a hut out of nothing

⁴⁹As noted by Sāriputta in his comment, the usage of the future tense in a construction like this is exclusively present in meaning. Cf. his commentary ad loc.: *anokappanāmarisanatthavasenā ti ettha anokappanam asaddahanam. amarisanam asahanam. anāgatavacanam anāgatasaddappayoge. attho pana vat-tamānakāliko va. tenāha “paccakkham pī” ti. na marisayāmi ti na visahāmi* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 9,1-3].

⁵⁰Cf. Kās ad loc.: *anavakṣṭyamarsayoḥ iti vartate. ... kiṃkilāstyarthesu upapadesu anavakṣṭyamarsayoḥ dhātoḥ lṛṭ pratyayo bhavati. ... asti nāma tatrābhavān vṛṣalam yājayisyati. ... na śraddadhe, na marsayāmi.*

mud?”, it is explained that the future (*anāgatavacanam*) is used in the sense of the past (*atītatthe*); the rule (*lakkhaṇam*) for this should be sought in grammar (*saddasatthato*).

The intention of this note is to explain why the future is used in preference to the tense required by the actual time [= past time] of the action referred to. In the present case Buddhaghosa refers to Pāṇ III 3 [142+] 144: *kiṃvṛtte liṅlṛṭtau*: “the [inflections] of the potential mood (*liṅ*) and the future (*lṛṭ*) are used when [interrogative pronouns like] ‘*kiṃ*’ occur [as a sentence complement, the meaning implied by the sentence being that of ‘censure’]”.⁵¹

One would have expected Buddhaghosa to refer to Pāṇ III 3 [142+] 143: *vibhāṣā kathami liṅ ca*: the [inflections] of the potential mood (*liṅ*) [as well as the inflections of the present tense (*laṭ*)] are optionally used, when [the word] “*kathaṃ*” [is used as a sentence complement, the meaning implied by the sentence being that of “censure”].⁵² There are in fact quite a number of instances in the Vin where “*kathaṃ*” is constructed with the potential mood, but they are not commented upon by Buddhaghosa.⁵³ It is possible, however, that he reinterpreted the scope of Pāṇ III 3 144 in order to find a grammatical justification for the usage in the Pāli, which in this case deviates from the usage described by Pāṇini. Sāriputta’s commentary on this passage in Sp

⁵¹Cf. Kās ad loc.: *kiṃvṛtte upapade garhāyām gamyamānāyām dhātoḥ liṅlṛṭtau pratyayau bhavataḥ. sarvalakārāṇam apavādaḥ. liṅgrahaṇam laṭo pari-grahāṇam.*

⁵²Cf. Kās ad loc.: *kathami upapade garhāyām gamyamānāyām dhātoḥ liṅ pratyayo bhavati, cakārāl laṭ ca. vibhāṣāgrahaṇam yathāsvaṃ kālavisyaye vihitānām abādhanāṇam.*

⁵³Cf.: *kathaṃ hi nāma mādiso samaṇam vā brāhmaṇam vā vijite vasantaṃ haneyya vā badheyya vā pabbājeyya vā*, Vin III 44,15-17.

shows that he identified the reference to *saddasattha* with Pāṇ III 3 144.⁵⁴

4 [Sp 296,13–14 ad Vin III 44,19]

Once again Buddhaghosa focuses on a question of semantics: the meaning of \sqrt{pac} . The term *vipācenti* which he comments upon in this case is found in the following passage: *manussā ujjhāyanti khīyanti vipācenti: “alajjino ime samaṇā sakyaputtiyā ...”* [= Vin III 44,19 foll.]. He writes:

*vipācentī ti vitthārikam karonti, sabbattha pattharanti;
ayañ ca attho saddasathānusārena veditabbo.*

“*vipācenti*” means: they disseminate far and wide, they report in detail everywhere. The meaning, moreover, should be known according to grammar.

Grammar in this case is, as in the previous examples from *Vism*, in all probability identical with sa-Dhātup. Cf. sa-Dhātup X 109: *paci vistāravacane*.⁵⁵

⁵⁴Cf. Sāriputta ad loc.: *saddasathavidūhi kiṃsaddayoge anāgatavacanassa icchitattā vuttam “tassa lakkhaṇam saddasathato pariyesitabban” ti* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 117,14-16].

⁵⁵Cf. Sadd 528,26: *paci vitthāre*.

5 [Sp 480,26–481,6 ad Vin III 88,2–4]

The problem which Buddhaghosa addresses this time is how to interpret the past participle “*bhāsito*” which occurs in the following passage:

*eso yeva kho āvuso seyyo yo amhākam gihīnaṃ
aññamaññassa uttarimanussadhammassa vaṇṇo
bhāsito ti.*

The best thing, friends, is if we speak to householders in praise of one another’s superhuman properties.

It would seem natural in the present case to construe the genitive “*amhākam*” [= the agent] with “*bhāsito*” used in the sense of the present tense.⁵⁶ If, however, it is interpreted according to the absolute tense value of the past participle, and this is clearly how Buddhaghosa interprets the form, it would seem to be in contradiction to the context in which the enunciation occurs: the *Vajjī janapada* is suffering from the famine and the monks have difficulties in providing for themselves. Therefore they decide to speak in praise of one another’s spiritual attainments in order to ingratiate themselves with householders, hoping that they, on those grounds, will provide for them. Since the context makes it impossible to interpret “*bhāsito*” as referring to the past, Buddhaghosa suggests complementing the sentence in such a way that the intention becomes unambiguous. He writes:

⁵⁶Cf. Pāṇ II 3 67: *ktasya ca vartamāne*: The past participle in *-ta* [is constructed with the genitive], when used in the sense of the present tense. Cf. also Pāṇ III 2 187-188; Pāṇ does not mention $\sqrt{bhāṣ}$ among the roots the pp. of which may be interpreted in the sense of the present tense. In Pāli, however, this usage seems to be extended to include other instances than those described by Pāṇini.

anāgatasambandhe pana asati na etehi yo tasmim khaṇe bhāsito 'va yasmā [CeBeSe so; Ee tasmā] na yujjati, tasmā anāgatasambandham katvā yo evaṃ bhāsito bhavissati so seyyo ti evaṃ ettha attho ved-itabbo. lakkhaṇaṃ pana saddasatthato pariyesitabbaṃ.

Since the [praise they] spoke at that moment would be unjustified, if there were no connection [of *bhāsito* = pp. of $\sqrt{bhās}$] with the future tense (*anāgatasambandhe pana asati*), by formulating a connection with the future tense, the meaning is in this case to be understood as follows: “the best thing would be if we spoke (*bhāsito bhavissati*) in such and such a way”. The rule, moreover, should be sought in grammar.

The rule to which Buddhaghosa refers here as a justification for complementing the verbal form *bhāsito* with the future form *bhavissati* [from $\sqrt{bhū}$], is found in Pāṇ III 4 1: *dhātusambandhe pratyayāḥ*: affixes are [valid in denoting a time other than the one for which they have been specifically enjoined] when they are used for [establishing] a relation between [the meanings of] the roots [in question].

The problem which Pāṇini addresses in this sūtra is that the usage of a particular suffix is generally restricted to the specific tense value that is attached to it. For instance, according to Pāṇ III 2 85 n word like “*agniṣṭomayājīn*” has a past tense value. It denotes a person who already has performed the *agniṣṭoma*. But in a sentence like “*agniṣṭomayājy asya putro janitā*”: “he shall have a son who will perform the *agniṣṭoma*”, a word with a past tense value (“*agniṣṭomayājīn*”) is construed with a word that has a future tense value (“*janitā*”). In such a case the future tense value of *janitā* takes precedence over the past tense value of

agniṣṭomayājīn, which thus assumes a future value. The same is the case in a sentence like: *ṛtaḥ kṛtaḥ śvo bhavitā*: “the mat will be made tomorrow”. In this clause the future tense value of *bhavitā* takes precedence over the absolute tense value of the past participle *ṛtaḥ*.⁵⁷

Here too, there is no reason for doubting that the grammar to which Buddhaghosa refers his readers is identical with Pāṇinian grammar. Sāriputta cannot have been in doubt since he quotes the sūtra in question. In addition he presents a slightly edited quotation from the Kāśikā.⁵⁸

6 [Sp 500,18–20 ad Vin III 95,3]

ukkheṭito [= Vin III 95,3] ti idaṃ ariyamaggena uttāsitattā ... svāyam attho saddasatthato pariyesitabbo.

The expression “scared” [*ukkheṭito*] is used because he is scared of the Noble Path. ... The meaning is to be sought in grammar.

Here Buddhaghosa is concerned with the meaning of *ut* + $\sqrt{khī}$. In this case too, grammar is probably identical with sa-Dhātup. Cf. sa-

⁵⁷Cf. Kāś ad loc.: *dhāvarthānaṃ sambandho viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvāḥ. tasmim sātī ayathākālokā api pratyayāḥ sādhabo bhavanti. ... ṛtaḥ kṛtaḥ śvo bhavitā. ... tatra bhūtaḥ kālaḥ bhaviṣyatkālena abhisambadhyamānaḥ sādhar bhavati. viśeṣaṇaṃ guṇatvād viśeṣyakālaṃ anurudhyate, tena viparyayo na bhavati.*

⁵⁸Cf.: “*anāgatasambandhe pana asati*” ti bhāsito bhavissati ti pāthasesaṃ katvā anāgatasambandhe asati. bhāsito ti atītavacanaṃ kathaṃ anāgatavacanaṃ sambandham upagacchati ti āha “*lakkhaṇaṃ pana saddasatthato pariyesitabbaṃ*” ti. idise hi thāne “*dhātusambandhe paccayā*” [= Pāṇ III 4 1] ti iminā lakkhaṇena dhārvatthasambandhe asati ayathākālavahitā pi paccayā sādhabo santi [≠ Kāś ad Pāṇ III 4 1] ti saddasatthavidū vadanti [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 278,21-26 ad loc.].

Dhātup I 324: *khiṭ trāse*. This assumption is corroborated by Sāriputta's *ṭikā* ad loc.⁵⁹

7 [Sp 584,16–21 ad Vin III 163,21,30]

It is not clear how we are to interpret Buddhaghosa's reference to grammar (*saddalakkhaṇaṃ*) in this case. The two words he comments upon (*duṭṭho doso*) occur in the following passage: *yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhum duṭṭho doso appatīto ... anuddhamseyya*: “whatever monk, offended, indignant⁶⁰, and ill-tempered, would defame a monk ...” [= Vin III 163,21–22]. The *niddesa* presents the following gloss on the two words: *duṭṭho doso ti kupīto anattamano anabhiraddho āhatacitto khilajāto* [= Vin III 163,30–31], but this gloss obviously does not clarify the question of how to construe them. The past participle *duṭṭho* [from √*dus*] presents no problem, but *doso* does. In this particular context it can only be interpreted as an adjective which in meaning is related to, if not synonymous with, *duṭṭho* and derived from the same root.⁶¹ This, apparently, is also the view of Buddhaghosa, who seems to interpret *doso* as a derivative of the causative stem of √*dus*:

“*duṭṭho doso*” *ti, dūsito c' eva dūsako ca, uppanne hi dose puggalo tena dosenā dūsito hoti: pakatibhāvaṃ*

⁵⁹Cf.: *khiṭasaddaṃ saddasatthavidū uttāsathē paṭhantī ti āha “svāyam attho saddasatthataṭo pariyesitabbo” ti* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 290,19-20]; Sadd 352,11: *khiṭa uttrāsane*.

⁶⁰The translation is tentative. It is obvious from the context that corrupted and corrupting are too strong; *doso* is probably used expegetically of *duṭṭho* in order to show that it does not mean corrupted, but rather indignant and upset, which the context would seem to support.

⁶¹In Pāli *dosa* normally occurs as a noun. This passage is the only recorded instance in the canon where it would seem necessary to interpret *dosa* as an adjective.

jahāpīto, tasmā duṭṭho ti vuccati. parañ ca dūseti vināseti, tasmā doso ti vuccati. iti duṭṭho doso ti. ekass' ev' etaṃ puggalassa dassitaṃ [v.l. *nidassanaṃ*], *tena vuttaṃ duṭṭho doso ti dūsito c' eva dūsako cā ti. tatha saddalakkhaṇaṃ pariyesitabbaṃ*.

“Offended, offending”, that is, “one who is both offended and one who offends (*dūsito c' eva dūsako ca*)”. Because (*hi*), when an offence has taken place (*uppanne dose*), a person is offended on account of this offence, that is, he is shocked (*pakatibhāvaṃ jahāpīto*), therefore he is called “offended”. And because he causes another [person] to be offended and frustrated therefore he is called “offending”. Hence (*iti*) [the words] “offended, offending”. This is used as an illustration of a single person according to the difference in his behaviour (*ākāranānattena*). Therefore it is said [above]: “offended, offending”, that is, “one who is both offended and one who offends”. One should consult grammar (*saddalakkhaṇaṃ*) on this point.

The question is whether Buddhaghosa actually wants his reader to refer to grammar for information on the derivation and meaning of *duṭṭha* and *doso*. It is clear that his purpose is to show that the two terms are mutually opposed, in the sense that one (*duṭṭha*) is intransitive (*kammasādhana*), whereas the other (*doso*) is transitive (*kattusādhana*), which, of course, is reflected in their respective meanings. This is also the way in which Sāriputta understands Buddhaghosa. But in addition he points out that the reason why Buddhaghosa says that a person who is *dūsito* is one who is shocked, is because √*dus* is read [in the Dhātupāṭha]

in the sense of alteration (*vikatiyaṃ paṭhitattā*).⁶² This remark seems to point to the fact that we are dealing with yet another reference to sa-Dhātup, which in view of the other references to sa-Dhātup is likely to be true. In that case it must be a reference to sa-Dhātup IV 76: *duṣa vaikṛtye*.

8 [Sp 770,33–37 ad Vin IV 38,2–3]

The last instance of explicit reference to grammar in Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā* is presumably also to sa-Dhātup. In this case it is to the meaning of the root *ut* + √*jhe* (= sa. √*dhyā*). The passage in which the form occurs presents no problem; it represents one of the stereotypes that are often met with in the *Nikāyas*.

ujjhāpentī [= Vin IV 38,2–3; this reading is recorded as a variant by the ct., which reads *ujjhāyanti*]; *Dabbaṃ Mallaputtaṃ bhikkhū ujjhāyanti ... taṃ āyasmantaṃ tehi bhikkhūhi avajānāpentī avaññāya olokāpentī lāmakato vā cintāpentī ti attho. lakkhaṇaṃ pan' ettha saddasatthānusārena veditabbaṃ.*

The definition (*lakkhaṇaṃ*) is this time found in sa-Dhātup I 957: *dhyai cintāyāṃ*. The identification is, if *Sāriputta* is correct, confirmed by his explicit reference to the Dhātupāṭha, with the remark

⁶²Cf. *dūsito ti duṭṭhasaddassa kammaśādhanaṃ dasseti. dūsayati paraṃ vināseti ti dūsako; iminā dūsayaṃ ti doso ti dosasaddassa kattaśādhanaṃ vuttā. "pakatiḥhāvaṃ jahāpito" ti dusasaddassa vikatiyaṃ paṭhitattā vuttaṃ* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 347,15–18 ad loc.].

that, since verbal roots have multiple meanings, the root √*jhe* has also the meaning of “looking down upon”.⁶³

Sumaṅgalavilāsini

1 [Sv 43,13–15 ad D I 2,9]

In this short passage Buddhaghosa comments upon the expression “*acchariyaṃ āvuso*”. The subject matter is the etymology of the word *acchariya*. First he presents the grammatical derivation (*saddanaya*) which he subsequently contrasts with the etymological derivation presented by the *Aṭṭhakathās* (*aṭṭhakathānaya*). The *saddanaya* is explained in this way:

*tattha andhassa pabbatārohanaṃ viya niccaṃ na hoti ti acchariyaṃ. ayaṃ tāva saddanayo.*⁶⁴

In this case *acchariyaṃ* means something unusual (*na ... niccaṃ*), like for instance a blind man who goes mountain climbing. This, in the first place, is the grammatical derivation⁶⁵.

⁶³Cf. *tatiye dhātupāṭhe jhesaddo cintāyāṃ paṭhito ti āha “lāmakato vā cintāpentī” ti ādi. ayaṃ eva ca anekatthattā dhātūnaṃ olokanattho pi hoti ti daṭṭhabbaṃ* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 24,17–19 ad loc.].

⁶⁴Cf. Mp I 113,11–13 ad *acchariyamanusso*.

⁶⁵Cf. *saddasatthaṃ anugato nayo saddanayo. tattha hi anabhiṅhavuttike acchariyosaddo icchito. ten' ev' āha “andhassa pabbatārohanaṃ viyā” ti* [Sv-ṭ I 67,17–18 ad loc.].

The *saddanaya* to which Buddhaghosa refers here is in all likelihood identical with Pāṇ VI 1 147: *āścaryam anitye*: the word ‘*āścaryam*’ [is formed with the augment *su-* = *s-*] in the sense of something unusual.⁶⁶

2 [Sv 245,16–19 ad D 1 87,7–8]

In this case Buddhaghosa selects the following clause for a grammatical comment: *Ukkaṭṭhaṃ ajjhāvasatī ti*, and continues:

*upasaggavasen’ ettha bhummatthe upayogavacanam
veditabbaṃ ... tath’ [Ee tath’] eva lakkhaṇam [CeBe
so; Ee na-] saddasatthato [so read with v.l. and Sv-ṭ]
pariyesitabbaṃ.*

In the present case it should be understood that the accusative, because of the preposition, is used in the sense of the locative. ... The rule for this should be sought in grammar.⁶⁷

The definition which Buddhaghosa has in mind in this case is Pāṇ I 4 [45+46+] 48: *upānvadhyāṅ vasaḥ*: [the place of the action] of

⁶⁶Cf. *anityatayā viṣayabhūṭayā adbhutatvam iha upalakṣyate, tasminn āścaryam nipātyate* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁶⁷Cf.: “*saddasatthato pariyesitabban’ ti etena saddalakkhaṇānuyogato vāyaṃ saddapayogo ti dasseti. upa, anu, adhi, ā iti evampubbake vasanakiriyādhāre upayogavacanam eva pāpuṇāti ti hi saddavidū icchanti* [Sv-ṭ Be 1960 I 376,5–9]. For an identical analysis cf. Ps III 414,24–26 ad M II 164,6.

√*vas*, when preceded by [the prepositions] *upa, anu, adhi*, and *ā* [is called “*karma*” (= the object *kāraka*)].⁶⁸

3 [Sv 481,3–5 ad D II 55,3]

Even though Buddhaghosa does not explicitly refer to grammarians or to grammar in this concise explanation of an apparent grammatical anomaly, there is good reason for including it among the examples of his references to grammar. Firstly, Buddhaghosa contrasts this explanation with the subsequent explanation of the Aṭṭhakathācariyas. Judging from the way in which he normally contrasts the views of the grammarians on points of grammar with the views represented by the Aṭṭhakathās, one can assume that his explanation is based on the views of the grammarians. Secondly, in his *ṭīkā*, Dhammapāla expressly identifies Buddhaghosa’s grammatical analysis with the opinion of the grammarians (*akkharacintakā*).

*tatrāyam anuttānapadavaṇṇanā. Kurūsu viharatī ti,
Kurū nāma jānapadino rājakumārā, tesam nivāso eko
pi janapado rūḷhisaddena Kurū ti vuccati: tasmim
Kurūsu janapade.*⁶⁹

In this case the following explanation is dealing with an obscure word. “Was dwelling in the Kuru state”: [the plural form] *Kurū* denotes those citizens who are descendants of the ruling class [of the state]. Although

⁶⁸Cf. Kāś ad loc.: *upa, anu, adhi, ā ity evampūrvasya vasater ādhāro yaḥ, tat kārakaṃ karmasaḅjñam bhavati*. Sv-ṭ ad loc. would seem to represent a slightly edited version of Kāś. Cf. note 67 supra.

⁶⁹Qu. Ps I 225,4–6; Cf. the identical passages in Sv 279,4–7 ad D I 111,2: *Aṅgesu*; 294,4–6 ad D I 127,2: *Magadhesu* and 672,3–8 ad D II 253,3: *Sakkesu*.

their habitation is singular, their state is denoted by the conventional term “*Kurū* [in the plural]”. [Consequently the loc. pl. “*kurūsu*” means] “in the Kuru state”.

The grammatical problem which Buddhaghosa briefly identifies and explains is the fact that the plural form “*Kurū*”, which actually denotes the descendants of the ruling class of a certain state, is used as the name of this state. Since the state as such is confined to a specific territory, one would expect it to be denoted by a noun in the singular. Moreover, when the words “*Kurū*” and “*janapada*” are used in apposition there is no syntactical agreement between them. The reason is, as Buddhaghosa explains, that the usage of the word “*Kurū*” is determined by convention (*rūḥisadda*), which in the present case means that usage takes precedence over the general rules of syntactical agreement.

Buddhaghosa’s source in this case is no doubt Pāṇinian grammar. In his *īkā*, Dhammapāla quotes (in slightly edited Pāli versions) two sūtras in which Pāṇini refers to certain views on grammatical derivation, the necessity and validity of which he is questioning later on.

The first sūtra quoted by Dhammapāla is Pāṇ I 2 51⁷⁰: *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane*⁷¹: In the case where [a *taddhita* affix] is elided [provided that the elision is denoted by “*lup*”], the gender and number [of the derivative from which they are elided] are the same as when they are

⁷⁰Cf. Sv-ṭ II 103,6-7 (Ee is utterly confused): *akkharacintakā hi idisesu thānesu yutte viya* [so read with Be (= sa. *yuktavat*); Ee *suttesu*; cf. v.ll.] *idīsalīṅgavacanāni* [so read with Be; Ee *vīlīṅga*-; cf. v.ll.] *icchanti*. In this quote Dhammapāla is replacing the archaic *vyakti* with *liṅga*.

⁷¹Cf. *vyaktiḥ = strīpumnapuṃsakāni. vacanam = ekatvadvitvabahutvāni. Pañcālāḥ = kṣatriyāḥ puṃliṅgā bahuvacanaṣayāḥ. teṣaṃ nivāso janapadaḥ. yathā teṣu kṣatriyeṣu vyaktivacane tadvaj janapade bhavataḥ. Pañcālāḥ, Kuravaḥ* [Kāś ad loc.].

joined [to the original word]. The purpose of this sūtra is to explain why certain words that are considered to be derivatives retain the gender and number of the word from which they are derived. For example, the word *Pañcālāḥ* is masculine plural, but applies to a single *janapada*.

The second sūtra quoted by Dhammapāla is the subsequent sūtra 52: *viśeṣānāṃ cājateḥ*.⁷² The underlying intention of this rule is to explain that terms which qualify such derivatives agree with them except when a qualifier is a class term, e.g. *janapada*, in which case the class term is used in the singular, whereas an additional qualifier agrees with the latter.⁷³

Finally, Dhammapāla might also have been expected to quote Pāṇ IV 2 81: *janapade lup*: [the suffixes whose function is defined in IV 2 67-70] are elided [provided that the elision is denoted by “*lup*”] when [the dwelling-place that is denoted by the word] is a kingdom.⁷⁴

We cannot know, of course, whether Buddhaghosa was actually thinking of these Pāṇinian sūtras when he wrote his commentary. Dhammapāla may be right when he identifies Buddhaghosa’s source with Pāṇ I 2 51-52. But the possibility cannot be excluded that the actual sūtras Buddhaghosa had in mind were the following sūtras 53-55: *tad aśiṣyaṃ samjñāpramāṇatvāt. lubyogāprakhyanāt. yogapramāṇe ca tadabhāve ’darśanaṃ syāt*. In these sūtras Pāṇini explains why it is unnecessary to establish those complicated rules of derivation described in 51-52 in order to explain usages that in the final analysis are based on convention.⁷⁵

⁷²Cf. Sv-ṭ II 103,11-12: *tabbisesane janapadasadde jārisadde ekavacanam eva.*

⁷³Cf. *ajāteḥ iti kim ? Pañcālāḥ janapadaḥ ... jātyarthasya cāyaṃ yuktavadbhāva-pratiṣedhaḥ. tena jātidvāreṇa yāni viśeṣānāni teṣāṃ api yuktavadbhāvo na bhavati: Pañcālāḥ janapado ramaṇīyo* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁷⁴Cf. *Pañcālānāṃ nivāso janapado Pañcālāḥ* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁷⁵Cf. Kāś ad 55: *dr̥ṣyate ca samprati vinaiva kṣatriyasambandhena janapadeṣu pañcālādiḥśabdāḥ, tato avasīyate nāyaṃ yoganimittakāḥ. kim tarhi rūḍhirūpeṇaiva tatra pravṛttaḥ.*

Papañcasūdanī

1 [Ps I 59,26–28 ad M I 6,27]

In this example Buddhaghosa comments upon the derivation of the city name Sāvathī. He explains that it has this specific form because it is named after the ṛṣi Savattha who lived there.

*Sāvathī ti Savatthassa isino nivāsaṭṭhānabhūtā nagarī, yathā Kākandī, Mākandī, [Ce v.l. adds Kosambī; Ee om., cf. Ps-pt] ti. evaṃ akkharacintakā.*⁷⁶

“Sāvathī” is a city which has status as the place where the ṛṣi Savattha was living, as for example Kākandī and Mākandī. This is the opinion of the grammarians.

This reference is undoubtedly to Pāṇ IV 2 [67+] 69: *tasya nivāsaḥ*: [when attached to a word the affix denoted “aṇ” and its substitutes mean] “dwelling-place of someone”, [the place being named after the person in question]. Buddhaghosa is probably also thinking of the preceding sūtra 68: *tena nirvṛtam*: [an affix attached to a word means] “constructed by someone”, [the place being named after the person in question]. The Kāśīkā illustrates inter alia this rule with the following example: *Kuśāmbena nirvṛtā Kauśāmbī nagarī*. Dhammapāla probably

⁷⁶Qu. Pj I 110,15-18; Paṭis-a 532,16-18. Pj I adds after *Mākandī ti evaṃ ithiliṅgavasena Sāvathī vuccati*. Cf. also Ud-a 55,13-16; Ps II 389,30-390,2 ad M I 320,26: *Kosambiyaṇ*.

has the same rule in mind in his ṭīkā.⁷⁷ There is no reference to ṛṣis in this particular context in the Pāṇinian tradition, but this, of course, does not exclude the assumption that Buddhaghosa is relying on Pāṇinian tradition for his interpretation.

⁷⁷Cf. *yathā Kākandī Mākandī Kosambī ti yathā Kākandassa isino nivāsaṭṭhāne māpitā nagarī Kākandī; Mākandassa nivāsaṭṭhāne māpitā Mākandī; Kusambassa nivāsaṭṭhāne māpitā Kosambī ti vuccati. evaṃ Sāvathī ti dasseti* [Ps-pt I 140,15-18]; cf. Ps II 390,1-2: *Kusumbassa nāma isino assamato avidūre māpitattā ti pi eke*.

2 [Ps I 129,32–33 ad M I 24,1]

In this instance Buddhaghosa addresses the question of the function and meaning of word-repetition (*āmeṇḍita* = sa. *āmreḍita*) as it occurs in the clause: *abhikkantaṃ bho Gotama, abhikkantaṃ bho Gotama*. In order to define the various semantic properties of *āmeṇḍita*, he quotes the following verse:

*bhaye kodhe pasamsāyaṃ turite kotūhalacchare
hāse soke pasāde ca kare āmeṇḍitaṃ budho.*⁷⁸

An intelligent person should use word-repetition in the following meanings: [1] threat, [2] anger, [3] praise, [4] haste, [5] excitement, [6] wonder, [7] joy, [8] sorrow, and [9] satisfaction.⁷⁹

Even though Buddhaghosa does not refer to grammarians or grammar in this case, the grammatical interest attached to this verse is reason enough for including it among his grammatical references.

It has not been possible to identify the source used by Buddhaghosa. The possibility cannot be excluded, however, that the verse is a Pāli adaptation of a Sanskrit verse, in which case there is good reason to believe that it represents an old kośa fragment. The verse was adopted by the compiler of the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* [v. Abh 107] and shows a structural similarity with many of the verses that constitute *Abh.*⁸⁰

⁷⁸This verse is found in similar contexts in Sp 170,24–25; Sv 228,11–12 [cf. Sv-pt I 354,25 foll]; Mp II 105,25–26; Sadd 40,29.

⁷⁹For examples of the various usages of *āmeṇḍita*, cf. Sv-pt I 354,25–355,7.

⁸⁰For this Pāli dictionary, cf. Norman, *Pāli Literature* pp. 166–167; Franke, *Gramm.* pp. 65–83.

In any case, there is a clear relation between the various functions which the verse ascribes to *āmeṇḍita* and the corresponding definition of *āmreḍita* found in Pāṇ VIII 1 [2+] 8: *vākyāder āmantrit-asyāsūyāsammatikopakutsanabhartsaneṣu*: A vocative in the beginning of a clause is repeated in the following meanings: [1] envy, [2] praise, [3] anger, [4] blame, or [5] threat. It is evident from this sūtra that the set of definitions found in the verse quoted by Buddhaghosa merely represents an elaborate version of the Pāṇinian definition.

3 [Ps II 389,29–390,1–2 ad M I 320,27]

In this example Buddhaghosa comments upon the derivation of the city name Kosambī. This time he does not refer explicitly to the opinion of the grammarians, but since his comment is intimately connected in subject-matter with the preceding example there is no reason to doubt that he is presenting the views of the grammarians. In addition, the specific grammatical rules upon which his comment is based can easily be traced to Pāṇinian grammar.

tattha Kosambīyan ti evaṃnāmake nagare. tassa hi [so read with v.l.; Ee kira] nagarassa ārāmapokkharāṇiādisu tesu tesu thānesu kosambarukkhā va ussannā ahesuṃ, tasmā Kosambī ti saṅkhaṃ agāmasi. Kusumbassa nāma isino assamato avidūre māpitattā ti pi eke.

In this case [the locative] “in Kosambī” means in a city thus named. Because there was an abundance of Kosamba trees in various places of this city such as in the parks and by the lotus ponds or the like, it was called Kosambī. Some [grammarians] are of the

opinion that [it is called Kosambī] because it was constructed not far from the hermitage of the ṛṣi Kusamba”.

There were apparently different views among grammarians about the correct derivation of Kosambī. Buddhaghosa therefore presents two alternative explanations, the first of which probably represents his own view. Both alternatives are based on two Pāṇini sūtras. In the first explanation he analyses Kosambī according to Pāṇ IV 2 67: *tad asminn astīti deśe tannāmi*: [when attached to a word the affix denoted “an” and its substitutes are used] in the sense of a place having such and such a name because such and such a thing is found in it. In the second explanation he presents the view of some scholars who apparently explained the derivation of Kosambī on the basis of Pāṇ IV 2 70: *adūrabhavaś ca*: and [lastly a place is named after whatever is found in its] vicinity.

Manorathapūraṇī

1 [Mp I 17,12–15 ad A I 1,7]

Buddhaghosa here focusses on the grammarians’ definition of the meaning of the suffix -u attached to the term bhikkhu [= sa. bhikṣu; derived from the desiderative root √bhikṣ]. He writes:

*bhikkhavo ti āmantanākāradīpanaṃ, tañ ca bhikkhaṇa-
sīlatādiguṇayogasiddhattā vuttaṃ; bhikkhaṇasīlatā-
guṇayutto pi hi bhikkhu, bhikkhaṇadhammatāguṇa-*

*yutto pi bhikkhu, bhikkhaṇe sādhu-kāritāguṇayutto pi
ti saddavidū maññanti.*⁸¹

The [vocative] “monks” is an encouragement in the form of an invitation (*āmantanākāradīpanaṃ*), and this [encouragement] is used because they have acquired such attributes as the habit of begging, etc. For a mendicant is either one who is in possession of the attribute that consists of the habit of begging, or one who is in possession of the quality that consists of the nature of begging, or one who is in possession of the attribute that consists of skillfulness in begging. This is the opinion of the grammarians.

The grammarians to whom Buddhaghosa refers as his source for this grammatical analysis are definitely Pāṇinians. The three qualities (*sīlatā, dhammatā, sādhu-kāritā*) which he enumerates in order to define the scope of meaning of the term *bhikkhu* are identical with those mentioned in Pāṇ III 2 134: *ā kveḥ tacchīlataddharmatatsādhu-kāriṣu*: from this sūtra to sūtra 177 [the affixes that are being described are used] in the sense [of agents] having such a habit (*sīla*) or such a nature (*dharma*) or such a skill (*sādhu-kārin*). This rule covers Pāṇ III 2 168 where Pāṇini deals with derivatives from desiderative roots and inter alia √bhikṣ: *sanāśaṃsabhikṣa uḥ*.⁸² It is obvious that Buddhaghosa must have had both sūtras in mind when he wrote this grammatical comment.

⁸¹This text is also found in Ps I 13,29–33 and Spk II 1,19–2,3.

⁸²Cf. *sanantebhyo dhātubhyaḥ āśaṃser bhikṣeś ca tacchīlādiṣu kartṛṣu uḥ pratyayo bhavati* [Kāś ad loc.].

2 [Mp III 76,15–20 ad A II 37,22–23]

In this case Buddhaghosa focusses on the usage of the preposition “*antarā*” in the following passage: *ekam samayaṃ Bhagavā antarā ca Ukkatṭhaṃ antarā ca Setabbyaṃ addhānamaggapaṭipanno hoti*: “Once Bhagavā was on his way between Ukkatṭhaṃ and Setabbyaṃ”. He continues:

*antarāsaddena pana yuttattā upayogavacanam katam. edisesu ca thānesu akkharacintakā ‘antarā gāmaṃ ca nadiṃ ca yāti’ ti evaṃ ekam eva [v.l. ettha] antarāsaddam payuñjanti, so dutiyapadena pi yojetabbo hoti, ayojyamāne upayogavacanam na pāpuñāti. idha pana yojetvā eva [v.l. evaṃ] vutto ti.*⁸³

Now the accusative is used because [Ukkatṭha and Setabbya] are construed with the word “between” (*antarā*). In such cases, however, the grammarians use the word “between” only once, as [e.g. in the following example]: he is on his way between the village and the river. The [word “*antarā*”] is surely to be construed with the second word, for if it were not construed [with it], the accusative would not obtain. And in the present case it is actually used in construction [with the second word].

⁸³ This text is also found in Sv 35,4-9; Ps II 188,26-30 (v.l.: *idisesu hi ... ; payuñjanti*). Cf. Ud-a 110,5-9.

This argument is only understandable on the basis of Pāṇ II 3 [1+] 4: *antarāntareṇa yukte*: [a word] when constructed with *antarā* or *antareṇa* [stands in the accusative]. When constructed with two nouns the preposition *antarā* generally precedes and the conjunction *ca* is put after each noun.⁸⁴ This is the basic usage in Sanskrit. In Pāli the situation is slightly different, as appears from the example Buddhaghosa has chosen to comment upon. He was apparently struck by the fact that *antarā* is used twice in contrast to normal Sanskrit usage. But he seems to regard this anomaly as a redundant feature which only emphasises Pāṇini’s description of the syntactical usage of *antarā*.

Conclusion

The relatively few instances where Buddhaghosa refers to grammar or grammarians fall into two distinct categories: grammatical references [a] with emphasis on syntactical, morphological and derivational problems, [b] with emphasis on questions of semantics.

In the case of [a] it has been shown that practically all the references can without great difficulty be traced to particular Pāṇinian sūtras. Although the possibility cannot be completely excluded that Buddhaghosa is referring to another grammar or grammatical system, it would seem extremely unlikely, in that the Pāṇinian source is well corroborated by the ṭikās. Buddhaghosa was obviously conversant with the Pāṇinian tradition as a whole since his references to such topics as the usage of the locative case in a causal sense [= *nimittasaptamī*],⁸⁵ are only understandable on the basis of Mahā-bh [+ vārttikas] ad Pāṇ II 3 36. Pāṇini does not himself address this usage in his grammar.

⁸⁴Cf.: *antarā tvāṃ ca māṃ ca kamaṇḍaluḥ ... yuktagrahaṇam kim ? antarā Takṣaśilāṃ ca Pāṇaliputraṃ Srughnasya prākārah* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁸⁵Cf. Sp 189,25; 727,20; 761,13.

In the case of [b] it is, of course, an open question whether Buddhaghosa actually refers to sa-Dhātup. There is good cause to believe that this is the case since it would be quite natural for him to make references to the collection of roots that was an indispensable part of the Pāṇinian grammatical system. It is, however, impossible to prove definitively that Buddhaghosa knew sa-Dhātup in its present form.

Buddhaghosa's references to grammar are not a pervasive feature in his works. Compared with the scope of his collected works they cannot, in fact, be considered an essential part of Buddhaghosa's scholarly work. But in the relatively few cases where he displays his skill as a grammarian and an interpreter, his analysis is always marked by a degree of sophistication that makes it reasonable to assume that the tradition about his elucidating the "ideas of Patañjali" (*Pātañjalimata*)⁸⁶ in one night is founded on fact. *Pātañjalimata* must be identical, in fact, not with the *yogasūtras* as Geiger assumed⁸⁷, but rather with the *Mahā-bh.*

Even though Buddhaghosa's references to grammar are relatively few and in several instances are applied in a way that leads one to assume that they represented a stock of grammatical explanations which he made use of in identical or analogous contexts, it is obvious that he must have assumed that the Buddhist scholars for whom he was writing were capable of identifying his references. Otherwise most of his grammatical analyses and statements about grammar would have been incomprehensible to them. Thus Buddhaghosa's references to grammar indirectly prove that the Sinhalese Buddhist scholars must have been conversant with Sanskrit and Sanskrit grammar.

It is, in fact, difficult to explain these references to Sanskrit grammar unless we assume that there was no clearly defined system of Pāli grammar in existence when Buddhaghosa was writing his

⁸⁶Cf. Mhv XXXVII 217.

⁸⁷Cf. Geiger, Mhv-Trsl. p. 23 no. 1.

commentaries. It appears from the way in which he often presents his analyses that they were conceived as a sort of complement to the explanations embodied in the *aṭṭhakathās*. In such instances the grammarians' statements are sometimes contrasted with the explanations of the *aṭṭhakathās*. This too seems to prove that there was no full-scale Pāli grammar available to Buddhaghosa as a reference work.

To conclude, it is highly unlikely that Buddhaghosa, whose respectful attitude towards the tradition is beyond doubt, would have failed to refer to such a work, had it been in existence. There is therefore no cogent reason for assuming that there ever existed a comprehensive Pāli grammar or grammatical system prior to Kaccāyana's grammar. The fact that this, in many ways remarkable, adaptation of the *Kātantra* is based on a Sanskrit grammar only underlines the dependence of the Pāli grammatical tradition on Sanskrit grammar.

In a subsequent article I shall analyse references to and fragments from Pāli grammars that were presumably written in the tradition of Kaccāyana's grammar, the importance of which is beyond doubt in the development of the Sinhalese Pāli grammatical tradition.

Copenhagen

Ole Holten Pind

STUDIES IN THE PĀLI GRAMMARIANS

II.1

- [A] Buddhaghosa on *itthambhūtakḥyāna*, *itthambhūtalakkhaṇa*, *accanta-samyoga*, *adhikaraṇa*, *bhāvalakkhaṇa*, *karaṇa*, *nimitta*, and *saṃīpa*.
[B] Grammatical References in *Paramatthajotikā I–II*.
[C] *Mahānāma* and *Buddhadatta* on Grammar.

Introduction

In *Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I*¹ I have shown that whenever Buddhaghosa refers to grammar or grammarians in support of his analysis of a grammatical or semantical problem in the Pāli, he is referring to Pāṇinian grammar. This apparently is also the case in those instances where he deals with a number of syntactical problems, without mentioning the source upon which his analysis is based. These analyses constitute a valuable complement to those I have dealt with in the previous article, and I have therefore found it worthwhile to focus on them in this paper, so as to present a more complete picture of Buddhaghosa as a grammarian. Since almost all of the examples occur in identical form in his *Aṭṭhakathās*, I have taken *Samantapāsādikā* as the primary source, being historically the first among the commentaries allegedly written by Buddhaghosa. In addition, I have dealt with a number of interesting grammatical comments found in *Paramatthajotikā I–II*, which are both traditionally ascribed to Buddhaghosa, although his authorship has been disputed.² In each case it has been possible to identify the source as Pāṇinian grammar.

Although the majority of grammatical references in the Pāli. *Aṭṭhakathās* are found in the writings attributed to Buddhaghosa, he is not the only Buddhist Pāli scholar who occasionally focuses on topics of grammatical interest. In *Mahānāma*'s and *Buddhadatta*'s commentaries on

¹ Cf. *Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I*, *JPTS* 1989 pp. 33–81.

² They are probably both post-Buddhaghosa, but historically they cannot be far removed in time from him. Whoever was the actual author of these two *Aṭṭhakathās* [for a discussion of this problem, cf. Norman, *Pāli Literature*, p. 129], internal evidence shows beyond doubt that they were written by the same person since there are several references in Pj II to topics which the author intends to deal with in detail in Pj I [cf., for example, Pj II 136,20: *ayam ettha saṃkhepo, vitthāraṃ pana Maṅgalasuttavaṇṇanāyama* (= Pj I 111,6 foll.) *vakkhāma*]; consequently Pj II must have been written first.

Paṭisambhidhāmagga and Buddhavaṃsa, respectively, we come across a number of similar references. Since both authors belong to the post-Buddhaghosa generation of Pāli scholars, I have for historical reasons found it interesting to study these references in order to decide whether one can trace, through their grammatical comments, a development toward a distinctively Buddhist Pāli grammatical tradition.

Mahānāma [first half of the 6th century A.D.]³ and Buddhadatta [8th century A.D. ?]⁴ apparently follow Buddhaghosa's example by taking Pāṇinian grammar as their main reference grammar, but in a few interesting cases they deviate from the strict Pāṇinian tradition.

Mahānāma rarely discusses questions of grammar. There are, in fact, only four grammatical references in Paṭis-a, but all of them are interesting.⁵ One of them is found in his commentary on the Suññakathā [= Paṭis II 177–84]. Commenting upon the meaning of the word “empty” (*suñña*), Mahānāma not only refers to grammar (*Saddagantha*), but also to *pramāṇavāda* (*Ñāyagantha*). Since this text raises a number of questions that are only remotely connected with the rise of the Pāli grammatical tradition, I have found it appropriate to deal with this text in a separate paper.⁶ Another reference seems to indicate that Mahānāma may well have been acquainted with another grammatical source in addition to Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī. If so, his source is no doubt identical with Candravyākaraṇa.

In contrast to Mahānāma, Buddhadatta refers more often to the rules of grammar (*lakkhana*). Although his grammatical statements ultimately would seem to derive from Pāṇinian grammar, it is nonetheless clear that in a few cases they reflect a distinctively Buddhist grammatical tradition. This, for instance, is evident in the case where Buddhadatta lays out alternative ways of analysing the word “*Buddha*”. There are indications that his source may

³ Cf. Norman, *Pāli Lit.*, p. 132.

⁴ The date of Buddhadatta has not yet been fixed definitively. He may belong to the period after Dhammapāla, to whose Vv-a he appears to refer. Cf. Norman, *Pāli Lit.*, p. 146.

⁵ The reference to *saddavidū* at Paṭis-a 645,3 [qu. Nidd-a 293,22] is not a genuine grammatical reference like some of those found in Buddhaghosa's writings [cf. *Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I*], being a mere gloss on the term *mahaddhano*. It has not been possible to identify Mahānāma's source, but it is probably not wrong to assume that he draws his information from a Pāli *kośa*. The passage reads: *dhanavā ti pasamsitabbapaññādhanavattā niccayuttapaññādhanavattā atisayabhūtapaññādhanavattā dhanavā. etesu tisu atthesu idam vacanam saddavidū icchanti*. In one place [v. Paṭis-a 569,19] he deals with a grammatical problem: the interpretation of the compound *vimokkhamukha*, which he interprets as a *karmadhāraya*, without referring to any grammatical source.

⁶ Cf. Mahānāma on the Interpretation of Emptiness (forthcoming).

have been identical with Kaccāyana's grammar and the commentarial tradition attached to it. The nature of the grammatical references that occur in the post-Buddhaghosa Pāli. Aṭṭhakathās would thus seem to reflect a wider variety of sources and influences than in the case of Buddhaghosa's grammatical comments.

[A]

1.1 *itthambhūtakkyāna* [Sp 111,30–112,3 ad Vin III 1,12–13]

Buddhaghosa only uses the term *itthambhūtakkyāna* sparingly and almost always in similar contexts. In Sp it occurs twice, the first time in connection with his exegesis of Vin III 1,12–13:

taṃ kho pana bhagavantam Gotamam evam kalyāno kittisaddo abbhuggato: ...

However, as regards him, the Lord Gotama, the highest praise (*kalyāno kittisaddo*) was spread (*abbhuggato*) in the following words (*evam*): ...

On this clause Buddhaghosa writes the following comment:

*taṃ kho panā ti itthambhūtakkyānatthe upayogavacanam: tassa kho pana bhoto Gotamassā ti attho.*⁷

[In the clause] “however, as regards him, [etc.,]” the accusative is used in the sense of a statement of circumstance. The meaning is “however, with respect to him, the lord Gotama.”

The question with which Buddhaghosa deals here is the function of the preposition *abhi* [in *abbhuggata*] when it is used as a *karmapravacanīya* [= Pāli *kammavacanīya*],⁸ i.e., a preposition used independently of an

⁷ For identical analyses, cf. Ps II 327,34 (ad M I 285,8); Mp II 286,22 (ad A I 180,20); Pj II 441,2 (ad Sn 103,6).

⁸ For this technical term, cf. Renou, *Terminologie*, s.v.

explicit verb form, which is to be complemented from the context. Pāṇini deals with these particles in Pāṇ I 4 83 foll. In Pāṇ I 4 [90+] 91, which is the sūtra Buddhaghosa has in mind, he describes the function of *abhi* as a *karmapravacanīya*: *abhir abhāge*: “*abhi*” [is a *karmapravacanīya* used in the sense of a sign (i.e., “in the direction of”), a statement of circumstance (i.e., “as regards; with respect to”), and of distribution (i.e., “separately; one after another”)] but not in the sense of division.

According to Pāṇini such *karmapravacanīyas* are regularly constructed with the accusative [cf. Pāṇ II 3 8: *karmapravacanīyayukte dviṭīyā*]. In Pāli the usage differs from Sanskrit since *abbhuggacchati* is constructed both with acc. and gen. in analogous contexts [v. CPD s.v. *abbhuggacchati*]. The construction with the gen. is no doubt reflected in Buddhaghosa’s paraphrase, which in addition conveys the particular semantic value of *abhi* when used in the sense of *itthambhūtakkhyaṇa*.⁹

It is, of course, questionable whether the Pāṇinian description of the category of *karmapravacanīya* is applicable to Pāli *abbhuggacchati* as suggested by Buddhaghosa. As a matter of fact, there is no clear case of a *karmapravacanīya* in Pāli. The verb *abbhuggacchati* is rather to be interpreted as a regular verbal compound with two *upasargas*, as indicated by the *sandhi*. The particle *abhi* therefore has no independent syntactical function in the same way that a *karmapravacanīya* is supposed to have according to the Pāṇinian definition. That which suggested to Buddhaghosa to interpret *abhi* as a *karmapravacanīya* and to take it in the sense of *itthambhūtakkhyaṇa* was no doubt the fact that in this particular case, which represents an old canonical stereotype, the verb *abbhuggacchati* is constructed with the acc. However, as mentioned before, there are several instances in canonical Pāli where it is constructed with the gen. This shows clearly that we are dealing with a regularly compounded verb that optionally may be constructed with the acc. or the gen. This represents a peculiarity of the Pāli, for which there is no parallel in Sanskrit. It is therefore justified to conclude that the linguistic category of *karmapravacanīya* in its Pāṇinian form is obsolete in Pāli.¹⁰

⁹ Buddhaghosa apparently never comments upon those instances where *abbhuggacchati* is constructed with the genitive. This situation is typical of the way in which he applies his knowledge of Sanskrit grammar to clarify grammatical features of the Pāli: he seems to consciously avoid dealing with those instances which contradict Sanskrit usage as defined by Pāṇini.

¹⁰ For an analogous example of the usage of the category of *karmapravacanīya* for exegetical purposes, cf. Buddhadatta’s analysis of *anupabajjati* ad Bv XX 5, q.v. infra.

Both Vjb [Be 1960 38,4–7] and Sp-ṭ [Be 1960 I 214,19–215,11] comment upon Buddhaghosa’s explanation. Sāriputta’s lengthy exegesis in Sp-ṭ, which he illustrates with examples quoted from either Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 54 or the Kāśikā ad Pāṇ I 4 91, displays his usual mastery of grammatical issues and thus confirms the Pāṇinian background of Buddhaghosa’s analysis.¹¹ Kacc-v ad Kacc 301 [= Sadd 586] quotes the example upon which Buddhaghosa comments, and adds another example taken from D II 30,11: *pabbajitaṃ anu pabbajjimsu*, that is analogous to the clauses at Bv II 47 and Bv XX 5, with which Buddhadatta deals in his commentary ad loc. [v. infra].

[Sp 622,11-12 ad Vin III 181,3-4]

Buddhaghosa’s reference to *itthambhūtakkhyaṇa* in this case is clearly a slip of the pen for *itthambhūtalakkhaṇa* [on which v. infra], which the context shows that he must have had in mind. This assumption is confirmed by the fact that in Sp he defines a similar usage, with reference to *itthambhūtalakkhaṇa*.¹² The syntactical problem with which he deals in his comment is a series of instrumental forms that occur in the following sentence: *atha kho so bhikkhu ... Kiṭāgiriṃ piṇḍāya pāvīsi pāsādikena abhikkantena paṭikantena ālokītena vilokītena sammāñjītena pasāritena okkhittacakkhu iriyāpathasampanno*. After having commented on the meaning of each instrumental form, he concludes: *sabbattha itthambhūtakkhyaṇatthe karanavacanāṃ*: in all [the above-mentioned cases] the instrumental is used in the sense of a statement of circumstances [correct

¹¹ Because of its intrinsic interest I quote the relevant part of Sāriputta’s ṭīkā: “*itthambhūtakkhyaṇatthe upayogavacanan*” *ti itthaṃ imaṃ pakāraṃ bhūto āpanno to itthambhūto. tassākhyānaṃ itthambhūtakkhyaṇaṃ so yeva attho itthambhūtakkhyaṇattho. athavā itthaṃ evaṃ pakāro bhūto jāto ti evaṃ kathanattho itthambhūtakkhyaṇattho. tasmīṃ upayogavacanan ti attho. ettha ca “abbhuggato” ti ettha abhisaddo itthambhūtakkhyaṇatthajotako abhibhavitvā uggamanappakāraṃ dipanato. tena yogato “taṃ kho pana bhavantaṃ Gotamaṃ” ti idaṃ upayogavacanaṃ sāmīatthe visamānaṃ itthambhūtakkhyaṇadīpanato itthambhūtakkhyaṇatthe ti vuttaṃ. ten’ evāha: “tassa kho pana bhoto Gotamassā” ti attho ti. idaṃ vuttaṃ hoti: yathā sādhu Devadatto mātaram abhi [= sādhu Devadatta mātaram abhi, Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 54 and Kāś ad Pāṇ I 4 91] ti attho abhisaddayogato itthambhūtakkhyaṇe upayogavacanaṃ kataṃ. evaṃ idhāpi taṃ kho pana bhavantaṃ gotamaṃ abhi evaṃ kalyāṇo kittisaddo uggato ti abhisaddayogato itthambhūtakkhyaṇe upayogavacanan ti, Sp-ṭ I 214,19 foll.*

¹² Cf. Sp 974,31.

to read *itthambhūtalakkhaṇe*: in the sense of an indication of a particular state or condition].

Although the usage of the instr. case is clearly modal in this case, the very fact that we are dealing with instrumental forms excludes the existence of the category of *karmapravacanīya*, of which *itthambhūtākhyāna* is a subset, being constructed with the acc. The corresponding modal usage of the instrumental is denoted *itthambhūtalakṣaṇa* in Pāṇini's technical vocabulary [cf. Pāṇ II 3 21 and v. infra]. And this usage is the subject of the following discussion.

1.2 *itthambhūtalakkhaṇa* [Sp 891,8–9 ad Vin IV 187,4]

In this example Buddhaghosa is concerned with a particular usage of the instrumental case. The vinaya text on which he comments is the following: *na ukkhittakāya antaraghare gamissāmī ti*: “I shall not walk between the houses with [the robe] lifted up,” on which he writes the following concise comment:

*ukkhittakāyā ti ukkhepena, itthambhūtalakkhaṇe karaṇa-
vacanaṃ.*

[The expression] “with [the robe] lifted up” means “by lifting up [the robe].” The instrumental (*karaṇavacanam*) is used in the sense of an indication of [someone or something being in] this or that state or condition.

This exegesis presupposes Pāṇ II 3 [18+] 21 which gives a concise definition of the modal usage of the instrumental: *itthambhūtalakṣaṇe*: [The third case, i.e., the instrumental case] is used in the sense of an indication of [someone or something being in] this or that state or condition. Buddhaghosa's identification of this particular usage of the instrumental is precise and to the point because, from a syntactical point of view, there is complete agreement between Sanskrit and Pāli usage in this case.

1.3 *accantasamyoga* [Sp 107, 27-31 ad Vin III 1,6]

The technical term *accantasamyoga* is rarely found in Buddhaghosa's *Aṭṭhakathās*. It is, however, an inseparable part of his elaborate discussion — reproduced, with minor changes according to the context, in his commentaries on the nikāyas — of the case syntax and meaning of the word *samaya*, which throughout the canonical literature is used either in the accusative, the instrumental or the locative. In this context Buddhaghosa addresses the usage of *samaya* in the accusative. The relevant passage reads:

*kathaṃ suttante tāva accantasamyogatto sambhavati ? yaṃ
hi samayaṃ bhagavā Brahmajālādīni suttantāni desesi
accantam eva taṃ samayaṃ karuṇāvihārena vihāsi, tasmā
tadatthajotanattham tatha upayoganiddeso kato.*¹³

How can it be that it is first of all (*tāva*) in the sutta(s) that the meaning of uninterrupted connection (*accantasamyoga*) [in time] occurs ? Because (*hi*) Bhagavan, during the time (*samayaṃ*) when he taught suttas such as Brahmajāla, uninterruptedly (*accantam*)¹⁴ remained in a state of compassion, (*tasmā*) the specification [of circumstances] in them (*tattha*) is put (*kato*) in the accusative (*upayoganiddesa*) in order to make this meaning clear.

According to a quotation from the *porānas* [= *aṭṭhakathācariyās*] which Buddhaghosa invariably quotes in this context, it makes no difference if *samaya* is put in the acc., instr. or loc.¹⁵ since the meaning is locative in any case. There is therefore good cause to believe that Buddhaghosa's elaborate exegesis represents a later attempt to relate the usage of the word *samaya*, in acc., instr., and loc., to distinct syntactical categories as defined by Pāṇinian grammar, while at the same time attempting to interpret a purely grammatical problem in the context of Buddhist hermeneutics.

¹³ The same text occurs also, with minor changes, at Sv I 33,23–25; Ps I 9,26–29; Spk I 11,28–31; Mp I 13,20–23.

¹⁴ Cf. Sp-ṭ Be 1903 I 188,5–7: *accantam evā ti ārambhato paṭṭhāya yāva desanāñiṭṭhānaṃ tāva accantam eva: niraṇṭaram evā ti*; Vjb Be 1960 34,26–27.

¹⁵ For a translation of this quotation, v. Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I, p. 36.

It is, of course, not possible to decide whether Buddhaghosa himself is responsible for this attempt, or whether his analysis merely reflects contemporary Theravāda exegesis. In any case, the context in which the above passage occurs — it represents one of the most complex sections of Buddhaghosa's *Aṭṭhakathās* — displays considerable knowledge of Pāṇinian grammar.¹⁶ For instance, his usage of the term *accantasamyoga* [= Sanskrit *atyantasamyoga*] for explaining the usage of *taṃ samayaṃ* is dependent on Pāṇ II 3 [2+] 5, which defines this particular usage of the acc. as follows: *kālādhvanor atyantasamyoge*: [The second case, i.e., the acc. is used] after [words expressing] temporal or spatial extension, when [the sense is] uninterrupted connection [in time or space].

1.4 *adhikaraṇa* and *bhāvalakkhaṇa* [Sp 107,31–108,5 ad Vin III 1,6]

This text is, like the one analysed above [v. supra 1.3], part of Buddhaghosa's exegesis of the syntax of the word *samaya*. This time he deals with the locative:

*Abhidhamme ca adhikaraṇattho bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇattho ca sambhavati. [so punctuate] adhikaraṇaṃ hi kālattho samūhattho ca samayo tatha vuttānaṃ phassādidhammānaṃ khaṇasamavāyāhetusaṅkhātassa ca samayassa bhāvena tesam bhāvo lakkhīyati, tasmā tadatthajotanatthaṃ tatha bhumma-vacanena niddeso kato.*¹⁷

In the *Abhidhamma* [the word “*samaya*”] occurs with the meaning of locus (*adhikaraṇattho*) and with the meaning of qualification of [one] action through [another] action (*bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇattho*). Because (*hi*) the locus (*adhikaraṇaṃ*) is

¹⁶ For another part of the same section, cf. the analysis of the text on *adhikaraṇa* and *bhāvalakkhaṇa*, q.v. infra.

¹⁷ The same text occurs with minor changes at Sv I 33,10–15; Ps I 9,14–19; Spk I 11,15–21; Mp I 13,7–13; cf. As 61,27–32 [one does not usually find statements with grammatical implications in As]: *adhikaraṇaṃ hi kālasaṅkhāto samūhasaṅkhāto samayo tatha vuttadhammānaṃ ti adhikaraṇavaseṇ' ettha bhummaṃ. khaṇasamavāyāhetusaṅkhātassa ca samayassa bhāvena tesam bhāvo lakkhīyati ti bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇavaseṇ' ettha bhummaṃ.* The whole passage looks very much like a grammatical afterthought added as a note to the otherwise detailed exegesis of Dhs § 1, to which also Buddhaghosa's exegesis relates. The passage is perhaps a slightly edited quotation from Buddhaghosa.

the occasion in the sense of the time and collection of the dhammas as explained therein [i.e. in the *Abhidhamma*] like, e.g. touch (*phassādidhammānaṃ*), and because their action is qualified through the action of the occasion which is denoted moment, combination, and cause (*khaṇasamavāyāhetusaṅkhātassa ca samayassa bhāvena*),¹⁸ (*tasmā*) the specification [of circumstances] is made therein [i.e. in the *Abhidhamma*] in the locative.¹⁹

In order to understand the scope of Buddhaghosa's rather complex exegesis, it is necessary to know the grammatical background of his argument. Buddhaghosa takes his point of departure in two well-known functions of the locative as defined by Pāṇini. The basic usage of the loc. is to denote any given locus (*adhikaraṇa*) of an action. Pāṇini defines this locus in Pāṇ I 4 45 in terms of being the support or substratum (*ādhāra*) of an action: *ādhāro 'dhikaraṇaṃ*.²⁰ Another syntactical function of the locative is the so-called absolute locative. Pāṇini describes this usage in Pāṇ II 3 [+36] 37: *yasya ca bhāvena bhāvalakṣaṇaṃ*: moreover, the thing, due to whose action some other action is qualified, stands in [the seventh case, i.e. the locative]. Buddhaghosa's technical vocabulary, as it appears from his exegesis, is completely identical with Pāṇini's. He even seems to quote Pāṇ II 3 37 in a slightly edited Pāli version.²¹

The canonical *Abhidhamma* passage, which Buddhaghosa interprets in the light of Pāṇinian grammar, is Dhs § 1, defining the particular occasion (*samaya*) on which certain dhammas are to be considered good (*kusala*). I quote only the part that is necessary for understanding Buddhaghosa's interpretation:

¹⁸ Cf. the verse — probably stemming from an unknown Pāli *kośa* — which Buddhaghosa quotes in Sp 107,1–2:

*samavāye khaṇe kāle samūhe hetuṭṭhisu
paṭilābhe pahāne ca paṭivedhe ca dissati.*

¹⁹ In his translation of the same passage, as quoted in Pj I, Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli takes *bhāva* to mean substantive, and thus misinterprets the issue under discussion; cf. Pj I-trsl. (*Illustrator*) p. 114.

²⁰ Cf. Dharmapāla's Ud-a 22,5–8 which quotes Buddhaghosa's explanation interspersed with glosses: *Abhidhamme ... ādhārabhāvasaṅkhāto* [so read; Ee *ādhārassa visayasāṅkhāto*] *adhikaraṇattho. kiriyāya kiriyantaralakkhaṇasaṅkhātena bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇattho ca sambhavati*; cf. also Dharmapāla's Sv-pt qu. n. 23 infra, which alludes to this Pāṇini sūtra.

²¹ The *yasya ca* of II 3 37 only makes sense in connection with the preceding sūtra and was therefore omitted by Buddhaghosa.

yasmim samaye kāmāvacaram kusalam cittam uppannam hoti ... tasmim samaye phasso hoti, vedanā hoti, saññā hoti, cetanā hoti ... : ime dhammā kusalā.

On which occasion (*yasmim samaye*) a good thought that is active within the sphere of the sensuous universe, has originated ... on this occasion (*tasmim samaye*) there is contact, feeling, perception, volition ... : these dhammas are good.

According to Buddhaghosa there are two ideas underlying the usage of the locatives *yasmim samaye ... tasmim samaye*. One is that the word *samaya* denotes the locus (*adhikaraṇa*) of action, in terms of a particular time (*kālattha*) and a particular collection (*samūhattha*) being the basis of the action, of certain dhammas [= *phassa, vedanā, saññā, cetanā*, etc.]. The implied action is in this particular case expressed through the two verbs *uppannam* (*hoti*) and *hoti*. This is the strict locatival interpretation of *samaya*. It is understandable that time, as such, should be interpreted as the locus of an action. It is less obvious how a collection of certain dhammas [i.e. conditions] could be taken, in a strict locatival sense, as the locus of an action. It would seem more straightforward to interpret this usage of the loc. in the sense of the aggregate being the cause [= *nimittasaptamī*] of the existence of other dhammas. The strict locatival interpretation would thus seem to be somewhat forced. However, when Buddhaghosa takes *samaya* in the sense of time (*kāla*) and a collection (*samūha*) [of dhammas], he draws on a tradition which is reflected in the verse defining the various meanings of *samaya*, which he quotes whenever he deals with the word *samaya*.²²

The other function which Buddhaghosa attributes to the locative is more difficult to understand, because it is far from obvious how one could possibly interpret the grammatical structure of *yasmim samaye ... uppannam hoti ... tasmim samaye ... hoti* according to the Pāṇinian definition of the locativus absolutus.

The phrase *samayassa bhāvena* [cf. Sp 108,4 qu. above], however, gives a clue to what Buddhaghosa had in mind. The underlying idea is — as Dhammapāla explains in a similar context in Sv-ṭṭ, illustrating the syntactical properties of the absolute locative with a citation, in Pāli transla-

²² Cf. the verse quoted above and v. the detailed exegesis at As 61,27–32 which clarifies the intention underlying Buddhaghosa's concise explanation.

tion, from Candravṛtti [ad Candra II 1 90] or the Kāśikā [ad Pāṇ II 3 37]²³ — that one should complement the locative phrases *yasmim samaye ... tasmim samaye* with the appropriate form of the pr. part. *sat* so as to read *yasmim samaye sati ... tasmim samaye sati*. The reason is that the verb *hoti* in the phrase *uppannam hoti* [q.v. supra] necessitates the complementation of existence (*sattā*) to *samaya* (*hotipadatthassa sattāviraḥābhāvato*) so as to form a regular absolute locative. In other words, the action of the origination of the mind (*cittassa uppādakiriya*) and the action of the coming into existence of contact, etc. (*phassādīnaṃ bhavanakiriya*) are both qualified by the existence of the occasion (*samayassa sattākiriya ... lakkhiyati*). Dhammapāla's explanation thus gives a clear exposition of the idea underlying Buddhaghosa's application of the Pāṇinian definition of the locativus absolutus to the phrases *yasmim samaye ... tasmim samaye*. The three meanings of moment, combination, and cause (*khana, samavāya, and hetu*) which he ascribes to *samaya* are, in this case as well, related to the verse mentioned above, in which the various meanings of the word *samaya* are defined.

1.5 *karana* and *hetu*

[Sp 108,5–11 ad Vin III 1,6]

This text continues the exegesis of the phrase *tena samayena*, as it occurs in Vin III 1,6. Buddhaghosa writes:

²³ Cf. his elaborate commentary at Sv-ṭṭ I 58,30 foll.: *adhikaraṇattho = ādhāratho. bhāva nāmo kiriya, kiriya kiriyantaralakkhaṇam = bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇam. yathā kālo sabhāvadhammaparichinno sayam paramatthato avijjamāno pi ādhārabhāvena paññāto taṅkhaṇappavattānam tato pubbe parato ca abhāvato: pubbaṅhe jāto, sāyaṅhe gacchatī ti ca ādisu, samūho ca avayavavinimutto avijjamāno pi kappanāmatasiddho avayavānaṃ ādhārabhāvena paññāpiyati: rukkhe sakkhā, yavarāsiyam sambhūto ti ādisu; evam idhāpi ti dassento āha "adhikaraṇam hi ... dhammānaṃ" ti. yasmim kāle dhammapuñje vā kāmāvacaram kusalam cittam uppannam hoti, tasmim yeva kāle dhammapuñje vā [so read; Ee va] phassādayo pi hontī ti ayam hi tattha attho. yathā ca "gāvīsū dūyamānāsu gato, duddhāsu āgato" [= Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 90 and Kāś ad Pāṇ II 2 37] ti dohanakiriya gamanakiriya lakkhiyati, evam idhāpi: yasmim samaye, tasmim samaye ti ca vutte satī ti ayam attho viññāyamāno eva hotipadatthassa [so read; Ee hoti padatthassa] sattāviraḥābhāvato ti samayassa sattākiriya [so read; Ee sattā kiriyā] cittassa uppādakiriya phassādīnaṃ bhavanakiriya ca lakkhiyati. yasmim samaye ti yasmim navame khane, yasmim yonisomanasikārādihetumhi paccayasamavāye vā satī kāmāvacaram kusalam cittam uppannam hoti, tasmim yeva khane, hetumhi, paccayasamavāye ca phassādayo pi hontī ti ubhayattha samayasaddena [so read with v.l.; Ee -sadde] bhummaniddeso kato lakkhaṇabhūtabhāvayutto ti dassento āha: khana- ... lakkhiyati ti.*

*idha pana hetuattho karaṇattho ca sambhavati. yo hi so sikkhāpadapaññattisamayo Sāriputtādīhi pi dubbhiññeyyo, tena samayena hetubhūtena karanabhūtena ca sikkhāpadāni paññāpayanto sikkhāpadapaññattihetuñ ca avekkhamāno bhagavā tattha tattha vihāsi, tasmā tadatthajotanatthaṃ idha karaṇavacanena niddeso kato ti veditabbo.*²⁴

In this context [i.e., in the context of the Vinaya], however, [the word “*samaya*”] occurs with the meaning of cause and with the meaning of instrument. Because (*hi*) the occasion for [Bhagavan’s] discoursing on the precepts was difficult to understand even for Sāriputta, etc., [and because] Bhagavan, while setting forth, through that [specific] occasion as a cause and an instrument (*hetubhūtena karaṇabhūtena*), the precepts and paying attention to the cause for discoursing on the precepts, lived in this or that [place], (*tasmā*) one should know that the indication [of circumstances] in this context [i.e., in the context of the Vinaya] is made by [using] the instrumental case (*karaṇavacanena*).

There is no grammatical subtlety involved in this comment. Buddhaghosa’s terminology shows that he has in mind Pāṇini’s definitions of the usage of the instrument *kāraka*, in Pāṇ II 3 18: *karṭṛkaraṇayoḥ tṛtīyā*, and II 3 23: *hetau*. In these sūtras Pāṇini explains that the instrument *kāraka* is used in the sense of an instrument or a cause of something. The identification of the relevant Pāṇini sūtras is corroborated by Buddhaghosa’s usage of the terms *hetubhūta* and *karaṇabhūta*.

It is noteworthy that some of the examples which Sāriputta and Dhammapāla quote in their respective commentaries on Buddhaghosa’s text appear to be quoted from Candragomin’s commentary on his grammar. This commentary was evidently used by the authors of the *Kāśikā*, which in many cases is indistinguishable from Candravṛtti.²⁵

²⁴ An expanded version of the same text is found at Ud-a 23,3–11.

²⁵ Cf. *annena vasati vijjāya vasati ti ādisu viya hetuattho. pharasunā chindati. kuddālena khaṇāti ti ādisu viya karaṇattho ca sambhavati* [Sp-ṭ Be 1903 I p. 186,27–28] ≠ Dhammapāla Sv-ṭ I 559,23–24 [cf. Ud-a 22,32–23,3]. These examples are partly identical with Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 68: *hetau: ... annena vasati. vidyayā yaśaḥ* [cf. *Kāś* ad Pāṇ II 3 23: *dhanena kulam. kanyayā śokaḥ. vidyayā yaśaḥ*; for Sv-ṭ *ajjhena vasati*, read *vijjāya vasati*] and 63: *karaṇe: ... dātreṇa lunāti, paraśunā chinatti* [= *Kāś* ad Pāṇ II 3 18]. Note that the examples

1.6 nimitta

[Sp 189,7–28 ad Vin III 8,30–33]

The Vinaya passage which Buddhaghosa attempts to interpret is syntactically ambiguous and difficult to construe. This fact leads him to suggest two alternative solutions to the problem, neither of which, however, is satisfactory. The passage reads:

tatra sudam Sariputta bhimsanakassa vanasandassa bhimsanakatasmim hoti yo koci avitarāgo taṃ vanasandaṃ pavisati yebhuyyena lomāni haṃsanti.

The syntax of this sentence raises several problems of interpretation. It is, in the first place, not clear how we are to construe *tatra*. Buddhaghosa suggests that it be taken as an anaphora, referring back to what has been said in the previous sentence (*tatrā ti purimavacanāpekkham*). He interprets *sudam* as an expletive particle (*sudan ti padapūraṇamatte nipāto*), and construes the sentence as follows (*ayam pan’ ettha atthayojanā*):

tatrā ti yaṃ vuttaṃ aññatarasmim bhimsanake vanasande ti. tatra yo so bhimsanako ti vanasando vutto tassa bhimsanakassa vanasandassa bhimsanakatasmim hoti, bhimsanakiriyāya hoti ti attho. kim hoti? idaṃ hoti: yo koci ... lomāni haṃsanti ti.

The expression “therein (*tatra*)” [refers back to the clause] “in a horrifying jungle-thicket [= Vin III 8,23].” In this case the jungle-thicket is explained (*vutto*) by the word “horrifying (*bhimsako*).” It happens (*hoti*), on account of this horrifying jungle-thicket’s creating horror (*bhimsanakassa vanasandassa bhimsanakatasmim*), that ... , i.e. (*iti attho*), it happens, because of its action of [creating] horror (*bhimsanakiriyāya*), that ... What happens? It happens that whoever enters this jungle-thicket without being devoid of passion, [his] hair as a rule stands on end (*haṃsanti*).

pharasunā chindati and *kuddālena khaṇāti* have a parallel in Kacc-v ad Kacc 281: *yena vā kariyate taṃ karaṇam: ... pharasunā rukkham chindati. kuddālena rukkham khaṇāti.*

From this exegetical tour de force it becomes clear that Buddhaghosa interprets *bhimsanakatasmim* as a compound, which he apparently derives from *bhimsana* + *kata*. According to Sāriputta, *kata* (n.) is to be interpreted as an action noun (*bhāvasādhana*),²⁶ but apart from that he makes no suggestion for the derivation of *kata*, about which Buddhaghosa also leaves us in the dark. The gloss *bhimsanakiriyāya*, however, would seem to indicate that he took *kata* as a pp. [\sqrt{kr}], and that he interpreted it as a neuter noun, equivalent to *kiriyā* in the compound *bhimsanakiriyā*. As indicated by Buddhaghosa's gloss, he interpreted the locative in a causal sense (*nimitta* = *nimittasaptamī*).²⁷

In the second alternative he returns more explicitly to this interpretation of the locative. First he suggests taking the locatival *tatra* in the sense of the genitive (*tatrā ti sāmīatthe bhummam*). He interprets *sudam* as a sandhi form of the particle (*nipāta*) *su* and the pronoun *idam*, with elision of the *-i-* (*sandhivasena ikāralopo veditabbo*), and he finally construes the sentence as follows (*ayam pan' ettha atthayojanā*):

tassa Sāriputta bhimsanakassa vanasaṇḍassa bhimsanakatasmim idam su hoti. bhimsanakatasmin ti bhimsanakabhāve ti attho. ekassa takārassa lopo daṭṭhabbo. bhimsanakakattasmim yeva vā pāṭho, bhimsanakatāya iti vā vattabbo, liṅgavipallāso kato. nimittatthe c' etam bhummavacanam, tasmā evam sambandho veditabbo: bhimsanakabhāve idam su hoti; bhimsanakabhāvanimittam, bhimsanakabhāvahetu, bhimsanakabhāvapaccayā idam su hoti: yo koci ... lomāni hamsantī ti.

This, Sāriputta, surely happens on account of this horrifying jungle-thicket's causing horror. [The word] *bhimsanakatasmim* means "on account of being horrifying." One should observe that a *-t-* [in *bhimsanakatasmim*] has been elided [from *bhimsanakat(t)asmim*]. Either the [correct] reading is

²⁶ Cf. Sp-ṭ Be 1903 I 406,10–12: *katan ti bhāvasādhanavāci idam padan ti āha bhimsanakatasmim bhimsanakakriyāyā ti. bhimsanassa karanam kriyā bhimsanakatam. tasmim bhimsanakatasmim.*

²⁷ The interpretation of the locative (*bhummam*) in a causal sense (*nimittatthe*) is rarely met with in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās. Apart from this example, I can only refer to Pj II 321,9 and 433,23 for similar interpretations of the locative in Pāli.

bhimsanakakattasmim, or one should read [as if it were] *bhimsanakatāya*, a change of gender (*liṅgavipallāso*) being made [of the abs. suffix *-tā* (f.) to *-ta* (m. or n.)]. Also (*ca*) this locative is used in the sense of a cause (*nimittatthe*). Therefore one should know that the connection (*sambandho*) [between the terms in the sentence, i.e., the syntax] is as follows: on account of being terrifying this surely happens, i.e., because of being terrifying, due to being terrifying, by reason of being terrifying this happens viz. that whoever enters this jungle-thicket without being devoid of passion, [his] hair as a rule stands on end.

This interpretation would seem to create as many problems as it tries to solve. Buddhaghosa is no doubt correct in suggesting the emendation *bhimsanakattasmim*, which makes better sense than the unusual compound *bhimsana* + *kata*. His gloss *bhimsanakabhāve* shows that he interprets, as one would assume, the abstract suffix *-tta* (n.) [$\sqrt{*tva}$] according to Pāṇ V 1 119: *tasya bhāvas tvatalau*.²⁸ There is no reason to believe, however, that he is right in claiming that the locatival *tatra* = *tassa*. Nor is Buddhaghosa's derivation of the particle *sudam* from the particle *su* [$\sqrt{*sma}$] + *idam* correct. It is rather to be derived from *su* + *taṃ* > *sudam* [= Sanskrit *sma tad*].²⁹ The reason is no doubt that he felt the need for a pronoun in construction with the relative pronoun *ya*, introducing the subordinate clause. In the case of *sudam*, however, canonical usage shows that it is exclusively used adverbially, i.e. as a particle (*nipāta*), which Buddhaghosa correctly suggests in the first alternative. The phrase *tatra sudam* or *tatra pi sudam* is often found in canonical narrative prose.³⁰ In every single case *tatra* has a locatival sense and *sudam* is merely used as an emphatic, often untranslatable, particle. It is clear that Buddhaghosa's interpretation is a result of a desperate attempt to construe an otherwise syntactically ambiguous sentence. First of all, he is forced to find a solution to the locative *bhimsanakatasmim*. Although he is probably correct in assuming that this form has to be

²⁸ There are many allusions to this Pāṇinian sūtra in the Aṭṭhakathās, e.g. Spk II 12,33 (ad S II 3,1): *cavanatā ti bhāvavacanena lakkhaṇanidassanam* = Vibh-a 100,20; *māyāvino bhāvo māyāvītā*, Vibh-a 493,16.

²⁹ Cf. O. von Hinüber, *Überblick*, § 134.

³⁰ For *tatra sudam*, cf. D I 1,10; M I 473,19; M II 164,5; for *tatra pi sudam*, cf. D I 119,1; II 91,6; II 126,6.

amended to read *bhimsanakattasmim*, it is nonetheless questionable whether his interpretation of the locative in a causal sense is correct. It is understandable, however, that Buddhaghosa, whose knowledge of grammar was largely, or perhaps exclusively, dependent upon Pāṇinian grammar, would try to find a solution to the problem of the locative *bhimsanakatasmim* in Pāṇinian grammar. He probably found it in Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ II 3 36 [+vārttika 6 ad loc.].³¹ Vajirabuddhiṭikā confirms this assumption by quoting a slightly edited Pāli version of a Sanskrit verse which Patañjali quotes ad loc. as an illustration of *nimittasaptamī*.³²

It is not possible to find an absolutely satisfactory solution to the syntactical problem of the sentence causing Buddhaghosa to write such an elaborate grammatical analysis. The locative *tatra* is probably to be construed with the *yo* of the relative clause, and can, in fact, be interpreted in the sense of a *nimittasaptamī*. As for the locative *bhimsanakattasmim* (adopting Buddhaghosa's emendation), I would suggest interpreting it in a predicative sense³³ — for which there are a few interesting canonical examples [v. infra] — and translating the sentence in the following way:

This indeed, Sāriputta, is the reason why the horrifying jungle-thicket is called horrifying, namely, that whoever enters this jungle-thicket without being devoid of passion, [his] hair as a rule stands on end.³⁴

The whole purpose of the sentence is obviously to give an “etymology” of the word *bhimsanaka*, which is here explained with reference

³¹ Cf. Mahā-bh and vārt. 6 ad loc.: *nimittāt karmasamyoge* [= vārt 6]. *nimittāt karmasamyoge saptamī vaktavyā*.

*carmaṇi dvīpinaṃ hanti dantayor hanti kuṅjaram
keṣeṣu camariṃ hanti simni puṣkalako hataḥ.*

³² Cf.: *nimittatthe ti ettha*

*cammani dipinaṃ hanti, dantesu hanti kuṅjaram
vālesu cāmarim hanti, siṅgesu saraso hatō.*

ti adhikaraṇaṃ [Vjb Be 1960 57,26–27]; cf. Ja VI 61,3 foll. ≠ 78,17.

³³ This particular usage of the loc. in Pāli is normally found with verba sentiendi et dicendi [cf. O. von Hinüber, *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli*, § 294]. The present usage differs syntactically from the few examples quoted in op. cit. § 294, in that it is not constructed with a verbum sentiendi et dicendi.

³⁴ In I. B. Horner's translation the sentence reads: Moreover, Sāriputta, whoever not devoid of passion, is in a terror of the awe-inspiring jungle-thicket, and enters the jungle-thicket, as a rule his hair stands on end [*Book of the Discipline*, I, p. 16].

to the root \sqrt{hams} [$< * \sqrt{hr̥s}$] ≠ the stem \sqrt{bhims} - [$< bhīṣma$ deriv. $< * \sqrt{bhī}$].³⁵ Fanciful etymologies of this type, being based upon a superficial phonetic similarity, are a well-known feature in Indian literature.³⁶ They are, for instance, to be found in great number in the Brāhmaṇa texts and the early Upaniṣads, not to mention Yāska's Nirukta. The way in which they are formulated, e.g. in the early Upaniṣads, would seem to lend support to Buddhaghosa's correction *bhimsanakatta*. In the majority of cases the reason for the nature or particular form of any given word *x* is explained there in terms of its *x*-ness.³⁷ This fits very well into the present context, where the word *bhimsanaka* is explained in terms of its *bhimsanaka*-ness, which is due to the fact that it makes people's hair stand on end (*hamsanti*).

The predicative usage of the loc. is rarely met with in the canon. As a matter of fact, I have only been able to identify two canonical examples, both from the Dīghanikāya. One example is D I 63,22: *idam pi 'ssa hoti silasmim*: this is what he has as virtue. The other example is D II 221,7: *idam tesam hoti āsanasmim*: this is what they have as seat.³⁸ It is clear that Buddhaghosa was ignorant of this function of the loc. because in Sv 182,14–18 ad D I 63,22 he quotes the view of the Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā as an alternative to his own explanation according to which the loc. has a partitive sense [cf. Pāṇ II 3 41]. The Aṭṭhakathā, however, is correct in interpreting the loc. as equivalent to the nominative (= *pacattavacanatthe*) as shown by the quote *idam pi tassa samanassa silam*, which simply is one way of saying that the loc. has a predicative function.³⁹

Buddhaghosa's alternative suggestions for interpreting the above Vinaya passage are ingenious, but certainly wrong. The main reason is that in general his grammatical analyses are dependent on whether he can find a paragraph in Pāṇinian grammar that is applicable to the problem in question. This obviously is not the case in this context, and his failure to interpret the

³⁵ The association of \sqrt{hams} - and \sqrt{bhims} - is common in the canon. Cf., for example, the canonical juxtaposition of *lomahaṃsa* and *bhimsanaka* in D II 106,23.

³⁶ For examples from Pāli canonical lit., cf. Norman, “Four Etymologies from the Sabhiya-sutta”, *Buddhist Studies in honour of Walpola Rahula*, London 1980, pp. 173–84.

³⁷ Cf., for example, Bṛhadāraṇyakōpaniṣad I 2.1: *so 'rcann acarat. tasyārcata āpo 'jāyanta. arcate vai me kam abhūd iti. tad evārkasyārkavam*; v. ibid. I 2.5.

³⁸ Buddhaghosa does not comment on this clause. Perhaps the reason is that he did not find any suggestions in the old Aṭṭhakathā as to its interpretation.

³⁹ Cf. Sv loc. cit.: *Mahā-Aṭṭhakathāyam hi idam pi tassa samanassa silan ti ayam eva attho vutto*, which indicates that, in the commentarial tradition, there was a clear understanding of the predicative function of the locative.

sentence correctly can be ascribed to the fact that Pāṇinian grammar does not recognize a similar function of the locative.

1.6 *samīpa*
[Sp 108,21–22 ad Vin III 1,6]

As appears from his reference to the usage of the loc. in the sense of cause (*nimitta*), Buddhaghosa must have been conversant with the Pāṇinian tradition as a whole. This is also the case in the context where he claims that the loc. is used in the sense of being close to or nearby something (*samīpattha*), although in this particular case he may rely on grammatical sources that are no longer accessible. In Sp 108,21–22,⁴⁰ commenting upon the loc. *Verañjāyaṃ* in the clause *Verañjāyaṃ ... viharati*, he writes: *Verañjāyaṃ samīpatthe bhumavacanāṃ*: “by *Verañjā*” is a locative in the sense of vicinity (*samīpa*). Buddhaghosa illustrates the meaning of this particular usage with the following example: *yathā Gaṅgayamunādīnaṃ samīpe goyūthāni carantāni Gaṅgāya caranti Yamunāya caranti ti vuccanti evaṃ idhāpi* [= Sp 109,18–19]: just as the cowherds that graze in the vicinity of [the rivers] Ganges and Yamuna are said to graze by the Ganges and the Yamuna, so also in this context.

Although there is no mention of this usage of the loc. in Pāṇini, it can be traced to Mahā-bh II 218,14–19 where it is used in a context analogous to the one with which Buddhaghosa is dealing: *tatsamīpyāt: Gaṅgāyaṃ ghoṣaḥ* [= Mahā-bh loc. cit.]. Elsewhere Patañjali mentions three types of locative *kāraka* relations: *adhikaraṇaṃ nāma triprakāraṃ vyāpakam aupasleṣikam vaiṣayikam iti* [= Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ VI 1 72]. To these the Pāli grammarians add *samīpika*.⁴¹ Although there can be no doubt that the use of *samīpika* has its origin in Mahā-bh — Aggavaṃsa’s citation of Mahā-bh loc. cit. in connection with his discussion of *samīpika* proves this beyond doubt — it has not been possible to find a justification, in contemporary Sanskrit grammatical sources, for the inclusion of *samīpa* in the locative *kāraka* relations; therefore its historical background remains unclear.⁴² Buddhaghosa’s

⁴⁰ For other references to *samīpattha*, cf. Sv I 132,23; Spk I 12,31 = Mp I 15,1 = Pj I 111,5.

⁴¹ Cf. the *kārikā* qu. in Rūp Ce 1897 113,29–30:

vyāpiko : tilakhīrādi; kaṭo : opasilesiko

samīpiko : gaṅgādi; ākāso : visayo mato.

⁴² It is noteworthy that the examples of the usage of the locative that are quoted in Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 88 (*kaṭe āste. ākāse kunayaḥ. tileṣu tailam. Gaṅgāyaṃ gāvah*) are used as illustrations of the various types of locative relations that are mentioned in the verse

example illustrating the *samīpattha* is analogous to the one used by Candragomin in Candravṛtti [ad II 1 88]: *gaṅgāyaṃ gāvah*, but Candragomin does not use the corresponding technical term for defining the nature of the locative. One cannot, of course, exclude the possibility that Buddhaghosa has taken his example from a common stock of examples illustrating *samīpya* and that he applied it ad hoc. For instance, one finds the following illustration of *samīpya* in Vātsyāyana’s Bhāṣya ad Nyāyasūtra II 2 62: *samīpyād — gaṅgāyaṃ gāvah caranti*.

[B]

Grammatical references in Paramatthajotikā I–II

Almost all the references to the views of the grammarians, or occasional allusions to Pāṇini, that are found in Pj I and II have already been identified by Helmer Smith in his careful editions of these important commentaries, but he never attempted a study of them. They are interesting and should be included in a study of the Pāli grammatical tradition as it is reflected in the Aṭṭhakathās. Since Pj II was written before Pj I, it is here treated before Pj I.

[Pj II 23,12–26 ad Sn 14]

In the first example the author deals with two problems. The first is an apparent morphological anomaly: the pp. *samūhatāse* [*< *samud + √han*] that occurs in the clause: *yassa ... mūlā akusalā samūhatāse* “who has destroyed all the evil roots.” On this form he writes:

*samūhatā icc’ eva attho, paccattabahuvacanassa hi (a)sakā-rāgamam*⁴³ [so read ? Ee sa-; Be se-] *icchanti saddalakkhaṇa-kovidā. atṭhakathācariyā pana se ti nipāto ti vaṇṇayanti. yaṃ ruccati, taṃ gahetabbaṃ.*

quoted by Buddhapiya in Rūp Ce 1897 113,29–30 [q.v. supra]. Comparatively late Sanskrit grammatical sources mention *samīpyaka* (scil. *adhikaraṇa*) as a subset of the locative *kāraka*; v. Renou, *Terminologie*, s.v. *adhikaraṇa*.

⁴³ For this emendation, cf. the discussion infra.

The meaning is the same as (*eva*) [of the form] “*samūhatā*,” because (*hi*) the grammarians claim that the nominative plural (*paccattabahuvacanassa*) gets the augment *as*. The teachers of the Aṭṭhakathās, however, comment that *se* is a particle. One may adopt whichever [view] one prefers.

One finds here the same scholarly attitude towards grammatical problems as is normal practice in Buddhagosa [cf. Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I]: first the view of the grammarians is presented and then the view of the aṭṭhakathācariyas.

The reading *sakārāgama*, however, is problematic. One would expect the reading *sekāra*- in accordance with the canonical reading, but the manuscript tradition seems to consistently read *sa* for the expected *se*.⁴⁴ Assuming that the reading *sa* is not an old corruption and that the author is trying to explain the ending *-āse* with reference to the grammarians’ view, one might suggest reading *asakārāgama*, from which the *a* was probably elided in conjunction with the immediately preceding *hi*. If this assumption is correct, then the reference to grammarians (*saddalakkhaṇakovidā*) becomes understandable. As a rule such references are to Sanskrit grammarians. This implies that the author is referring to Sanskrit;⁴⁵ and in this particular case he is probably thinking of those Vedic plural forms ending in *-āsas*, which Pāṇini addresses in Pāṇ VII 1 [38+] 50: *ājjaser asuk*: after stems in *a* or *ā* [the nom. pl. augment *as*] gets [in the Veda the augment denoted] *asuk* [= *as*].⁴⁶ However, the author of Pj was probably not aware of the fact that Sanskrit *-āsas* > Pāli *-āse*.⁴⁷ His primary intention seems to have been to contrast Sanskrit nom. pl. forms in *-āsas* with analogous Pāli nom. pl. forms in *-āse*.⁴⁸ It is therefore surprising that an authority like Aggavaṃsa regards the *se* as not constituting a part of the pl. form itself (*apadāvyava*), and that he thus

⁴⁴ The reading of Be is probably a modern attempt at being consistent.

⁴⁵ He refers explicitly to Vedic Sanskrit (*sakkata*) at Pj II 43,21, q.v. infra.

⁴⁶ One cannot, of course, exclude the possibility that the author refers to the normal Sanskrit plural ending *-ās*, and that the *sakārāgama* is to be interpreted with reference to the Pāli plural ending *-ā + s*, which represents the normal Sanskrit nom. pl. ending. If so, it leaves the *-e* in *-āse* unexplained.

⁴⁷ The ending *-āse* is probably a reflex of an eastern Prakrit; cf. O. von Hinüber, *Überblick*, § 312. Analogous nom. pl. forms that occur in Sn are passed over in silence in Pj II, but they are correctly identified as such; cf. Pj II 368,5: *upāsakāse ti upāsakā icc eva vuttam hoti* (ad Sn 376); II 553,28: *paṇḍitāse = paṇḍitā* (ad Sn 875).

⁴⁸ This appears clearly from the way in which he correctly contrasts the form *carāmase* in Sn 32 with Sanskrit *carāmasi* at Pj II 43,21–22; v. infra.

would seem to agree with the aṭṭhakathācariyās that *se* is a particle (*nipāta*).⁴⁹

The next problem the author addresses is the present form *jahāti* occurring in the first line of the refrain of the Urugasutta: *so bhikkhu jahāti orapāram*: this monk abandons this shore and the far shore, on which he writes the following concise comment:

n’ eva ādiyati na pajahati, pajahitvā thito ti vutto. tathā pi vattamānasamīpe vattamānavacanalakkaṇena [≠ Pāṇ III 3 131] *jahāti orapāran ti vuccati*.

What is meant is that he neither appropriates nor abandons, being in a state where he already has abandoned (*pajahitvā thito*). In the same way also [the present form *jahāti* in the clause] “he abandons (*jahāti*) this and the far shore” is used, according to the rule about the present [being used to express the past or the future time], when [the past or the future time is] contiguous to the present time (*vattamānasamīpe*).

This interpretation alludes to Pāṇ III 3 131, in which Pāṇini lays down the rule that affixes that are employed for denoting the present time may also be used to express the past or future time, provided that they express the immediate past or future: *vattamānasamīpye vattamānavad vā*: optionally, [the affixes that are used to express the present time] may in the same way as when the meaning is that of present time, be used [in the sense of past or future time] when [the past or the future time is] contiguous to the present.

The reason why Buddhaghosa alludes to this sūtra is, of course, that the present form *jahāti* of the refrain follows immediately after the pp. *samūhatāse*. This would seem to create a logical problem, because having given up *mūlā akusalā* is, according to Buddhaghosa, equivalent to having given up “this and the far shore.” He therefore solves the problem with reference to this particular Pāṇini sūtra. In the present context this means that the tense value of the pp. *samūhatāse* takes precedence over the tense value of *jahāti* which thus assumes a past tense value, referring to the

⁴⁹ Cf. Sadd 513,14-15: *apadāvyavo pana ... “mūlā akusalā samūhatā se* [= Sn 14].”

immediate past. Thus, following Buddhaghosa's analysis, one might translate the refrain: he has given up this and the far shore.

In the following example Buddhaghosa addresses the problem of the form *carāmase* that occurs in the verse: *Gopī ca ahañ ca ... brahmacariyaṃ Sugate carāmase* [= Sn 31]. He writes:

carāmase iti carāma yaṃ hi taṃ sakkatena carāmasī ti vuccati, taṃ idha carāmase iti. aṭṭhakathâcariyā pana se iti nipāto ti bhananti, ten' eva c' ettha āyācanatthaṃ sandhāya carema [v.l. *carā-*] *se iti pi pāṭhaṃ vikappenti. yaṃ ruccati, taṃ gahetabbam.*

[The form] *carāmase* = *carāma*, because [the form] which in Sanskrit reads *carāmasi*, in this [verse reads] *carāmase*. The teachers of the Aṭṭhakathā, however, say that *se* is a particle (*nipāto*), and therefore they optionally propose (*vikappenti*) the reading *carema se*, with regard to the meaning of the vow [expressed] therein [i.e. in the verb *carāma se* (*ettha āyācanatthaṃ sandhāya*)]. One may adopt which [view] one prefers.

It appears from Buddhaghosa's commentary that he interprets *carāmase* = *carāmasi* [Vedic ind. pr. 1 pl.]. We may therefore deduce that he also knew Sanskrit (*sakkata*) in its Vedic form, at least to the extent that it is covered by Pāṇini's rules for *chandas*. This fact also lends support to the suggestion [v. supra] that he contrasted Pāli nom. pl. *-āse* with Vedic nom. pl. *-āsas*, and that the proposed emendation therefore may be correct.

It is, of course, another question whether Buddhaghosa is correct in suggesting that *carāmase* = *carāmasi* = *carāma*. The form *carāmase* itself is ambiguous and admits of two interpretations: it may either be interpreted as indicative mid. 1 pl. [cf. Geiger § 122, which cites analogous forms that cannot be interpreted as subjunctive forms], the ending *-mase* being the middle counterpart of Vedic *-masi*, or as subjunctive mid. 1 pl. [cf. Geiger § 126 according to which *carāmase* belongs to this category].⁵⁰ In this case there is no reason to doubt that it is a subj. mid. form, and we may therefore translate Sn 31: *Gopī* and *I ...* shall practice *brahmacariya* for the sake of

⁵⁰ Cf. also Norman, *Elders' Verses* II, n. ad Th 370–71; O. von Hinüber, *Überblick*, § 433.

Sugata (*sugate* = *nimittasaptamī*). The *aṭṭhakathâcariyas* apparently had preserved the tradition that it was a subjunctive⁵¹ [cf. the phrase *āyācanatthaṃ sandhāya*], but they clearly were unable to analyse correctly the form itself, which is a Middle Indian innovation. Since Buddhaghosa had no other possibility of identifying the form than to try to find as close a parallel in Sanskrit as possible, he could only suggest that *carāmase* = *carāmasi*.⁵² In those cases where analogous forms occur, he might have been correct [for the present ind. forms, cf. the forms listed in Geiger § 122], but in this context it would seem necessary to interpret *carāmase* as a subjunctive.⁵³

In this example the presence of the ind. mid. 3 sg. *kurute*, in the verse *sante na kurute piyaṃ*:⁵⁴ he does not make good men his friends, gives Buddhaghosa another opportunity to display his knowledge of Pāṇinian grammar. He offers two alternative explanations of this clause, only the first of which can be considered correct: *sante na kurute piyaṃ, attano piye itthe kante manāpe na kurute iti attho* [= Pj II 169,11–13]. From this paraphrase it appears that he correctly interprets *piyaṃ* [= eastern acc. pl. *piye*], in apposition to *sante* [eastern acc. pl.].⁵⁵ This interpretation probably represents the view of the *aṭṭhakathâcariyas*. In the second alternative, however, he suggests interpreting *kurute* according to Pāṇ I 3 32, which lays down the rule that when the verb \sqrt{kr} inter alia means “to revile” or “to serve,” the middle (*ātmanepada*) is used, even though the fruit of the action does not fall to the agent (*gandhanâvakṣepaṇasevanasâhasikyapratiyatna-prakathanôpayogesu kṛñah*). He therefore suggests the following paraphrase: *sante na sevati ti attho yathā rājānaṃ sevati*: they do not serve the good men, on the grounds that the grammarians take, e.g. the expression “*rājānaṃ pakurute*” in the same meaning (*etasmim atthe “rājānaṃ pakurute” ti saddavidū mantenti*).⁵⁶ The suggestion is ingenious, and it is therefore

⁵¹ This speaks for the historical validity of the Aṭṭhakathā tradition, which in many cases has preserved the correct interpretation; cf. n. 39 supra.

⁵² He evidently took *carāmase* = *carāmasi* = *carāma*, because he quotes Ja IV 53,20: *brahmacariyaṃ carāma* as a parallel.

⁵³ This applies mutatis mutandis to the interpretation of *bhavāmase* in the following line of Sn 31; cf. Pj II 44,2–4.

⁵⁴ Cf. Dh 217: *taṃ jano kurute piyaṃ*: such a man the world makes its friend.

⁵⁵ For *piyaṃ* = eastern acc. pl., v. Lüders, *Beobachtungen*, § 205.

⁵⁶ Cf. Fausbøll's translation which tries to do justice to the “Pāṇinian” interpretation: he does not do anything that is dear to the good, which Lüders [op. cit., § 205] incorrectly claims does not do justice to the medium.

surprising that Buddhaghosa did not simply take *piyaṃ* as acc. pl. in apposition to *sante*, but proposed to interpret *piyaṃ* as a part.⁵⁷ Indeed, it cannot be entirely excluded that we have to translate: the good men he does not treat as his friends. Nor is it impossible that the parallel in Dh 217: *taṃ jano kurute piyaṃ*, is to be translated as: such a man the world treats as a friend.

[Pj II 321,10–12 ad Sn 302]

Commenting on the phrase “*pahūtadhanadhañño 'si, yajassu, bahu te vittam, yajassu, bahu te dhanam,*” Buddhaghosa writes:

pahūtadhanadhañño 'sī ti, pahūtadhanadhañño bhavissasi abhisamparāyan ti adhippāyo, āsaṃsāyaṃ hi anāgate pi vat-tamānavacanaṃ icchanti saddakovidā.

The intention (*adhippāyo*) of [the clause] “you become⁵⁸ abundantly rich” is “you shall become abundantly rich in the future,” because (*hi*) those who are well versed in grammar (*saddakovidā*) claim that, in the case of a wish (*āsaṃsā*), the present is also used in the sense of the future.

The grammarians to whom the author refers here are, as one would expect, Pāṇinians. In this case the Pāṇinian rule that justifies his exegesis is found in Pāṇ III 3 [131+] 132: *āsaṃsāyāṃ bhūtavac ca*: in the case of a wish [the affixes that are used to express the present time or the past time] may [optionally, i.e., instead of the affixes expressing the future time] be used in the same way as when [the meanings are that of present time] and that of past time.

The intention of the reference to the grammarians becomes clear when one takes a look at Buddhaghosa's paraphrase: *mahārāja, bahu te vittam dhanam ca, yajassu, āyatim pi pahūtadhanadhañño bhavissasi ti*. He simply wants to show that the Sn clause has the following underlying structure: May you offer [= if you offer] ... then you shall become abundantly rich. It is therefore clear that he is forced to give a reason for why the present form *asi*, which he tacitly interprets as equivalent to *bhavati*, is used instead of the expected future. He consequently turned to the relevant Pāṇini sūtra which would seem to justify his exegesis. However, there is

⁵⁷ Cf. Pj II 169,16–17: *piyan ti piyamāno tussamāno modamāno ti attho.*

⁵⁸ I translate *asi* = *bhavati* in accordance with Buddhaghosa's intention; v. infra.

nothing in the verse that would support this learned display of Sanskrit grammar. The clause *pahūtadhanadhañño 'si* is clearly syntactically co-ordinated with the clauses *bahu te vittam* and *bahu te dhanam*, and thus one cannot, without distorting the syntax of the verse, attribute the value of *āsaṃsā* to the usage of *asi*.

[Pj I 17,28–19,22 on “*buddham saraṇam gacchāmi*”]

Nearly all the exegeses of grammatical interest that occur in Paramatthajotikā I are found in identical or slightly edited forms in other commentaries ascribed to Buddhaghosa. However, in one case where he deals with the controversy over the correct interpretation of the canonical stereotype *buddham saraṇam gacchāmi*, the scope of the discussion goes far beyond the corresponding treatment of the same sentence in his other commentaries.⁵⁹ Buddhaghosa deals briefly with the analogous phrase, *Bhagavantam saraṇam gacchāmi*, in Sv 229,18–23,⁶⁰ but without even touching upon the grammatical question of co-referentiality [= apposition (*samānādhikaraṇatta*)], which is the focal topic of the controversy recorded in Pj I. The following section is the most interesting part of it from a grammatical point of view:⁶¹

codako āha: buddham saraṇam gacchāmi ti ettha, yo buddham saraṇam gacchati, esa buddham vā gaccheyya saraṇam vā. ubhayathā pi ca ekassa vacanam niratthakam. kasmā ? gamanakiriyāya kammadvayābhāvato, na h' ettha “ajam gāmaṃ neti” ti ādisu viya dikammakattam akkharacintakā icchanti, — “gacchat' eva pubbam disam gacchati pacchimaṃ disan” [= S I 122,2] ti ādisu sātthakam evā ti ce, — na: buddhasaraṇānaṃ samānādhikaraṇabhāvavassānādhipeṭato, etesaṃ hi samānādhikaraṇabhāve adhippete paṭihatacitto pi buddham upasaṃkamanto buddham saraṇam gato siyā, yaṃ

⁵⁹ This is one of several indications that Pj I may not be by Buddhaghosa.

⁶⁰ Cf.: *bhagavā me saraṇam parāyanam, aghassa sātā hitassa ca vidhātā ti iminā adhippāyena etaṃ gacchāmi bhajāmi sevāmi payirupāsāmi ti evaṃ vā jānāmi, bujjhāmi ti, yesaṃ hi dhāṭūnaṃ gati attho, buddhi pi tesam attho*, Sv 229,20–22 ≠ Pj I 19,1–3.

⁶¹ Unfortunately the purport of the entire passage was misunderstood by Nāṇamoli who translated *samānādhikaraṇabhāva* as “identical causativity” [v. *Illustrator*, p. 10 foll.].

hi tam "buddho" ti visesitam saraṇam, tam ev' esa gato ti [= Pj I 17,29–18,6].

The objector (*codako*) says: In the [proposition] "I go to the Buddha, [to] protection," the one who goes to Buddha, [to] protection, may either go to the Buddha or to the protection. In either case (*ubhayathā pi*), however, the word [that denotes] one [of them, i.e. *Buddham* or *saraṇam*] is meaningless. — How can that be? — Because the verbal action of going does not take two object [*kāraḥas* (*kammadvaya*)]; for in this case the grammarians do not claim that there are two object [*kāraḥas*], in the same way as in [the proposition] "he takes the goat to the village." Suppose you object that [the word that denotes one of them] is meaningful, in the same way as, for instance, [the word *pubbam* or *disam* in the phrase from S I 122,2]: "he goes to the eastern region, he goes to the western region." This [assumption] is wrong (*na*), because it is not intended that [the word] Buddha and [the word] protection be co-referential [i.e., in apposition (*buddhasaraṇānaṃ samānādhikaraṇabhāvassānadhipetato*)]; for (*hi*) if it were intended that they be co-referential, even a depraved person who approached the Buddha would come to the Buddha as protection, because he has come to precisely that protection which is qualified as "Buddha" (*buddho ti visesitam*).

The first objection is based upon the grammarians' assumption that \sqrt{gam} cannot be constructed with two accusatives — except in its causative form — in the same way as \sqrt{ni} .⁶² The example used for illustrating the opposition between \sqrt{ni} and \sqrt{gam} : *ajam gāmaṃ neti*, is quoted from a related discussion in Mahā-bh [= *ajām nayati grāmam*, Mahā-bh I 335,13 ad Pāṇ I 4 51].

The next objection starts from the assumption that *Buddham* and *saraṇam* are in apposition (*samānādhikaraṇabhāva*). The idea is that *saraṇam* qualifies *Buddham* in the same way as the two adjectives *pubbam* or *pacchimaṃ* qualify *disam*. In his *ṭikā* [ad Sv 229,18–23] Dhammapāla claims

⁶² Cf. the corresponding discussion at Sv-pt I 357,19–20 [ad Sv 229,18–23]: *ettha ca nāyaṃ gamusaddo nisaddādayo viya dvikammako*.

that it is necessary to complement the sentence according to its underlying syntax. In his view an *iti*, showing the apposition, has been elided after *saraṇam*. The correct reading, according to Dhammapāla, should therefore be: *bhagavantam saraṇam iti gacchāmi*.⁶³ The author of Pj I objects to a similar view by pointing to the fact that, for instance, at S III 57,7: *aniccam rūpaṃ aniccamaṃ rūpaṃ ti yathābhūtaṃ pajānāti*, there is no *iti* found after *aniccam*, as one would expect.⁶⁴ Consequently there is no need for complementing the sentence, which simply has to be interpreted as if an *iti* had been applied (*payutto viya*).⁶⁵ The claim that *saraṇam* stands in apposition to *Buddham* or *Bhagavantam* would seem to be grammatically sound. Accordingly we should translate the canonical stereotype: I go to the Buddha as [my] protection.

[B]

1 [Paṭis-a 538,6–8 ad Paṭis II 4,4–6]

In this grammatical note Mahānāma deals with the semantical and syntactical conditions under which the past participle in *-ta* is constructed with the genitive. The passage commented upon reads:

na m' ete bhikkhave samaṇā vā brāhmaṇā vā samaṇesu c' eva samaṇasammataṃ brāhmaṇesu ca brāhmaṇasammataṃ.

I do not, monks, consider these recluses or brāhmaṇas to be recluses among recluses and brāhmaṇas among brāhmaṇas.

In this clause *samaṇasammataṃ* is to be construed with *me*, and Mahānāma therefore comments:

samaṇasammataṃ ti na mayā samaṇā ti sammataṃ. sammataṃ ti vattamānakālavasena vuccamāne saddalakkhaṇavasena me ti ettha sāmivacanam eva hoti.

⁶³ Cf. Sv-pt I 357,21–23: *bhagavantam saraṇam gacchāmi ti vattum na sakkā; saraṇam ti gacchāmi ti pa vattabbaṃ. itisaddo c' ettha luttaniddiṭṭho*.

⁶⁴ The author evidently interprets the syntactical function of *niccam* as equivalent with, e.g., the predicative usage of ablatives in *-to* [*< *-tas*] used at S III 57,5 (*attato*).

⁶⁵ Cf. Pj I 19,4 foll.

samaṇasammata, i.e. I do not consider them as recluses. When [the past participle] *sammata* is used in terms of the present tense, then (*ettha*) according to the grammatical rule, [the personal pronoun] *me* stands exclusively (*eva*) in the genitive.

Although Mahānāma refers to a specific Pāṇinian rule codified in Pāṇ II 3 67, his explanation also presupposes Pāṇ III 2 188. In this sūtra Pāṇini defines the semantical conditions under which the past participle in *-ta* is present in meaning: *matibuddhipūjārthebhyas' ca*: And after [the roots] that denote thought, understanding or respect [the past participle affix denoted *kta* is used in the sense of the present tense].⁶⁶ This rule applies to the past participle *sammata* [*< sam + √man*] which is subsumed under the Pāṇinian *mati* [*< √man*].

The rule that applies to the construction with *me* is found in Pāṇ II 3 67 where Pāṇini lays out the conditions under which a past participle in *-ta* is constructed with the genitive: *ktasya ca vartamāne*: And [the past participle affix denoted] *kta* (= *-ta*), when it is used in the sense of the present tense, takes [the genitive of the agent in construction].⁶⁷ Since the enclitic form *me*, from a purely morphological point of view, is equivalent to the three case forms *mayā* [= instr.], *mayhaṃ* [= dat.], and *mama* [= gen.], Mahānāma uses the delimitative particle *eva* in order to emphasise that in this particular syntactical construction it is only possible to interpret *me* as genitive.⁶⁸

2 [Paṭis-a 481,26–32 ad Paṭis I 172,34]

This reference takes its point of departure in a pun based upon the phonological affinity of \sqrt{ci} with \sqrt{ji} . Commenting upon the word *paricitā* at Paṭis I 172,5: *ānāpānasati yassa ... anupubbam paricitā yathā Buddhena desitā*, Paṭis explains that *sati* is called *paricitā* [*< √ci*] because it conquers [*jināti < √ji*] bad and evil dhammas (*satiyā pariggaṇhanto jināti pāpake akusale dhamme, tena vuccati paricitā*). On this text Mahānāma writes inter alia the following commentary:

⁶⁶ Cf. Kās ad loc.: *etadarthebhyas' ca dhātubhyo vartamānārthe ktapratyayo bhavati: rājñām mataḥ, rājñām iṣṭaḥ, rājñām buddhaḥ, rājñām jñātaḥ, rājñām pūjitaḥ, rājñām arcitaḥ.*

⁶⁷ Cf. Kās ad loc.: *ktasya vartamānakālavihitasya prayoge ṣaṣṭhī vibhaktir bhavati: rājñām mataḥ, rājñām buddhaḥ.*

⁶⁸ Cf. Buddhaghosa's grammatical observations in Sv 28,8 foll. about the three meanings of *me*.

te ca dhammā satim avihāya attano pavattikkhane jinitum āradhā 'jitā' ti vuccanti, yathā bhuñjitum āradhō 'bhutto' ti vuccati. lakkhaṇam pan' ettha saddasatthato veditabbam. evaṃ sante 'pi parijitā ti vattabbe ja-kārassa ca-kāram katvā paricitā ti vuttam ... imasmim atthavikappe paricitā ti padaṃ kattusādhanam.

And these [evil] dhammas that have started being conquered (*jinitum āradhā*) at the moment, when he, without forsaking being mindful, applies himself [to the destruction of them], are said to have been conquered, in the same way as [someone who] has started eating (*bhuñjitum āradhō*) is said to have eaten. The rule, moreover, [that applies] in this case (*ettha*) should be known according to grammar (*saddasatthato*). Even though [the word *paricitā*] in those circumstances ought to read *parijitā*, [the reading] *paricitā* is used by substituting the letter *c* for the letter *j* ... In this alternative meaning the word *paricitā* [in its identity with *parijitā*] is active (*kattusādhanam*).⁶⁹

There is no need to go into all the details of this exegetical tour de force: the basic intention is to show that *paricitā* = *parijitā* as a qualifier of *sati* [mindfulness] points to the fact that *sati* when practised properly (= *paricita*) annihilates the evil dhammas. The reading *paricitā* is well attested in canonical Pāli where it occurs in similar contexts.⁷⁰ Mahānāma obviously took the pun of Paṭis as an occasion for displaying his knowledge of grammar.

The reference itself is rather obscure, but from the context it seems clear that he must have thought of those cases — as shown by his remark that the word *paricitā* is active (*kattusādhanam*) — where a *-ta* participle [= *kta*] is used in an active sense, while at the same time having an inchoative sense, as indicated by the paraphrase *jinitum āradhā* or *bhuñjitum āradhō*. A past participle in *-ta* is normally not used in the sense of the agent *kāraka*, i.e. in an active sense. In Pāṇ III 4 71, however, Pāṇini defines the semantical and syntactical conditions under which this is possible: *ādikarmaṇi ktaḥ*

⁶⁹ Cf. the corresponding technical term of Sanskrit grammar *karṭṛsādhanam*, on which see Renou, *Vocabulaire*, s.v.

⁷⁰ Cf., for example, S I 116,30; II 264,15.

kartari ca: the suffix “*ka*” is also used in the sense of the agent [*kāraka*], in the case of an inchoative action (*ādikarmaṇi*). The Kāśikā [q.v. ad loc.] illustrates this rule by the following examples: *prakṛtaḥ kaṭaṃ devadattaḥ*: D. has started making a mat, and *prabhukta odanaṃ devadattaḥ*: D. has started eating. In this example the word *prakṛtaḥ* or *prabhuktaḥ* is in agreement with the agent [*kāraka*] Devadatta, and it is therefore, according to Pāṇinian syntactical theory, used in the sense of the agent [*kāraka*]. As shown by the example, the *ka* participle is constructed with the object *kāraka* [= *kaṭaṃ* or *odanaṃ*].

Although one would have expected Mahānāma to illustrate his analysis with a more appropriate example (the context requires *pabhutto*, with the preposition *pa* [*< *pra*] indicating the inchoative aspect of the action,⁷¹ instead of *bhutto*), there is no reason to doubt that he refers to a grammatical rule similar to Pāṇ III 4 71. It is therefore surprising that his grammatical analysis does not reflect the Pāṇinian technical vocabulary. For instance, he uses *ārambh-* for the Pāṇinian *ādi*. This would indicate that he may well be referring to Candravāyākaraṇa which substitutes *kriyārambha* [cf. Candra I 3 28]⁷² for the Pāṇinian *ādikarma(n)*, because the strict Pāṇinian tradition, from the Kāśikā and onwards, does not use a similar technical term.

Although Candragomin’s grammar is written in the Pāṇinian tradition and does not deviate substantially from Pāṇini, it exhibits nonetheless noticeable innovations in its technical vocabulary. It is difficult to explain Mahānāma’s usage of *ārambh-* in this particular context unless we assume that he is dependent on a Sanskrit model, which in the present case is probably identical with Candravāyākaraṇa: it would only be natural for a Buddhist scholar to avail himself of the grammar of a fellow Buddhist scholar.

3 [Paṭis-a 567,12–16 ad Paṭis II 63,34–35]

This discussion shows that Mahānāma knew of the controversy over the semantical properties of the absolutive suffix. I have dealt with Buddhaghosa’s treatment of this question in *Studies in the Pāli Grammarians*

⁷¹ Cf. Jinendrabuddhi’s Nyāsa ad Kāśikā ad Pāṇ III 4 71: *sarvatra praśabda ādikarma dyotayati*.

⁷² Cf. Mogg-v ad V 58: *kattari cārambhe. kriyārambhe kattari kto hoti ... pakato bhavaṃ kaṭaṃ*. Moggalāna, as is well-known, has to a large extent based his grammar upon Candravāyākaraṇa.

I, and I therefore refer the reader to the previous article in this series.⁷³ I should add, however, that Buddhaghosa actually does seem to be aware of the problems involved in putting a strict Pāṇinian interpretation on certain constructions with the absolutive, although it is difficult to decide from what he says whether or not he draws upon the grammarians’ discussion of the problem.

The text in question occurs in Vism 653,21–28 where Buddhaghosa comments upon the same Paṭis passage as Mahānāma. Mahānāma copied verbatim most of Buddhaghosa’s commentary. He deleted the introductory clause and inserted a reference to the grammarians’ view before the concluding passage, where Buddhaghosa explains that the origination process of knowledge has to be taken as a unity. Mahānāma’s intention was probably to complement Buddhaghosa’s explanation by showing that it was also supported by the authority of the grammarians.

“*nimittaṃ paṭisaṅkhā ñāṇaṃ uppajjati* [= Paṭis loc. cit.]”⁷⁴
kāmaṃ ca na paṭhamaṃ jānītvā pacchā ñāṇaṃ uppajjati. vo-
hāravasena pana “manaṃ [Ee w.r. mā-] ca paṭicca dhamme ca
uppajjati manoviññāṇaṃ [= S IV 33,32]” ti ādīni viya evaṃ
vuccati [= Vism loc. cit.]”⁷⁵ Saddasatthavidū ’pi ca “ādiccaṃ
pāpunītvā tamo vigacchati” ti ādīsu viya samānakāle ’pi imaṃ
padam icchanti. ekattanayena vā purimaṃ ca pacchimaṃ ca
ekaṃ katvā evaṃ vuttan ti veditabbaṃ [= Vism loc. cit.]

“Knowledge arises by reflecting (*paṭisaṅkhā*) upon the object (*nimittaṃ*).” And it is by no means the case (*kāmaṃ ca na*) that, after having previously become known, knowledge subsequently arises. The [above passage] is propounded in accordance with common usage (*voḥāravasena*), in the same way as the [canonical proposition] “In dependence on the mind and the mental objects (dhamme) mental cognition arises,” and the like. The grammarians, moreover, acknowledged (*icchanti*)

⁷³ Cf. *Studies in the Pāli Grammarians* I, p. 51 foll.

⁷⁴ Mahānāma has deleted the following passage from Vism 653,21: *saṅkhāranimittaṃ adhuvaṃ tāvakālikan ti aniccalakkhaṇavasena jānītvā*.

⁷⁵ Here ends the first part of the quotation from Vism. The second part begins with the concluding clause *ekattanayena ... veditabbaṃ*.

this [type of] inflected word (*padam*)⁷⁶ [= *paṭisaṅkhā*] even when [the absolutive affix attached to the verb *paṭisaṅkhāti* expressing one action] is used in the sense of being simultaneous in time (*samānakāle 'pi*) [with the other action expressed by the verb *uppajjati*] as, for instance, in the [proposition] “Darkness disappears in contact with the sun.”⁷⁷ Optionally (*vā*), one should know, according to the unity method (*ekattanayena*),⁷⁸ that it is expressed in this way by taking the preceding [action] and the subsequent [action] as one (*ekam katvā*).

There is no way of explaining why Buddhaghosa, who obviously knew that the absolutive in certain cases admits of being interpreted in the sense of *samānakāla*, did not refer to the grammarians in this case. The definition laid out in Pāṇ III 4 21: *samānakarṭṛkayoḥ pūrvakāle*, clearly does not apply, and one would have expected him to point that out. Mahānāma, however, interprets Buddhaghosa’s explanation in the light of Kātyāyana’s supplement to Pāṇ III 4 21.⁷⁹

Although the discussion of the semantics of the absolutive suffix can be traced back to Kātyāyana and Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ III 4 21, Kacc⁸⁰ and its main source, the Kātantra, take no notice of it. Nor do Vajirabuddhi [in Mmd ad Kacc 566] or Buddhapiya [ad Rūp 624 = Kacc 566], who copied almost verbatim the relevant passage from Mmd, go into a discussion of the problem. The same is the case with Moggallāna ad Mogg V 64. Aggavaṃsa, however, deals with it, and he may well be one of the first Pāli grammarians to have done so.⁸¹

II

1 [Bv-a 25,26–30 ad Bv I 4b]

In this example, the most discursive of his grammatical analyses, Buddhadatta exhibits three ways of analysing the word “*buddha*” [formally a

past participle in *-ta*], as it occurs in Bv I 4b (*buddho ayaṃ īdisako naruttamo*):

Buddho ti catusaccadhamme buddho anubuddho ti buddho, yathāha:

abhiññeyyaṃ abhiññātaṃ

bhāvetabbañ ca bhāvitam

pahātabbam pahīnam me

tasmā buddho 'smi brāhmaṇa [= Sn 558]

Idha pana kattukārake buddhasaddasiddhi datṭhabbā. (so punctuate) adhigatavisesehi devamanussehi sammāsam-buddho vata so bhagavā ti evaṃ buddhattā ñātattā buddho. idha kammakārake buddhasaddasiddhi datṭhabbā. buddham assa atthi ti vā buddho buddhavanto ti attho. taṃ sabbam saddasatthānusārena veditabbam.

Buddha means [one who has] undertaken to know, [one who has] undertaken to recollect,⁸² the norms of the four truths. As he says [in Sn 558]:

I have obtained insight into that into which one should obtain insight, and realised what has to be realised, and rejected what has to be rejected, therefore, brāhmaṇa, I am a Buddha.

In this [verse] the formation (*siddhi*) of the word “*buddha*” should be taken in the sense of the agent *kāraka* (*kattukāraka*), [i.e. in a transitive/active sense]. [Or, alternatively,] he is [called] Buddha because he is recognised and acknowledged by gods and men who have obtained eminence, in the following words: “the Bhagavan, indeed, is fully awakened.” In this case the formation of the word “*buddha*” should be taken in the sense of the object *kāraka*. Or (*vā*), he is Buddha because (*iti*) he has (*assa atthi*) awakening (*buddha* [n.]),⁸³ that is, he is “one who possesses awakening

⁷⁶ Cf. the Pāṇinian definition of *pada* (n.) in Pāṇ. I 4 14: *suptiñantaṃ padam*.

⁷⁷ For analogous examples, cf. AkBhāṣ 455,7-8: *sahabhāve 'pi ca ktvāsti dipam prāpya tamo gatam*; Vism-sn p. 1254,12: *dīpaṃ prāpya tamo vigacchati*.

⁷⁸ For this term, cf. CPD s.v. *ekattanaya*.

⁷⁹ Cf. vārttika 5 and Mahā-bh ad loc.

⁸⁰ Cf. Kacc 566: *pubbakālekakattukānaṃ tun-tvāna-tvā vā*.

⁸¹ Cf. the discussion at Sadd 312,22–313,30.

⁸² The reason for this translation will appear from the analysis below.

⁸³ Formally *buddha* (n.) is a neuter pp. used as a noun by analogy with neuter pp. forms in Sanskrit. Cf. Nidd 458,7 and 459,7 [ad Sn 957] and Pj I 16,2: *buddhi, buddham, bodho ti pariyāyavacanāṃ*.

(*buddhavanta*).⁸⁴ All this should be known according to grammar.

Each of the three explanations which Buddhadatta suggests here would seem to depend on Pāṇinian grammar, although it is obvious that he has to some extent reinterpreted the scope of the relevant Pāṇinian rules so as to justify his grammatical analysis.

[i]

In the first alternative Buddhadatta ascribes a transitive value to *buddha*. It is clear, that this explanation — illustrated with the quotation of Sn 558 — has canonical support, because the Niddesa, in its comment upon the meaning of the word *buddha* in Sn 957, uses two nominal derivatives from \sqrt{budh} , with a transitive [+ causative] value, to explain its meaning:

*buddho ti ken' atthena buddho ? bujjhitā saccāni ti buddho, bodhetā pajāyā ti buddho.*⁸⁵

In what sense is he a Buddha ? He is a Buddha because (*iti*) he [himself] knows the [four] truths, and he is a Buddha because he makes [them] known to mankind.⁸⁶

In this gloss *bujjhita* is a derivative in *-tr* from \sqrt{bujjh} [*<* passive stem * \sqrt{budhya} -] to be construed with *saccāni* [= acc.], whereas *bodhetā* is an analogous causative derivative [*<* causative stem \sqrt{bodhe} -] in *-tr*, to be construed with *saccāni* [= acc.] and *pajāyā* [= dat./gen.].⁸⁷

⁸⁴ I.B. Horner's translation is based upon a wrong punctuation of the text and thus confuses the point at issue.

⁸⁵ Qu. Paṭis I 174,7; Vism 209,21; Sadd 481,28; cf. Paṭis-a 485,5: *tattha yathā loke avagantā avagato ti vuccati, evaṃ bujjhitā saccāni ti buddho; yathā paṇṇasosā vātā paṇṇasosā ti vuccanti evaṃ bodhetā pajāyā ti buddho.*

⁸⁶ Cf.: *yasmā vā cattāri saccāni attanā pi bujjhi, aññe pi satte bodhesi, tasmā evaṃ ādīhi kāraṇehi buddho* [Vism 209,18–20]; *yathā loke avagantā "avagato" ti vuccati, evaṃ bujjhitā saccāni ti buddho; yathā paṇṇasosā vātā "paṇṇasosā" [cf. Ujjval. ad Uṇādis II 22] ti vuccanti, evaṃ bodhetā pajāyā ti buddho* [Pj I 15,10–13].

⁸⁷ It is noteworthy that Nidd is the only canonical text in which the two terms are recorded. Their formation clearly presupposes more than just basic knowledge of Pāli nominal derivation. Thus, for instance, we cannot exclude the possibility that, for example, the term *bodhetar* is coined by analogy with Sanskrit *bodhayitr*.

A past participle in *-ta* [= *kta*] is normally not used in the sense of agent *kāraka*. In Pāṇ III 4 71, however, Pāṇini lays down the semantical and syntactical conditions under which this is possible: *ādikarmaṇi ktaḥ kartari ca*: the suffix "*kta*" is also used in the sense of the agent, when it is used in the sense of an inchoative action. The Kāśikā illustrates this rule by the following example: *prakṛtaḥ kaṣaṇ devadattaḥ*: Devadatta has undertaken to make a mat. In this example the word *prakṛtaḥ* is in agreement with the agent Devadatta and is therefore, according to Pāṇinian syntactical theory, used in the sense of the agent. As shown by the example the *-ta* participle is constructed with the object *kāraka* [= *kaṣaṇ*]. We find an exact parallel to this syntactical structure in Buddhadatta's initial remarks about the meaning of "*buddha*": *catusaccadhamme* [= acc.] *buddho ... ti buddho*. There is thus no reason to doubt that his analysis presupposes Pāṇinian grammar.

In the Pāli grammatical literature we find a reflex of this analysis in Kacc [558+] 559 and Kacc-v ad loc.:

budhagamādyatthe kattari. budha gama icc evaṃ ādīnaṃ atthe tapaccayo hoti kattari sabbakāle. yathā saṅkhatāsāṅkhate dhamme bujjhati, abujjhi, bujjhissatī ti, buddho. saraṇaṃ gato, samathaṃ gato iccevaṃādi.

[The suffix denoted *kta* is used] in the sense of the agent *kāraka*, when [the verbal root to which it is joined] has the meanings of the roots \sqrt{budh} , and \sqrt{gam} , etc.

The suffix denoted *kta* is used in all times in the sense of the agent *kāraka*, when it is joined to verbal roots that have the meaning of such roots as \sqrt{budh} , and \sqrt{gam} . For instance, [the word] *buddha*: who knows, has known and will know the dhammas that are conditioned and not conditioned. *saraṇaṃ gata*: who has found refuge, *samathaṃ gata*: who has found peace.

This analysis obviously presupposes that in Pāli — as in Sanskrit literature — one finds instances where a *-ta* participle is constructed with the accusative of goal, as in the above examples from Kacc-v. It clearly must rely on a distinctly Buddhist tradition because there is nothing in Pāṇinian grammar that justifies the interpretation of *buddha* and *gata* in this sense. Buddhapiya may have realised that Kacc departed from the tradition of

Sanskrit grammar, because he quotes the illustration of the meaning of *buddha* in Kacc-v with the remark that the *tapaccaya* is here used in the sense of the present (*ta iti vattamāne*), which, of course, reflects Pāṇinian theory (cf. Pāṇ III 2 188). In the following [Rūp 592 = Kacc 559], however, he quotes a slightly edited version of Kacc-v ad Kacc 559, with the remark that the *ta* suffix also occurs in the sense of *sabbakāla*. This clearly has no support in Pāṇinian grammar. Kaccāyana's rule may ultimately derive from a commentarial tradition connecting \sqrt{budh} and \sqrt{gam} , which can be traced back to Buddhaghosa.

In connection with the interpretation of the Buddhist stereotype *Bhagavantam saranam gacchāmi*, Buddhaghosa suggests taking \sqrt{gam} in the sense of \sqrt{budh} :

yesam hi dhātūnaṃ gati attho buddhi pi tesam attho, tasmā gacchāmi ti imassa jānāmi, bujjhāmi ti ayam attho vutto [Sv 229,22-24 = Ps I 131,4; qu. Nidd-a 442,6].⁸⁸

Because (*hi*) the verbal roots that have the meaning of movement also have the meaning of understanding, (*tasmā*)⁸⁹ the [word] *gacchāmi* is said to have the meaning "I know", "I recognize".

A Sanskrit verse ascribed to a certain Rāhulapāda by Prakramabāhu II in Vism-sn 479,19-20 evidently reflects the same tradition, although it has not been possible to trace the discussion to any known Sanskrit source:

budha ity avagamane yo dhātuḥ pariṇāyate yatas tajjñaiḥ, gatyartha ity ato 'smāt kartary api yujyate 'yam ktaḥ.

Since (*yatas*) the verbal root \sqrt{budh} is enumerated [in the dhātupāṭha] by those who know it, in the sense of understanding (*avagamane*),⁹⁰ (*atas*) the *cta* suffix [= *-ta*] is also correctly used (*yujyate*), in the sense of the agent

⁸⁸ Cf. Paṭis-a 485,25-26: *gamanatthānaṃ dhātūnaṃ bujjhanatthattā, bujjhanatthāpi dhātuyo gamanatthā honti tasmā...*

⁸⁹ *tasmā* is to be construed with *hi* [= *yasmā*].

⁹⁰ This is a reference to sa-Dhātup I 911: *budhā avagamane*.

[*kāraka*, i.e., in an active sense] after [the verbal root \sqrt{budh}] when it has the meaning of movement.

It is no doubt the affinity between \sqrt{budh} as defined by *ava* + \sqrt{gam} and the fact that Pāṇini in III 4 72 ascribes an active meaning to *cta* when attached to verbs expressing movement. This may very well have suggested the particular treatment of *buddha* in the grammatical literature.

Rāhulapāda is not known from other source. His date and the nature of his work therefore remain uncertain. There is no doubt, however, that Buddhadatta has based his analysis on a similar tradition. Since there is a striking similarity between Buddhadatta's text and a text dealing with the same topic, which Aggavaṃsa quotes in Saddanīti [see below], there is reason to believe that Buddhadatta has utilised material from a Pāli source which may well be a post-Kaccāyana source.

[ii]

Buddhadatta's second alternative, according to which "*buddha*" has an passive value (*kamma*), would also seem to be supported by Pāṇinian grammar. In Pāṇini III 4 [69 +] 70: *tayor eva kṛtya-cta-khalarthāḥ*: [the suffixes whose meaning is denoted by] "*kṛtya* [= *-tava*, *-anīya* and *-ya*]," [the suffix whose meaning is denoted by] "*cta* [= *-ta*]" and [the suffix whose meaning is denoted by] "*khal*" are only used in the sense of these two [i.e. action (= *bhāva*) and object *kāraka* (= *karma*)].

According to Pāṇinian grammatical theory, a *-ta* participle is used in the sense of the object *kāraka* when it occurs in a passive construction, in agreement with the [theoretical] object, which itself is identical with the grammatical subject of the sentence. The example used by the Kāśikā for illustrating this particular syntactical function of "*cta*" [ad loc.]: *ctaḥ karmani: kṛtaḥ kaṭo bhavata* "a mat [= *karma*] is made by you," shows clearly the theoretical presupposition that underlies Buddhadatta's explanation: in the same way as the word *kṛtaḥ* qualifies the object *kaṭaḥ* as made by someone, the word *buddha* qualifies the object Buddha as recognised by gods and men (*devamanussehi*), and therefore it can be interpreted as the object *kāraka*.

There is reason to believe that Buddhadatta's explanation is based upon a source which was also known to Aggavaṃsa. In Saddanīti he refers to the view of certain [grammarians ?] according to whom the formation of "*buddha*" can be interpreted in terms of the object *kāraka*. In support of this

theory, he quotes a text which is almost identical with Buddhadatta's explanation. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Buddhadatta and Aggavaṃsa utilised the same source:

*keci pana kammaṇa*⁹¹ *pi buddhasaddassa siddhiṃ icchantā evaṃ nibbacanaṃ karonti: sammāsambuddho vata so Bhagavā ti adhiḡatagaṇaviseṣehi khīṇāsavehi bujḡhitabbo ti buddho ti* [Sadd 482,1-4]

Some [grammarians?], however, taking the formation of the word “*buddha*” in the sense of the object [*kāraḡa*, i.e. in a passive sense], analyse it as follows: *buddha* means that he should be recognised (*bujḡhitabbo*)⁹² by those persons whose defilements have been annihilated and who have obtained distinctive qualities, in the words “the Bhagavan, indeed, is fully awakened”!

Unfortunately it has not been possible to trace the quotation to the work from which it was taken. It therefore remains unclear whether it is a purely grammatical source — which Aggavaṃsa's way of quoting it would indicate — or whether it is an unknown piece of canonical exegesis. If it should be the latter, it must be fairly late because Buddhadatta is the only Pāli commentator to mention it. In similar contexts in Vism, Paṭis-a, etc. we find nothing of the same nature. It probably stems from a Pāli source. If this were not the case, Aggavaṃsa surely would not have failed to identify it. It is remarkable that he does not refer to Bv-a [quoted in several places in Sadd], since he is conscientious in supporting his grammatical statements with quotations from the cts and tīkās.

The last alternative would seem to be based upon an extension of the scope of Pāṇ V 2 [94+] 127: *arśa-ādibhyo 'c*: the [*taddhita*] affix *ac* [= -a] is [used in the sense of the suffix denoted *matup*, i.e. in the sense of “whose it is” or “in which or in whom it is”] after [the class of words = *ākṛtigana*] beginning with *arśah*. We can safely assume that Buddhadatta had this particular sūtra in mind because Mahānāma, in a context where he addresses

⁹¹ The reading *kammaṇa* is problematic. It might be suggested that *kamme* [loc.] is read for *kammaṇa* which is difficult to construe.

⁹² The presence of the *kr̥tya* form [= ger.] of *√budh* would seem to be an allusion to the Pāṇinian rule in Pāṇ II 4 70 quoted above.

the meaning and derivation of the word *buddha*, supplies us with the information necessary for identifying it. We find the text in Paṭis-a 486,20-22, which was quoted verbatim by Upasena in Nidd-a 442,33-443,2. The text reads:

buddhi, buddham, bodho ti paryāyavacanam etaṃ. tattha yathā nilarattagaṇayogā “nilo paṭo,” “ratto paṭo,” ti vuccati, evaṃ buddhigaṇayogā “buddho” ti ṇāpetuṃ vuttaṃ hoti [= Pj I 16,2-5].

“*buddhi, buddham, bodho*” are synonyms. In that case, just as one says that a piece of cloth is blue or red on account of the blue or red quality inherent⁹³ [in it], so on account of the quality of illumination inherent [in him], the word “*buddha*” is used to denote [him as “Buddha”].

The idea is basically the same. The only difference is that this text is sufficiently explicit to identify the relevant grammatical context. Among the words included in the *ākṛtigana* to which Pāṇini refers, are words denoting colour (*varṇa*),⁹⁴ which is reflected in the two examples used by Mahānāma. The idea that the possessive suffix *matup* is deleted from words denoting colour goes back to Kātyāyana's vārttika 3 (*gaṇavacanabhyo matupo luk*) on Pāṇ V 2 94.

2 [Bv-a 67,33-68,2]

This etymology of the word *brāhmaṇa* [*< brahma + √aṇ*] is basically the same as the one that occurs in Buddhaghosa's cts. Buddhadatta has only inserted the reference to the grammarians' view to complement Buddhaghosa's explanation:⁹⁵

⁹³ The term *yoga*, evidently, belongs to the philosophical context of Nyāyavaiśeṣika ontology; cf., for example, Vātsyāyana ad Nyāyasūtra II 2 61: *yogāt — kṛṣṇena rāgena yuktah śāṭakah kṛṣṇa ity abhidhīyate*.

⁹⁴ Cf. Kāśikā ad Pāṇ V 2 127.

⁹⁵ Cf., for example, Sp 111,12-15 = Sv 244,10 = Ps I 109,23: *brahmaṇaṃ aṇatī ti brāhmaṇo, mante sajjhāyatī ti attho, idam eva hi jātibrahmaṇānaṃ niruttivacanaṃ, ariyā pana bāhitapāpatā brāhmaṇā ti vuccanti*.

brāhmaṇo ti brahmaṇ anāti ti brāhmaṇo, mante sajjhāyatī ti attho. akkharacintakā pana brahmaṇo apaccam brāhmaṇo ti vadanti. ariyā pana bāhitapāpattā brāhmaṇo ti vadanti.

brāhmaṇa means one who recites (*anāti*) *brahma* [= *brāhmaṇ* = the sacred scriptures, i.e., the Veda], that is, he studies the scriptures (*mante*). The grammarians, however, explain that *brāhmaṇa* means a descendant (*apaccam*) of a brahmin [= *brahmān*]. The Buddhists (*āryā*) on their side claim that he is a *brāhmaṇa* because he keeps away from sin (*bāhitapāpattā*).

It is not possible to decide which tradition the first etymology belongs to. It probably stems from the commentarial tradition of the *Aṭṭhakathācariyas*. The last one, however, has canonical precedents.⁹⁶ It only makes sense in a context where the actual pronunciation of the Pāli consonant cluster *br-* in *brāhmaṇa* was *b-* as recorded in the reading *baṃhana* of the Aśokan inscriptions. There is no problem in identifying the grammatical reference, which is to Pāṇ IV 1 [83+] 92 defining the formation of patronyms: *tasyāpatyam*: [the suffix denoted *an*, etc. denotes] someone's descendant. In the present case the *vrddhi* formation *brāhmaṇa* is covered by the scope of the suffix *an*.

3 [Bv-a 89,16–18 ad Bv II 47]

This remark about the case syntax of the preposition *anu* can only be understood in the light of the similar analysis in Bv-a 238,32–35 [see § 6 below].

anuyanti tathāgatan ti tathāgatassa pacchato yanti. [so punctuate] *anuyoge sati sāmī-atthe* [so read; Ee -*attho*] *upayogavacanam hotī ti lakkhanam.*

[The sentence] “They follow after the tathāgata” means they follow behind the tathāgata. When *anu* is used in composition the acc. is used in the sense of the genitive. This is the rule.

⁹⁶ For references, v. PED s.v. ¹*bāheti*.

There is no rule that justifies Buddhadatta's claim that *anu* governs the acc. in the sense of the genitive. Such a remark is absent from the analogous analysis in Bv-a 238,32–35, and one cannot therefore exclude the possibility that it stems from Buddhadatta himself. He may have based it upon the fact that *pacchato*, in the paraphrase *tathāgatassa pacchato yanti*, is to be constructed with the genitive. As it appears from the way in which the problem is formulated, Buddhadatta deals with the syntactical and semantical properties of the so-called *karmapravacanīyas* [cf. Buddhaghosa on *itthambhūtakkhyaṇa*, q.v. supra; cf. Bv-a 238,32–35 ad Bv XX 5, q.v. infra].

4 [Bv-a 114,12–13]

In this case Buddhadatta deals with the well-known fact that the word *aññatra* [= Sanskrit *anyatra*] is constructed with the ablative.

n' atthi aññatrā ti aññatralakkhaṇam saddasatthato gahetabbam. tato dasa pāramito añño buddhakāradhammo n' atthī ti attho.

[As regards the clause] “there is no [other] except ...,” the rule concerning the word except (*aññatra*) should be sought in grammar. The meaning is that there is no other norm that creates a buddha, than the ten pāramitās.

It is not clear what rule of grammar Buddhadatta has in mind. In the Pāṇinian tradition there appears to be no explicit rule about the case with which Sanskrit *anyatra* is to be constructed. There is reason to believe, however, that Buddhadatta is thinking of Pāṇ II 3 [28+] 29: *anya- ... -yukte*, in which Pāṇini lays down the rule that a noun, when constructed with *anya*, is put in the ablative. Buddhadatta's own paraphrase [with *añña* + abl.] supports the assumption. He presumably extended the scope of the Pāṇini sūtra so as to cover the usage of *aññatra*, which is treated as a substitute form for the locative. Aggavaṃsa is apparently the only Pāli grammarian to formulate a rule for the case syntax of *aññatra*: *aññatrayoge pañcamī tatiyā ca*: the ablative and the instrumental are used in construction with *aññatra* [Sadd 703,22].

5 [Bv-a 173,21–24 ad Bv]

In this short remark Buddhadatta focuses on a peculiar grammatical construction where an action noun (*dassana*) is to be constructed with a nominal in the accusative:

dassanenā pi taṃ buddhan ti tassa buddhassa dassanenā pi ti attho. idisesu pi sāmivacanam payojenti (Be payujj-) saddaviduno (Be saddasatthavidū).

By seeing the Buddha: The meaning is “by the sight of the Buddha”. In such cases, however, the grammarians use the genitive.

It is not normal practice in Pāli or Sanskrit to construct an action noun with the accusative. In such a case one would normally expect the genitive (genitivus objectivus) of the nominal that is syntactically dependent on the action noun. The grammarians to whose usage Buddhadatta refers are no doubt, in this as in other cases, identical with the Pāṇinians, because Pāṇini addresses this usage in Pāṇ II 3 65: *karṭṛkarmanoḥ kṛti:* when used with a word ending with the suffixes denoted *kṛt* [i.e. primary derivatives], [the genitive] is used in the sense of the agent [*kāraka*] or the object [*kāraka*].

6 [Bv-a 238,32–35 ad Bv XX 5]

In this text Buddhadatta deals with the syntactical peculiarity of the *karmapravacanīya anu*.

tattha caturāsītisahasāni sambuddham anu pabbajjun ti tattha anunā yogato sambuddhan ti upayogavacanam katan ti veditabbam. sambuddhassa pacchā pabbajjimsū ti attho. lakkhanam saddasatthato gahetabbam.

In this case one should know that in the verse “eighty-four thousand who had gone forth after The fully Awakened One,” the [word] “*sambuddham*” is put in the accusative because it is constructed with “*anu*”. The meaning is “they went forth

after the Fully Awakened [had gone forth]”. The rule is to be sought in grammar.

Buddhadatta deals here — like Buddhaghosa in connection with his analysis of the verb *abhuggacchati* [v. supra] — with the linguistic category *karmapravacanīya*. Pāṇini deals specifically, in Pāṇ I 4 84: *anur lakṣaṇe*, with the usage of *anu* when used in the sense of a sign (*lakṣaṇe*). The idea is that the thing denoted by the word governed by *anu*, assumes the function of the cause of the verbal action. Consequently *anu* means “after” in a logical sense, i.e. in the sense of “as a consequence of”, or “because of.” It is, of course, debatable whether Buddhadatta is correct in assuming that *anu* has this specific force in the verse upon which he comments. However, the relatively few occurrences of the verb *anupabbajati* in Pāli would seem to suggest — in contrast to the usage of *abhuggacchati* — that we interpret *anu* in the sense of a *karmapravacanīya*, although its usage in the Pāli is not absolutely parallel to the usage defined by Pāṇini. In the Pāli it is questionable if *anu* can be treated as syntactically disjoint from the finite verb. For instance, in Vin II 180,6: *Sakyakumārā bhagavantam pabbajitam anu pabbajjanti*, it would seem to be treated as an ordinary preposition constructed with a noun in the accusative (*bhagavantam*), in agreement with an explicit not finite verb-form (*pabbajitam*). On the other hand, the Pāli grammatical literature would seem to be correct in ascribing a causal function to *anu* in this particular context: Sakyakumārā went forth after [= because] bhagavan had gone forth. Kacc-v ad Kacc 301: *kammappavacanīyayutte* uses an analogous canonical example for illustrating the rule about *kammavacanīya*: *pabbajitam anu pabbajjimsu* [= D II 30,11] = Sadd 716,13 (§ 586).

Buddhadatta noticed that the pp. *pabbajitam* was absent in Bv, and he found a justification for its absence in the grammatical literature. It is not possible to decide whether Buddhadatta relied upon a distinct Pāli grammar, but the nature of his analysis and the context in which it occurs makes it reasonable to assume that he knew Kaccāyana’s grammar and the commentarial tradition attached to it. The example chosen by the authors of the *vutti* in this particular instance is not merely a Pāli reproduction of an example taken from a Sanskrit grammar but is distinctly canonical, and its presence in Kacc-v would seem to indicate that we are dealing with a tradition which aimed at illustrating the rules of Pāli, not merely by means of Pāli translations of examples taken over directly from Sanskrit grammar, but

through genuine canonical quotations. This tendency reached its peak with Aggavaṃsa, who is claimed, by the author of the Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā, to have based his grammar on the Pāli.⁹⁷

(to be continued)

Copenhagen

Ole Holten Pind

PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES VII¹

FIVE PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random collection of words which are either omitted from PED,² or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. *gandhana* “harming”
2. *pāreti* “to be successful”
3. *marissa* “going to die”
4. *vivicca-sayana* “a secluded lodging”
5. *sosinna* “very wet”/*sosīna* “very cold”

1. *gandhana* “harming”

In his investigation of the phrase *vāntam āpātum* “to drink one’s vomit”,³ Alsdorf mentioned the Pāli word *gandhana* found in the compound *kula-gandhana* at It 64,9:

*atijātaṃ anujātaṃ puttāṃ icchanti paṇḍitā,
avaajātaṃ na icchanti yo hoti kula-gandhano.*

“Wise men desire a son of higher birth or equal birth; they do not desire a son of lower birth, who harms the family”.

¹ See K.R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicographical Studies VI”, in *JPTS*, XIII, pp. 219–27.

² Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: CDIAL = R.L. Turner, *Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*; EWA = M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*; Geiger = W. Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*; MW = Sir Monier Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS’s *Pali-English Dictionary*; Pischel = R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*; PSM = Sheth, *Pāiasaddamahāṇavo*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance*; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit; GDhp = *Gāndhārī Dharmapada*; Be = Burmese (Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana) edition; Ce = Sinhalese edition; Ee = European (PTS) edition; Se = Siamese edition; cty = commentary.

³ L. Alsdorf, “Vāntam āpātum”, *Indian Linguistics*, 16, 1955, 21–28.

⁹⁷ Cf. Kacc-vaṇṇ p. 301,28–30: *Rūpasiddhikāraḷo Candabyākaraṇanissito. Nyāsakāraḷo Kalāpabyākaraṇanissito. Saddanūtikāraḷo Pālinissito.*