

How Many Sounds are in Pāli?

Schism, Identity and Ritual in the Theravāda *saṅgha*

Alastair Gornall

Published online: 4 April 2014
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Abstract This article highlights the central importance of Pāli phonetics in Theravāda Buddhism. In doing so, I focus on a single yet fundamental point of contention regarding the number of sounds in the Pāli language from the twelfth to fifteenth century. I argue that this debate on the number of sounds was of central concern due to the importance of Pāli pronunciation in the ritual sphere, the development of new regional monastic identities, and the introduction of regional scripts. In tracing this debate between two competing systems of Pāli grammar I show that these developments in the phonetic description of the Pāli language reveal the use and adaptation of Sanskritic phonetics in order to differentiate Pāli from Sanskrit, the Prakrits, and its surrounding vernaculars.

Keywords Theravāda · Pāli · Sri Lanka · Phonetics · Buddhism · Ritual · Cosmopolitanism · Grammar · *Vyākaraṇa* · Grammaticisation

In this article, I translate both ‘*akkhara*’ (S. *akṣara*) and ‘*vaṇṇa*’ (S. *varṇa*) with the term ‘sound’, a short form for ‘speech-sound’. While both ‘*akkhara*’ and ‘*vaṇṇa*’ are often translated as ‘letter’, in the phonetic discussions of Pāli grammatical literature these terms mean the sounds of speech rather than the graphic representation of speech. This is not to say that orthography does not have a bearing on the discussions of speech-sounds, but that it is not primarily signified by either ‘*akkhara*’ or ‘*vaṇṇa*’. In addition, the terms ‘*akkhara*’ and ‘*vaṇṇa*’ in the discussions of Pāli phoneticians refer to a syllable consisting of a vowel or a consonant with an inherent vowel, e.g. ‘*a*’, ‘*ā*’, ‘*ka*’ and ‘*kā*’. Different vowels may be combined with a consonant base to make an *akkhara*, e.g. ‘*ka*’, ‘*kā*’, ‘*ki*’, ‘*kī*’. In this regard, Pāli does not have an ‘alphabet’ but a syllabary. However, the Pāli syllabary, i.e. the enumeration of *akkharas*, does not include every possible combination of consonants and inherent vowels. The Pāli syllabary only counts the vowels (*a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, *u*, *ū*, *e*, [*ē*], *o*, [*ō*]) and the consonants with an inherent vowel ‘*a*’ (*ka*, *kha*, *ga*, *gha*, *ṇa* etc.).

A. Gornall (✉)

Singapore University of Technology and Design, 20 Dover Drive, Singapore 138682, Singapore
e-mail: alastair_gornall@sutd.edu.sg

‘GRAMARYE, S. Magic.’

An Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language
Jamieson 1818, p. 112.

The importance of the correct pronunciation of Pāli in the Theravāda¹ ritual sphere has received a fair amount of attention (von Hinüber 1987; Bizot 1988; Crosby 2000). However, there has been little regard for the theoreticians of Theravāda ritual, those scholar monks who debated the nature of Pāli sounds in order to guard the recitation of the *tipiṭaka* and its ritual formulae. In this article, I focus on the rich history of Theravāda Buddhist phonetics and explore a fundamental point of contention in the *saṅgha* concerning the number of sounds in the Pāli language.

This important debate can be traced to the aftermath of the *saṅgha* reforms of the Laṅkan king Parākramabāhu I in 1165, where the monarch famously united the three main *nikāyas* on the island, the Mahāvihāra, Jetavana, and Abhayagiri.² As part of these reforms a new system of grammar, the *Moggallāna* system, was produced in order to supplant the earlier *Kaccāyana* grammatical tradition. The creation of the *Moggallāna* system, and by implication its deviation from the orthodox *Kaccāyana* tradition, was heralded by Moggallāna’s sole authorship of its rules (*Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa* [Mogg]), their gloss (*Moggallāna-vutti* [Mogg-v]) and commentary (*Moggallāna-pañcikā* [Mogg-p]).

Central to this schism was a disagreement about the number of sounds in Pāli, with the *Moggallāna* grammarians counting forty-three sounds and the *Kaccāyana* grammarians forty-one. In order to explain why the Pāli sound system became a point of dispute in the *saṅgha*, this article takes the separation of the *Moggallāna* and *Kaccāyana* traditions in the middle of the twelfth century as a starting point and traces this debate on Pāli sounds from its gestation up until the fifteenth century.

I begin my analysis by describing the dispute on the number of sounds between Moggallāna, author of the *Moggallāna* system, and Cōla Buddhappiya, author of the *Rūpasiddhi* (Rūp), an important *Kaccāyana* handbook. I situate this debate within the context of the shifting identities and concerns of the monastic communities in Laṅkā and Damiḷa country in the twelfth century. By tracing this debate through later *Moggallāna* and *Kaccāyana* works, I highlight the centrality of the discipline of phonetics in the Pāli grammatical tradition and relate its increasing importance to an expansion of the parameters of the Pāli language that were thought to be worth theorising.

In the second part of this article, I further investigate the reasons behind the debate on the number of sounds in Pāli. In particular, I discuss a summary and explanation of the debate given by Śrī Rāhula (c. 15th) in his *Padasādhana-ṭīkā* (Pds-ṭ). According to Śrī Rāhula, these debates arose due to the importance of the correct pronunciation of Pāli within the ritual sphere. I investigate the historical validity of Śrī Rāhula’s statement and explore the relationship between phonetics

¹ In this article, I follow Skilling (2007, p. 183) and ‘reserve the term “Theravāda” for the monastic lineage—the aggregate or series of lineages, changing with time and place, that emanate or claim to emanate from the Mahāvihāra tradition of Ceylon.’ For an insightful investigation of the use of the term ‘Theravāda’, cf. Skilling et al. 2012.

² Cf. Paranavitana (1960, pp. 566–570), Gunawardana (1979), De Silva (1981, p. 73), De Silva (1999 [=1987], p. 92), Bechert (1993, pp. 18–19).

and Theravāda ritualism between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. Finally, I investigate a further possibility that the development of regional scripts also added to the contestations regarding the validity of certain sounds in Pāli. In this regard, I consider how far the development of language-specific scripts had led to a fracturing of trans-regional linguistic communities, resulting in the development of more local religious, political and social identities.

***Kaccāyana* 1 and the Importance of Phonetics**

The importance of phonetics to the Pāli grammatical tradition is evident from the first *sūtra* of the *Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa* (Kacc): Kacc.1 *attho akkharasaññāto* (meaning is understood from sounds). This *sūtra* heads the first two chapters of the grammar, which contain an enumeration of the sounds of the Pāli language and also the treatment of *sandhi*. In this way, Kacc.1 possibly acts as an early justification for the discussion of Pāli phonology. Both Senart (1871, p. 8) and Pind (1996, p. 68) translate the past participle ‘*saññāto*’ here as ‘expressed’, perhaps pre-empting the discussions of later commentators on the articulation of Pāli sounds. However, ‘*saññāto*’ can also mean ‘perceived’ or ‘understood’ and, therefore, might have originally referred to cognition rather than articulation.³ It is the *Kaccāyana-vutti* (Kacc-v) of Saṅghanandi⁴ that explicitly links this statement to the issue of pronunciation:

The sense of all speech is expressed only through sounds. When there is a mistake in [the pronunciation of] sounds, there is a misunderstanding (*dunnayatā*) of the meaning. Therefore, skill [in the pronunciation of] sounds is a great help in [understanding] the *suttantas*.⁵

With respect to this statement in the Kacc-v, Pind (1996, p. 68) states that ‘the use of the term *dunnayatā* indicates that the *vuttikāra* interprets the introductory sutta in light of the term *dunnaya* as it is used, e.g. at A II 147,20 foll. describing the confusion caused by [the] incorrect recitation of [a] canonical text: *dunnikkhit-tassa...padavyañjanassa attho pi dunnayo hoti* «the meaning of an expression that has been incorrectly laid down is difficult to infer».⁶ Pind’s association of this passage with Kacc. 1 is quite possible since Moggallāna in the Mogg-p cites this exact passage as a canonical justification for studying grammar:

For the Blessed One has said: ‘Monks, these two conditions lead to the confusion and destruction of the true *dhamma*. What two? [1] an incorrectly placed expression and [2] the misunderstanding of meaning. If an expression

³ This is the sense in which Subhūti (2001 [=1876], p. 7) understands it in his essay on the history of Pāli grammar (*arthaya akuruvalinma dāṅgaṇu lābē* [Meaning is understood from sounds]).

⁴ Śrī Rāhula in the Pds-ṭ (1908, p. 6, 1. 5–6) states that ‘Saṅghanandi’ is the author of the Kacc-v: ‘... *kaccāyana-saṅghanandi-vimalabuddhimahātherādīhi katesu suttavuttinyāsādīsu...*’ (...in the *sutta*, *vutti*, and *nyāsa* composed by the great elders Kaccāyana, Saṅghanandi and Vimalabuddhi...). On the authorship of the Kacc-v cf. Pind (2012, p. 89).

⁵ Kacc-v (2012, p. 1, 1. 11–13): *sabbavacanānaṃ attho akkhareh’ eva saññāyate. akkharavipattiyāṃ hi atthassa dunnayatā hoti; tasmā akkharakosallaṃ bahūpakāraṃ suttantesu*.

⁶ The brackets are my own addition.

is misplaced the meaning in turn is liable to be misunderstood (*dunnaya*). Monks, these two conditions lead to the confusion and destruction of the true *dhamma*.' This is the fault in not knowing grammar. Further, the benefit in knowing [grammar] is understood as the opposite of what is said [above].⁷

This passage appears to have long been used to support Pāli philological enterprise since it is also used in the *Nettipakaraṇa* (Nett) to justify the glossing of words in the exegesis of canonical texts.⁸ It is noteworthy, then, that a passage which is solely concerned with textual recitation should come to support the practice of Pāli philology as a whole.

The *Mukhamattadīpanī* (Mmd), a commentary on the Kacc-v by Vimalabuddhi, states with respect to the term '*saññāta*' that the preaffixal base '*saññā*' is in the sense of 'causing to know' (*avabodhana*) and that the past participle suffix *-ta* signifies the three times; past, present and future:

All meaning, of expressions such as 'jug' and 'cloth', is expressed only by sounds. It is expressed, was expressed and will be expressed. Here, the [word] '*saññāta*' is formed (*rūpa*) with a verbal base [that consists of] a prefix '*sañ*' and '*ñā*' in the sense of 'causing to know'. And after this verbal base the suffix *-ta* occurs also in the sense of the three times (i.e. past, present and future), as it is said '*ḥṛt* suffixes (*ṇādayo*) [convey] the three times' (cf. Kacc.552 *ṇādayo tekālikā*).⁹

In this way, Vimalabuddhi stresses the universality of the principle that meaning is expressed by means of sounds. In addition, Vimalabuddhi makes it explicit that this *sūtra* supports the study of phonetics with the following statement:

This [*sūtra*] is uttered, since (*tī*), as one's first duty, one should study only phonetics (*akkharapabheda*, lit. the divisions of sound), which expresses the meaning of the discourses (*vacana*) that are categorised as either mundane or supramundane.¹⁰

⁷ Mogg-p (1931, p. 4, l. 16–22): *vuttaṃ h' etaṃ bhagavatā: dve 'me bhikkhave dhammā saddhammassa sammōsāya antaradhānāya saṃvattanti katame dve dunnikkhittā ca padavyañjanaṃ attho ca dunnīto. dunnikkhittassa bhikkhave padavyañjanassa attho pi dunnayo hoti. ime kho bhikkhave dve dhammā saddhammassa sammōsāya antaradhānāya saṃvattanti ti, ayaṃ saddalakkhaṇassa ajānane doso. (jānane) ānisaṃso pana vuttapaṭipakkhato veditabbo.*

The parentheses and punctuation are as found in the editions quoted. Emendations in brackets are my own.

⁸ Nett (1902, p. 21, l. 12–14): *dunnikkhittassa padavyañjanassa attho pi dunnayo bhavati. tasmā atthavyañjanupetaṃ saṃgāhitabbaṃ suttaṃ ca pavicinītabbaṃ.* "There is a misunderstanding of the meaning of an expression when it is incorrectly placed. Therefore, the meanings and expressions that are met with are to be understood and the *sutta* is to be reflected upon."

⁹ Mmd (2454, p. 6, l. 24–28): *yo koci ghaṭapaṭādivacanatto, so sabbo akkhareh' eva saññāto. saññāyati saññāyittha saññāyissatī ti, ettha ca saññāto ti saṃpubbāya ñā avabodhane icc etāya dhātuyā rūpaṃ. tāya ca pana dhātuyā tappacayo kālattaye pi sambhavati, āha ca "ṇādayo[sic!] tekālikā" ti.*

¹⁰ Mmd (2454, p. 6, l. 29–30): *idaṃ vuttaṃ hoti, lokiyalokuttarasamkhātavacanattasāññāpakko akkharapabhedo va paṭhamam sakkaccaṃ sikkhitabbo ti.*

The term '*akkharapabheda*' is mentioned in the *Dīgha Nikāya* (D I 88, 6) as an accessory to the three *vedas*. In his commentary (Sv 247, 25), Buddhaghosa states that the term '*akkharapabheda*' can refer to 'phonetics and semantic analysis' ('*sikkhā ca nirutti ca*'). As a result, the PED (Rhys Davids and Stede 1999 [=1921]) appears to interpret this compound as a *dvandva* since under '*akkhara*' it gives the following definition: 'As tt. for one of 4 branches of Vedic learning (D.188) it is Phonetics which

The *Rūpasiddhi* (Rūp) of Buddhappiya is the first grammar to use the phonetic terminology found in commentarial literature in its explanation of how Kacc.1 justifies the study of phonetics:

Whatever the meaning is of the discourses (*vacana*), whether it is mundane or supramundane, it is all expressed only by means of sounds. When there is a mistake in the [pronunciation of] sounds, which are unvoiced and voiced etc., the meaning is misunderstood. Therefore, skill in the [pronunciation of] sounds is a great help in [understanding] the discourses of the Buddha. In this connection, since their form is comprised of sounds, words also are understood only [from] sounds (lit. among sounds).¹¹

Therefore, through an analysis of the commentaries on Kacc.1, it is clear that phonetics was a key part of the Pāli grammatical tradition from its inception. In this regard, the Pāli grammatical tradition differs from *Vaidika* Sanskrit grammarians, who view phonetics (*śikṣā*) as a discipline separate and distinct from grammar (*vyākaraṇa*).¹²

In the following sections, I show that Pāli phonetics remained a central component of the Pāli grammatical traditions in the twelfth century and that debates on Pāli phonetics contributed to the birth of a new grammar of the Pāli language, the *Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa* (Mogg).

Rupture

The Mogg begins its grammatical tour de force with Mogg.1.1 *aādayo titālīsavaṇṇā* (beginning with ‘a’, there are forty-three sounds), a *sūtra* that advertises Moggallāna’s intent to separate from the *Kaccāyana* grammatical tradition, which holds that Pāli has forty-one sounds. Moggallāna’s addition of short ‘e’ and short ‘o’ to Kaccāyana’s enumeration appears to be the culmination of a debate that had been running within the *Kaccāyana* grammatical tradition itself.¹³ For instance, the Rūp of Buddhappiya (c. 12th), Moggallāna’s main source from the *Kaccāyana* tradition, displays clear knowledge of contestations regarding the number of sounds in Pāli and is the first

Footnote 10 continued

probably included Grammar, and expl^d by *sikkhā* (DA. 1.247 = SnA 477).’ However, Cone (2001) in the DOP has understood in her entry for ‘*akkhara*’ that, according to Buddhaghosa, the whole compound ‘*akkharapabheda*’ can either refer to phonetics or semantic analysis. That this compound is not a *dvandva* but a *tatpuruṣa* (‘the analysis of sounds’) is clear from the sub-commentary of Sāriputta (Sp-ṭ B^e 1.108: *thānakaraṇādivibhāgato nibbacanavibhāgato ca akkharā pabhedīyanti...*

‘Sounds are analysed according to their place of articulation and instrument of articulation, and according to their semantic explanation...’). This sense is captured in Franke’s (1913, p. 87, n. 6) more general translation of ‘*Unterscheidung der Silben*’.

¹¹ Rūp B^e 1: *yo koci lokīyalokuttarādibhedo vacanatto, so sabbo akkhareh’ eva saññāyate. sithiladhaniṭṭiakkharavipattiyañ hi atthassa dunnayatā hoti, tasmā akkharakosallaṃ bahūpakāraṃ buddhavacanesu. ettha padāni pi akkharasannipātārūpattā akkharesv eva saṅgayhanti.*

¹² For more information on the Brahmanical *śikṣā* tradition, cf. Ciotti (2012, 2014).

¹³ It has long been recognised by European philologists that there is a shortening of *e* and *o* before a double consonant in accordance with the law of *mora*. For the most recent discussion on this matter, see Oberlies (2001, pp. 17–18 [Sect. 3]). Also, see Geiger (2005 [=1943], pp. 4–5 [Sect. 5]). On the shortening of *e* and *o* in Prakrit, see Pischel (1900, pp. 73–75 [Sect. 84–85]) and Jacobi (1879, pp. 292–298).

Pāli grammar to provide a detailed phonetic analysis of Pāli sounds using terminology familiar from works on Sanskrit phonetics. After listing the sounds of Pāli while commenting on Kacc.2 *akkharāp' ādayo ekacattālīsam* (Also, beginning with 'a', there are forty-one sounds), Buddhappiya states:

Further, this order of [sounds], beginning with 'a', is dependent on a method [of differentiating sounds according to their] 'place of articulation' (*thāna*) etc. For instance, sounds are produced by means of a place of articulation, instrument of articulation (*karana*) and mode of articulation (*payatana*). In this respect, there are six places of articulation, viz. the throat, palate, head, teeth, lips and nose. Here, 'a', the 'ka' class [of consonants] and 'ha' are guttural. 'i', the 'ca' class and 'ya' are palatal. The 'ta' class, 'ra' and 'la' are cerebral. The 'ta' class, 'la' and 'sa' are dental. 'u' and the 'pa' class are labial. 'e' is guttural and palatal. 'o' is guttural and labial. 'va' is dental and labial. The *niggahita* is nasal. 'ṇa', 'ṇa', 'ṇa', 'na' and 'ma' are produced (-ja) at their respective places of articulation and are also nasal.

They say that 'ha' is one of (lit. combined with) the nasals [lit. the fifth class] and the semi-vowels, and that the pulmonic [sound] (*orasam*) is guttural and is not one of the [nasals or semi-vowels].¹⁴

For palatal [sounds], the instrument of articulation is the middle of the tongue. For cerebral [sounds], the instrument of articulation is before the tip of the tongue. For dental [sounds], the instrument of articulation is the tip of the tongue. The remaining [sounds] take their own [respective] place and instrument of articulation. The mode of articulation is characterised by whether the instrument of articulation is closed etc. 'a' has [the status of] being closed. The remaining vowels and 'sa' and 'ha' have [the status of] being open. For the class [consonants], there is full contact [of the instrument of articulation]. For 'ya', 'ra', 'la' and 'va', there is slight contact [of the instrument of articulation].

Thus, among the sounds—which are differentiated by place [of articulation], instrument [of articulation], mode [of articulation], and the duration of the sound (*sutikāla*)—the vowels are supports and the other [consonants] are supported. In this connection, it is said:

Vowels are mentioned first due to being supports. Then the consonants [are mentioned] due to being supported [by vowels]. Those [sounds] that have a single class (*vagga*) are mentioned first since they are numerous. Then [the sounds that have more than one class are mentioned] according to their place of articulation and according to their weight (i.e. lighter sounds are mentioned first).¹⁵

¹⁴ I have relied upon Rūp-sn (1926, p. 12, l. 33–36 – p. 13, l. 1–2) in interpreting this verse.

¹⁵ In translating this difficult verse I have relied heavily upon the Rūp-sn (1926, p. 14, l. 9–39 – p. 15, l. 1–5). With respect to the challenging final *pada*, the Rūp-sn states that sounds that belong to more than one class (*varga*) are to be listed in the order of their place of articulation and also in the order of their weight. Literally, the expression '*lahukkama*' means 'according to their lightness' or 'in the order of their lightness'. With respect to this, the Rūp-sn states that short vowels are lighter than long vowels and that unaspirated consonants are lighter than aspirated consonants.

And it is said:

Further, the order (*anukkama*) of [sounds] is uttered (*vutta*) according to the order (*paṭipāṭi*) of the five places of articulation etc. and through the divisions of support etc.

Forty with the addition of one is forty one. According to this enumeration [it is said:]

That which has more than forty-one sounds is not *buddhavacana*.
[So says] the Illuminator, Bull among Teachers.¹⁶

Buddhappiya's long excursus on the correct pronunciation of Pāli sounds and their enumeration reveals vulnerability within the *Kaccāyana* tradition. The serious religious implications of this debate are laid bare in his final verse, which warns that if it has more than forty-one sounds it is not to be considered *buddhavacana*. Buddhappiya's claim would appear to question the validity of the canonical literature of those monks who adhere to an unholy number of sounds.¹⁷

In his commentary on Mogg.1.1 *aādayo titālīsavaṇṇā* in the Mogg-p, Moggallāna explicitly criticises the *Kaccāyana* tradition's enumeration of sounds and singles out Buddhappiya's Rūp for censure:

Furthermore, this enumeration [of sounds] is for the purpose of refuting the opposition. For Kaccāyana composed the *sūtra* 'the sounds, beginning with "a" are forty one', which is not suitable, since there are forty three sounds in

¹⁶ Rūp B^e 2: *akārādīnam anukkamo pan' esa thānādikkamasannissito. tathā hi thānakaraṇappayatanehi vaṇṇā jāyante. tattha cha thānāni kaṇṭha-tālu-muddha-danta-oṭṭha-nāsikāvasena. tattha avaṇṇak-avaggahakārā kaṇṭhajā. ivaṇṇacavaggayakārā tālujā. ṭavaggarakāraḷakārā muddhajā. tavaggalakārasakārā dantajā. uvaṇṇapavaggā oṭṭhajā. ekāro kaṇṭhatālujo. okāro kaṇṭhoṭṭhajo. vakāro dantoṭṭhajo. niggahūtaṃ nāsikaṭṭhānajaṃ. nañāṇanamā sakatṭhānajaṃ, nāsikaṭṭhānajaṃ cā ti.*

hakāraṃ pañcameh' eva antaṭṭhāhi ca saṃyutaṃ.

orasan ti vadant' ettha, kaṇṭhajaṃ tadasaṃyutaṃ.

karaṇaṃ jivhāmajjhaṃ tālujānaṃ, jivhopaggaṃ muddhajānaṃ, jivhāggāṃ dantajānaṃ, sesā sakatṭhāna-karaṇā. payatanaṃ saṃvutādikaraṇaviseso. saṃvutattaṃ akārassa, vivaṭattaṃ sesasarānaṃ sakārahakārānaṃ ca, phuṭṭhaṃ vaggānaṃ, isamphuṭṭhaṃ yaralavānaṃ ti. evaṃ thāna-karaṇa-ppaya-tana-suti-kālabhinnesu akkharesu sarā nissayā, itare nissitā. tattha:

nissayādo sarā vuttā byañjanā nissitā tato

vaggekaṇṭhā bahuttādo tato thānalahukkamā.

vuttañ ca:

pañcannaṃ pana thānānaṃ paṭipāṭivasāpi ca

nissayādippabhedehi vutto tesam anukkamo ti.

ekenādhikā cattālīsāṃ ekacattālīsāṃ, etena gaṇanaparicchena

adhikakkharavantāni ekatālīsato ito

na buddhavacanaṃ dīpetācariyāsabho.

¹⁷ It is noteworthy that, when interpreting this final verse, the Rūp-sn (1926, p. 15, l. 21) states that the extra sounds are those found in Sanskrit, such as 'śa' and 'ṣa' etc. The Rūp-sn does not mention short 'e' and 'o' and clearly does not relate this verse to the debates on sounds occurring at the time of the production of the Rūp. Since the author of the Rūp-sn was Sinhalese, it is possible he interpreted this passage in a light that did not undermine the *Moggallāna* grammatical tradition. In this regard, his commentary may be seen as an attempt to reconcile the Rūp with Lankan literary culture.

the language of Magadha, including short ‘e’ and ‘o’. These are seen in use, [in examples] such as ‘seyyo’ (better) and ‘sothhi’ (well-being). Further, one should understand that Kaccāyana composed the *sūtra* in this way, having understood that ‘e’ and ‘o’ are only long by relying on Sanskrit. Also, some (i.e. Buddhappiya) say that ‘sometimes the sounds “e” and “o” before a compound consonant are pronounced as if short, for instance “seyyo”, “oṭṭho” (camel) and “sothhi”’. This also is not suitable. Since the existence of short and long [sounds] is only due to the duration of pronunciation, those [sounds] which only have a short duration of pronunciation are only short [and] those which have a long duration are only long. However, these have only a short duration and, [therefore], there is no difference at all in the duration of the pronunciation of ‘ettha’ [here], ‘sothhi’ or ‘attho’.¹⁸

Initially, then, Moggallāna accuses Kaccāyana of being too dependent on Sanskrit phonetics in his analysis of the Pāli sound system. Moggallāna indicates that this dependence meant that Kaccāyana neglected the existence of short ‘e’ and ‘o’. In his commentary on the Mogg-p, Saṅgharakkhita, Moggallāna’s pupil, explains that the statement ‘relying on Sanskrit’ (*sakkatānusārena*) means that Kaccāyana followed the Sanskrit expression ‘the diphthongs are not short’ (*sandhiyakkarāṇaṃ rassā na santi*, S. *sandhyakṣarāṇāṃ hrasvā na santi*).¹⁹ I have managed to trace the exact statement ‘*sandhyakṣarāṇāṃ hrasvā na santi*’ to the *vṛtti* of Mahākassapa’s *Bālāvabodhana* on C.1.1.1 *ādir itā samadhyah* (The initial item that is to be denoted (*ādi*) together with the final IT marker, [denote themselves] along with the intervening items).²⁰

However, by the twelfth century, the *Kaccāyana* tradition also appears to have adjusted its position on the length of ‘e’ and ‘o’, since Moggallāna quotes the Rūp of

¹⁸ Mogg-p (1931, p. 6, 1. 17–29): *gaṇanaparicchedo pan’ esa vipptāpattinirāsatto. kaccāyanena hi “akkhārāp’ ādayo ekacattālīsan” ti (Kacc.2) suttitaṃ tañ ca na yuttaṃ, taccattālīsakkarāṇaṃ māgadhikāya bhāsāya sambhavato rassaeokārehi. dissanti hi te seyyo sothhi ti evaṃ ādi ppayoge. kaccāyanena pana sakkatānusārena eodīghā yecā [sic! ‘yevā’ (?) ti gahetvā tathā suttitan ti veditabbaṃ. yam p’ āha koci “kvaci saṃyogapubbā ekārokarā rassā iva vuccate yathā ettha seyyo oṭṭho sothhi” ti tam pi na yujjati. uccāraṇakālakatattā rassadīghabhāvassa ye ‘va uccāraṇe rassakālavanto te rassā yeva ye pana dīghakālavanto te dīghā yeva ete tu rassakālavanto yeva na ca ettha sothhi attho ti vā uccāraṇakālakatato koci bhedo sambhavatī ti.*

¹⁹ Mogg-p-ṭ B^e 21: *sakkatānusārenā ti sakkate “sandhiyakkarāṇaṃ rassā na santi” ti vuttassa anusārena.*

²⁰ Bbh (1924, p. 4, 1. 4).

While it likely that this is the statement that Saṅgharakkhita is referring too, there is also evidence of a rejection of short ‘e’ and ‘o’ in Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya*. Patañjali’s comments are found in his discussion of *vārttika* 4 ‘*atapara “eca ig ghrasvādeṣe”*’ (If they [i.e. the sounds *e*, *o*, *ai*, *au*] are read with a following T sound, then [A.1.1.48] *eca ig ghrasvādeṣe* would have been stated). Particularly relevant to the debate at hand are the follow comments:

Mbh I, p. 22, 1. 21–25: *na tau staḥ. yadi hi tau syātām tāv evāyam upadiṣet. nanu ca bhoś chandogānām sātīyamugrīrāṇāyānīyā ardham ekāram ardham okāram cādhiyate. sujāte e aśvasūnṛte. adhvaryo o adribhiḥ sutam. śukraṃ te e anyad yajataṃ te e anyad iti. pārśadaktīr eṣā tatra bhavatām naiva hi loke nānyasmin vede ‘rdha ekāro ‘rdha okāro vāsti.*

“They (i.e. short *e* and *o*) do not exist. For if they did exist, then he (Pāṇini) would have taught them. Is it not though that, among the chanters of the *vedas*, the followers of the sub-branch *satīyamugri* of the *Rāṇāyānīya* recite short *e* and short *o*, [in instances such as] ‘*sujāte e’ aśvasūnṛte*’ (Sāma. I.421), ‘*adhvaryo o’ adribhiḥ sutam*’ (Sāma. I.499), ‘*śukraṃ te e’ nyad yajataṃ te e’ nyad*’ (Sāma. I.75)? This is the usage of their school there, for short *e* or short *o* are found neither in the world nor in any other *veda*.”

Buddhappiya as stating that ‘the sounds “e” and “o” before a compound consonant are pronounced *as if* short, for instance “seyyo”, “oṭṭho” and “soṭṭhi”’. Saṅgharakkhita names Buddhappiya as the source of the quote in his commentary, the *Moggallāna-pañcika-ṭīkā* (Mogg-p-ṭ), stating that ‘[with the expression] “someone”, he [i.e. Moggallāna] indicates the Teacher, Coḷiya Buddhappiya, purifier of the religion.’²¹ The passage in question quoted by Moggallāna occurs at the end of Buddhappiya’s gloss on Rūp.5 (=Kacc.5) *aññe dīghā* (The other [vowels, i.e. ā, ī, ū, e and o,] are long):

Sometimes the sounds ‘e’ and ‘o’ before a compound consonant are pronounced as if short, for instance ‘ettha’, ‘seyyo’, ‘oṭṭho’ and ‘soṭṭhi’. Why ‘sometimes’? [Since there are the examples:] ‘maṃ ce tvaṃ nikhaṇaṃ vane’ (If you bury me in the forest...) and ‘putto ty āhaṃ mahārāja’ (Great king, I am [your] son).²²

There is no mention of the shortening of vowels in the Mmd of Vimalabuddhi, an earlier commentary to the Kacc, and therefore it is possible Buddhappiya was responding to recent debates within his grammatical community, debates that almost certainly led Moggallāna to introduce short ‘e’ and ‘o’ as sounds in their own right. At the end of his discussion, Moggallāna rejects Buddhappiya’s standpoint by arguing that ‘e’ and ‘o’ cannot have a long duration and then, in certain situations, be short. If ‘e’ and ‘o’ are ever short these sounds must be acknowledged as completely different sounds from long ‘e’ and ‘o’.

Identity and Religious Community

In this debate on sounds, and in his appropriation of the *Kaccāyana* tradition in general, Moggallāna appears to have viewed the Rūp of Buddhappiya as a standard of the *Kaccāyana* tradition and, therefore, used the work as his primary object of criticism. This would make sense since the Rūp was the most recent production within the *Kaccāyana* tradition at the time and its author lived nearby on what is now the northern

²¹ Mogg-p-ṭ B° 21: *kocī ti sāsanappasādakacōḷiyabuddhappiyācariyaṃ dasseti*.

²² Rūp B° 4: *kvaci saṃyogapubbā ekārokarā rassā iva vuccante. yathā ettha, seyyo, oṭṭho, soṭṭhi. kvacī ti kiṃ? maṃ ce tvaṃ nikhaṇaṃ vane. putto ty āhaṃ mahārāja*.

It is noteworthy that Moggallāna does not address the counterexamples given by Buddhappiya, viz. ‘maṃ ce tvaṃ nikhaṇaṃ vane’ and ‘putto ty āhaṃ mahārāja’. As far as I am aware, the only *Moggallāna* grammar to do so is Ledi Sayadaw’s *Niruttiḍḍipāṇī* (c.19th). When discussing the *sūtra* Mogg.4 *pubbo rasso* (The first [of the pairs of vowels] are short), Ledi Sayadaw adds a qualification that ‘e’ and ‘o’ are short before a conjunct consonant only in the same word (*ekapadasaṃyoga*) and not before a conjunct consonant in a different word (*padantarasāṃyoga*). He also admits, though, that even in the same word, ‘e’ and ‘o’ are sometimes long before a conjunct consonant:

Nir-d B° 3, 8–13: *tattha eta, ota iti dve ekapadasaṃyoge pare kvaci labbhanti. eṭṭhi, seṭṭho, oṭṭho, soṭṭhi. ekapadasaṃyoge ti kiṃ? padantarasāṃyoge pare rassā mā hontū ti. maṃ ce tvaṃ nikhaṇaṃ vane* [Ja B° 2.149] *putto ty āhaṃ mahārāja* [Ja B° 1.2]. *kvacī ti kiṃ? ekapadasaṃyoge pi vaggantesu vā ya-ra-la-vesu vā paresu rassā mā hontū ti. enti, senti, eyya, bhāseyya, meṇḍo, soṇḍo*.

“In this connection, both [short] ‘e’ and ‘o’ are sometimes found before a conjunct consonant in the same word. For example: ‘eṭṭhi’, ‘seṭṭho’ and ‘oṭṭho’, ‘soṭṭhi’. Why ‘before a conjunct consonant in the same word’? There should not be short [‘e’ and ‘o’] before a conjunct consonant in a different word. For example, ‘maṃ ce tvaṃ nikhaṇaṃ vane’ and ‘putto ty āhaṃ mahārāja’. Why ‘sometimes’? Even before a conjunct consonant in the same word, [‘e’ and ‘o’] should not be short before a nasal (*vagganta*) or a semi-vowel. For example ‘enti’ (they go), ‘senti’ (they lie), ‘eyya’ (it should be), ‘bhāseyya’ (one should proclaim), ‘meṇḍo’ (a ram) and ‘soṇḍo’ (a drunkard).”

coast of Tamil Nadu. Moggallāna and Buddhappiya, then, not only shared a common grammatical culture but were situated within a wider religious and political network. In this regard, situating their grammatical debate within the wider socio-political context at the time may provide further information on the schism within the Pāli grammatical tradition and the nature of Parākramabāhu I's reforms in 1156.

The colophon to the Rūp states that 'this correct *Rūpasiddhi* was composed by a monk named Buddhappiya, also known as Dīpaṅkara—a student of the excellent teacher Ānanda *thera*, who was like a standard for Tambapaṇṇi (Laṅkā)—he (Dīpaṅkara) was renowned like a lamp in the Damiḷa country, and being the chief incumbent of two monasteries including Bālādicca, caused the religion to shine forth.'²³ The Sinhala commentary, the *Rūpasiddhi-sannaya* (Rūp-sn), glosses 'Damiḷa country' (*damīlavasumatī*) with 'coḷadeśaya' (Cōḷa country) and 'soḷīraṭa' (Cōḷa kingdom). In addition, the Rūp-sn (1926: 444, 14) states that the other monastery Buddhappiya resided at was the 'Cūḍāmaṇikarmavihāraya'. Paranavitana (1944, pp. 17–25) has persuasively argued that this monastery can be identified with the Cūḍāmaṇivarmavihāra, the construction of which is referred to in the Leiden Copper Plates as being requested by the ruler of Śrīvijaya, Māraṇijayōttuṅgavarman of the Śailendra dynasty. This monastery was further endowed by Rājaraḷa I (r. 985–1014), Rājendra I (r. 1014–1032) and Kulōttuṅga I (r. 1120–1163). The Cūḍāmaṇivarmavihāra was located in the city of Nāgapattanam, modern day Nagapattinam, in Cōḷa country. It is likely, therefore, that Buddhappiya was head monk (*adhivāsa*) at both of these prominent monasteries in the Cōḷa kingdom, the Bālādiccavihāra and the Cūḍāmaṇivarmavihāra (P. Cūḍāmaṇivammavihāra).

The specific mention of Buddhappiya's Cōḷa background conforms to a wider tendency in this period for monks to identify themselves with the kingdom in which they were writing. In her groundbreaking work *Imagining a Place for Buddhism*, Anne Monius (2001, p. 123) explores this issue in depth and states that '...with the writings of South Indian Buddhist monks such as Buddhappiya, Kassapa, and others, the terms of articulating identity, an author's place in the Buddhist world and literary culture, change dramatically. Pāli commentators and editors writing in a transregional language associate the authors of their respective texts with the Cōḷa or Tamil country or realm (*coḷaraṭṭhe*, *damīlaraṭṭhe*) or simply refer to the writer as Coliya or Damiḷa.' The *Moggallāna* grammarians too were also sensitive to Buddhappiya's Cōḷa identity since, as I have shown above, Saṅgharakkhita calls Buddhappiya 'the Teacher, Coliya Buddhappiya, purifier of the religion'.

Despite this differentiation of the *saṅgha* along regional lines, it is clear that Cōḷa monks interacted heavily with their Sinhala-speaking counterparts (Monius 2001; Liyanagamage 1978). For instance, Buddhappiya praises his Laṅkan teacher Ānanda *thera*, a monk who is likely identical with an Ānanda *thera* mentioned as 'a

²³ Translation adapted from Liyanagamage (1978, p. 115).

Rūp B° 1:

*vikhyātānandatheravhayavaragurunam tambapaṇṇiddhajānam,
sisso dīpaṅkarākhyaddamīlavasumatīdīpaladdhappakāso;
bālādiccādivāsadvitayam adhivasaṃ sāsanaṃ jotayī yo,
so 'yaṃ buddhappiyavho yati imam ujukaṃ rūpasiddhiṃ akāsi.*

banner raised aloft in the land of Laṅkā' in the inscription of Sundaramahādevī, the queen of Vikkamabāhu II (r.1116-37) (Matsumura 1999, p. 158). Buddhappiya's relationship with the Laṅkan *saṅgha* has caused great confusion in the history of medieval Laṅkā. Until recently, Buddhappiya has often been considered identical to his namesake, the author of the *Pajjamadhu*, a Pāli devotional poem to the Buddha. The latter Buddhappiya states that his teacher was 'Araññaratana' Ānanda.

Since Araññaratana Ānanda wrote a Sinhala commentary on the *Padasādhana* of Piyadassī, Moggallāna's pupil, he is dated to the thirteenth century. As a consequence, scholars have often placed Buddhappiya, author of the *Rūp*, in the thirteenth century too. However, Matsumura (1999, p. 158) has convincingly argued that these two Buddhappiyas, both with teachers called Ānanda, are in fact different monks. This is supported by the fact that Moggallāna, writing in the middle of the twelfth century, uses Buddhappiya's *Rūp* as his main source for the *Kaccāyana* grammatical tradition. It would be impossible for Buddhappiya, author of the *Rūp*, to be the pupil of Araññaratana Ānanda, a monk who wrote in the thirteenth century.

The regional differentiation of monks in this period was perhaps influenced by their associations with royal power and the political tensions between Laṅkā and the mainland in the preceding centuries. For instance, it is well established that in the eleventh century the Cōlas founded a kingdom in Laṅkā. However, there is little evidence that any political animosity caused by this invasion seeped into monastic relations. In this regard, Liyanagamage (1978, p. 134) states, 'Cola *mahatheras* like Dipankara and Kassapa were held in the highest esteem in Ceylon, and nowhere in the record is the slightest insinuation that they hailed from an "enemy" territory or belonged to a different racial group.'²⁴

Rather than animosity, then, the political tension between the regions perhaps led to the two groups having greater autonomy in their monastic practice. Liyanagamage and Monius have both outlined in detail various indications of the separation of the Cōla and Laṅkan *saṅghas* during this period. However, a particular *vinaya* debate between the Cōla and Laṅkan *saṅghas* concerning the legality of unknowingly drinking alcohol is of particular interest. This debate has been studied in detail by Kieffer-Pülz (2005) and so I only focus here on a passage contained in the *Vimativinodanī* (Vmv), the twelfth century *vinaya* commentary of Cōla Kassapa, since it refers to both Sāriputta, Moggallāna's teacher, and to Buddhappiya:²⁵

(20) Further the statement that 'drinking (alcohol) is unwholesome only when done knowingly' is the doctrine only of the Abhayagiri schismatics. However, without knowing that this is the doctrine of others (*paravāda*, i.e. of the schismatics), the authors of the *Gaṇṭhipadas* wrote it down, having included it in their own doctrine. Also, having entered the Vibhajjavādin school (*maṇḍala*), it defiles the religion even today. (21.1) And formerly, even in this Damiḷa kingdom, a certain schismatic elder called 'Nāgasena' had the *Kuṇḍalakesīvatthu* composed in Tamil verse for the purpose of illustrating ways to refute (lit. crush) the doctrines of others. He taught the author/poet (*kavī*) of the poem (*kabbākāra*) many wrong principles, such as: [1] 'Drinking wine is

²⁴ Also quoted in Monius (2001, p. 125).

²⁵ I am thankful to Paolo Visigalli for his helpful suggestions on my translation of the following passage.

unwholesome in principle only when done knowingly'; further, [2] 'It is not possible to know in specific detail (*salakkhaṇavasena*) the omniscient knowledge, which is boundless in time and space, since the delimitation of knowledge would result (unwantedly) in the destruction of the boundlessness of what is knowable. But it is possible to know (the omniscient knowledge) only in terms of its general content, such as impermanence etc.'; [3] 'Just as the division of ultimate dhammas begins with name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*), so too the division of objects begins with conventions, such as 'person' (*puggala*)'.

Due to the false purposes of this work, he had [the poem] composed and caused a confusion of mindfulness. And, on account of this poem this heretical doctrine remained here for a long time, commingled in the doctrine of the Vibhajjavādins. (21.2) Furthermore, after this, even though the teaching was purified by the Great Elder, Teacher Buddhappiya—who was establishing a completely pure religion here, having destroyed the net of (wrong) views inside and out—on account of the reconciliatory statement in the *Sāratthadīpanī vinaya* sub-commentary that 'the thoughts of one drinking wine are unwholesome only when it is done consciously', the [doctrine] reared its head again due to some of corrupt thoughts. (21.3) And the Great Elders, having investigated and crushed this contemptible doctrine and also expelled the monks who adhered to it, suppressed this [doctrine] for a long time according to the *dhamma*, *vinaya*, and the teaching of the teacher. Accordingly, here, we have refuted this doctrine extensively so that this belief may not defile other Vibhajjavādins. Therefore, here, after considering the explicit (*vutta*) and implicit (*avutta*) evidence thoroughly, one should understand the topic like this since it does not conflict with scriptural authority (*āgama*).²⁶

²⁶ Kieffer-Pülz's (2005, pp. 200–201) edition of this passage in the Vmv (Vmv B^e 1.117ff) is as follows: (20) *yaṃ pana "jānitvā pivantass' eva akusalan ti gahaṇaṃ"* (Vmv I 114, 18; Anhang 2, Sect. 14.1), *taṃ bhinnaladdhikānaṃ Abhayagirikādīnaṃ eva mataṃ. Taṃ pana Gaṇṭhipadakāraḥkādhī "paravādo" ti ajānantehi attano matiyā saṃsanditvā likhitaṃ Vibhajjavādīmaṇḍalam pi pavisitvā yāvajjatanā sāsanaṃ dūseti.*

(21.1) *Purāpi kira imasmim pi Damiḷaraṭṭhe koci bhinnaladdhiko Nāgaseno nāma thero Kuṇḍalakesivathuṃ paravādamathananayadassanathāṃ dāṇiḷakabbarūpena kārento: "imaṃ surāpānassa jānitvā va pivane akusalanayaṃ; aññañ ca desa-kālādibhedena anantam pi ñeyyaṃ sabbaññutaññāṇaṃ salakkhaṇavasena' eva ñātuṃ na sakkoti, ñāṇena paricchinattena ñeyyassa anantattahānippasaṅgato; aniccādisāmañña-lakkhaṇavasena' eva pana ñātuṃ sakkoti" ti ca; "paramatthadhammesu nāmarūpan ti ādibhedo viya puggalāsammuti pi visuṃ vatthubhedo evā" ti ca evamādikaṃ bahuṃ viparītattathanayaṃ kabbākārassa kavino upadisitvā tasmim pabandhe kāraṇābhāsehi satim sammohetvā pabandhāpesi. Tañ ca kabbam nissāya imaṃ bhinnaladdikamataṃ idha [118] Vibhajjavādimate sammissaṃ ciraṃ pavattittha.*

(21.2) *Taṃ pana pacchā Ācariya-Buddhappiya-Mahātherena bāhirabbhārikaṃ dīṭṭhijālaṃ vighātetvā idha parisuddhaṃ sāsanaṃ paṭiṭṭhāpentena sodhitam pi Sāratthadīpaniyā Vinayaṭṭikāya surāpānassa "sacittakapakkhe yeva cittaṃ akusalan" ti (≠ Sp-ṭ II 39, 26–40, 1.2.21–22) samatthanavacanaṃ nissāya kehici vipallatthacittehi puna ukkhittasiraṃ jātaṃ.*

(21.3) *Tañ ca Mahātherehi vinicchinittvā gārayhavādaṃ katvā madditvā laddhigāhake ca bhikkhū viyojetvā dhammena vinayena satthusāsanena ciren' eva vūpasamitaṃ. Ten' ev' ettha mayaṃ evaṃ vitthārato idaṃ paṭikkhipimha "mā aññe pi Vibhajjavādino ayaṃ laddhi dūsesi" ti. Tasmā idha vuttāni avuttāni ca kāraṇāni suṭṭhu sallakkhetvā yathā Āgamavirodho na hoti, tathā attho gahetabbo.*

Kieffer-Pülz's (2005, pp. 221–223) translation of this passage differs slightly from my own and is as follows: '(20) Die [Auffassung] aber, daß nur für einen, der [Alkohol] trinkt, [obwohl] er weiß [, daß es Alkohol ist, das Denken] unheilsam [ist], das ist die Meinung nur der Schismatiker, [i.e.] der Abhayagirin usw. Das aber [was] von den Autoren der **Gaṇṭhipadas** usw., ohne zu wissen, daß es die Doktrin Anderer (i.e. die falsche Ansichten vertreten) ist, geschrieben wurde, nachdem sie es mit der eigenen Meinung

In this description, Cōla Kassapa, writing just after the reforms of Parākramabāhu I, provides a wealth of information regarding the relationship between the Cōla and Laṅkan *saṅghas* at the time of the separation of the *Kaccāyana* and *Moggallāna* grammatical traditions. For instance, it is clear that Kassapa views his own religious community and those in Laṅkā as being part of the same Vibhajjavādin school (*maṇḍala*).²⁷ However, he states that this doctrine concerning wine drinking re-entered the Cōla *saṅgha* from the *Sāratthadīpanī* (Sp-ṭ), a *vinaya* sub-commentary written by Sāriputta, leading scholar of Parākramabāhu's reforms and teacher of Moggallāna. It is possible that the mention of this doctrine in Sāriputta's Sp-ṭ caused tension between the *saṅghas* in Laṅkā and Cōla country.

Such a separation between the Cōla and Laṅkan *saṅghas* is hinted at in the passage, since Buddhappiya, most likely the same Buddhappiya as the author of the Rūp, appears to have conducted some reforms to rid the *saṅgha* of this doctrine. The

Footnote 26 continued

vermischt hatten, befleckt, nachdem [es] auch in den Zirkel der **Vibhajjavādin** eingedrungen ist, die Lehre (*sāsana*) [des Buddha] bis zum heutigen Tag.

(21) Früher aber ließ bekanntlich auch in diesem Königreich Damiḷa ein bestimmter Schismatiker, ein Thera namens **Nāgasena**, nach der Form eines tamilischen Kāvya das **Kuṇḍalakesivātthu** verfassen, um die Methode zu zeigen, die Doktrin Anderer zu verwirren: "(1) Der Grundsatz des unheilsamen [Denkens] für das Trinken von Alkohol [gilt] nur beim Trinken, wenn man vorher weiß [, daß man Alkohol trinkt]: unter (2) die allwissende Erkenntnis (Allwissenheit) vermag ein zu Erkennendes, das gemäß der Unterscheidung nach Raum, Zeit usw. aber unendlich [ist], nicht wirklich kraft [seines] spezifischen Merkmals (*salakkhaṇa*) zu erkennen, wegen der [unerwünschten] Folge, daß durch das Erkennen mit seiner Begrenztheit die Unendlichkeit des zu Erkennenden schwinden [würde]; und nur kraft [seines] allgemeinen Kennzeichens (*sāmaññalakkhaṇa*) 'vergänglich' usw. vermag [die allwissende Erkenntnis dieses] zu erkennen; (3) wie unter den höchsten Gegebenheiten (*paramatthadhamma*) 'Name und Form' eine Art von Beginn [, so ist] auch der Ausdruck 'Individuum' getrennt nur eine Art Grundlage / Gegenstand [für die Sinne(?)]."

Indem er den Dichter, den Kāvya-Verfasser, viele so beginnende Folgerung[en] verkehrten Inhalts lehrte [und] bei der Verfassung [des Werkes] mit als Grund/Begründung [dienenden] Reden [dessen] Achtsamkeit verwirrte/trübte, veranlasste er [ihn des Werk] zu verfassen. Und gestützt auf dieses Kāvya bestand diese Meinung der Schismatiker, die hier [118] in die Meinung der **Vibhajjavādin** hineingemischt ist, für lange Zeit.

(21.2) Obwohl diese [Lehre] aber später durch den Ācariya, Mahāthera **Buddhappiya**, nachdem er das zu den äußeren (=den abgespaltenen Sekten?) und den inneren (=den Mahāvihārin?) gehörige Netz der [falschen] Ansichten zerschlagen hat, gereinigt wurde, indem er hier (i.e. im Königreich Damiḷa [?]) die reine Lehre etablierte, hat dennoch diese [falsche Meinung] wieder [ihren] Kopf erhoben, [und zwar] durch gewisse verkehrte Gedanken, die auf eine Aussage in dem Vinaya-Subkommentar, **Sāratthadīpanī**, gestützt sind, [eine Aussage,] die untermauert, daß beim Trinken von Alkohol *nur im Falle eines Vorsatzes das Denken unheilsam ist*.

(21.3) Und nachdem diese [falsche Meinung] durch die Mahātherās untersucht, zu einer verachtenswerten Doktrin erklärt [und] vernichtet wurde und die Mönche, die an [dieser falschen] Ansicht festhalten veranlaßt wurden, sich [von dem Nikāya?] zu trennen (i.e. aus der Gemeinde auszutreten?), ist [diese falsche Ansicht] gemäß dem Dhamma, gemäß dem Vinaya und gemäß dem Lehre des Lehrers nach wirklich langer Zeit [nun] ausgelöscht. Nur deshalb weisen wir dieses hier so ausführlich zurück, damit diese [falsche] Ansicht nicht auch andere Vibhajjavādin korrumpiert. Deshalb soll man die Bedeutung so aufnehmen, wie kein Widerspruch zum **Āgama** vorliegt, nachdem man die hier genannten und nicht genannten Gründe gut geprüft hat.'

²⁷ For more information on the designation 'Vibhajjavādin' for the monastic lineage that is described here as 'Theravāda', see Cousins (2001).

use of 'here' (*idha*) in Kassapa's description would suggest that these reforms were local and may only have included Cōla monks. Further, a reference to Buddhappiya's *saṅgha* reforms is perhaps latent in Saṅgharakkhita's description of him as a 'purifier of the religion' (*sāsanappasādaka*) in the Mogg-p-ṭ.²⁸ If the Cōla monks indeed held a separate reform council a few years before the Laṅkan monks did the same, it would suggest an increased regionalisation, perhaps even a regional consciousness, within the Vibhajjavādin sect at the time.

It is possible that these reforms, while both intending to standardise monastic practice, had different goals in mind. For instance, Kassapa accuses the Abhayagiri *nikāya* of creating this doctrine concerning wine drinking and labels its inclusion in Sāriputta's sub-commentary as a 'reconciling statement' (*samatthanavacana*). His position, then, can potentially be seen as accommodating to some degree the Abhayagiri position that drinking wine is unwholesome only when done intentionally.²⁹ Therefore, it could be interpreted that Kassapa viewed Sāriputta as a mediator between the various positions of the *nikāyas*, rather than as a strict proponent of Mahāvihāra orthodoxy.

A different intellectual approach between the two *nikāyas* may also be gleaned from further information in Kassapa's description. For instance, he rebukes the monk Nāgasena for exposing monks to the wine doctrine, even though Nāgasena was discussing these doctrines in order to show ways of refuting them (*paravādamathananayadassanattha*). Compare this standpoint with that of Saṅgharakkhita in a passage in the Mogg-p-ṭ, where he explains Moggallāna's use of a non-Buddhist grammatical example by stating that an engagement with heretical doctrines is beneficial since it allows one to see the flaws in them and to develop faith in one's own doctrine.³⁰ Clearly, when compared to its Cōla counterparts, the

²⁸ Mogg-p-ṭ B^e 21: *kocī ti sāsanappasādakacōḷiyabuddhappiycariyaṃ dasseti*.

²⁹ Gethin (2004) provides an excellent discussion explaining how wholesome (*kusala*) and unwholesome (*akusala*) mental states relate to intentionality.

³⁰ Mogg-p-ṭ B^e 81: *paratthānubaddhakicchaṃ pana mahāpuñṇapañṇā na kiñci viya mañṇanti. hoti (hi) etena parattho: "matantare pi siddhi sissānaṃ, taṃtaṃmatañṇuno vā kadāci karahaci yadidaṃ avalokeyyuṃ te cetthāvatāraṃ labheyyuṃ etādiso ca pañṇavā paṭiladdhabuddhavacanappasādo ti tadavatārena ca buddhe bhagavati kamena daḷhaṃ pasādaṃ paṭilabheyyuṃ" ti. evaṃ evaṃ tattha tattha taṃtaṃbyākaraṇodāharaṇappasaṅge pi tadanusāren' eva tantāṃpayojanaṃ veditabbaṃ. na niratthaka-kathāpasuto 'yam ācariyo ti.*

"Moreover, those of great merit and wisdom do not think that it is a problem to pursue the interests of others. Others' interests [are considered] by this [teacher as follows]:

'Students can have success even in other systems of thought; and whenever and wherever they who are knowledgeable in this or that system of thought analyse it, they should perceive the weakness (*avatāra*) in it. And with this much wisdom, one gains confidence in the discourses of the Buddha. And through [perceiving] this weakness, they would gradually gain great faith in the Lord Buddha.'

In this way, whenever there is an unwanted consequence from this or that grammatical example, one should understand that there are various purposes for using it. This teacher (i.e. Moggallāna) does not pursue pointless discussions."

There is also another possible interpretation of this passage, where the subject '*taṃtaṃmatañṇuno*' does not refer to the students who have had success in others' doctrines but to other non-Buddhists. In this case, '*avatāra*' could mean an entry point and the sense of the passage would be that non-Buddhists could find an entry point in the Buddha's doctrine due to a doctrinally familiar grammatical example.

Laṅkan *saṅgha* was more engaged with non-Vibhajjavādin thought. It seems, then, that this different intellectual approach allowed Moggallāna to create a new system of Pāli grammar using a large variety of sources from non-Theravāda communities.

The hypothesis that the Cōḷa and Laṅkan *saṅghas* had become autonomous entities in the twelfth century, marked most perspicuously by holding separate reforms from each other, is supported by a passage in the *Cūlavamsa* concerning the reign of Parākrāmabāhu II. According to the verse, due to the degeneration of the Laṅkan *saṅgha*, Parākrāmabāhu II sent gifts to the Cōḷa kingdom and invited disciplined and learned Cōḷa monks to Laṅkā, thereby unifying the two orders (*kārāpesi samaggaṃ so rājā ubhayasāsanaṃ*).³¹ Geiger (1953, p. 354) interprets the two orders (*ubhayasāsana*) here to mean the ‘*hīnayāna*’ and ‘*mahāyāna*’. However, in light of the context of the growing autonomy of the Cōḷa and Laṅkan *saṅghas* in the preceding decades, the term ‘*ubhayasāsana*’ seems much more likely to refer to the Cōḷa and Laṅkan monastic communities. This passage in the *Cūlavamsa*, then, clearly shows that there was a desire for the reunification of the Cōḷa and Laṅkan *saṅghas*, which were considered separate entities in this period.

In her study of the development of such regional monastic identities in Laṅkā and Damiḷa country at the time, Monius (2001, p. 126) provides the most perceptive conclusions on this matter when she states that ‘...perhaps the identification of Coḷiya monks and Coḷiya grammar in this era is tied to a closer association of two different orders—the Tamil-speaking and the Sinhala-speaking—than ever before; close contact might have created a need to differentiate, to mark boundaries between monastic associations ever more clearly. However, the breakdown in international relations, particularly those between South India and Sri Lanka, near the end of the tenth century perhaps also contributed to a newfound need to associate oneself and one’s monastic lineage with one side of the conflict, even if such political mechanisms did not necessarily translate into animosity among various monastic communities.’

Sacred Text, Language, and Languages

In light of these considerations, in the following sections I explore some of the reasons given by the *Moggallāna* grammatical tradition for the dispute on the number of sounds. I investigate these official narratives and seek to understand some of the deeper cultural currents that shape them.

Moggallāna’s reasoning for the addition of short ‘*e*’ and ‘*o*’ is clear. He states that he includes these sounds since they are found in the language of Magadha (*māgadhikāya bhāsāya*).³² Māgadha/ī or Māgadhabhāsā, referring to the language

³¹ CI (1980, p. 155, [84:10]):

*pasiddhe Coḷiye bhikkhū ānetvā Tambapaṇṇiyaṃ
kārāpesi samaggaṃ so rājā ubhayasāsanaṃ.*

(Having brought the preeminent Coḷiya monks to Tambapaṇṇi the king united the two orders.)

³² Mogg-p (1931, p. 6, l. 19–20).

of the geographical area or the inhabitants of Magadha, is commonly used in Pāli commentarial literature to refer to canonical and non-canonical language (Crosby 2004, pp. 74–78). In stating in his incipit that his work was a grammar of Māgadha (*māgadham saddalakkhaṇam*), Moggallāna delineates his object of study as including both canonical and non-canonical literature. In contrast, the Kacc defines its parameters of analysis as ‘*jinavacana*’ (the discourses of the Buddha), a term used almost exclusively for the Pāli canon. However, this restriction is not strictly observed by later *Kaccāyana* grammarians, who include non-canonical examples in their discussions. Despite such discrepancies, it can be generalised that the Kacc sets out to describe a corpus of literature (*jinavacana*), whereas the Mogg expands the parameters of language worth theorising and describes the language as a whole.

Buddhaghosa describes Māgadhabhāsā in both the *Visuddhimagga* and the *Sammohavinodanī*, his commentary to the *Vibhaṅga*, as the root language (*mūla-bhāsā*) of all beings and a natural language (*sabhāvanirutti*) uniquely capable of conveying the Buddha’s doctrine.³³ While the scholar monks subsequent to Buddhaghosa accepted and reiterated these claims, by the twelfth century the *Moggallāna* grammarians also appealed to Māgadhabhāsā as a specific language of a region or community in order to provide a language-specific treatment of its phonology, criticising *Kaccāyana* for treating Pāli phonology as if it were Sanskrit. Therefore, while they shared Buddhaghosa’s belief in the universality of Pāli as the root language (*mūla-bhāsā*), the grammarians also used the idea of Magadha to stress the particular features of Pāli as a language in the world different from the other languages that surrounded it. This transition from describing a corpus of literature to treating Pāli as a language in its own right begs the question: What stimulated this change of focus? Is there evidence in the Pāli grammatical tradition that records this transition?

To provide an answer it is perhaps helpful to return to the developments in the *Kaccāyana* tradition prior to the creation of the *Moggallāna* system. The term ‘*jinavacana*’ occurs at Kacc.52 *jinavacanayuttaṃ hi* (In conformity with the discourses of the Buddha). This *sūtra* heads the section on nominal declension in the Kacc and, as an *adhikāra sūtra*, it governs all the rules that follow in the grammar. This is made clear since Saṅghanandī, author of the *vutti*, continues the term ‘*jinavacanayutta*’ in his gloss on the next two *sūtras*, Kacc.53 *liṅgaṃ ca nipajjate* (A nominal stem is also to be treated in conformity with the discourses of the Buddha) and Kacc.54 *tato ca vibhattiyo* (Case endings [are appointed] after a nominal stem that is in conformity with the discourses of the Buddha).³⁴

By the time Buddhappiya was commenting on this *sūtra* in the *Rūpasiddhi*, interpretations had developed considerably. He states:

This is a governing [rule]. Here, ‘the conqueror’, [i.e.] the Buddha, means ‘He has conquered the five Māras’. The discourses of the conqueror are ‘*jinavacana*’. That which is connected to the discourses of the conqueror is ‘*jinavacanayutta*’. This governing [rule] is to be understood as meaning ‘Only connected, conforming, to the scriptures (*tepitaka*), the discourses of the

³³ Vsm XIV, 25; Vibh-a B° 387.

³⁴ This function of Kacc.52 as an *adhikāra* (governing) *sūtra* is captured in Senart’s (1871, p. 33) translation: ‘[Les règles qui vont suivre sont fondées] sur l’usage des discours du Buddha.’

Buddha, the natural language (*sabhāvanirutti*) of the Magadhan people (*māgadhi*).³⁵

This language of Magadha is the root language, in which men of the first eon, Brahmas, those who have never heard speech, and also Buddhas speak.

Further, a governing [rule] is threefold, viz. the mannerism of a lion, the mannerism of a frog, and a sequential [application]. This [rule] is either the mannerism of a lion, since it gazes both forwards and backwards,³⁵ or it is only [applied] sequentially.

Indicating the dissimilarity with Sanskrit, [this] meta-rule is said for the purpose of establishing the Prakrit in conformity with the discourses of the conqueror.³⁶

The first point of note in Buddhapiya's analysis is that he expands the sense of 'jinavacana' to include Māgadha, defined here as a primordial, trans-mundane language. While the Pāli canon certainly forms a part of a wider 'language of Magadha', it is clear here that Buddhapiya is referring to Māgadha as a whole, a language spoken by men of the first eon, Brahmas and Buddhas. Therefore, within this terminological shift, it is perhaps possible to perceive a change in the focus of the *Kaccāyana* tradition from text (*jinavacana*) to language as a whole (*māgadha*).

Evidence of this expansion of focus is also present in Buddhapiya's analysis of the grammatical function of the *sūtra*. For instance, Buddhapiya clearly saw a problem with this governing (*adhikāra*) *sūtra* occurring after the section on phonology. As I have shown above, in his gloss Saṅghanandi indicates that this *sūtra* only governs the rules that follow it, thereby excluding the section on phonology. Buddhapiya, therefore, is eager to stress that Kaccāyana's phonological discussions are also in accordance with the discourses of the Buddha (*jinavacanayutta*) and states that this *sūtra* can be interpreted as a 'mannerism of a lion' (*sīhagatika*) governing rule, so-called because it gazes forwards and back, i.e. it applies to the *sūtras* that precede it and follow it. However, Buddhapiya also acknowledges the validity of the traditional interpretation that this *sūtra* only applies to the rules that follow it.³⁷

³⁵ I thank Aleix Ruiz-Falqués for pointing out to me that the Mmd ad Kacc.52 states that 'the mannerism of a lion' refers to when a lion sits and moves his head from left to right.

³⁶ Rūp B^e 41: *adhikāro 'yaṃ. tattha pañca māre jītavā ti jino, buddho. jinassa vacanaṃ jinavacanaṃ, tassa jinavacanassa yuttaṃ jinavacanayuttaṃ. teṭṭakassa buddhavacanassa māgadhiṃ sabhāvaniruttiyā yuttaṃ anurūpam evā ti idaṃ adhikāratthaṃ vedītabbaṃ.*

*sā māgadhi mūlabhāsā, narā yāyādikappikā;
brahmāno ca 'ssutālāpā, sambuddhā cāpi bhāsare.*

adhikāro pana tividho sīhagatikamaṇḍūkagatikayathānupubbikavasena, ayaṃ pana sīhagatiko pubbāparavilokanato, yathānupubbiko yeva vā. sakkatavisadisam katvā jinavacanānurūpavasena pakatīthapanatthaṃ paribhāsam āha.

³⁷ The three types of *adhikāra sūtra* mentioned by Buddhapiya are first mentioned in Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (Mbh) on A.1.1.49 *śaṣṭhī sthāneyogā* (Katre 1987, p. 19): 'The sixth (*śaṣṭhī*) sUP triplet is used to indicate that the expression after which it is introduced is the substituendum (*sthāne-yogā*)'. He states:

Mbh I, p. 119, 1. 9–13: *adhikāro nāma triprakāraḥ. kaścid ekadeśasthaḥ sarvaṃ śāstram abhivālayati yathā pradīpaḥ suprajvalitaḥ sarvaṃ veśmābhijvalayati. aparo 'dhikāro yathā rajjvāyasā vā baddhaṃ kṣāṭham anukṛṣyate tadvad anukṛṣyate cakāreṇa. aparo 'dhikāraḥ pratiyogaṃ tasyānirdeśārtha itī yoge yoga upatiṣṭhate.*

'Because an *adhikāra* is of three kinds. A certain kind, standing at its one place, illumines the whole corpus of rules as a bright-shining lamp fully illumines a house. Another [kind of] *adhikāra* is dragged

The trace of an idea that phonological discussions in Pāli grammar were not exclusively concerned with ‘the discourses of the Buddha’ is perhaps reflected in a statement by the *Kaccāyana* commentator Vimalabuddhi in his *Mukhamattadīpanī* (Mmd) on Kacc.2 *akkharāp’ ādayo ekacattālīsaṃ*:

Or rather there is an objection (*codanā*) that, since there is mention of [the sounds] ‘a’ etc. in the expression ‘the sounds beginning with “a”’, why is ‘forty-one’ mentioned? Here, the answer (*parihāra*) is that [the enumeration of sounds] indicates that the forty-one [sounds] are a help [in understanding] the *suttantas*, even though there are also other sounds existing outside [of the *suttantas*].³⁸

In his commentary on Mogg.1.1 *ādayo titālīsaṃ*, Moggallāna seizes upon this passage to call into question the *Kaccāyana* tradition’s observations on Pāli phonology. However, his reading of the passage omits the important concessive ‘even though’ (*pana*) and therefore, according to him, the Mmd statement reads: ‘... [the enumeration of sounds] indicates that the forty-one [sounds] are a help [in understanding] the *suttantas* and that there are other sounds existing outside [of the *suttantas*]’. His criticism of this statement is as follows:

Further, it is said in the *Kaccāyanavuttivaṇṇanā* (i.e. the Mmd) that ‘the enumeration of sounds indicates that there are other sounds also existing outside [of the *suttantas*]’. This is not suitable, due to the uselessness [of indicating that there are other sounds outside]. That which has a use is to be taught, nothing else.³⁹

Footnote 37 continued

along by means of the particle *ca* ‘and’, just like a log is dragged along which has been tied to a rope or an iron chain. Another [kind of] *adhikāra* makes its presence in rule after rule so that it need not be stated in each subsequent rule.” (Translation by Kahrs 1998, p. 208.)

The first and third types of *adhikāra* mentioned by Patañjali correspond well with the ‘mannerism of a lion’ (*sīhagatika*) and the ‘sequential’ (*yathāpubbika*) governing rules mentioned by Buddhappiya. It is likely that the so-called ‘mannerism of a frog’ (*maṇḍūkagatika*) governing rule included by Buddhappiya operates in an analogous way to the type of *anuvṛtti* known as a ‘frog’s leap’ (*maṇḍūkaplutī*). This type of *anuvṛtti* allows for the words of a former *sūtra* to be inserted into another *sūtra* by ‘jumping’ over any intervening *sūtras*. Therefore, one might imagine that a ‘mannerism of a frog’ *adhikāra* would allow the application of the *adhikāra* to some *sūtras* and not others, by jumping over any intervening *sūtras*. In any case, Buddhappiya utilises these various types of *adhikāra* to explain how the rule Kacc.52 ‘*jina-avacanayuttaṃ hi*’ also governs the preceding section on phonology.

³⁸ Mmd (2454: p. 8): *athavā akkharāpādayo ti vutte yeva akārādīnaṃ gahaṇe sati pi ekacattālīsaṃ ti kasmā vuttan ti codanā. idha suttantopakārā ekacattālīsaṃ, bahiddhā pana aññe pi akkharā santī ti nāpanatthan ti parihāro*. I am grateful to Aleix Ruiz Falqués for clarifying the sense of this passage.

³⁹ Mogg-p (1931, p. 6, 1. 30–33): *yam pana vuttaṃ kaccāyanavuttivaṇṇanāyaṃ “gaṇanapariccheto bahiddhā aññe pi akkharā santī ti nāpanattho” ti tad ayuttaṃ taññāpane payojanābhāvā sappayojanaṃ hi nāpetabbaṃ netaran ti*.

One can imagine that, despite Buddhappiya's attempts to reinterpret Kacc.52 'jinavacanayuttam hi' as also governing the section on phonology, the Mmd's statement here (according to Moggallāna's reading), compounded by the position of Kacc.52, would provide Moggallāna enough material to doubt the accuracy of the *Kaccāyana* tradition's phonological observations.

As I have shown, the main argument offered by the *Moggallāna* grammarians against the *Kaccāyana* tradition is that they relied too much on Sanskrit and did not take into account the specific characteristics of the Māgadha language. It is true that, within the *Kaccāyana sūtras* and *vṛtti*, there is little evidence the authors saw 'jinavacana' as a language in its own right (Pind 2012, p. 77). This term only refers to a specific body of literature and, at best, differentiates the object of study, i.e. the Pāli canon, from language as a whole, the parameters of which were almost exclusively defined by Sanskrit literary culture.⁴⁰

It is only within the Rūp that Kacc.52 is interpreted as differentiating Pāli as a language from other languages. For instance, in the last line of his discussion of Kacc.52, Buddhappiya states that 'this *paribhāsā* has the purpose of establishing the Prakrit in conformity with the discourses of the Buddha, as different from Sanskrit.' Moggallāna, too, states in the Mogg-p that his use of the term 'Māgadha' to describe his grammar serves the purpose of differentiating his work from grammars of Sanskrit etc.:

Since grammar is manifold on account of the different [languages] such as Sanskrit etc. (*sakkaṭādi*), in order to distinguish my grammar, it is said 'Māgadha'. *Māgadha* words are those [words] that are understood in the Magadha region/among Magadhans. This [work] is a *Māgadha* grammar (*lakkhaṇa*) of those [words]. It is said 'A grammar of *Māgadha*'.⁴¹

Sanḥarakkhita in the Mogg-p-ṭ explains that '*sakkaṭādi*' here refers to other Prakrits, Paisāci and Apabrahṃsā too.⁴² Therefore, the self-conscious differentiation of Pāli as a language first found in the Rūp perhaps reaches its full systematised development in the *Moggallāna* system.

In this context, the *Moggallāna* tradition's appeal to a supposed Magadhan linguistic community to validate its description of sounds can be understood. It is possible that the Kacc, as a grammar of a corpus of literature, brought the Pāli canon into the fold of literary, cosmopolitan language since it became subject to the technologies of Sanskrit, the archetypal South Asian cosmopolitan language. 'Language' here was exclusively delimited by Sanskrit, a paradigm in which Pāli had to assimilate. However, within the later *Kaccāyana* tradition and the

⁴⁰ These dynamics have interesting parallels with the relationship between other southern South Asian languages and Sanskrit. See, for instance, Freeman's (1998) work on the historical differentiation of Malayalam in Kerala.

⁴¹ Mogg-p (1931, pp. 3–4, 1. 33–1): *saddalakkhaṇassāpi sakkaṭādibhedena bahuvidhattā sakaṃ saddalakkhaṇaṃ viśeṣayitum āha māgadhaṇ ti magadhesu viditā māgadhā saddā tesam idaṃ lakkhaṇaṃ māgadhaṃ, idaṃ vuttaṃ hoti māgadhaṃ saddalakkhaṇaṇ ti.*

⁴² Mogg-p-ṭ B^e 14: *sakkaṭādi ti ādisaddena pākāṭādiṃ saṅgaṇhāti, bahuvidhattaṃ sakkata-pākata-pesācika-apabbhamsavasena.*

"With the word 'etc.' (*ādi*) in [the expression] 'Sanskrit etc.', one includes 'Prakrit etc.', which is manifold, viz. Sanskrit, Prakrit, Paisāci, and Apabrahṃsā."

Moggallāna tradition, Pāli developed from participating in cosmopolitan ‘language’ to establishing itself as ‘a language’, its grammatical technologies producing results to differentiate it from other languages. This desire to differentiate from Sanskrit, rather than assimilate, perhaps led to the recognition of the pronunciation of short ‘e’ and ‘o’ in the Rūp and their realisation as full-fledged sounds in the Mogg.

The differentiation of Pāli from Sanskrit can also be viewed in the context of the increasing regionalism within the *saṅgha* at the time. For instance, many of the facets of the debate between the *Moggallāna* and *Kaccāyana* traditions share certain similarities with the development of cosmopolitan vernaculars, defined by Sheldon Pollock (2006, p. 23) as ‘the historical process of choosing to create a written literature, along with its complement, a political discourse, in local languages, according to models supplied by a superordinate, usually cosmopolitan, literary language.’ In this regard, *Moggallāna* argues for the existence of short ‘e’ and ‘o’ on the basis that he takes into account the characteristics of Pāli as a language in its own right, whereas he accuses the *Kaccāyana* tradition, in particular his Cōla adversary, Buddhappiya, author of the Rūp, of treating Pāli as if it were Sanskrit. However, in doing so, *Moggallāna* uses the models of cosmopolitan discourse (i.e. the Sanskritic discipline of phonetics) to describe Pāli as an independent language separate from Sanskrit. While this process has certain similarities with the creation of a ‘cosmopolitan vernacular’, the exact dynamics of which have been outlined in detail by Pollock (1998; 2006, pp. 283–482), it is perhaps more appropriate in the case of Prakrits such as Pāli to view the process as part of a broader ‘grammatisation’.⁴³

It is possible that the regionalism described above among the Laṅkan and Cōla monks led to the increasing treatment of Pāli as a literary language with peculiar linguistic properties that distinguished it from its surrounding languages. The reestablishment of the Magadhan realm as the site of the Pāli language perhaps created a territory, albeit an imaginary one, on which the Laṅkan and Cōla *saṅghas* could stake their claim. The Pāli language was no longer a shared, transregional idiom but the site of a struggle between two competing monastic traditions. The destruction of the old Pāli cosmopolitan order by the *Moggallāna* tradition fractured this transregional touchstone, separating the Cōla *Kaccāyana* grammarians from the scholarly cultivation of Pāli and their control of religious discourse in Laṅkā. In its particularised form, the Laṅkan *saṅgha* was able to claim that only they could appreciate the true properties of the Pāli language. In doing so, they placed themselves as cultural heirs to the kingdom of Magadha and also laid claim to ownership of the Pāli language and its cultural formations. In the following sections, I show how the Laṅkan *saṅgha* utilised its newfound linguistic authority in the ritual sphere and provide further evidence that this grammatisation of Pāli was linked to the development of a ‘regional consciousness’ within the Laṅkan *saṅgha*.

Phonetics and Theravāda Ritual

The Pāli grammarians of the twelfth century, then, gave special importance to Pāli-specific phonological analysis, perhaps as part of a growing consciousness of Pāli as

⁴³ I borrow the term ‘grammatisation’ from Auroux (1994).

a language in its own right. However, what are some of the other factors that contributed to this debate? In order to answer this question it is necessary to investigate the reasons given by Moggallāna for the production of his grammatical system. His only overt statement on this matter comes in his opening discussion on the purposes of grammar in the Mogg-p:

But what is the fault in not knowing grammar and what is the benefit in knowing [it]? It is said: The one who is ignorant of grammar is not skilled in the *dhamma* and *vinaya*, and since he is not skilled in them he is not able to practice according to the *dhamma*. In losing [his] practice he partakes only in the suffering of *saṃsāra*, and is not able to become a support for the faithful renunciates, the noble sons. For only those who know grammar, having checked the form according to the meaning and the meaning according to the form, are able to train noble sons in the *dhamma* and *vinaya*; and, having recited the ritual formulae (*kammavācā*) in *vinaya* acts, such as the probation ritual (*parivāsa*), in accordance with the [*vinaya*], [they are able] to complete this or that legal act (*kamma*). No other [can do this]. However, he who does not know grammar and who does not practice accordingly eliminates the three-fold true *dhamma*. To explain: He who does not know grammar destroys scripture (*pariyatti*), which is based on it (i.e. grammar). Then when this is destroyed, practice, which is based on scripture, (is destroyed). And then realisation, which is based on practice, is also destroyed. For the Blessed One has said (AN B^e 1.60 [E^e 1.58]):

‘Monks, these two conditions lead to the confusion and destruction of the true *dhamma*. What two? (1) an incorrectly placed expression and (2) the misunderstanding of meaning. If an expression is misplaced the meaning in turn is liable to be misunderstood (*dunnaya*). These two conditions lead to the confusion and destruction of the true *dhamma*.’

This is the fault in not knowing grammar. Further, the benefit in knowing [grammar] is understood as the opposite of what is said [above].⁴⁴

Moggallāna states, then, that the benefit of knowing grammar is that the canon can be preserved correctly and that its meaning can be understood, that canonical literature can be taught, and that *vinaya* legal acts can be performed. The concern for the preservation of meaning is familiar from the discussions on Kacc.1 by the

⁴⁴ Mogg-p (1931, p. 4, 1. 2–22): *ko pana saddalakkhaṇassa ajānane doso ko cānisaṃso jānane? vuccate: aviññātasaddalakkhaṇo hi dhammavinayesu kusalo na hoti, tesu cākusalattā yathādhammaṃ paṭipajjitum asakkonto. paṭipattiyam virādhettvā saṃsāradukkhass’ eva bhāgī hoti, na ca saddhāpabbajitānaṃ kulaputtānaṃ paṭiṭṭhā bhavitum sakko ti, saddalakkhaṇaññū yeva hi atthānurūpaṃ vyāñjanaṃ vyañjanānurūpaṃ atthaṃ sallakkhetvā dhammavinayesu kulaputte sikkhāpetum parivāsādisu ca vinaya-kammesu tadanurūpaṃ kammavācam katvā taṃ taṃ kammaṃ nittharitum sakko ti nāñño. ajānanto pana saddalakkhaṇam ayathāpaṭipajjamāno tividham pi saddhammaṃ antaradhāpeti. tathāhi: so saddalakkhaṇam ajānanto tammūlikaṃ tāva pariyattiṃ nāseti. tāva ca nāsītāya pariyattimūlikā paṭipatti paṭipattimūliko ca paṭivedho nāsito va hoti, vuttaṃ hetam bhagavatā: “dve ime bhikkhave dhammā saddhammassa sammosāya antaradhānāya saṃvattanti. katame dve dunnikkhiṭṭā ca padavyaṇjanaṃ attho ca dunnīto dunnikittassa bhikkhave padavyaṇjanaṃ attho pi dunnayo hoti. ime kho bhikkhave dve dhammā saddhammassa sammosāya antaradhānāya saṃvattanti” ti ayam saddalakkhaṇassa ajānane doso, (jānane) ānisaṃso pana vuttapaṭipakkhato veditabbo.*

earliest Pāli phoneticians. However, what is particularly interesting is that Moggallāna links the importance of grammar to the ritual sphere. He specifically mentions the importance of reciting the ritual formulae (*kammavācā*) in various *vinaya* acts. It is possible, then, that a greater sensitivity to the recitation of Pāli in the ritual sphere perhaps led to innovations in Pāli phonetics.

Śrī Rāhula in his Pds-ṭ, a commentary on Piyadassī's *Padasādhana*, takes up this point and directly links the debate on Pāli phonology with its importance for the recitation of ritual formulae (*kammavācā*). In addition, illustrating his keen sense of history, Śrī Rāhula also provides an overview of older debates on Pāli phonology that had occurred prior to the creation of the *Moggallāna* system:

The enumeration 'forty-three' has the purpose of collecting all the sounds that are recognised in the Magadha language. In this regard, there is also a difference of opinion among the teachers about the number of sounds. The Venerable Great Elder Bodhisatta stated that 'forty sounds are of service [in understanding] the discourses of the Best of men.' However, the Teacher, Great Elder Kaccāyana stated that 'there are forty-one sounds, beginning with "a"'. The Great Elder Sabbaguṇākara stated that 'there are forty-three sounds, established in an order that begins with "a"'. The Venerable Teacher Moggallāna also stated that 'there are forty-three sounds, beginning with "a"'. Among these [views], in the first view, eight vowels, beginning with 'a' and thirty-two consonants, excluding 'la', make forty sounds. In the second view, the forty-one sounds include 'la'. In the third view, with [the addition of] short 'e' and 'o' there are forty-three sounds. In this connection, about the characteristics of vowels it is said 'consonants function in dependence on vowels [and] vowels do not function in dependence on consonants'. And in the semantic analysis, which is without obstacles [for understanding], [it is said] that 'vowels (*sara*) [are so-called because] they shine independently (*sayam rājanti*)'. Having not understood that, when they occur before a conjunct consonant (cf. examples: *seyyo*, *oṭṭho* etc.), the sounds 'e' and 'o' at any time and in any position are recognised as short due to a difference in pronunciation, it is said 'here there are eight vowels, ending in "o"' (Kacc.3). However, here (i.e. in this work), seeing no benefit (*payojana*) in the omission of [short] 'e' and 'o'—which are found in the language of Magadha, are apprehended by direct perception, and have a phonetic quality called 'short'—and due to the clear benefit in [their] mention, it is said 'among those [sounds] beginning with "a", there are ten vowels' (Mogg.1.2). To explain: The *saṅgha* should perform the *uposatha* ceremony, should ritually proclaim (*uddis-*)⁴⁵ the *pāṭimokkha*, should perform the ritual at the end of the rains retreat, should perform the higher ordination ritual, should proclaim and should perform the ritual sanctioning the *sīmā*.⁴⁶ In the ritual formulae etc. (*kammavācā*)—where there is the pronunciation of short 'e' and 'o' prior to a conjunct consonant in such [ritual expressions] as 'so *bhikkhu yaṃ iccheyya taṃ vadeyya*' (That monk can say what he wants!), 'lajjīdhammaṃ okkanto hīrottappe patīṭṭhito' (He is

⁴⁵ Crosby (2000) has shown that *ācikh-* means 'to explain' and *uddis-* 'to proclaim ritually'.

⁴⁶ Walters (1999, p. 345): 'A *sīmā* 'demarcates the space within which all monastic legal rituals (*saṅghakamma*) including ordination, higher ordination, the yearly confession of guilt and the fortnightly recitation of the *vinaya* rules themselves, must be performed.'

remorseful, full of a shame and guilt) and ‘*netthāraṃ vatteti*’ (He seeks to remove fault)—the lack of error in the [pronunciation] of sounds is the root cause for the stability of the *sāsana*. Therefore, it is in this respect the main purpose of short ‘e’ and ‘o’ is to be understood.⁴⁷

At the beginning of his discussion, Śrī Rāhula provides what appears to be a chronological outline of the different views on the number of sounds in Pāli, in which he quotes the relevant *sūtra* from each of the grammarians he mentions. For instance, he notes that, prior to the creation of the Kacc, there was a grammarian called Bodhisatta who stated that ‘forty sounds are of service [in understanding] the discourses of the Best of men’ (*naravaravacanopakārā ti cattālīsakkharā*). According to Śrī Rāhula, these forty sounds excluded retroflex *ḷ*. Kaccāyana then criticised this view and stated that ‘there are forty-one sounds, beginning with “a”’ (*akkharāpādayo ekacattālīsam*) including retroflex *ḷ*. Hinting at dissention within the Kaccāyana tradition prior to the creation of the Moggallāna system, Śrī Rāhula also states that, after Kaccāyana, another grammarian called Sabbaguṇākara argued that ‘there are forty-three sounds, established in an order that begins with “a”’ (*siddhakkamādādayo vaṇṇākkharā titālīsā*). According to Śrī Rāhula, Sabbaguṇākara’s enumeration also included short ‘e’ and short ‘o’. Therefore, within this history of the debates on Pāli phonology, Moggallāna adopted the view of Sabbaguṇākara in opposition to Kaccāyana when creating his grammatical system. Unfortunately, little is known about Sabbaguṇākara and references to him are few outside of the works of Śrī Rāhula. However, it is easy to imagine that grammatical discussions were far more widespread than the scant literature we possess would suggest. Nevertheless, despite the long history of debates on the number of sounds in Pāli, it should still be noted that it was not until Sabbaguṇākara/Moggallāna that non-Sanskritic sounds were entertained as being included in the Pāli sound system.

In the second part of his discussion, Śrī Rāhula links these phonological debates to the need for correct pronunciation of ritual formulae (*kammavācā*).⁴⁸ Initially Śrī

⁴⁷ Pds-ṭ (1908, p. 12, 1. 6–31) “*tecattālīsā*” ti gaṇanaparicchedo pana māgadhiḱāya bhāsāya vijjānānaṃ sabbesaṃ pi akkharānaṃ saṅghaṇṭhatho – atra ca akkharasaṃkhyāsu ācariyānaṃ matabhedo. bhadantabodhisattamahāthero “*naravaravacanopakārā ti cattālīsakkharā*” tīti āha; ācariyakaccāyanamahāthero pana “*akkharāpādayo ekacattālīsā*” ti āha; sabbaguṇākaramahāthero “*siddhakkamādādayo vaṇṇākkharā titālīsā*” ti āha; ayaṃ bhadantamoggallāyanācariyo pi “*aādayo titālīsavaṇṇā*” ti āha. etesu paṭhamavāde akārādayo sarā aṭṭha ḷakāravajjitā dvattiṃsavayaṇjanāni cattālīsakkharāni, dutiyavāde tāny eva ḷakārasahitāni ekacālīsakkharāni, tatiyavāde rassaekāraokārehi tecattālīsakkharāni ti—tatra sarapaṭibaddhāvuttino vyaṇjanā na vyaṇjanapaṭibaddhāvuttino sarā ti vuttassa saralakkhaṇassa ca, sayamaṃ rājanāti ti sarā ti nibbānassa ca virodhāpattino, saṃyogapubbatte satī ekārokarānaṃ kadāci katthaci uccāraṇabhedenā sampajjamānaṃ rassattaṃ agahetvā “*tatthodantā sarā aṭṭhā*” ti vuttaṃ. idha pana māgadhiḱāya bhāsāya sambhavantānaṃ paccakkhato samupalabbhamānānaṃ rassattasaṃkhyātavaṇṇagūṇayuttānaṃ eokārānaṃ parivajjane payojanābhāvā gahaṇe payojanasabbhāvā ca “*dasādosarā*” ti vuttaṃ. tathā hi saṅgho uposathaṃ kareyya pātimokkhaṃ uddiseyya saṅgho pavāreyya upasampādeyya so bhāseyya sīmaṃ sammanneyya. “*sobhikkhu yaṃ iccheyya taṃ vadeyya*”, “*lajjiddhammaṃ okkanto hirottappe paṭiṭṭhito*”, “*netthāraṃ vatteti* [sic! ‘vattati’]” cc evaṃ ādisu saṃyogapubbānaṃ rassaekāraokārānaṃ uccāraṇena kammavācādisu akkharavipattiyaṃ asambhavato sāsanaṭṭhiyaṃ mūlakāraṇattā mahāpayojano rassaekārānaṃ idha saṅgho ti.

⁴⁸ There are clear parallels here between the recitation of Pāli and Sanskrit in the ritual sphere. Ciotti (2012) has discussed at length the relationship between meaning (*artha*) and form (*lakṣaṇa*) in the Vedic recitational context. In a similar way, the Sanskrit phoneticians make it clear that the recitor of Vedic mantras must master both the form and meaning of the texts he recites. See also Ciotti (2014).

Rāhula lists various transactions relating to the functioning of the *saṅgha* (*saṅghakamma*), viz. (1) the *uposatha* ceremony, a fortnightly ceremony in which the *pāṭimokkha* is recited; (2) the *pavāraṇā* ceremony, a ritual held at the end of the yearly rains retreat in which monks invite other members of the *saṅgha* to criticise them by pointing out the errors they have committed during the retreat;⁴⁹ (3) the *upasampadā* ceremony, the higher ordination ritual for monks and nuns; (4) the sanctioning of the *sīmā*, a ceremony in which the space of all monastic legal rituals is consecrated.

Śrī Rāhula uses these ceremonies as examples since each contain certain ritual formulae (*kammavācā*), the correct pronunciation of which is particularly important for the efficacy of the rituals. If there is inaccuracy in the pronunciation of these *kammavācā* then the transactions relating to the functioning of the *saṅgha* (*saṅghakamma*) would be invalid. As a result, Śrī Rāhula argues that accurate Pāli pronunciation is the foundation of the *saṅgha*. By the fifteenth century then, the acceptance of short ‘e’ and ‘o’ had influenced Śrī Rāhula’s view of ritual pronunciation. In addition, Śrī Rāhula claims that the concern for the correct pronunciation of Pāli in the ritual sphere was the main motivation behind the acceptance of these sounds in the twelfth century.

Short ‘e’ and ‘o’ and a Gāṃ Sān Manual

I have shown above that the early Pāli grammarians argued that one could not understand the meaning of the *suttāntas* without knowledge of the Pāli phonetic system. Their concern for phonetics, then, was directed towards the oral transmission of *buddhavacana*. Phonetic analysis was justified in so far as it helped preserve and convey the meaning of the canonical text. Both von Hinüber (1994, p. 226) and Crosby (2000, p. 461) have shown that by the time of Buddhaghosa there was a division in approach between the preservers of the *sutta-piṭaka* and the *vinaya-piṭaka*. The former prioritised the preservation of the meaning of the texts, whereas the latter also emphasised the preservation of the pronunciation of the texts. It is possible that the Kacc’s phonetic analyses were directed towards the preservation of meaning in the *sutta-piṭaka* and, therefore, his description is not exhaustive. Moggallāna, on the other hand, may well represent the attitude of the preservers of the *vinaya* and, thus, he demands greater specificity and accuracy in the phonetic analysis of Pāli. Certainly, the introduction of short ‘e’ and ‘o’ appears to have been based on a desire to preserve the peculiar phonetic characteristics of Pāli for their own sake. In support of Śrī Rāhula’s view, then, this prioritisation of form above meaning makes the influence of the ideas of ritual language on this phonetic development a persuasive possibility.

Perhaps the most famous example of how Theravāda ritualists focus on phonetics rather than semantics can be found in the debates on the pronunciation of the accusative endings in the refuge formulae (*buddham/m saraṇam/m gacchāmi* etc.) at the beginning of the ordination ceremony (*pabbajjā*). Buddhaghosa (Sp 969, 27 foll.) states that when the refuge formulae are pronounced as a connected sentence (*ekasambandha*), the final vowel of the accusative endings is to be nasalised (*anunāsikanta*). However, when there is a pause between the words (*vicchinditvā*), the

⁴⁹ See Tieken (2002, p. 271).

sound *-m* is to be pronounced instead. von Hinüber (1994, pp. 226–227) has pointed out that the first recitation is a *saṃhitā* text and that the latter is *padapāṭha* text.⁵⁰

The tradition of Pāli phonetics in the ritual sphere certainly has a longer history than its manifestations in grammatical texts. For instance, when commenting on a passage in the *kammavagga* which states that a ritual act (*kamma*) may be invalidated due to the proclamation (*anussāvana*) of the ritual formulae (*kammavācā*) (Vin V 221, 1–4), Buddhaghosa outlines in detail the phonetic rules for pronouncing Pāli. This passage has already been discussed at length by von Hinüber (1994) and therefore I only treat aspects of this discussion relevant to the phonetic debates of the twelfth century.

This *vinaya* passage states that garbled recitation (*sāvanaṃ hāpeti*) is one of the mistakes of recitation and on this point, in the Sp, Buddhaghosa outlines the general phonetic guidelines for the pronunciation of Pāli:

He mispronounces: On this matter, there is further reflection. One who pronounces one sound when a different one is to be pronounced, mispronounces. Therefore the following should be carefully observed by a monk who pronounces a ritual formula:

Unaspirated and aspirated, long [and] short

Heavy, light, [and] nasalised,

Combined, separated, [and] with an open [mouth].⁵¹

This is the tenfold division of the cognition of sounds.⁵²

According to Buddhaghosa, then, these ten principles of Pāli recitation are to be observed in any ritual formula (*kammavācā*). von Hinüber (1994, p. 219) points out that these principles are also quoted at Sv I 177, 1*–4*, Ps II 203, 20*–30* and Mp II 289, 17*–20* and he further states that ‘the respective sub commentaries Sv-pt E^e I 308, 28–309, 20 = Ps-pt B^e II 150, 27–51, 5 = Mp-pt B^e II 155, 27–56, 14, cf. Sv-nt

⁵⁰ Interestingly, Bizot (1988, pp. 49–51) has shown that this differentiation has resulted in a schism in the ordination ritual of Southeast Asia, the accusative ending being nasalised in Thailand and Cambodia and it being pronounced as *-m* in Burma and other areas of northern Southeast Asia. It is clear that this schism was concerned with preserving correct Pāli phonetic form for its own sake, since the meaning in either pronunciation would not be obscured. It is possible, then, that similar concerns motivated Moggallāna to introduce short ‘*e*’ and ‘*o*’ into his grammar.

⁵¹ The translation of this last line, especially the term ‘*vimutta*’, is tricky. Von Hinüber (1987, p. 107) has rendered it as ‘oral’; a rather ambiguous translation. The Sp, however, defines all the terms found in this verse in detail. According to the Sp (7.1399, 14ff), ‘*sambandha*’ means with the application of *sandhi*, ‘*vavatthita*’ means without the application of *sandhi*, and ‘*vimutta*’ means keeping the mouth open at the end of syllables in order to avoid an unwanted nasalisation. This interpretation lends the verse an attractive symmetry between the second and third lines. For instance, the second line begins with a pair of opposites, viz. ‘heavy, light’, and ends with ‘nasalised’. Similarly, the third line begins with a pair of opposites, viz. ‘combined, separated’, and ends with ‘open’, i.e. not nasalised.

⁵² Sp E^e 7.1399, 1. 14–21.

duruttaṃ karotī ti ettha pana ayaṃ vinicchayo, yo hi aññasmiṃ akkhare vattabbe aññaṃ vadati, ayaṃ duruttaṃ karoti nāma. tasmā kammavācaṃ karontena bhikkhunā yāyaṃ:

*sithilaṃ dhanitaṃ ca dīgharassaṃ,
gurukaṃ lahukaṃ ca niggahītaṃ,
sambandhaṃ vavatthitaṃ vimuttaṃ,
dasadhā byañjanabuddhiyā pabhedo ti*

vutto, ayaṃ suṭṭhu upalakkhetabbo.

B^e II 71, 29 -72,25 attribute various mispronunciations to particular languages: Coincidence (*ekappakāra*) and wrong pronunciation (*vippakāra*) of sounds is attributed to Tamil; in the Kirāta languages the labials are missing (*oṭṭhe aphasāpetvā...sabbaniroṭṭhavyañjanā*); the language of the Yavanas (or: Savaras) is *sabbavissatṭhavyañjanā* and that of the Pārasikas and other *milakkhas* has been completely nasalised (*sabbaniggahītavyañjanā*).⁵³

The oldest work mentioned by von Hinüber that contains this passage is the *Sāratthamañjūsā* (Mp-t), a commentary on Buddhaghosa's *Manorathapūraṇī* possibly written by Sāriputta in the twelfth century. That Sāriputta may be the original author of these observations, is supported by the fact that this discussion, along with Buddhaghosa's ten principles of Pāli pronunciation, is also found in Sāriputta's Sp-ṭ, a work not taken into account by von Hinüber in his analysis.⁵⁴ This commentary is perhaps the origin of these observations. The passage states:

With respect to the sounds divided into unaspirated and aspirated etc., whose recitation (*desanā*) contains only one or two types of sound etc., [that recitation] is like the Tamil language which is comprised of only one type of sound etc. [The recitation which] has sounds without any labials is like the Kirāta language since that is to be pronounced with an open mouth (lit. with an open organ of articulation). [The recitation in which] all the sounds are strongly aspirated (*vissatṭha*) is like the Greek language since it contains *visargas* everywhere. [The recitation in which] all sounds are nasalised is like one of the Barbaric languages such as that of the Pārasikas since it has nasalisations (*niggahīta*) everywhere...⁵⁵

This almost impressionist discussion of phonetic mistakes and their similarity with other languages illustrates Sāriputta's awareness of the transregional nature of the Buddhist community. In addition, the passage may have comic undertones since some of his observations—for instance that Greek is full of *visargas* or that Kirāta has no labial sounds—seem to be humorous generalisations rather than formal linguistic observations. In any case, Sinhala is conspicuous by its absence and it is possible Sāriputta thought that the pronunciation of Sinhala was equivalent to the

⁵³ The German original (Von Hinüber (1987, p. 117) is as follows: 'Die jeweiligen Subkommentare Sv-pt E^e I 308, 28-309, 20 = Ps-pt B^e II 150, 27-51, 5 = Mp-ṭ B^e II 155, 27-56, 14, cf. Sv-nṭ B^e II 71, 29 -72,25 ordnen verschiedene Fehlaussprachen bestimmten Sprachen zu: Zusammenfall (*ekappakāra*) und falsche Aussprache (*vippakāra*) von Lauten wird dem Tamil zugeschrieben; in den Kirāta-sprachen fehlen die Labiale (*oṭṭhe aphasāpetvā...sabbaniroṭṭhavyañjanā*); die Sprache der Yavana (oder: Savara) ist *sabbavissatṭhavyañjanā* und die der Pārasikā und anderer *milakkha* wirkt durchgehend nasalier (*sabbaniggahītavyañjanā*).'

⁵⁴ Von HINÜBER appears to have also had an incorrect edition of this passage since he reads '*vippakāra*' and translates it as 'wrong pronunciation'. However, the CSCD editions of this passage have '*dvippakāra*' (two types) in opposition to '*ekappakāra*' (one type). Therefore, the problem with Tamil is that it has 'one or two types' of sound, rather than 'coincidence' (*ekappakāra*) and 'wrong pronunciation' (*vippakāra*).

⁵⁵ Sp-ṭ B^e 1.327: *yassa pana desanā sithiladhanitādibhedesu byañjanesu, ekappakāren'eva dvippakāren'eva vā byañjanena yuttatāya ekabyañjanādiyuttā vā damīlabhāsā viya. vivaṭakaraṇatāya uccāretabbato sabbaniroṭṭhavyañjanā vā kirātabhāsā viya. sabbatth'eva vissajjanīyayuttatāya sabbavissatṭhavyañjanā vā yavanabhāsā viya. sabbatth'eva sānusāratāya sabbaniggahītavyañjanā vā pādasikādimilakkhubhāsā viya...*

correct pronunciation of Pāli. This would support the hypothesis I gave at the end of section three, where I argued that the development of regional identities among the Laṅkan and Cōla monks at the time may have led to an increased emphasis on the peculiar characteristics of Pāli as a language independent of Sanskrit and its surrounding vernaculars.

Once the Pāli cosmopolis had been disrupted through this process of grammatisation, the regional *saṅghas* were able to stake their claim to the language and its cultural formations. This passage is also of historical importance since Sāriputta's discussion of other vernaculars demonstrates his ability to adapt Sanskrit phonetics to describe other languages. It is possible then that this comparative attitude also led Moggallāna to look for ideas outside of the Sanskritic sphere when analysing Pāli phonetics. In this respect, I speculate below that Moggallāna's acceptance of these sounds may well have been influenced by the development of graphic distinctions between long/short 'e' and 'o' in Sinhala script during this period.

In his commentaries, however, Sāriputta does not make any reference to the debates on short 'e' and 'o' and certainly does not mention them in his discussions of Buddhaghosa's rules of Pāli pronunciation. In contrast to the later developments indicated by Śrī Rāhula, Buddhaghosa himself did not think that errors in the pronunciation of vowel length invalidated a ritual:

With the other six sounds, the long ones, the short ones, etc., there is only to be a long [sound] when a long one is needed (*dīghaṭṭhāne*), [and] there is only to be a short [sound] when a short one is needed. In this way (*evaṃ*), one should pronounce the ritual formula (*kammavācā*), by articulating each of the sounds in their proper place of articulation (*yathāṭṭhāna*), without violating the traditional arrangement. If, however, this is not done—and a short [sound] is pronounced instead of a long [sound], a long [sound] is pronounced instead of a short [sound], a light [sound] is pronounced instead of a heavy [sound], a heavy [sound] is pronounced instead of a light sound, the sounds are separated instead of connected, or they are connected instead of separated—even when pronounced like this, the ritual formula is not violated. For these six sounds do not violate a ritual act (*kamma*).⁵⁶

However, later commentaries on this passage are less liberal with respect to the interchange of long and short vowels. For instance, Kassapa in his *Vmv* states:

With respect to the [expressions] beginning 'a short is pronounced instead of a long', it is permitted to exchange a long or short sound etc. with a long or short sound only in suitable places. For instance (*evaṃ*), instead of *bhikkūnaṃ*: *bhikkhunaṃ*, instead of *bahūsu*: *bahusu*, instead of *na kkhamaṭi*: *na khamati*, instead of *upasampadāpekko*: *upasampadāpekho*. However, it is not to be

⁵⁶ Sp E^c 7.1400: *itaresu pana dīgharassādīsu chasu vyañjanesu dīghaṭṭhāne dīgham eva rassatṭhāne ca rassam evā ti evaṃ yathāṭṭhāne taṃ tad eva akkharaṃ bhāsantena anukkamāgataṃ paveṇiṃ avināsentena kammavācā kātābā. sace pana evaṃ akatvā dīghe vattabbe rassam, rasse vattabbe dīgham vadati, tathā garuke vattabbe lahukam, lahuke vattabbe garukam vadati, sambandhe pana vattabbe vavathitam, vavathitte vā vattabbe sambaddham vadati, evaṃ vutte pi kammavācā na kuppati. imāni hi cha vyañjanāni kammaṃ na kopenti.*

uttered in unsuitable places. For instance, instead of *nāgo*: *nago*, instead of *saṃgho*: *sagho*, instead of *tisso*: *tiso*, instead of *yācati*: *yācanti*. It is to be understood, though (*pana*), that everywhere there can be connection or separation.⁵⁷

Therefore, by the twelfth century it appears that the rules surrounding ritual pronunciation have become even stricter than those laid down by Buddhaghosa. However, still, Kassapa makes no reference to whether ‘e’ and ‘o’ are to be pronounced short before a conjunct consonant. Even though the *Kaccāyana* and *Moggallāna* traditions debated about whether short ‘e’ and ‘o’ should be regarded as independent sounds, both agreed that ‘e’ and ‘o’ were pronounced short before a conjunct consonant. Therefore, this consensus perhaps made it a mute point among *vinaya* commentators since its recognition as an independent sound did not influence pronunciation.

However, despite the silence of Moggallāna’s immediate contemporaries on this matter in their *vinaya* commentaries, there is evidence that supports Śrī Rāhula’s claim that there was concern about the pronunciation of short ‘e’ and ‘o’ in the ritual sphere. This evidence comes from a manual of Pāli pronunciation found by François Bizot in northern Thailand, in what was then the kingdom of Lanna. According to local historiography, namely the *Jinakālamālī*, the *Mūlasāsanā* of Wat Suandok and the *Mūlasāsanā* of Wat Padeng, king Kilanā (1355–1385) invited Mahāsāmi Udumbarapuppha to bring the Laṅkan ordination lineage to Lanna. The name of this *mahāsvāmi* suggests a possible association with Udumbaragiri/Diṃbulāgala, the twelfth-century bastion of *Moggallāna* grammatical studies.

Udumbarapuppha delegated responsibility to a monk called Ānanda, who once in Lanna asked a *thera* Sumana of the Laṅkan *saṅgha* of Sukhothay to come to the region and perform the ordinations. After some trouble, Sumana eventually came to Lanna and founded Wat Pra Yun in 1369 and Wat Suandok of Chiang Mai in 1371/73. Sumana ordained the monastic community there in the Laṅkan lineage and, according to the *Mūlasāsanā* of Wat Padeng, the king wanted to regulate the local pronunciation of Pāli texts. The monks of other areas, such as Chiang Tung and Chiang Sen, were then invited to study the correct ordination formulas and Pāli pronunciation that had been established in Suandok by Sumana. However, in 1420 the monks of Suandok went on pilgrimage to Laṅkā and their ordination was rejected by the monks at the Thūpārāma since they pronounced the *niggahīta* in the refuges as ‘-ām’, i.e. ‘*buddhām*’, and they employed surplus sounds (Bizot 1988, pp. 60–61; Swearer and Premchit 1977).

It was in this historical context that various Lanna manuals on Pāli phonetics (Gāṃ Sān) were produced. With respect to his edition of one of these pronunciation manuals, Bizot (1988, p. 62) states that ‘it is without doubt that the rules relating to

⁵⁷ Vmv B^e 2.315: *ḍighe vattabbe rassan ti ādisu bhikkhūnan ti vattabbe bhikkhūnan ti vā bahūsū ti vattabbe bahūsū ti vā na khamatī ti vattabbe na khamatī ti vā upasampadāpekkho ti vattabbe upasampadāpekkho ti vā evaṃ anurūpaṭṭhānesu eva dīgharassādi rassadīghādivasena parivattetum vaṭṭatī. na pana nāgo ti vattabbe nago ti vā saṃgho ti vattabbe sagho ti vā Tisso ti vattabbe Tiso ti vā yācatī ti vattabbe yācanti ti vā evaṃ ananurūpaṭṭhānesu vattum saṃbandham pana vavatthānañ ca sabbathā pi vaṭṭatī ti gahetabham.*

the *upasampadā* are, in part, those which are referred to by the faithful of the Thūpārāma' (i.e. the Laṅkan Mahāvihāra).⁵⁸

Since this manual was meant to establish a Laṅkan ordination lineage, along with its tradition of Pāli pronunciation, it is especially relevant that the text recognises the pronunciation of a short 'e' before a double consonant in the ordination ceremony. With respect to this statement in the text, BIZOT remarks that '...il est curieux de signaler que ce qui est dit sur la longueur d'une syllabe en *e* ou *o* suivi d'une consonne géminée est conforme à la 'loi des deux mores'..., ce qui montre que les auteurs du texte devaient connaître la prononciation correcte du moyen-indien.' This passage in the text is as follows:

Sont *guru* les consonnes liées, comme dans les mots [*sakko*] ou *seṭṭho*: le E (de *seṭṭho*) a 2 mores [25 A]; lié avec *ṭṭho*, la more s'accroît et devient (4 mores). Pour réciter les Kammavācā, il faut [les] raccourcir d'[le more et demi] et [donc les] récite [d'une longueur de] 2 mores et demi. Cela dit, lorsqu'on récite le Pāṭimokkha et le Parivāsa, il convient de [les] réciter [avec une longueur de] 3 mores et demi. Ainsi c'est correct! (Bizot 1988, pp. 63–64)

This text cannot be directly related to the *Moggallāna* tradition since it states that there are forty-one sounds in Pāli rather than forty-three (Bizot 1988, p. 63). However, its acknowledgement of short 'e' in the ordination ceremony reflects grammatical observations shared by the *Kaccāyana* and *Moggallāna* traditions after the twelfth century. This work, therefore, certainly lends support to Śrī Rāhula's view that the correct pronunciation of short 'e' and 'o' was important for the efficacy of Pāli rituals.

It is also interesting that, in the *pāṭimokkha* and *parivāsa*, one should pronounce the syllable with a length of three and a half morae. Therefore, here the 'e' would only be slightly shorter than its usual length. The reason why there is a further stipulation for the liturgy of the *pāṭimokkha* and *parivāsa* is unclear to me at present. In any case, Bizot's Gāṃ Sān manual displays clearly that the pronunciation of short 'e' was a concern for ritualists of the Laṅkan ordination lineage. This concern for minute variations in pronunciation also shows that by the middle of the second millennium the pronunciation of Pāli in the ritual sphere had become a strictly regulated affair, far stricter than the recommendations made by Buddhaghosa in the Sp. That these phonetic observations had serious soteriological implications is also indicated by the concluding discussion of the text, in which errors in Pāli pronunciation are said to lead one to the depths of hell:

Si l'on déforme les *gāthā* en pāli, on a pour nom Destructeur de la religion de l'Auguste qui est le maître, ce qui représente une lourde faute. Si l'on meurt,

⁵⁸ '...nul doute ce que ces règles relatives à l'*upasampadā* sont en partie celles auxquelles se référaient les fidèles du Thūpārāma.' BIZOT continues: 'Furent-elles introduites dans le Nord par la réforme du Sumana ou, au contraire, à la suite du rejet de la validité de son ordination au siècle suivant? Il est difficile de répondre à cette question car, de toute façon, dans la mesure où le programme de Sumana aurait effectivement contenu ces instructions, leur adoption par le clergé traditionnel n'aurait vraisemblablement pas pu se faire sans atermoiements. Le plus probable est que la prononciation locale du pāli, déjà corrigée et unifiée par la réforme de Sumana, avait conservé des inflexions régionales et un certain nombre de fautes typiques.'

on va renaître dans l'enfer Avīci pour un *kalpa*. Celui-là s'appelle Destructeur des lettres des formules (*dhamma*). Aussi, vous tous, qui craignez de tomber aux enfers, il convient de vous efforcer d'étudier la phonétique des lettres (*dhammasaddā*) pour connaître les lettres et les consonnes qui sont fausses et qui sont justes, alors c'est bien. Si l'on n'étudie pas les lettres du *dhamma*, comment le saurait-on? Si l'on ne sait pas les *dhamma*, comment saurait-on enseigner les *dhamma*, réciter les *dhamma*, écrire les *dhamma*? Comment saurait-on [distinguer] le juste du mauvais? (Bizot 1988, p. 66)

Graphic Identity: The *virāma* and the *pulli*

Śrī Rāhula places the debates on the existence of short 'e' and 'o' within a Theravāda ritual context and demonstrates the role of Pāli phonetics in governing correct ritual practice. While this discussion may explain the benefits of controlling debates on Pāli phonetics, it does not explore any further the regional currents that underlined Moggallāna's separation from the phonetic tradition of the *Kaccāyana* system. For instance, the Rūp also maintained that long 'e' and 'o' are pronounced short before a double consonant, but differed on whether they should be accepted as independent sounds in their own right. However, for Moggallāna, this position was untenable since length of pronunciation is a key factor in differentiating sounds. He argues that 'e' and 'o' cannot have a long duration and then, in certain situations, be short. If 'e' and 'o' are ever short these sounds must be acknowledged as completely different sounds from long 'e' and 'o'. While this argumentation is logical and consistent, I argue in this section that there may have been an additional factor determining the recognition of short 'e' and 'o', one that was heavily influenced by the emerging local identities described above. This factor was the development of regional scripts.

In around the seventh to eighth century, the Brāhmī script used in Laṅkā underwent various modifications, ultimately producing a rounder more versatile script for the Sinhala language. This development towards a local Sinhala script was stimulated by influences from Pallava-Grantha. Fernando (1949, pp. 300–301) links the adoption of a Pallava-influenced writing system with a period of intense cultural interchange between Laṅkā and the Pallava kingdom in the second half of the first millennium.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ 'After the Brāhmī alphabet was introduced to the country the script was ever in a process of development but consistent with the changes that were going on in India. The script which was angular at first, gradually assumed round forms as a concession to convenience and speed. But the period immediately following was one of intense literary activity. The *Dīpavaṃsa* and the *Mahāvaṃsa* and the commentaries of Buddhaghosa were written during this period. Even the layman seems to have begun to interest himself in literary pursuits during this period as is testified to by the earliest forms of the graffiti found on the mirror-wall at Sīgiriya. The *Cūlavāṃsa* says that poets wrote numerous poems in the Sīhala tongue in the reign of Aggabodhi I (564–598 A.D.) and the *Nikāya Saṅgraha* and the *Pūjāvaliya* have preserved for us the names of twelve of these poets. Thus it would be seen that there was at this time a genuine demand for a script that would enable writers to produce books with minimum effort and maximum speed. Within limits the script that was already in use in the country had attempted to meet this demand, when Ceylon came into contact with a people who had developed an efficient script. These were

Hallisey (2003, pp. 295–296) has touched upon the effects of the formation of this local script and states that its development allowed Sinhala to be recognised as a language capable of literature. He states (2003, p. 296) that the new script also enabled the writing of Sanskrit, thereby allowing ‘the intellectual precision of Sanskrit discourse to be textualized in a continuum with Sinhala (and with Pāli, which also used the new script.)’ With respect to the way regional scripts brought transregional Sanskrit into the local literary domain, Pollock (2006, p. 274) also states that ‘Kālidāsa could have written the opening words of the *Rāghuvamśa*, *vāgarthau iva samprktau*, in Javanese, Thai or Sinhala script, in the Grantha script of the Tamil country or the Śāradā script of Kashmir. Perhaps no better sign than the graphic sign itself shows how clearly one could be in the Sanskrit cosmopolis and simultaneously remain at home.’ While the relationship between transregional language and local script has often been portrayed as a symbiotic relationship, relatively little attention has been paid to the way these local scripts may disrupt and fracture the territory of the transregional language. In this section, I argue that the development of Sinhala script could well have temporarily ruptured the ‘Pāli cosmopolis’, separating the *saṅghas* in Laṅkā and Damiḷa country, and also the *Moggallāna* and *Kaccāyana* traditions.

According to the Rūp, sounds (*akkhara*) are differentiated by place of articulation, instrument of articulation, mode of articulation, and the duration of the sound (*sutikāla*).⁶⁰ As I have shown above, Moggallāna debates with the Rūp using similar parameters and argues for the existence of short ‘e’ and ‘o’ as independent sounds on the basis of their duration (*sutikāla*). However, there is also evidence elsewhere in the *Moggallāna* tradition that script may have played a role in the differentiation of sounds. This is most evident in Moggallāna’s debate with the Rūp at Mogg.1.46 (*chā lo*) regarding the distinction between *la* and *la*.

The *sūtra* Mogg.1.46 prescribes the optional augment of *la* after *cha*. This accounts for forms such as ‘*chaḷaṅgaṃ*’ (six-limbs), where the *ḷ* in Sanskrit *ṣaḍ* (six) has re-emerged as *l* after the Pāli word *cha* (six).⁶¹ With respect to this augmentation, in the Mogg-p’s discussion of this rule Moggallāna criticises the

Footnote 59 continued

the Pallavas of South India, with whom Ceylon had relations from the 6th century onwards. King Sinhaviṣṇu, 580–600 A.D., of the Pallavas is said to have defeated the Sinhalese king at the time. And King Mānavamma of Ceylon (second half of the 7th century) being harassed by Dāṭhapatissa II fled to India and entered the service of the Pallava king Narasiṃhavarman I (630–668 A.D.). In other spheres of art the Pallavas seem to have influenced the Sinhalese during this period. The Geḍige at Nālandā and some of the sculptures at Isurumuniya are considered to have been executed according to the Pallava style of sculpture. The script of the Pallavas was also used in Ceylon in some inscriptions set up in the 7th and 8th century. These circumstances, perhaps, led the Sinhalese scribes to adopt at least some of the characters of the Pallava Grantha alphabet. The extent to which this adoption was carried out is beyond the scope of this paper, but a comparison of the script of the 7th and 8th centuries with the contemporary Pallava Grantha script will show to what extent the latter had a bearing on the development of the Sinhalese script.’

⁶⁰ Rūp B^e 2: *evaṃ ṭhānakaraṇappayatanasutikālabhinnesu akkharesu...*

⁶¹ Mogg-v (1931, p. 27, 1. 7): *chasaddā parassa sarassa ḷakāro āgamo hoti vā; chaḷaṅgaṃ, chaḷāyatanam; vā tv eva cha abhiññā*. (After the word ‘*cha*’, there is the optional augment ‘*la*’ before a vowel. [For example:] ‘*chaḷaṅgaṃ*’ (six-limbs), ‘*chaḷāyatanam*’ (six-sense bases). [Why] is this only optional? [For there is also the form] ‘*cha abhiññā*’ (six higher knowledges).)

Kaccāyana tradition for prescribing both the augmentation of ‘l’ and ‘ḷ’ on the basis that ‘ḷ’ and ‘l’ are mutually interchangeable:

However, in this connection, the *Kaccāyanas* [also] accept the sound ‘la’ and state that ‘there is no difference between “la” and “ḷa”’. This is unsuitable since also the sound ‘ḷa’ is described separately in their [rule] defining the technical term ‘sound’ (*akkhara*) (Kacc.2). For if there is no difference, [their] separate mention (*dvidhā pāṭho*) would be pointless. Thus (*iti*), these [sounds] are distinct. For also, the differentiation of these [sounds] according to place of articulation, their sound and their graphic representation (*lipi*) is clear (lit. is not obscured). To explain: out of the [sounds], the sound *ḷa* is designated as having a cerebral place of articulation, whereas the sound *la* has a dental place of articulation. The difference of [their] sound and graphic representation is clear.⁶²

Moggallāna’s criticism here is that the *Kaccāyanas* argue that there is no difference between *la* and *ḷa*. By quoting the statement ‘there is no difference between “la” and “ḷa”’ (*laḷānam aviseso*), Moggallāna shows that he is primarily criticising Buddhappiya’s Rūp. For instance, the Rūp uses this maxim throughout its grammar to indicate that *la* and *ḷa* may be interchanged. With respect to the sound ‘la’ in Kacc.35 *yavamadanataralā c’ āgamā*,⁶³ the Rūp states:

There is the sound ‘la’ after the numeral six (*cha*). There is no difference between ‘la’ and ‘ḷa’. [Therefore, there are the examples:] *cha abhiññā* or *chaḷabhiññā* (six higher knowledges), *chaḷaṅgaṃ* (six limbs), *chaḷāsīti* (eighty-six), *chaḷamsā* (six parts), *saḷāyatanaṃ* (six sense bases).⁶⁴

The Rūp, therefore, uses Kacc.35, which sanctions ‘la’ as an augment (*āgama*), to also allow the sound ‘ḷa’ as an augment in such cases as ‘*chaḷabhiññā*’ on the basis that there is no difference between ‘la’ and ‘ḷa’. The Rūp uses the same procedure to prescribe ‘ḷa’ as well as ‘la’ in Kacc.381 *la darāṇaṃ*⁶⁵ and Kacc.591 *hantehi ho hassa lo vā adahanahānaṃ*.⁶⁶ Moggallāna disagrees with this procedure and indicates that ‘la’ and ‘ḷa’ are distinguishable both due to their sound and also due to

⁶² Mogg-p (1931, pp. 27–28, 1. 31ff): *kaccāyanā pan’ ettha lakāraṃ karonti “laḷānam aviseso” ti cāhu tad ayuttaṃ tesam pi akkharasaññāyaṃ viṣuṃ ḷakārassa paṭhitattā. aviseso hi dvidhā pāṭho ’va niratthako siyā ti viṣiṭṭhā yev’ ete. ṭhānasutilipibhedo pi hi nesam anivārīto va. tathāhi: tesu ḷakārassa muddhaṭṭhānīyatam anujānan ti, lassa tu dantaṭṭhānīyatam, sutilipibhedo pākaṭo va...*

⁶³ Kacc-v (2012, p. 11, 1. 9–10): *sare pare yakāro vakāro makāro dakāro nakāro takāro rakāro lakāro imā āgamā honti vā*. (Before a vowel, there are these optional augments, viz. *ya, va, ma, da, ta, ra* and *la*.)

⁶⁴ Rūp B° 21: *lakāro chasaṅkhyāhi. laḷānam aviseso. cha abhiññā chaḷabhiññā, chaḷaṅgaṃ, chaḷāsīti, chaḷamsā, saḷāyatanaṃ*.

⁶⁵ Kacc-v (2012, p. 136, 1. 12–13): *dakārarakārāṇaṃ saṅkhyānaṃ lakārādeso hoti*. (There is the substitution of ‘la’ for ‘da’ and ‘ra’, when they form part of numbers.)

⁶⁶ Kacc-v (2012, p. 194, 1. 11): *hakāra icc evam antehi dhātūhi tappaccayassa hakārādeso hoti hassa dhātavantassa lo hoti vā adahanahānaṃ*. (For the [past participle] suffix ‘-ta’ there is the substitution of ‘ha’ after verbal bases ending in ‘ha’. Optionally, [for the past participle suffix ‘-ta’] there [is the substitution of] ‘la’ for the ‘ha’ ending a verbal base, but not for the [verbal bases] ‘dah’ (to burn) and ‘nah’ (to bind).)

their graphic representation. From this discussion it is clear that Moggallāna takes the graphic representation of sounds into account when acknowledging them as independent. Such a standpoint is made in Saṅgharakkhita's Mogg-p-ṭ on Mogg.1.1 when he again refers to this debate:

Even though [on account of the maxim] 'there is no difference between "la" and "la"' some say that there is no difference between the two [i.e. between 'la' and 'la'], due to the distinction of graphic representation and place of articulation, "la" is to be acknowledged separately as a sound (*akkharabhāva*).⁶⁷

Saṅgharakkhita makes it clear that the different graphic representation of 'la' is a factor in acknowledging it as an independent sound. With respect to the interchangeable nature of 'la' and 'la' in the *Kaccāyana* tradition, Pind (2012, pp. 78–79) speculates that this feature of the grammar is a relic from a period in the tradition's development when 'la' was not recognised as a sound.⁶⁸

Therefore, according to Pind, the Rūp's maxim that 'there is no difference between "la" and "la"' may well have been formulated to cope with the fact that Kaccāyana created his rules without 'la' in mind. Pind (2012, p. 79) uses this feature of the grammar to suggest that Kacc may well have a North Indian origin since, after the fourth century C.E., the use of *l* is no longer preserved there.⁶⁹ Once 'la' began to be written in Pāli a grammatical mechanism to inscribe 'la' back into the Kaccāyana rules was required. This compensatory mechanism of the Rūp's, then, appears to be an attempt to do so. Moggallāna clearly saw problems with this and made sure he standardised the distinction between 'la' and 'la' in his own grammar. However, importantly, part of his recognition of 'la' as a sound independent from 'la' was its separate graphic representation. Could it be possible, then, that similar factors influenced him to recognise short 'e' and 'o' as independent sounds?








Prior to the eighth century in Laṅkā, vowel length was almost universally absent from inscriptions. It was not until the Pallava-Grantha influence after the eighth century that Sinhala script began to regularly differentiate vowel length (i.e. *a/ā*, *i/ī*

⁶⁷ Mogg-p-ṭ B^e 24: *kehici "laṅānamaviseso"ti dvinnam avisesse vuccamāne pi lipibhedena ṭhānabhedena ca bhinnattā laṅāro viṣuṃ akkharabhāvena gahito.*

⁶⁸ 'Kacc 2: *akkharā p'ādayo ekacattālīsaṃ*, enumerates 41 sounds of the Pāli, although the rules only make use of 40 sounds: Kacc does not use the sound *l* (<*ḍ*) which is represented by *l*, also *lh* (<*ḍh*) by *lh*. Although most Kacc mss and editions are inconsistent as regards the representation of *lll* and *lh*, it is clear that Kacc did not count *l* as a sound of Pāli, because Vajirabuddhi explicitly remarks at Mmd 10,38ff. that the author of the suttas (*suttakāra*) uses *l* in place of *ḷ*: *suttakāro pana tassa* (scil. *laṅāra*) *ṭhāne laṅāram eva paṭhati. dissati hi "yavamadanataralā c' āgamā"* (Kacc 35), "*dahassa do laṃ*" (Kacc 616) *iccevamādīsu*. It is thus possible to deduce that Kacc 2 was compiled at a time when the distinction between *l* and *ḷ* was not preserved, and later on reformulated so as to correspond with the graphic practice of a later age.'

⁶⁹ 'Other Pāli grammars, like Cūḷ-nir (see IV.2.5), evidently an old commentary on the Kacc, and the grammar attributed to Bodhisattamahāthera, state that there are forty sounds in Pāli, and thus reflect the old version of Kacc.' However, Aleix Ruiz-Falqués (personal communication) has pointed out to me that *l* is in fact present in Kacc 267. *bālhaṣsa sādho*. This appears to be the only *sutta* that includes *l* and, therefore, further work is needed to determine whether this reading should be accepted.

etc.) graphically.⁷⁰ After the tenth century, this also included the graphic differentiation of long and short ‘e’ and ‘o’ due to the possible influence of South Indian scripts. Wickremasinghe argues that in the Vēvālkāṭiya inscription of Mahinda IV (c. 1026–1042)⁷¹ there is the first graphic representation of long medial ‘o’:

Attention should also be drawn to the akṣara,  yō, at the beginning of the third line. It is doubtless the precursor of the modern form . The upward stroke attached to the sign of the medial vowel *o* to lengthen it is no other than the final circular stroke  in the Telugu, e.g.  *kē* and  *kō*. In South Indian alphabets a loop or an extra curved stroke attached to a short vowel is the common sign used to denote that it is long. In Sinhalese the curved stroke seems to have been confounded with the vertical *virāma* sign, owing perhaps to their resemblance to each other. Otherwise it is difficult to account for the use of the *virāma* signs  and  in modern Sinhalese to indicate the long vowels *ē* and *ō*. Besides, the marking of these two vowels long is in itself an innovation. I have not yet come across a single instance in early Sinhalese inscriptions. The present one is unusual and is the earliest case I know of a medial *o* marked long.⁷²

This example, then, is the earliest known graphic representation of a medial *ō* in Laṅkā and it is noteworthy that Wickremasinghe also links its development with Telugu script. Both the modern Telugu and Kannada scripts have separate graphemes for long/medial ‘e’ and ‘o’ (with the long vowel taking the marker as in Sinhala), though according to Burnell they did not develop until after the sixteenth century (Burnell 1878, p. 30).⁷³ It is of course possible that this was an independent innovation in the Sinhala script but further research would be needed to confirm this.

While the Vēvālkāṭiya inscription contains the only example of such an early use of a graphic representation for *ō*, by the thirteenth century the demarcation of long *e* and *o* was commonplace in Sinhala script. Using a manuscript of the *Cullavagga* as his main source—a manuscript that appears to have been written at the request of Moggallāna’s pupil, Medhaṅkara (Fernando 1982)—Fernando (1950, p. 241) notes that long ‘e’ and ‘o’ had become marked by a *virāma*:

Ē, O, Ō: These medial signs call for no comments. The *virāma* sign used in medial *ē* and *ō* is represented by a short vertical stroke even in connection with

⁷⁰ GAIR (1985, p. 53, n. 11): ‘It should be noted that vowel length is not written in inscriptions prior to the 8th century except sporadically. However, its presence and origin in part from compensatory lengthening accompanying the later simplification of assimilated consonant sequences can be inferred from other changes requiring length as a conditioning factor...’.

⁷¹ E.Z. I. No. 21.

⁷² E.Z. I. No. 21: 242.

⁷³ Shriramana Sharma (personal communication) has kindly pointed out to me that Pallava Tamil occasionally distinguishes between short and long ‘e’ and ‘o’ by putting a *virāma* with the short vowel. However, due to fact that such occurrences are infrequent and that the *virāma* is used to mark the short vowel and not the long vowel, I think that the possibility of a Pallava Tamil influence is rather slight.

sounds like *ma* and *va* etc., see *dē*, *mē* and *sē* in the Inscriptions of Niśsaṅkamalla near the Vān Āḷa, *E.Z.* III, plate II A, II. 8, 15 and 7.

Fernando (1950, p. 227) also mentions that the Sinhala *virāma* has a similar form to the Pallava-Grantha *virāma*, which was used in inscriptions as early as the seventh century. Therefore, while the Sinhala *virāma* appears to have been borrowed from Pallava-Grantha, its use to differentiate long ‘e’ and ‘o’ can be said to be an independent innovation or perhaps related to certain developments in South Indian scripts. As the graphic differentiation in Sinhala between long and short ‘e’ and ‘o’ came into prominence between the tenth and thirteenth centuries, coinciding with the literary revolution of the reforms of Parākramabāhu I and the creation of the *Moggallāna* grammatical system, it is possible that the acceptance of short ‘e’ and ‘o’ in the *Moggallāna* system was influenced by these recent graphic developments.

In contrast to Sinhala, Tamil has a far longer tradition of graphically differentiating between short/long ‘e’ and ‘o’. The earliest known Tamil grammar, the *Tolkāppiyam*, for instance, explicitly states (T.16) that short ‘e’ and ‘o’ are to be differentiated from their longer counterparts by placing a dot, known as a *puḷḷi*, above them.⁷⁴ In this regard, one might have expected Cōḷa monks, such as Buddhappiya, to be more tolerant of the differentiation between short/long ‘e’ and ‘o’ in the *Moggallāna* system. The *Vīracolīyam* (Vīr), an eleventh-century Tamil grammar written by the Buddhist monk Puttamittiraṇ (S. Buddhmitra), also maintains that ‘the sound “e” (*ekara*), the sound “o” (*okara*) and consonants (*mey*) should have a *puḷḷi*’ (*ekara okara mey yirpuḷḷi mēvum*).⁷⁵ However, despite this traditional standpoint of the grammarians, the evidence from this period indicates that from the tenth century onwards, the *puḷḷi* begins to disappear from Tamil inscriptions, leaving no graphical differentiation between short/long ‘e’ and ‘o’. For instance, Bühler (1980 [=1904], pp. 94–95) observes as follows:

But the inscriptions of the tenth, eleventh and later centuries...offer a new variety [of script], which is more strongly modified through the influence of the Grantha...It is worthy of note that in the later Tamil inscriptions the use of the *Virāma* (*Pulli*) first becomes rarer and finally ceases, while in the quite modern writing the *Virāma* is again marked by a dot.

Chevillard (2008, p. 30, fn. 72) also notes that despite the use of a *puḷḷi* to differentiate short and long ‘e’ and ‘o’ in early Tamil inscriptions, to his knowledge ‘there is no known instance of this use in surviving Tamil palm-leaf manuscripts’. Therefore, in this period, there was a decreasing frequency of the use of the *puḷḷi* in Tamil script, resulting in an inability to differentiate short and long ‘e’ and ‘o’. In an opposite trend, there was the use of the *virāma* in Sinhala script to graphically differentiate short/long ‘e’ and ‘o’ for the first time. It is possible, then, that these two developments in the regional scripts of the Cōḷa and Laṅka *saṅghas* contributed to tensions within the monastic community concerning Pāli phonetics. As I have shown, such tensions should not be underestimated since the correct

⁷⁴ Tolk (1999, p. 3).

⁷⁵ Vīr (2005, p. 86, 1. 10). I am very grateful to Jean-Luc Chevillard for clarifying the meaning of this sentence.

pronunciation of Pāli was vital for the correct performance of the rituals of the Theravāda tradition. It is in this light that one should understand Buddhappiya's statement on Kacc.2 that whatever 'has more than forty-one sounds is not *buddhavacana*'.

Conclusions

The debate on the number of sounds in Pāli in the twelfth century reflects a long-standing concern within the Theravāda Buddhist tradition about Pāli pronunciation. However, this debate differed from all previous debates since, for the first time, sounds that were not present in Sanskrit were recognised in the Pāli language. This debate, then, was symptomatic of a new era in Pāli scholarship, where Pāli was treated as a language among others, different and independent from Sanskrit and its surrounding vernaculars.

In addition, this debate highlights that the interactions of grammarians and grammatical ideas may reflect wider socio-political developments. For instance, the twelfth-century debate on the number of sounds in Pāli can be interpreted as symptomatic of the separation of the *saṅghas* in Laṅkā and Cōḷa country at the time. Although Pāli was already a cosmopolitan language, superordinate to Tamil and Sinhala, the split between the Laṅkan and Cōḷa *saṅghas* perhaps led to an attempt by the Laṅkan *saṅgha* to particularise Pāli, to locate it within parameters it could control. The *Moggallāna* system can be seen in this regard as part of their attempt to control the Pāli language and wrestle it out of the hands of the predominantly Cōḷa *Kaccāyana* grammarians.

Since the performance of certain Pāli rituals is one of the common denominators that unites Theravāda Buddhist practice, it is of no surprise that the pronunciation of Pāli would also have been a principle subject of debate for two competing monastic communities. Possessing authority in the field of Pāli phonetics perhaps allowed the Laṅkan *saṅgha* to have unprecedented power over those that used its ordination lineage. This is particularly clear from the historical accounts of the transmission of the Laṅkan ordination lineage to Lanna in northern Thailand. Due to its authority in Pāli phonetics, the Laṅkan *saṅgha* was able to critique the validity of the ordination of all the monks in the region and, in effect, had the capacity to delegitimise their religious authority.

The fact that the development of this new era of Pāli literature was directly related to these newly emerging local identities is made explicit by the role of regional scripts in the debates on Pāli sounds. The developments in Sinhala script, for instance, may have influenced the recognition of short 'e' and 'o' as independent sounds in the *Moggallāna* system. In this regard, the *Moggallāna* tradition reflected a new regional consciousness that had developed in Laṅkā and signalled a temporary fracture in the transregional Pāli literary culture that existed between Laṅkā and Cōḷa country. However, Laṅkan Pāli had cosmopolitan ambitions and this literary Pāli was used by the Laṅkan *saṅgha* to spread and exert its influence across Southeast Asia.

Acknowledgements I am very grateful to Eivind Kahrs, Vincenzo Vergiani, James Benson, Rupert Gethin, Anne Monius, Shriramana Sharma, Jean-Luc Chevillard, Paolo Visigalli, Aleix Ruiz-Falqués, Giovanni Ciotti, Phyllis Granoff and the anonymous reviewers of JIP for reading and commenting on various drafts of this paper.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

- A (*Aṣṭādhyāyī*): Katre, Sumitra M., trans. 1987. *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini in Roman Transliteration*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- AN B^e (*Āṅguttara-nikāya*): CSCD *Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Āṅguttaranikāya”.
- AN E^e (*Āṅguttara-nikāya*): Morris, R. and E. Hardy. 1885–1900. *Āṅguttara-nikāya*. 5 vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- Bbh (*Bālāvabodhana*): Sri Seelaskandha, C.A., ed. 1924/2467. *Bālāvabodhanaya*. Alutgama: K.D.J. Gunatunga & Sons, Saddharmaparakāśa Printing Works.
- Cl (*Cūlavamsa*): Geiger, Wilhelm, ed. 1980. *Cūlavamsa: Being the more Recent Part of the Mahāvamsa*. Vol. I, II. London: The Pali Text Society.
- DN B^e (*Dīgha-nikāya*): CSCD *Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Dīghanikāya”.
- DN E^e (*Dīgha-nikāya*): Rhys Davids, T.W. and J. Estlin Carpenter, eds. 1890–1911. *The Dīgha Nikāya*. 3 vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- EZ: *Epigraphia Zeylanica, being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon*. Edited and translated by Don Martino de Zilva Wickremasinghe. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1904–1912.
- Ja B^e (*Jātakapāṭi*): CSCD *Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Jātakapāṭi”.
- Ja E^e (*Jātakapāṭi*): Fausbøll, Michael Viggo, ed. 1877–90. *The Jātaka*. 6 vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- Jin (*Jinakālamāli*): Buddhaddatta, A.P. Aggamahāpaṇḍita, ed. 1962. *Jinakālamāli*. London: Pāli Text Society.
- Kacc (*Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa*): Pind, Ole Holten, ed. 2012. *Kaccāyana*. Bristol: Pali Text Society.
- Kacc-v (*Kaccāyana-vutti*): Pind, Ole Holten, ed. 2012. *Kaccāyana*. Bristol: Pali Text Society.
- KN B^e (*Khuddaka-nikāya*): CSCD *Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Khuddakanikāya”.
- Mbh I (*Mahābhāṣya*): Kielhorn, F., ed. 1962. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Third edition revised and furnished with additional readings, references and select critical notes by MM. K. V. Abhyankar. Volume I. Pune: Bhandarkar Institute Press, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Mbh II (*Mahābhāṣya*): Kielhorn, F., ed. 1965. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Adhyāyas III, IV and V*. Third edition revised and furnished with additional readings, references and select critical notes by MM. K. V. Abhyankar. Volume II. Pune: Bhandarkar Institute Press, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Mogg (*Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa*): Śrī Dharmānanda, ed. 1931. *Moggallāna pañcīkā suttavuttisametā: anurādhapure thūpārāmamahāvihāramajjhāvutthena mahāsaddikena Sirimatā Moggallāna-mahāsāminā viracitā*. Colombo: P.A. Peries Appuhamy Wirahena, Saccasamuccaya Press.
- Mogg-v (*Moggallāna-vutti*): Śrī Dharmānanda, ed. 1931. *Moggallāna pañcīkā suttavuttisametā: anurādhapure thūpārāmamahāvihāramajjhāvutthena mahāsaddikena Sirimatā Moggallāna-mahāsāminā viracitā*. Colombo: P.A. Peries Appuhamy Wirahena, Saccasamuccaya Press.
- Mogg-v B^e (*Moggallāna-vutti*): CSCD *Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Moggallānavyākaraṇa”.
- Mogg-p (*Moggallāna-pañcīkā*): Śrī Dharmānanda, ed. 1931. *Moggallāna pañcīkā suttavuttisametā: anurādhapure thūpārāmamahāvihāramajjhāvutthena mahāsaddikena Sirimatā Moggallāna-mahāsāminā viracitā*. Colombo: P.A. Peries Appuhamy Wirahena, Saccasamuccaya Press.
- Mogg-p-ṭ B^e (*Moggallāna-pañcīkā-ṭīkā*): CSCD *Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Moggallānapañcīkāṭīkā”.
- Mmd (*Mukhamattadīpanī*): Siri Dhammaratanattheravara, ed. 2454. *Mukhamattadīpanī*. 2nd edition. Kolamba: Adhissara Mahāsaya.
- Nett E^e (*Nettipakaraṇa*): Hardy, E., ed. 1902. *The Netti-pakaraṇa with Extracts from Dhammapāla's Commentary*. London: Henry Frowde.
- Nir-d B^e (*Niruttiḍḍipāṇī*): CSCD *Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Niruttiḍḍipāṇī”.
- Pds-ṭ (*Padasādhana-ṭīkā*): Sri Dhirananda and Vacissara, ed. 1908. *Buddhippasadani: A commentary on Padasadhana, Grammar of the Pali language by Sangharaja Sri Rahula, Principal of the College Sri*

- Sanghabodhi Srivijayabahu Parivena, Totagamuwa*. Colombo: A.D.A. Wijeyasinha Arachchl, Kalutara, Vidyasagara Printing Works.
- Rūp B^e (*Rūpasiddhi*): *CSCD Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Rūpasiddhi”.
- Rūp-sn (*Rūpasiddhi-sannaya*): Dhammaratana, Baddegama, ed. 1926. *Maha Rupa Siddhi Sanna or Paraphrase of Maha Rupa Siddhi by an Ancient Pandit*. Peliyagoda: Satyasamuccaya Press.
- Sp B^e (*Samantāpāsādikā*): *CSCD Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Samantāpāsādikā”.
- Sp E^e (*Samantāpāsādikā*): Takakusu, J., Makoto Nagai and Kogen Mizuno, eds. 1947. *Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka*. Vol. VII. London: The Pali Text Society.
- Sp-ṭ B^e (*Sāratthadīpanī*): *CSCD Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Sāratthadīpanī”.
- Sv (*Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*): Rhys Davids, T.W. and J. Estlin Carpenter, eds. 1886. *The Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī, Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya*. Part I. London: Henry Frowde.
- Tolk (*Tolkāppiyam*): Sastri, P.S. Subrahmanya, trans. 1999. *Tolkāppiyam: The Earliest Tamil Grammar with a short commentary in English. Volume I* Eḷuttatikāram. Chennai: The Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute.
- Vīr (*Vīracōḷiyam*): Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar, ed. 2005. *Vīracōḷiyam*. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, École Française D'Extrême-Orient.
- Vmv B^e (*Vimativinodanī*): *CSCD Tipiṭaka (Roman)*, s.v. “Vimativinodanī”.
- Vsm (*Visuddhimagga*): Warren, Henry Clarke, ed. 1950. *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya*. Revised by Dharmanda Kosambi. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Secondary Literature

- Auroux, S. (1994). *La Révolution Technologique de la Grammatisation*. Liège: Mardaga.
- Bechert, H. (1993). The *Nikāyas* of Mediaeval Sri Lanka and the unification of the Sangha by Parākrāmabāhu I. In N. K. Nagle & F. Watanabe (Eds.), *Studies on Buddhism in honour of Professor A.K. Warder* (pp. 11–21). Toronto: Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Toronto.
- Bizot, F. (1988). *Les traditions de la pabbajjā en Asie du Sud-Est, Recherches sur le bouddhisme khmer*, IV. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht in Göttingen - Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen.* Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, no. 169.
- Bühler, G. 1980 (repr. 1904). *Indian paleography*. New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation.
- Burnell, A. C. (1878). *Elements of South-Indian Palaeography: From the Fourth to the Seventeenth Century A.D.* London: Trüber & Co.
- Chevillard, J. L. (2008). *Companion volume to the Cēṅāvaraiyam on Tamil morphology and syntax. Le commentaire de Cēṅāvaraiyar sur le Collatikāram du Tolkāppiyam. English introduction, glossaire analytique, appendices* (Vol. 2). Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, École Française D'Extrême-Orient.
- Ciotti, G. (2012). The representation of Sanskrit speech-sounds: Philological and linguistic historiographies. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Ciotti, G. (2014). Like a howling *Piśāca*: A note on the pronunciation of the *R̥gvedasamhitā*. In G. Ciotti, A. Gornall and P. Visigalli (Eds.), *Puṣpikā: Tracing ancient India through texts and traditions* (Vol. 2, pp. 41–60). Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Cone, M. (2001). *Dictionary of Pali*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Cousins, L. S. (2001). On the Vibhajjavādins: the Mahimsāsaka, Dhammaguttaka, Kassapiya and Tambapaṇṇiya branches of the ancient Theriyas. *Buddhist Studies Review*, 18, 131–182.
- Crosby, K. (2000). Uddis and Ācikh: Buddhaghosa on the Inclusion of the *Sikkhāpada* in the *Pabbajjā* Ceremony. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 28, 461–477.
- Crosby, K. (2004). The origin of Pāli as a language name in medieval Theravāda literature. *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka*, 2, 70–117.
- Fernando, P. E. E. (1949). Palaeographical development of the Brāhmī script in Ceylon from 3rd century B.C. to 7th century A.D. *University of Ceylon Review*, VII(4), 282–301.
- Fernando, P. E. E. (1950). The development of the Sinhalese script from 8th century A.D. to 15th century A.D. *University of Ceylon Review*, VIII(3), 222–243.
- Fernando, P. E. E. (1982). A note on three old Sinhalese palm-leaf manuscripts. *Sri Lanka Journal of the Humanities*, 8, 147–157.

- Franke, R. O. (1913). *Dīghanikāya. Das Buch der Langen Texte des buddhistischen Kanons in Auswahl übersetzt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Freeman, R. (1998). Rubies and coral: The lapidary crafting of language in Kerala. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 57, 38–65.
- Gair, J. W. (1985). How Dravidianized was Sinhala phonology? Some conclusions and cautions. *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications*, No. 20, For Gordon H. Fairbanks, 37–55.
- Geiger, W., trans. (1953a). *Cūlavaṃsa: Being the more recent part of the Mahāvaṃsa, part I. Translated from the German by Mrs. C. Mabel Rickmers*. Colombo: The Ceylon Government Information Department.
- Geiger, W., trans. (1953b). *Cūlavaṃsa: Being the more recent part of the Mahāvaṃsa, part II. Translated from the German by Mrs. C. Mabel Rickmers*. Colombo: The Ceylon Government Information Department.
- Geiger, W. (2005). *A Pāli Grammar*. Translated by Batakrishna Ghosh. Revised and Edited by K.R. Norman. Oxford: The Pāli Text Society.
- Gethin, R. (2004). Can killing a living being ever be an act of compassion? The analysis of the act of killing in the Abhidhamma and Pāli commentaries. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, 11, 167–202.
- Gunawardana, R. (1979). *Robe and plough: Monasticism and economic interest in early medieval Laṅkā*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Hallisey, C. (2003). Works and persons in Sinhala literary culture. In S. Pollock (Ed.), *Literary cultures in history: Reconstructions from South Asia* (pp. 689–746). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- von Hinüber, O. (1987). Das buddhistische Recht und die Phonetik des Pāli. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13/14 (Festschrift für Wilhelm Rau), 101–127.
- von Hinüber, O. (1994). Buddhist law and the phonetics of Pāli. In *Selected papers on Pāli studies*, O. von Hinüber (pp. 198–232). Oxford: The Pāli Text Society.
- Jacobi, H. (1879). Das qualitätsgesetz in den Prākṛitsprachen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*, XXV, 292–298.
- Jamieson, J. (1818). *An etymological dictionary of the Scottish language*. Edinburgh: Abernethy & Walker.
- Kahrs, E. (1998). *Indian semantic analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Katre, S. M., trans. (1987). *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini in Roman Transliteration*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kieffer-pülz, P. (2005). Die Klassifizierung des Alkoholverbots in der buddhistischen Rechtsliteratur der Theravādin. In P. Schalk, et al. (eds.), *Im Dickicht der Gebote. Studien zur Dialektik von Norm und Praxis in der Buddhismusgeschichte Asiens* (Vol. 26, pp. 153–223). Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum.
- Liyanagamage, A. (1978). A forgotten aspect of the relations between the Sinhalese and the Tamils: The Upasakajanalankara: A re-examination of its date and authorship and its significance in the history of South India and Ceylon. *The Ceylon Historical Journal*, 25(1–4), 95–142.
- Matsumura, J. (1999). Remarks on the Rasavāhinī and the related literature. *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, XXV, 155–172.
- Monius, A. E. (2001). *Imagining a place for Buddhism: Literary culture and religious community in Tamil-speaking South India*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Oberlies, T. (2001). *Pāli: A grammar of the language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Paranavitana, S. (1944). Negapatam and Theravāda Buddhism in South India. *Journal of the Greater India Society*, XI, 17–25.
- Paranavitana, S. (1960). *History of Ceylon* (Vol. 1). Colombo: University of Ceylon Press Board.
- Pind, O. H. (1996). Saddavimāla 12.I–II and its Mūlasarvāstivādin origin. In F. Bizot & F. Lagarde (Eds.), *La Pureté par les mots* (pp. 67–72). Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Pind, O. H. (2012). Pāli grammar and grammarians from Buddhaghosa to Vajirabuddhi: A survey. *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, XXXI, 57–121.
- Pischel, R. (1900). *Grammatik Der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Strassburg: Verlag Von Karl J. Trübner.
- Pollock, S. (1998). The cosmopolitan vernacular. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 57(1), 6–37.
- Pollock, S. (2006). *The language of the gods in the world of men: Sanskrit, culture, and power in pre-modern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rhys Davids, T. W., & Stede, W. (1999) (Reprint). *The Pāli Text Society's Pāli–English Dictionary*. Oxford: Pāli Text Society.
- Senart, M. E., trans. (1871). *Kaccāyana et la Littérature Grammaticale du Pāli. 1re partie. Grammaire Pālie de Kaccāyana, sūtras et commentaire*. Paris: L'Imprimerie Nationale.

- De Silva, K. M. (1981). *A history of Sri Lanka*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- De Silva, R. C. (1999) (Repr. 1987). *Sri Lanka: A history*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- Skilling, P. (2007). King, Sangha, and Brahmins: Ideology, ritual and power in pre-modern Siam. In I. Harris (Ed.), *Buddhism, power and political order* (pp. 182–215). London: Routledge.
- Skilling, P., Carbine, J., Cicuzza, C., & Pakdeekham, S. (Eds.). (2012). *How Theravāda is Theravāda? Exploring Buddhist identities*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.
- Subhūti, V. 2001 (repr. 1876). *Nāmaṃālā*. Delhi: Asian Educational Services.
- Swearer, D. K., & Premchit, S. (1977). Mūlasāsanā Wat Pā Daeng: The chronicle of the founding of Buddhism of the Wat Pā Daeng tradition. *Journal of the Siam Society*, 65, 73–110.
- Tieken, H. (2002). The Buddhist Pavāraṇā ceremony according to the Pāli Vinaya. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 30, 271–289.
- Walters, J. S. (1999). Mahāsena at the Mahāvihāra: On the interpretation and politics of history in pre-colonial Sri Lanka. In D. Ali (Ed.), *Invoking the past: The uses of history in South Asia* (pp. 322–366). Oxford: Oxford University Press.