

## The Sources of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, the First Grammar of Sinhala

Alastair Gornall<sup>1</sup>

### 1. Introduction

This article explores some of the possible sources for the first grammar of Sinhala, the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, which was most likely composed in the late 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>2</sup> It focuses on the work's structure and its metalanguage, that is, its technical terms (*san*, Sk. *saṃjñā*; P. *saññā*), in light of the contemporaneous grammatisation of Tamil, Pali, and Sanskrit.<sup>3</sup> Previous work on the source material of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* has largely been concerned with ascertaining its chief source, that is, the grammar on which it was modelled. This debate can be split into two main camps; those who emphasise the influence of the Tamil grammatical tradition through the *Vīracōliyam* and those who claim

---

<sup>1</sup> An early version of this paper was presented with the title “Monks, Metalanguage and Metaphysics: Notes on the Intellectual Culture of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*” at an American Institute of Sri Lankan Studies workshop on the “*Sidat Saṅgarā* and Sinhala Grammatical Tradition” (Galadari Hotel, Colombo, 14 July 2014). I am grateful to the American Institute of Sri Lankan Studies for their support and for the invitation to speak about the sources of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*.

<sup>2</sup> My work on the *Sidat Saṅgarā* would not be possible without two pioneering translations, namely, the late James W. Gair and W.S. Karunatillake’s translation of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* and the late T.S. Gangadharan’s unpublished translation of the *Vīracōliyam*. I owe a great deal of gratitude to all three of these great scholars of Sinhala and Tamil who are sadly no longer with us. The manuscript of Gangadharan’s translation is held at the EFEO (Pondicherry) and I obtained it thanks to Eva Wilden, who through great effort typed up the translation.

<sup>3</sup> I borrow the term ‘grammatisation’ from Auroux (1994). This article focuses solely on source criticism. For a detailed intellectual history of the literary culture of 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century Sri Lanka, see Gornall (2020).

that the grammar is based on Sanskrit or Pali models through the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, respectively.

Those who perceive an affinity between the *Sidat Saṅgarā* and the *Vīracōliyam*, which is said to have been composed by a Buddhist monk, Puttamittirāṇi, in the reign of Vīrarājendra Cōla (ca. 1063–1070 CE), highlight the architecture of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, in particular its inclusion of two chapters on poetics.<sup>4</sup> C.E. Godakumbura popularised the link between the two grammars in an article “The Dravidian Element in Sinhalese” (1946) and his *Sinhalese Literature* (1955), the latter being the most often cited in this regard.<sup>5</sup> An alternative perspective comes from Herbert Günther who observed parallels between the rules of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* and Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa*, and especially the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, a late 12<sup>th</sup>-century Pali grammar.<sup>6</sup> Günther subsequently modified his view in a later publication and argued that the chief source (*Hauptquelle*) for both the *Sidat Saṅgarā* and *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* was Candragomin’s *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, a 5<sup>th</sup>-century Sanskrit grammar that was commented on in the 10<sup>th</sup> century by a Sri Lankan monk, Ratnamati.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See Monius (2001: 116–36).

<sup>5</sup> Godakumbura (1946: 837–41; 1955). We find the same view expressed by Vimalavāma Sthavira (1960: 56), quoted in Gair and Karunatillake (2013: xvi). With respect to the source material of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, Godakumbura (1955: 318) states that “the method of this grammar, however, is not that of the Sanskrit and Pali grammars, but it has in this respect followed the Tamil grammatical school of Virasōlian ... Even in grammatical terminology and methods of enunciation of rules, the Sidatsaṅgarā shows its indebtedness to Tamil grammars”. For citations of this passage, see De Silva (1969: 235–48); Vijayavenugopal (1979: 93–8); Monius (2001: 216n133).

<sup>6</sup> Günther (1942: 84–97). Citing both Godakumbura (1955) and Günther (1942), Hartmut Scharfe states that “besides Pāṇini, Kātantra and Moggallāna, it is influenced by the Tamil grammar *Vīracōliyam* and, like the latter, includes the elements of poetics”. See Scharfe (1977: 195); also, Hallisey (2003: 729).

<sup>7</sup> Günther (1943: 29), cited in Gair and Karunatillake (2013: xv). On Ratnamati as author of the *Cāndravyākaranapañcikā*, see Dimitrov (2016: 599–706). Heinz Bechert has noted

In this paper, I argue that the *Sidat Saṅgarā* was not modelled on the *Vīracōliyam*. Rather, I provide evidence to support Günther's revised opinion that it is in fact influenced by the *Cāndra* grammatical tradition. To speak of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* as its chief source, though, is misleading since the composition of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* reflects equal influence from a number of different sources in Sanskrit and Pali. This does not mean either that there was no influence from the Tamil grammatical tradition in general. The placement in the *Sidat Saṅgarā* of its final two chapters on poetics and the borrowing of some Tamil grammatical terms clearly demonstrate intellectual links between the traditions, though importantly these features do not suggest that the *Vīracōliyam* was the main source or even a source for the *Sidat Saṅgarā*.

## 2. Structure

The date of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* has largely hinged on the question of its authorship. In the colophon at the end of its fourth chapter and in the *cakrabandhana* puzzle embedded in its final verse the work ascribes its authorship to *patiraja piruvana* “the Pratirāja monastery”. This final colophon also mentions that the work was composed at the behest of Patirājadeva who is described as one who “protects the whole of Southern Sri Lanka”.<sup>8</sup> Scholarly opinion differs on whether to identify the author of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* with a prominent monk Vedeha Thera, who is described in the colophons of his *Samantakūṭavāṇṇanā* and *Rasavāhini* as the author of *sīhalasaddalakkhaṇa* “a grammar of Sinhala”, or with Anomadassi (Sk.

---

that in *sūtra* I-25 the *Sidat Saṅgarā* mentions the names “Saṅdagōmī” and “Ratāesipā”, which he renders as “Candragomin” and “Ratnaśripāda”, respectively. See Bechert (1987: 8). Dimitrov (2016: 122n69), however, has perceptively noted that the latter name actually corresponds to the Sanskrit “Raktākṣipāda”.

<sup>8</sup> Gair and Karunatillake (2013: 61; 139).

Anavamadarśin), who apparently refers to himself in a Sanskrit astrological work as chief incumbent of the Pratinṛpati (= Pratirāja) Mahāvihāra. Both authors were active in the 13<sup>th</sup> century during the reign of Parākramabāhu II (1236–1270) and it is noteworthy that the *Sidat Saṅgarā* also quotes from the king's epic Sinhala poem, the *Kavsilumiṇa*.<sup>9</sup>

The arrangement of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* is one of its most puzzling features since it differs markedly from the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, and *Vīracōliyam*. The grammar is divided topically into twelve chapters, namely, (1) *san* “metalanguage”, (2) *saṅda* “sandhi”, (3) *liṅgu* “gender”, (4) *vibat* “nominal declension”, (5) *samas* “compounds”, (6) *vesesun-veses* “modifiers and modified nominals”, (7) *kiriya* “verbal conjugation”, (8) *pasarut* “secondary derivatives”, (9) *vut-avut* “passive/active constructions”, (10) *kiriya-karu-pada-sabaṅda* “semantico-syntactic relations”, (11) *ituniṭu* “desirable and undesirable sounds”, and (12) *lakara* “poetic embellishments”. Unlike the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, it adheres to a topical arrangement and resembles the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* and *Vīracōliyam* in this regard. It does not, however, follow the *Vīracōliyam* in treating phonetics (*eḷuttu*) in an independent chapter (the first section of the *Vīracōliyam*), nor does it include chapters on the subject matter of poetry (*porul*) or metrics (*yāppu*).<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> For an overview of this debate and for a more detailed discussion of the historical context of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, see Gair and Karunatillake (2013: xiii–xv). Gair and Karunatillake refer to this Sanskrit work as the *Paropakāra*, which I have been unable to locate. The only Sanskrit astrological and astronomical work that I am aware Anomadassi composed is the *Daivajñakāmadhenu*, though I cannot find reference in this work to his status as the chief incumbent of the Pratinṛpati Mahāvihāra.

<sup>10</sup> The chapter divisions of the *Vīracōliyam* are as follows: (1) *eḷuttu* (sounds), (2) *col* (words), (2.1) *vēṛrumai* (nominal declension), (2.2) *upakārakam* (semantico-syntactic relations), (2.3) *tokai* (compounds), (2.4) *tattitam* (nominal derivatives), (2.5) *tātu* (verbal bases), (2.6) *kiryāpatam* (verbal declension), (3) *porul* (poetic content), (3.1) *yāppu* (metrics), and (3.2) *alaṅkāram* (poetic embellishments). The chapters of the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* are (1) *saññādi* (metalanguage and sandhi), (2) *syādi* (nominal declension), (3) *saṁsa*

It differs from both the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* and *Viśracōliyam*, to a lesser extent, by dedicating a number of chapters and sub-chapters specifically to semantics and syntax.<sup>11</sup> It includes, for instance, a subsection on the five-fold division of words (*pas bē*) in its first chapter on metalanguage, a chapter on modifiers and modified nominals (*vesesun-veses*), a chapter on active/passive constructions (*vut-avut*), and a chapter on case-verb relations (*kiriya-karu-pada-sabañda*). A possible clue to the rationale behind the presence of these sections can be found in *sūtra* I-2: “all rules for sounds and meanings are in accordance with the usage of the erudite” (*siyal sadarutvidī sēpiyōnan anurū*).<sup>12</sup> In using the expression *sad-arut-vidi* (rules for sounds and meanings, Sk. *śabdārthavidhi*) the author indicates that the grammar provides rules with respect to phonetics/morphology (*śabda*) and semantics (*artha*).

The separate chapters the work dedicates to issues of semantics resemble other late medieval works such as the 10<sup>th</sup>-century *Śabdārthacintā* (“reflections on words and meanings”), a Sanskrit grammatical treatise in the *Cāndra* tradition composed by the Sri Lankan monk Ratnamati, otherwise known as Ratnaśrijñāna.<sup>13</sup> There we find independent chapters similarly dedicated to semantico-syntactic relations (*kārakārtha-mātra-*

---

(compounds), (4) *ṇādi* (nominal derivatives), (5) *khādi* (verbal derivatives), and (6) *tyādi* (verbal conjugation).

<sup>11</sup> The *Viśracōliyam* only includes a chapter on *kārakas*.

<sup>12</sup> Translation adapted from Gair and Karunatillake (2013: 1).

<sup>13</sup> On the common authorship of the *Ratnaśriṭikā*, a commentary on Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa*, the *Śabdārthacintā*, and *Cāndravyākaraṇapañcikā*, see Dimitrov (2016: 51–74; 557–706). The *Śabdārthacintā*’s appearance in Sri Lanka represents the first example of a wider interest in descriptive works on particular topics of grammar. In his own systematisation of the Pali grammatical tradition, Vaskāduvē Subhūti refers to these types works as *lakṣaṇa* texts, that is, texts that are descriptive (*lakṣaṇa*), and contrasts them with derivational grammars (*padasiddhikrama*) such as the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*. See Subhūti (1876: v).

*sambandha*) and modifiers and modified nominals (*viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣya*).<sup>14</sup> The sub-chapter in the *Sidat Saṅgarā* on the “five-fold division of words” (*pas bē*), in particular, highlights the shared grammatical culture of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, and *Śabdārthacintā* since all three works accept this five-fold typology.<sup>15</sup> The *Vīracōliyam* makes no mention of any such form of categorisation.

### 3. Case Relations and Compounds

The *Sidat Saṅgarā* uses the following semantico-syntactic categories in its treatment of nominal cases: (1) *katu* “agent”, (2) *kam* “object”, (3) *karāṇa* “instrument”, (4) *sampadan* “beneficiary”, (5) *avadi* “limiting point”, and (6) *adara* “support, locus” (X-1). The search for any model for the *Sidat Saṅgarā* is made difficult by the fluid intellectual culture of the period in which grammatical ideas crossed linguistic boundaries. Günther’s observation that technical terms, such as *avadi* (< *avadhi*) and *adara* (< *ādhāra*), are used by both the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* and *Sidat Saṅgarā* in their treatment of *kārakas*, for instance, could apply equally to both the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and the

<sup>14</sup> According to Dimitrov (2016: 574–5), the chapter divisions of the *Śabdārthacintā* are as follows: (1) *śabdārtha-nirdeśa* (instruction on words and meanings), (2) *kārakārtha-māṭra-sambandha-nirdeśa* (semantico-syntactic relations), (3) *viśeṣaṇa-viśeṣya-nirdeśa* (modifiers and modified nominals), (4) *aikārthyā-nirdeśa* (compounds), (5) *nañ-arthā-nirdeśa* (negative particles), (6) *kriyā-nirdeśa* (verbs), (7) *kāla-nirdeśa* (time), (8) *tīrṇ-arthā-nirdeśa* (verbal endings), (9) *tavyādy-arthā-nirdeśa* (verbal derivatives), (10) *aṇādy-arthā-nirdeśa* (nominal derivatives).

<sup>15</sup> This view was not accepted by all grammarians. Bhartr̥hari in his *Vākyapadiya*, for instance, notes that some categorise words as two-fold, four-fold, and five-fold too: *dvidhā kaiś cit padam bhinnam caturdhā pañcadhāpi vā, apoddhṛtyaiva vākyebhyah prakṛtipratyayādīvat* (3.1.1). For further information on Ratnamati’s philosophy of language, see Dimitrov (2016: 565–96; 642–9). Moggallāna explicitly accepts this five-fold typology of words in his *pañcikā*. See Śrī Dhammānanda (1931: 36,<sub>18</sub>–37,<sub>15</sub>).

*Vīracōliyam*.<sup>16</sup> Apart from their continued use of the term *karman* for the accusative, the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, *Sidat Saṅgarā* and *Vīracōliyam* all have adopted the other innovations of the *Cāndra* grammatical tradition, such as the term *avadhi* for the ablative and *ādhāra* for the locative. These grammars also show an equal dissimilarity with the metalanguage of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa*, the oldest grammar of Pali, which use the term *apādāna* for the ablative and *adhikaraṇa* and *okāsa*, respectively, for the locative.<sup>17</sup>

If we turn to the *Sidat Saṅgarā*'s treatment of compounds, though, the difference between it and the *Vīracōliyam* becomes clearer. The terms employed in the *Sidat Saṅgarā* (V-1) for the different types of compound are as follows: (1) *aviya-samas* "indeclinable compounds", (2) *vibat* "case [compounds]", (3) *vesesun* "adjectival [compounds]", (4) *an-arut* "exocentric [compounds]", and (5) *da-arut* "co-ordinate [compounds]". Here the *Sidat Saṅgarā* continues to use the same metalanguage as that of the *Cāndra* and *Moggallāna* grammatical traditions.<sup>18</sup> Apart from the Pāṇinian term

<sup>16</sup> Günther (1942: 96). The terms used in the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* are as follows: (1) *kartṛ* (2.1.62), (2) *āpya* (2.1.43), (3) *karaṇa* (2.1.63), (4) *sampradāna* (2.1.73), (5) *avadhi* (2.1.81), and (6) *ādhāra* (2.1.88). The *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* has: (1) *kattu* (2.18), (2) *kamma* (2.2), (3) *karaṇa* (2.18), (4) *sampadāna* (2.26), (5) *avadhi* (2.28), and (6) *ādhāra* (2.34). Similarly, the *Vīracōliyam* (sūtra 29) employs the following terms: (1) *karuttā*, (2) *karumam*, (3) *karaṇam*, (4) *kōli*, (5) *avati*, and (6) *ātāra*. On *kārakas* in the *Vīracōliyam*, see Victor B. D'Avella's contribution to this volume.

<sup>17</sup> The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* employs the following terms: (1) *kartṛ* (1.4.54), (2) *karman* (1.4.49), (3) *karaṇa* (1.4.42), (4) *sampradāna* (1.4.32), (5) *apādāna* (1.4.24), and (6) *adhikaraṇa* (1.4.45). The terms used in the *Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa* are (1) *kattu* (283), (2) *kamma* (282), (3) *karaṇa* (281), (4) *sampadāna* (278), (5) *apādāna* (273), and (6) *okāsa* (280).

<sup>18</sup> As well as first noticing the link between the *kāraka* metalanguage of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* and the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, Günther (1942: 96) was the first to suggest that this relationship continued in their treatment of compounds too. The terms for the different compounds employed in the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* are (1) *asamkhya* (2.2.2), (2) *kāraka* (2.2.16), (3) *viśeṣaṇa* (2.2.18), (4) *saṃkhyādi* (2.2.76), (5) *anyārtha* (2.2.46), and (6)

*aviyasamas* (< *avyayibhāva*), it employs *Cāndra* technical terms such as *da-arut* (< *cārtha*) for what in Pāṇinian terminology is referred to as a *dvandva* or “copulative” compound.<sup>19</sup> The *Vīracōliyam* in its treatment of compounds (*tokai*), provides both the Sanskrit (*sūtra* 45) and traditional Tamil technical terms (*sūtra* 50).<sup>20</sup> Unlike the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, however, the *Vīracōliyam* employs Sanskrit terms from the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition, not those of the *Cāndra* tradition. There we find Pāṇinian terms such as *tuvantuvam* (< *dvandva*) and *tar̄puruṭam* (< *tatpuruṣa*). With respect to compounds then the *Sidat Saṅgarā* bears greater similarity with the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* and *Cāndrayyākaraṇa* than with the *Vīracōliyam*.

#### 4. Poetic Figures

The *Sidat Saṅgarā* ends with two chapters dedicated to the composition of poetry. The first of these chapters deals with phonetic faults (*dos*, Sk. *doṣa*) and rather unusually begins with descriptions of desirable (*iṭu*) and

---

*cārtha* (2.2.48). In the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa* they are (1) *asam̄khya* (3.2), (2) *amādi* (3.10), (3) *visesana* (3.11), (4) *saṅkhyādi* (3.21), (5) *aññattha* (3.17), and (6) *cattha* (3.19).

<sup>19</sup> The terms used in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* are (1) *avyayibhāva* (2.1.5), (2) *tatpuruṣa* (2.1.22), (3) *karmadhārya* (1.2.42), (4) *dvigu* (2.1.52), (5) *bahuvrhi* (2.2.23), and (6) *dvandva* (2.2.29). The *Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa* employs the equivalent Pali terms, namely, (1) *abyayibhāva* (321), (2) *tappurisa* (329), (3) *kammadhāraya* (326), (4) *digu* (327), (5) *bahubbihi* (330), and (6) *dvanda* (331). For a more detailed comparison of the technical terms employed by Sanskrit and Pali grammars, see Deokar (2008).

<sup>20</sup> These traditional types of compound reflect the systematisation of the *Tolkāppiyam*, namely, (1) *vērrumai*, (2) *uvamai*, (3) *viṇai*, (4) *paṇpu*, (5) *ummai*, and (6) *aymolī* (*sūtra* 50). The Sanskritic terms used for compounds in the *Vīracōliyam* are (1) *avviyapāvam*, (2) *tar̄puruṭam*, (3) *kaṇmatārayam*, (4) *tuviku*, (5) *palanel* (< *bahu-vṛhi*), and (6) *tuvantuvam* (*sūtra* 45).

undesirable (*anītu*) sound combinations and their magical properties.<sup>21</sup> The second chapter deals with ornaments of sense (Sk. *arthālaṅkāra*). The *Vīracōliyam* similarly ends with a treatment of poetics, though it focuses almost exclusively on figures of meaning and pays little attention to poetic faults.

While the *Sidat Saṅgarā*'s discussion of auspicious and inauspicious sounds is unusual, this section of the chapter appears to be loosely based on faults of sound (Sk. *śabda-dosā*) since it ends with the fault of the incorrect division of metrical feet (XI-6). The chapter then moves on to faults of meaning (Sk. *artha-dosā*), namely, *punarut* “tautology” (XI-7), *virudu-arut-dos* “contrary meaning” (XI-9), *upili-vela* “incongruous order” (XI-11), *asabahav* “impossibility” (XI-14), and *guļu-arut-dos* “the obscurity of meaning” (XI-15).<sup>22</sup> Almost all of these poetic faults of meaning can be traced back to works on Sanskrit or Pali poetics, though the *Sidat Saṅgarā*'s terminology here reveals no single model work on which it is based. The term *punarut* (Sk. *punarukta*) is not found in Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* nor Saṅgharakkhita's *Subodhālaṅkāra*, both of which use the term *ekārtha* (P. *ekattha*) for tautology instead.<sup>23</sup> Other late medieval poets, such as Mammata (259), though, refer to tautology as *punarukta* and Ratnamati uses the term in his commentary on the *Kāvyādarśa* too.<sup>24</sup> The fault of *virudu-arut-dos* “contrary meaning” echoes the *Subodhālaṅkāra*'s *viruddhatthantara* (21), a fault in

<sup>21</sup> There may be some connection here between the *Sidat Saṅgarā* and the *poruttam* “correspondence” section of the so-called *pāṭṭiyal* genre of Tamil grammars dedicated to auspicious sounds and words and their magical properties. See Clare (2011: 72–83). Other sections of the *pāṭṭiyal* genre, however, have little in common with the architecture of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*.

<sup>22</sup> On poetic flaws in the *Lilātilakam*, see Sivan Goren Arzony's contribution to this volume.

<sup>23</sup> See *Kāvyādarśa*, 3.135 and *Subodhālaṅkāra*, 40. References to the *Kāvyādarśa* and *Subodhālaṅkāra* are to the editions of Thakur and Jha (1957) and Jaini (2000), respectively.

<sup>24</sup> See Jha (1967: 245,). Ratnamati uses the term when commenting on *Kāvyādarśa*, 3.138 (Thakur and Jha 1957: 258,<sub>23</sub>).

which the polysemy of a word obstructs the intended poetic sense. Other terms such as *guļu-arut-dos* “the obscurity of meaning” and *asabahav* “impossibility” have direct equivalents in Vāmana’s *Kāvyālaṅkāra* (< *gūḍhārtha*, *asambhava*), a work known to Saṅgharakkhita and also the author of the *Siyabaslakara*, the first work on Sinhala poetics.<sup>25</sup> The only non-Sanskritic term *upiliveḷa* “incongruous order” is a conceptual parallel of the fault Daṇḍin (3.144) and Saṅgharakkhita (59) refer to as *apakrama* (P., *apakkama*).

Incidentally the order of faults here may have some relevance to the question of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*’s authorship. Vedeha in his *Rasavāhīnī* states that the source for his work, which was likely the *Sahassavatthuppakarāṇa*,<sup>26</sup> was filled with *punaruttādidosā* “faults beginning with tautology (Sk. *punarukta*)”. The list of defects mentioned here beginning with “tautology” matches the order of *arthadoṣas* in the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, which uniquely, as far as I am aware, treats the fault of tautology first.

The second and final chapter of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* deals with ornaments of sense (*arthālaṅkāra*) and is more clearly indebted to Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa* than the chapter on faults. Here there is a direct parallel with the *Vīracōliyam* which explicitly cites Daṇḍin as a source for its discussion of these poetic figures. The *Sidat Saṅgarā* introduces eight main ornaments of

<sup>25</sup> 2.1.10 (*gūḍhārtha*) and 4.2.20 (*asambhava*) in the *Kāvyālaṅkāra*. See Durgāprasāda and Parab (1926: 14; 48). Saṅgharakkhita relies on Vāmana throughout his treatment of faults and ornaments of sound (*śabdālaṅkāra*). When discussing the merit of “tenderness” (*sukhumālatā*), for instance, he similarly divides the merit into two — “tenderness” in sense (*arthaguṇa*) as well as sound (*śabdaguṇa*) — and uses the same example given by Vāmana that instead of stating directly that someone has “died” (*mata*) one should instead say that only their “fame remains” (*kittisēsa*). See, *Subodhālaṅkāra*, 139: *sukhumālattam ath’ eva padatthavisayam pi ca, yathā matādisaddesu kittisēḍikittanām* ~ *Kāvyālaṅkāravṛtti* on 3.2.12: *yathā mṛtam yaśahšeṣa ity āhuḥ*. On a reference to Vāmana in the *Siyabaslakara*, see Hallisey (2003: 695n25).

<sup>26</sup> Matsumura (1992: xxxv–l).

sense, namely, *uvam* “simile” (XII-1), *virudu-vā* “contradictory statement” (XII-8), *uba-bas* “dialogue” (XII-10), *nidi-pasas* “insult-praise” (XII-12), *an-alap* “other saying” (XII-14), *upē* “expectation” (XII-16), *hē-rū* “metaphor accompanied by a reason” (XII-18), and *rūlaka* “metaphor” (XII-19). The ornaments, *uvam*, *upē*, *hē-rū*, and *rūlaka* are direct equivalents of Daṇḍin’s *upamā* (2.14), *utprekṣā* (2.221), *hetu-rūpaka* (2.86) and *rūpaka* (2.66). The *Sidat Saṅgarā* further subdivides *uvam* into three types, namely, *vat-uvam* (XII-2), *seles-uvam* (XII-3), and *niñdi-uvam* (XII-7), borrowed from the thirty-two subtypes of *upamā* given in Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa* and which are listed in their entirety in the *Vīracōliyam* (156–7).<sup>27</sup> The figures *virudu-vā*, *uba-bas* and *nidi-pasas* are conceptual equivalents of Daṇḍin’s *virodha* (2.331), *aprastutapraśamsā* (2.339), and *vyājastuti* (2.341) respectively. The figure *an-alap* appears to be equivalent to Rudraṭa’s *anyokti* (8.74),<sup>28</sup> “a figure in which the real subject of comparison is suggested by explicit description of the object, where, nevertheless, the two compared terms have no common property, but only a mode of action in common”.<sup>29</sup>

We can say then that, while it relies on Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa*, the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, unlike the *Vīracōliyam*, makes use of a broader range of sources for its treatment of poetics. Whereas the *Vīracōliyam* takes care to mirror the detail provided by the *Kāvyādarśa* in its treatment of thirty-two *upamais*, for instance, the *Sidat Saṅgarā* provides a far more cursory analysis of the few figures of speech it adopts. The *Sidat Saṅgarā*, like Saṅgharakkhita’s *Subodhālaṅkāra*, relies markedly less on Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa* in its treatment of faults of meaning and also adopts certain ideas from Vāmana’s treatment of the topic in his *Kāvyālaṅkāra*. To sum up then, we can say that, while the position of these two chapters on poetics likely reveals the influence of the

<sup>27</sup> The three are equivalent to *vastūpamā* (2.16, “a simile in which the common property is omitted”), *śleṣopamā* (2.28, “a punning simile”) and *nindopamā* (2.30, “a rebuking simile”) in Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa*.

<sup>28</sup> Durgāprasāda and Parab (1886: 114).

<sup>29</sup> Gerow (1971: 108–9).

organisational principles of the Tamil grammatical tradition, the treatment of the topic itself in the *Sidat Saṅgarā* is certainly not modelled on the *Vīracōliyam*.<sup>30</sup>

### 5. Other Metalinguistic Issues

The first chapter of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* is dedicated to the grammar's basic metalanguage and defines twenty grammatical terms, such as *san* “technical term”, *sañda* “sandhi”, and *liṅgu* “gender”, etc.<sup>30</sup> Many are common to Sanskrit, Pali, and Sanskrit-influenced Tamil grammars, such as the *Vīracōliyam*,<sup>31</sup> but three of these terms have been highlighted in academic scholarship because they appear to have a unique function or definition in the *Sidat Saṅgarā*.<sup>32</sup>

Gair and Karunatillake argue that *san* (Sk. *samjñā*; P. *saññā*) has a special sense in the grammar and means both “technical term” and also “phonetics”. This interpretation has a long history, originating perhaps in

<sup>30</sup> (1) *san* (Sk. *samjñā*), (2) *sañda* (Sk. *sandhi*), (3) *liṅgu* (Sk. *liṅga*), (4) *vibat* (Sk. *vibhakti*), (5) *samas* (Sk. *śamaśa*), (6) *piyavī* (Sk. *prakṛti*), (7) *pasa* (Sk. *pratyaya*), (8) *kiriya* (Sk. *kriyā*), (9) *lop* (Sk. *lopa*), (10) *ades* (Sk. *ādeśa*), (11) *agam* (Sk. *āgama*), (12) *pera-rū* (Sk. *pūrvavarūpa*), (13) *de-rū* (Sk. *dverūpa*), (14) *perēli* (Sk. *viparyaya*), (15) *vēdi* (Sk. *vrddhi*), (16) *aḍu* (Sk. *hāni*), (17) *nipā* (Sk. *nipāta*), (18) *niyam-[vidi]* (Sk. *niyamavidhi*), (19) *aniyam-[vidi]* (Sk. *aniyamavidhi*), (20) *aviduman-vidi* (Sk. *avidyamānavidhi*).

<sup>31</sup> The generic quality of these technical terms is underlined by the fact that Anne Monius has highlighted the use of *ulōpam* (*lopa*), *ākamam* (*āgama*), *ātecam* (*ādeśa*), *kuṇam* (*guṇa*), and *virutti* (*vrddhi*) in the *Vīracōliyam* (*sūtras* 10–12) too. See Monius (2013: 113). The *Vīracōliyam*, however, does not possess an equivalent chapter on metalanguage and does not define each of its technical terms in the same way as the *Sidat Saṅgarā*.

<sup>32</sup> We might further add *aviduman-vidi* (Sk. *avidyamāna-vidhi*), the Sanskrit equivalent of which is difficult to trace in any of the grammatical traditions I am aware of.

James D'Alwis' 1852 translation of the *Sidat Saṅgarā*.<sup>33</sup> The term itself is defined in the *Sidat Saṅgarā*'s opening chapter in *sūtra* 1.4: "Designation of life-letters (vowels) and body-letters (consonants) etc. by name and features is called *san* (< *saṃjñā*)".<sup>34</sup> Gair and Karunatillake state that here the term *san* denotes the topic of phonetics as it is qualified by the expression "life-letters and body-letters etc." (*pañakuru gatakuru āē*), a clear borrowing from Tamil (< *uyir-eluttu*, life-letters, and *meyy-eluttu*, body-letters) referring to vowels and consonants respectively.<sup>35</sup> If we take *āē* (< *ādi*) in its literal sense of "beginning with", however, this expression simply indicates that *pañakuru* and *gatakuru* are the first of all the technical terms used in the grammar and does not limit the scope of *san* to the topic of phonetics. Rather than having a sense peculiar to the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, the term *san* is identical to its Sanskritic counterpart *saṃjñā* (P. *saññā*) "technical term".

Gair and Karunatillake have also questioned the origins of the technical term *peræli* "interchange" or "metathesis", a word that appears to be derived from the Tamil *piral* "turn, change the order". They argue that although the Sinhala commentary on the *Sidat Saṅgarā* glosses the twenty technical terms given in chapter one with Sanskrit equivalents – in this case, with the Sanskrit *viparyāsa* – "one cannot assume that the Sinhala terms are direct equivalents".<sup>36</sup> While clearly a lexical equivalent to its Tamil counterpart, an analysis of the Pali grammars contemporary with the *Sidat*

<sup>33</sup> For instance, James De Alwis translates *sūtra* 1.4 as follows: "san, Sign (which may be rendered *Orthography*) is that which both by *name* and *sign* teaches or points out vowels, consonants, &c." See De Alwis (1852: 2). According to Gair and Karunatillake, this interpretation was followed by Günther (1943), who was the primary influence on their own observations. We also find the same interpretation in De Silva (1965: 71), where the term is translated as "phonetics, phonology and graphemics".

<sup>34</sup> *Sidat Saṅgarā*, I-4: *pañakuru gatakuru āē namlakūṇī hañdunvanu san nam*. Translation adapted from Gair and Karunatillake (2013: 3).

<sup>35</sup> Gair and Karunatillake (2013: xxx).

<sup>36</sup> Gair and Karunatillake (2013: 2-3).

*Saṅgarā* reveals that *peræli* is in fact a conceptual equivalent to *viparyāsa/vipallāsa* (“metathesis”, also Sk. *viparyaya*). The Sinhala commentary on the *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, for instance, glosses *vipallāsa* with *peræli* when commenting on *sūtra* 1.50 *hassa vipallāso*.<sup>37</sup> The 13<sup>th</sup>-century *Payogasiddhi* too defines *vipallāsa* in similar terms to the *Sidat Saṅgarā*’s definition of *peræli*.<sup>38</sup>

Finally, I should mention the *Sidat Saṅgarā*’s definition (1.12) of the term *lop* as the “non-pronunciation of letters” (*vaṇan anusuruvīm*) since it has also stimulated discussion in modern scholarship. M.W. Sugathapala De Silva has argued that the *Sidat Saṅgarā*’s definition of *lop* is “confusing” and “erroneous” since “if one says that a syllable is not pronounced, one implies that the particular syllable is written in the word”.<sup>39</sup> In fact, the *Sidat Saṅgarā* adopts here a Pāṇinian understanding of *lopa* that mirrors the definition given in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* on *sūtra* 1.1.60 *adarśāṇam lopah*, where *anuccāraṇa* (“non-pronunciation”) is also given as one of the synonyms of *adarśāṇa* (“invisibility”). In the Pāṇinian and Cāndra traditions, *lopa* may entail absence but not non-existence and the grammatical properties of that which is elided continue to be efficacious in the derivation of a word after the elision. While this specific function of *lopa* is not identifiable in the *Sidat Saṅgarā*, we can understand the extra-sensory definition of elision in the work as a survival of older definitions of the term in earlier grammatical thought.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Śrī Dharmmānanda (1927: 30,<sub>10</sub>).

<sup>38</sup> *Payogasiddhi*, 2.21: *vipallāso tividho liṅgavipallāso vacanavipallāso vibhattivipallāso ti*. See Siri Nāṇāloka (1974: 77,<sub>15-16</sub>). Compare with *Sidat Saṅgarā*, I-22: *piliperaeli vaṇaperæli padaperæli vibatperæli kiryaperæli vi peræli pas vədərum*.

<sup>39</sup> De Silva (1965: 80).

<sup>40</sup> See, for instance, *sūtras* I-3, I-6, I-17, I-18, II-1, II-2, II-3, II-4, II-5, II-6, II-8, II-10, III-4, and V-5.

## 6. Conclusion

The *Sidat Saṅgarā* adopts a common Sanskritic metalanguage shared by the *Moggallāna* tradition, *Cāndra* tradition, and, to a lesser extent, the *Vīracōliyam*. It seems very unlikely however that the *Vīracōliyam* was a model or even a direct source for the *Sidat Saṅgarā*. The grammar displays a greater influence from the Sanskrit and Pali language sciences, in particular, the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, *Kāvyādarśa*, *Moggallānavyākaraṇa*, and the *Subodhālankāra*. This is not to say there is no influence on the *Sidat Saṅgarā* from the Tamil grammatical tradition more generally. We find certain terminology, such as, ‘life-letters’ and ‘body-letters’, that demonstrate a clear Tamil influence and the final chapters on poetics are likely appended at the end of the *Sidat Saṅgarā* in imitation of Tamil grammars too. What is of greater significance historically is the fact that both the *Sidat Saṅgarā* and *Vīracōliyam* – and 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>-century Sinhala and Tamil literary cultures, more broadly – were influenced by the *Cāndra* grammatical tradition and the *Kāvyādarśa* at roughly the same time. This common inspiration for the grammatisation of Tamil and Sinhala in the early second millennium hints at a deeper intellectual connection than source criticism can demonstrate.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> On the limits of source criticism in this regard, see Cox (2013). On the social, political and religious dynamics of the period, see Gornall (2020).

### Bibliography

- Auroux, Sylvain. (1994). *La révolution technologique de la grammatisation: Introduction à l'histoire des sciences du langage*. Liège: Mardaga.
- Bechert, Heinz. (1987). “Sanskrit-Grammatiken in singhalesischer Überlieferung.” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13/14: 5–16.
- Clare, Jennifer Steele. (2011). “Canons, Conventions and Creativity: Defining Literary Tradition in Premodern Tamil South India.” PhD Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Cox, Whitney. (2013). “From source-criticism to intellectual history in the poetics of the medieval Tamil country.” In *Bilingual Discourse and Cross-Cultural Fertilisation: Sanskrit and Tamil in Medieval India*, edited by Whitney Cox and Vincenzo Vergiani, 115–60. Pondicherry: École française d’Extrême-Orient.
- De Alwis, James, trans. (1852). *The Sidath Sangarawa: A Grammar of the Singhalese Language, Translated into English, with Introduction, Notes and Appendices*. Colombo: William Skeen, Government Printer.
- Deokar, Mahesh A. (2008). *Technical Terms and Techniques of the Pali and Sanskrit Grammars*. Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- De Silva, M.W. Sugathapala. (1965). “Some Observations on the Scope of the Sidat Sangarava.” In *Senarat Paranavitana Felicitation Volume*, 67–88. Colombo: Gunasena.
- De Silva, M.W. Sugathapala. (1969). “Sinhalese.” In *Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 5: Linguistics in South Asia*, edited by Thomas E. Sebeok, 234–48. The Hague: Mouton.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir. (2016). *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind: On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati: A Philological Chronicle (Phullalocanavamsa)*. Naples: Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”, Dipartimento Asia Africa e Mediterraneo.
- Durgāprasāda, Mahāmahopādhyāya Pañṭit and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab, ed. (1886). *The Kāvyālankāra (A Treatise on Rhetoric) of Rudraṭa, with the Commentary of Namisādhu*. Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press.

- Durgāprasāda, Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍit and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab, ed. (1926). *The Kāvyālaṅkāra-Sūtras of Vāmana with his own Vṛtti*. Revised by Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Śāstrī Paṇṣikar. Third edition. Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press.
- Gair, James W. and W.S. Karunatillake, ed. and trans. (2013). *The Sidat Saṅgarā: Text, Translation and Glossary*. American Oriental Series 95. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Gerow, Edwin. (1971). *A Glossary of Indian Figures of Speech*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Godakumbura, C.E. (1946). “The Dravidian Element in Sinhalese.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 11.4: 837–41.
- Godakumbura, C.E. (1955). *Sinhalese Literature*. Colombo: Colombo Apothecaries' Company.
- Gornall, Alastair. (2020). *Rewriting Buddhism: Pali literature and monastic reform in Sri Lanka, 1157–1270*. London: UCL Press.
- Günther, Herbert. (1942). “Das Sidat-saṅgarāva, eine Grammatik des Klassischen Sinhalesisch.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 96 (Neue Folge 21): 84–97.
- Günther, Herbert. (1943). “Das Sidat Saṅgarāva (Zusammenfassung der Regeln); die einheimische sinhalesische Grammatik.” Dr. Phil Habilitationsschrift, Universität Wien.
- Hallisey, Charles. (2003). “Works and Persons in Sinhala Literary Culture.” In *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*, edited by Sheldon Pollock, 689–746. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S., ed. (2000). *Subodhālaṅkāra. Porāṇa-ṭīkā (Mahāsāmi-ṭīkā) by Saṅgharakkhita Mahāsāmi, Abhinava-ṭīkā (Nissaya) (anonymous)*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Jha, Ganganatha, ed. and trans. (1967). *Kāvyaprakāsha of Mammaṭa with English Translation (Revised) (Chapters I to X) (With Index & Appendices)*. Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.
- Matsumura, Junko, ed. (1992). *The Rasavāhīni of Vedeha Thera, Vaggas V and VI: The Migapotaka Vagga and the Uttaroliya Vagga*. Osaka: Toho Shuppan.

- Monius, Anne E. (2001). *Imagining a Place for Buddhism: Literary Culture and Religious Community in Tamil-Speaking South India*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Monius, Anne E. (2013). “‘Sanskrit is the Mother of All Tamil Words’: Further Thoughts on the *Viracōliyam* and its Commentary.” In *Buddhism among Tamils in Tamilakam and Ilam, Part 3, Extensions and Conclusions*, edited by Peter Schalk and Astrid van Nahl, 103–29. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
- Scharfe, Hartmut. (1977). *Grammatical Literature. A History of Indian Literature* 5.2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Siri Ñāṇāloka, Kōdāgoḍa, ed. (1974). *Payogasiddhi mugulan viyaraṇa äsiri koṭa Medhañkara vanaratana mahāsthavirayan vahansē visin viracitayi*. Colombo: Śrī Laṅkā Saṃskṛtika Maṇḍalaya.
- Śrī Dharmmānanda, Dharmakīrti, ed. (1927). *Moggallānavyākaranaya hā anyatara ācaryyyottamakenakun visin racita Viritasanyaya*. Colombo: Satyasamuccaya Press.
- Śrī Dharmmānanda, Dharmakīrti, ed. (1931). *Moggallāna Pañcikā with Sutta Vutti by the Venerable Moggallāna Mahā Sāmi*. Colombo: Satyasamuccaya Press.
- Subhūti, Vaskaḍuvē. (1876). *Nāmamālā; or A Work on Pāli Grammar*. Colombo: Government Printing Office.
- Thakur, Ananthalal and Upendra Jha, ed. (1957). *Kāvyalakṣaṇa of Daṇḍin* (also known as *Kāvyādarśa*) with commentary called *Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrijñāna*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Vijayavenugopal, G. (1979). “Some Buddhist Poems in Tamil.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 2.2, 93–8.
- Vimalavaṁsa Sthavira, Baddegama. (1960). *Siṁhala Grantha Vicāraya*. Maradāna: Anula Mudraṇālaya.